INTERPRETATIONS AND EMENDATIONS OF EARLY ENGLISH TEXTS.

(Cf. *Anglia* N. F. XIII, XIV.)

III.

This section shall be devoted chiefly to some passages in *Beowulf* (cf. the list on pp. 236—237). I shall quote the following editions, translations, and other works relative to the subject:

AfdA. = *Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Philologie*.

Archiv = *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*.

BARNOUW, *Textkritische Untersuchungen nach dem Gebrauch des best. Artikels*, Leiden 1902.

Beitr. = *Beiträge zur Gesch. d. deutschen Spr. und Literatur*.

TEN BRINK, *Untersuchungen, in Quellen u. Forsch.* no. 62, Strassburg 1888.

BOSWORTH-TOLLER, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, Oxford 1882—1898.

COSIJN, *Aanteekeningen op den Beowulf*, Leiden 1892.

Est. = *Englische Studien*.

GARNETT (translation), Boston 1885.

GREIN, *Bibliothek der ags. Poesie*, Cassel und Göttingen 1857—1864.

GRUNDTVIG (edition), Kjöbenhavn 1861.

HALL (translation), London 1901.

HEYNE-SOCIN (edition), Paderborn (1888) 1898. [Cf. Postscript.]

HOLDER (edition), Freiburg 1899.

KEMBLE (edition), London 1837.

THORPE (edition), Oxford 1855.

SIEVERS, *Beowulf und Saxo*, in *Ber. ü. d. Verhandl. d. kgl. sächs. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. zu Leipzig, Philol.-histor. Classe*, 1895.

SWEET, *An Anglo-Saxon Reader*, Oxford 1898.

TRAUTMANN, *Berichtigungen, Vermutungen und Erklärungen zum Beowulf*, in *Bonner Beiträge zur Anglistik*, Heft II, 1899.

WÜLCKER, *Bibliothek der ags. Poesie I*, Kassel 1881 (1883).

WYATT (edition), Cambridge 1901.

ZfdA. = *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*.

ZfdPh. = *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*.

ZUPITZA (edition), E. E. T. S. 77, London 1882.

Where one of the above authors is mentioned without book-title, the work here indicated is alluded to.

60. *Oft Scyld Scefing sceapen[a] preatum,
monegum mægþum, meodu-setla ofteah,
egsode eorl, syððan ærest wearð
fea-sceafst funden* 4—7.

*Þær genehost brægd
eorl Beowolfes ealde lafe* 794—795.

*Þær on bence wæs
ofer æþelinge yþ-gesene
heapo-steapa helm, hringed byrne* 1243—45.

HEYNE-SOCIN take *eorl* in l. 6 to be the subject of the clause, the word being used of king Scyld, and *egsode* to be an intransitive verb: "had experienced terror, or trouble". This is to give to the verb a signification which it is not known to have elsewhere.¹⁾ GREIN, GARNETT, and HOLDER likewise look on *eorl* as the subject, but allow the verb to keep its usual, transitive, meaning: "the earl frightened, caused terror". However, we miss an object, the more so on account of the expected parallelism of the members (*ofteah* + objectives = *egsode* + objective). KEMBLE, THORPE, SIEVERS, TRAUTMANN, BARNOUW²⁾ therefore take the noun to be the object, but do not approve of it in its present shape: sense, or rhythm, or both, they think, require the plural *eorlas*. I have quoted the two other passages out of Beowulf in order to show that there is no necessity for such an alteration as far as the meaning is concerned. *Eorl* in both instances and *æþelinge* in l. 1244 are singular in form, plural in sense.³⁾ And it is not advisable to build much on metrical theories. Who has actually proved that *egsode eorl*, earlier *эгсòðæ eorl*, is "zu kurz", or more "falsch", or "anstössig", or "mangelhaft"

¹⁾ Cf. SIEVERS, TRAUTMANN. ²⁾ p. 27.

³⁾ HEYNE-SOCIN's 5th edition referred *æþelinge* to Beowulf, although l. 1299 states expressly: *Næs Beowulf ðær*. In the 6th edition the error is corrected, and the right explanation is given, introduced however by a hesitant "vielleicht". It is sure enough that the word is used, just as *beor-scealca sum* 1240, with reference to all those of king Hroðgar's men, *unrim eorla* 1238, who stayed in the Hall, after the king — as well as Beowulf — had retired, and who there, when making preparations to go to sleep, true to their custom, kept their arms beside them: over the warrior's head was seen his helmet and corslet.

(SIEVERS, TRAUTMANN, SARRAZIN¹⁾, BARNOUW) than *únfægne eorl* 573, *ándlōngne eorl* 2695? or that *gyddode þus* Metr. 1: 84 ought to be twisted about, or that *irena cyst* 673 (= *ireнна cyst* 802) requires an emendation? I therefore unscrupulously recommend the retaining of the line in its handed-down shape and translate it: "terrified many a warrior".²⁾

61. *þæt hine on ylde eft gewunigen*
wil-gesipas, þonne wiȝ cume,
leode gelæsten 22—24.

þonne his sunu hangað
hrefne to hroðre, and he him helpan ne mæg,
eald and infrod, ænige gefremman 2447—49.

