

"To me, the fact that so careful and elaborate a study of the story of Beowulf's Return fails to betray any satisfactory evidence of separate suthorship, is a confirmation of the verdict of 'not proven' against the 'dividers'. But there can be no doubt that Schucking's method, his attempt to prove differences in treatment, grammar, and style, is the right one. If any satisfactory results are to be attained, it must be in this way." p. 120

"Even in the rare cases where the character in Beowulf and his Scandinavian equivalent bear names which are not phonologically identical, the difference does not point to any corruption such as might have arisen from borrowing in Viking days. We have only to contrast the way in which the names of Viking chiefs are recorded in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, to be convinced that the Scandinavian stories recorded in Beowulf are due to contact during the age when Britain was being conquered, not during the Viking period three or four centuries later." p. 323

"And the arguments from literary and political history, which Schucking adduces to prove his late date, seem to me to point in exactly the opposite direction, and to confirm the orthodox view which would place Beowulf nearer 700 than 900." (p. 323)

Footnote on page 401 - "Mullenhoff's book, like that of ten Brink, is based on assumptions generally held at the time, but now not so widely accepted; yet it remains important."

Footnote on page 113 - "Both the tendencies specially associated with Mullenhoff's name - the 'mythologizing' and the 'dissecting' - are due to the influence of Lachmann. It must be frankly admitted that on these subjects Mullenhoff did not ~~begin~~ begin his studies with an open mind."