

**A Lexical and Syntactical Analysis of *Beowulf*:
a comparative analysis between the original manuscript
and many translations of the 19th- and 20th-centuries**

By

Jeanette D. Jacobsen, B.A.

A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English

California State University Bakersfield

In Partial Fulfillment for the Degree of

Masters of English

Spring 2015

Copyright

By

Jeanette D. Jacobsen

2015



Attachment 4: Signature Page

**A Lexical and Syntactical Analysis of *Beowulf*:
a comparative analysis between the original manuscript and many
translations of the 19th- and 20th-centuries**

By Jeanette D. Jacobsen

**This thesis or project has been accepted on behalf of the Department of
English**

by their supervisory committee:

Andrew Troup

Andrew Troup

Charles MacQuarrie

Charles MacQuarrie

Electronic Theses or Culminating Project Release Form

Student papers, projects, and other academic creations, whether in printed or electronic form, nearly always enjoy automatic copyright protection as soon as the work is fixed in some tangible form. Student academic creations might also constitute academic records and be subject to privacy protections under other federal laws.

By signing below, the student is specifically granting a non-exclusive distribution license to California State University, Bakersfield for the purposes set forth in this document, authorizing disclosure of the student's work to others, and is relinquishing and waiving all claims that may arise under any statutory or common law protections as a result of the use of this work for these purposes

Non-exclusive Distribution License

To properly administer this Research Repository and preserve the contents for future use, California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB) requires certain permissions from you, the author(s) or copyright owner. By accepting this license, you still retain copyright of your work. You do not give up the right to submit the work to publishers or other repositories.

By accepting this license, you grant to California State University, Bakersfield the non-exclusive right to reproduce, translate (as defined below), and/or

distribute your submission (including the metadata and abstract) worldwide, in any format or medium for non-commercial, academic purposes only.

CSUB will clearly identify your name(s) as the author(s) or owner(s) of the submission, including a statement of your copyright, and will not make any alteration, other than as allowed by this license, to your submission.

You agree that CSUB may, without changing the content, translate the submission to any medium or format and keep more than one copy for the purposes of security, back up and preservation. You also agree that authorized readers of your work have the right to use it for non-commercial, academic purposes as defined by the “fair use” doctrine of U.S. copyright law, so long as all attributions and copyright statements are retained.

If the submission contains material for which you do not hold copyright and that exceeds fair use, you represent that you have obtained the unrestricted permission of the copyright owner to grant CSUB the rights required by this license, and that such third-party owned material is clearly identified and acknowledged within the text or content of the submission.

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Linguistics of *Beowulf*

A Lexical and Syntactical Analysis of *Beowulf*:

a comparative analysis between the original manuscript

and many translations of the 19th- and 20th-centuries

-composed by: Jeanette “Kat” Jacobsen, M.A. candidate

Little is known regarding the reliability of translations of epic poems such as the Anglo-Saxon epic, *Beowulf*. This is partly because of the time period in which the *Beowulf* manuscript was created, approximately 1000 A.D. For this manuscript, most Anglo-Saxons were unable to read it because of the low literacy rate of their time period. Although the vast majority of today’s population in the United States is literate, very few can read Old English (OE), the language of *Beowulf*. Contemporary readers are forced to rely exclusively upon a translated edition of the work. By doing so, it is unknown whether the translations remain faithful to the original manuscript of *Beowulf*. This is a cause for concern amongst not only scholars, but every day readers. How can they be certain that they are reading a translation that is faithful to the original manuscript without having to learn the language of the poem?

In order to ascertain whether or not the authenticity of *Beowulf* is preserved in translation, it is necessary to compare the manuscript of *Beowulf* with six translations of the 19th- and 20th-centuries. This argument, as to the importance of the art in translation and the reliability of thus, began in the 19th-century with J.R.R. Tolkien’s essays, “*Beowulf*: The Monsters and The Critics” and “On Translating *Beowulf*.” In these essays, Tolkien calls for an examination of the art of *Beowulf* in its original Anglo-Saxon as well as in translation by deeming it “the most successful

Old English poem because in it the elements, language...structure, are all most nearly in harmony” (Tolkien *Beowulf* 30). Arthur Brodeur, in 1969, furthers this argument within *The Art of Beowulf* where he “tries to supply sufficient evidence to support...that *Beowulf* is the work of a great artist” (Brodeur viii). In order to determine the art of *Beowulf* in translation, this research examines the lexicon and syntax, Tolkien’s elements (as argued in his array of articles within “*Beowulf*: The Monsters and The Critics” and “On Translating *Beowulf*”), language, and structure, of the selected translations. In doing so, this research hopes to not only prove that the art remains within the translated edition of *Beowulf*, but also that *Beowulf* is still worthy of academic scrutiny within the English literature curriculum.

Furthermore, *Beowulf* has often been difficult to comprehend, for both scholars and the general public. This is caused by the complex language of the poem as well as *Beowulf* containing a unique lexicon that is exhibited solely in the manuscript. For example, according to Brodeur, the *Beowulf* poet(s) created approximately 1070 compounds, 578 of the substantive compounds only seen once in use, in the poem. Tolkien furthers this in “In Translation and Words,” where he states that “the effort to translate, or to improve a translation, is valuable, not so much for the version it produces, as for the understanding of the original which is awakes” (Tolkien 53). This linguistic ingenuity can sometimes explain why the translation process becomes difficult when translating this poem into “modern” English and accounts for some of the variations seen within translations over the decades. Furthermore, these unique words, as well as the carefully constructed adjectival compounds, provide the “richest and most meaningful content-words in the poetic vocabulary” (Brodeur 8). Because of this artistic creativity in the Old English manuscript, the reliability of translations is an issue. For example, a renowned translator, such as Edward Seidensticker, has noted that a translator’s purpose

influences his or her lexical choices (Seidensticker 27). This, in turn, impacts the syntactical decisions each translator makes as they decipher the text. Therefore, a translator's aim, determines how they interpret the original manuscript. As a result, the original content is altered to suit the author's needs.

This issue of accuracy in translation is imperative to *Beowulf*, the English curriculum in general, and addresses issues which arise in the translation process. These six translators, renowned for their vast readership as well as respect amongst other scholars, fall into different traditions of translating: literal, poetic, and a combination of literal and poetic. This project has determined that modern translations of this work have been successful as well as unsuccessful in capturing the authenticity and art of *Beowulf*. The results of this research have concluded two aspects surrounding *Beowulf* in translation. First, the translation of this poem has slowly improved over the years. This is partly because the knowledge of the language of Old English and its poetic devices has grown. This is caused by the amount of scholarly research that has been conducted on Old English and its poetics as well as languages that have influenced Old English itself as a means to understand its rules and functions. Secondly, the original content of the poem is not always preserved in translation over the last two hundred years.

The early translations created by Wackerbarth, Arnold, and Garnett unsuccessfully attempted to preserve the authenticity and art of the poem. However, in the 20th-century, Heaney does come close, arguably the closest of his predecessors, through his technique of blending the approaches of poetic and literal, but he, too, does not always utilize the original meanings that are represented in the Old English manuscript. In doing so, Heaney is able to garner more readership of the poem and create a new type art of *Beowulf*; therefore bringing the poem into the modern era. Although the original art is not preserved, a feat which is albeit impossible due

to translation issues and the evolution of English, Heaney is able to come the closest in doing so. This research argues that, because of Heaney's translation of *Beowulf* with its new literary and artistic "art", the art of *Beowulf* is preserved and should remain within the English literature curriculum.

Furthermore, although it appears on the surface that the six translators convey the same storyline, the inconsistencies in the syntax and lexicon between the translations express something wholly different between each translation. While it is almost impossible to give a true literal translation because Old English writers left out parts of speech such as to-be verbs, prepositions, determiners, modals, and articles as well as indirect (and sometimes direct) objects in their writings, the translators Arnold and Donaldson come close through their literal, prose translations in conveying an authentic *Beowulf*. The next translator camp, of poetic translations, is written by Wackerbarth and Lehmann. The last camp is comprised of Garnett and Heaney who endeavor to blend the literal and poetic traditions. In doing so, the authenticity and art finally begins to be apparent. This is especially seen with Seamus Heaney's translation of *Beowulf*, which comes the closest to capturing the authenticity and art. Furthermore, each translation displays a variety of different meanings between the Old English words in the manuscript and what they wrote.

According to Frederic Grundtvig, an early translator of the manuscript, who, with the renowned philologist Rasmus Rask, presented a folio of the manuscript as well as a translation, the poem needs to have some aspects added to the original in order for modern readers to grasp the meanings as well as poetics (Tinker). In his translation, Grundtvig noted that he has "studied the poem as if I were going to translate it word for word...but I will not and have not translated it in that way, and I will venture to maintain that my translation is a faithful one, historically

faithful, inasmuch, as I have never willfully altered or interpolated anything, and poetically faithful inasmuch as I have tried with all my might vividly to express what I saw in the poem...whoever understands both languages and possesses a poetical sense will see what I mean” (Tinker 24). In other words, he only added (if forced) what was needed; he did not add aspects, or any words or phrases, to the original work that was not needed nor what was part of his agenda. Tolkien expands upon this argument a century later in “On Translating *Beowulf*” with his claim that it is often necessary to utilize more modern terms in order to correctly convey the content (“On Translating *Beowulf*” 1). Therefore, it is difficult, if not impossible, to convey the original poetics and meaning of the original manuscript without adding something to the poem in order to transfer its complex story into modern times.