The structure of the former sentence is misrepresented in BOSWORTH-TOLLER'S "*Ðæt hine ðonne wiȝ come leode gelæsten*", that the people serve him when war comes", in HEYNE-SOCIN'S "c. acc. pers.: *þæt hine . . . leode gelæsten*", and in WYATT'S "*gelæstan*, with acc. or dat., serve". There is no *hine . . . gelæsten* in this sentence, nor in any other. It is the verb *gewunigen* alone that governs the accusative case; *gelæsten*, in the sense of "follow", "serve", here and always requires the dative. But the poet felt no necessity of repeating, in another shape, the pronoun of the former verb before the latter; *hine* serves for a *him* as

¹⁾ Engl. Stud. 28, 407.

²⁾ Even where a line is metrically faulty, we should not confuse two so different objects as 1. the interpretation and emendation of a text such as it actually appears in a late unique MS., and 2. the restoration of the original text. Verses which, in all probability, appeared right enough to an average 10th century hearer or scribe, are justifiable in their way, quite independently of the fact that the poem had gradually assumed a shape very different from the original one. Whoever thinks he can, in part at least, trace that original shape, let him do so; let him not content himself with accepting whatever gives an acceptable meaning, and emending only what seems to be a blunder or give no sense at all; let him also rearrange words, phrases, clauses, lines; let him give a large number of notes on the text, or even publish a separate, reconstructed Beowulf, which we will receive with more or less confidence and gratitude; but let him forego his claims (see e. g. TRAUTMANN in *Anglia Beibl.* 10, 257—258) on having his, or anybody else's, "7th century" guesses introduced into ordinary editions of the 10th century text!

well. The same phenomenon, as important as it is simple, meets us in the latter of the passages quoted. *Helpan*, whether only "vom Schreiber als Infinitiv gemeint" (SIEVERS¹⁾), or used by the poet himself, is an infinitive and governs the dative case. (KEMBLE, THORPE, RIEGER²), BOSWORTH-TOLLER p. 592 a substitute *helpe*; GREIN, HEYNE-SOCIN, WYATT, BOSWORTH-TOLLER p. 527 b assume a weak *helpe*, acc. *helpan*, not otherwise known.) *Ænize*, whether originally meant for an accusative or not, appears here as an instrumental: "by anything", "in any way". *Zefremman* requires an accusative; and the acc. can be mentally supplied out of *him*. The sentence, as it stands, means: "and he, old and stricken in years, cannot help him, assist him in any way". Further examples: Beow. 47—49, 673—674, Genesis 250—251 (misunderstood by ETTMÜLLER and RIEGER²). Finally I will mention instances like: *weana gehwelcne*, *sidra sorȝa* Beow. 148—149, where *gehwelcne* includes *gehwelce*.

62. *swa he selfa bæd,*
þenden wordum weold wine Scyldinga,
leof land-fruma lange ahte 29—31.

The old king Scyld was dead. His men placed his remains on a ship, "as he himself had bidden, whilst the Scyldings' friend could give orders, [whilst] the dear prince of the country . . ." Here it seems hard to find a good continuation. Many attempts have been made, but all, I believe, in vain. THORPE and GREIN make of the last line an independent clause: he had long been owner (viz. of the land). BUGGÆ³) places it after l. 32. HEYNE-SOCIN, not willing to sacrifice the parallelism of the members, want *geweald* to be mentally supplied (out of *wordum weold* in the preceding line): "[whilst] the dear prince had long possessed the power". RIEGER⁴), feeling the want of a proper objective, proposes *lif* for *leof*. KLUGE⁵), from a similar motive, suggests *lændas* or *land* for *lange*. LÜBKE⁶) proposes *land leodfruma*. COSIJN and TRAUTMANN rid themselves of the troublesome objectless verb, the former by the substitution of *lange þrage*, "a long time",

¹) ZfdPh. 21, 357.

²) See WÜLCKER.

³) Beitr. 12, 80.

⁴) ZfdPh. 3, 382.

⁵) Beitr. 9, 188.

⁶) AfdA. 19, 342.

the latter by the less violent alteration into *langre ahte*, "the long possession". SIEVERS¹⁾, despairing of an acceptable emendation, takes recourse to the supposition of a lacuna. — Thus there are three points kept in view by the various interpreters: 1. the adhering to the MS. (THORPE, GREIN, HEYNE-SOCIN, in a sense also SIEVERS), 2. the parallelism of the members (HEYNE, RIEGER, KLUGE, LÜBKE), 3. the obtaining of an objective (RIEGER, KLUGE, LÜBKE), or else the removing of the verb (COSIJN, TRAUTMANN). Each interpreter has been forced to sacrifice one or two of these points, irreconcilable as they have seemed to be. BUGGE, venturesome in his emendatory speculations, throws them all up, and thrusts the whole line into another context. Moreover it may be remarked²⁾ that HEYNE-SOCIN give no satisfactory proof of the "kühnen, im Beowulf auch sonst nicht unerhörten Konstruktionen, in denen das Objekt eines folgenden Satzgliedes aus einer sinnverwanten Phrase des vorhergehenden zu verstehen ist". There is no corresponding construction in the poem; for those mentioned in No. 61 are very different. RIEGER's and LÜBKE's alterations give us an uncommon word-order. Besides, the adverb *lange*, both in HEYNE-SOCIN's and RIEGER's periods, appears out of place. KLUGE's *land* would, apart from metrical considerations, be a poor tautology, whereas his *lændagas* would do well, had we only the smallest certainty for the correctness of the guess. The same may be said of COSIJN's and TRAUTMANN's attempts.

