troth-oath of all the folk

In another revision in the manuscript Morris had failed to render exactly the word "œraefi." For some unknown reason he had cancelled Magnússon's form and had inserted the translation "desert"; according to Vigfússon's An Icelandic-English Dictionary, this is the meaning "œraefi" regularly has in the plural in modern usage, but in the Old Norse the word was used almost exclusively in the specific sense "havenless." In the printed text Morris's "desert" has been rejected, and "œraefi" is correctly rendered "havenless":

 XV, 8-10, He...let build...a work and harbour where formerly no harbour was : He let gera...vírki ok höfn, build...a work and a haven where erst was er dór var œraefi desert : 263, 17-3, He let build...a work and a haven where erst was havenless

Similarly, in a revision in the manuscript in XVI, 5, Morris had freely translated the Old Norse "teygði" as "bound," in place of Magnússon's "drew"; in the printed text "drew" was restored. Both of these corrections also were very likely the work of Magnússon.

Moreover, in three of the cases in which the printed version gives more literal renderings of words that both Magnússon and Morris had translated rather freely, the changes were very likely made, or at least suggested, by Magnússon:

IV, Visa IV, 4, laid to : laid on : 250, 63, 663, 11a, h168 laid low

1. In quoting changes made in the proofreading I have in the main followed the same procedure as I followed in quoting specimens of the alterations already considered. However, in listing the changes now under discussion, I have usually presented three forms in the left-hand column, the first one being Magnússon's original, the second one Morris's revision, and the third one the version in the printed text; when Magnússon's and Morris's translations in the manuscript were the same, I have given only two forms, and have placed the words "Ma. and M." in parentheses before the first one. In all cases the reference before the last form in the left-hand column is to the page and line in Volume V of The Saga Library in which the passage under consideration occurs. For further details concerning my procedure see below, on page 853, the introductory section in Part E of Appendix I.
In the making of some of the changes in this group, both the collaborators seem to have had a share. Such is the case, for example, with three of the alterations which were made in Morris's renderings of the "visur." In two of these revisions words or phrases that Morris had omitted in his verse form are added, and in the third case a misplaced adjective is transposed to its proper position. In all probability it was Magnússon who first noticed these errors, for it does not seem likely that when Morris read the proofs he took time to look up Magnússon's prose order and prose rendering of the "visur" in order to compare his versions with Magnússon's for possible slips; and he would not have been apt to detect these mistakes by comparing his translations with the original "visur" in Unger's text. However, if it was Magnússon who noted the errors, it was almost certainly Morris who made the actual changes, for two of them necessitated the remaking of several lines of the verse rendering.

III, Vísa II, 3-4, the sea's mare rushed to English earth beneath the lord: Thereat the sea's mare ran on Unto the English lea-land; 249, 13-4, Sea's mare sped 'neath the lord king Unto the English lea-

land

VI, Vísa XI, 5-6, But war-alert Thrott of Gondul's-Thing's-din: But the war-deft of the clashing of Gondul's Thing: 254, 10-11, But he the Thrott of clashing Of Gondul's Thing

XI, Vísa XVIII, 5, The strong dyer of the mouth of fight falcon: The strong war-
hawk's mouth dyer: 258, 15, The war-hawk's vals

strong mouth-dyer

1. It should be noted that in this revision the important name "Thrott" was inserted but the adjective "hernenninn" was omitted.
There is another alteration which seems to have been made in this way:

XVII, 4, history : doomings : 264, 28, | 672, 9, doœmum
deed-tales

Vigfússon's An Icelandic-English Dictionary, referring to this passage in the 
Heimskringla, defines "daœmi" as "old lore, tales." Magnússon's original translation, "history," was of course correct; but Morris, in his zeal for introducing cognates of the Old Norse words, had replaced it with "doomings," which to the English reader would convey the very misleading meaning "judgments." The change to "deed-tales" in the printed text was probably the work of both Magnússon and Morris; it was very likely Magnússon who objected to the rendering "doomings" and suggested the alteration, but it was almost certainly Morris who coined the form "deed-tales."

The other changes in the printed text made in the interest of greater exactness are of such a nature that they could have been made by Morris alone, for the slight inaccuracies corrected are quite obvious and easily detected; on the other hand, in most of these cases there is nothing to preclude the possibility of attributing them to Magnússon. Thus, the following alterations may have been made by either Magnússon or Morris:

XX, 8, who sought him to that end : when they sought thereto : 268, 18, who sought him thereto
XXII, 61-2, Thou championest this matter greatly, King Eystein : Mickle of championship layest thou hereon, King Eystein : 273, 26-7, Mickle of championship layest thou on this case, King Eystein

A number of the remaining revisions, however, show signs of

1. Page 112, s.v. "daœmi."
Morris's insistence on the exact translation of minor, unimportant sentence elements, and can perhaps be safely attributed to him. Note, for example, the following changes:

V, 7-8, (Ma. and M.) Haldor the Gabbler: 663, 28, Halldòrr
251, 17, Haldor Gabbler
XX, 29, which will be sure to strike home: 674, 34, sem a mun
which will lie on me: 269, 12-3, which liggja
will lie thereon

As I have already stated, 28 of the 29 changes made for the sake of greater exactness were devoted to the more literal reproduction of the sense or substance of the original. In the remaining alteration a cognate of the word to be rendered was introduced; this change was almost certainly made by Morris.

It is rather surprising that only 5 revisions were made in the proofreading for the apparent purpose of giving the translation a suitable tone. In 1, a Romance word was replaced with a Germanic word; in 2, archaic or poetic words were introduced; and in 2, obsolete inflectional forms were inserted. These alterations were in all probability the work of Morris.

The most interesting and most important of all the changes made in the proofreading are, as I have already stated, those which fall into Group III, for, as I have also previously indicated, in the majority of the revisions which appear to have been made for the sake of improving the quality of the English, renderings which had been made in accordance with Morris's usual principles of translation are rejected. In 32 of these 37 alterations we find that literal translations of the meaning or sub-

1. See below, on page 862, the change listed in Group I, B.
2. See below, on pages 862-863, the changes listed in Group II.
3. See below, pages 863-866.
stance of the Old Norse, reproductions of the sentence structure of the original, an imitation of the inconsistency frequently found in the Old Norse in the use of tenses, and cognates of the words used in the saga are sacrificed for translations that are smoother, more idiomatic, and clearer. Although there is nothing that definitely precludes the possibility that these changes were made by Magnússon, it seems likely that Magnússon would have hesitated to alter these passages, most of them already revised by Morris, simply because they were awkward, for none of them are actually inaccurate. It is much more probable that Morris, rereading the finished translation in the printed form with only an occasional reference to the Old Norse original, simply felt that these passages were unsatisfactory and accordingly changed them. It is worth while examining some of these alterations in detail. For the sake of convenience I shall assume in the following discussion that Morris was responsible for all these revisions.

In eleven of these changes literalness in the reproduction of the sense or substance of the Old Norse was sacrificed. All of these alterations were entirely justified; some of them were even urgently necessary, for often Morris's zeal for exactness had led him to introduce translations that were extremely awkward or even unintelligible. The three following revisions will serve as specimens:

IV, 23, slew all the folk there : slew there all the folk ; 250, 31-2, slew there all the folk 663, 16, drap bar alt fólk

1. See below, pages 563-565, the changes listed in Group III, A.
2. See below, on pages 563-564, the changes listed in Group III, A, 1.
XI, 13, further the tithe and himself do it (yield it) : further the tithe, and himself do it : 257, 26-7, further the tithe, and himself pay it

XX, 54-5, that his oversight will abide with me : that his oversight will stand over me : 270, 11-2, that his over-sight will stand me in stead

In fourteen cases reproductions of stylistic features of the original were rejected. Of these, the most surprising are the thirteen changes in which Morris broke up long, loose, rambling sentences into short, unified ones, for this looseness of construction, as I have already pointed out, is one of the salient characteristics of the Old Norse prose style and was one of the stylistic qualities which Morris seemed to be striving to imitate in his manuscript revisions. Perhaps he realized, however, on rereading the finished translation, that this type of sentence structure was annoying and tiring to the English reader, and accordingly felt justified in altering these passages. In one or two cases the change was decidedly necessary and very salutary, as in the following sentence from Chapter XI of the manuscript:

They sailed north to that island which hight Cyprus, and there King Sigurd dwell somewhat, and fares sithence to Gækeand and laid to all his host off Angelnness, and lay there for half a month; and every day was fair breeze north along the main; but he willed to ride such a wind as would be a right sidewind so that sails might be set endlong of the ship; for all his sails were set with p’al, both fore and aft; for this reason that both, they who were forward as well as they who were aft would not to look on the unfair sails.

Here in the printed text a new sentence is begun before "and" in line 4. Less urgent but certainly justified are the rest of these

1. See below, on pages 864-865, the changes listed in Group III, A, 2.
2. See ibid., the change listed in Group III, A, 2, a.
3. See below, page 864, the change listed under XI, 27.
alterations, as, for example, the change in the following passage from Chapter XIV:

King Sigurd went from the east first through the land of the Bulgars and then through Hungary realm and through Pannonia, and Svava and the land of the Belars; there he met Lothaire the Kaiser of Romeburg, who gave him an exceeding good welcome, and fetched him a wayleader through the whole of his realm, and let hold cheapings for them according as they needed for all chaffer.