The Translators

The translators at issue in this thesis, however, would disagree with Tolkien’s assertion that it is impossible to convey the original poetics and/ or meaning. The six translators in this study were chosen not only because they further the discourse Tolkien began, but because each were renowned and made an impact on their peers and readers. The first translator, A. Diedrich Wackerbarth (1813-1884), who wrote his poetic translation between 1837 and 1842, stopped midway through the poem due to illness. During his long illness, another edition of Kemble’s was published which Wackerbarth quickly consumed. Because of this, Wackerbarth continued his endeavor of translating *Beowulf*, even though he was not a scholar in the poem itself, but rather of the Anglo-Saxon language. This would have made Wackerbarth’s attempt seem almost impossible because there are many words and phrases within *Beowulf* that are only seen once, within the poem.

In fact, John Kemble's translations and emendations were very important to Wackerbarth's work because Kemble was a recognized translator and *Beowulfian* scholar during Wackerbarth's life. Because of this, throughout his translation, Wackerbarth solely utilized Kemble's comments, notes, and interpretations in order to make sense of the ancient poem (Tinker), especially in instances where Wackerbarth encountered the distinctive language of *Beowulf*. For example, Wackerbarth is quoted as stating "in my Version I have scrupulously adhered to the text of Mr. Kemble, adopting in almost every Instance his Emendations" (Tinker 46). However, unlike Kemble, Wackerbarth wrote in poetic verse that was familiar to his intended audience, that of his contemporaries.

According to Chauncey Tinker, Wackerbarth did this in order to make the poem more readily available to his peers. Rather than utilizing a similar rhyming scheme as the Anglo-Saxon poem, and thereby Kemble, he used the poetics that were common during his personal time period; "I wish to get my book read, that my Countrymen may become generally acquainted with the Epic of our Ancestors" (Tinker 46). In order to do this, Wackerbarth had to use a meter that society was familiar with. This was the rhythmic ballads that utilize the aa, bb, cc, dd, ef, ef poetic pattern. Each set of lines rhymed, even when the strict rhyming scheme interfered with the storyline that the original poet(s). It is because of this that Wackerbarth would utilize a unique, and sometimes perplexing, lexicon throughout his translation. For example, according to Tinker, Wackerbarth's rigid, fluid poetic style hinders the original story of *Beowulf* in many instances. The most prevalent is that of the swimming match between *Beowulf* and Brecca. Tinker, and other critics, believed that this passage, and other meaningful passages, in particular called for "calmness, solemnity, or elevation of thought" were destroyed by Wackerbarth's "monotonous" style (Tinker 49).

Although there were many problems with Wackerbarth's translation due to the poetic style, this translation is worthy of study. This is because Wackerbarth's edition was the correct step in the right direction caused by the impact Wackerbarth's (only) publication had on society. Wackerbarth's translation was the most read translation of his predecessors (Tinker) and contemporaries. In accomplishing this task of gaining more popularity and knowledge of the Anglo-Saxon epic, Wackerbarth's painstaking work was able to expand the study of the poem, not only in its language but of the poetic value of the classic. It is because of this that translations of *Beowulf* began to emerge more and more frequently.

Between the time period of Wackerbarth and Arnold, German scholarship on the poem rose significantly (Tinker 158). This scholarship included criticism, translations, and general understanding of the essence of the poem (Tinker 158). It is because of this scholarship, and mass emergence of German translations, that Thomas Arnold (1823-1900) decided to compose his own translation of *Beowulf* in order to write "an improved English edition" (Tinker 72). However, in order to accomplish this, Arnold undertook a very unusual course.

According to Tinker, and another translator, James Garnett, Arnold wrote "the most thorough description" (Tinker 72) of the manuscript and had ready access to the manuscript; however the manuscript was hardly utilized within his translation. Instead, Arnold relied upon previously published translations of *Beowulf* in order to compile his own. Garnett, for example, stated that Arnold used works by John Kemble, Benjamin Thorpe, and Christian W.M. Grein's 1857's text. In order to prove this, especially in the case of Thorpe's heavily criticized translation, Garnett checked the two translations thoroughly. He perceived that every miscalculated emendation was the same in each presentation of the manuscript from both authors. For example, Benjamin Thorpe's translation was written in a poetic style which had a

half-line, stiling rhyming scheme that reminded readers of the time period of the Anglo Saxons (Tinker). In his presentation of the manuscript, Thorpe transcribed the words incorrectly more than the much critiqued Thorkelin (who had very little, if any, knowledge of Old English). All of Thorpe's misinterpretations and style were copied repetitiously by Arnold throughout his translation.

However, Arnold tried to mask the duplications by utilizing other texts besides Thorpe's well-read and studied translation, such as John Kemble's and Grein's translations. Kemble's text was written with a simplistic poetic style by adhering to Old English poetic devices that he perceived to be within the manuscript; however, to Kemble's contemporaries, his translation was considered to be literal (Tinker 37). Unlike Thorpe, Kemble created a folio of the manuscript which had emendations that made more sense than earlier ones by scholars such as Thorkelin because of his knowledge of other ancient languages such as Old High German, Old Saxon, Old Norse, and Gothic (Tinker 35).

Christian W.M. Grein, on the other hand, wrote a translation in 1857 which was considered to be a very literal, line-by-line, translation. This translation was considered a very accurate translation of the poem for the 19th-century, especially in Germany (Tinker 59). For this reason, Arnold decided to refer to it during his examination of the poem. In order to encompass these three translators into his work, Arnold utilized a very unique, purely literal, style like that of Kemble, but he did so in prose. Arnold's translation also included a presentation of the manuscript verbatim of Thorpe's above the "modern" English translation. It is with Arnold's literal style that gained him readership from his contemporaries as well as reverence from his critics.

James Garnett (1840-1916), who was the first American translator for *Beowulf*, wrote his translation in the late 19th-century. He had read the previous translators' texts and because of that, Garnett believed that the American citizens needed their own translation of *Beowulf*. Garnett's translation, which was published first in 1882, used a similar method as Arnold. Like Arnold, Garnett utilized a Grein text as an outline for the two reasons: the storyline and in order to decipher the meanings of unique words and phrases. However, Garnett employed a different edition, that of 1867, rather than the earlier edition that Arnold utilized.

Furthermore, Garnett, within his translation, used a literal, line-by-line translation which was written in stilted half-lines that had accents and caesura (Tinker). According to Garnett, he did this in order "to give the general reader a better idea of the poem than a mere prose translation would do, in addition to the advangeness of literalness" (Tinker 84). He did succeed in his goal. For example, Garnett's *Beowulf* translation was used within the secondary schools throughout America during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. He published six editions, far more than previous translators in England and Germany. This, along with the popularity and verbatim style made this an important translation to show a different way to translate. In doing so, it will show how the art is effected with this style of translations.

E. Talbot Donaldson (1910 – present), in the mid-20th century, composed his translation of *Beowulf*. With his translation, Donaldson utilized a literal, prose translation. This translation, with its style, would remind a scholar of *Beowulf* translations of Arnold's earlier translation. Both translators used a prose style; however, Donaldson's is considered to be far more literal in its word choices in deciphering the Old English manuscript. For example, Donaldson's text reorders the syntax to fit 20th-century syntax, in order to make sense of the poem through a modern lens, and also adheres to the original lexicon by using literal meanings for each Old

English word. Furthermore, this translation is a very useful rendition for Old English scholars, but to other readers, it would be considered to be incredibly dry and boring. This is because of the word choices as well as the monotone tone interwoven into the text through the narration style of the author.

Chapter 2: Lines 499-505

Each of the previously mentioned translators describes the scenes of what occurs in the manuscript differently. This is especially seen with an examination of their lexicon and syntax. For example, lines 499-505 exhibit an array of differences from the original as presented by Klaeber to the translations in the 19th- and 20th-centuries by Wackerbarth, Arnold, Garnett, Donaldson, Lehmann, and Heaney.

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| “Ūnferð maþelode, | Ecglāfes bearn, |
| þē æt fōtum sæt | frēan Scyldinga, |
| onband | beadurūne. |
| Wæs him | Bēowulfes sīð, |
| mōdges merefaran, | micel æfþunca, |
| forþan þe hē ne ūþe | þæt ænig oðer man |
| æfre mārða þon mā | middangeardas |
| gehēdde under heofenum | þonne hē sylfa.” (Klaeber 19). |

In other words, “Unferth made a speech, (the) son (of) Ecglaf, who sat at (the) feet (of the) Lord (of the) Scyldings. (He) let loose a hostile speech, (because the) undertaking (of) *Beowulf*, (the) brave sea-farer, was (to him) a great cause for resentment. Indeed, he did not wish that any other man ever (should care) anymore (about) glorious deeds under heaven (and) middle-earth than himself” (Jacobsen).

