

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>.

© 2023 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston

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

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 Tournian 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

Preface — VII

List of Tables — XV

List of Figures — XXI

Symbols and abbreviations — XXIII

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

- 1.1 The Old English *Genesis*: *Genesis A*, *Genesis B*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — 1
- 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 — 4
- 1.3 Variation on the principle of four metrical positions in Old Germanic meter: The verse size — 9
- 1.4 Variation in the alignment of metrical positions with language material — 12
 - 1.4.1 The lift — 13
 - 1.4.1.1 Resolution — 13
 - 1.4.1.2 Suspension of resolution — 14
 - 1.4.2 The normal drop — 17
 - 1.4.3 The heavy drop — 18
 - 1.4.4 Variation in metrical–linguistic alignment: a generalization based on the four-position principle — 22

2 The Meter of *Genesis A* — 23

- 2.1 Introduction — 23
- 2.2 Type A1 without anacrusis — 24
- 2.3 Type A1 with anacrusis — 29
- 2.4 Subtypes A1s and A2as — 34
- 2.5 Types A2a and A2b — 39
- 2.6 Type A3 — 43
- 2.7 Type B1 — 48
- 2.8 Type B3 — 54
- 2.9 Type C — 56
- 2.10 Types D1, D2a, and D2b — 61
- 2.11 Types D*1, D*2a, and D*2b — 64
- 2.12 Type E — 69
- 2.13 Three-position verses — 85

- 2.13.1 Noncontracted verses — **85**
- 2.13.2 Contracted verses — **98**
- 2.14 The system of verse types — **110**
- 2.15 Resolution and Kaluza's law — **112**
- 2.16 Section-based distinctions — **122**
- 2.17 Changes introduced under the influence of Old Saxon meter — **129**
- 2.17.1 Anacrusis as a full metrical position — **130**
- 2.17.2 The reanalysis of PS#px as a reduced variant of PS#Px and the emergence of Px#px — **132**
- 2.17.3 Increased preference for -Sx# as a realization of \x in type E — **134**
- 2.17.4 The verse-initial drop in section-initial position — **135**
- 2.17.5 Relaxation of the four-position principle in *Genesis A* as a generalization of adaptations to Old Saxon meter — **136**

3 The Meter of *Genesis B* — 139

- 3.1 Introduction — **139**
- 3.2 Type A1 without anacrusis — **140**
- 3.3 Type A1 with anacrusis — **144**
- 3.4 Subtype A1s — **150**
- 3.5 Types A2a and A2b — **150**
- 3.6 Type A3 — **153**
- 3.7 Type B1 — **155**
- 3.8 Type B3 — **160**
- 3.9 Type C — **161**
- 3.10 Type D — **169**
- 3.11 Type D* — **173**
- 3.12 Type E — **179**
- 3.13 Three-position verses — **184**
- 3.14 The system of verse types — **187**
- 3.15 Resolution and Kaluza's law — **189**
- 3.16 Section-based distinctions — **198**
- 3.17 The metrical conversion of the Old Saxon *Genesis* to *Genesis B* — **200**
- 3.17.1 The metrical correspondence between *Genesis B* and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **200**
- 3.17.2 Relaxation of the four-position principle for composition of *Genesis B* as a strategy of conversion and adaptation to Old English meter — **211**
- 3.17.3 Metrical features inherited from classical Old English meter, in defiance of the Old Saxon practice — **216**
- 3.17.3.1 Prefixal anacrusis — **216**
- 3.17.3.2 Alliterative pattern: the relative proportion of single and double alliteration in the a-verse in general — **217**
- 3.17.3.3 PS#Px scanned as type A2a — **217**

- 3.17.3.4 The size of the first drop of types A1, A3, B1, and C — **218**
- 3.17.3.5 The distribution of the resolved second lift in type B1 — **219**
- 3.17.3.6 Lack of distinction between x...PSx/x...Psx and x...PXx/x...Pxx in terms of verse distribution — **219**
- 3.17.3.7 A weaker preference for -S- relative to -S# as the first drop of type E — **220**
- 3.17.3.8 The frequency of heavy verses — **220**
- 3.17.4 The loss of Kaluza's law — **221**

