The two main groups of changes which I have so far considered in this discussion — the first one being made up of revisions devoted to rendering the translation more exact in substance, style, and diction and the second one being composed of alterations made for the purpose of giving the rendering a certain archaic coloring — contain not only the great majority of the changes Morris made in Magnusson's rendering of the first half of the Sigurðar saga Jóraðalafara, Eyystína ok Ólafsf but also the most important of these alterations. The third group of revisions, which I shall next treat, is very small as compared with the first two groups, and the changes included here are on the whole rather insignificant. In these alterations Morris seems to have sought to improve the quality of the English of the translation, first by rectifying grammatically incorrect, awkward, or otherwise undesirable expressions or constructions used by Magnusson, secondly by correcting mistakes in spelling, and thirdly by rectifying errors in punctuation. In all, 152 changes, or 3 per cent of the total number 1932, fall into this group.

When we examine the alterations that Morris made for the purpose of correcting faulty expressions or constructions used by Magnusson, we find that in 23 of these 71 revisions the defects which Morris remedied were the result of Magnusson's carelessness or lack of full acquaintance with the English language; in the other 48 changes, however, the faulty constructions Morris corrected in Magnusson's rendering were the outcome of too close an adherence to the original. These 48 revisions are by far the most interesting ones in this whole group, for they show that Morris was not always consistent in making his altera-

1. For a complete list of these changes, see below, pages 779-788.
2. See below, on pages 782-786, the changes listed in Class III, A, 2.
3. See below, on pages 779-782, the changes listed in Class III, A, 1.
tions. As we have already seen, he was usually painstakingly literal in his own translation, even when the resulting rendering was awkward; we now find, however, that when in Magnússon's version he encountered unidiomatic expressions which had been introduced for the sake of exactness, he frequently rejected these renderings and inserted in their place translations which were smooth and grammatically correct but less literal. This inconsistency was probably not the result of a confusion in his principles of translation but simply the result of the fact that he did not have the same attitude towards Magnússon's work as towards his own. Before he began revising Magnússon's draft, he probably read each paragraph or each sentence in its complete form without paying any attention to the original Icelandic, and coming thus to the material with a fresh mind and regarding it as a whole, he was in a good position to realize how objectionable unidiomatic but literal translations were; after he had revised Magnússon's translation, however, and had put it into the form he desired, he very likely did not take time to read over each passage or each sentence as a whole and consequently did not have an opportunity to perceive to what an extent awkward but exact expressions and constructions marred his translation. Support is given this explanation of his toleration of undesirable expressions in his own manuscript version but not in Magnússon's by the fact that in the printed text of the translation under consideration some of Morris's own unidiomatic renderings have been replaced with modern and normal constructions; evidently it was his rereading of his own work as a whole in the process of proofreading that led him to realize how objectionable some of the literal but awkward expressions he had used in his own manuscript.
translation really were. These changes in the printed text will be discussed more fully later.

In 38 of the 48 manuscript revisions in which Morris rejected translations that were exact but awkward and replaced them with renderings that were less literal but which conformed to modern principles of style, he sacrificed only fidelity to the meaning or substance of the original. In most of these cases there can be no doubt whatsoever that it was far more desirable to give up exactness of translation than to keep the awkward and unidiomatic expressions and constructions which Magnússon had used in his attempt to give a close rendering of the Old Norse; note, for example,

Magnússon’s translations in the following revisions:

IV, 23-4, slew all the folk there because it would not let itself be christened; but it was not so.

VI, 35-5, lost their life some of them: but that was not.

XX, 43-4, but that was not: but that was not so.

In some of the other changes Magnússon’s versions were not seriously at fault, and in these Morris simply added a connective, an adverb, or some other minor word to make the sentence smoother; thus, for example,

I, 2-3, Eystein, Sigurd, Olaf: Eystein, Sigurðr, Olafr
I, 17-8, one of them or the other, Eystein or Sigurd: one of them or the other, eitharbeira, Eystein or Sigurd

In the 10 remaining revisions, however, in which Morris gave up exactness for improvements in form and diction, he sacrificed translations that reproduced stylistic features of the Old Norse. 3

1. See below, pages 498-512.

2. See below; on pages 779-782, the changes numbered (1).

3. See ibid., the changes numbered (2a), (2b), and (2c).
Most important are the 8 changes in which he remade long, loose sentences which Magnússon had used in imitation of the sentence structure of the original, in 6 cases breaking up Magnússon's sentence into two, and in 2 cases giving unity to Magnússon's sentence by omitting the connective between the two main clauses, using only a semicolon at this point. The two following alterations illustrate these two types of revision:

XIII, 39-91, King Eystein arrayed himself together with much company out of Cheaping, and sought to the Thing, and then he over-took by handfast from Sigurd Ranison plain and defence in the case: King Eystein arrayed himself together from Cheaping with much folk, and seeks to the Thing. He took then by handfast from Sigurd Ranison plain and defence in the case.

XIII, 16-9, And when the kaiser and the queen find out that there is no lack of goods, she sends men to find out what fuel they cook with; and so they come to a certain house and find that it is full of walnuts and tell her thereof: And when the kaiser and the queen find out that there is nought lacking, then sendeth she men to vót what they had to firing; so they come to a certain house, and find that it is full of walnuts and tell her thereof.

In 1 of the other 2 changes he rejected a translation that reproduced a case of effective word order in the Old Norse, and in the other he remade a sentence in which, following the construction in the original, Magnússon had used a pronoun without a clear antecedent:

III, 5-6, then was there King Henry: there then was King Henry

XII, 40-1, that all this seems to be alive, when they come to the game: that all men seem to be alive, when they come to the game.

670, 20-3, Eysteinn konungr bjóst or kaupangi með miklu líði, ök svo til þingsins; hann tekr þó með handfasti sókn ok þvörn af Sigurði Hren-æsni

670, 3-6, Ók er þat fínnr keisarinn ok dróttning, at engi efn skortir, þá sandir hon menn at vita, með hverju þeir elda; ok nú koma þeir at húsí aina, ok sjá at þat var fúlt af valhnotum, ok segja henni

The other alterations in the first division of this group:

1. See below, on pages 779-782, the changes numbered (2b).

2. See below, page 780, note 2.
the ones in which the faulty expressions Morris corrected were not the result of too literal a translation but of Magnússon's lack of complete familiarity with the English language - are not very important. There are 23 such revisions. They are of a varied nature. Sometimes Morris simply offered a better choice of word, as in the following cases:

XVII, 4, nimble of counsel: swift of counsel

XXII, 9, more than answered a fair measure: more than befitted fair measure

In other changes he altered an expression or construction so as to make it conform to the English idiom or to modern English usage: thus, for example,

XV, 9, a wory and harbour: a work and a haven

XVI, 2, sent woris: sent word

Occasionally he changed an expression that was simply a trifle awkward, as here:

IV, 8-9, the getting of victuals grew hard: the meat grew hard to get

In a few cases he remade a clause or a sentence for the purpose of avoiding an objectionable word-order; thus,

XI, 26, and laid all his host to by Angelness: and laid to all his host of Angelness

XVI, 17, he brought his parley about: he brought about his matter

The changes in the second division of this group - the ones devoted to corrections in Magnússon's spelling - deserve only a word of comment. There are 27 such corrections. Some of the mis-spellings which Morris rectified, such as

---

1. See below, on pages 782-786, the changes listed in Class III, A, 2.

2. See below, on page 787, the changes listed in III, B.
"wat" for "was," and "Sigurds" for "Sigurd" were obviously simply slips. We find definite mistakes in spelling, however, in 25 cases. Four of these misspellings consist in the use of small letters instead of capitals at the beginning of proper nouns or adjectives derived from proper nouns: Magnússon incorrectly wrote "thing" for "Thing" on 2 occasions, "christian" for "Christian," and "holy cross" for "Holy Cross." The other 21 mistakes in spelling are "fathers" for "father's," "botes" for "boats," "Kaiser" for "Kaiser" in 14 cases, "sea" for "see," "walhote" for "walnuts," "aread" for "arede," "areeded" for "areed," and "may be" for "Maybe"; many of these misspellings also, it should be pointed out, may have been mere slips, for Magnússon spelled "boats," "see," and "walnuts" correctly in other passages.