In lines 499-502, the approach that is utilized in introducing Unferth and his feelings concerning *Beowulf* is different in every presentation of the manuscript, especially with those of the 19th-century translators. A. Diedrich Wackerbarth (1849), arguably the earliest cohesive translator of his era (Tinker), portrays these same lines as

By haughty Hunferth, Ecg-láf's Son
Who sat at royal Hróth-gár's Feet,

To bind up Words of Strife begun,
And to address the noble Geat.
The proud Sea-farer's Enterprize
Was a vast Grievance in his Eyes (Wackerbarth 21).

Wackerbarth, in his translation utilized a different lexicon than what is seen in the original. For example, Wackerbarth adds the word “haughty” to the translation of these few lines. This word is not seen anywhere within the original manuscript. However, Wackerbarth, in employing such a tactic, as seen in these lines as well as others, he tries to capture the art and authenticity of *Beowulf* by also using 19th-century poetic devices. This is seen with the way in which Wackerbarth uses the rhyming scheme of his time. In order to adhere to this, Wackerbarth was forced to add additional lexicon to his translation.

However, with the addition of “haughty,” Wackerbarth does so for a different reason. For example, by adding this solitary word, Wackerbarth is able to further the art of this passage by producing a more negative image of Unferth in the mind of his reader. This image is the one which Wackerbarth perceived to be hinted at within the manuscript through the way in which the instance was worded in Old English. Moreover, in utilizing this approach to these lines, Wackerbarth also portrays an Old English poetic device, that of inferred images, direct and indirect objects. Furthermore, in more directly exposing this opposition between Unferth and Beowulf, Wackerbarth provides a parallel between the two warriors.

In comparison to Wackerbarth, Thomas Arnold (1876), the earliest prose translator of *Beowulf*, provides a slyer image of Unferth. This is seen through the lexical decisions that Arnold made throughout his translation. For example, his translation states the same three lines as “Hunferth spake, the son of Ecglaef, who sat at the feet of the master of the Scyldings; he

unbound the secret counsel of his malice. The expedition of *Beowulf*, the valiant mariner, was to him a great cause of offence” (Arnold 37). Lexical choices such as “secret,” “counsel,” “malice,” and “offence” exhibit Unferth as a sly, conniving person. This is seen with the definitions of each of these words. Each, for instance, refer to concealment, evil, misdeeds, or illegal acts before Unferth verbally says anything to his opponent, Beowulf. The reader, therefore, is able to predict the proceeding speech against Beowulf, the hero of the narrative.

The image of Unferth as provided by earlier translators such as Wackerbarth and Arnold changed with the verbatim translation of James Garnett in 1892. For example,

“Hunferth then spoke, son of Ecglaf,
 Who at the feet sat of the lord of the Scyldings,
 Unloosed his war-secret (was the coming of Beowulf,
 The proud sea-farer, to him mickle grief,” (Garnett 16).

Through Garnett’s lexical decisions, Unferth is depicted as an honorable warrior, one who was comparable to *Beowulf*. This is seen with the words “war-secret” and “unloosed.” These lexical decisions in particular render Unferth as being more warrior-like than the other translations examined in the 19th-century. Unferth’s description veers from the conniving courtier present in English aristocracy to a Scandinavian thane.

These lexical deviations between the 19th-century translators are furthered evidenced with the rest of this passage. In lines 503-505, the original manuscript states “Indeed, he did not wish that any other man ever (should care) anymore (about) glorious deeds under heaven (and) middle-earth than himself” (Jacobsen). Wackerbarth, with these exact lines, portrays these lines as

For ill could bear that jealous Man

That any other gallant Thane

On Earth, beneath the Heavens' Span,

Worship beyond his own should gain." (Wackerbarth 21).

Wackerbarth, with these lines, furthers his parallel between the warriors of Beowulf and Unferth.

This is seen with the way in which Unferth refers to himself and Beowulf as "gallant thanes."

Lines 503-505 specifically do more than merely further Wackerbarth's parallel between the warriors; these lines also create the negative imagery of Unferth. For example, the lexical decisions of "ill" and "jealous" denote this. The word, "ill", when it entered the English language during the 13th-century, meant to be "morally evil or wicked" (*OED*), but when Wackerbarth utilized this term, this term started to become obsolete when referred to a person. However, by using "jealous" within the same line, it is obvious that Wackerbarth meant to use it in its earlier sense. This is because "jealous" entered the language during the same time period as the previous term. Furthermore, "jealous" is defined as "vehement in feeling, as in wrath, desire, or devotion" (*OED*). Therefore the reader might infer that Unferth is an evil individual who has wrathful or malicious desires through this one line of text. This imagery of Unferth is furthered more with Wackerbarth's lexical decision of utilizing "worship." This is because Unferth does not desire for anyone to be worshiped more than himself. He wishes that only he himself can be placed upon a pedestal for others to gaze upon in wonderment.

Arnold, however, translates these lines as "for that he allowed not that any other man on the earth should ever appropriate more deeds of fame under heaven than he himself" (Arnold 37). This furthers Arnold's depiction of Unferth with his lexical decisions of "allowed," "appropriate," and "fame." These words, in origin, have positive definitions. However, by utilizing a negation of "not" at the beginning of these lines, the illustration becomes negative.

The reader is able to gather that only Unferth is permitted to gain “fame”, or “celebrity or renown” (*OED*) status. This is because Unferth believes that he has enough status in his society to prohibit any other to outshine him.

Garnett, on the other hand, displays these last lines of this passage as

For that he granted not that any man else

Ever more honor of this mid-earth

Should gain under heavens than he himself): (Garnett 16).

Garnett’s portrayal of Unferth as an honorable warrior is furthered with the lexical decisions of “granted,” “honor,” and “gain.” Although Garnett utilizes a negation in the first section of these lines similarly to Arnold, the usage of a positive lexical decision is able to continue the positive imagery of Unferth. This is because of the word, “honor.” When it entered the English language during the 13th-century, “honor” meant “glory, renown, fame earned” (*OED*), but changed during Garnett’s time period to mean “high respect, esteem, or reverence, accorded to exalted worth or rank” (*OED*). Therefore the reader is able to perceive Unferth as a highly respected or renowned warrior who has exalted worth or rank within Hrothgar’s society.

However, because Garnett also utilized the word “gain” within the same lines, the reader is left to question whether or not Unferth is truly honorable. This is because “gain,” when it entered the language during the 13th-century, meant “advantage, use, avail, benefit; remedy, help”, but this definition became obsolete in the 15th-century. During Garnett’s time, the word meant an “increase of possessions, resources or advantages of any kind, consequent on some action or change of conditions; an instance of this; profit, emolument” (*OED*). In doing so, Garnett is able to draw the reader more into his translation, unlike his predecessors.

The 20th-century translators also exhibited a variety of lexical differences in their translations of these lines, 499-505, and others. The first translator of this century, Donaldson, stated the before mentioned lines to read as “Unferth spoke, son of Ecglaf, who sat at the feet of the king of the Scyldings, unbound words of contention—to him was Beowulf’s undertaking, the brave seafarer, a great vexation, for he would not allow that any other man of middle-earth should ever achieve more glory under the heavens than himself.” (Donaldson 11). There are a few lexical choices, such as “unbound,” “contention,” “vexation,” “glory,” and the utilization of negations in his phrasing that denote a negative presentation of the first unveiling of Unferth, Beowulf’s polar opposite.

First of all, the lexical decision of “unbound” is an interesting one. This is because there are two different dates as to when it entered the English language, the literal and figurative; it is the figurative sense which entered the language first, during the early OE period. During this time period, the word (since it was an adjectival) meant that the noun was “not tied up or unfastened” (*OED*). It was not until the late 13th-century that the literal sense of the word to mean, “unconfined, unconstrained or not bound by any engagement or vow” (*OED*), came into the language. Although both definitions were part of the vernacular during Donaldson’s time, he clearly meant to utilize the literal definition as a reference to the phrase “unbound words”.

Secondly, the lexical choice of “contention” is also interesting, albeit unique in its history. First of all, contention entered the language during the late 14th-century and was used until the early 19th-century. During this time frame, the word meant “the action of contending or striving together in opposition; strife, dispute, verbal controversy” (*OED*). In the midst of this definition’s time frame, another definition became part of the vernacular. During the 1530s, “contention”, came to mean a type of “contrast [or] comparison” (*OED*). Following this time

period, the definition became obsolete. In the 20th-century, “contention” used the same definition as “tension” which entered the language during the early 19th-century to mean a type of verse contest between travelling French poets who specialized in courtly love (*OED*) or “a piece of verse or song composed for or sung in such a contest” (*OED*); however, when tracing its origin, the word “tension” is a cognate of Old French’s (OF) “tencion” which means “a contention, dispute, [or] quarrel” (*OED*). OF’s tencion, unfortunately, became obsolete after only a decade of textual use.

Donaldson, in his translation, might have utilized the definition of his peers; however, he did not, as seen with the context of the word as well as syntactical order of the sentence. Through this, Donaldson could have been referring to two different definitions. He could have either used “contention” to mean contention as in a “verbal controversy” or tencion as a means to create a dispute or quarrel with Beowulf. On the one hand, by using verbal controversy as a definition, Donaldson would have created more dialogue between the two key characters in this scene, Unferth and Beowulf. This is because this definition hints at the diverse points-of-view as to the “details” of the swimming match between Beowulf and Breca because the reader has no knowledge outside of Unferth’s and Beowulf’s words as to the actual events.