The printed text divides this sentence into two by beginning a new sentence before "there" in line 3.

There is one other revision in which Morris sacrificed the reproduction of a stylistic feature for the sake of improving the English; in this alteration he changed the present "answers" to the past "answered," although in the manuscript he had replaced Magnússon's "answered" with "answers" in order to imitate a good example of the inconsistency in the use of tenses common in the Old Norse.

Finally, I should like to point out that in 7 cases Morris rejected cognates which he had introduced in the manuscript. In 2 of these passages the change was well justified, for Morris's manuscript translation was awkward and almost unintelligible:

XI, Vísa XVII, 3, gavest it out of bounteousness: 668, 2b, gaf af mildi
siv'st by mildness: 258, 8,

gav'st by bounty
AXII, 35-6, though he averred the guilt was wrongly laid at his door: though he told not that he was soothly guilty: 272, 28,
thought he held not that he was soothly guilty

The other 5 alterations are concerned with the word "berg,"

1. See below, on page 864, in Group III, A, 2, a, the change listed in XIV, 13.

2. See below, on page 865, the changes listed in Group III, A, 2, b.

3. See ibid., the changes listed in Group III, A, 3.
which Morris had apparently used in the manuscript because the Old Norse had some form of "bjarg"; in 1 case "berg" is replaced by "sheer-rock," and in 4 passages by "rock" alone. According to the New English Dictionary the word "berg" is never used in English to refer to a rock or mountain, but only to indicate a mass of ice; probably Morris on second thought felt that the word he had introduced in the manuscript might be misleading, although it seems very likely that most English readers would have understood from the context that "berg" here meant "rock."

In the remaining 5 changes which were apparently made for the sake of rendering the translation smoother and more effective, the undesirable forms rejected were not the outcome of too close a reproduction of the original. These revisions are not important, and call for no special comment here.

Among the other alterations made in the proofreading we find a surprisingly large number which are concerned with the form of proper nouns. There are 34 such changes in all. They were very likely made by Morris, probably for no other reason but that he happened to feel as he read the proofs that it was preferable to treat these names in a different manner. These revisions do not indicate any change in his views as to how Old Norse proper nouns in general should be dealt with in an English translation. In 13 cases he showed now a preference for modern or at least partly Anglicized forms, in 15 he rejected modern or partly Anglicized names for Old Norse forms, and in 1 he translated the name "Lögretta"

2. See below, on pages 865-866, the changes listed in Group III, B.
3. See below, pages 866-869.
into "Lawcourt." The other alterations are of a miscellaneous nature.

Two of the changes made in the proofreading are of a special nature. As I have explained in detail below in Part F of Appendix A, Magnússon did not always use the forms given in Unger's edition of the *Heimskringla* when he wrote out the Old Norse original of the "vísur" in prose order in the manuscript. In one case Morris in his revision called attention to such a departure: in Chapter III, Vísa II, line 1, Magnússon had used "Vás-auðigr" in place of Unger's "Vásöfligr," and in the manuscript Morris wrote on the left-hand page opposite this passage, "(Vásöfligr in text)." In the printed version we find at this point that Magnússon and Morris's manuscript translation "Toil-wealthy" has been replaced by "Toil-mighty"; very likely this alteration was made by Magnússon as a result of Morris's comment. In another of the cases in which Magnússon had departed from Unger's form, we likewise find in the printed text the translation of Unger's reading, but here Morris had not noticed the discrepancy or at any rate had not commented upon it in the manuscript:

IV, Vísa V, 6, with the Hord's king: with the Hord's lord: 251, 6, With the hardy lord: 663, 18b-19b, við Hörða gram(Ka.); við harðan gram(Unger)

Perhaps Magnússon realized from Morris's note on "Vás-auðigr" that Morris wished to keep Unger's readings, and therefore made this change in Vísa V. It should be noted, however, that in three of the other cases in which his departure from Unger's

1. See below, on page 869, the changes listed in Group V.

2. See below, pages 878-884.
text resulted in a definite change in the meaning of the Old Norse, Magnússon left his manuscript translation unaltered; perhaps he simply overlooked these differences, or considered them so unimportant that it was not worth while to make any changes in the rendering.

Finally, there are twenty-nine alterations, the reasons for which are not clear or ascertainable; as usual, I have listed these in the Appendix under the heading "Miscellaneous Changes." Some of these alterations present a new consideration, for they seem to have been made neither by Magnússon nor by Morris but by the printer. The procedure here seems to have been as follows: in those cases in which Morris's manuscript revisions were unclear or incomplete, the printer very likely had to use his own judgment in selecting a readable form; although many of the resulting renderings might be very different from what Morris had intended to give, they could easily pass unnoticed by Magnússon and Morris in the proofreading and thus find their way into the published translation. There is no other apparent explanation for some of the forms that appear in the printed text. Thus, in Chapter XI Magnússon wrote, "Then that holy relic was given to King Sigurd himself, on his swearing together with twelve other men with him, that he would further Christian faith...:" In his revision of this passage Morris did not complete his alterations of the construction "on his swearing," so that the final manuscript form reads thus: "Sithence that holy relic was given to King Sigurd,

1. These differences are the use of "æastr" for "ææzt" in IV, Visa III, 1, the use of "söttri" for "sotti" in VI, Visa XI, 7, and the use of "hvatt" for "hvatr" in X, Visa XVI, 9.

2. See below, pages 869-877.
this bargain that he swore together with twelve other men with him, that he would further Christian faith..." In the printed text we find the sentence in this form: "Sithence that holy relic was given to King Sigurd; this bargain then he swore, together with twelve other men with him, that he would further Christian faith..." The Old Norse original of this passage is as follows:

"Síðan var sá heilagr dómr gefinn Sigurði konungi, með því at hann sör sör, ok 12 menn aðrir með honum, at hann skyldi fremja kristni..." Morris had probably intended to use here some preposition like "on" or "with" before "this bargain" in imitation of the phrase in the original, but had simply forgotten to do so. It does not seem at all likely that the translation that appears in the printed text was the one he had planned to give in the manuscript or that it could have been inserted by either Magnússon or Morris in the proofreading, for it fails completely to imitate the construction used in the Old Norse; very likely this form was given to the sentence by the printer, who, faced by this confused rendering, was forced to remake the passage according to his own judgment. Similarly, in Chapter XX, Morris changed Magnússon's clause "Now, whereas he seemed to thee to come to me with not an equal blitheness" so that the final manuscript version read "Now, whereas thee-seemed he came to meet me not the like blitheness." Here he either crossed out "with" by mistake, or intended to use a different construction in place of the phrase but failed to complete his alteration; the first alternative seems somewhat the more likely, for it is natural to

1. For the exact references for this change see below, on page 873, the alteration listed under XI, 8-9.
suppose that he would wish to keep the phrase when a phrase is used in the original, the Icelandic for this passage being "En þar er þar syndist hann mér í mót koma, ok eigi með jafnmikilli blöðu." In the printed text, however, we find, "Now, whereas these seemed he came to meet me not the like blithely." Here, too, one cannot help suspecting that the new construction was the work of the printer, which later escaped the notice of Magnússon and Morris in the proofreading. There are several other readings in the published translation which may have had their origin in the same way.

With these comments on the differences between the final manuscript version of the Magnússon-Morris translation of the Sigurðar saga Jórsalafara, Eyvisteins ok Ólafs and the published form of the same rendering, I shall conclude my discussion and analysis of the various changes that were made in Magnússon's original draft in the preparation of this translation. I shall now turn to a brief consideration of the manuscripts of some of the renderings that Morris produced at an earlier date, and I shall try to determine, on the basis of the alterations made in these manuscripts, in what respects his principles of translation differed in these other works.

Part III: Morris as an Early Translator of Old Norse

The manuscript translation of the Sigurðar saga Jórsalafara,

1. For the exact references for this change, see below, on page 874, the change listed under XX, 52-3.

2. See below, on pages 869-875, the changes listed under I, 10; IV, 23-4; V, 11-2; VI, 25-6; VI, 36-7; VIII, 8; X, Vísa XV, 1-2; XV, 11; XX, 6; and XXII, 90.
Eyþeins ok Ólafs, which has served as the basis of the foregoing detailed analysis and which is part of the manuscript material on which, according to Magnússon, the ultimate estimate of Morris's work as a translator must rest, was produced in the 1890's, late in Morris's life, and it consequently embodies his fully developed principles of translation, worked out after many years of practice. Needless to say, Morris's style of translation in his early work was in many respects different; an excellent opportunity to ascertain the nature and extent of the change which his style underwent in the course of the twenty-eight years in which he engaged in this work is furnished by his rendering of the Eyrbjagría saga, for this translation exists in two versions, - one produced late in 1868 or early in 1869, only a short time after he had begun his study of Icelandic, the other, undated, but in all probability prepared in the early 1890's, almost at the end of his life. As I have pointed out previously in this study, the Eyrbjagría saga was one of the first Icelandic works that Morris and Magnússon turned into English; they did not publish any rendering of this saga, however, until 1892, when they presented a translation in Volume II of The Saga Library. When we compare the holograph manuscript of the original rendering, which has fortunately survived and is now deposited in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, England, with the printed translation, we find at once that there are a great many differences between the two, and that these differences show clearly that the first draft was extensively revised - in fact, completely rewritten in parts - before it was published; as

1. See above, page 398.
2. See above, pages 47-52.
I have just stated, the date of this second version is not definitely known, but most likely the revision of the original draft was made just before the work was put into print - that is, in the early 1890's. In order to determine what light the differences between these two versions throw upon the development of Morris as a translator, I have carefully analyzed the alterations appearing in the first four chapters of the saga. In Part A of Appendix II I have presented the two versions of these chapters side by side, placing the original rendering on the left-hand page and the published, revised translation on the right; in Part B I have classified the changes in the printed text according to the reasons for which they seem to have been made. In the following pages I shall present the results of my study of these two versions of the 

Eyrbyggja saga rendering.

