Seiichi Suzuki

The Miniatures and Meters of the Old English *Genesis*, MS Junius 11

Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde

Herausgegeben von
Sebastian Brather, Wilhelm Heizmann
und Steffen Patzold

Band 138

Seiichi Suzuki

The Miniatures and Meters of the Old English *Genesis*, MS Junius 11

Volume 2: The Metrical Organization of the Old English *Genesis*: The Anglo-Saxon Foundations and Old Saxon Adaptation.

DE GRUYTER

ISBN 978-3-11-078688-0
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-078806-8
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-078817-4
ISSN 1866-7678

Library of Congress Control Number: 2022950671

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the internet at http://dnb.dnb.de.

Typesetting: Dörlemann Satz GmbH & Co. KG, Lemförde
Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck

www.degruyter.com

To my mother, Suzuki Umeko
and
the memory of my father, Suzuki Keisaku

Preface

This book is a companion volume to my concurrent work on the pictures of the Old English *Genesis*, MS Junius 11 (Volume 1, Suzuki 2023). While addressing independently the metrical and the pictorial (re)organization of the Old English *Genesis* in their synchronic systematicity and diachronic dynamicity, the two volumes intersect in significant ways, complementing, corroborating, and reinforcing each other in their claims and conjectures.

Drawing on my previous work on Old Germanic meter (e.g., Suzuki 1996; 2004; 2014a), this volume provides a formally-oriented, cognitively-based, principled account of the metrical system of the Old English *Genesis* in its whole network of organization, that is, the meters of *Genesis A* and *Genesis B* individually and their coordination and integration at various levels of generalization, from both synchronic–structural and diachronic–dynamic perspectives. Ultimately originating from the Old English and Old Saxon classical meters, the meters of *Genesis A* and *Genesis B* were interactively shaped through mutual adaptation and recomposition aimed at their optimal integration into a synthesized Old English *Genesis*.

Among the most significant contributions of the book bearing on the metrical harmonization of *Genesis A* and *Genesis B* is the finding that the Old English *Genesis* is bisected in terms of alliterative pattern between lines 966 and 967. This demonstrated metrical integrity of the earlier portion comprising *Genesis A* up to line 966 and *Genesis B* in its entirety, then, may be attributed to its narrative unity. The textual unity thus adduced for explanation is in turn corroborated by the systemic pictorial organization of exclusively the first twenty-two illustrations in MS Junius 11, as substantiated in Volume 1, exactly the set of pictures that are aligned with the part of the text at issue. Furthermore, as argued at length in the preceding volume, these pictures—subsumed under the three cycles, the Fall of the Rebel Angels, the Creation, and Adam and Eve—were originally created at Tours for the thematically corresponding Old Saxon *Genesis* episodes before their eventual incorporation into the Old English *Genesis*.

The present volume figures prominently in the problematics it defines and addresses, the approaches and methodologies it explores, and the conclusions and conjectures it reaches. First, in previous metrical scholarship, neither *Genesis A* nor *Genesis B* has ever received full treatment on its own as an autonomous distinct system, with rare exceptions. Due to its varied deviations from the standard meter, *Genesis A* is usually dismissed as simply an inexact verse, while, being a translation from Old Saxon, *Genesis B* is excluded from consideration as an authentic Old English verse. This is a serious scholarly lacuna, because both poems are composed regularly in conformity with their own reorganized meters of Old English, as fully substantiated in this book. Such detailed analysis of the component meters each in turn constitutes an empirical basis for principled account of their interactive reorganization, as explored below.

Second, in addition to bringing to light the metrical systematicity of both components of the Old English *Genesis*, this work is concerned with the emergence of these

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110788068-017

meters through a close diachronic–comparative examination of the formal and cognitive mechanism by which the Anglo-Saxon poet/editor executed metrical innovations at the junction of the two distinct metrical traditions, Old English and Old Saxon.

Third, fully complementary to recent macroscopic works treating a long timespan of metrical evolution (e.g., Weiskott 2016; Cornelius 2017; Russom 2017), this book aims to provide a thorough microscopic analysis of a single poem in its reworking, with a focus on the poet's active engagement in reorganizing the inherited versification by implementing manifold adaptations and compromises to the heterogeneous and often conflicting conventions he confronted.