On the other hand, in utilizing such an ambiguous definition as tencion has, Donaldson draws in his reader with the unusual spelling, and, at the same time, creates more of a dissonance between the two speakers of this scene, Beowulf and Unferth. This occurs because the definition refers back to the previous lexical decision of “unbound” that Donaldson utilized in this line of text. However, Donaldson does something completely inexplicable. He blends the three definitions, as seen with its usage. In doing so, Donaldson encompasses the meaning of

contention throughout its history and creates negative imagery of Unferth as well as leaves the reader questioning whose side to believe, Beowulf or Unferth.

This negative imagery is continued with Donaldson's third lexical decision that denotes negativity with "vexation". This noun entered the language in the early 14th-century from Old French and was common up until the 16th-century, when it became rare in usage. During these two hundred years, vexation meant "the action of harassing by aggression" (*OED*) or more commonly, "abuse, harassment; insult, affront" (etymonline). This definition would create Unferth a negative character because it would denote that he is harassing, abusing, or insulting the hero, Beowulf. However, during Donaldson's time period, the definition was different.

For example, "vexation" changed meaning in the 17th-century to imply "a source or cause of mental trouble or distress; a grief or affliction...chiefly [seen] with [an] 'a' [prior to the word]." (*OED*). The way in which that Donaldson utilized the word, he clearly used the 17th-century definition because of two reasons. First, he used an "a" in the phrasing. For example, "vexation" is seen in the noun phrase of "a great vexation". Secondly, it is also with this phrasing, and the previous lines, that the usage of the noun phrase is used as a means to create a type of mental distress in not only himself, but also Beowulf. This is because Beowulf's presence, and speech about his heroic feats, causes personal mental trouble and distress in Unferth. Unferth begins to see his own place at the revered seat at the feet of King Hrothgar in peril. Because of this "mental distress," Unferth tries to render a more negative appearance and characterization of Beowulf, which makes Unferth himself emerge as a more and more negative character.

This negative imagery is furthered with Donaldson's usage of "glory". Glory entered the English language from an unknown origin in the 11th-century with the definition of: "fame,

renown, great praise or honor" (etymonline). A century later the definition changed to "the splendor of God or Christ; praise offered to God, worship" (etymonline). In the 14th-century, the definition harkened to its beginning definition, which is, "the disposition to claim honour for oneself; boastful spirit" (*OED*). This definition became obsolete until the 19th- and 20th-centuries, the time period of Donaldson's translation. By knowing the different definitions of this word throughout the centuries, Donaldson could have either conveyed the definition of his time or the original meaning.

This depiction of Unferth is more negative than the previous 19th-century translators' portrayals. According to Wikia, an online pop culture, gaming, and comic mythos website, an anti-villain "the anti-villain plays a villain's game, but for a noble cause, at least in their eyes...their ends are often considered immoral, unjust, sometimes even evil. Sometimes, they may simply be a villain with gentlemanly qualities, a code of honor or some sense of justice...[and] will occasionally side with their rivals (usually the protagonist) if a greater threat than themselves comes or it is in both of their best interests" (Wikia "anti-villain"). This definition fits Donaldson's depiction of Unferth, and furthers Donaldson's description, as seen with his earlier seen lexical decisions concerning the swimming match Beowulf had with Breca as well as his encounter with Grendel's mother where he receives a sword from Unferth which assists him in defeating the monster. In doing so, Unferth fits the role of the anti-villain.

Lehmann, in her poetic translation, portrays Unferth as a sneaky and sly character much akin to Norse mythology's Loki or a spy as seen in Hollywood films during her first introduction of Beowulf's antagonist. For example, Lehmann displays the lines as reading

Unferth spoke out, Ecglaf's scion,

From below at foot of the lord of Danes,

Disclosed a covert grudge, quarrel of rivals,
 The voyage hither vexed him deeply,
 Beowulf's coming, brave seafaerer's,
 For he admitted none did more to win
 Fame on the earth so fervently (Lehmann 34).

With Lehmann's first dialogue between Unferth and Beowulf, Lehmann employs interesting and diverse lexical decisions such as "scion", "covert", "grudge", "quarrel", "rivals", "vexed", and "fervently" in her translation that bring a different depiction of Unferth, and thereby art, to her readers. By employing these words, Lehmann's Unferth is seen as being sly and sneaky; a character that would not be perceived as negative until the end or until her lexicon is examined more closely. For example, this is perceived the most with words such as "covert", "grudge", and "rivals." In doing so, Lehmann creates a dual nature in Unferth by portraying him as intelligent and nefarious by taking on the characteristics of a type of spy (as seen with the villains in 007 movies).

In order for Lehmann to portray a spy-like Unferth, she first employed the utilization of the word "covert." This word entered the English language, from French, in the 1300s to mean something that is "covered, hidden; roofed over; overgrown; sheltered" (*OED*). Covert became rare by the late-19th century, especially in every day usage during Lehmann's time period of translation. During the 16th-century another definition replaced the first to mean "concealed, hidden, secret; disguised" (*OED*). This definition, unlike the first meaning, is still used today and is the only surviving definition of this adjective. The latter meaning of "covert" is what Lehmann intended in this passage because of the time frame in which she composed her translation as well as the fact that Lehmann's manuscript is poetic. With the utilization of this definition for

“covert,” Lehmann is able to create a very sly Unferth. This is because the image of Unferth being able to hide or disguise himself (or his words) which is perceived through the definitions.

The last part of covert’s phrase is “grudge.” This word is interesting in its usage due to its etymology as well as the way the word is utilized in Lehmann’s translation. The word “grudge”, when it entered the language, did so as a noun and verb. Even though both word classes entered the language during the 15th-century, the noun definition derives itself from that of the verb meaning. For example, the first verb definition from 1461 stated that it meant “to murmur; to utter complaints murmuringly; to grumble, complain; to be discontented or dissatisfied” (*OED*); whereas the noun’s definition, which entered the language at the same time, is stated as “murmur, murmuring, grumbling; discontent, dissatisfaction; reluctance, unwillingness” (*OED*). These two meanings, from the verb and noun, became obsolete in the 1600s.

The next definition to enter the language was from the noun side. In the early 1600s, “grudge” referred to someone who displayed “ill-will or resentment due to some special cause, as a personal injury, the superiority of an opponent or rival, or the like” (*OED*). This definition was utilized until the late 1800s, when the noun meaning became obsolete. After this meaning became extinct, there were not any more new definitions for the noun word class.

However, there was a definition for the verb word class being used in every day speech. During the same time frame as the noun’s new definition in the 1600s, another one entered the language for the verb. Grudge, as a verb, now referred to someone who is “unwilling to give, grant, or allow (something); to begrudge” (*OED*). This was in use until well into the 1900s. This definition was the one that Lehmann intended, even though she utilized “grudge” as a noun as a part of the noun phrase “covert grudge” rather than the verb meaning that Lehmann actually referred to in her translation.

Furthermore, by utilizing the verb meaning rather than the noun meaning, Lehmann furthered two aspects of her translations. The first being would be her image of Unferth as a spy-type character. This character is one who does not have many redeeming qualities as seen with the usage of “grudge.” This is someone who is not willing to neither bestow anything to anyone nor allow anyone to have something they do not have. With the second, Lehmann utilized an archaism with the employment of “grudge” that creates more of a poetic, and artistic, image. By using words that invoke a poetic quality such as this and the next word, rival, in her translation, Lehmann is able to construct a translation that harkens to the original and that was filled with poetic devices and imagery.

For example, with the word rivals (rival), a certain image comes to mind; much like that of the previous words “covert” and “grudge.” Rival brings the image of two characters fighting over something such as another person, an object, destination, or concept. This is due, in part, to the definition that entered the language in the 16th-century until the 1980s, the time period of Lehmann’s translation. During this time frame, “rival(s)” referred to “a person or thing competing with another for the same objective, or for superiority in the same field of activity” (*OED*). By utilizing this word in her translation, Lehmann is able to further not only the artistic value, but also the image of Unferth as a spy. This is because in every spy movie or novel, there is a clear protagonist and antagonist who compete for a single objective throughout.

Heaney, on the other hand, through his blended style of the poetic and literal translation camps, states that the lines read as:

From where he crouched at the king’s feet,

Unferth, a son of Ecglaf’s, spoke

Contrary words. Beowulf’s coming,

His sea-braving, made him sick with envy:

He could not brook or abide the fact
 That anyone else alive under heaven
 Might enjoy greater regard than he did: (Heaney 35).

In doing so, Heaney portrays Unferth as a more sly character than previous translators did. This is seen with his lexical decisions of three specific words such as “crouched”, “contrary”, and “envy.” By using these words in particular Heaney is able to create a type of subversive villain who uses veiled lexicon in order to attempt to cause conflict with Beowulf and create a clouded view of Beowulf to their audience.