I propose an entirely new way of reading the MS.³⁾, a way which disposes at once of all the difficulties, and reconciles all the various claims. Six lines above, on the same page of the MS., we find *mange* (end of line) [*þ*] *eon*, which means *man gefeon*; on the second next leaf: *Nege* (end of line) *feah*, which is *Ne gefeah*. In the same way I here read: *lan geahte*.

Lan, whence the modern *loan*, is the well-known side-form of *læn*, due to Scandinavian influence, and quoted by BOSWORTH-TOLLER from Codex Diplom. Ævi Saxon., ed. Kemble, III 165, 5: *he hit hæfde to lanlande*. Or else we may assume

¹⁾ Beitr. 9, 136.

²⁾ Cf. RIEGER, l. c., COSIJN.

³⁾ The MS. has *lange* (end of line) *ahte*; WÜLCKER's *lange* is an inadvertency.

the accidental omission of a small loop, a prior copy necessarily having had *læn*. *Ʒeahte* is the past tense of *Ʒeagan*, "obtain", "possess", not recorded by BOSWORTH-TOLLER, but found in Ælfric's Homilies.¹⁾ Compounds given by BOSWORTH-TOLLER are the adj. *Ʒeagen*, the verb *Ʒeagnian*, and so forth. *Lan Ʒeahte* means: "possessed the grant", i. e. the land or the transitory life lent him by God (*lænland*, *læne lif*, *lændagas*).

63. *Ʒa wæs on uhtan mid ær-dæge*
Ʒrendles Ʒuð-cræft Ʒumum undyrne;
þa wæs æfter wiste wop up ahafen,
micel morgen-sweg 126—129.

I here emphatically pronounce my approval of COSIJN'S and TRAUTMANN'S view in opposition to TEN BRINK'S, HEYNE-SOCIN'S, and HOLDER'S. The poet cannot have been unpoetical enough to express the grief of the Danes by saying that they were lamenting "on account of Grendel's food"! SOCIN'S remark: "Zu Gunsten unserer Erklärung sei verwiesen auf Greins Sprachschatz s. h. v., wo das Flusswasser als Heimat der eszbaren Fische *vistum gehladen* genannt ist", is not to the point. It would be better to refer to the other passage in the epos itself where the word is used: *wunað he on wiste* 1735. There it means "eating", "feasting", "enjoyment". The Danes had arranged beds for themselves in the Hall *æfter beorþege* (117); they slept there *æfter symble* (119); now there was a *wop æfter wiste*: the weal of the evening was followed by woe in the morning.

64. *ne þær nænig witenas wenan þorfte*
beorhtre bote to banan folmum 157—158.
Ʒonne wene ic to þe wyrsan Ʒeþingea
ðeah þu heaðo-ræsa Ʒehwær dohte 525—526.
and him to anwaldan are Ʒelyfde
frofre and fultum 1272—73.
Ʒys dozor þu Ʒeþyld hafa
weana Ʒehwylces, swa ic þe wene to! 1395—96.

BOSWORTH-TOLLER (p. 46 a) translate l. 1272: "in him as sole ruler reverently trusted"; HEYNE-SOCIN (under *to*, adv.):

¹⁾ SWEET'S Reader p. 65, l. 122.

“vertraute für sich auf des Allmächtigen Hilfe”. The former of these translations requires no refutation; the latter gives the right sense, but shows an entire misapprehension of the syntactical relations. *To* is not an “adv.,” or what I would call a postposition, governing the preceding *him*; it is a preposition, governing the subsequent *anwaldan*, which in consequence is not a genitive, but a dative. *Him* is a reflective dative, which need not exactly be rendered by any special word. The right translation is this: “and believed in help [for himself] from the Monarch (God)”. A sufficient proof is the following parallel: *se ðe him to ðam halȝan helpe ȝelifeð, to ȝode ȝioce, he þær ȝearo findeð* Waldere B 27—28. The construction is the same in the case of *wenan*: the person for whom something is expected, is expressed by a dative, e. g. *hwelces wites ge wenen ðam þe oðre men reafiað* Cura Past. p. 328, l. 13 (E. E. T. S. 50); *ða dieglan sætinga, þe he him* (reflective dative) *wenan mæg* ib. p. 162, l. 14; the person, again, in, or with, or of, or from whom (or the place where, or from where) something is expected, is expressed by *to* + a dative (or by an adverb: *þær*, etc.), e. g. *Ðæs ilcan is to wenanne to callum ðam ȝesældum þe seo wyrd brenȝð* Boethius p. 84, l. 6 (ed. Cardale); *ælcum ðara ðe him ænges yfles to wend* Cura past. p. 451, l. 25; see the numerous examples in WÜLFING’s Syntax.¹⁾ L. 1396 b, therefore, should be rendered: “as I expect of you (from thee)” (BOSWORTH-TOLLER p. 991 a, WYATT), not “wie ich dir zuhoffe” (HEYNE-SOCIN); l. 158 is misplaced in HEYNE-SOCIN’s Glossary (under *to* I 1). As for l. 525, TRAUTMANN is right in his opinion that *ȝepinȝea* (or *ȝepinȝes*?) does not mean “Verhängnisse” (HEYNE-SOCIN), but has the same signification as in ll. 398, 709, i. e. “result”; in all the three lines the word is used in connection with verbs which mean “abide”, “wait for”. But he shares HEYNE-SOCIN’s error regarding *to þe*, when he translates: “Dann fürcht ich für dich schlechtern ausgang”. The line means: “dann erwarte ich von dir schlechteres resultat” (= dass du in dem kampf weniger leisten wirst).²⁾

¹⁾ Die Syntax in den Werken Alfreds des Grossen, Bonn 1894.