The changes listed in the third division of this group - the 34 corrections Morris made in Magnússon's punctuation - are even less important. These alterations demand no comment; I shall merely point out that in 32 cases he added commas, - 23 times between the parts of compound sentences or compound predicates, 3 times before a non-restrictive clause, once to set off an appositive, and 5 times to indicate a pause in reading - that in 1 case he inserted a semicolon in place of a comma between the clauses of a compound sentence, and that once he introduced a colon instead of a comma in a similar situation.

In the fourth group of revisions which Morris made in Magnússon's manuscript translation I have placed the 22 changes which are concerned with the form of proper nouns. In the Preface to *Volume VI of The Saga Library* Magnússon says, speaking of the principles he and Morris followed in their translation in regard to

1. See, for example, "boats" in VI, 23 and 28, "see" in XI, 33, and "walnuts" in XIII, 12.
names of places and persons. "We took the course of translating them wholly, when practical, or else, partly, or not at all; in which case the vernacular form is retained shorn of its inflective termination if it had one." Magnusson evidently means that sometimes he and Morris used the modern English forms of the proper nouns that appeared in the text, that occasionally, when it was possible to do so, they translated the Old Norse names, and that when neither of these procedures was feasible, they kept the original forms, omitting any inflectional endings found in the Old Norse. The changes that Morris made in the proper nouns in Magnusson's translation were evidently simply the result of a difference in feeling on his part as to which of these procedures should be followed. On the whole he seems to have preferred the modern English names. Thus, in 9 of the 13 alterations involving place-names he introduced the normal, modern form in place of the Old Norse name or of a partly Anglicized form, once he used a translation of the Old Norse word instead of the original form itself, and once he inserted the Old Norse name in place of the modern form. The following changes illustrate these three types of revision:

XII, 32, Padreim : Hippodrome
Erne
XXII, 50-1, the Thing of Arnarness : the Erneness Thing
X, 3, Jorsalaland(Jerusalem-land) : Jorsa-
land

In the 2 remaining alterations concerned with place names Morris simply corrected "Orkney" to "Orkneys" for the Old Norse "Orkneyjar"; evidently Magnusson had intended to use the regular modern English term for these islands but did not know, not being fully acquainted

1. Page viii.
2. See below, on page 739, the changes listed under IV, A, 1.
with the English language, that as a noun the name was always used in the plural.

In the changes that he made in the form of personal names in Magnusson's translation, Morris showed a distinct preference for the use of the modern English forms, 8 of his 9 alterations involving personal names being devoted to the introduction of the normal, modern forms in place of the Old Norse names or of partly Anglicized forms; thus, for example,

VIII, 1, Rodger: Roger
XV, 11, the Church of Nicolas: the Nicholas-church

In the last change in this group he preferred a translation of the Old Norse word to the Old Norse name itself:

XVII, 9, the son of Shavehew (? or will you rather have Skafhogg ?): the son of Shavehew

Before closing my discussion of this group of alterations, I wish to call attention to the fact that the changes listed here are by no means the only ones that Morris made in the form of proper nouns. I have already treated in the earlier groups revisions that Morris made in the names of persons and places and in personal epithets for the apparent purpose of reproducing the substance of the Old Norse more exactly, or of imitating the Old Norse compactness of expression, or of introducing cognates of the words in the original, or of imitating the compounds used in the text, or of improving the quality of the English of the translation; in the group I have just discussed are listed only those alterations in-

1. See below, on page 790, the changes listed under IV, A, 4.
2. See below, on page 790, the changes listed under IV, B, 1.
volving proper nouns in the making of which Morris's regular motives could not and did not play any part, and for which Morris's only reason was that he disagreed with Magnússon as to which Norse names should be given in their modern English form, which should be translated, and which should be kept in their original form.

As I pointed out at the beginning of my discussion of Morris's changes in Magnússon's translation, Morris made a number of revisions for which it is impossible to ascertain with any definiteness his exact motive but for which one can suggest one or several possible reasons. I have found 100 such alterations; I have listed them all in the Appendix in Part I of Group V under the heading "Miscellaneous Changes." Inasmuch as I have commented upon each one of these revisions in the Appendix, it is not necessary to discuss this group of alterations here as a whole; a few of these changes, however, are especially interesting and deserve further treatment at this point.

We have already seen that Morris labored hard to make his translation as literal as possible, and that many of the revisions he made with this end in view reveal that he had a thorough and accurate knowledge of the Old Norse language. Two alterations which show in a striking manner how well acquainted Morris was with Old Norse inflections and syntax are found in Part I of Group V:

XX, 3, people could have but little talk with him: folk might have but little of his talk
XX.18, to win for yourself a still greater realm: and get thee yet more of realm

674, 14, mátti líttr njóta tals hans
674, 25-6, ok afla enn meira rfrís

1. See below, pages 792-812.
Here Morris evidently used "talk" and "realm" as the objects of the preposition "of" because "tals" and "ríkis" in the original were genitives; it is significant that even when he was hurriedly collating Magnússon's translation with the original text he noticed that these two words were in the genitive case although they were both used as the objects of verbs. To be sure, he did not reproduce the Old Norse construction exactly in his own rendering, because he made "of his talk" dependent on "little" and "of realm" dependent on "more," whereas in the original the genitives were dependent on the verbs; it is of course impossible to determine whether Morris misunderstood the Icelandic construction or whether he felt it impossible to imitate this construction exactly in the English translation.

In the great majority of his changes Morris showed that he understood the meaning of the original and the constructions used. In one of the revisions in Group V, however, he seems to have misinterpreted the sense of the Old Norse; this alteration is extremely important, for in the manuscript pages I have examined this is the only case in which one of Morris's changes makes the translation definitely inaccurate.

XVI, 21-3, And towards this end mighty men there began by taking oath of fealty from all the people: Ani first towards this end mighty men swore there troth-oath at the behalf of all the folk.