For example, the word choice of “crouched” has an interesting history. When “crouched” first entered the language during the late 14th-century from Old French, the verb meant “bowed [or] bent together” (*OED*); this definition was utilized until the mid-19th-century. Later during that century, however, the meaning changed to “with the body in a crouching posture, usually on its side” (*OED*). This definition continued well into the 20th-century, the time period of Heaney's translation. Because of the time frame in which Heaney created his translation (between the 20th and 21st centuries), the later definition would have to be the one utilized; even though the beginning definition would have made more sense and created a more subservient image of Unferth. The latter meaning of “crouched,” as seen in Heaney's translation of these lines depicts Unferth as being in a position where he could launch himself at Beowulf without warning and his entourage to begin the battle that Unferth clearly wants.

Heaney's second noted lexical difference, which perpetuates the sly image of Unferth, is with the word “contrary.” This word entered the language during the mid-14th-century from Anglo French and Latin with the meaning of “opposite, opposed, [or] against” (*etymonline*). However, in the *OED*, this word is has a more complex meaning. For example, the first

definition reads as "opposed in nature or tendency; diametrically different, extremely unlike...Repugnant, antagonistic" (*OED*) when it entered the English language. This definition would have made cohesive sense, especially in the context of Heaney's passage, if the word had not changed meaning. This is because Unferth is portrayed as Beowulf's polar opposite. However, there is a deeper layer to Unferth, as seen with the way in which contrary's meaning undergoes semantic linguistic feature of narrowing. Narrowing, for example, is a semantic change that is defined as a word or phrase that becomes more specific over time. This is seen with the change of the definition of "contrary."

Approximately half a millennium later, in the middle of the 19th century, the meaning of "contrary" altered to encompass characters of fiction, such as Unferth, who are "of antagonistic or untoward disposition, perverse, obstinately self-willed" (*OED*). With this definition in place during the time period of Heaney's translation, this was meant with his utilization of "contrary" in relationship to Unferth, because this word was part of the phrase "contrary words," which Unferth would later speak to Beowulf, and Hrothgar's court. These words are antagonistic and purposeful with their intent. While he is speaking these words, he (Unferth) is crouched at Hrothgar's feet while feeling sick with envy. This illusion itself creates a very sly and devious character for the reader and creates the image of a snake; something which has been tied with descriptors such as sly, devious, evil, malicious, sneaky, and trickery.

The next noted lexical difference, which furthers a sly Unferth, is with the word "envy." This is because of how the word is used within the phrase "made him sick with envy." By using this type of phrasing, Heaney denotes a person who, whenever envious of others, is overcome with an illness similar to Irish mythology's berserker. A berserker becomes overcome with an uncontrollable rage, when they are needed as protectors or when feeling an intense emotion like envy, fear, or anger, and attacks their opponent(s) vehemently until they are victorious or dead. This correlation becomes more apparent in the word's etymology. For example, when "envy" entered the vernacular during the late 13th century from Old French (OF), envy meant someone

who had a "malignant or hostile feeling; ill-will, malice, enmity" (*OED*) toward another individual. This definition was in effect for many centuries before becoming obsolete in the early 18th century.

During this time frame (1200s-1900s), another definition of "envy" blossomed into fruition of someone who has the "feeling of mortification and ill-will occasioned by the contemplation of superior advantages possessed by another" (*OED*); this definition was typically accompanied with prepositions such as at, of, or to. With Heaney's utilization of envy, it was used with the phrase "made him sick with envy." In this case, it is with the way in which the translator utilized a word or phrase that illustrates which definition Heaney was correlating with its Old English equivalent rather than merely the time frame of the translation itself. The phrase "with envy" is the prepositional phrase of the sentence with "with" as the preposition and "envy" as the noun; the way in which "with" is utilized in the phrase shows the word as a preposition instead of an adverb or part of a coordinating conjunctive phrase. Therefore by knowing this, Unferth is shown as a more cunning and malicious character. This is because Unferth is envious of Beowulf's accomplishments and by being so, Unferth begins to plan how to bring Beowulf's reputation against him.

Chapter 3: Lines 99-114

These lexical, as well as the way in which the story and characters are illustrated, differences are seen throughout the manuscript, before and after the previously mentioned lines. For example, lines 99-114 also display vast variances between the 19th- and 20th-century translators.

Swā ðā drihtguman drēamum lifdon,

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| ēadiglice, | oð ðæt ān ongan |
| fyrene fre(m)man | fēond on helle; |
| wæs se grimma gæst | Grendel hāten |
| mære mærcstapa, | sē þe mōras hēold, |
| fen ond fæsten; | fīfelcynnes eard |
| wonsæli wer | weardode hwīle, |
| sīþðan him scyppen | forscrifen hæfde |
| in Cāines cynne— | þone cwealm gewræc |
| ēce drihten, | þæs þe hē Ābel slōg; |
| ne gefeah hē þære fæhðe, | ac hē hine feor forwræc, |
| metod for þy mäne | mancynne fram. |
| þanon untýdras | ealle onwōcon, |
| eotenas ond ylfe | ond orcneas, |
| swylce gī(ga)ntas, | þā wið Gode wunnon |
| lange þrāge; | hē him ðæs lēan forgeald (Klaeber 6-7). |

These lines, in modern English, read: “So then the people rejoiced happily, until a certain hellish fiend (began) to do wicked deeds. Grendel was the fierce creature’s name, who (was) notorious (for) marching in the waste borderland. He possessed the fastness of the fens. The unfortunate man occupied the land of the race of monsters, while the Creator (has) condemned Caine’s people.—The eternal Lord punished (them) for the murder. After the slaying of Abel there wasn’t (any) rejoicing, but banishment by God for his crime against mankind. All those born of his evil offspring, (such as) Grendel, elves, orcs, (and) giants, then fought with God for a long time. Therefore, He gave them their comeuppance” (Jacobsen).

However, in the mid-19th-century, Wackerbarth translated these same lines as
Thus gallantly the Comrades fared,

Till one both stark and fell,
 Dark Deeds to perpetrate prepared,—
 A ghastly Foe from Hell:
 And Grendel hight that demon gaunt;
 The Marches were his lonely Haunt,
 The Moor and Fen and Fastness' Height
 He held subjected to his Might.
 The Dwellings of the Demon-kin
 Full long had he been doom'd to guard,
 Sith first of old condemn'd for Sin
 By the Creatour's just Award.
 Th' eternal Lord on Race of Cain
 Avenged the Death of Abel slain,
 For little was he pleased to see
 That Deed of salvage Enmity,
 But for his Crime th' Creator's Ban
 Out-drove him from the Haunts of Man.
 Therefrom arose the Monster Crew,
 Eotens, Elves, Orks, and Gyants too;
 And long 'gainst GOD a War they made,
 He therefore Vengeance due repaid (Wackerbarth 5).

In these lines there are many apparent lexical differences in comparison to the original; many of which are deliberately archaic themselves or spelled in such a way to denote thus. For example, words such as hight, sith, and drave are archaic and completely obsolete; whereas words like eotens, orks, and gyants are old spellings that have left English, utilized in order to show their archaisms. Veiled within all of the obsolete, or near obsolete, lexical decisions by Wackerbarth

are three words, "gallantly", "deeds", and "ghastly", which each portray an image of the coming of Grendel and the beginning of Hrothgar's problems.

Firstly, the word "gallantly" entered the language during the 1550s to mean "in gorgeous style; showily" (*OED*). This word's meaning changed in 1610 to the romanticized definition of the word, which describes an individual who extends "with courtesy or politeness; exaggerated gallant or courtier courtesy toward women" (*OED*). The first definition is one that would be the most apt way of describing Hrothgar's thanes, as seen through the eyes of Wackerbarth.

However, it was the last definition that was in usage during Wackerbarth's time period. This brings to mind the romanticized version of a courtier as seen in Victorian literature. However, according to Wackerbarth, the history of gallantly is the opposite of its true timeline. A "modern" reader would expect Hrothgar's thanes to be honorable, excellent swordsmen, and fearless. This is seen in the way in which gallantly is used to describe Hrothgar's thanes before they were slaughtered by Grendel. This is because the word "fared" in the passage refers back to the "gallant Comrades." In this passage, the verb also hinges onto the second part of the line which creates a contrast between the thanes and Grendel with the phrase "stark and fell." One who is "stark" is plain whereas one who is "fell" is below the surface, which brings an image of hell to a reader's mind. This type of parallel is furthered with the imagery between gallantry, or light, in comparison to that of darkness.

The thanes do fall into the darkness, but not without a fight; a fight that is honorable and holds true to the Victorian courtier. This is seen with the utilization of the word "deeds" throughout the passage. Deed(s) entered the language in the 900s from OE with the definition: "that which is done, acted, or performed by an intelligent or responsible agent; an act of bravery"

(*OED*). This definition is one which would continue the imagery of the bravery of Hrothgar's thanes; if a new definition had not entered the language 1400-1600.

For example, this meaning referred to a "thing to be done, work the task or duty of any time or person" (*OED*). This appears to be the definition that Wackerbarth was thinking of when he decided to utilize this noun to replace Anglo-Saxon word meaning the same thing.

