

The Applicable Theories and Cruces of Gift Giving in *Beowulf* : From the Guest-Friendship Perspective

Tomoaki MIZUNO

Émile Benveniste, the distinguished comparative linguist, ingeniously illuminated the Indo-European practice and institution of 'gift and exchange' through the scrupulous examination of words in question, such as Skr. *dānam*, Gr. *dōs*, *dōron* and *dōtīnē*, Lat. *dōnum*, Arm. *tur*, Slav. *darŭ*, and others, which commonly mean 'gift'. According to his survey, these words "correspond to as many different ways of envisaging a gift—from the purely verbal notion of 'giving' to 'contractual presentation imposed by the terms of a pact, an alliance, or a friendship', or a 'guest-host' relationship" (Benveniste, 53). Benveniste cites the Homeric epic *Odyssey* (9. 266–286) as one of the appropriate evidences: 'We are come to your knees to see whether you will offer us a *xeinēion* (a gift of hospitality) or whether you will give us a *dōtīnē*, as is the law of hospitality (*thēmis xeinōn*)'. In this passage, a relationship is established, claims Benveniste, "between *dōtīnē* and the presents which are exchanged between host and guest according to the traditions of hospitality" (Benveniste, 56).

Turning his outlook to Germanic terms, such as Goth. *gild* 'tax', Old Icel. *gjald* 'recompense, punishment, payment', OE *gielð* 'substitute, indemnity, sacrifice', and OHG *gelt* 'payment, sacrifice', Benveniste detects behind these words the common but "extremely complex" notion of "a religious, economic and legal character" (Benveniste, 58). Then he took notice of three phases of development: "first religious, the *sacrifice*, a payment made to the divinity, secondly *economic*, the fraternity of merchants, and thirdly, *legal*, a compensation, a payment imposed in consequence of a crime, in order to redeem oneself" (Benveniste, 61). Subsequently while Benveniste confers the Germanic words, such as Goth. *hansa* 'crowd, cohort', OE *hōs* 'the follower of a lord', and OHG *hansa*: the translated word of Lat. *cohors* 'a company of warriors', he concludes, the Hanseatic League or the "commercial association" with a common interests, which was set up among the Northern Germanic merchants around 13–15th century, can be traced back to the military association of young men (*comitatus*: Tacitus, *Germania* 13–14) "who attach themselves to a chieftain" (Benveniste, 64). These young warriors would live on bountiful gifts bestowed by their chieftain and enjoy abundant food 'which serves instead of pay' (*Germania* 14) in occasional feasts. Instead, in terms of Benveniste, young warriors "are always ready to follow him [their chieftain] and defend him" and *vie with each other* "to win renown under his orders" (Benveniste, 64; emphasis added). Benveniste also gives a very crucial supposition that, on the other hand, the chieftains

“*compete among themselves* each in the effort to attach to himself the keenest followers” (Benveniste, 64-65; emphasis added). Thus, in carrying out an investigation into the gift giving scenes and their contexts in *Beowulf*, we should take account of his vital theory that both a chieftain and his warriors stick together with mutual dependance under the extremely competitive principle of society.

Besides, based upon the lexical meanings of Gr. *dapánē* ‘ostentatious expenditure’, Lat. *dapsilis* (a coinage from Greek) ‘abundant, ostentatious’, Icel. *tafn* ‘consumption of food’, or Arm. *tawn* ‘a solemn feast’, Benveniste postulates that there existed the Indo-European social practice which the ethnologist has called *potlatch*: “the display and consumption of wealth on the occasion of a feast” (Benveniste, 62). In addition, he explains as follows :

It is necessary to make a show of prodigality in order to demonstrate that one sets no store by it, to humiliate one’s rivals by the instantaneous squandering of accumulated wealth. A man conquers and maintains his position if he outdoes his rivals in this reckless expenditure. The *potlatch* is a challenge to others to do likewise in their turn. The competitors make a still more lavish outlay, and this results in circulation of wealth, which is accumulated and extended for the prestige of some and the enjoyment of others, as Mauss has shown so well.