In this passage from the account of how King Óystein won the allegiance of the men of Iamtland, Morris incorrectly thought that Snorri meant that the chief men of the province swore allegiance to Óystein as representatives of the people, whereas what Snorri says here is that the chiefs made the people swear fealty to them;
later Snorri relates that the leading men went to the King and pledged allegiance to him. In the printed text Morris's mistranslation has been corrected, and the sentence there reads thus: "And first towards this end took mighty men there troth-oath of all the folk."¹ In another change included in Part I of Group V Morris replaced a literal translation with a very free rendering, but here he probably deliberately departed from the original for the purpose of making an obscure passage in the Old Norse a little clearer. In Chapter XX, in the account of King Þystein's interpretation of King Sigurd's dream, Magnússon translated the Old Norse "enn er þær sýndi Olafr konungr koma með blífú i móti Ólafí konungi broður okkrum, þar mun hann lifa skemst ok mun hann eiga gott fyrir hóndum, er hann er vinsgæll ok ungr, ok fát fjir líðit, ok mun Ólafr konungur hjálpa honum"² as "whereas it seemed to thee that King Olaf came with great blitheness towards our brother, Olaf, that means, that he will live the shortest, and will have bliss awaiting him; he is wellbeloved and young and has come in for few trials, and King Olaf will vouchsafe him his avail";³ when Morris read Magnússon's rendering of this passage, he evidently felt dissatisfied with the clause "and has come in for few trials," for he wrote on the blank left-hand page of the manuscript, opposite this passage, "litteral[sic] of fát fjir líðit?" Very likely he felt that the sentence as it stood was not entirely logical, since it did not necessarily follow that King Olaf should be especially favored because he had "come in for few trials." The fault, however, lies not in the translation but in the original, for Magnússon's

¹. Saga Library, V, 264.
². Unger's Heimskringla, p. 675.
³. See Note 6 to translation in Part I of appendix I: Sig.
expression is an accurate and exact rendering of the Old Norse. The tendency towards terseness and compactness in the Icelandic has been here carried so far that only part of the thought has been expressed, and the rest has been left to be supplied by the reader. The full meaning of the passage evidently is that Olaf was subjected to few trials and consequently seldom erred. We find in the manuscript that Morris rejected Magnússon's rendering "and has come in for few trials" and inserted in its place "and in few things hath he fallen"; it is not known whether Morris introduced this translation in the course of his first revision or after he had consulted Magnússon about the literal meaning of the Old Norse. Morris's version of course reproduces this particular phrase much less exactly than Magnússon's rendering, but it expresses the meaning of the whole sentence more clearly. It is interesting to note that many of the other translators of the Heimskringla have rendered the expression in a manner very similar to Morris's; it was translated by Samuel Laing as "and has gone but little into excess," by P. A. Munch as "hans Forseelser er kun faa," and by Monsen and Smith as "and has fallen in few excesses."1

I have already discussed two changes in Part I of Group V which indicate that Morris was well acquainted with Old Norse inflections. In two other alterations in this class, however, he

---

1. See Morris's translation in Part I of Appendix I, Chapter XX, lines 50-51.
seems to have misinterpreted the construction in the original either through ignorance or through carelessness.

III, 2-3, King Sigurd went with his company: fared King Sigurd his folk
V, 4, Spain christian and Spain heathen: Spain christened, and Spain heathen

In the first of these changes Morris made "folk" the direct object of "fared" although "liði sínú" is in the dative case. Nothing seems to have been gained by the alteration. The use of "to fare" with a direct object "folk" is not archaic; the New English Dictionary cites no such use of "fare" at any time in English. In fact, there seems to be no reason at all for the change, unless we suppose that he failed to notice that "liði sínú" is in the dative case, not the accusative, and thought that he was making his translation more exact by his revision. In the second alteration he changed the adjective "christian" to the past participle "christened" for the Old Norse adjective "kristna." Here also nothing was gained through the revision. As in the case of the first change, it is impossible to suggest any other reason for the alteration but that he misinterpreted the Old Norse, and that, thinking that "kristna" was a past participle, he made the revision for the purpose of rendering the translation more exact.

As I have already pointed out, there are, in addition to these changes for which it is possible to suggest one or several reasons but impossible to determine with any certainty Morris's exact motive, a number of minor, unimportant alterations for which it is impossible even to suggest any likely reason. These 90 revisions form Part II of Group V. It is very likely that in

1. See below, pages 812-817.
making most of these changes Morris himself did not have any definite reason in mind for preferring his translation to Magnússon's rendering. In some cases he may have felt vaguely that his version made the rhythm of the sentence or phrase smoother or made the English more effective in some way, or, possibly, that his rendering brought the translation closer to the original. Inasmuch as the great majority of these alterations have no significant effect upon the character of the translation and in view of the fact that the motives underlying them are so unclear, I have considered it idle to make conjectures about Morris's possible aims in making these revisions, and I have accordingly listed them in the Appendix without any comment, except in a few instances. With the exception of three changes, which are similar in nature, none of these alterations deserve comment here.

XV, 2-3, had done many things...such as were useful(profitable) : hai wrought much...such as was profitable | 671, 2-3, hafði mært gert...pat er nytsamligt var

XVI, 21, into the power of King Eystein : under the dominion of King Eystein | 671, 33-4, undir ríki Eysteins konungs ríki

XVI, 23-4, and swore him the power : and swore him the dominion | 672, 2, ok sóru honum ríki

Here Morris seems to have proceeded directly contrary to the principles he generally followed in choosing his diction. Usually, as we have already seen, he endeavored to use only simple and direct words in his translation. Here, however, for no apparent reason, he rejected the words "useful" and "power," which, though non-Germanic in origin, harmonize with the general tone of the rendering, and inserted instead "profitable" and "dominion," which, because they are learned and literary in tone and obviously of Latin origin, are entirely out of keeping with the general simplicity and con-
creteness of his diction. It is of course possible that Morris had some motive for making these changes which in his opinion justified the use of such words, but it is impossible to suggest any such motive.

In the discussion which I have just completed of the revisions that Morris made in Magnússon's translation of the first half of the Sigurðar saga Jórsalafara, Eysteins ok Olafs, I have not included the changes that Morris made in the "vísur" occurring in the material studied. My reason for listing these alterations separately in Part C of Appendix A and for considering them here apart from the others is twofold. First, although for a comprehensive study of Morris's aims as a translator it is of course essential that we examine the revisions that he made not only in the prose of Magnússon's version but also in the poetical passages, it is obvious that Morris must often have been hampered by metrical considerations in carrying out his principles in the rendering of the "vísur," and that it is accordingly on the basis of the changes in the prose that we can best form an accurate estimate of his aims as a translator. Secondly, as a result of listing the alterations in the "vísur" apart from the others and in one group, we can determine at a glance just how far Morris did succeed in following his regular principles of translation even when he was impeded by considerations of metre and alliteration.

As I pointed out above in my description of the manuscript on which this study is based, Magnússon translated the "vísur" in the text by first writing out the Old Norse in prose order and by then placing his English rendering underneath it, word for word;
when Morris revised Magnússon's draft and came to a "vísa," he always struck out Magnússon's prose translation completely and wrote on the blank left-hand page opposite Magnússon's rendering a poetical version of the "vísa," roughly preserving the metrical form of the original. He always gave each stanza the same number of lines as it had in the Old Norse; he placed the same number of main stresses in each line as in his original, not of course reproducing the Old Norse feet exactly but almost without exception ending each line with a trochee as in the original and using in the rest of the line a great variety of measures in order to imitate the rough, uneven flow of the rhythm of Old Norse poetry; he introduced alliteration freely, but he of course did not, and could not, reproduce exactly the scheme of alliteration found in the particular "vísa" he was rendering, and he did not always alliterate only accented syllables, as the custom was in early Germanic poetry; finally, he followed his original in not using end-rhyme, but he did not try to imitate the internal rhyme found in the "dróttkvætt" measure, except, possibly, in a few rare cases. ¹

In turning Magnússon's prose translation of the "vísur" into a poetical form, Morris was of course compelled to make a great many changes simply for metrical reasons; these alterations do not throw any light on Morris's principles of translation, and I have not included them in this study of Morris's revisions in the "vísur." ² I have considered here only those changes which Morris did not

¹. For a discussion of possible imitations of "áðahending," see below, page 329, under IV, Vísa V, 6.