In the original holograph manuscript of this work the translation is written out by Morris on large sheets of paper of foolscap size; only one side of each sheet is used, the left-hand page being left blank. We find that Morris has written out his translation very carefully and neatly, that he has here and there made revisions, evidently in the course of his work, and that he has sometimes left blanks in the rendering and filled in these spaces later in pencil, often rewriting in ink the words inserted in pencil. There seem to be no changes in this manuscript by Magnusson, although at times it is difficult to determine with certainty

1. See below, pages 885-907.

2. See below, pages 908-923.

3. This manuscript, measuring 13\ by 9 inches, is bound in green cloth covers. On the back, in gilt letters, is the title "Eyrbyggja M.S. W. Morris." On the inside of the front cover is pasted a slip of paper bearing the note "From the Library of Ch: Fairfax Murray." On
whether an alteration was made by Magnússon or by Morris, for when Morris wrote small and neatly his handwriting was very similar to Magnússon's. In the main, however, it seems certain that the translation in this manuscript was written out by Morris and revised by Morris himself, and that although Magnússon undoubtedly helped Morris in making certain changes, the rendering as a whole was not revised by Magnússon.

In my discussion of the procedure that Morris and Magnússon followed in producing their translations of Icelandic sagas, I pointed out that the early renderings seem to have been prepared in the following way: the two collaborators first read together the saga selected, meeting at regular intervals; after each meeting Magnússon wrote out the translation of the part covered, and gave it to Morris the next time; with this as a guide Morris produced his own rendering; this version was next revised by Magnússon, and then sent to the printer. The manuscript of the Eyrbyggja saga translation now under consideration was thus evidently written out by Morris on the basis of a rendering made by Magnússon after the two collaborators had read the saga together; perhaps Morris left blanks for passages he did not understand or did not know how best to translate, asked Magnússon about them at the next meeting, and then inserted renderings in pencil, some of which, later, on reconsideration, he rewrote in ink. It was probably at this point that the two collaborators determined not to publish this translation, for the next step in the usual procedure was not taken: as I have already stated, it is clear that Magnússon

1. See above, pages 391-397.
did not take the trouble to collate the manuscript with the original or to revise it in general.

As I have previously pointed out, the published rendering differs considerably from the original translation. When Morris decided some twenty years later to print an English version of the *Eyrbyggja saga*, he evidently found the rendering he had already prepared unsatisfactory, and so decided to write out a new one. There can be little doubt that the original version of 1868 and 1869 did not serve directly as the basis for the printed text of 1892, and that the differences between the two were not the result of changes made in the proofreading. In the first place, the original translation is not complete; it breaks off forty-four lines from the end with the words "he gave his daughter Sigrid to Brand the Generous, the son of Varmund the Slender." Secondly, the number of the discrepancies between the form of the rendering in the manuscript prepared in the late 1860's and the printed text is so great that all these changes could scarcely have been made in the proofs; among these differences are those resulting from the fact that Morris and Magnússon did not use the same edition of the *Eyrbyggja saga* in 1868 as in the 1890's. Furthermore, there are no printers' names inserted in this manuscript, as in the manuscript of the rendering of the *Sigurðar saga Jórsalafara*,

1. For this passage in the published translation, see *The Saga Library*, II, 183, lines 25-6.

2. As I pointed out above (see page 357), Morris and Magnússon based their first rendering on the *Eyrbyggia-Saga*, ed. G.J.Thorkelin (Copenhagen, 1787), but used the *Eyrbyggja saga*, ed. G.Vigfusson (Leipzig, 1864) for the version they prepared in the 1890's. The discrepancies in translation resulting from this use of different texts I have listed below in Appendix II, Part B, Group VI (see below, pages 924-925), but I have not included them in my discussion of these two renderings in the following pages.
Eysteins ok Ólafs. However, if it is clear that the holograph manuscript now under consideration was not the immediate source of the printed translation, it is equally clear that this first rendering served as the basis for the second, revised manuscript translation, for sometimes large sections of the original version and the printed text are absolutely alike, and these passages are of such a nature that the similarity cannot be accidental.

The changes that Morris made in writing out his revised version were undoubtedly not the only ones made in the translation. When he had completed his second rendering, Magnusson in all probability collated it with the Old Norse text, and then sent it to the printer. While it was being printed, it was probably subjected to another revision by both Morris and Magnusson, for very likely both collaborators read the proofs of this translation, just as we have seen that they read the proofs of their rendering of the Sigurðar saga Jóralafara, Eysteins ok Ólafs. It is important to remember that there were thus probably two intermediate stages in the translation between the form we have in the manuscript of 1868-1869 and that in the printed edition of 1892. This consideration is rather important in the case of the fairly large number of changes in the published text in which literal renderings were sacrificed for the sake of making the English more readable; these alterations do not really indicate that Morris was less interested in making his translation exact in 1892 than in 1868, for they were probably made in the course of the proofreading, when, as we

1. In this manuscript we find names such as "Trött," "Critchley," "Hayward," and "Parkinson" inserted at fairly regular intervals in pencil. Evidently these names are the names of the printers who were assigned to set up the sections which their names precede.

2. Note below, for example, on pages 886-907, the following passages (the references are to the chapter and line in the revised translation on the right-hand page): I, 16-19; II, 22-23; III, 2-4; IV, 18-21; and IV, 43-44.
have already seen in connection with the manuscript of The Story of Sigurd the Jerusalem-farer, Eystein, and Olaf, Morris seems to have changed his original rendering rather freely, without reference to the Old Norse text, merely because he felt that the quality of the English was not satisfactory.

With these preliminary remarks out of the way, I shall now proceed to my analysis of the differences between the translation in the original holograph manuscript and the printed text of 1892. Most numerous of the 185 changes appearing in the revised version are those which seem to have been made for the purpose of rendering the translation more exact, there being 69 such revisions in all. A number of these changes are devoted to the correction of mistakes. That such alterations should frequently have been necessary is not surprising, for, as I have already pointed out, the original rendering was written out by Morris when he had just begun his study of Old Norse and it was not corrected by Magnússon. The majority of the 69 revisions in this group, however, are not concerned with the correction of actual mistranslations, but simply replace rather free renderings with more exact translations or render the English version more literal in some relatively unimportant way. These alterations are of special interest, for they indicate not only that Morris was better acquainted with the Old Norse when he prepared his second rendering, but also that he was much more interested in reproducing his original with the

1. See below, pages 909-913, the changes listed in Group I.
utmost fidelity in the 1890's than he was in the late 1860's.

Of the 69 changes in the first group, 45 are concerned with the substance or meaning of the original. The great majority of these revisions were almost certainly made by Morris. Even most of the alterations devoted to the correction of mistakes were probably made by Morris alone, his more advanced knowledge of Old Norse in the 1890's revealing to him at once the errors he had made in the first version. In a few cases, however, the passages mistranslated are rather difficult, and in making these corrections Morris may very likely have been aided by Magnússon; such is the case with the following changes, for example:

II, 8-9, and thereon he fared north up to Brøntheim : and thereon he fared by the inland road north to Thrandheim.

IV, 45-6, But within the house was there another house : But off the inmost house was there another house

Two of the alterations in this group were almost certainly made or suggested by Magnússon, for one of them involves a knowledge of the exact meaning of the title "Hersir," and the other is based on an emendation suggested by Magnússon:

I, 5, a mighty lord : a famous hersir

IV, 16-7, they saw great firths cut into the land : they saw that two big bights cut into the land

In a long note on the first of these passages at the end of Volume

1. See below, on pages 909-911, the changes listed in Group I, A.

2. In quoting changes made in the published translation of the Eyrbyggja saga, I have placed in the left-hand column first the original holograph manuscript version and then the revised rendering, and in the right-hand column I have placed as usual the Old Norse original. The reference in the left-hand column is to the chapter and line in which the change occurs in the published translation as it is reproduced in Part A of Appendix II; the reference in the right-hand column is to the page and line in which the original occurs in Vigfússon's edition of the Eyrbyggja saga.
II of The Saga Library, Magnússon explains carefully the duties and powers of a "hersir," and states that it is impossible to translate this term exactly into English. It was obviously for this reason that "lord" was cancelled for "hersir" here. In another long note on the second passage, he points out that both the situation and the context here demand the insertion of "two" before "firths"; he believes that the Old Norse originally read "iňij firðir stórir," but that a careless scribe misread "iňij" as "inn" instead of as "inn ii," and that the word for "two" was thus omitted by mistake in our text. The change in the translation here could not of course have been made by Morris alone.