Fourth, outstanding in methodological terms are the formal rigor and cognitive insight in theorizing, the vigorous and imaginative application of inferential statistics in reasoning, and the close attention to the paradigmatic dimension of the meter—relations based on exclusivity and substitutability, in contrast to the conventional preoccupation with the syntagmatic dimension—relations based on linearity and combinability, that is, individual verse expressions and their internal and external relations.

Fifth, the book is multidisciplinary in its research interests and implications. While comparative Germanic linguistics and philology constitute the core as prime disciplines for verse text, the book is constructively fed by and feeds into art historical studies, with due respect for the pictorial dimension of the manuscript illumination involved. Of lasting importance is the conjecture that the Anglo-Saxon poet/translator/editor responsible for the recomposition of the Old English *Genesis* consulted an illustrated manuscript of Old Saxon *Genesis* episodes, the hypothesis convergently entailed by the two conclusions independently reached and mutually supporting: that verse lines 1 through 966, composed of *Genesis A* 1–234, 852–966, and *Genesis B*—that is, the textual portion corresponding to the pictorial narratives covered by the twenty-two Junius pictures from p. ii to p. 46—are delineated from the rest in terms of alliterative preference; and that these first twenty-two pictures in Junius 11, integrated into a sophisticated system of pictorial organization—the multidimensional network of opposition, complementation, parallelism, and variation in conceptual and compositional terms—are of Touronian origins, produced around the year 850 by a Carolingian artist affiliated with the School of Tours, as substantiated in detail in the first volume (Suzuki 2023).

With the rationale for and scope of inquiry formulated above, the book is organized as specified in the Table of Contents and outlined below. Chapter 1, by way of introduction, offers an overview of the Old English *Genesis* with respect to its textual basis and its unique compositional properties, and presents, from a comparative Germanic perspective, the basics of Old English (*Beowulf*) and Old Saxon (the *Heliand*) classical meters—the descriptive and explanatory framework of reference for subsequent exploration—in regard to prototype and its variation along a set of parameters.

Chapter 2 deals with the meter of *Genesis A*. Its earlier, greater part (sections 2.2 through 2.16) is devoted to a comprehensive synchronic account of the meter, as it is transcribed in MS Junius 11, that is, verse lines 1–234 and 852–2936 in the edited text (Doane 2013). The meter of *Genesis A* thus investigated should be appreciated as an

autonomous system, unified and monolithic in its synchronic functionality (for all its imperfections) rather than a product of inferior versecraft. Subsequently, the later part of this chapter (section 2.17) explores how the original Anglian meter, hypothesized as essentially equivalent to the classical Old English meter, was reconstituted through partial adaptation to the modified Old English meter in the remaking as the *Genesis B* meter, overlaid with properties derived from Old Saxon versification.

Chapter 3 treats the meter of *Genesis B*. The greater substance of this chapter provides a synchronic account of the meter as a distinct system articulating with Old English meter on the one side and Old Saxon meter on the other (sections 3.2 through 3.16), and uncovers its basically Old English metrical identities while loaded with Old Saxon features modified largely through Anglo-Saxon adaptation (sections 3.17). Specifically, a contrastive investigation into the ways in which the original Old Saxon verses were converted into the Old English ones (section 3.17.1) leads to microscopic analysis of how the meter would likely have undergone reanalysis and reorganization through interlingual recomposition. Of still greater interest for understanding the emergence of the *Genesis B* meter is to explore whether and how the recipient's Old English metrical basis maintained its original identity, or conversely had it subverted, in confrontation with influx of extraneous features from the continental source (sections 3.17.2 and 3.17.3).

Chapter 4 pursues a wide-ranging organization of the Old English *Genesis*, now integrated into a single whole, as it crosses the boundaries between the two component meters. Of immediate relevance here is the interpolation of the continental material (*Genesis B*) in the insular counterpart (*Genesis A*). Correspondingly, *Genesis A* is physically—if not as obviously on other grounds—divided into two parts, *Genesis A1* (1a–234b) and *Genesis A2* (852a–2936b), by the insertion of *Genesis B* (235a–851b) in between. Such a unique material basis seemingly motivated the separate metrical organization of the two portions. Specifically, there are indications that *Genesis A1* and *Genesis A2* thus delimited follow separate metrical generalizations in common with or in distinction from *Genesis B*.