The second word, "ghastly," entered the language in 1300 with the definition of "causing terror, terrible, horrible, full of fear" (*OED*). This meaning became obsolete in the 1600s and was replaced during the same time period with "like a spectre, or a dead body; death-like, pale" (*OED*). This definition had the longest period of usage of 300 years as seen with its decline in the 19th-century. It was during this decline that another definition replaced the last by changing the meaning of "ghastly" to "shocking, frightful" (*OED*). Readers would expect Wackerbarth to correlate the meaning of "ghastly" with that of the final definition, but that was not the time period in which he wrote his translation.

For the word "ghastly", Wackerbarth intended either the first or second meaning. On the one hand, the first could be the one Wackerbarth envisioned because of his inclination toward archaisms in his translations. On the other hand, the second could be the meaning Wackerbarth meant. This is because the second definition creates more imagery and a poetic feel to the lines. Ghastly enhances the passage and creates an image of the initial fight between Hrothgar's thanes and Grendel. This word also fashions more sympathy for the thanes and Hrothgar's plight. In doing so, Wackerbarth designs the platform for Beowulf and his successful adventures.

The next translator, Thomas Arnold, however, translated the lines vastly differently. According to Arnold, the lines read as:

So did the king's men live in pleasures, right blessedly, until that one, a fiend in hell, began to work mischief. This cruel spirit was called Grendel, a great bestrider of the mark, who beset the moors, the fen and the wilderness. The man accursed inhabited for a while the abode of the sea-serpent brood, after that the Creator had condemned him. On the kindred of Cain the eternal Lord avenged that murder by which he slew Abel. Nor did he have joy of that feud, but he, the Creator, banished him for that offence far off from mankind. Thence monstrous births all woke into being, Jotuns, and elves, and ghosts, as well as giants, which strove against God for a long time: he for that paid them their reward" (Arnold 9-10).

In this passage, Arnold creates a correlation between the Christian heaven and hell as a means to describe the plight of Hrothgar's thanes and create a benevolent image of the fallen heroes. This is seen with lexical decisions such as "blessedly," "mischief," and "cruel" made by Arnold in this passage.

For example, the word "blessedly" is from the late 12th-century which means "supremely happy" (etymonline). This definition was in usage for a couple hundred years until it was replaced in the 1400s to mean "in a blessed manner; fortunate, happily" (*OED*). It was this definition that, according to Arnold's timeline, would be linked with that of Arnold's translation. In utilizing this meaning in the passage it generates a relationship with Arnold's benevolent imagery by fashioning an image of a monk, or other religious male figure, that feels fortunate or acts with blessed mannerisms. This is furthered with the next key word Arnold utilized in his translation.

The second word, "mischief," entered in the early 1300s with the primary definition of a "misfortune, a calamity" (*OED*). This meaning was short-lived by becoming obsolete in the 1500s. During this time period two definitions for mischief entered the language at the same time, one of which became obsolete over time. These definitions are separated through their

contextual usage. For example, the first referred to the physical nature of people by meaning an “evil plight or condition; ill-fortune; trouble, distress” (*OED*). This definition became obsolete within a few hundred years. The second meaning, however, referred to the physicality of an action with the definition of to “harm, injury, or evil done to or suffered by a person” (*OED*). This definition was in usage during the time of Arnold’s translation and is thereby the one that he intended. In utilizing such a word in his translation, Arnold once again harkens to the benevolent imagery. This is because the latter definition is reminiscent of the Christian Jesus figure, a symbol that has a benevolent nature, but suffers many wrongs and evils in his life.

This is continued with the last word chosen by Arnold, “cruel.” This word entered the language in the 1300s with the definition “disposed to inflict suffering; indifferent to or taking pleasure in another's pain or distress; destitute of kindness or compassion; merciless, pitiless, hard-hearted” (*OED*). This was in the English vernacular until the 1800s. During this meaning’s time frame, another definition entered the adjective’s inventory. In the 16th-century, cruel meant one who is “causing or characterized by great suffering; extremely painful or distressing” (*OED*). This definition was in usage until the 19th-century, the time period of Arnold’s translation. It is because of the time frame, as well as the previous definitions, that Arnold clearly meant to utilize the last meaning that entered the language. By knowing this, Arnold’s image of the fallen heroes is furthered. This is because the lexical decision creates a parallel between saints and Jesus figures with that of persecution

Garnett, the last 19th-century translator, stated the lines read:

Thus were the warriors living in joys
 Happily then, until one began
 Great woes to work, a fiend of hell:
 The wrathful spirit was Grendel named,

The mighty mark-stepper who the moors held,
 Fen and fastness: the sea-fiend's abode
 The joyless being a while in-dwelt,
 Since the Creator him had proscribed.
 Upon Cain's kin that crime avenged
 The Lord eternal, for that he slew Abel:
 Joyed he not in that feud, but him afar banished
 For that crime the Creator away from mankind:
 Thence evil demons all were produced,
 Eotens and elves and monsters of sea,
 Such were the giants who strove against God
 For a long time: He repaid them for that. (Garnett 4).

Through this, a new image of Grendel, and of Hrothgar's thanes, is created through Garnett's lexical decisions. This is seen with words such as "happily," "woes," and "wrathful." With these words, Arnold's Grendel is transformed into a more forgivable character. This is perceived through each word's etymology.

For example, the first word "happily" has an interesting history based on how the meanings altered over the centuries. "Happily" first entered the language in the 14th-century with the definition of "by chance; perhaps, possibly" (*OED*). This meaning became archaic and rare in usage by the 1600s; during which time another definition blossomed into fruition. The definition of "with or by good fortune; successfully; fortunately, luckily; contentment" (*OED*) was inserted into the vernacular in the mid-16th-century. Through this, the reader knows that Hrothgar's thanes (or warriors) were lucky and had good fortune until their loud feasting reached the ears of Grendel. Grendel, in a sense, is forced into the position against Hrothgar, Hrothgar's thanes, and

later, Beowulf. This is because prior to each attack, there is a loud feast or celebration in the hall. This is perceived through Garnett's decision to use "woes" to describe the coming of Grendel. "Woes" entered the language during the early OE period to mean "an exclamation of loss, grief, or lamentation" (*OED*). This definition became obsolete 1400-1500. Before it became obsolete completely, however, other meanings for this word entered the language.

For example, in 1000, the definition of "woes" was "in prophetic or denunciatory utterances of the type of Old English" (*OED*) once this word became part of the vernacular. This meaning, much like the original definition, became obsolete in the 1500s. The next meaning to enter the vernacular for "woes" occurred in 1300. It was during this century that "woes" changed to mean that "I am distressed, afflicted, unfortunate, grieved" (*OED*). During this time period, another definition entered the language. "Woe" also meant that "evil [may] befall or light upon; a curse upon; cursed be or shall be" (*OED*). Both of these definitions from 1300 were in use during the time period in which Garnett composed his translation. Because of this, it is important to look at the context of "woes". If two lines are ordered into modern English syntactical order, then "woes" is visibly being used as a noun. Therefore, the definition that Garnett intended was the first one that entered the vernacular in 1300 AD.

By knowing the definition of "woes," Grendel was cursed to reap vengeance on Hrothgar and Beowulf's men. Grendel did not want to attack the innocent citizens, but was forced to because of his affliction, or an unfortunate or grieved event. For Grendel, each of the definitions fit his circumstances. For example, Grendel's affliction is being a son, or descendant, of Cain; whereas his unfortunate/ grievous event is the noise coming from the feasting in Hrothgar's hall. Because both of these are characteristics of Grendel and his story, Grendel is changed into a

sympathetic creature. This is furthered with the last word in Garnett's translation, "wrathful", which facilitates an understanding for the events surrounding the attacks on Hrothgar's hall.

"Wrathful" entered the language in the early 11th-century with the definition of "anger, angry" (*OED*). This became obsolete in the late 1300s. During this time frame, another meaning became popular. "Wrathful" now referred to someone who is or was "harboring wrath; full of anger; enraged, incensed" (*OED*) as a means to replace the archaism. Wrathful, in essence, kept most of its original meaning; although today's definition is more pejorative than its ancestor.

Grendel, with this lexical decision, is transformed into an individual who is consumed with anger and wrath ("violent anger" (*OED*)). Grendel, because of his description as being a "wrathful spirit", never had a chance to be anything other than an evil being, bent on destruction.

Donaldson, much like Garnett, portrayed a different rendition of Grendel. Donaldson, as the first 20th-century translator, depicted lines 99-114 as

Thus these warriors lived in joy, blessed, until one began to do evil deeds, a hellish enemy. The grim spirit was called Grendel, known as a rover of the borders, one who held the moors, fen and fastness. Unhappy creature, he lived for a time in the home of the monster's race, after God had condemned them as kin of Cain. The Eternal Lord avenged the murder in which he slew Abel. Cain had no pleasure in that feud, but He banished him far from mankind, the Ruler, for that misdeed. From him sprang all bad breeds, trolls and elves and monsters—likewise the giants who strove for a long time with God. He paid them their reward for that (Donaldson 5).

In these lines, Donaldson utilizes many negations as well as words that are associated with an undesirable imagery.