Four of the alterations made in the interest of greater exactness reproduce stylistic features of the original. In one Morris imitated a case of unusual word order which seems to have been adopted for the purpose of giving emphasis to an important word, and in the other three he reproduced the looseness of the sentence structure of the Old Norse.

The 20 remaining changes in the first group are devoted to the more exact reproduction of the character of the diction of the original. In 8 alterations he introduced compound words for compounds in the Old Norse, in 2 he inserted derivative words as a translation of derivatives in the original, and in 10 he introduced cognates of the words used in the text. It is significant that in

1. Page 264. That Magnússon was responsible for the notes he himself states, as I have previously pointed out; see above, page 356.
2. Pages 266-267
3. See below, on pages 912 , the changes listed in Group I, B.
4. See below, on pages 912-913, the changes listed in Group I, C.
his revision he found 10 cases in which to insert compounds or derivatives. Except for a few proper nouns, such words are extremely rare in his original rendering; evidently when he first began translating the sagas, he had not thought of imitating the structure of the Old Norse words in this way. Cognates of the words in the text, however, are used rather freely in the 1868-1869 version, and it is consequently not surprising that only 10 changes were made in the revision for the purpose of introducing such words. To be sure, in his first rendering he had by no means employed words of this type so extensively as he usually did in his later translations, and it should be noted that all but one of the cognates he saw fit to insert when revising his Eyrbyggja rendering for publication are common modern words or well-known archaisms which in his later work he always used when translating the corresponding Old Norse words. Such is the case with "drag" for "draægi," "took" for "tök," "rede" for "råð," "-faring" for "-ferðar," "-wit-" for "-vits-," and "hight" for "hét"; the last word, "hight," was introduced four times.

Another interesting group of changes is that composed of revisions which were apparently made for the purpose of giving the translation an appropriate tone or atmosphere. In 9 cases Morris replaced Romance with Germanic words in his revised version, and in 14 he introduced archaisms, - in 10 cases archaic or poetic words or expressions, in 2, obsolete inflectional forms, and in 2, archaic syntactical constructions.\(^1\) These alterations indicate

---

1. See below, on pages 913-915, the changes listed in Group II.
that just as he was more interested in making his translation as literal as possible in his late work, so he was more careful to give it what seemed to him a suitable tone. In his first rendering he had by no means so assiduously avoided Romance words that were learned or literary in character as he generally did in the translations he produced in the 1890's, and most of the Romance words he replaced with Germanic words in his revision of his *Eyrbyggja saga* rendering were words he never admitted into his later translations. Such words as "domains," "pavement," "assemblies," "reverence," and "accord" are, needless to say, out of keeping with the general tone of simplicity found in the sagas, and it is not surprising that in his revision he rejected them. Archaisms, on the other hand, he had introduced rather freely in the first rendering; however, the fact that in rewriting this work in the early 1890's he inserted fourteen more archaic or poetic words, forms, and constructions shows that he was then even more eager to impart an archaic tone to his translation.

The remaining changes that Morris made in revising his original rendering of the *Eyrbyggja saga* are less interesting. In 28 alterations he seems to have been trying to improve the quality of the English. In 20 of these he sacrificed fidelity to the Old Norse; in considering these changes, we should remember, as I have already pointed out, that although he was in so many cases willing to give up exactness for improvements in the English, it is not safe to assume from this fact that when Morris prepared his new version in the 1890's he was less interested in keeping close to his text than he was in the late 1860's, for many of these alterations may not have been

1. See below, on pages 915-916, the changes listed in Group III.
made during this revision but in the course of the proofreading, and in reading proofs, as we have seen above from our comparison of the final manuscript version of the rendering of the Sigurðar saga Jórsalafara, Eysteins ok Ólafs with the published edition of the same work, he seems to have revised his translation simply according to his own reactions at the time without much reference to the original text.

We also find that in rewriting his Eyrbyggja saga rendering, Morris made 12 alterations in the form of proper nouns. These changes are of a miscellaneous nature, and do not indicate that Morris's opinion as to how Old Norse names should be treated in an English translation had undergone any definite change.

Finally, there are 53 revisions for which it is either impossible to determine Morris's exact motive or impossible even to suggest any likely reason. None of these alterations deserve special comment here.

This comparison of the original draft and the final version of the Eyrbyggja saga rendering shows clearly that Morris's style of translation changed considerably between 1868 and 1892. In many respects the style of translation found in the first version is preferable to the style of the revised form; in fact, the style of all the early renderings is to a certain extent more pleasing than that of the translations he produced in his last years, for although the early works are less literal and less exact, the language used in them is less awkward, less stilted, and less archaic.

1. See above, pages 504-508.
2. See below, on pages 917-918, the changes listed in Group IV.
3. See below, on pages 918-923, the changes listed in Group V.
Thus, as I have just pointed out in my study of the two versions of the *Eyrbyggja* rendering and as we find if we compare Morris's early translations in general with his late work, Morris very rarely in his early renderings of the sagas introduced unusual or coined compound and derivative words in imitation of compounds and derivatives in the Old Norse. Furthermore, although he showed a fondness for the use of cognates even in his first translations, he employed such words much less extensively at this time than later; and very seldom inserted extremely rare or coined words to satisfy his demand for cognates. Moreover, he did not consider it so important in his early work to exclude Romance words in favor of Germanic words, and thus was not so often led to introduce unusual words for this purpose. Likewise, although he from the very beginning used archaic words and expressions for their own sake, he then as a rule employed only common ones, and he used these with moderation. Archaic inflectional forms and syntactical constructions he also inserted less frequently; in the 1868-1869 rendering of the first four chapters of the *Eyrbyggja saga* the only archaic or poetic forms found are "gat," "spake," and "wrought," and the only archaic constructions used are "had to wife," "got to wife," "they wotted not," and "he let build." Finally, it should be noted that the fact that in his early productions he put less stress on exactness in the reproduction of the sense and style of the original was also to a certain extent responsible for the use of a more normal language in his first renderings. In his version of the *Sigrðar saga Jórsalafara, Eyasteins ok Ólafs*, as we have seen, he was so possessed with a passion for absolute literalness that again and again he willingly sacrificed
smoothness and clearness of translation in order to satisfy his demands for exactness. In his early renderings, however, we find that he only occasionally introduced unidiomatic or awkward constructions for the sake of giving a literal translation of minor, unimportant words or for the sake of imitating the compactness of expression, the word order, the sentence structure, or any of the other stylistic peculiarities of the Old Norse.

The earlier translations are thus on the whole much more readable than the later ones, but are less reliable. It is to be regretted that when Morris acquired the ability to translate accurately and closely, he carried his zeal for exactness and his fondness for archaisms so far that the resulting rendering became awkward and stilted.

In the foregoing discussion of the changes that Morris's style of translation underwent between 1868 and the 1890's, I have not included any account of the changes that took place in his method of reproducing the form of the "vísur" that occurred in the sagas he rendered into English, this question involving problems of a special nature and consequently demanding separate consideration. As I pointed out in my discussion of Morris's version of the Sigurðar saga Jórsalafara, Eyváins ok Ólafs, he reproduced the form of the "vísur" fairly closely in that work; if we examine his method of dealing with the poetry in his early renderings, however, we find that just as in the case of the prose, so in his verses he reproduced the Old Norse much less exactly in his first translations than in his later ones.

1. See above, pages 475-476.
In the section of the *Eyrbyggja* rendering which I have just considered, no "visur" occur; in the other part of the work, however, there are a number of "visur," some in the "dróttkvætt" and others in the "fornyrðislag" metre. In turning the verses in the "dróttkvætt" measure into English, Morris used stanzas consisting of eight four-stress lines rhyming aabccedd, and in translating the "fornyrðislag" verses he employed two-stress lines and rhymed every two lines. In both forms he introduced very little or no alliteration. He varied the nature of the metrical feet to some extent, but used mainly iambics. In the Grettis saga rendering, which was produced and printed at the same time as the *Eyrbyggja* manuscript was written out, Morris employed the same forms in translating verses in the "dróttkvætt" and "fornyrðislag" metres, and in the rendering of the Gunnlaugs saga also, which was first published in 1869, he treated "dróttkvætt" stanzas in the same way.

In the last mentioned saga there are no verses in the regular "fornyrðislag" measure, but there are several stanzas of unequal length made up of two-stress lines, each two lines rhyming, and in translating these Morris as a rule used three-stress lines and rhymed every two lines. Needless to say, the procedure he followed in rendering the Old Norse "visur" in these early works is very unsatisfactory, for the use of rhyme for the "dróttkvætt" and "fornyrðislag" verses, the absence of any marked alliteration, and the regular use of iambic feet give his "visur" an entirely different tone from what they have in the original; moreover, the

1. There is one exception to this statement: in translating one "dróttkvætt" stanza Morris used three- instead of four-stress lines (see Collected Works, VII, 78).