On closer inspection, however, the separation of *Genesis A1* and *Genesis A2* was not directly conditioned by the physical insertion per se of *Genesis B*: as fully substantiated in section 4.4, and contrary to the usual conceptualization, *Genesis A* is not divided into two parts—*Genesis A1* (1a–234b) and *Genesis A2* (852a–2936b)—by the intervening *Genesis B* as naively conceived. Rather, at odds with the physical interpolation, an alternative more feasible splitting of *Genesis A* between verses 966b and 967a—that is, at a point well after the interface between *Genesis B* (851b) and *Genesis A* (852a)—is evidenced by a significant difference in the probability for double alliteration to occur. Accordingly, the actual bipartition may be characterized as distinguishing the set of *Genesis A1/Genesis B* (1a–966b) from *Genesis A2* (967a–2936b). This overall division of the Old English *Genesis* stems ultimately from the particular situation in which the underlying Old Saxon *Genesis* episodes—the antecedent of *Genesis B*—were available for Old English recomposition, and from the specific ways in which the Old Saxon material was

used and concomitantly the narratively overlapping portions of *Genesis A* were metrically reorganized through partial assimilation to the continental source.

Finally, Chapter 5 concludes by reformulating and elaborating on the central claims of the book in cognitively plausible terms and providing conjectures and implications of empirical substance for further study.

This work was supported in part by a grant from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS KAKENHI)—a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research C (#26370582). The substance of this book was written during the period of this program (2014–2017). Subsequently, during my tenure for 2018–2019 as a Member of the Institute for Advanced Study (IAS), Princeton, I made extensive revisions while working primarily on another project (Volume 1, Suzuki 2023), actually the twin to this book as referred to above. I am deeply grateful to Robbert Dijkgraaf, IAS Director and Leon Levy Professor, Patrick J. Geary, Andrew W. Mellon Professor at IAS, and all staff members at the Institute for support and service they supplied promptly all time.

Small parts of this book appeared in print elsewhere: "Metrical positions and their linguistic realisations in Old Germanic metres: A typological overview," *Studia Metrica et Poetica* 1, 9–38 (rewritten as sections 1.2 through 1.4); "Three-position verses in *Beowulf* and *Genesis A*: Syntagmatically-induced exceptions to the four-position principle," *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 29, 50–84 (incorporated after revision in section 2.13.2). To the editors (Mihhail Lotman and Tracy Alan Hall) and the publishers (University of Tartu Press and Cambridge University Press) of both journals, I wish to express my gratitude for giving permission to use these materials.

Worthy of particular thanks is A. N. Doane, a philologist with a capital P whose exemplary scholarship on and masterful expertise in the Old English *Genesis* (Doane 1991; 2013) never cease to be awe-inspiring and thought-provoking. Doane (2013: 55n27) kindly mentioned my *Genesis* meter project still in its infancy, which is at last presented here in completion with my best scholarly regards to him.

Finally, it is a pleasant duty to acknowledge, as always, my profound indebtedness to Yoshitaka Tanimoto, former President of Kansai Gaidai University, for his continued support of my research.

Seiichi Suzuki
May 2020, Neyagawa, Osaka

Contents

List of Tables

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110788068-018

List of Figures

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110788068-019

Symbols and abbreviations

a	alliterating lift in contrast to ‘x’ (nonalliterating lift)
acc.	accusative
adj.	adjective
adv.	adverb
anom.	anomalous verb
Beo	*Beowulf*
C	consonant
dat.	dative
fem.	feminine
GenA	*Genesis A*
GenB	*Genesis B*
Go.	Gothic
Hel	*Heliand*
ind.	indicative
neut.	neuter
nom.	nominative
OE	Old English
ON	Old Norse
OS	Old Saxon
OSG	Old Saxon *Genesis*
P	primary-stressed long syllable
p	primary-stressed short syllable
PGmc.	Proto-Germanic
pl.	plural
pres.	present
pret.	preterite
pron.	pronoun
S	secondary-stressed long syllable
s	secondary-stressed short syllable
sg.	singular
st.	strong verb
subj.	subjunctive
V	vowel
wk.	weak verb
X	unstressed long syllable
x	unstressed short syllable or unstressed syllable in general; nonalliterating lift in contrast to ‘a’ (alliterating lift)
x…	one or more unstressed syllables
#	word boundary
/	lift
\	heavy drop
×	normal drop
>	becomes; ranks higher than
<	derives from; ranks lower than
≥	apparently ranks higher than, but lacking statistical support