². Most of these changes are of a distinctly minor, unimportant nature. In the great majority of cases, they consist of the insertion or omission of definite or indefinite articles, demonstratives, pronouns, adverbs, or conjunctions, the introduction of compound, instead of simple, pronouns or adverbs, or the slight rearrangement of the words in a phrase or clause.
make solely or primarily for the purpose of fitting Magnússon's prose to a metrical pattern; these 118 alterations, as I shall now show, fall into the same groups as the revisions in the prose.

In Group I there are 49 changes. In 19 of these Morris reproduced more literally the meaning or substance of the Old Norse; in the other 30 he reproduced more closely the character of the diction of the original. At first it seems surprising that he made only 19 alterations - 15 per cent of the total 118 - for the purpose of rendering more exactly the sense of the "visur"; 25 per cent of the changes he made in the prose were of this type. However, the reasons for the scarcity of such revisions in the poetry are obvious. In the first place, Magnússon's rendering of the "visur" was even more literal than his translation of the prose, and consequently Morris had less occasion to make alterations of this type. Secondly, the fact that he had to fit his rendering to a certain metrical form undoubtedly prevented him from carrying his insistence on exactness so far here as in the prose.

Eleven of the 19 changes in the first part of Group I are of a special type. In translating the kennings with which Old Norse skaldic verse abounds, Magnússon usually first gave a very literal rendering and then added an interpretation or a freer version above his original translation; needless to say, Morris always

1. For a complete list of these changes see below, pages 819-831.

2. See below, pages 819-820.


4. See below, on pages 819-820, the changes in III, Visa II, 8; IV, Visa V, 3 and 7-8; VII, Visa XIII, 2 and 4; X, Visa XV, 2 and 5; X, Visa XVI, 4 and 5; and XI, Visa XVII, 1.
chose the more exact rendering if he could possibly fit it into his verse. Note, as examples, the following alterations:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{river's} & = \text{gold} \\
\text{IV, Vísa V, 3, the slinger of Van's day:} & \quad 663, 19a-20a, \text{slöngvir} \\
\text{The slinger of the Van's day} & \quad \text{Vánar dags} \\
\text{= hand} & \quad 667, 10b, \text{hauka-fróns}
\end{align*}
\]

Magnússon tells us in the Preface to the last volume of The Saga Library that Morris was very fond of these kennings; he says, "The quaint vividness of fancy that manifests itself in these kennings appealed greatly to Morris' imaginative mind, and he would not account slur over them by giving in the translation only what they meant, instead of what they said."

The remaining 3 changes in the first part of Group I are similar in nature to the alterations of this type that Morris made in the prose, and consequently do not call for any special comment here. In none of these revisions did Morris make any important corrections.

The changes in the second part of Group I are somewhat more numerous. In 2 of these 30 alterations Morris introduced compound words as a translation of compounds in the Old Norse; in the other 28 he inserted cognates of the words used in the original. The 2 compounds he introduced are "Alwielder's" in place of "king's" for "alvâld" and "slaughter-slingers" in place of "catopulta" for "valslöngur." The meaning of the first of these words is entirely clear; the second one, however, which Morris evidently coined,

\[1. \text{For a description of the form I have used in quoting changes in the } "\text{visur}," \text{ see below, page } 818.\]
\[2. \text{VI, ix.}\]
\[3. \text{See below, on page } 821, \text{ the changes listed under I,B,1.}\]
\[4. \text{See below, on pages } 821-822, \text{ the changes listed under I,B,2.}\]
makes the translation obscure. The 28 cognates Morris introduced fall into the same classes as the cognates he inserted in his prose changes. Thus, 7 are modern words used in their modern sense, 5 are words that are now only archaic, poetic, or otherwise rare, 9 are modern words used in an archaic, poetic, or otherwise rare sense, and 7 are current words used in an entirely new way. As in the case of the cognates introduced into the prose, most of these words do not have any objectionable effect on the translation; a few of the cognates of the third and fourth types, however, make the rendering unclear and even misleading. Note, for example, the following alterations:

V, Visà VIII, 1-2, I heard of deeds done to the sorrow of the heathen women: Heard of sorrows winning Unto the women heathen
VI, Visà IX, 1, (You) ventured (to) redden edge: Ye trusted edge to redden

664, 6a-7b, Ek frá unnit til sorga heiðins vifs
664, 14a-15a, (Pér) treystuzkð(at) rjóða egg

Of special interest is Morris's insertion of "winning" as a cognate of the Old Norse "unnit" in the first of these changes, for it shows that he was at this time so well acquainted with the Old Norse inflections that he readily recognized "unnit" as the past participle of "vinna," even when he was hastily comparing Magnússon's translation with the original.

Fairly extensive is the second group of alterations also, 23 changes—24 per cent of the total 118—having been made for the sake of giving the translation an appropriate tone or atmosphere. In the

1. See below, on pages 821-822, under I,B,2, the changes numbered (1).
2. See ibid., the changes numbered (3).
3. See ibid., the changes numbered (2).
4. See ibid., the changes numbered (4).
5. See below, pages 823-825, the changes in Group II.
prose only 14 per cent of the revisions seem to have been made for this purpose. Of these 28 changes, 6 are alterations which make the diction simple and direct; the other 22 are revisions which give the translation an archaic character. The first 6 comprise 4 changes in which Morris struck out Romance words in favor of words of Germanic origin, and 2 alterations in which he in other ways replaced words that were learned or literary in tone with words that were simple and concrete. These revisions are similar in nature to the changes of this type in the prose, and do not call for any special comment. The 22 alterations which impart an archaic tone to the rendering fall into three classes: 11 bring into the translation words or expressions that are archaic, poetic, or otherwise rare, 10 insert obsolete inflectional forms, and 1 introduces an archaic syntactical construction.

The great majority of the 11 archaic or poetic words and expressions used by Morris are fairly common in poetry today and hence are readily intelligible. Five are words which are not definitely archaic but which are now restricted to poetry, and 2 are current words that are employed not in an archaic sense but in a sense in which they are now used only in poetical compositions.