2. Morris and Magnússon's translation of the Gunnlaugs saga *ormstungu* was first published in 1869 in Volume V (New Series) of the Fortnightly Review (pages 27-56); when it was republished in Three Northern Love Stories in 1875, the verses were completely revised.
forms he adopted for his translations of stanzas in the "drótt-kvaett" metre and of the poems in "runhenda" in the Gunnlaugs saga fail even to reproduce the number of stresses each line has in the Old Norse.

By 1870, when his version of the Völsunga saga appeared, Morris had completely changed his method of rendering the "vísur"; in this work, and in all the succeeding translations but two, he reproduced the form of his originals much more closely than he had done in his first renderings. In the translations that were printed after 1869, we find that Morris never used rhyme unless the Old Norse "vísa" was in rhyme, and that, except in the "drótt-kvaett" stanzas in the two renderings to which I just referred and which I shall discuss in detail later, he introduced alliteration freely, imitated the uneven rhythm of the original by changing the metre frequently, and preserved the distinctive line-lengths of the various Old Norse metrical forms, using three-stress lines for the "drótt-kvaett" stanzas, two-stress lines for verses in the "fornyrðislag" metre, and a group of two-stress lines and one three-stress line alternately for the "ljóðaháttr" stanzas. Moreover, in translating "vísur" of the "drótt-kvaett" type, he almost always made the last foot a trochee, as it was in the original.

The two saga-renderings referred to above which appeared after 1869 but which do not deal with the "drótt-kvaett" verses in this new way are the versions of the Eyrbyggja saga and of the Heiðarvíga

1. In the Old Norse "ljóðaháttr" stanza the first and third lines had four main stresses with a caesura, and the second and fourth lines had three main stresses without any caesura; in his translations Morris preferred to present the two halves of the first and third lines as separate lines, thus giving each stanza six instead of four lines but preserving the metrical effect of the original. In the great majority of his translations of "ljóðaháttr" stanzas he used this form; occasionally, however, he made some of the lines a little longer, evidently being unable to express the contents of the original within the prescribed limits. For examples of such a departure from...
saga, both of which were published in 1892 in the second volume of *The Saga Library*. As I pointed out above, in the original 1868-1869 rendering of the *Eyrbyggja saga*, Morris turned the Old Norse verses into rhymed couplets, introduced practically no alliteration, and used a regular, iambic metre. When he revised his work for publication a little over twenty years later, he completely remade his earlier versions of the "vísur," giving the "fornyrðislag" verses the form which he regularly used after 1869 but failing to reproduce the "dróttkvætt" stanzas so exactly as he did in the majority of his later saga-translations. He abstained from the use of rhyme, and introduced some alliteration; but he used four-stress lines, and instead of imitating the uneven, jerky rhythm of the original, he employed a fairly regular anapestic metre which gave the English stanzas a lilt which was entirely foreign to the originals. In the *Heiðarvígs saga* rendering he used the same form in translating verses in the "dróttkvætt" metre. In the case of this work the date of the original rendering is unknown, and the holograph manuscript is not to be found. Consequently it cannot be determined whether the "vísur" were originally loosely translated like the *Eyrbyggja* verses but revised in the 1890's, or whether they were first put into the form which we have seen that he regularly used for "dróttkvætt" stanzas after 1869 but were altered before they were published, or whether they were from the very beginning rendered as we find them in *The Saga Library*, and, if so, whether this translation was first made in the early

1. See above, pages 189-191.
1890's when it was published or had been prepared between 1868 and 1876. Whatever may have been the situation in the Heimskringla rendering, it is clear from the Eyrbyggja translation that this method of rendering "dróttkvætt" stanzas met with Morris's complete approval in the 1890's, and was not merely an early form which he now retained when publishing work prepared many years before. His motives for preferring this rather unsatisfactory form in the 1890's to the more exact method he had used some twenty years earlier it is extremely difficult to surmise. It is possible that he felt that the longer, four-stress, anapestic lines made it easier for him to translate fully and accurately the many elaborate kennings found in the Old Norse poetry, but that after experimenting with this type of stanza in two renderings he decided it was preferable to keep closer to the form of the original and consequently returned to the three-stress lines in a varied metre for the "vísur" in "dróttkvætt" in the Heimskringla.

In my introductory comments a few pages above on the holograph manuscript of the Eyrbyggja saga translation, I pointed out that when Morris and Magnússon prepared their early saga-renderings, Morris first wrote out a version of his own on the basis of a draft by Magnússon, and that Magnússon afterwards collated this translation with the original and revised it in
a general way; I then called attention to the fact that in the
Eyrbýggja manuscript of 1868 and 1869 this process was not com-
pleted, for in that work Magnússon did not revise Morris's origi-
nal rendering, evidently because the two collaborators decided
not to publish the translation at this time. However, in the
holograph manuscript of the Grettis saga rendering, which was
produced in 1868 and published the next year, we have a perfect
example of the way in which Morris and Magnússon prepared their
early saga versions, for here Morris has written out the original
translation, Magnússon has revised it, and Morris has in turn
passed judgment on Magnússon's changes, keeping some and rejecting
others. These two sets of alterations—Magnússon's revisions
in Morris's work and Morris's changes in Magnússon's revised form—
deserve brief consideration, for they throw light, first, on

1. See above, page 515.
2. See above, pages 47-52 and 56-57.
3. This manuscript is now in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge,
England. It measures 13½ by 9 inches, and is bound in green cloth
covers. The back bears the words "Grettir M.S. William Morris" in
gilt. On the inside of the front cover is pasted a slip of paper
reading "From the Library of Ch: Fairfax Murray." On the opposite
page is written "This was the first M.S. given me by William Morris—
the printed copy the first book he gave me/ C.F. Murray." There are
six flyleaves. On the first paper with ruled lines stands the Sonnet
to Grettir found at the very beginning of the printed edition of the
Grettis saga rendering. The translation itself extends to 145 pages.
On three of the nine blank pages at the end we find passages of German
written out by Morris and corrected.
Magnússon's principles of translation and, secondly, on Morris's attitude towards the help and guidance offered by his collaborator. In Part A of Appendix III. I have reproduced the first two chapters of the Grettis saga rendering as they appear in this holograph manuscript, describing in the footnotes all the revisions by Magnússon and Morris; in Part B I have classified according to the reasons for which they seem to have been made all the important alterations in these two chapters and also the changes in the next three chapters, treating Magnússon's revisions first and then Morris's.

In 28 of the 57 alterations that Magnússon made in the first five chapters of Morris's rendering, he seems to have sought to render the translation more exact. Twenty of these changes he appears to have made for the purpose of reproducing the meaning and substance of the original more closely. It is not surprising that more than one-third of the revisions he saw fit to make were

1. I have listed and classified all but a few of the changes in the first five chapters; the only alterations not included are those which were devoted to the correction of obvious mistakes and those which Magnússon and Morris made in their own work.

2. See below, on pages 934-935, the changes listed in Group I.

3. See ibid., the changes listed in Group I, π.
of this nature, for in the first place Morris had of course at that time only recently begun his study of Icelandic and his knowledge of the language was naturally imperfect, and in the second place we know from Magnússon's own translations of medi eval Icelandic works and from the statements that he made about his renderings that he was distinctly in favor of close translation. When we examine the alterations of this type that he made, we find that in most of them he replaced free or vague renderings with literal and exact translations; note, for example, the following changes:

II, 36, when they set on : when they rushed forth2 2, 21-2, or þeir geystust fram
4, 24-5, who was Land-ward over Ireland : who was Land-ward along the coasts of Ire land
7, 28, they set : they pushed 7, 18, Þeir skutu

There are also a number of revisions devoted to the insertion of words or phrases that Morris had omitted, obviously through mere inadvertence; such is the case with the following alterations, for example:

II, 46-9, and made him unmeet for fight : and forthwith made him unmeet for fight
4, 20, before Harald the King : from the warfare of Harald the King

In some of the changes in which Magnússon introduced more literal

1. See, for example, Ljálfa, edited by Æiríkr Magnússon (London and Edinburgh, 1870), pages xlviii-xlxxix.

2. In quoting changes made by Magnússon in Morris's rendering, I have placed in the left-hand column first Morris's translation and then Magnússon's revision, and in the right-hand column I have placed as usual the Old Norse original. The reference in the left-hand column is either to the chapter and line in which the alteration occurs in the holograph manuscript as it is reproduced in Part A of Appendix III or to the page and line in which the change is to be found in Volume VII of The Collected Works of William Morris; if the reference begins with a Roman numeral, it is of the first type, but if it begins with an Arabic numeral, it is of the second type. The reference in the right-hand column is to the page and line in which the Old Norse original occurs in the Grettis Saga, edited by Gisli Magnússon and Gunnlaugr Thordarson (Copenhagen, 1859).
renderings, the difference between Morris's form and Magnússon's revised version is very slight; these alterations are extremely interesting, for they show that Magnússon was almost just as eager to make the translation absolutely literal as Morris was when he became an experienced translator. Note, for example, the following revisions:

II, 4, At first he was King of the Uplands: 1, 18-9, Havn var ðör konungr ð Upplóndum.
Before that he was King of the Uplands 1, 19, norðr í land
II, 5, north through the land : north into the land
II, 17, that autumn : this autumn

Of the other 8 changes apparently made for the sake of exactness, 1 reproduces the looseness of the sentence structure of the Old Norse, and 7 introduce cognates of the words in the original. The alterations in which cognates were inserted are of special interest. In the translations that Magnússon published before or just after he met Morris, he does not show any marked preference for cognates of the Old Norse words to be rendered, but in his English version of the Thomas Saga Erkibyskups, which he published between 1875 and 1883, he appears frequently to be striving to use words of this type. It seems as if he had formed a predilection for cognates as a result of his work with Morris, who, as we have seen, from the very beginning showed a decided eagerness to employ cognates whenever possible. Hence, Magnússon's introduction of seven cognates in his revision of Morris's translation of the first five chapters of the Grettis saga was evidently partly the result of his own growing fondness for such words and partly the result of a desire to please Morris. It should be noted, however, that although the number of changes apparently made for the purpose of introducing cognates is relatively large, this fact does not indicate that Magnússon

1. See below, on page 935, the change listed in Group I,B.
2. See ibid., the changes listed in Group I,C.
3. The works referred to are Lilja and Icelandic Legends, collect-
had developed an inordinate eagerness to translate Old Norse words by cognates and was using words of this type in every possible case as Morris later did, for Morris had introduced only a moderate num-
ber of cognates in the original translation so that there were still a great many opportunities to use such words, and all but one of the cognates Magnússon inserted are modern words or common archaisms. 1

The only rare word is "-wick" for "-vík."

If Magnússon did not reveal any fondness for cognates in the translations he had produced before he met Morris, he did show a definite liking for archaisms in his early work. In fact, in the first series of Icelandic Legends, which Magnússon together with George Powell had translated and published in 1864, four years before Magnússon met Morris, we find Magnússon and his collaborator stating definitely in the Preface that they favored the use of a slightly ar-
chaic language in rendering early Icelandic works. It is consequent-
ly surprising that in his revision of Morris's draft Magnússon in-
serted only three archaic or poetic words and constructions. It is clear that it was only a very moderately archaic tone that he wished to impart to his renderings of Icelandic works; it is also obvious that it was not he who induced Morris to use so many archaic words, inflectional forms, and constructions in his late translations as we have seen that Morris did. Moreover, it should be noted in passing that in no case in his revision did Magnússon introduce compound or derivative words in imitation of compounds and derivatives in the Old Norse, and in no change did he replace Romance words with German-
ic words for the sake of avoiding diction of a learned or literary

---

1. Such is the case with "hight" for "hét," "gave out the be-
heat" for "hét," "the main fleet" for "meginflóttinn," "all" for "allr," "rede" for "forrða," and "holm" for "hólmr."


3. See below, on page 936, the changes listed in Group II.
nature; these devices that Morris used so extensively in his later renderings for reproducing the tone of the sagas were evidently his own.

The other alterations are less important and less interesting. In 7 revisions Magnússon seems simply to have tried to make the English translation smoother and more effective; in 4 changes he altered the form of proper nouns, disagreeing slightly with Morris as to how they should be treated; and in 15 cases he made revisions for which it is either impossible to determine his exact motive or impossible even to suggest any likely reason. None of these alterations deserve comment here.

After Magnússon had revised the translation in this way, it was not sent to the printer, as I have pointed out above, until Morris had passed judgment on Magnússon's changes. In doing so, he sometimes cancelled his first rendering and rewrote in ink the suggested translation that Magnússon had inserted in pencil; at other times he struck out Magnússon's suggestion and kept his own form; and on still other occasions he left both renderings, the printed edition in most of these cases presenting Morris's translation. If we count as rejections cases in which Morris retained both his own and Magnússon's form but the published version restored Morris's original rendering, we find that of the 57 alterations

1. See below, on page 936, the changes listed in Group III.
2. See below, on pages 936-937, the changes listed in Group IV.
3. See below, on pages 937-938, the changes listed in Group V.
4. On the basis of the material at hand it is of course impossible to determine definitely in these cases whether the selection of one of the two forms was actually eventually made by Morris, or whether the printer chose at random one form and Morris afterwards accepted the printer's selection; the second suggestion is more likely to be correct than the first, but even if such was the case, the fact that in the manuscript Morris retained both versions indicates that he was not entirely satisfied with Magnússon's change,
Magnússon had made, Morris accepted only 27 - slightly less than half of the total number. Morris seems to have had a great deal of faith in his ability to translate Old Norse even at this early stage of his study of the language; undoubtedly his rather unjustified confidence in his knowledge of Old Norse and the readiness with which he rejected the suggested changes of his Icelandic collaborator are ultimately to be traced to the strong will with which Nature had endowed him and which he revealed in his actions throughout his life.

When we examine Morris's treatment of Magnússon's revisions, we find that Morris did not favor any one group of alterations that Magnússon had made; of the 20 changes Magnússon had introduced in order to reproduce the meaning of the original more exactly Morris accepted only 8, of the 7 cognates inserted he retained only 2, of the 7 revisions presumably made for the purpose of improving the quality of the English he left only 3 completely untouched, of the 4 alterations involving proper nouns he used Magnússon's form only 3 times, and of the 15 changes for which the motives are not clear he decided to keep only 7. He did retain all the 3 archaisms Magnússon had introduced and the 1 revision in which Magnússon had reproduced a stylistic feature of the Old Norse, but inasmuch as there were so few alterations in these two classes, the fact that he kept all the changes here cannot of course be taken as evidence that he favored these two types of revision in particular.

Even more surprising than the number of cases in which Morris refused to retain Magnússon's alterations is the inconsistency he

---

1. In Part 3 of Appendix III, in the list of changes by Magnússon on pages 934-938, the alterations not starred are the ones Morris kept.
showed in determining which changes should be accepted and which should be rejected. Sometimes he seems to have preferred exactness; sometimes he seems to have been interested in giving the rendering an archaic tone; sometimes he seems to have been guided by a desire to make the translation smooth; and in some cases no reason at all is apparent for his decision. Thus, in the following passage, in which Magnusson had evidently altered the rendering in order to make the English clearer and more effective by placing the main idea in the principal clause and the subordinate thought in a dependent construction, Morris seems to have restored his original translation simply because it was more exact:

I, 17-8, and Hallvard was the name of the third of them; and a man nght Hallvard was the third of them; and Hallvard was the name of the third of them.

In another case, however, in which Magnusson had suggested a more literal rendering, Morris kept his own, apparently because it was less awkward:

I, 12-3, the kin of his father dwelt chiefly about Rogaland and Hordaland: the kin of his father was chiefly about Rogaland and Hordaland: the kin of his father dwelt chiefly about Rogaland and Hordaland.

We even find that in one passage in which Magnusson had introduced a closer translation, Morris not only rejected the revision but also

---

1. For an analysis of the motives Morris seems to have had for rejecting the 30 changes by Magnusson that he found undesirable, see below, pages 938-941.

2. In quoting changes made by Morris in Magnusson's revisions, I have in the main followed the same procedure as in quoting alterations by Magnusson in Morris's original translation. Here, however, I have usually placed three forms in the left-hand column, - first Morris's original, then Magnusson's change, and finally Morris's revision of Magnusson's alteration. In quoting passages in which Morris kept both Magnusson's change and his own form but the printed text used Morris's original rendering, I have placed in the left-hand column, first, Morris's original version, then Magnusson's revision, then the words "(M: both)," and finally the form in the
altered his own form so that the final rendering is much less exact than the original one:

II, 31, in the very midst of the fleet: much in the midst of the fleet: about the midst of the fleet

Moreover, in the following case, in which Magnússon's suggested change made the translation both more exact and more forceful, Morris failed to accept the revision:

II, 36, when they set on: when they rushed 2, 21-2, er þeir forth: (M: both): (P) when they set on geystust fram

Sometimes we find that Morris kept minor, insignificant alterations that Magnússon had made in the interest of exactness, but rejected important changes of this nature. Thus, he accepted Magnússon's revision in the following passage:

II, 4, At first he was King of the Uplands: Before that he was King of the Uplands

A little later, however, when Magnússon had made the rendering more exact by inserting an important word that Morris had omitted, Morris struck out the revised translation:

4, 20, before Harald the King: from the warfare of Harald the King: before Harald the Haralds konungs

This examination of Morris's treatment of the corrections and improvements made by Magnússon in Morris's version of the first five chapters of the Grettis saga shows thus that even when he had just begun to study Icelandic Morris was extremely confident - often unduly so - in his ability to translate the sagas, and it indicates further that he was frequently willing to depart from the suggestion of his Icelandic collaborator even without having any definite motive in mind, for he appears often to have rejected Magnússon's
revisions merely on the basis of momentary impulses. Evidently Morris was not a very tractable student. In evaluating the early translations published by Morris and Magnússon, it is important that we bear these facts in mind, for they make it clear that for few - perhaps not for any - of the inaccuracies and unduly free renderings found in these works can Magnússon be held responsible.