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110788068-020

1 Introduction: The Old English *Genesis* at the interface of Old English and Old Saxon Meters

1.1 The Old English *Genesis*: *Genesis A*, *Genesis B*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis*

The Old English *Genesis*—often referred to as the *Caedmon(ian) Genesis* owing to the misplaced attribution of its authorship to Caedmon in earlier scholarship—is a biblical poem composed in accordance with the Anglo-Saxon alliterative tradition. The work is located in an illustrated manuscript, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 11 (Gollancz 1927; Krapp 1931; Ker 1957: 406–408; Temple 1976: 76–78; Lucas 1980; 1981; Raw 1984; Karkov 2001: 19–32; Lockett 2002; Doane 2013: 1–41; Gneuss/Lapidge 2014: 491–493; Bodleian Library MS. Junius 11). Containing 2936 verse lines, the poem constitutes the longest Old English verse text after *Beowulf* (3182 lines; Fulk/Bjork/Niles 2008).

The poem is divided into two parts corresponding to its double origins in terms of composition: *Genesis A* (Doane 2013; verse lines 1–234 and verse lines 852–2936; pp. 1–12/18 and pp. 40/8–142/8; key: page/line in the manuscript) and *Genesis B* (Doane 1991; verse lines 235–851; pp. 13–40/8). On the one hand, *Genesis A* is based on an insular original composed in Old English, broadly in eighth century Mercia or Northumbria (cf. Cable 1981: 80–81; Fulk 1992: 60–65, 348–351, 392; Cronan 2004: 47–49; Doane 2013: 51–55; Neidorf 2013–2014: 34–40). This antecedent Old English work underlying *Genesis A* may be referred to as the Anglian *Genesis* (section 2.1). On the other hand, *Genesis B* is an Old English translation of some episodes constitutive of the Old Saxon alliterative biblical verse text, composed on the continent in the mid-ninth century (ca. 830s; Doane 1991; see also below) and reflected in the Old Saxon *Genesis* fragments (Doane 1991: 232–252; Behaghel/Taeger 1996: 241–256; Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, Palatinus Latinus 1447, fols. 1r, 2r, 2v, and 10v). Thus, the extant Old English *Genesis* is an amalgamation of the two thematically related works of distinct compositional identities by embedding the translated continental material (resulting in *Genesis B*) into the native work (resulting in *Genesis A*). Yet the resultant work would have been intended as a unitary piece, for all the obvious differences involved between the two constituents in matters of language, style, meter, diction, and most importantly, the ways in which the biblical materials are used for poetic narrative. Uniquely embodying interlingual conversions of verbal and visual representations of Genesis episodes, the Old English *Genesis* was an ambitious experimental project, and as such it invites intensive cross-disciplinary investigation in both the synchronic and diachronic dimensions of its multifaceted reworking.

The designed integrity of the two disparate works into a single whole is confidently ascertained in the absence of any explicit marking of the break between the two constituents. Specifically, there are no indications in evidence of a textual discontinuity on

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110788068-021

the eighth line of page 40 (p. 40/8) in the extant manuscript in which *Genesis B* reverts to *Genesis A* at a transition from *Genesis B* 851b to *Genesis A* 852a. The total lack of a formal distinction seems significant, given that a variety of marking devices would have been independently available to the scribe for appropriation: a capitalization and illumination of a section-initial letter, a cluster of dots for signaling a section ending, a picture inserted at a section boundary, or presumably the simplest means—leaving a blank space after verse 851b and starting verse 852a at the following line (i.e., p. 40/9).[1]