For example, words such as "evil," "enemy," "hellish," "grim," "unhappy," "creature," "monster," "Abel," "murder," "slew," "misdeed," and "trolls" are all words that

represent an objectionable imagery. Out of this array of negative lexicon, the ones which portray an adverse image of Grendel are “enemy,” “rover, and “hellish.” This is recognized through their etymologies as well as their contexts and the way in which Donaldson utilizes the words in his prose translation. The first one displays the depth of Grendel’s negative character with the word choice of “enemy.” “Enemy” entered the language in the 12th-century from Latin with the meaning of “an unfriend; enemy, demon, foe” (etymonline). However, in the 15th-century, “enemy” refers directly to the Enemy, the Devil [of Christianity]” (*OED*) became another definition for “enemy.” Because the definition relates directly with religion, and the word itself, this meaning could not be the one Donaldson intended for his translation. This can be perceived through his previous lexical decisions, where he did not choose such words that refer directly to themselves previously. Donaldson’s word choice is a literal, verbatim translation that adheres to the OE, but the translation does not imply religion through its lexicon.

Moreover, Donaldson was well versed in archaisms, as seen with his previous lexical decisions. Because of thus, the first definition is what Donaldson intended. This choice starts to create a truly negative image of Grendel. Grendel is first seen as a demon and dark spirit to be feared, and later, destroyed. He does not have a choice to be anything but a villain toward those that “live in joy” (Donaldson 5) or any that go into the moors.

Additionally, according to Donaldson, the one who controlled the moors was Grendel, who was also known as “a rover of the borders” (Donaldson 5). The word “rover” sounds negative and also brings an undesirable image to a reader’s mind. “Rover” entered the language in the 14th- century to refer to “a pirate” (*OED*). This definition has an interesting history because it was first obsolete and then returned 50-100 years later. During the time period that “rover” was first obsolete, the meaning replaced by another (before it returned obsolete again). In the 1600s,

“rover” indicated “a robber, marauder, raider” (*OED*). Unfortunately, this meaning, and the original, became obsolete by the late-20th- to early 21st-century.

Nevertheless, the two definitions are relatable. This is seen with how individuals, and Hollywood, depict a pirate as someone who robs/ steals, raids/ plunders, and retreats to their hideout when threatened. Therefore, Donaldson means both definitions simultaneously. In doing such, Donaldson creates a parallel between Beowulf’s time period and modern readers. Readers of Donaldson’s era were able to perceive the negative connotations that are inherent in piracy or Viking (“in general use, a warlike pirate or sea-rover” (*OED*)). Modern readers, of the 21st-century, would not always make the same connection. This is because of the continual romanticizing of land and sea piracy by Hollywood since Donaldson’s time period.

However, modern individuals do recognize what a robber, marauder, and raider is. Through this, Donaldson ensures that his translation is able to stand a small test of time (half a century). Readers, in the 21st-century, are given a greater negative image of Grendel through the utilization of rover, as seen through the word’s definition as well as history. A pirate, robber, or marauder do not (typically) have redeeming qualities; similarly to a spirit or demon. With these words used in the same passage in Grendel’s introduction, Grendel is being likened to the epitome of evil. This is seen with the last crucial lexical decision by Donaldson.

The last decisive word seen in Donaldson’s translation is “hellish.” “Hellish” entered the language in the 12th-century with the definition of “hellish, infernal” (etymonline). This meaning was in use until it became rare in the vernacular and replaced in the 1500s with “of, belonging to, or relating to hell or the infernal regions in all mythologies including Christianity; infernal” (*OED*). This meaning was still in usage during Donaldson’s translation. Because of this, and the previous etymologies in this passage of “enemy” and “rover”, Donaldson meant the final

definition in relationship to “hellish.” Therefore, Grendel becomes a truly negative image as well as an evil that is not man-made. This is because Grendel is birthed in the fiery regions of hell and has the attributes as being such as seen with the meanings of enemy and rover. Furthermore, in the reader’s eyes, Grendel is not given any redeeming or likable qualities.

In utilizing these lexical decisions in this passage, Donaldson is able to create art through imagery and his knowledge of etymology as well as language. The first is seen with the devilish image that Donaldson creates through his word choices in describing Grendel and his heritage; whereas, the latter two is realized through the way in which Donaldson blends definitions together as if he knew how the noun was going to be affected by time.

Lehmann, as the poetic translator of the 20th-century, represented lines 99-114 as

Thus that group of men gleefully lived
With smiles and laughter until a single foe
Began harmful works, a hellish demon.
That ghastly grim one, Grendel, they called him,
Was that fiend of fens who defended the waste,
Marsh and moorland. Where the monsters dwell
That gloom-weary ghoul guarded a season
After the Creator had outlawed the cursed one
Among the kin of Cain. The King of heaven
Had avenged Abel for his violent death;
In that feud he found no favor of the Master,
Who banished him from bounds of men.
Thence uncouth creatures crept forth, both giants,
Elves, and ettins, orcs, rocs followed—
Those that had battled long against blessed God,
Who sent, to right wrongs done, retribution. (Lehmann 24).

In doing such, Lehmann creates a distinct parallel between Hrothgar's thanes and Grendel (as well as aligning herself with 19th-century translators Garnett and Arnold with furthering this dichotomy between these two fictional entities). However, in order to do so, Lehmann had to be very selective with her lexicon as well as the syntax she employed. There are three words in particular that are able to accomplish both parallels: "gleefully," "works," and "demon."

"Gleefully" entered the language in the late 1500s "full of glee; manifestation or possessed by glee" (*OED*). This definition became rare in usage until the mid-1800s because the word "glee" became obsolete by 1500-1700. The meaning did return to English, but as a new, more simplified definition in the 1800s "with glee" (*OED*). Many modern readers would not know the definition of such a word. According to the *OED*, "glee" is when someone experiences "mirth, joy, rejoicing" (*OED*). In utilizing this word, Lehmann started to create a parallel between Hrothgar's thanes and Grendel. This is perceived, for example, through two aspects: recognizing precisely what Lehmann intended as well as a quick comparison between the OE word and the way that Lehmann translated it. "Gleefully" replaces the OE word *drēamum* because of the syntactical order of *drēamum* in comparison to *eadiglice*; both words are associated with good tidings and feelings. *Drēamum*, can be loosely translated as "rejoiced/rejoicing"; the exact definition that Lehmann used in her translation. In doing so, Lehmann creates the same parallel as the original scribes.

Similar to the original scribes of *Beowulf*, Lehmann utilizes a word that is associated with religion. This word is "works." "Works" entered the language during the OE period, referring to "an act, deed; something that is in the process of, or has been done, or performed" (*OED*). This definition would have been perfect in describing OE's "fyrene" (wicked deeds), but this meaning

became archaic and rare in the vernacular until the 1400s. In the 1400s, the definition of “works” changed to “an act or deed expressive of a particular moral quality or purpose” (*OED*). This last definition would have to be the one which Lehmann truly intended in her translation and furthers the parallel between the scribes as well as another parallel with Hrothgar’s thanes and Grendel. In incorporating religious undertones with the usage of “works”, another parallel with the characters of Grendel and Hrothgar’s thanes is seen. On the one hand, Grendel is seen as purely evil with his description as the “son of Cain” who is being punished for the actions of his ancestors. Hrothgar’s thanes, on the other hand, are slaughtered for having a saintly life with their feasting, partying, and/or merry-making. This was something which Grendel did not experience much in the moors due to his exile.

This parallel between the two groups of Grendel and Hrothgar’s thanes in continued with the final word of “demon” as a word to describe Grendel in Grendel’s introduction. “Demon,” when it entered the English language in the 1200s, indicated “any evil spirit or malevolent supernatural being; a devil” (*OED*). However, in the 1600s, a “demon” also referred to “a cruel, wicked, or destructive person or animal” (*OED*). This added meaning surprisingly affected the earlier distinct parallel between good and evil as seen by the previous translators and Lehmann’s own lexical decisions. The last definition, because of the time period of its usage, displays Grendel as a more “forgiveable” character than he was beforehand. Grendel is able to be redeemed as a person or animal, but not as a spirit or supernatural being.

Chapter 4: Lines 99-114

According to Heaney, lines 99-114 read:

So times were pleasant for the people there

Until finally one, a fiend out of hell

Began to work his evil in the world.

Grendel was the name of this grim demon

Haunting the marshes, marauding round

The heath and the desolate fens; he had dwelt

For a time in misery
 Among the banished monsters,
 Caine's clan, whom the Creator had outlawed and condemned as outcasts.
 For the killing of Abel the Eternal Lord had exacted a price;
 Caine got no good from committing that murder
 Because the Almighty made him anathema,
 And out of the curse of his exile there sprang
 Ogres and elves and evil phantoms
 And the giants too who strove with God
 Time and again until He gave them their reward. (Heaney 9).

In these lines, Heaney downplays the parallel between Grendel and Hrothgar's thanes. This is seen specifically with the word choices of "pleasant," "evil," and "grim." For example, "pleasant" entered the language in the 14th-century from OF (Old French) to imply that someone is "favorable, well-disposed" (*OED*). This meaning became rare and then obsolete very quickly. However, by the mid-14th-century, "pleasant" referred to someone "having pleasing manners, demeanor, or appearance; amiable, cheerful, good-humored" (*OED*). As the only surviving meaning of Heaney's time period of translation, Heaney intended the meaning in the vernacular of the decades encompassing the years of 1350 - 21st-century. This means that Hrothgar's thanes are not only happy, as seen in previous translations, but also have the romanticized characteristics of a chivalric knight. With this, Hrothgar's thanes become less innocent and wholly good (angelic). Anyone who is "pleasant" will possess chivalric knight characteristics. That is, the individual will know and use proper etiquette, has a favorable appearance, and/ or is good-humored). However, he/ she will have a flaw in being such a person all day and night. This

is because in the tales of King Arthur and his knights, knights in Hollywood or Renaissance Fairs, each of the knights will have a flaw (excluding Galahad).