1. See below, on page 823, the changes listed under II,A.
2. See below, on pages 823-825, the changes listed under II,B.
3. See below, on page 823, the changes listed under II,A,1.
4. See ibid., the changes listed under II,A,2.
5. See below, on pages 823-824, the changes listed under II,B,1.
6. See below, on page 824, the changes listed under II,B,2.
7. See below, on page 824, the change listed under II,B,3.
8. See below, on pages 823-824, under II,B,1, the changes numbered (2).
9. See ibid., the changes numbered (1b).
Only 4 of these 11 words are words that are employed in a definitely archaic sense. Of the 11 changes in this first class, there is only 1 that is decidedly objectionable:

IV, Vísa V, 1-Z, Now shall I tell of those great deeds of the king which befell in Spain: 663, 16a-21a, Nú skal ek inna þau stór verk konungs er váruká Spáni

Morris's use of "fell" here is of course very misleading. Undoubtedly the great majority of readers interpret it as meaning, not "befell," but "was killed," and think it refers to "king," for it is only the use of "which" instead of "who" that indicates that the relative clause modifies "deeds" and not "king."

In 6 of the 10 cases in which Morris introduced obsolete inflectional forms he used the common archaic preterites "gat," "wan," and "bake." In 3 alterations he inserted the obsolete second personal pronoun forms "thee" and "ye." Once, in "strideth," he revived the early English third person singular present indicative ending "-eth."

The only archaic syntactical construction he introduced in the "visur" was the use of the simple personal pronoun "him" as a reflexive:

X, Vísa XVI, 6, got...to bathe: Gat...to 667, 8b-9b, náði... bathe him laugask

In Group III, which contains the changes Morris made in the "visur" for the apparent purpose of improving the quality of the

1. See below, on pages 823-824, under II,B,1, the changes numbered (1a).
2. See below, on page 824, under II,B,2, the changes numbered (1).
3. See ibid., the changes numbered (2).
4. See ibid., the change in III, Vísa II, 7.
5. See below, on page 825, the change listed under II,B,3.
English of the translation, there are 18 alterations. It is not surprising that Morris found it necessary to make such a large number of revisions of this type here - 15 per cent of the total, as compared with 8 per cent in the prose -, for, as I have already pointed out, Magnússon had made his rendering of the "visur" extremely literal and in so doing he had frequently introduced awkward and unidiomatic expressions which could not be used, and which he evidently had not intended should be retained, in the finished translation.

In 15 of the 18 changes in which Morris improved the English of his rendering, he corrected ungrammatical, awkward, unclear, or otherwise undesirable expressions or constructions used by Magnússon. If we analyze these alterations, we find that in making these improvements he in 8 cases sacrificed exactness of translation and in 4 revisions rejected cognates; in the other 3 changes the awkward renderings he avoided did not embody any of his own principles of translation. The 3 remaining alterations in Group III are devoted to the correction of misspellings. All these revisions are similar in nature to the changes of this type in the prose.

One of the alterations in this group demands special consideration because it throws light on the way in which Magnússon and

1. See below, pages 325-327.
2. See ibid., the changes listed under III,A.
3. See ibid., the changes listed under III,A,1, the changes numbered (1).
4. See ibid., the changes numbered (2).
5. See below, on page 327, the changes listed under III,A,2.
6. See ibid., the changes listed under III,B.
Morris prepared their translations:


It is very surprising that Magnússon here used "wreath" as a translation of the Old Norse "hríð," meaning "a tempest, storm."
The New English Dictionary does not cite any example of the use of "wreath" in this sense in modern English; the definition "A bank or drift of snow; a snow-wreath, snowdrift. Freq. wreath of snow. Orig. (and chiefly) Sc." is the only one listed which approaches even remotely the meaning given the word here. Somewhat closer is one of the definitions given the verb "wreath" in Wright's English Dialect Dictionary: "To drift, eddy, swirl; to overlay or bank up with a drift; esp. used of snow."
The use of the word even in these only roughly similar senses, however, is very rare and is limited almost entirely to Scotland. It consequently does not seem probable that Magnússon simply happened to be familiar with this uncommon word and stretched its meaning to fit the passage under consideration; it is much more likely that the word was suggested to him in some way. In the linguistic comments on "hríð" in Vigfússon's An Icelandic-English Dictionary, we find the following remark: "A. S. hríð a 2yn λεγ in the poem Wid-sith; Scot. and North. E. snow-wreath"; is it not possible that Magnússon saw this comment and that it was this that led him to

2. VI, 552, s.v. "wreath," No. 9.
use the word "wreath" in his translation? Equally interesting is Morris's rejection of "point-wreath" in favor of "point-storms." It seems extremely unlikely that he could have understood from Magnússon's rendering "wreath" that the literal meaning of the Old Norse "hríð" was "storm." Was he so thoroughly familiar with the Old Norse vocabulary that he knew offhand the meaning of "hríð," or did he take the trouble to look up the meaning of the word in an Icelandic-English dictionary when he found himself dissatisfied with Magnússon's translation? The second of these suggestions seems somewhat more likely to be the correct explanation; other revisions that Morris made in Magnússon's draft indicate that he referred occasionally to dictionaries in making his changes.

In turning Magnússon's prose rendering of the "vísur" into poetical form, Morris made 6 alterations in the spelling of proper nouns, but all but 1 of these were entirely or at least primarily dependent upon considerations of metre. In the 1 revision which was not made for the sake of the metre, he changed "Sintére" to "Cintra" for the Old Norse "Sintére," showing a preference in this case for the modern form.

Finally, just as in the prose, Morris made a number of alterations in the "vísur" for which it is impossible to determine his exact motive; for 14 of these changes one can suggest possible reasons, but for 3 no likely motives are apparent. Only one of

1. See above, for example, pages 406-407, and below, pages 485-486.

2. See below, on page 827, under Group IV.

3. See below, pages 828-831.

4. See below, pages 828-830.
these revisions demands comment here.

The alteration referred to is one of the most interesting of all the changes that Morris made in the "vísur":

IV, Vísa IV, 2-3, the Fjólnir's-rote's = rut's, surf's 663, 10a-12a, Fjólnis-mighty king: the mighty hróts rákum gram
King of the roofs of Fjólnir

The disagreement of Magnússon and Morris as to the translation of the Old Norse "hrótt" raises several interesting questions. In the 1860 edition of the Lexicon Poëticum - the only edition which had appeared by 1895 when Magnússon and Morris published the translation under consideration - , Egilsson defined "hrótt" as "procella"; he explained the kenning "Fjólnis hrótt" as "procella Odinis, pugna" and the expression "fjólnis-hróts rákri" as "potens in pugna, belligeros." It is this interpretation "procella" which Magnússon seems to have adopted for "hrótt" here, the word "rote" apparently being used in his rendering, as the insertion of "rut's, surf's" above it indicates, in the sense of "the roaring of the sea or surf"; he evidently selected this word as his original translation of "hrótt," in spite of the fact that it does not reproduce very closely the meaning "storm, tempest, tumult" which Egilsson had ascribed to the Old Norse original, because of the similarity in form between the Old Norse and the English words. In Morris's version, however, we find an entirely different translation of "hrótt," the word being there interpreted as "roof." This is the meaning given for "hrótt" in Vigfússon's An Icelandic-English Dictionary.

If Morris made the change from "Fiolnir's-rote's" to "of the roofs of Fiolnir" without the help of Magnússon - and there is nothing whatever in the manuscript to indicate that he inserted it after consultation with his collaborator -, he was very likely indebted to this dictionary for his new rendering. Finally, it should be noted that in the printed text Morris's translation "the roofs of Fiolnir" has been retained; and in the explanations of the kennings, which we know that Magnússon prepared, the expression has been interpreted as "shields."