(Benveniste, 62-63)

In his famous essay, the French anthropologist Marcel Mauss, as here referred to, has directed special attention to the custom of the competitive exchange of gifts at feasts in archaic societies (1923-24). The system of gift and counter-gift almost naturally bears the *agonistic* character. Recently, Adelheid Thieme meticulously comments in her dissertation (1994) that the priority should be assigned to Vilhelm Grønbeck over Marcel Mauss in the light of essential contribution to the study of gift economies. The former’s theory, affirms Thieme, has been disregarded by Marcel Mauss and his successors, mainly because Grønbeck published his work in Danish (1909-12), the “inaccessible” language to the majority of scholars (Thieme, 19-20). Mauss expresses himself, though, that he followed such scholars, as Barbeau, R. Lenoir and M. Davy, in employing the Chinook word *potlatch* with the original meaning ‘to nourish’ or ‘to consume’ (See Mauss, 83, Notes 3; 84, Notes 10).

Currently, when several decades have passed since the English translation appeared (1931), Grønbeck’s undertaking seems to be winning a proper appraisal, as some of *Beowulfian* commentators took notice of the interconnection between gift giving and continuing reciprocity: “gifts, trust, and honour on the lord’s part for service, honour, and loyalty on the retainer’s part” (John M. Hill 1995, 88). Grønbeck has accentuated the importance of the Germanic legal edicts which reveal that accepting a gift incurs the

sense of obligation. To the Germanic mind, affirms Grønbeck, a gift without return, without obligation, is inconceivable (vol. II, 7-9). John M. Hill mentions that Grønbeck has enlarged our sense of Germanic gift exchange as “a bond for and a concomitant of friendship”, adding that Germanic exchange could approach *potlatch*, “a premonetary system of exchange between families and between groups in which one must give, receive, and return gifts” (J. M. Hill, 92). Hill, though citing Grønbeck, identifies this Germanic system with the ‘competitive’ *potlatch* which necessarily causes “an obligation to return the gift” (Hill, 92). Grønbeck himself, however, did not stress the competitive element, even without offering the ethnological term *potlatch*. To his mind, “the gift is a social factor”, in the sense that “passing from man to man and to man again, it draws through a mesh of obligations so strong that the whole state is moved if but one or another point of the chain be properly grasped” (vol. II, 10; emphasis added). “A gift always look for its return”, —the proverb does Grønbeck quote to express the situation of gift exchange appropriately.

According to Grønbeck, a gift “comes dripping with memories and honour, and surrenders itself with friends and foes, gods and forefathers, past and future purpose”, while it may be “an unmistakable manifestation, or rather crystalization, of the good will, and to make sure of the sincerity of the other party one might wish to see his cordiality step out into the light” (vol. II, 60-61). Charles Donahue might be apparently the first scholars who claimed that the anthropological term *potlatch* can be a useful instrument for the investigation of the Anglo-Saxon poem *Beowulf* (1975, 25), making palpable reference to Mauss’ essay, although he touched upon neither Grønbeck, the Danish pioneer, nor Benveniste, the French linguist. In terms of Donahue, warrior societies basically consist of “a warlord (*dryhten*) and a body of retainers (*gedryht*)”. And as far as the *dryhten* is “keeper of the treasure”, “heroic munificence is incumbent” on him (Donahue, 24). Donahue adds to say :

The arms and the rings he [a warlord] distributes ceremoniously at feasts are of practical use to his warriors and they convey status (*weorþ*). The warrior is bound in honor to make a counter-gift of his military services and all that they bring. He is bound to lay down his life in defense of his *dryhten* or to die in an effort to avenge him if the defense fails. Heroic loyalty is the counterpart of heroic munificence.

