

Commenting on Schucking's composite theory Chambers alludes to Schucking's enumeration of several constructions which are found in the Return, but not elsewhere in Beowulf and Chambers says, "Syntax is a subject to which he (Schucking) has given special study, and his opinion upon it must be of value. But I doubt whether anyone as expert in the subject as Schucking could not find in every passage of like length in Beowulf some constructions not to be exactly paralleled elsewhere in the poem." p. 118

"The fact that no parentheses occur in the Return does not differentiate it from the rest of Beowulf: for, as Schucking himself points out elsewhere, there are three other passages in the poem, longer than the Return, which are equally devoid of parenthesis." p. 119

"There are, in addition, examples which occur only in the Return, and in certain other episodic passages. These episodic passages also, Schucking supposes, may have been added by the same reviser who added the Return. But this is a perilous change of position. For example, a certain peculiarity is found only in the Return and the introductory genealogical section; or in the Return and the Finn Episode. But when Schucking proceeds to the suggestion that the Introduction or the Finn Episode may have been added by the same reviser who added Beowulf's Return, he knocks the bottom out of some of his previous arguments. The arguments from the absence or parentheses (whatever it was worth) must go: for according to Schucking's own punctuation, such parentheses are found both in the Introduction and in the Finn Episode. If these are by the author of the Return, then doubt is thrown upon one of the alleged peculiarities of that author; we find the author of the Return no more averse on the whole to parentheses than the author or authors of the rest of the poem." (p. 119)

"Peculiar usages of the moods and tenses are found twice in the Return, and once again in the episode where Beowulf recalls his youth. Supposing this episode to be also the work of the author of the Return, we get peculiar constructions used three times by this author, which cannot be paralleled elsewhere in Beowulf." (p. 119, 120)

"Now a large number of instances like this last might afford basis for argument; but they must be in bulk in order to prove anything. By the laws of chance we might expect, in any passage of three hundred lines, taken at random anywhere in Beowulf, to find something which occurred only in one other passage elsewhere in the poem. We cannot forthwith declare the two passages to be the work of an interpolator. One swallow does not make a summer." (p. 120)

"And the arguments as to style are not helped by arguments as to matter. Even if it be granted - which I do not grant - that the long repetition narrating Beowulf's contest with Grendel and Grendel's mother is tedious, there is no reason why this tedious repetition should not as well be the work of the original ~~author~~ ~~for~~ ~~the~~ poet as of a later reviser. Must we find many different authors for The Ring and the Book? It must be granted that there are details (such as the mention of Grendel's glove) found in the Grendel struggle as narrated in Beowulf's Return, but not found in the original account of the struggle. Obviously the object is to avoid monotony, by introducing a new feature: but this might as well have been aimed at by the old poet retelling the tale as by a new poet retelling it." p. 120