There are a number of surprising elements in this revision, as I have already said. In the first place, how did it happen that Morris was dissatisfied with Magnússon's rendering of this particular kenning, - a kenning the interpretation of which was justly open to question? It is true that Magnússon's translation here is very unclear and that it may have puzzled Morris; it was possibly this fact which led him to look up the meaning of "hrót." Did he then, on finding the definition "roof" in the dictionary mentioned above, have so much confidence in his own ability to translate the Old Norse that he felt justified in altering Magnússon's rendering of the kenning? Furthermore, Magnússon's explanation of the metaphor "the roofs of Fiolnir" as "shields" in the printed edition raises interesting questions, for, so far as I have been able to ascertain, this interpretation of

1. See The Saga Library, V, 250.

2. See ibid., V, 502.

3. See Magnússon's statement concerning his share in the work in ibid., VI, vii.
the kenning had never before appeared in print. Was he, then, the originator of this explanation? When we examine the eighteen renderings of the Sigurðar saga Jórgalafara, Eysteins ok Ólafs that had appeared before 1895, we find that seven of them do not translate this "vīsa" at all, that three which do include renderings of this stanza translate it very freely and omit the kenning "Fjölnis hróts," and that six of the remaining ones interpret it as "battle" and two as "Fjölners Storm." It should also be noted that the translation of the "vīsa" that had appeared in Vigfusson and Powell's Corpus Poeticum Boreale omitted this kenning. Moreover, none of the dictionaries that had been published before 1895

1. See (1) Norske Kongers Krönike og Bedrift (Copenhagen, 1594); (2) Norske Kongers Chronica, tr. Peder Claussøn (Copenhagen, 1633); (3) Norlands Chronika och Beskrifning (Wijsingzborg, 1670); (4) Norges Konge-Krönike, tr. Nik. Fred. Sev. Grundtvig (Copenhagen, 1818-1820) (2nd ed.; Copenhagen, 1865) (3rd ed.; Copenhagen, 1878); (5) Norges Konge-Sagaer, tr. P. A. Munch (Christiania, 1856-1871) (2nd ed.; Christiania, 1881); (6) Heimskringla elder Norigs Kongesogur, tr. [Steiner] Schjøtt (Christiania, 1874, 1877-1879); and (7) Konunga sàgor, ed. Hans Hildebrand (Stockholm, 1889).

2. See (1) and (2) Heimsringla, ed. Johann Peringskiöld (Stockholm, 1697), II, 234, for a Latin and a Swedish translation, and (3) Norske Kongers Krönike, tr. Peder Clausen (Revised ed.; Copenhagen, 1757), p. 431.

3. See (1) and (2) Heimskringla, edd. Gerhardus Schöning, Skuli T. Thorlaci, Børge Thorlacius, and E. Chr. Werlauf (Copenhagen, 1777-1826), III, 234, for a Latin and a Danish translation; (3) Konunga-Ságór, tr. J. G. Richert, Cnattingius, G. Guldbrand, and Liedzen (Stockholm, 1816, 1819, and 1829); (4) Oldnordiske Sagar udgivne i Oversættelse af det Kongelige Nordiske Oldskrift-Selskab (Copenhagen, 1832), VII, 67-68; (5) Scripta Historica Islandorum (Copenhagen, 1828-1846), VII, 84; and (6) Heimskringla, tr. Samuel Laing (London, 1844), III, 150 or ibid. (2nd ed.; London, 1889), IV, 119.


5. II, 249.
explained the expression in this way. Eleven of these works omit the word "hrót" entirely, the 1860 edition of the *Lexicon Poeticum*, as I have already pointed out, defines it as "procella," and Vigfússon in his dictionary, as I have also stated above, renders the word as "roof" but does not explain the kenning "Fjölnis hróts." Since the publication of Volume V of *The Sagas Library* in 1895, however, "hrót" has four times been defined as "roof" and the metaphor "Fjölnis hróts" interpreted as "shield," — once by Finnur Jónsson in his edition of the *Heimskringla*, twice by the same scholar in his revised editions of Egilsson's *Lexicon Poeticum*, and once by E. A. Kock and R. Meissner in their *Skaldisches Lesebuch*. To all appearances this new and now generally accepted explanation of the kenning "Fjölnis-hrót" was first suggested by Magnússon.


So far in this discussion of Morris's principles of translation we have considered all the changes that Morris made, in both the prose and the poetry, in the first half of Magnússon's rendering of the Sigurðar saga Jóraslafara, Óysteins ok Ólafs. In addition to these alterations, we find in the manuscript under consideration a number of changes made by both Magnússon and Morris in their own translations. The great majority of these alterations, if not all of them, were undoubtedly made, not after each rendering had been completed, but in the course of the translating itself, for very frequently a word or expression is begun but cancelled, when only partially completed, in favor of a different rendering, and sometimes a word or expression is completed and is then struck out and immediately followed by a new translation. These two groups of changes throw further light on Morris's aims as a translator, for not only do his own corrections reveal for what he was striving, but Magnússon's revisions indicate the type of translation that he knew Morris wanted and that he very likely had been requested by Morris to produce as a first draft. If we examine these alterations, we find that they can be classified in much the same way as Morris's revisions in Magnússon's rendering.

I shall first discuss the changes that Magnússon made in his own work in the course of preparing his draft translation of...

1. These changes have been listed and classified in Part D of Appendix I; see below, pages 832-857. In listing and classifying the alterations that Magnússon and Morris made in their own work, I have not taken into consideration mere slips that they made in writing out their renderings; for a detailed account of the principles I have followed in selecting the changes to be classified, see the introductory remarks to Part D of Appendix I.
the saga; this set of revisions is in many respects the more
interestig of the two.

Very surprising is the comparatively large number of alter-
ations that Magnússon made - 29 out of a total 99 - in order to
give his translation greater exactness. These changes indicate
that Morris had asked Magnússon to make his rendering as literal
as possible, and they also show that Magnússon knew that Morris
was satisfied only with absolutely literal translations.

In 22 of these 29 alterations, Magnússon endeavored to re-
produce more exactly the meaning or form of the original, as,
for example, in the following revisions:

IV, Vísa III, 6, king : helmed leader 662, 24b, hilmí
IV, 14-5, went : arrayed him for going 663, 3, bjóst
XVII, 41-2, That is not pleasing to me : 673, 21, Ekki uní ek
In that I take not pleasure.