(Charles Donahue, 24)

Thus, for instance, the banquet following Beowulf’s victory over Grendel (991-1238), appears to be a “*potlatch*”, in Donahue’s view, because Hrothgar is told to have given Beowulf splendid treasures (1020-25; 1035-38) as a “counter-gift” (Donahue, 26) for the greatest feat performed by this hero. As Donahue himself noted, however, the social phenomenon *potlatch*, which anthropologists detected among the American Indians of the

northern Pacific coast, should be defined as “the competitive exchange of gifts at feasts” (Donahue, 25). According to Mauss, the Tlingit and Haida of Norse–West America “pass their winters in continuous festival, in banquets, fairs and markets” (Mauss, 4). Mauss proceeds to delineate the notion :

But the remarkable thing about these tribes is the *spirit of rivalry and antagonism* which dominates all their activities. A man is not afraid to challenge an opposing chief or nobleman. Nor does one stop at the purely sumptuous destruction of accumulated wealth *in order to eclipse a rival chief* (who may be a close relative). We are here confronted with total prestation in the sense that the whole clan, through the intermediacy of its chiefs, makes contracts involving all its members and everything it possesses. But the *agonistic character of prestation* is pronounced. Essentially usurious and extravagant, it is above all a struggle among nobles to determine in the hierarchy to the ultimate benefit, if they are successful, of their own clans. This agonistic type of total prestation we propose to call the ‘potlatch’ (Mauss, 4–5 ; emphases are mine).

Therefore, before we attempted to interpret, for instance, the Danish gift giving scene as one example of potlatch, following Donahue’s view, we should bring, above all, the above italicized elements into focus. As to the French term *total prestation*, Mauss gives the definition as follows : “what they exchange is not exclusively goods and wealth, real and personal property, and things of economic value. They exchange rather courtesies, entertainments, ritual, military assistance, women, children, dances, and feasts ; (...) [Although] the prestations and counter-prestations take place *under a voluntary guise* they are in essence *strictly obligatory*, and their sanction is private or open warfare. We propose to call this the system of *total prestations*” (Mauss, 3 ; emphases added except for his term *total prestations*). As is cited above from Benveniste, *potlatch* must basically entail “the display and consumption of wealth” with the aim of, in many cases, “humiliating or outdoing one’s rivals by prodigal and reckless expenditure”. It seems thus quite doubtful that Hrothgar’s prodigality had such a humiliating effect towards the donee Beowulf. But if so, we should argue this crucial point, putting forward the supporting evidences for it in the poem. In a forthcoming paper, I will focalize the Danish gifts, especially such as ‘eight’ horses, corslet, and the magical necklace. In parenthesis, Benveniste affirms : “there is no clear notion of rivalry” in Indo–European, and such agonistic character has a “subordinate role” there in the case of Indo–European societies (63). Nevertheless, to my mind, agonistic character can be assuredly noticed in the Danish gift bestowal scene, between the donors themselves rather than between a donor and the recipient Beowulf, as I touch upon it below. Furthermore, we could interpret the behavior of gift bestowal displayed by Hrothgar and Wealthew as “strictly obligatory” in

recompense for Beowulf's heroic feat, even though it appears to be performed 'voluntarily'.

In preference to the agonistic character or emulation, Benveniste rather emphasizes that the gift exchange is closely connected with hospitality. In the light of Latin word *daps* 'sacrificial feast; banquet offered to the gods', the essence of the old custom lies originally in the host's obligation to make a gift of food or riches for a guest and to establish reciprocal and sacred relationship between respective partners in the *supposed presence of some deities*. Elsewhere, by way of applying the theories of the past Japanese folklorist Shinobu Orikuchi and the ethnologist Masao Oka, I have stressed that a stranger typified by Beowulf or Loki, when coming into a community, is held generally to have an ambivalent character of 'a sacred visitor and a terrible stranger' (Mizuno 1989; 1996). For the people in a community, according to Masao Oka, a stranger appears to be the inflictor of disease and misfortunes, or to be the deity-like being of bringing happiness and fortunes (Mizuno 1989, 11). So, at the arrival of a stranger, people perform some ceremony to dispel the evil and latent powers from him, or, under opportune circumstances, they are ready to reinforce their respective solidarity through the practice of gift exchange.