Part IV: Morris's Style of Translation in his Illuminated Manuscripts

In Chapter II, in my account of Morris's activities during the years 1870 to 1874, I pointed out that Morris was at that time in the habit of devoting all his leisure moments to the production of illuminated manuscripts, and that the works he usually selected for writing out and decorating were his translations of Icelandic sagas. When we examine his illuminated manuscripts of saga renderings, we find that in preparing these works Morris did not always reproduce exactly the holograph manuscript that he was following; in fact, he sometimes made both numerous and startling changes in his original, and as a result of these alterations the tone of the translation as a whole is in some of these illuminated works decidedly different from the tone in the holograph manuscript or in the published text. Needless to say, these illuminated manuscripts must be given careful consideration in a study of Morris's principles of translation. In order to determine what light the changes Morris made in these works throw upon his aims as a translator, I have carefully examined certain of these

1. See above, pages 179-180.
manuscripts, and have analyzed some of the differences between the versions found here and the renderings in the holograph manuscripts or in the printed texts.

The most interesting of these illuminated works is the manuscript of the Morris-Magnússon translation of the Eyrbyggja saga which Morris prepared in 1875 and which is now in the City Museum and Art Gallery, Birmingham, England. In the case of this rendering we are fortunate enough to possess also the holograph manuscript and a printed version. For the purpose of comparing these three forms, I have, in Part A of Appendix IV, reproduced the first chapter of the Morris-Magnússon translation as it appears in the holograph manuscript of 1868 and 1869, in the illuminated manuscript of 1875, and in Volume II of The Saga Library, placing the holograph manuscript and illuminated manuscript versions side by side and the printed text at the bottom of the page. Then, assuming that the holograph manuscript was the basis of the illuminated manuscript as well as of the published rendering — and such was almost certainly the case —, I have in Part B listed and classified according to the reasons which seem to underlie them all the important changes in the illuminated manuscript, in order that these alterations may be compared with the changes in the printed text, which have been listed and analyzed in Part B of Appendix III.

When we compare these two lists of alterations, we find that Morris made a great many more changes in writing out the illuminated manuscript than he did in preparing the published transla-

1. For a description of this manuscript, see above, page 48.
tion, there being 87 revisions in the former and 47 in the latter. Furthermore, we find that there is a very striking difference in the nature of the alterations in the two works. Of the 47 changes in the printed text, 12 reproduce the meaning or substance of the original more exactly, 3 imitate the compound and derivative words used in the Old Norse, 7 introduce cognates, 2 substitute Germanic words for words of Romance origin, 4 insert archaic or poetic words, 5 improve the quality of the English, 5 are concerned with the form of proper nouns, and 9 were made for reasons not ascertainable. In short, these alterations are of the type that Morris regularly made in preparing a translation for publication, the chief emphasis being on reproducing the sense of the Old Norse literally, on using cognates, and on giving the rendering a suitable tone. In the illuminated manuscript, however, the situation is quite different. Of the 87 revisions in this version, 9 reproduce more exactly the meaning or substance of the original, 1 serves to bring in a cognate, 1 replaces a Romance word with a word of Germanic origin, 4 introduce archaic, poetic, or otherwise rare words, 51 offer improvements in the quality of the English, 3 alter the form of proper nouns, and 18 are unexplainable. Here, clearly, the emphasis is not on exactness, on the use of cognates, or on a simple and archaic tone, but on making the translation pleasing to the modern reader; the 51 changes that I have classified as improvements in English offer more idiomatic expressions, reject awkward or obsolete phrases, make the sentence rhythm smoother and more pleasing, and give greater vividness, force, and

1. See below, on pages 909-923, the changes listed as occurring in Chapter I.
2. See the changes listed below on pages 950-955.
unity to the translation. Moreover, in all but 5 of these 51 revisions, the renderings rejected reproduced the meaning, style, and tone of the Old Norse more exactly than the revised form does.

Let us look more closely at the large body of alterations that Morris apparently made for the purpose of improving the style of the translation. As I just stated, he frequently sacrificed fidelity to the sense and substance of the original for the sake of making the rendering more effective and more pleasing. In many of these cases, to be sure, the literal translations he rejected were rather weak and colorless or somewhat awkward; but very few of them were particularly objectionable, and it is surprising that he was willing to take such liberties with the Old Norse for so little cause. Note, for example, the following revisions:

1. 12-3, Biorn the son of Ketil was fostered east in Jamtaland with that earl who was called Kiallak: Biorn the son of Ketil Flatneb was fostered east in Jamtaland at an earl's called Kiallak

2. 7-8, Biorn son Ketil's var fostrapr austur Jamtalandi med iarli hehim er Kiallakr het

1. 17, Some there were who in winter kept themselves in the South-isles or the Orkneys: and some withal abode in the South-isles in winter

2. 12-3, þeir voru summer helldu sik á vetrum Í Sudreyium eðr Orkneyium

1. 22, and said that Ketil Flatneb should be captain thereof: and commanded Ketil Flatneb to be captain over it

2. 17-8, oc quad Ketill Flatnef skyldlu hòfpingia vera yfer þeim her

Moreover, with no regard for the original, he frequently altered

1. See below, on pages 951-953, the changes listed in Group III, A.

2. In quoting changes in the illuminated manuscript of the Eyrbyggja saga rendering, I have placed first in the left-hand column the holograph manuscript form and then the illuminated manuscript version; in the right-hand column I have presented the Old Norse original. The reference in the left-hand column is to the chapter and line in which the change occurs in the illuminated manuscript as it is reproduced in Part A of Appendix IV; the reference in the right-hand column is to the page and line in which the original occurs in Thorkelin's edition of the Eyrbyggja saga.
passages reproducing or imitating characteristics of the Old Norse prose style. The loose, incoherent sentences which are extremely common in the original seem particularly to have displeased him, for on several occasions he struck out translations which imitated the Old Norse in this respect and inserted in their place renderings that from the standpoint of modern English grammar are far superior but which fail completely to reproduce the quality of the original. Such is the case in the following change, for example:

1, 12-3, fostered...with that earl who was called Kiiallak, but Giaflaug was his daughter: fostered...at an earl's called Kiiallak, whose daughter was Giaflaug dotter hans

He did not even hesitate to use phrases introduced by a present participle, although such constructions are extremely rare in the Old Norse and although, as we have already seen, he was particularly careful to avoid such participial phrases in his translation of the Sigurðar saga Jórarafara, Þysteins ok Ólafs:

2, 15-6, Bagndr kærdu þetta fyrer Kóngi. oc þáðu hann frelsa sín af þessum úfríbi

He likewise occasionally tried to improve upon the original by avoiding vague or misleading connectives, as in the following

---

1. See above, pages 424-425.
alterations:

I, 26-7, But when Ketil came west over the sea, some fighting he and his had: Now when he came west over sea some fighting he and his had

I, 34-5, But when the king knew that, then he took to himself those lands that Ketil owned in Norway: So when the king heard that, he took to himself all Ketil's lands in Norway

Moreover, in this group of changes he not only sacrificed fidelity to the sense and style of the Old Norse, but he also in a few cases gave up cognates and archaic expressions:

I, 24-5, to the faring: to that voyage 2, 20, til ferdarinnar

I, 9, he had to wife Yngvild: and his wife 2, 4, hann átti Yngvhilde was Yngvild

In short, the number and nature of these alterations, together with the fact that he made only 9 changes for the purpose of reproducing the meaning of the original more exactly, only 1 for the sake of introducing a cognate, and only 5 for the purpose of giving the rendering a simple and archaic tone, make it clear that in preparing the illuminated manuscript version of the opening of the Eyrbyggja saga, Morris was primarily interested in presenting a translation that was smooth, vivid, forceful, and generally pleasing, and was only secondarily concerned about the exactness and tone of the rendering.

The situation in this illuminated manuscript of the Eyrbyggja saga is by no means unique, for in the majority of the other illuminated works which I have examined, I have found the translation similarly free and easy-flowing. Let us glance briefly at some of these other manuscripts.

Unfortunately, for the other illuminated manuscripts I have
been unable to locate, or for other reasons have not had an opportunity to examine, the holograph manuscripts on which the illuminated works are based, so that for these it is impossible to determine definitely just how far Morris departed from his holograph material in the illuminated version, and in the case of those illuminated manuscripts which contain translations that were published, it is also impossible to compare Morris's treatment of the holograph manuscript in the illuminated book with his treatment of the same material in the printed text, as I did in the case of the Æyrbyggja saga rendering. However, when the translation in the illuminated manuscript exists also in a published form, it is possible to analyze the discrepancies between these two versions and to determine in this way what, if any, were the main differences in Morris's aims in the two works.