In some cases the difference between the two renderings is in-
significant:

XIV, 22-3, that never had there been such a 670, 29-30, at eigi
glorious journey : that never had there hafi verit farin
been a more glorious journey meiri vírðingarfór
XVI, 5, into his friendship : into friend-
ship towards him 671, 18, til vínattu
við sik

Especially interesting are two of these changes in which Magnú-
son introduced a more exact translation of minor, unimportant
words, for these alterations show that Magnússon knew that Morris
demanded literalness down to the smallest detail:

1. See below, pages 833-845.
2. See below, pages 833-836.
3. See ibid., the changes listed in Group I, A.
4. In the quotations of changes made by Magnússon in his own translation, the reference in the left-hand column is to the page and line or to the page, "visa," and line in which the alteration occurs in Magnússon’s translation of the Sigurðar saga Jórsalfar, Eysteinss ok Ólafs as it is reproduced in Part A of Appendix I; the passage before the colon is Magnússon's original rendering, and the passage after the colon is his revised version; the reference in the right-hand column is to the page and line in Unger's edition of the Heimskringla, and the passage that follows is the Old Norse original.
XII, 32, when: if 669, 12, ef
XXII, 124, over the meat-board; at the 679, 20, at matbord
meat-board

In 2 of the 7 remaining changes in Group I Magnússon seems to
have tried to reproduce in his rendering the subdued tone of the
original through the omission of intensives he had at first used.
In the other 5 revisions he introduced cognates of the words used
in the text. Only one of these alterations is particularly inter-
esting:

XXII, 86, and made for the thing; and 678, 21, ok sökir
tsought to the thing til þingsins

It is not at all unlikely that in thus inserting "sought to" in
place of "made for" as a translation of "sökir til," Magnússon
was using an expression which he had learned from Morris, for "to
seek to" is often employed in this sense in Morris's work but
very rarely otherwise in modern English.

We also find that Magnússon made 5 changes in his own work
for the purpose of giving the translation an appropriate tone or
atmosphere. In 2 alterations he sought to make the diction sim-
ple and direct, once by rejecting a word of Romance origin in
favor of a Germanic word and once by replacing a word of Romance
origin with another Romance word that was less learned and literary
in character; and in 3 cases he tried to give the rendering an
archaic tone, by introducing in 2 changes archaic or poetic words
and by inserting in 1 alteration an archaic construction.

Extremely interesting are a number of the revisions Magnússon
made for the purpose of improving the quality of the English.

Twenty-six of his 99 changes are of this type, and in 24 of

1. See below, on page 835, the changes listed under I, B.
2. See below, on page 836, the changes listed under I, C.
these alterations the original translation that he thought undesirable and hence rejected had become awkward either through
too close an adherence to the substance or style of the original
or through the introduction of cognates or archaisms. In many
of these cases the forms he replaced were not especially objectionable, and we find that in 12 of these 24 changes Morris
either completely or essentially restored Magnússon's original
rendering in the course of his own revision; these alterations
seem to indicate that Magnússon was not so willing as Morris to
sacrifice the quality of the English in order to make the translation absolutely literal or to give it an archaic tone.

Thus, for example, in the following cases in which Magnússon first reproduced the substance of the Old Norse exactly and
then, realizing that his rendering was awkward, decided to give up literalness for the sake of conforming to modern English
usage, Morris restored Magnússon's original translation when he
made his revisions:

IV, 24, and slew all folk there : and slew all the folk there
IV, 25-6, Haldor Gabbler : Haldor the Gabbler

663, 16, ok drap þar alt folk
663, 17, Halldórr skvaldri

Moreover, in the following case in which Magnússon first tried
to imitate the sentence structure used in the Old Norse and then

1. See below, on pages 837-839, under III,A, the changes numbered (1).
2. See ibid., the changes numbered (2).
3. See ibid., the changes numbered (3).
4. See below, on page 840, the change listed under III,B.
5. These changes are the ones listed below on pages 837-839 under I, 3; IV, 22; IV, 24; VI, 5; XI, 27-8; XII, 4-5; XIII, 13-5;
   XVIII, 5-8 (the change of "marked" to "learned"); XX, 7-8; and XX, 25-6, (2 changes) and the one listed below on page 840 in Group III,B.
determined to employ a different construction, apparently because he found the first one too awkward, Morris preferred to follow the original:

XIII, 13-5. And now comes the emperor and his favourites and sit down together, and are honoured in a manifold wise: And now comes the emperor and his favourites and sit down together, being honoured in a manifold wise 1

When Morris came to this passage in the course of his revision, he changed Magnússon's final form to "And now comes the kaiser and his worthies and they sit down together, and are in manifold honour there." Similarly, in the 4 cases in which, apparently for the sake of improving the quality of the English, Magnússon struck out cognates of the Old Norse words that he had used, and in the one case in which, for the same reason, he cancelled an archaism he had introduced, Morris restored Magnússon's original translation; note, for example, the following alterations by Magnússon:

XII, 4-5, people saw from the land into the bend of all the sails: people looked from the land into the bend of all the sails XVII, 3, of much lore: of much knowledge

Needless to say, it is rather surprising to find that Magnússon was more concerned about the quality of the English of the translation than Morris was.

Among the other changes that Magnússon made in his own work, there are 3 that deal with the form of proper nouns; in 1 of these cases he rejected the partly Anglicized form "Cintre" for the Old Norse name "Sintre," and in the other 2 he showed a preference

---

1. The first of these two translations is not written out completely in the manuscript; it is clear, however, from what we do find in the manuscript that this is the translation which Magnússon originally intended to give. See the discussion of this change below on page 838.
for the use of consonantal "i" instead of "j" in two Norse names, changing "Ingibjorg" to "Ingibjorg" and "Fjolnir's--" to "Fiolnir's--."

Finally, there are 36 alterations for which it is impossible to determine with any definiteness Magnússon's exact motive or, in some cases, impossible even to suggest any likely reason. In some of these changes he wrote out so little of his first translation that we cannot ascertain how he originally planned to render the passage in question, and consequently we cannot of course determine why he made the change. In the others the original rendering is complete, but the motive for the alteration is nevertheless not clear. For the sake of completeness, I have listed all these revisions in Group V of Part D of Appendix I, suggesting, in some cases, possible reasons for the changes. None of these alterations deserve comment here.

When we examine the 71 changes that Morris made in his own work in the course of revising Magnússon's translation, we find that they fall into the same groups.

Thus, in 17 cases Morris altered his rendering so as to make it more exact. In 10 of these alterations he endeavored to reproduce more literally the meaning or substance of the Old Norse. Three of these revisions are rather interesting because they show how eager Morris was to bring into his translation every single word or phrase in the original. Thus, when he came to Magnússon's

---

1. See below, on page 840, the changes listed in Group IV.
2. See below, pages 840-845.
4. See below, on pages 846-848, the changes listed in Group I.
5. See below, on pages 846-847, the changes listed in Group I, A.
rendering "and went to the cave, which was in sheer sea-rocks," Morris first cancelled "sheer sea-rocks" for "a berg"; then, evidently because the Old Norse had "f bergrnokkur," he changed "a berg" to "a certain berg," although the "certain" was not at all necessary to the meaning here. Similarly, he rewrote completely the last four lines of his translation of Vísa XV, simply, it seems, to be able to bring in the phrase "with their king" as a rendering of "með stilli," and he likewise seems to have entirely remade lines 5 and 6 of his version of Vísa XVIII merely because he did not want to omit the adjective "váligt" in his translation:

X, Vísa XV, 5-8. Or ever the wolf-feeder 667, 3b-6b, dór ulf-
Made fast his ships aland there at the nestir festi skip við
huge broad burg of Acre. Fain morning all einkar breiða Akrsborg;
folk bided: Or ever the wolf-feeder 668, 4b-5b, Sterkr mun-
Made fast his ships to Acre The huge broad nitr gunnar vals braut
burg. Fain morning All folk with their váligt virki
king abided 2

XI, Vísa XVIII, 5-6. The strong one he who 3
The war-hawk's mouth a work brake: for the Old Norse "leitar," thus imitating an example of the in-
The strong war-hawk's mouth dyes  A woful consistency in the use of tenses common in the sagas.
work he brake there

Morris made only one revision in his own translation for the purpose of reproducing stylistic features of the Old Norse; in this alteration he changed the past "sought" to the present "seeks" for the Old Norse "leitar," thus imitating an example of the in-
consistency in the use of tenses common in the sagas.