²⁾ The article *to* in HEYNE-SOCIN’s Glossary is a weak performance also in other respects. Under I 3 b the editors have jumbled up the most

65. *no he þone gif-stol gretan moste,*
maþðum for metode, ne his myne wisse 168—169.

TRAUTMANN, the last commentator on these lines, wants, like HOLTZMANN¹⁾ before him, to refer *he* to Hroðgar, which is simply impossible. The fact that Grendel is the acting personage in the fifteen preceding lines, whereas Hroðgar is not mentioned at all after l. 152 (and not even there as the subject of the sentence), ought in itself to be a sufficient proof, and TRAUTMANN admits that it is “zu beachten”. But there is another circumstance which is decisive. “Man sieht sofort ein”, says T., “warum Hroðgar den tron nicht berühren durfte: das Grendelübel, mit dem Gott ihn heimsuchte, wehrte es ihm”. Similarly HOLTZMANN.¹⁾ This is nonsense. Hroðgar sat on his throne just as before (*secg wisode under Heorotes hrof* 402—403, *þær Hroðgar sæt mid his eorla gedriht* 356—357) — till the dark came on. Then he went to bed (*siððan nipende niht, scadu-helma gesceapu, scriðan cwoman* 648—650, *him Hroþgar gewat mid his hæleþa gedryht ut of healle: wolde wig-fruma Wealhþeo secan, cwen to zebeddan* 662—665). He used to do so even when no “Grendelübel” threatened (1236—37, 1791—92), and had not the smallest desire to sit up on the throne in *sweartum nihtum*! In other terms: it was only the using of the Hall as a sleeping-place that was put a stop to by Grendel’s visitations. Accordingly Beowulf says to the king, when standing before the throne in Heorot: *secgað sæ-liðend, þæt þes sele stande idel and unnyt, siððan æfen-leoht under heofenes hador beholen weorþeð* (411—414).

Thus we may feel satisfied that it was Grendel who could not *þone gif-stol gretan*. This last expression has carried the thoughts of some (e. g. GREIN²⁾, KÖRNER²⁾, TEN BRINK) to God’s Seat of Mercy — as if that had anything to do with Grendel’s nocturnal expeditions. Others have tried to force into it the strange significations “destroy the Hall”

heterogeneous matter. The sentences with the verbs *geliefan*, *wenan*, *wilnian* (‘602’, ‘525’, ‘2923’, ‘188’ under I 3, ‘158’ under I 1, ‘1273’ under II 1) are more closely allied to those in I 2 than to ‘1139’. Different, again, is ‘1579’; ‘648’ belongs to I 1.

¹⁾ Germania 8, 489 f.

²⁾ See WÜLCKER.

(WÜLCKER¹⁾) and "approach the Altar" (SARRAZIN²⁾). HEYNE-SOCIN and COSIJN believe it denotes the solemn ascending on Hroðgar's throne, the distribution of gifts from it, nay, the wielding of the sceptre over the Danish nation. Fancy Grendel, who never appeared except in the night, a pretender to the Danish throne! Others, again, suppose Grendel, after entering the Hall, to have been prevented by God, or "by a vague awe", from destroying the throne (KÖLBING³⁾) or even from mounting or touching it (HALL, BROOKE⁴⁾). But what on earth had the demon to do with an empty seat?⁵⁾ To read of the atrocities committed — and permitted — in ll. 740 ff., 1294 f., 1420 ff., and the havoc played in ll. 771 ff., and yet believe in a special divine care for a piece of furniture! Indeed, after the demon had got into the Hall, he did what he chose. But he did not get in till after dark. That is the point. Only when night set in, and the festive Hall was transformed into a dormitory, did he leave his dismal haunts. He could not partake in the festivities of the day, not step, like the others, before the precious throne to salute the Monarch (and receive his gifts); for he was prevented by the Creator, a stranger to Him. He was excluded from the society and rejoicings of men (*dreamum bedæled* 721) and bore God's wrath (*godes yrre bær* 711), like his ancestor Cain (*he þa faḡ gewat, morþre gemearcod, man-dream fleon, westen warode* 1263—65). Cf. ll. 103—114.

To this I will briefly add that GRUNDTVIG supposes a lacuna; GREIN translates: "dem gabenstuhle nahen und kleinod-gaben heischen"; POGATSCHER⁶⁾, whose arguments concerning l. 168 coincide with mine, proposes *for-metode*, "verschmähte", which would both give us a ἀπαξ λεγόμενον, and make of the rejected one a rejecter.

TRAUTMANN's doubts of l. 711 are superfluous.

66. *Ʒesloh þin fæder fæhðe mæste* 459.

TRAUTMANN says: "Es scheint mir völlig unbeweisbar, dass *geslean fæhðe* heissen solle 'einen kampf kämpfen', ganz

¹⁾ Anglia 1, 185 f.

²⁾ Anglia 19, 369 f.

³⁾ Est. 3, 92.

⁴⁾ See Beitr. 19, 544.

⁵⁾ WÜLCKER, l. c., asks the same question.