The translation and interpolation of the Old Saxon source obviously determined the identity of the resultant Old English *Genesis* no less decidedly than the underlying native work that framed the foreign material. In light of the demonstrable integrity of the final product characterized by the smooth transition from *Genesis B* to *Genesis A* observed above, it may be warranted to infer that the poet in charge executed other comparable editorial practices for harmonization and integration of the two constituents. To situate this stage of poetic merger more specifically in the whole evolution of the Old English *Genesis*, one may postulate the following series of events in the early West Saxon period, in agreement with Doane:

> About 900 the direct ancestor of *Genesis A* was combined with *Genesis B*. The first part of *Genesis A* received a revision introducing many early West-Saxon forms in the process of being combined with the recently or simultaneously west-saxonized *Genesis B*. (Doane 2013: 40)

Among the many conceivable domains targeted for revision and refinement would no doubt have been the metrical organization, as the meter is the prime defining basis of verse. Moreover, it is not only *Genesis B* that underwent metrical revision by way of Anglo-Saxonization as an Old English poem; *Genesis A* also would have been implicated no less significantly in editorial reorganization and integration to effect a better harmonization with *Genesis B*. That is, one must conceptualize that, with a view to attaining a unity of the whole work, the editorial reworking would have been performed through negotiation and compromise between the Old English and Old Saxon meters. On the one side, the meter of the immediate predecessor of *Genesis A*—the Anglian *Genesis*—would have been reorganized under the influence of the Old Saxon meter through the intermediary of the Old English translation of the relevant portions of the Old Saxon *Genesis*. On the other side, the meter of *Genesis B* would have come into being through restructuring of its pre-edited version, largely in concert with the surrounding Old English material (i.e., the pre-edited version of *Genesis A*). Thus, situated at the interface of the insular and continental traditions, the meters of *Genesis A* and *Genesis B* would eventually have emerged in their extant form through mutual adaptation and reciprocal reorganization as integral constituents of the Old English *Genesis* at large.

---

1 The exact place of transition from *Genesis A* to *Genesis B* is unrecoverable, because two leaves were lost between the end of *Genesis A* (234b; p. 12/18) and the beginning of *Genesis B* (235a; p. 13/1) in the current manuscript (Doane 2013: 11). For details, see section 4.1 below, and also section 1.1, Volume 1.

The ultimate objectives of this book, therefore, are to substantiate the ways in which and the means by which such metrical revision and refinement would have been exercised and to evaluate accomplishments brought about (with varying degrees of success) by the strategy of metrical integration. Since, methodologically and epistemologically, static–synchronic investigations of the resultant, directly observable meters precede dynamic–diachronic ones addressing their earlier (i.e., premanuscript) stages, one must prioritize exploration into the attested meters of *Genesis A* and *Genesis B* on their own terms as autonomous systems. Yet as they are embedded in the metrical traditions, they need to be appreciated in relation to the traditional canons. Under the usual working hypothesis that the Old English and Old Saxon meters are fully exemplified in *Beowulf* (Fulk/Bjork/Niles 2008) and the *Heliand* (Behaghel/Taeger 1996), respectively, it may be justified to use these classical works as the overall metrical framework, by reference to and in comparison with which the synchrony of the two Old English *Genesis* meters (*Genesis A* and *B*) will be subject to systematic description and made to yield viable dataset for a contact-based evolutionary account to be pursued from a dynamic–diachronic perspective. In more specific terms, the major deviations from the canonical meters will be substantiated to have arisen through mutual adaptation and reorganization implemented as part of the strategy for integration of the Old English *Genesis* into a single text.

With the rationale and problematics for exploration thus defined, the remainder of this introductory chapter provides a contrastive account of Old Germanic meter by illustrating its parametric variations that largely determine the metrical identities of the two major West Germanic alliterative poems, the Old English *Beowulf* and the Old Saxon *Heliand*.[2] The primary parameters to be examined here are the principle of four metrical positions per verse and its varying binding force (sections 1.2 and 1.3), and the differing ways in which these constituent positions are aligned with linguistic material (metrical–linguistic alignment; section 1.4). On the one hand, the four-position principle works with a maximal strictness in *Beowulf*, whereas it allows for a wider range of deviations in verse size in the *Heliand*. On the other hand, the variation in the metrical–linguistic alignment in the two close cognate meters may be generalized by positing the common scale, *Heliand* > *Beowulf*, whereby the *Heliand* is distinguished in overall terms by the higher likelihood of resolution, the lower likelihood of suspending resolution, and the larger size of the drop, all being ultimately reducible to the greater metrical prominence inherent in the Old Saxon poem.