4 Split metrical identities of *Genesis A*: *Genesis A1* and *Genesis A2* in relation to *Genesis B* — 223

- 4.1 Introduction — **223**
- 4.2 Alliteration: increased implementation of double alliteration in *Genesis A1* in concert with *Genesis B* and in contrast with *Genesis A2* — **224**
- 4.3 Further distinguishing properties — **229**
 - 4.3.1 Size of anacrusis — **229**
 - 4.3.2 The initial upbeat of type A3 — **230**
 - 4.3.3 The extra drop of class D* — **230**
 - 4.3.4 The first drop of type E: -S# versus -S- — **231**
 - 4.3.5 Subtypes A1s/A2as relative to types A1/A2a — **232**
 - 4.3.6 Summary — **232**
- 4.4 The pictorial and textual foundations of *Genesis A1*: assimilation to *Genesis B* and dissimilation to *Genesis A2* — **234**
- 4.5 The mechanism of boosting double alliteration in *Genesis A1* — **253**

5 Conclusion — 267

Bibliography — 283

Index — 287

- Index of authors — **287**
- Index of subjects — **288**
- Index of verses cited for discussion or exemplification — **292**

List of Tables

- Table 1.1. Formation of basic verse types — 7
- Table 1.2. The system of verse types — 8
- Table 1.3. Occurrences of anacrustic and nonanacrustic configurations (classes A, D, and D*, excluding type A3) — 10
- Table 1.4. Occurrences of class D* relative to class D (excluding anacrusis) — 11
- Table 1.5. Occurrences of anacrusis in class D* (all variants) — 11
- Table 1.6. Resolution on the first lift — 14
- Table 1.7. Resolution on the second lift — 14
- Table 1.8. Occurrences of PS#px, Ppx, and Px#Px — 15
- Table 1.9. Occurrences of x...Ppx and x...PPx — 15
- Table 1.10. Size of the verse-initial drop in types B1 and C in terms of syllable numbers realized — 17
- Table 1.11. Size of the verse-final drop of type A1 in terms of syllable numbers realized — 18
- Table 1.12. Realizations of the heavy drop of type E according to syllable shape — 21
-
- Table 2.1. Verse distribution and alliterative pattern of type A1 according to the size of the first drop in *Genesis A* (excluding anacrusis) — 24
- Table 2.2. Size of the first drop of type A1 in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* — 25
- Table 2.3. Verse distribution and alliterative pattern of type A1 according to the variation of the monosyllabic first drop in *Genesis A* — 26
- Table 2.4. Verse distribution and alliterative pattern of type A1 according to the variation of the disyllabic first drop in *Genesis A* — 27
- Table 2.5. Verse distribution of PxSx in *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, and the *Heliand* — 28
- Table 2.6. Anacrusis and verse distribution of type A1 in *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, and the *Heliand* — 29
- Table 2.7. Anacrusis and alliterative pattern of type A1 in the a-verse in *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, and the *Heliand* — 30
- Table 2.8. Occurrence of anacrusis in type A1 according to the size of the first drop in *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, and the *Heliand* — 31
- Table 2.9. Occurrence of anacrusis in type A1 according to the variation of the monosyllabic first drop in *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, and the *Heliand* — 32
- Table 2.10. Size of anacrusis in type A1 in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* — 33
- Table 2.11. Verse distribution and alliterative pattern of variants of subtypes A1s/A2as (with the monosyllabic first drop) in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* — 35
- Table 2.12. Verse distribution and alliterative pattern of PS#Px and PS(#)(#)...Px in *Genesis A* — 40
- Table 2.13. Resolution on the heavy drop of type A2a in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* — 41
- Table 2.14. Resolution on the first lift of type A2a in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* — 41
- Table 2.15. Verse distribution and alliterative pattern of Px...PS, PS#PS, and Px...PP in *Genesis A* — 42
- Table 2.16. Verse distribution of type A2b (Px...PS) according to the size of the first drop in *Genesis A* — 43
- Table 2.17. Verse distribution of type A2b (PxPS) according to the variation of the monosyllabic first drop in *Genesis A* — 43
- Table 2.18. Size of the initial upbeat in type A3 in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* — 46
- Table 2.19. Verse distribution of type A3 variants in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* — 48
- Table 2.20. Verse distribution and alliterative pattern of type B1 variants in *Genesis A* — 49
- Table 2.21. Verse distribution of type B1 according to the size of the first drop in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* — 50
- Table 2.22. Alliterative pattern of type B1 according to the size of the first drop in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* (excluding x...PxS) — 51