⁶⁾ Beitr. 19, 544 f.

abgesehen davon, dass *fæhðð* nicht 'kampf' sondern 'feindschaft' bedeutet." He adds that no similar phrases are to be found. To this I wish to remark firstly that in *fæhðe* the idea of "hostility" has more or less distinctly passed over into that of "hostile deed, or action", "flight", also in ll. 109, 1380, 1537, 2513, 2618, etc., secondly that, if this be the case, there seems to be no essential difference between *wig gefeohtan* 1083 and *fæhðe geslean* 459. Neither phrase occurs more than once in the poem. In Ælfred's works we find *size geslean* (Bede) synonymous to *size gefeohtan* (Cura Past.). There are difficulties enough in *Beowulf* without creating fresh ones.

67. *Siððan þa fæhððe feo þingode,*
sende ic Wylfmægum ofer wæteres hrycg
ealde madmas 470—472.
- sippan geara in gold-wine mine*
hrusan heolstre biwrah and ic hean þonan
wod winter-cearrig Wanderer 22—24.

Both these passages are considered faulty by many scholars. TRAUTMANN says of the former: "Zwischen *siððan* und *þa* ist ein schon öfter verlangtes *ic* einzuschieben, das zwar der vers, nicht aber die grammatik entbehren kann." In the latter, ETTMÜLLER¹⁾, GREIN, RIEGER¹⁾, WÜLCKER, SWEET, JACOBSEN²⁾ change *heolstre* into *heolster*. I here place the two attacked sentences together for mutual support. In both, the pronoun is given only in connection with the latter of two co-ordinated verbs. This is a construction of which I can but say that it is in harmony with the peculiar ways of Old English versification, where a pronoun is not unfrequently omitted and where often a fuller expression follows on a less definite one. I therefore consider BOSWORTH-TOLLER's translation (p. 968) correct. An analogous passage is the following:

nymeð nyð-badee, nænægum arað
leode Deniga, ac he lust wigeð 598—599.

¹⁾ See WÜLCKER.

²⁾ Darstellung der syntaktischen Erscheinungen im ags. Gedichte vom Wanderer. Rostock 1901.

68. *ætwtiton weana dæl* 1150.

oð þæt him on innan ofer-hygda dæl
weaxeð and wridað 1740—41.

Þy ic Heoðobearna hylde ne telge,
dryht-sibbe dæl, Denum unfæcne 2067—68.

Biowulfe wearð
dryht-maðma dæl deaðe forgolden 2842—43.

BOSWORTH-TOLLER, under *dæl*, do not bestow one word on the peculiar usage of the word exemplified in the above quotations. Under *dryht-sib* they render l. 2067 f.: "I esteem not part of the Heathobeards' lordly kinship to the Danes guileless." HEYNE-SOCIN say: "Oft hebt *dæl* die einem Individuum überhaupt eigene Stimme einer Sache oder Eigenschaft hervor", and translates l. 1740 f.: "bis ihm im Innern sein Teil des Uebermuts wächst, d. h. was ihm überhaupt an Uebermut eigen ist, sein Uebermut"; likewise l. 2842 f.: "Beowulf ward sein Teil der herrlichen Schätze mit dem Tode vergolten, d. h. was ihm an herrlichen Schätzen bestimmt war, was er davon im Drachenkampfe erobern konnte." HALL renders l. 1150: "blamed them for their share of woes"; and so forth. This is not satisfactory. *Dæl*, here, does not mean "part", nor yet simply the individual share in a thing or experience, feeling or quality. The share must be a large one. The idea of something considerable, frequent, or numerous, is always prevalent, as in the modern *a deal* (*a good deal, a great deal*). Although GREIN was partly on the right track, and COSIUS¹⁾ (in 1892) briefly stated the true signification, the editions keep on misleading the student. *Weana dæl* 1150 = "their manifold misfortunes"; *ofer-hygda dæl* 1740 = "a good deal of presumption", "great pride"; *dryht-sibbe dæl* 2068 = "their great friendship"; *dryht-maðma dæl* 2843 = "his numerous treasures", "the many costly things"; and so forth. Further examples: Beow. 1752, 2028, 2245, *wintra dæl*, "a good many years" Wanderer 65; *wundres dæl*, "a great wonder" Cynewulf's Riddles 61, 10.

¹⁾ p. 33.

69. *þær se goda sæt,*
Beowulf ġeata be þæm ġebroðrum twæm 1190—91.

TRAUTMANN says: "Solche verbindungen wie *Beowulf Ġeata* (*Ġeata* als gen. plur. genommen) sind sonst m. w. nicht nachweisbar, wol aber sprechen solche wie *Wulf Wonreding* für nom. sing. *Ġeata*." Cf. *Beowulf Scyldinga* 53, *Hreþel ġeata* 374, *Beowulf ġeata* 676, *Hnæf Scyldinga* 1069, *Higelac ġeata* 1202. The first *Scyldinga* is "metrisch fehlerhaft und sprachlich auffallend", says TRAUTMANN. What about the second (l. 1069)? The genitive is certainly proved through the above quotations — as far as the late MS. is concerned. As for the original shape of the poem, in this case and many others, cf. the second footnote on p. 220.

70. *nu oþer cwom*
mihƿig man-scaða, wolde hyre mæg wrecan,
ge feor hafað fæhðe ġestæled,
þæs þe þincean mæg þegne monegum,
se þe æfter sinc-ġyfan on sefan ġreoteþ,
hreþer-bealo hearde 1338—43.
þa ic on morgne ġefrægn mæg oðerne
billes ecgum on bonan stælan,
þær Ongenþeow Eofores niosað 2484—86.

