PHILOLOGIA ANGLICA

*Essays
Presented to
Professor
Yoshio
Terasawa
on the
Occasion
of His Sixtieth
Birthday*

PHILOLOGIA ANGLICA

Essays Presented to Professor Yoshio Terasawa
on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday

(寺澤芳雄教授還暦記念論文集)

Edited by

Kinshiro Oshitari

Yoshihiko Ikegami

Eiichi Suzuki

Shuji Sato

Tadao Kubouchi

Yasuhiro Yano

Shigeaki Karakida

KENKYUSHA · TOKYO

PREFACE

Professor Yoshio Terasawa of the University of Tokyo celebrates his sixtieth birthday on 24th February 1988. He has taught and exerted much influence upon his juniors and pupils with his wide and deep academic interest as well as his gentle tolerance. It was natural that these students should think of dedicating a book of collected essays to him in honour of this occasion as a token of their gratitude.

Thus it was in February 1983 that the editors first met and talked about the basic plan for the publication of a festschrift. When we revealed this plan to Professor Terasawa to ask his approval, he at first strenuously declined our offer, fearing that it should prove too great a burden for us. He later, however, granted our request and we met several times to plan the details of our undertaking. In September 1985 we sent our requests for scholars to write and contribute essays. There were many scholars who were good friends with Professor Terasawa, and whom it would have been appropriate to ask. It however posed somewhat of a dilemma: we had, on the one hand, to take the limited space into consideration, and, on the other hand, we wished to select themes which would form a coherent whole.

As is well known, Professor Terasawa's research has shown a wide and many-sided interest, ranging over practically all subjects in English philology, but it is also clear that his work has focused mainly on four fields: (1) history of English; (2) medieval English literature; (3) the English Bible; and (4) lexicography and lexicology. We, therefore, decided to collect essays in these four areas to reflect his interest as accurately as possible.

Consequently our requests for contributions were sent out to a limited number of scholars only, realizing with regret that there were many other scholars who were closely associated with him in their research. Fortunately there were not a few scholars at home and abroad who were willing to contribute an essay with a readiness which was entirely due to the admiration they felt for Professor Terasawa. By the deadline 15th December 1986, forty-two essays including twelve from abroad had been collected. These demonstrate that Professor Terasawa's friendship and activities extend beyond Japan. The editors express their joy and gratitude that, with the help of these contributing scholars, this volume has evolved into something

which can appropriately be dedicated to this man whom we so honour and respect.

A brief biographical note provided by Professor Terasawa, and a list of his publications, are included in this festschrift. The latter was prepared by Mr Y. Yano and Mr S. Sato. Mr T. Kubouchi helped see the volume through the press.

Our heartful thanks are due to Mr Torao Ueda, President of Kenkyusha Ltd., who made the publication of this volume possible, and to Mr Nobuyuki Nagashima of the Dictionary Department, who took charge of all the stages of production and without whose devoted work it would never have reached its present form. We also owe much to Professor Kazuo Ueda of Meisei University, who helped with the early stages of this volume. Lastly our thanks are due to Mrs Yukiko Kinoshita, secretary to the Centre for Mediaeval English Studies, Tokyo, who willingly helped Mr Kubouchi in various clerical and editorial work.

<div align="right">

Kinshiro Oshitari
for the editors

</div>

January 1988

CONTENTS (目次)

Part II　Medieval English Literature　第2部　中世英文学

Part III　The English Bible　第3部　英訳聖書

Part IV Lexicography and Lexicology　第4部　辞書学・語彙論

Part I History of English

第 1 部　英語史

Relative and Personal Pronouns in *Beowulf* : Eight Notes

Bruce Mitchell

Introduction

Professor Yoshio Terasawa himself touched on a problem concerned with Old English relative pronouns in his review of Visser's *An Historical Grammar of the English Language*; see *OES*, § 2304. I therefore hope that my reflections on the same topic will be acceptable to the distinguished scholar in whose honour I am pleased to write.

Before discussing the problem passages from *Beowulf*, I will remind the reader of the three functions in which combinations of the declinable pronoun *se* and the indeclinable particle *þe* may be used when the *se* element is not the only antecedent. They are:

(i) the '*seþe* relative, in which both elements have the case required by the adjective clause, as in *Genesis A* 138
Him arn on last,
þrang þystre genip, þam þe se þeoden self
sceop nihte naman;

(ii) the *se'þe* relative, in which the *se* element has the case of the principal clause and *þe* the case of the adjective clause, as in *Genesis A* 150
Flod wæs adæled
under heahrodore halgum mihtum,
wæter of wætrum, þam þe wuniað gyt
under fæstenne folca hrofes;

(iii) the *seþe* relative, in which both clauses require the same case, as in *Daniel* 33
þa wearð reðemod rices ðeoden,
unhold þeodum þam þe æhte geaf.