2 The following sections are an abridged and condensed version of Suzuki (2014b). For a fuller survey taking the Norse meters into account, see Suzuki (2014a; 2014b).

1.2 The metrical position as a minimal constituent of a verse, the principle of four positions per verse, and the system of verse types

Drawing on Suzuki (1996: 10, 371; 2004: 7; 2014a: 13–15), I conceptualize the meter as a prototype-based cognitive system of rules, constraints, and representations. Such theoretical constructs are categorized and computed in terms of the graded opposition between their prototypes (core/central/unmarked members) and derivative variants (peripheral/outlying/marked members). Predicated thus on prototype in categorization, the system legitimates a given verbal expression as a verse (or a metrical unit sub- or superordinate to it; see below) by determining its metricality in gradient terms along a set of relevant parameters or preference conditions. Since the rules and constraints postulated to account for metrical phenomena are formulated and executed differentially, corresponding to varying prototypicality, and thus allow for a range of gradable deviations in a principled way, the metrical system is inherently subject to parametrically patterned variations, which are amenable to frequency-based descriptions and stochastic generalizations.

The meter thus conceptualized organizes versification at multiple levels according to the hierarchy of metrical units. The significant units in Old Germanic meter include the following (from bottom to top in the metrical hierarchy): position; verse; line; and section.

The metrical position, the lowest in the prosodic hierarchy, is postulated as an abstract invariant minimal metrical unit underlying a host of linguistic realizations that vary widely along a wealth of parameters including stress, syllable length and number, and lexical properties. Equipped with this underlying unit, one is principally concerned with the differing ways in which the metrical position is aligned with various language materials by versification. In other words, the central issues of Old Germanic metrics are to account for the range and likelihood of legitimate linguistic realizations of a given metrical position according to context. Thus, the varying alignments of metrical positions with language materials serve as significant parameters along which individual cognate meters differ in the evolution of Old Germanic versification (section 1.4).

It was Cable (1974: 84–93) among other metrists who brilliantly brought to light the primacy of metrical positions (or members) as foundational units of Old English alliterative verse: he laid out the arrangement of four metrical positions as the fundamental principle of verse composition in Old English. Indeed, Sievers (1893: 25) had earlier rightfully conceptualized this unit (*Glieder*) as the smallest metrical constituent, but he failed to fully work out its implications to the logical conclusion (Cable 1974: 32), which Cable accomplished with admirable clarity. By addressing the grouping of these smallest constituents into feet, Sievers obscured rather than clarified their primary status in the meter (Cable 1974: 91). Thus, Cable (1974) firmly laid the foundation for Old English (and Old Germanic in general by implication) metrics by his articulate formulation of the

principle of four positions as its ultimate basis of versification—a verse is composed of four metrical positions.

The four-position principle formulated above differs in its exact manners of execution from one meter to another in the Old Germanic alliterative traditions: it prescribes versification with varying strictness and flexibility. The principle of four positions is accordingly involved in parametric variations along a number of attributes, thereby accounting for the variability of Old Germanic meters in no small measure (section 1.3).

Apart from the canonical number of constituent positions dictated, their identities and arrangement are specifically prescribed. Building on a binary opposition between lift (strong position, represented as /) and drop (weak position, represented as ×), each verse normally comprises two such lifts and drops, respectively. A further distinction—a subcategorization of the drop—may be made between normal (×) and heavy (\) drops through promotion of a (normal) drop to a relatively prominent variant, a heavy drop. A heavy drop is substituted for a normal one by a secondary operation of metrical strengthening (or promotion). The set thus organized of the binary-opposed metrical positions—lift versus drop—supplemented with a further two-way subdivision—normal versus heavy drops—is differentiated optimally according to their prototypical metrical–linguistic alignment. The lift is aligned with a primary-stressed long syllable (P); the heavy drop, with a secondary-stressed long syllable (S); and the normal drop, with an unstressed syllable or a string thereof (x…).[3]