These passages, the only two in *Beowulf* where the verb (*ġe*)*stælan* is employed, have both been misunderstood. I venture to say the same of:

- leoht sceal wið þystrum,*
fyrð wið fyrde, feond wið oðrum,
lað wið laþe ymb land sacan,
synne stælan Gnostic Verses Cott. 51—54,
Feowertig daga fæhðe ic wille
on weras stælan Genesis 1351—52,

and (the corrupt):

- hu hie him on edwit oft asettað*
swarte sust-bonan . . . stæleð
fæhðe & in firne þær ðe hie drihten
ecne anwaldan oft forġeaton
 Chr. & Sat. 273—276 (639—642),

so that the lexicographic account of the verb (*ge*)*stælan* requires a thorough revision. (*Ge*)*stælan hwæt on hwone* means "lay something to somebody's charge", hence "call him to account for it", "avenge it on him". In the majority of sentences quoted by BOSWORTH-TOLLER, the idea of charging, or accusing, or upbraiding, is quite distinct: *on me fyrene gestælan*, "impute crime to me"; *ðy læs on me mæge leagung beon gestæled*, "ne mendacio dignus efficiar"; *ðara ðinga ðe hine mon on stælde* (accused him of); *ðec soð on stældun*, "brought a true charge against thee"; *stældon on me ðæt ic ne nyste*, "quae ignorabam interrogabant me"; similarly: *us synne gestælan*, "accuse us of sin", etc. The object of the active (the subject of the passive) clause is in each case a real or imputed crime or injury (*fyrene*, *synne*, etc.). As quite analogous to these sentences I construe the fifth of the opening quotations. It refers to such souls as have been sent to Hell, and there endure the Devil's conversation. The subject of *stæleð* is missing, apparently *Satanas* or some similar word. *Fæhðe & in firne* contains one word too many. (Confusion and repetition of *&* and *in* I have come across more than once in old MSS.) THORPE leaves the text unamended. BOUTERWEK¹⁾, GREIN, WÜLCKER, and BOSWORTH-TOLLER read *fæhðe in firne*, DIETRICH¹⁾, *fæhðe in firnum*. Not one has suggested *fæhðe & firne*! And yet this is such a common collocation; cf. *fæhðe and fyrene* Beow. 137 and 2480, *fæhðe and fyrena* 879, *fyrene and fæhðe* 153. The way in which all those editors and lexicographers have dealt with the passage would to me appear most surprising, did not the misapprehension of *stæleð* ("*Stæleþ fæhðe*, declares enmity", BOSWORTH-TOLLER) account for the fact. One error has generated another. How many of the learned gentlemen take *in firne* (*in firnum*) to mean "in the torment(s) of Hell", I have not tried to ascertain; nor do I know what sense they, from their point of view, can possibly wrest out of the succeeding relative clause. Something seems to be amiss also in that clause, as there is no alliteration in the latter half of the third line; but it need not be anything that influences the meaning. At all events the clause, as it stands, gives, in my way of looking at it, perfect sense:

¹⁾ See WÜLCKER.

*hu hie him on edwit oft asettað,
 swarte susl-bonan, [Satanas] stæleð,
 fæhðe and firne, þær ðe hie drihten,
 ecne anwaldan, oft forȝeaton,*

"how they, the black tormenting manslaughterers (i. e. devils) oft reproach them with, and how Satan accuses them of, the enmity and crime in which they so oft forgot the Lord, the eternal Monarch."

The same enmity against God which is the object of *stæleð* in the passage now discussed, is the object of *stælan* in the quotation out of Genesis. Thus *fæhðe* 1351 is not used "of the threatened deluge" (BOSWORTH-TOLLER p. 908 a); it does not mean "vengeance" (p. 264 b); it does not denote God's "vijandschap" against mankind (COSIJN p. 23); but it expresses the relation of the sons of Seth to God after their taking wives out of Cain's cursed race (Gen. 1248—52, 1257—59). Those who had before been *on friðe* (1262) with their Creator, became *wær-logan* (1266) through their association with God's *feonda* race (1259); so that the expression *fæhðe* is in perfect keeping with the whole way of putting matters. Hence the correct translation of the lines is this: "During forty days I will avenge on men their hostility."

Just as here the idea of accusing or upbraiding has developed into that of avenging, so also in the quotations from the Gnostic Verses and Beowulf. SWEET renders *synne stælan* by "institute injury, or hostility", COSIJN by "veete, vijandschap bedrijven". *Synne*, however, means an infringement of divine or human law, wrongdoing; it is not used of hostility in general, or looked on as lawful; it is used of wrongful hostility or invasion, injury. The clause means: "call to account for injury", "avenge [wrongful] hostility".

Grendel's mother had her injury to avenge — the killing of her son, spoken of before as *þa fæhðe þe þu ȝystran niht ȝrendel cwealdeſt* (1333—34). She *wolde hyre mæg wreccan* (1339) and — far has she avenged (far has she gone in her revenge of) the hostile deed. (I see no reason for explaining *feor* as a comparative.)