- Table 2.23. Verse distribution of type B1 according to the size of the second drop in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* — **51**
- Table 2.24. Alliterative pattern of type B1 according to the size of the second drop in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* (excluding x...PxS) — **52**
- Table 2.25. Verse distribution of type B1 according to the variation of the monosyllabic second drop in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* — **53**
- Table 2.26. Alliterative pattern of type B1 according to the variation of the monosyllabic second drop in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* (excluding -x-) — **53**
- Table 2.27. Verse distribution of the long and the resolved second lift in type B1 in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* — **53**
- Table 2.28. Verse distribution of the long and the resolved lift in type B3 in *Genesis A* — **55**
- Table 2.29. Verse distribution and alliterative pattern of type C variants in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* — **57**
- Table 2.30. Verse distribution of type C according to the size of the first drop in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* — **57**
- Table 2.31. Alliterative pattern of type C according to the size of the first drop in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* (with exclusive reference to variants with the primary-stressed second lift) — **58**
- Table 2.32. Size of the first drop of type C according to the stress variation of the second lift in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* — **59**
- Table 2.33. Size of the first drop and length of the first lift of type C in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* — **59**
- Table 2.34. Size of the first drop and length of the second lift of type C lift in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* — **60**
- Table 2.35. Variation of the first and second lifts of type C in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* — **61**
- Table 2.36. Verse distribution and alliterative pattern of types D1, D2a, and D2b in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* — **62**
- Table 2.37. Anacrusis and verse distribution of class D in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* — **63**
- Table 2.38. Occurrence of anacrusis in types D1, D2a, and D2b in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* — **64**
- Table 2.39. Verse distribution and alliterative pattern of types D*1, D*2a, and D*2b in *Genesis A* (including five instances with anacrusis) and *Beowulf* — **67**
- Table 2.40. Realizations of the extra drop of types D*1, D*2a, and D*2b in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* — **68**
- Table 2.41. Verse distribution and alliterative pattern of type E variants ending in P in *Genesis A* — **72**
- Table 2.42. Verse distribution and alliterative pattern of the configurations ending in px in contrast to those in Px in *Genesis A* — **77**
- Table 2.43. Categorization of configurations ending in P/px as types A1, A2a, or E in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* — **79**
- Table 2.44. The system of verse types in *Genesis A* — **111**
- Table 2.45. Occurrence of short and long disyllables according to metrical context in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* — **121**
- Table 2.46. Size of sections in terms of the number of constituent verses in *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, and the *Heliand* — **124**
- Table 2.47. Proportion of lift-initial to drop-initial verses in *Genesis A*, *Genesis B*, *Beowulf*, and the *Heliand* — **126**
- Table 2.48. Size of the verse-initial upbeat in the section-initial versus noninitial a-verses of *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, and the *Heliand* — **129**
- Table 2.49. Verse distribution of PS#px, PS#Px, and Px#Px in *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, and the *Heliand* — **133**
- Table 2.50. Categorization of PS#px, PS#Px, and Px#Px in *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, and the *Heliand* on the basis of their verse distribution measured in p-values by Fisher's test — **133**
- Table 3.1. Verse distribution and alliterative pattern of type A1 according to the size of the first drop in *Genesis B* (excluding anacrusis) — **141**