The arrangement of these lifts and drops in turn is subject to constraint (Suzuki 1996: 18–19). A concatenation of two (normal) drops in nonfinal position is disallowed. This prohibition stems from the generalization just presented that a nonfinal (normal) drop may be occupied by a varying quantity of linguistic material, to be determined in due course. Since a nonfinal drop is thus qualified for alignment with multiple syllables in its realization, the nonfinal succession of two drops × × is formally equivalent to the occurrence of a single drop × in terms of linguistic materialization. This reducibility of two successive drops to one gives rise to the following regulations as its derivatives. First, at least one of the first two positions must be strong. That is, the concatenation × × / / is categorically excluded, because it is indistinguishable from the illegitimate configuration *× / /, an ill-formed, three-position construct that violates the four-position requirement. Second, and by the same token, the sequence / × × / is disallowed, as it is counted as equal to the sequence / × /, too short a verse comprising only three positions. By contrast, the configuration ending in × ×, namely, / / × ×, is licensed because of the strictly monosyllabic realization of the verse-final drop. Due to the invariable monosyllabicity, the occurrence of more than one unstressed syllable at the end of a verse indicates unequivocally the presence of two successive normal drops.

Unlike the unmetrical verse-initial sequence × ×, the verse-internal counterpart is susceptible to improvement so as to be admitted eventually into the set of legitimate

3 For marked modes of alignment, see section 1.4 below.

configurations (verse classes and basic verse types; see below). Specifically, in place of a succession of normal drops that is no different in effect from a single drop in terms of linguistic manifestation, the first one is promoted to a heavy variant \ by metrical strengthening (to be treated fully in due course), thereby leading to the configuration / \ × /, classified as type E (see below).

Two questions arise at this point. First, why was / × \ / not allowed to occur as an improved alternative? Second, why was the verse-initial sequence × × immune to a comparable drop promotion creating *\ × / /? The first question is adequately addressed by invoking the linearity-based prominence scale of metrical positions, whereby, of two like positions, the one closer to the beginning of a verse is identified as more prominent than the other (Suzuki 1996: 167; 2004: 10; 2014a: 11). Accordingly, given the string × ×, the first one is characterized as more prominent than the second. Inasmuch as a promotion to a heavy drop increases prominence, strengthening the first drop—the inherently more salient one—may be viewed as the more natural execution than the alternative of adding prominence to the second relatively weaker one at variance with the general contour of falling prominence.

The second question is subject to a principled account based on linguistic structure. At stake is the prototypical realization of a heavy drop. It is prototypically embodied by a secondary-stressed syllable, as noted above. In Old Germanic versification, the verse-initial position invariably matches the word-initial position, as no verse is allowed to occur that begins with a medial or word-final syllable. Since, with rare exceptions, a secondary-stressed syllable normally appears after a primary-stressed one, with or without an intervening unstressed syllable, the concatenation \ (×) / virtually lacks a linguistic reality. There is therefore no way of constructing a verse starting with a secondary-stressed syllable. Accordingly, metrical strengthening is precluded from implementation on the verse-initial drop.

In summary, the principle of four metrical positions and their rule-governed arrangement determined on the basis of the primary opposition between lift and (normal) drop and their prototypical metrical–linguistic alignment define the following inventory of configurations as basic verse types in Old Germanic poetry:

(1) Five basic verse types
Type A: / × / ×
Type B: × / × /
Type C: × / / ×
Type D: / / × ×
Type E: / \ × /

Following conventional practice (e.g., Sievers 1893), the alphabetical labels given to the five basic types A through E are designed to correspond in descending order with their relative frequency, with type A / × / × occurring with maximal incidence. As shown below, the classificatory labels will be elaborated as derived verse types are added to

the system. Accordingly, designations A through E without subdividing markers will be reused to refer to verse classes, superordinate to verse types.