The sentence not yet discussed here has been more grievously misunderstood than the others. HEYNE gives, without

reserve, an explanation which is next to unparalleled for far-fetchedness, and helplessly clashes with the statements of the poem itself. HOLDER is likewise in the dark. BOSWORTH-TOLLER's translation (p. 908 a) is essentially right; only the comment on it added within brackets, and wisely marked with a note of interrogation, is wrong. What COSIJN says of the passage is, in my opinion, as correct as his acceptance of the other instances is erroneous (he does not mention Gen. 1351—52). There would be no occasion, then, to dwell on this any further, did not HEYNE-SOCIN and HOLDER, in the latest editions (1898, 1899), still adhere to the old explanation. (WYATT and HALL follow COSIJN.) Before I saw COSIJN's Aanteekeningen, I had arrived at exactly the same conclusions. I will give my remarks below, within brackets, in their original shape. Although they say essentially the same as COSIJN's paragraph, I may, perchance, be more fortunate in persuading Mr. SOCIN and Mr. HOLDER, and thus reach the numerous students who benefit from their editions.

[When Hæðcyn had fallen in the battle against the Swedish king Ongenpeow, his men fled into a forest. There they would have been annihilated next morning, had not Hæðcyn's younger brother Hyzelac, come to the rescue. Then the Swedes in their turn had to retire, and the two invading divisions joined in pursuit of them. In the ensuing battle two brothers in Hyzelac's force, Wulf and Eofor, distinguished themselves: the former wounded king Ongenpeow, but received a smart blow in return; the latter managed to kill the king, and divested him of his armour. HEYNE says: "da erfuhr ich, dasz am Morgen ein Bruder den andern mit Schwertes Schneide zu dem Mörder hinzog, d. h. der Schwertstreich, mit dem Ongenpeow Wulf niederschlug, trieb dessen Bruder Eofor zur Blut-rache". A murdered brother drawing with the edge of the murderer's sword the other brother to that murderer is, indeed, a wonderful performance. And Wulf did not die! He recovered (*hyne gewyrpte* 2976), returned safely to his land, and received there from the king *hund þusenda landes and locenra beaga*! Ongenpeow was in reference to him no murderer. It was Hæðcyn that the Swedish king had slain in the battle; his *bona* he was. And the one who wanted to take "Blut-rache" was, of course, king Hyzelac. So he did, too, in the

battle where his man Wulf wounded the Swedish king and Eofor administered the fatal blow. Accordingly, in l. 1968, Hyzelac is called *bona Onzenþeoes*. Besides, *him* and *he* in l. 2490 cannot refer to Eofor! Thus, by taking matters as they are, and allotting to *stælan* the same signification as in the preceding instances, we clear all difficulties at once: "I have heard that then in the morning one brother avenged the other on the murderer with the edges of swords."

It is almost superfluous to add that also the above-mentioned *hyne gewyrpte*, which, as is well known, means "recovered", is falsely rendered in HEYNE'S Glossary. Wulf, when wounded, did not immediately "aufspringen" or "sich erheben". He remained lying on the battle-field till his country-men were masters of it. Then only did they bind him up and *arærdon* him! — Cf. Postscript.]

71. *Oft seldan hwær*
æfter leod-hryre lytle hwile
bon-gar bugeð, þeah seo bryd ðuge! 2029—31.

Wundur hwar þonne
eorl ellen-rof ende gefere
lif-gesceafta, þonne leng ne mæg
mon mid his [ma]gum medu-seld buan 3062—65.

SIEVERS¹⁾ gives the right explanation of the latter passage. *Wundur* means "a wonder", hence "something causing wonder or uncertainty", "something uncertain", just as the modern *I wonder (if)* is expressive of doubt. This *wundur*, placed before the interrogative *hwar*, is in itself as good as a whole clause: "uncertain it is, where". Such a construction is not due to an accidental omission; it is not a piece of poetical license; it is not harsh, nor awkward. It is an easy and natural brachylogy used in prose as well as in poetry. COSIJN adduces: *Uncuð hu longe* (uncertain it is how long) *þær swæ gelærede biscopas sien* Cura Past. p. 8, l. 3 (E. E. T. S. 45); *uncuð þeah þe he slæpe* Ælfric's Homilies (III) p. 390, l. 119 (E. E. T. S. 82). The first *þonne* is an adverb²⁾, not a conjunction, as HEYNE-SOCIN put it. — Thus prepared, we will pass over to l. 2029 ff., a period which has puzzled so many brains

¹⁾ Beitr. 9, 143.

²⁾ Thus: *Wundur, hwar þonne*.

and set so many pens a-going, yet without having hitherto received a satisfactory explanation. GRUNDTVIG suggests a violent alteration. So does RIEGER.¹⁾ KLUGE says first²⁾: "mit *oft seldan hwær* weiss ich ebensowenig etwas anzufangen als die bisherigen erklärer"; then, in HOLDER's edition, he introduces: *seldan wære* (they made a treaty). BUGGE³⁾ commends this, but wants to strike out *oft*. COSIJN, in his Aanteekeningen, gives up an earlier explanation, "*zelden pleegt ergens*", and thinks that "*wat te emendeeren is, is juist seldan hwær*", for "*gewoonlijk en zelden sluiten elkander uit*". HEYNE-SOCIN, WÜLCKER, and WYATT insert *no*, in analogy with *oft nalles æne* 3019, *oft nalæs seldan* Ps. 74, 4. They believe, like KÖLBING⁴⁾, that *no* may even have stood once at the beginning of the line now defective. ZUPITZA thinks there was no room for it. Such prosodists as frown even at *oft*, will do so still more at *oft no*. I explain the unaltered text in the following manner. *Oft* only marks the general applicableness of the sentence, which is a gnomic one: "as a rule", "always". It is no more irreconcilable with the following *seldan* than *always* is with *seldom* in the modern: *He has always called very seldom*, which of course means: "he has always been in the habit of calling seldom", "he has always been a rare guest". *Hwær* does not mean "anywhere" ("irgendwo", HEYNE-SOCIN), nor yet is it an interrogative adverb; it is a general relative adverb, and is, just as in the three oldest instances quoted in § 175 of my essay on the relatives⁵⁾, preceded by a negative (*no seldan* would make an affirmative expression!). *Seldan hwær* is the same brachylogy as the one already discussed: "there is seldom a place where", "it rarely happens that". *Lytle hwile* is not expressive of duration (as it might very well have been), but of a point of time; it does not mean "for (or during) a short time", but "when some time has elapsed". *Seo bryd* does not directly refer to Freawaru, king Hroðgar's daughter, as KLUGE⁶⁾ thinks, and as BARNOUW, the latest to my knowledge to discuss this passage, energetically maintains. "Mit *seo bryd*", he says⁷⁾,