Thus, soon after Beowulf makes an appearance as a Geatish youth, in the middle of the banquet, Unferth who has served 'at the feet of the king Hrothgar' (500) flings insulting words at Beowulf as a stranger for the Danes (506-28). Unferth, with the distinguished title *þyle* 'prophetic orator' (1165; 1456) may be privileged to speak on behalf of other noble retainers in the Danish court. In my recent paper, I have maintained that his harshly insulting words could be a touchstone to evaluate the heroic potency of Beowulf, an adventurous young man, and also to estimate the true character of this stranger (Mizuno 1995, 196). After suffering Unferth's slander and insult, Beowulf delivers a sharp and clever retort against him (529-604). As I pointed out in the paper, Othin, the Norse god of poetic art and prophecy, is called *fimbul-þulr* 'an orator with great wisdom' (Hávamál 80; 142). Distinctly, in my view, Unferth assumes the sacred duty in common with Othin who can be defined as the god of hospitality, as is typically revealed in the Eddaic poem *Grímnismál* (Mizuno 1996, 82-83). Loki is also allowed to cast abusive words at gods and goddesses who have been present at the banquet in the sea god *Ægir* (Lokasenna), properly, to my mind, in order to bestow bliss on the divine attendance. Therefore I have concluded: "blame and insult uttered by a magical orator should be interpreted as a form of giving hospitality to a sacred visitor" (Mizuno 1995, 199).

Ward Parks has directed his attention to the ceremonial aspect of flying or verbal contest. Shortly, he maintains that the "adversative verbal display" between two heroes is conducted in such a way as to "reaffirm their heroic identities and to have them contend with each other for *kléos* or glory" (Parks 1986, 294). In this respect, we could readily comprehend the apparent contradictory account that, before the fight against

Grendel's mother, Unferth displays such benevolence as to lend his own sword named Hrunting to Beowulf, his once verbal opponent. Once they exchange words to "reaffirm their heroic identities" respectively, they may set up the bond of friendship. Total prestation, according to Marcel Mauss, "not only carries with it the obligation to repay gifts received, but it implies two others equally important: the obligation to give presents and the obligation to receive them" (Mauss, 10-11). In my view, this statement can hold true of the reciprocal relationship between a lender and a borrower. And Mauss give us an appropriate remark to illuminate the gift exchange system: "To refuse to give, or to fail to invite, is—like refusing to accept—the equivalent of a declaration of war; it is a refusal of friendship and intercourse" (Mauss, 11). Almost the same can be said about the exchange of words, even if they were insults or slanders. Robert E. Bjork ingeniously perceived the similar and reciprocal characteristics between words and gifts. In terms of Bjork, "the mechanism of material exchange coincides with and is illuminated by 'the mechanism of linguistic exchange' (applying Pierre Bourdieu's term)" (Bjork, 996).

Thus, to apply and enlarge Bjork's ideas to the practice of flyting, Unferth's verbal attack necessarily incurs the verbal counterattack from Beowulf, just as proverbially 'a gift always looks for its return'. Contrariwise, refusing to give words to a visitor must be equivalent to ignoring his existence or declaring an actual battle against him. In this respect, as I have contended, flyting or the exchange of insulting words is to serve as a preliminary contest which would presage a success or a failure in the coming actual battle (Mizuno 1995, 196). In the presence of all the Danish attendances at the banquet, Beowulf, through getting over Unferth's harsh accusation, seems to be acknowledged as a proper challenger against Grendel or a possible success. As the poet tells us, the king Hrothgar felt much pleased to hear Beowulf's courageous speech, and boisterous laughter was then aroused among the warriors (607-11). Beowulf did not betray their expectations by achieving a feat of the conquest of Grendel. This Geatish hero is told to 'have fulfilled his boasting words' (*gylp gelæsted*: 829) by relieving the Danish people of the long and severe affliction (*torn unlytel*: 833) caused by the monster.