See further *OES*, §§ 2153–79.[1]

---

[1] Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* (*ÆCHom* i and ii) are quoted from Benjamin Thorpe's edition (London, 1844 and 1846)
Beowulf is quoted from E.v.K. Dobbie's edition in Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records

I

Beowulf 841   No his lifgedal
              sarlic þuhte   secga ænegum
              þara þe tirleases   trode sceawode, ...

The Wrenn-Bolton note reads:

842–43. *secga ǣnegum . . . scēawode.* The dat. sing. *ǣnegum* with gen. pl. *þāra,* like such prons. as *gehwylc* with gen. pl., takes the verb in the sing.—hence *scēawode.*

This is misleading on three counts:

(*a*) *ænegum* can be singular or plural; see *OES,* § 2348;

(*b*) *sceawode* may not be unambiguously singular; see *OES,* § 19;

(*c*) even when *þara þe* depends on an unambiguously singular form of an indefinite, the verb in the adjective clause may be plural; see *OES,* § 2349.

IV (New York, 1953; London, 1954)

OES is Bruce Mitchell *Old English Syntax* volumes I and II (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985).

I use the name(s) of the author(s) as the cue-title for the following:

Beowulf with the Finnesburg Fragment, edited by C. L. Wrenn, fully revised by W. F. Bolton (London, 1973)

Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg, edited by Fr. Klaeber, third edition with First and Second Supplements (Boston etc., 1950)

Beowulf with the Finnsburg Fragment, edited by A. J. Wyatt, new edition revised with Introduction and Notes by R. W. Chambers (Cambridge University Press, 1943)

Beowulf and the Finnesburg Fragment, translated by John R. Clark Hall, new edition by C. L. Wrenn with prefatory remarks by J.R.R. Tolkien (London, 1950)

Beowulf A New Prose Translation by Talbot Donaldson (W. W. Norton, 1966; Longmans, London, 1967)

Beowulf, translated by Kevin Crossley-Holland, introduced by Bruce Mitchell (London and New York, 1968)

The Old English Rune Poem: A Critical Edition by Maureen Halsall, McMaster Old English Studies and Texts 2 (University of Toronto Press, 1981)

Shin Oshima, "Anaphora in Old English", *Research Reports of the Kochi University* 29 *Humanities* (1980), 1–43

Knud Sørensen, "The Growth of Cataphoric Personal and Possessive Pronouns in English", *Current Topics in English Historical Linguistics : Proceedings of the Second International Conference on English Historical Linguistics Held at Odense University 13–15 April 1981,* edited by Michael Davenport, Erik Hansen, and Hans Frede Nielsen, *Odense University Studies in English* 4 (1983), 225–38.

II

Beowulf 1750   . . . ond he þa forðgesceaft
                    forgyteð ond forgymeð,   þæs þe him ær god sealde,
                    wuldres waldend,   weorðmynda dæl.

The problem here is the interpretation of *þæs þe*.   The Wrenn-Bolton edition is silent, both in the notes and the glossary.   The Wrenn-Clark Hall translation takes *þæs þe* as a relative pronoun ['which'] translating 'No thought has he about the world to come, and he disdains the share of honours God, the Lord of Glory, gave him in time past.'   This cannot be a literal translation, because *þæs* singular cannot agree with *weorðmynda* plural—hence we cannot have the *se'þe* relative—and because *sellan* is not recorded with the genitive—hence we cannot take *þæs* as referring to *dæl* and so we cannot have the '*seþe* relative.

In order to have a coherent discussion, we must note the following:

(a) *þa forðgesceaft* is feminine and therefore cannot be taken with *þæs*;

(b) *forgytan* is recorded with the accusative or the genitive (*OES*, § 1092 s.v. *for-gietan*);

(c) *forgyman* is recorded in *OES*, § 1092 (s.v. *for-gieman*), with 'acc., ?gen. in *Beo* 1751'.   That it—like *gyman* and *begyman*—can take the genitive is attested by *Law Rect* (Liebermann, p. 452) 20.1 *forðam gyf he for slæwðe his hlafordes forgymð* . . . .

In view of (c), we can translate 'and he forgets the world to come and disdains that which God, the Lord of Glory, gave him in times past, a share of honours'.   With this interpretation, *þæs* is the sole antecedent, *þe* is relative, and *dæl* is accusative, in apposition with *þe*; (see *OES*, § 2153).   Alternatively, we can translate *þæs þe* as 'what' (*OES*, § 2133) and explain *weorðmynda dæl* as an uninflected appositional variant; see *OES*, §§ 42(8) and 44(3).