- Table 3.2. Size of the first drop of type A1 in *Genesis B*, *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **142**
- Table 3.3. Verse distribution and alliterative pattern of type A1 according to the variation of the monosyllabic first drop in *Genesis B* — **142**
- Table 3.4. Verse distribution of PxSx in *Genesis B*, *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **143**
- Table 3.5. Anacrusis and verse distribution of type A1 in *Genesis B*, *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **144**
- Table 3.6. Anacrusis and alliterative pattern of type A1 in *Genesis B*, *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **145**
- Table 3.7. Occurrence of anacrusis in type A1 according to the size of the first drop in *Genesis B*, *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **146**
- Table 3.8. Occurrence of anacrusis in type A1 according to the variation of the monosyllabic first drop in *Genesis B*, *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **147**
- Table 3.9. Size of anacrusis in type A1 in *Genesis B*, *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **149**
- Table 3.10. Verse distribution and alliterative pattern of PS#Px, PSx#Px, Px...PS, and Px...Ppx/Px...Psx in *Genesis B* — **151**
- Table 3.11. Size of the initial upbeat in type A3 in *Genesis B*, *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **154**
- Table 3.12. Size of the first drop of type B1 in *Genesis B*, *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **155**
- Table 3.13. Verse distribution and alliterative pattern of type B1 according to the size of the first drop in *Genesis B* — **156**
- Table 3.14. Verse distribution and alliterative pattern of type B1 according to the size of the second drop in *Genesis B*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* (excluding x...PxS for alliterative pattern in the a-verse) — **158**
- Table 3.15. Verse distribution of type B1 according to the variation of the monosyllabic second drop in *Genesis B*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **159**
- Table 3.16. Alliterative pattern of type B1 according to the variation of the monosyllabic second drop in *Genesis B*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* (excluding -x- due to its inherent bias toward single alliteration) — **159**
- Table 3.17. Verse distribution of the long and the resolved second lift in type B1 in *Genesis B*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **160**
- Table 3.18. Verse distribution and alliterative pattern of type C variants in *Genesis B*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **162**
- Table 3.19. Size of the first drop of type C in *Genesis B*, *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **163**
- Table 3.20. Verse distribution and alliterative pattern of type C according to the size of the first drop in *Genesis B*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **164**
- Table 3.21. Size of the first drop of type C according to the stress variation of the second lift in *Genesis B*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **166**
- Table 3.22. Size of the first drop and length of the first lift in type C in *Genesis B*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **167**
- Table 3.23. Size of the first drop and length of the second lift in type C in *Genesis B*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **168**
- Table 3.24. Variation of the first and second lifts of type C in *Genesis B*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **169**

- Table 3.25. Verse distribution and alliterative pattern of D1, D2a, and D2b in *Genesis B*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* (excluding anacrusis) — **170**
- Table 3.26. Anacrusis and verse distribution of class D in *Genesis B*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **172**
- Table 3.27. Occurrence of anacrusis in D1, D2a, and D2b in *Genesis B*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **172**
- Table 3.28. Size of anacrusis in class D in *Genesis B*, *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **173**
- Table 3.29. Verse distribution and alliterative pattern of D*1, D*2a, and D*2b in *Genesis B*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* (excluding anacrusis) — **174**
- Table 3.30. Proportion of D1, D2a, and D2b to D*1, D*2a, and D*2b in *Genesis B*, *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **175**
- Table 3.31. Anacrusis and verse distribution of class D* in *Genesis B*, *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **176**
- Table 3.32. Occurrence of anacrusis in D*1, D*2a, and D*2b in *Genesis B*, *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **177**
- Table 3.33. Size of anacrusis in class D* in *Genesis B*, *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **178**
- Table 3.34. Realizations of the extra drop of class D* in *Genesis B* (including anacrusis) — **178**
- Table 3.35. Verse distribution and alliterative pattern of type E variants ending in P in *Genesis B* (without anacrusis) — **179**
- Table 3.36. Categorization of x...PSx...P and x...PXx...P as type E with anacrusis and/or type B1 in *Genesis B*, *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **183**
- Table 3.37. Statistical difference in terms of p-values in the probability of three-position verses in *Genesis B*, *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **185**
- Table 3.38. Statistical difference in terms of p-values in the ratio of the long and resolved first lifts in three-position verses in *Genesis B*, *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **186**
- Table 3.39. The system of verse types in *Genesis B* — **187**
- Table 3.40. Occurrence of short and long disyllables according to metrical context in *Genesis B* and *Beowulf* — **192**
- Table 3.41. Occurrence of short and long disyllables according to metrical context in *Genesis B* and *Genesis A* — **193**
- Table 3.42. Occurrence of short and long disyllables according to metrical context in *Genesis B* and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **196**
- Table 3.43. Occurrence of open and closed disyllables according to metrical context in *Genesis B* and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **197**
- Table 3.44. Verse distribution of type A1 according to the size of anacrusis in *Genesis B*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **204**
- Table 3.45. Correlation of the number of verse-initial unstressed syllables to the a-/b-verse distinction in *Genesis B*, *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, the *Heliand*, and the Old Saxon *Genesis* — **204**
- Table 4.1. Single versus double alliteration in the a-verse in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* — **224**
- Table 4.2. Size of the first drop of type A1 (including anacrusis) in *Genesis A1* and *A2* — **226**
- Table 4.3. Size of anacrusis in terms of syllable numbers in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* — **230**
- Table 4.4. Size of the initial upbeat of type A3 in terms of syllable numbers in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* — **230**
- Table 4.5. Frequency of PSx#...P and PS#x...P in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* — **232**