¹⁾ ZfdPh. 3, 404.

²⁾ Archiv 56, 107.

³⁾ Beitr. 9, 190.

⁴⁾ Beitr. 9, 190.

⁵⁾ The English Relative Pronouns, Lund 1897.

⁷⁾ p. 26.

⁶⁾ Beitr. 12, 368.

hence, in general, how much one is to have or take from the other. Thus in l. 2147: "as many as I myself decided", "as many as I wished to have"; in l. 2964: "what Eofor as sole judge decided", "Eofor's absolute judgment". Similarly: *sylfes dome* (as many as he pleased) Beow. 2776; *þa gebead he him hiera agenne dom* (to decide for themselves how much they would have; as much as they wanted; their own choice) *feos & londes* Chronicle, ed. Thorpe, p. 84; *syllan sæ-mannum on hyra sylfra dom feoh wið freode* Battle of Maldon (Byrhtnoð) l. 38—39.

73. *eorl Ongenþio ufor oncirde* 2951.

HEYNE-SOCIN and HOLDER translate *ufor* by "höher", WYATT by "higher, upwards, on to higher ground". This may be right. However, we know nothing of the relative position of Ravenswood and king Ongenþeows stronghold. Probably BOSWORTH-TOLLER are right in their observation that "distance rather than height is marked". Very distinct is a passage in Ælfric's Homilies, where the heathen standing outside the temple were asked by St. John *þæt hi ufor eodon fram þam deofles temple* (SWEET's Reader p. 69, l. 244). The temple was built rather on a hill than in a hollow; but the people were to go further away (draw back, withdraw, retire), so as not to be crushed by the toppling walls, when God made the temple fall. I will also mention the M. H. German *hoher, uf hoher*. Hagen and Volker, for instance, *wolden niht hoher stan* (stand back, step out of the way), when Attila and his Queen came out of Church. The master of the hunt, when Tristan objected to the Cornish way of cutting the venison, asked him to show his own method, and *stuont uf hoher do*.

List of passages discussed.

I include some lines out of Beowulf mentioned in my essay on
The English Relative Pronouns (ERP), Lund 1897.

Beowulf.		Line 31. No. 62.	
Line 6.	No. 60.	"	128. No. 63.
" 15.	ERP p. 21 (TRAUTMANN has afterwards taken the same view).	"	158. Nr. 64.
" 22—24.	No. 61.	"	168—169. No. 65.
		"	459. No. 66.
		"	470. No. 67.

Line 488. ERP p. 57 (or: "through death taking those away").	Line 2147. No. 72.
" 525. No. 64.	" 2245. No. 68.
" 647. No. 64 (second footnote).	" 2448—49. No. 61.
" 711. No. 65, end.	" 2484—85. No. 70.
" 765—766. ERP p. 32.	" 2540. ERP p. 24.
" 1048. ERP p. 51.	" 2733—35. ERP p. 22.
" 1141. ERP p. 35.	" 2776. No. 72.
" 1150. No. 68.	" 2843. No. 68.
" 1191. No. 69.	" 2951. No. 73.
" 1244. No. 60.	" 2964. No. 72.
" 1272. No. 64.	" 3062—65. No. 71.
" 1291. ERP p. 78.	" 3165. ERP p. 49.
" 1340. No. 70.	
" 1396. No. 64.	Chr. & Sat. 274—275 (640—641).
" 1436. ERP p. 57 (cf. l. 488).	No. 70.
" 1654. ERP p. 45.	Cynew. Ridd. 61: 10. No. 68.
" 1740 (1752, 2028). No. 68.	Genesis 1351—52. No. 70.
" 2029—31. No. 71.	Gnomic Verses Cott. 54. No. 70.
" 2068. No. 68.	Wanderer 22—23. No. 67.
	" 65. No. 68.

Corrigenda to Anglia N. F. XIV.

P. 364, l. 3, and p. 376, middle. Read: Anglia N. F. XIII.
P. 373, l. 6. Read: the end of no. 50.

LUND in May 1903.

ERNST A. KOCK.

Postscript (October 1903).

While reading the advance-sheets, I receive HEYNE-SOCIN'S 7th edition. It has adopted the right translation of *hyne zewyrpte*, l. 2976. Other things discussed here are unaltered. — Cf. my review, which will appear in the 20th vol. of *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*.

E. A. K.