An alternative interpretation is that of Klaeber (Glossary, s.v. *se*), who takes *þæs þe* as '(semi-conj.) *because, as*'.   Of the eight examples he cites, all but two follow a form of the noun *þanc* or the verb *þancian* and can be explained as meaning 'that which' or 'what'; see above.   The two exceptions are

Beowulf 107   Þone cwealm gewræc
                    ece drihten,   þæs þe he Abel slog . . . ,

in which *þæs þe* cannot be construed as 'that which' or 'what', and the ex-

ample under discussion. But the causal interpretation is acceptable in all eight; see *OES*, §§ 3113–17.

III

Beowulf 1845   Wen ic talige,
            gif þæt gegangeð,   þæt ðe gar nymeð,
            hild heorugrimme,   Hreþles eaferan,
            adl oþðe iren   ealdor ðinne,
            folces hyrde,   ond þu þin feorh hafast,
    1850   þæt þe Sægeatas   selran næbben
            to geceosenne   cyning ænigne,
            hordweard hæleþa,   gyf þu healdan wylt
            maga rice.

Since *þæt þe/þæt ðe* is not otherwise found in *Beowulf* as the equivalent of the conjunction *þætte*, the presumption must be that *ðe* in line 1846 and *þe* in line 1850 are both personal pronouns meaning respectively 'from you' (*OES*, § 1350) and 'than you' (*OES*, §§ 1358–64); compare *þæt þe* in line 1221 and *þæt þec/þæt ðec* in lines 1763, 1768, and 1827.

IV

Beowulf 2053   Nu her þara banena   byre nathwylces
            frætwum hremig   on flet gæð,
            morðres gylpeð,   ond þone maðþum byreð,
            þone þe ðu mid rihte   rædan sceoldest.

Klaeber's note on this passage reads:

> 2056. *þone þe.* The accus., in place of the more regular dat. (instr.) (with *rǽdan*), is the result of attraction to *þone māðþum* 2055. Cp., e.g., 2295, 3003.

With the dative *þæm þe/þam þe*, we would have the '*seþe* relative. The manuscript reading, rightly retained by Klaeber, has the *se'þe* relative, *þe* being the equivalent of a dative. The latter is more common in *Beowulf*. The '*seþe* relative appears in lines 1298, 1342, 1462, and (if we accept the Wrenn-Bolton reading; see **VII** below) 2468. The *se'þe* relative appears twenty-four times:

    lines 98, 206, 785, 843, 937, 996, 1051, 1123, 1196, 1407, 1461, 1578,
    1686, 1779, 2130, 2251, 2295, 2383, 2601, 2861, 3003, 3034, 3059, 3116.

It seems to me unnecessary to speak of 'attraction' in such examples.

V

Beowulf 2377   . . . hwæðre he him on folce   freondlarum heold,
                            estum mid are,   oððæt he yldra wearð,
                            Wedergeatum weold.

Here Dobbie's *him* for manuscript *hī* is clearly right, despite Klaeber (1950) and Wrenn-Bolton (1973), who both read *hine*; see Dobbie's note— copyright 1953, first published in England 1954.

VI

Beowulf 2646   Nu is se dæg cumen
                    þæt ure mandryhten   mægenes behofað,
                    godra guðrinca;   wutun gongan to,
                    helpan hildfruman,   þenden hyt sy,
        2650   gledegesa grim.

In the course of his generous review of my *Old English Syntax* (*RES* 37 (1986), 234–7) E. G. Stanley writes:

> My last example is not found in Dr. Mitchell's index, and probably not in his book (see §§ 1031–51): *hyt* perhaps 'it' at *Beowulf* 2649, where Klaeber and many others believe *hyt* means 'heat'. The point may be so obvious that it does not need to be made, yet Klaeber's note says 'That *hyt* should be the "proleptic" pronoun is not likely (though perhaps not impossible)'. Discussion would have been desirable in a standard work of syntax. The final words of § 1051 are applicable, 'There is room for more work here'.

I endeavour to rectify the omission here.

In *OES*, § 247, where I discuss the anticipatory or proleptic or cataphoric pronoun under the borrowed but less happy term 'backwards pronominalization', the important distinction between examples involving two clauses, e.g. 'When he heard this, the king became angry', and those involving only one clause, e.g. 'He said this, the apostle Paul', could have been made more forcefully.