In the second fight, Unferth's sword Hrunting proves to betray the trust of the borrower Beowulf at the imminent time when Beowulf is confronting Grendel's mother (1522-28; 1659-60), even though the sword has earned the praise 'the matchless one of inherited treasures' (*þæt wæs an foran eald-gestreona*: 1458). The poet remarks about it: 'This was the first time to the excellent treasure that it damaged its own reputation' (1527-28). Grønbeck has given pertinent remarks about this useless weapon:

The *sine qua non*, then, for using another man's weapon was that one had either wit to make its soul one's friend or power to compel it. One might perhaps be surprised by a sudden stubbornness on the part of treasure, a dark will that ran

athwart one's own; this was the spirit of the former owners, suddenly made manifest (Grønbeck vol. II, 29).

In other words, the spirit of the owner *Unferð*, the name of which has been often interpreted as *Un-frið*, i. e., 'un-peace: discord', abruptly interferes with Beowulf's winning a victory over Grendel's mother in urgent need. Significantly, the poet comments about Unferth's character: 'He (Unferth) did not himself venture to risk his life under the surging waves, or to test his valor (*driht-scype*); Thus he lost reputation (*dom*), his fame for courage (*ellen-mærpu*)' (1468-71). Resultantly the 'best heirloom' is also to damage its *dom* (1528) in the actual battle, when revealing the slack spirit of the disgraceful owner Unferth who has already lost his own *dom* (1470). Although Hrunting proved to be ineffective in the struggle against Grendel's mother, the poet tells, God afforded Beowulf the opportunity to notice a 'victorious blade' (*siege-eadiġ bil*: 1557) or an 'old sword made by giants' (*eald sweord eotenisc*: 1558), with which he could achieve a victory. In other words, at the critical moment was the hero saved narrowly from death by the Providence of God or a 'divine gift'.

To Beowulf who successfully cleansed the court Heorot by conquering Grendel, the king Hrothgar delivers an appreciative speech (928-56). In this speech, he offers the serious proposal that he would adopt this promising hero as his son, adding that Beowulf should keep 'this new kinship' (*niwe sibbe*: 949) deeply in mind (946-49). I have already brought forward my arguments to demonstrate that Beowulf willingly observed this 'new contract of kinship' (*niwe sibbe*) with Hrothgar, even after returning to the Geats (Mizuno 1989, 30; 35). As I have discussed into the detail in my paper, Beowulf turns out to be a terrible stranger who should bring misfortunes for the Geats or invite the deaths of Hygelac and his son Heardred (Mizuno 1989, 35-36).

In accordance with his benevolent speech, Hrothgar presents the hero with four kinds of treasure, such as a golden standard, a helmet, a suit of armor or corslet, and a precious sword, in the presence of all the attendance at the banquet (1020-24). In her doctoral dissertation, Adelheid Thieme precisely comments: "In tribal cultures, gift giving is embedded into a public gathering so that as many people as possible can witness the act" (27). And she proceeds to explain: "The exquisite objects, which serve as an indicator of the donor's excellence and the recipient greatness, are publicly displayed before they are actually conferred on the new owner" (Thieme, 27). Reasonably the *Beowulf* poet does not forget to add, with the use of *Ne gefrægn ic* ('I have not heard') formulaic phrase, that the act of gift giving is performed with open and firm 'friendship' (*freondlicor*: 1027) shown by Hrothgar. To my mind, however, the more emphasis the poet puts upon the friendship which is suggestive of the established 'new kinship' (*niwe sibbe*) between Hrothgar and Beowulf, the more seriously weakened the Geatish kinship between Hygelac and Beowulf appears to me.