1. This change occurs in VI, 12.

2. See the discussion of this change below, on page 846. I should also like to point out here that in quoting changes that Morris made in his own work, I have stated first, in the left-hand column, the chapter and line or the chapter, "Vísa," and line in which the change occurs in Morris's translation as it is reproduced in Part A of Appendix I; then I have quoted Morris's original version, and followed that with the revised rendering; in the right-hand column I have stated the page and line in Unger's edition of the Heimskringla in which the original occurs, and then I have quoted the Old Norse itself.
In 6 cases Morris changed his original translation apparently for the purpose of introducing cognates of the Old Norse words he was rendering. One alteration, "Moored" to "Made fast" for "festi," occurs in a "visa," and may have been made to meet the demands of the metre as well as to bring in a cognate. The other changes, however, he almost certainly made simply for the sake of introducing cognates, and they show clearly how eager Morris was to use cognates whenever possible. Thus, for example, when, in the course of his revision, he came to Magnússon's clause "though he averred the guilt was wrongly laid at his door," he first changed "averred" to "claimed," very likely considering "averred" too literary in tone; then he evidently consulted the text and found that "teldi" was used there, for he next struck out his "claimed" and inserted "told" in its place, giving the clause the very awkward form "though he told not that he was soothly guilty." Similarly, when he came across Magnússon's translation "that you are minded" for the Old Norse "at þér vilit," he first altered the expression to the archaic form "that thou art minded," and then, apparently because he noticed the "vilit" in the original, he changed this translation to "that thou wilt."

It is rather surprising to find that Morris made only 5 revisions in his own work for the purpose of giving the rendering a suitable tone or atmosphere. In one of these alterations he

1. See below, on page 848, the changes listed under I, C.
2. This change occurs in X, Visæ XV, 6.
3. This change occurs in XXII, 36.
4. This change occurs in XX, 18.
5. See below, on page 848, the changes listed in Group II.
seems to have tried to make the diction simple and concrete by replacing a word of Romance origin with a Germanic word; in the others he endeavored to give the translation an archaic tone, by introducing in three cases archaic or poetic words and expressions and by inserting once an archaic construction.

In 8 cases Morris made changes in his own work for the apparent purpose of improving the quality of the English. In 3 of these alterations he sacrificed exactness of translation, and in one he struck out a cognate he had introduced; in the other 4 the renderings he cancelled did not embody any of his regular principles of translation. These revisions are not particularly interesting nor important, except for the fact that they show that although Morris often used very awkward or even ungrammatical constructions in his rendering merely in order to reproduce the substance or style of the Old Norse exactly or in order to introduce cognates or archaisms, he did not entirely disregard the quality of his English, but occasionally broke away from his usual principles when the resulting translations failed to conform to modern English usage. It is rather significant, however, that 26 per cent of the changes that Magnússon made in his own work were aimed at improving the English of the rendering, but that only 11 per cent of Morris's alterations were of this type.

Finally, I should like to point out that Morris made 41 other changes in his own work in the course of revising Magnússon's translation, but that for these it is either impossible to determine his exact motive or impossible even to suggest any likely

---

1. See below, on pages 349-350, the changes listed in Group III.
reason. Just as Magnússon did in some of his alterations, so Morris in several of his revisions wrote out so little of the first form that it is extremely difficult to ascertain just how he had originally planned to translate the passage in question, and it is consequently impossible to determine why he changed his rendering. I have listed all these alterations, as well as those that are complete but for which the motives are nevertheless not clear, in Group IV of Part D of Appendix I, adding in some cases a few words of comment. None of these changes are important.

The four sets of alterations which I have so far discussed - namely, Morris's revisions in Magnússon's prose, Morris's changes in the "visur," Magnússon's alterations in his own translation, and Morris's revisions in his own work - include all the changes that are to be found in the manuscript under consideration. Still further alterations, however, were made in the translation before it was published: when we compare the final form of the rendering as it appears in the manuscript with the version given in the printed text, we find that there are a great many discrepancies between the two, and that many of these differences are extremely important. We do not definitely know who was responsible for these changes. In the account that Magnússon gives, in the Preface to Volume VI of The Saga Library, of the method of work that he and Morris followed, he does not state how the proofreading was done, and he does not indicate whether it was he or Morris who gave the translation its ultimate form. The only piece of external evidence bearing on this question that I have come across is a note at the top of

1. See below, pages 350-357.

the first page of the manuscript of the Morris-Magnússon translation of the Ólafsf saga helga; this note, which was written carelessly in pencil and has been partly obliterated and is consequently scarcely legible, seems to read, "1 proof & MS to Mr. M. I prof [sic] to W. Morris." In the proofreading of this rendering it was evidently Magnússon's duty not only to examine the text for possible mistakes in translation but also to compare the proof sheets with the manuscript, while Morris, freed from the tedious work of collation, merely reread the rendering to determine whether or not the general effect was satisfactory. Very likely the same procedure was followed in the case of the translation now under consideration. That both men took part in the proofreading is obvious from the nature of the changes; as I shall show in my discussion of these revisions, some of the alterations are of such a character that they must have been made either by Magnússon or with the help of Magnússon, and others show, equally clearly, the influence of Morris. However, although it is obvious that both men shared the labor of this revision, there can be practically no doubt that it was Morris who in all cases made the final decisions and was responsible for the printed form as we have it today.

Before I proceed to an analysis of the discrepancies between the manuscript and the printed text, I should like to point out that the great majority of these changes fall into the same groups as the other alterations we have considered, but that, quite unlike the situation in the other sets of changes, the most numerous of these revisions are those which seem to have been made for the

1. This manuscript is now in the Brotherton Library, Leeds, England; for a description of it, see above, pages 394-395.
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purpose of improving the quality of the English, and that in most of these alterations changes which Morris had made in the manuscript in order to render the translation more exact were rejected. These revisions are of course the most interesting and the most important ones in this set, and I shall describe them in detail in their proper place in the following discussion.

Of the 138 changes made in the proofreading, 29 seem to have been made for the sake of greater exactness. In 28 of these alterations the revisers appear to have endeavored to reproduce more literally the substance and sense of the original; it is in these 28 revisions that the influence of Magnússon is most apparent.

A few of these changes are devoted to the correction of inaccurate, misleading, or unduly free translations which Morris had introduced in his revision of Magnússon's draft. Thus, one passage, which I have already commented upon, in which Morris had completely misinterpreted the Old Norse and had altered Magnússon's rendering so that it became incorrect, is again changed in the printed text so that it conveys correctly the meaning of the original; there can be but little doubt that this revision was Magnússon's work:

XVI, 21-3, And towards this end mighty men there began by taking oath of fealty from all the people: And first towards this end mighty men swore there troth-oath at the behalf of all the folk: 264, 16-7, And first towards this end took mighty men there

1. See below, pages 359-362, the changes listed in Group I.
2. See ibid., the changes listed in Group I,A.
3. See above, pages 470-471.