At the time of my bibliographical deadline for *OES* (30 June 1981), I had noted no OE examples of the first type. Since then Sørensen (p. 227) has cited the sentence beginning *Đa ða he into ðam wætere eode* in *ÆCHom* ii. 40.21

> Crist wolde beon gefullod, na forði ðe him neod wære æniges fulluhtes,
> forði ðe he næfre nane synne ne geworhte, ac he wolde mid his
> eadmodnysse astellan ða bysne, þæt nan cyning ne nan rice man ne
> sceolde þincan to huxlic þæt he gebuge to Cristes fulluhte, þaða he sylf
> gemedemode þæt he wolde gebigan his halige heafod to his ðeowan
> handum. Ða ða he into ðam wætere eode, ða wæs þæt wæter and ealle
> wyllspringas gehalgode þurh Cristes lichaman to urum fulluhte,

with the suggestion that it may be a slavish rendering from an unknown
Latin source. This is quite possible. Alternatively one might argue that
the use of the emphatic *Cristes* rather than *his* was a deliberate stylistic
choice. Sørensen also wrote (p. 236 n. 10):

> 10. Although they do show cataphora, the following two examples from
>   poetry do not fall within the type studied here:
>   Hwæþre þæt gegongeð,   þeah þe hit sy greote beþeaht,
>   lic mid lame,   þæt hit sceal life onfon.
>   (*Judgement Day* I, 98–9)
>   'Sigel' semannum symble biþ on hihte,
>   ðonn hi hine feriaþ ofer fisces beþ,
>   oþ hi brimhengest bringeþ to lande.
>   (*Rune Poem* 45–7)

The sequence *hit . . . lic* in *Judgement Day* I 98 is clearly an example of
my second type; see below. (On the anticipatory *þæt*, see *OES*, § 1963.)
So Sørensen was right to distinguish it from his Ælfric example. *Rune Poem*
45 may not be an example of cataphora at all, as Halsall's note points out:

> 46. *ðonn* possibly should be expanded to *ðonne*, as by Dickins, p 17 and
>   Grienberger, p 212 (compare *ðon* in line 32, however).
>   *hine* the masculine accusative singular pronoun referring to *brim-
>   hengest* (as in Dobbie, p 157, following Grienberger, p 212).
>   Dickins (p 17) reads *hine* as a variant form of *heonan* (hence, away)
>   in order to avoid the awkwardness of a delayed referent; this inter-
>   pretation would make *feriaþ* an intransitive verb as in *The Battle
>   of Maldon*, line 179.

If *hine* is a cataphoric pronoun, the example belongs with my first type rather
than my second type in that two clauses are involved, not one. But there is
a difference between it and the Ælfric example. Ælfric has already men-
tioned *Crist*—the referent of *he*. So the pronoun is cataphoric only in the
sentence in which it occurs and not in the whole context. (Oshima (pp. 4–

6), in an article which also came to my attention after 30 June 1981, quoted *ÆCHom* ii. 40.21 above (with the sequence nominative *he* . . . genitive *Cristes*) and added further examples of this type: *BlHom* 79.7, 231.31, and 149.4 7 *þa he þis gecweden hæfde, þa astah ure Drihten on heofenas* (all with the sequence nominative . . . nominative); *BlHom* 49.2 *Gif him mon þonne hyran nelle, þonne mot se mæssepreost hit wrecan* . . . (dative . . . nominative); and *ÆLS* 21.120 *Hi wacodon ða þa niht wið ða byrgene mid him, biddende þone ælmihtigan god þæt he ðam adligan menn his hæle forgeafe* (dative . . . dative).) But if *hine* in the *Rune Poem* does refer to *brimhengest*, it is cataphoric in both the sentence and the context. These two sub-divisions must be distinguished in my first type; compare Sørensen, p. 235.

The second type too must be sub-divided; Sørensen (p. 225) quotes 'Only her naval supremacy saved England' and 'With their conversion to Christianity, the Vikings forged new links . . .'. Another variation, well-attested in OE but today normally at any rate unacceptable, is relevant to *Beowulf* 2646. Examples include *ÆCHom* i. 146.33 *He cwæð, se apostol Paulus, Judgement Day* I 98 above, and the second sentence in

Beowulf 26 Him ða Scyld gewat   to gescæphwile
felahror feran   on frean wære.
Hi hyne þa ætbæron   to brimes faroðe,
swæse gesiþas,   swa he selfa bæd, ...

(Compare here Oshima, pp. 36–7 n. 7.) The difficulty about taking lines 2649b–50a as an example of this type is not that the pattern is unidiomatic, but that *hyt*=*hit* would be neuter whereas *gledegesa grim* is masculine. Lack of concord between anaphoric *hit* and an antecedent is found in OE, e.g. *ÆCHom* ii. 266.33 *Etað þisne hlaf, hit is min lichama* (quoted below again in another connection); see *OES*, §§ 69–71 and 1489. At the moment I know of no examples of such lack of concord between cataphoric *hit* and a postcedent. But in view of *OES* i, pp. lviii-ix, I must conclude that this 'may be' an example of the type *He cwæð, se apostol Paulus* with lack of concord.

However, there is another syntactical possibility. All the editions to which I have immediate access agree in inserting a comma after *sy*. If we remove this comma, we have the sequence *þenden hyt sy gledegesa grim*, a construction in which *gledegesa grim* is the complement of the verb *sy*, not in apposition with the pronoun *hyt*.

OE examples of this type can easily be found. They range from patterns