Besides these treasures, the king orders his men to lead eight horses, furnished with golden bridles, into the hall (1035 ff.). One steed seems to be a matchlessly fine among these horses, viewed from the lucid description that 'a saddle, delicately wrought, studded with jewels, was put only on this horse' (1037-38). Hrothgar thus grants the ownership of these eight horses and weapons to the Geatish visitor Beowulf, 'exhorting him to make full use of them' (*het hine wel brucan* : 1045). Since the verb *brucan* (1045) means 'to make use of ; to enjoy', the passage undoubtedly signifies that the recipient Beowulf is here entrusted with all the responsibilities and the right to employ the apparently splendid gifts. At the same time, however, this gift-giving ceremonial appears, in my mind, to cast a shadow on Beowulf's career in the future. In this sense, Grønbeck's meticulous remark sounds quite ominous to me: "A gift carries with it something from the former owner, and its former existence will reveal itself, whether the new possessor wished it or not" (vol. II, 16).

The focal point is to scrutinize the lines of the text which revealingly tell or suggest as to how the recipient Beowulf 'makes full use of' these frugal gifts, whether for himself or for other persons. In a remarkable parallel with Hrothgar's gift giving, her queen Wealhtheow also confers gifts on Beowulf, which are in no way inferior to those of Hrothgar. She presents the guest Beowulf with such splendid treasures, as braided gold, two bracelets, corslet, rings, and finally the 'most marvelous necklace' (*heals-beaga mæst* : 1195) that the poet, calling himself 'ic', has ever heard on earth (1196). Conspicuously, among these five kinds of treasures, the poet himself makes a definite assessment only about the last one: 'I have not heard, under heaven, of any better hoard-treasure bestowed upon warriors (than this necklace), since Hama carried off the *Brosinga mene*, brilliant jewel and a costly goblet, into his radiant fortress' (1197-1200). The poet seems, in a suggestive way, to furnish us with a striking contrast between Wealhtheow's 'most marvelous necklace' and Hrothgar's 'most excellent horse'.

We are not told explicitly as to why Wealhtheow is ready to give away such a splendid necklace, which might be a target of covetous minds. The two donors as a host and a hostess appear to be competitive, as if they tried to outdo the other donor in quality of their gifts each other. In terms of M. Mauss, "the agonistic character of prestation" can be more clearly noticed between these two noble donors rather than between either donor and the recipient Beowulf.

When pursuing investigations into the significance of gift bestowal or exchange in *Beowulf*, we should take it into account that the offered material must be charged with the whole spirit of the former owner, such as his wish, expectations, favor, worries, ill will, curse, or other various intentions or feelings. Thus it is of crucial importance that we take a careful survey of the context in question from the whole poem and from other relevant sources to illuminate the background and history of a gift itself. Gift giving is usually accompanied with a ceremonial speech which the donor delivers to the recipient

and with the recipient's response, but sometimes complete silence prevails in a certain gift giving scene, where the poet furnishes us only with the legendary fact that something was offered from one person to another. In the former's case, a certain word or a phrase may afford a promising or substantial clue to detect the donor's intentions. Verbal exchange, in some cases, may form an apt parallel of gift exchange, and become an instrument to uncover the implicit or explicit intentions inherent in the gift. In the latter's case, however, it would be rather difficult to carry out a proper assessment of the gift as to whether it may incorporate the donor's genuine favor or ill will.

The Danish king Hrothgar and his queen Wealhtheow bestow *apparently magnificent* (That is my question !) gifts upon the Geatish hero Beowulf. I would like to investigate the donors' spirit and intentions, especially focalizing the 'eight' horses and the corslet as Hrothgar's gifts, and the wondrous necklace as Wealhtheow's gift. Receiving each of these gifts seems, to my mind, to cast an ominous shadow on Beowulf's career in the future, when the returning hero with splendid gifts, in turn, becomes a donor to his lord Hygelac and Hygd, his 'beloved' queen according to my supposition. About these serious problems will the author argue in a forthcoming paper entitled "The Magical Necklace in *Beowulf*". My primary aim is there to bring the hidden and evasive background of the gift scene into focus. And at the same time, I would like to uncover one of Beowulf's serious sins: his 'hidden and scandalous love' with Hygd.