The static manner of representation as in (1) seems to obscure the underlying mechanism of verse generation. In order to reveal such a dynamic dimension of verse making, one may restructure the inventory in terms of derivational processing, as follows:

Table 1.1. Formation of basic verse types

Initial position	Second position	Third and final positions	Whole configuration	By promotion	Verse class	Verse type
/	×	/ ×	/ × / ×	—	A	A1
/	×	× /	*/ × × /	/ \ × /	E	E
/	/	× ×	/ / × ×	—	D	D1
×	/	× /	× / × /	—	B	B1
×	/	/ ×	× / / ×	—	C	C

Taking the first row as a representative example, the above table reads: put / in the first slot, × in the second, and / × in the last two, to obtain the configuration / × / ×, verse class A, prototypically realized as verse type A1 (see below). The second case needs an additional process of promoting the first drop × (second position) to a heavy one \, so that a well-formed configuration / \ × / may substitute for the otherwise ill-formed sequence */ × × /. The extra implementation of metrical reinforcement means that the whole process of derivation is more complex than those responsible for the other four types. This derivational complexity provides a formal account of why type E among others occurs with minimal incidence. The derivational representation also brings to light a major dichotomy of the basic verse types to two groups according to the identity of the verse-initial position, lift-initial (A, D, E) or drop-initial (B, C). As will be substantiated in subsequent chapters, this major division of verse types predicated on verse-initiality (verse opening) has profound significance in the metrical organization.

While the metrical strengthening of a drop to a heavy one is uniquely involved in deriving one of the five basic types (type E), comparable operations of drop promotion are found responsible for constructing heavier variants out of some of the basic configurations. Operating on each drop in type A (/ × / ×, hereafter referred to as type A1—the basic variant of verse class A—in distinction from its derived variants) and type D (/ / × ×, hereafter referred to as type D1, in distinction from its derived ones), a metrical strengthening gives rise to the following increased types:

(2) Increased verse types
Type A2a / \ / ×; type A2b / × / \; type A2ab / \ / \
Type D2a / / \ ×; type D2b / / × \

Thus, an increased type is derived from its basic counterpart through substitution of a heavy drop for a normal one. As should be clear, the classifier "2" designates an increased type, that is, a derived variant resulting from metrical strengthening of a drop in general; the labels "a" and "b" indicate that the promotion at issue involves the first and the second drop, respectively. Correspondingly, the basic types that provide a basis for metrical strengthening are distinguished by the label "1," namely, types A1 and D1, noted above.

A secondary process of metrical adjustment that is implemented on the basic types may proceed in the opposite direction, that is, by reducing a lift to a drop rather than strengthening a normal drop to a heavy one. Specifically, the first lift may be replaced by a (normal) drop, producing types A3 (× × / ×) and B3 (× × × /). The designator "3" corresponds to a reduced type that is constructed by such metrical demotion.

Thus, the whole system of verse types may be organized with maximal elaboration, as follows:

Table 1.2. The system of verse types

Class	Basic type	Increased type	Reduced type
A	A1	A2a, A2b, A2ab	A3
B	B1	—	B3
C	C	—	—
D	D1	D2a, D2b	—
E	E	—	—

Inasmuch as both the increased and reduced types are derived through an extra mechanism of transforming the default composition comprising the maximally differentiated positions, two lifts and two normal drops, they must be counted as marked configurations. These marked verse types—increased or reduced—are distributed differentially between the a-verse and the b-verse, as most eloquently testified in *Beowulf* (Suzuki 1996: 65–68, 95–110), and somewhat less conspicuously in the *Heliand* (Suzuki 2004: 66–68, 125–136). Regardless of the extent of differentiation, it holds generally true that the a-verse is more accommodating: the marked types are more likely to occur in it than in the b-verse on statistical grounds.

Moreover, which particular derived types are in function is an empirical issue that requires substantiation for each work of poetry (cf. Suzuki 1996: 375; 2004: 177; 2014a: 203). Accordingly, the major issues addressed in the synchronic parts of the subsequent investigations into the meters of *Genesis A* and *Genesis B* will be to determine in rigorous terms the identities of verse types, their varying linguistic realizations, and their underlying organization into the paradigmatic system.

Drawing on the analytical framework outlined above, I will provide a typological survey of the organization of Old Germanic meters in their structural foundations. Of