However, the flaw will not be as great as the flaw seen in characters such as Grendel. For example, according to Heaney, in his introduction of Grendel, Grendel is from hell and is bringing his evil to the world. “Evil”, for example, entered the language during the OE period with the definition of someone or something that is “morally depraved, bad, wicked, vicious” (*OED*). This meaning became obsolete, but was replaced in the 13th-century to refer to someone who is “doing or tending to do harm; hurtful, mischievous, prejudicial; boding ill” (*OED*). Because of the time frame of the obsolete definition, Heaney intended the meaning still in his vernacular. However, with the last definition, Heaney’s decision to use “evil” to describe Grendel starts to make light of Grendel’s depravity. This is seen with the ameliorative way that the meaning was affected over time. Grendel is no longer bad or wicked, but mischievous someone who does harm. This renders Grendel as a character that can change and be liberated from the moors.

This is furthered with Heaney’s word choice of “grim” to describe the character of Grendel himself (not merely his actions wrought in the world). “Grim,” when it entered the language in the late 900s, characterized someone as being “fierce, cruel, savage or harsh in disposition or action; daring, determined, bold” (*OED*). In the 14th-century, another meaning replaced the original. “Grim” now, and through Heaney’s time period, indicated that someone was “stern, unrelenting, merciless; resolute, uncompromising” (*OED*). With this definition replacing the original, Heaney aimed to utilize the meaning in use during his lifetime. Thus, Grendel’s softening is confirmed. This is because, once again, Heaney chose a word that was

affected by amelioration semantically. Grendel, rather than being a cruel or savage demon, is transformed into a stern, unrelenting creature (animalistic or humanoid).

Chapter 5: Conclusion

Through these two passages, the lexicon, as well as the syntactical order of the word in question, is very important in presenting the art of *Beowulf*. This is seen in the imagery depicted by the six renowned 19th- and 20th-century translators: A. Diedrich Wackerbarth, Thomas Arnold, James Garnett, E. Talbot Donaldson, Ruth Lehmann, and Seamus Heaney. Out of these

translators, there are two main camps of translators that are perceived (with an extra camp which is a combination of two of them): literal, verbatim, and poetic(, and a combination of the two first camps). The first camp is the poetic camp as seen through the translations by Wackerbarth and Lehmann. These translators compromised the true meaning or essence of the OE word as a means to show the art of *Beowulf*.

For example, Wackerbarth chose words which rhymed and adhered to 19th-century poetic verse rules; whereas Lehmann utilized strict devices as seen in the original poem. In doing such, Lehmann uses OE poetic devices through her lexical decisions as well as the syntax of the original manuscript. In doing so, Lehmann selected words that adhere to alliteration as well as the half-lines, or syntax, of the poem. This, unfortunately, affect how readers perceive the story and the story's message and history.

The second camp is the literal or verbatim camp which includes translators Arnold and Donaldson. Arnold and Donaldson each utilize the literal translations of the OE words seen in the manuscript followed by the syntax of their time periods. Arnold, for example, uses the syntactical order of his time period as well as word choices from his era to demonstrate the meaning of *Beowulf*. Donaldson does the same, but, in doing so, each translator does not illustrate the art of *Beowulf*. It is lost through the decision to use the direct meaning of the OE word and forego any of the poetic devices.

The final camp encompasses the works by Garnett and Heaney. Garnett, for instance, indicates through his decision to blend the two camps, is able to start to capture the art of *Beowulf* as well as the intended meanings, imagery, parallels, and dichotomies in the poem through lexicon and syntax. In doing so, Garnett, as the first American translator, influences Heaney to create his own. Heaney, in his translation, expresses a type of art and utilizes much of

the intended meanings through imagery, parallels, and dichotomies through the characters. In these camps, each translator aspires to convey the dichotomy or parallel between Hrothgar's thanes (or Beowulf) and Grendel (or Unferth) as a means to show the art of *Beowulf* and further readership of the poem itself.

The 19th-century translators are unable to capture the art of *Beowulf*, but they are able to provoke the discussion of its art and authenticity. In each translation, the parallel or dichotomy between the two parties is furthered which continued the study of the poem itself. These translators, therefore, lay the groundwork for the most successful 20th-century translators. Out of the three 19th-century writers, Arnold and Garnett's works inspired future discussion by influencing 20th-century translators. This is because these three translators each changed the reader's perception through their lexicon in the two passages (as well as throughout their translations).

For example, Arnold incorporated religious undertones in order to give reasoning through poetry (or art) as to the actions of good vs. evil and the fallen heroes (Hrothgar's thanes). Garnett, however, was the first translator to portray, through his verbatim "art," Grendel as a forgivable character. The imagery created by Arnold and Garnett began the groundwork for the 20th-century translators. However, out of the three translators of this century, it is Heaney's translation that stands out the most through the lexical decisions that are constructed in the passages. This is because, through a lexical and syntactical analysis of the before-mentioned passages, Heaney's translation reveals a new type of art; something which was not seen before his text.

In doing so, Heaney shows that although the original art of *Beowulf* is lost in translation, a new art is created. This is because of the language barrier between Old English and modern

English is vast to the average reader. In order to comprehend the original art, the reader has to be well-versed in both languages. However, because of Heaney and his translation, the original and new art is apparent in his dual language editions. First, these show his translation alongside the transcribed *Beowulf* poem. By doing thus, Heaney is able to expose the reader to the original art; he displays the original alliteration, imagery, style, lexicon, and syntax. It is also through this translation, the reader is also able to observe the new type of art of *Beowulf*. This art draws in the reader and makes the translation more viable to readers than ever before.

In order to do so, Heaney incorporated many aspects of the original. For example, Heaney used words in his translation that have been in the English language since the time period of the *Beowulf* manuscript. In his translation, Heaney utilized the half-lines which are synonymous to the syntax of the poem, but also employs modern English syntax simultaneously. This is because Heaney seeks to draw in more readerships to display his art and continue the exploration and discussion of the poem alive. Furthermore, it is because of this that the *Beowulf* manuscript should not leave the English literature curriculum. Without this great piece of literature, the first and only epic written in English would be lost in time, like many other great works have suffered over the millennia.

Works Cited

Arnold, Thomas. *Beowulf: An Epic Poem Translated From The Anglo-Saxon Into English Verse*.

London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1876. Print.

Brodeur, Arthur G. *The Art of Beowulf*. Berkeley: University of CA Press, 1969. Print.

Donaldson, E. Talbot. *Beowulf*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1966. Print.

Online Etymology Dictionary. Douglas Harper, n.d. Web. Sept. 2013.

<<http://www.etymonline.com/>>. Web.

Garnett, James M. *Beowulf: An Anglo-Saxon Poem* Boston: Ginn, Heath & Company, 1882.

Print.

Heaney, Seamus. *Beowulf*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2000. Print.

Klaeber, FR. *Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg*. Boston: D.C. Heath & Co., 1950. Print.

Lehmann, Ruth P.M. *Beowulf an Imitative Translation*. Austin: University of TX Press, 1988.

Print.

Magennis, Hugh. *Translating Beowulf*. Great Britain: D.S. Brewer, 2011. Print.

Oxford English Dictionary Online. Oxford UP, n.d. Web. Sept. 2013.

<<http://www.OED.com.falcon.lib.csub.edu/>>. Web.

Overing, Gillian R. *Language, Sign, and Gender in Beowulf*. Carbondale: S. IL University Press,

1990. Print.

Niles, John D. *Beowulf: The Poem and its Tradition*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University

Press, 1983. Print.

Niles, John D. "Rewriting *Beowulf*: The Task of Translation." *College English* 55.8 (1993): 858-

878. Print.

Tinker, Chauncey B. *The Translations of Beowulf: A Critical Biography*. New York: Henry Holt

& Co., 1903. Print.

-- *Beowulf*. Trans. Tinker, Chauncey. Newson and Co., 1912. Print.

-- *Beowulf*. Trans. Tinker, Chauncey. New York: Newson and Co., 1902. Print.

Tolkein, J. R. R. "Beowulf: The Monsters and the Critics." *The Monsters and The Critics and*

Other Essays. Ed. Christopher Tolkien. Hammersmith: HarperCollins Pub., 2006. 5-48.

Print.

-- "On Translating *Beowulf*": *The Monsters and The Critics and Other Essays*. Ed.

Christopher Tolkien. Hammersmith: HarperCollins Pub., 2006. 49-71. Print.

Wackerbarth, A.D. *Beowulf: An Epic Poem Translated From The Anglo-Saxon Into English*

Verse. London: William Pickering, 1849. Print.

“Anti-hero” *Wikia: Villains Wikia* . N.d. Web. Sept 2013.

<<http://villains.wikia.com/wiki/Category:Anti-Villain>>. Web.