Finally, very significantly, Lat. *damnum* 'loss; injury' (the older form *dampnum*) is known to have the original sense 'outlay; expenditure' (Gr. *δανᾶν*). In his etymological dictionary, T. G. Tucker mentions, the notion of "condemnation" represented by the word *damnare* is secondarily developed with the legal sense of "being outside the law". Viewed from the reversed angle, we are allowed to suppose that the old practice of gift exchange or lavish hospitality had originally aimed at setting up solidarity, reciprocity, and sacred bond between a host and a guest with religious, legal, economic, and spiritual levels. Probably, when *damnum* or its older form *dampnum* was closely associated with *daps* 'a sacrificial feast; religious banquet', gift bestowal had such a strictly religious form of showing or displaying hospitality with extravagance to a sacred visitor. However, as the religious significance of gift exchange gradually and seriously declined with the deterioration of 'guest-friendship' principle (G. Herman's term, 2-4; 10-13; see my applied theory, Mizuno 1989, 22-28), 'ostentatious expenditure' displayed even for an originally sacred visitor appeared to be no more than 'an outright loss' in respect of hosts or proprietors of wealth.

Primary Sources

Chickering, Howell D., Jr. ed. & tr. *Beowulf: A Dual-Language Edition*. (New York: Anchor Press, 1977). [Throughout this paper I refer to Chickering's text].

- Klaeber, Friedrich. ed. *Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg*. (1922 ; Lexington, Mass. : D. C. Heath and Company, 1950). [I refer to Notes and Glossary of this text].
- Neckel, Gustav & Hans Kuhn. ed. *Edda : Die Lieder des Codex Regius nebst verwandten Denkmälern*. (Heidelberg : Carl Winter, 1962).

References

- Benveniste, Émile. *Indo-European Language and Society*. trans. Elizabeth Palmer. (1969 ; tr. Univ. of Miami Press, 1973).
- Bjork, Robert E. "Spech as Gift in Beowulf". *Speculum*, vol. 69 (1994), pp. 993-1022.
- Donahue, Charles. "Potlatch and Charity : Notes on the Heroic in *Beowulf*". In *Anglo-Saxon Poetry : Essays in Appreciation*. eds. Lewis E. Nicholson and Dolores Warwick Frese. (Indiana : Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1975), pp. 23-40.
- Grønbeck, Vilhelm. *The Culture of the Teutons*. 3 vols. trans. W. Worster. (Danish original, 1909 -12 ; tr. London : Oxford Univ. Press, 1931). [About the subject of gift exchange, we could refer to chap. I-V in vol. II].
- Herman, Gabriel. *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City*. (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1987).
- Hill, John M. *The Cultural World in Beowulf*. (Univ. of Toronto Press, 1995).
- Mauss, Marcel. *The Gift : Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*. trans. Ian Cunnison. (1923-24 ; tr. Illinois : The Free Press, 1954).
- Mizuno, Tomoaki. "Beowulf as a Terrible Stranger". *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* (Washington D. C.), vol. 17, Nos 1 & 2 (1989), pp. 1-46. [Many misprints are found, because the author was not given any opportunity for proofreading].
- Mizuno, Tomoaki. "Praise and Blame Directed at Beowulf". *Tohoku University Linguistics Journal*, vol. 4 (1995), pp. 193-200.
- Mizuno, Tomoaki. "Loki as a Terrible Stranger and a Sacred Visitor". *Studies in Humanities : Culture and Communication*, Faculty of Arts, Shinshu Univ., No. 30 (1996), pp. 69-90.
- Mizuno, Tomoaki. "The Magical Necklace and the Fatal Corslet in *Beowulf*". *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* [expectedly forthcoming in 1997].
- Parks, Ward. "Flyting and Fighting : Pathways in the Realization of the Epic Contest". *Neophilologus*, vol. 70 (1986), pp. 292-306.
- Thieme, Adelheid L. J. "Gift exchange and the heroic ethos in Old English poetry". Diss. Arizona State Univ., 1994.
- Tucker, T. G. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin*. (Chicago : Ares Publ. Inc., 1931).