I have accordingly in Part C of Appendix IV presented the first part of the Morris-Magnússon translation of the "Prologus" to the Heimskringla as it appears in an illuminated manuscript which Morris gave to Sir Emory Walker and in Volume III of The Saga Library, placing the two versions side by side, the former on the left-hand page and the latter on the right-hand page; in Part D I have analyzed those differences between the two that can be classified. This study reveals that in 23 of these discrepancies the printed text renders the meaning and substance of the Old Norse more exactly, in 7 it imitates important stylistic features of the original, in 7 it reproduces the character of the diction of the saga, in 4 it introduces archaic or poetic words, forms, or con-

1. For a description of this manuscript, see above, pages 182-183.
structions, and in 6 it is smoother and more idiomatic. The Walker Manuscript, however, renders the sense more precisely in only 11 of these differences, imitates the style in only 1, reproduces the character of the diction in only 2, introduces a rare form in only 1, but is smoother, more vivid, and in general more pleasing in 22. Of course, all these differences may not be the result of changes that Morris made in the holograph manuscript when he wrote out the illuminated work, for in some of these cases he may have retained the holograph manuscript form in the illuminated manuscript and altered it in the published translation. However, even though such may have been the case in some of these differences, there can be no doubt that Morris's aims in the two renderings were decidedly different, for in one version he was obviously striving for exactness and a suitable tone and in the other he was clearly chiefly interested in making the translation pleasing.

A similar situation is found in the section of The Story of Harald Hairfair which is written out on four vellum leaves of an illuminated manuscript owned by Miss May Morris in 1934. When we compare, for example, the last two pages of this passage with the corresponding section in the published version, as I have done in Parts E and F of Appendix IV, we find that in 18 of the differences in the prose of the two renderings the translation

1. For a complete list of these differences, see below, pages 962-966.
2. For a description of this manuscript, see above, pages 182-183.
3. In the analysis given above in the text I have not included the differences between the two versions of the "visa" that occurs in this passage. This "visa" appears in an entirely different form in the two renderings. Undoubtedly, these differences are the result of Morris's revision of the holograph manuscript translation when he prepared his work for publication; the
in Volume III of The Saga Library renders the meaning and substance of the Old Norse more exactly, in 4 it imitates important features of the style of the original, in 5 it reproduces the character of the diction, in 1 it brings in a poetic word, and in 2 it is more coherent and forceful, but the illuminated manuscript reproduces the meaning of the Old Norse more literally in 4 differences, imitates stylistic peculiarities in 2, uses archaic or poetic forms in 3, and is more idiomatic, clearer, and in general more pleasing in 1. In this illuminated manuscript also, the emphasis is plainly on the smoothness, force, and clarity of the language of the translation.

As I have already indicated, Morris did not in all his illuminated manuscripts make so many changes in his holograph manuscript material and depart so freely from the Old Norse as he did in the Birmingham illuminated manuscript of the Eyrbyggja saga rendering and as he seems to have done in the other two illuminated works we have considered. That Morris's procedure in preparing illuminated manuscripts was not always the same is well brought out by a comparison of the first chapter of the translation of the Hávarðar saga Ísfirðings as it appears in an illuminated manuscript which he gave to Georgiena Burne-Jones and in an illuminated book presented to Sir Emory Walker. For the purpose of comparing his procedure in these two works, I have reproduced in Part G of Appendix IV the first chapter of this rendering as it is found in the

(continuation of note 3 on page 546) likely that Morris took time to rewrite any of his verse translations when he was producing the illuminated work. The differences between the two renderings of the "visa" are consequently of no interest in a study of the style of translation Morris used in his illuminated manuscripts.

1. For a complete list of these differences, see below, pages 973–976.
Burne-Jones manuscript, in the Walker manuscript, and in Volume I of The Saga Library; in Part H I have analyzed the changes he seems to have made in the Walker manuscript.

In all probability these three versions were all based, independently of one another, on the holograph manuscript. Usually all three agree. In thirteen passages, however, all three differ; in these cases we cannot of course, in the absence of the holograph manuscript, determine which translation, if any, retained the holograph manuscript form and which ones made a change. There are, however, a number of passages in which two of these renderings agree but the third one differs; and in such cases, if our assumption that all three versions were based on the holograph manuscript is correct, the two that are alike must have kept the holograph manuscript form but the one that disagrees must have departed from this translation. When we examine the differences of this type, we find that in 9 cases the Burne-Jones manuscript and the Walker manuscript agree but the printed text differs, that in 66 passages the Burne-Jones manuscript and the published rendering are alike but the Walker manuscript disagrees, and that in 4 cases the Walker manuscript and the printed text have the same form but

1. In the analysis presented in this paragraph of the various differences in the three versions, I have not included unimportant differences in spelling, punctuation, and paragraphing. The passages or words that differ in all three are the following (the references are to the chapter and line in the Walker manuscript as it is reproduced in Part G of Appendix IV): I, 1-3 ("Here" - "Halt"); I, 8-9 ("neither" - "him"); I, 15 ("Havard"); I, 19 ("Havard"); I, 22 ("of" - "fashioned"); I, 23 ("Havard"); I, 26 ("was called"); I, 30 ("A" - "dwell"); I, 34-5 ("he" - "speech"); I, 36 ("Two men more"); I, 49 ("at Knoll"); I, 51 ("Skarfi"); and I, 54 ("albeit" - "presence").

2. These cases are as follows (the references are as in note 1): I, 10-11 ("from" - "goods"); I, 13-4 ("which" - "hand"); I, 16 ("but" - "days," with the exception of the omission of "now" in the Walker manuscript, very likely through a mere slip); I, 19 ("on his knee-pan"); I, 24 ("to them"); I, 25 ("of him"); I, 34 ("but a feeble-heart"); I, 43 ("murderous"); and I, 43-4 ("he" - "before").

3. See the changes listed below on pages 987-992.
the Burne-Jones manuscript differs. The discrepancies of the first type are of no interest in a comparison of Morris's procedure in the two illuminated works, but the other two sets of differences indicate that in writing out the first chapter of this translation, Morris made approximately 16 times as many alterations in the Walker manuscript as in the Burne-Jones manuscript.

The changes that he made in the Walker manuscript are in the main similar in nature to the alterations that we have seen that he regularly made in his illuminated books. He seems as usual to have been eager to make the rendering smooth and pleasing, but he shows here a little more interest in exactness than in the other illuminated works we have examined. Thus, if we assume that this translation was based on the holograph manuscript and that in the case of the differences between it and the other two renderings the Burne-Jones manuscript and the printed text reproduce the form in the holograph manuscript, it appears that Morris made 10 changes in the Walker manuscript for the purpose of rendering the meaning and substance of the Old Norse more exactly, 7 alterations in order to reproduce the style of the original more closely, 2 revisions for the sake of introducing cognates, 2 changes because he wanted to give the translation a more archaic tone, 23 alterations for the purpose of making the rendering smoother, clearer, and more forceful, and 22 revisions for reasons that are not evident. It should be noted that in 14 of the 23 changes apparently made for the sake

1. For a list of these differences see the next page.

2. This figure is of course only approximate, for in the thirteen cases in which all three versions disagree, one of the illuminated manuscripts must have departed from the Old Norse, and both may have done so. However, the number of such differences is comparatively small, so that even if some of them were the result of changes in the Burne-Jones manuscript, it is still true that Morris made a great many more alterations in the Walker manuscript than in the Burne-Jones manuscript.

3. For a complete list of these changes, see below, pages 987-
of improving the quality of the English, he sacrificed exactness of translation.

 Completely different, however, was Morris's procedure in writing out the same material in the Burne-Jones manuscript; for here, as I have already indicated, he seems to have made only 4 alterations in the holograph manuscript version. All of these changes are very insignificant; for none of them is Morris's reason apparent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1, 11, He had taken</th>
<th>1, 9, Þorbjörn hafði tekit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, 13, while she was</td>
<td>1, 12, meðan hón vægri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 33, are named</td>
<td>2, 12, eru nefndir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 50, Thoralf was the name of him who</td>
<td>3, 1, Þórðalfr hét maðr,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abode at Loonsere</td>
<td>er bjó þar sem heitir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoralf was a man who</td>
<td>4, 1, Lónseyri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abode at Loonsere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The situation we encounter in the Burne-Jones manuscript is what we should expect to find in all Morris's illuminated works; instead, as I have already stated, in the majority of the illuminated books that I have examined, he made numerous alterations, and in these changes showed a much greater interest in rendering the translation smooth and pleasing than in keeping close to the original.

The very unusual procedure which we have noted in a number of Morris's illuminated manuscripts raises the question, Why was Morris's attitude toward his Icelandic renderings generally so entirely different when he was making an illuminated manuscript from what it was when he was preparing the version to be published?

1. See below, on pages 988-999, the changes listed in Group III,A.

2. In listing these four changes I have placed first in the left-hand column the Walker manuscript form and then the Burne-Jones manuscript version. The reference in the left-hand column is to the chapter and line of the Burne-Jones manuscript as it is reproduced in Part G of Appendix IV; the reference in the right-hand column is to the page and line of the Hávarðar saga Ísfirðings, edited by Guðlaugr Thordarson, in Nordiske Oldskrifter, XXVIII.