- Table 4.6. Frequency of types A1 and A2a and subtypes A1s/A2as in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* — **232**
- Table 4.7. Statistical differences in terms of p-values between *Genesis A1* and *Genesis B* along the six metrical parameters — **235**
- Table 4.8. Statistical differences in terms of p-values between *Genesis A1* and *Genesis A2* along the six metrical parameters — **235**
- Table 4.9. Statistical differences in terms of p-values between *Genesis B* and *Genesis A2* along the six metrical parameters — **235**
- Table 4.10. Single versus double alliteration in the a-verse in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* according to the varying boundary between *Genesis A1* and *Genesis A2* — **236**
- Table 4.11. Size of anacrusis in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* according to the varying boundary between *Genesis A1* and *Genesis A2* — **236**
- Table 4.12. Size of the initial upbeat of type A3 in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* according to the varying boundary between *Genesis A1* and *Genesis A2* — **237**
- Table 4.13. Size of the extra drop of class D* in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* according to the varying boundary between *Genesis A1* and *Genesis A2* — **237**
- Table 4.14. Frequency of PSx#...P and PS#x...P in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* according to the varying boundary between *Genesis A1* and *Genesis A2* — **238**
- Table 4.15. Frequency of types A1/A2a and subtypes A1s/A2as in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* according to the varying boundary between *Genesis A1* and *Genesis A2* — **238**
- Table 4.16. Frequency of double alliteration per 100 a-verses according to sections in the Old English *Genesis* — **243**
- Table 4.17. Parameter estimates report for the regression coefficient on S in *Beowulf*, the *Heliand*, *Genesis A*, and *Genesis B* — **245**
- Table 4.18. Parameter estimates report for the regression coefficient on S in *Genesis A1/Genesis B* and *Genesis A2* according to their four varying boundaries — **247**
- Table 4.19. Alliterative pattern of verse classes in the a-verse in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* — **254**
- Table 4.20. Distribution of verse classes in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* — **254**
- Table 4.21. Single versus double alliteration in type A2 in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* — **255**
- Table 4.22. Single versus double alliteration in D*2a and D*2b in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* — **256**
- Table 4.23. Single versus double alliteration in type A1 (Px...Px) in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* (excluding anacrusis, PxSx, and subtype A1s) — **257**
- Table 4.24. Single versus double alliteration in type B1 (x...Px...P) in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* — **257**
- Table 4.25. Single versus double alliteration in type C (x...PPx) in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* — **258**
- Table 4.26. Single versus double alliteration in D1 (PPxx) in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* (excluding anacrusis and PSxx) — **258**
- Table 4.27. Single versus double alliteration in D*1 (PxPxx) in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* (excluding anacrusis) — **258**
- Table 4.28. Single versus double alliteration in type E in general in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* (excluding anacrusis) — **259**
- Table 4.29. Size of the first drop of type A1 in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* (excluding PxSx and anacrusis) — **260**
- Table 4.30. Single versus double alliteration in type A1 variants with the monosyllabic first drop (Px#Px/P#xPx/P#x#Px) in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* — **260**
- Table 4.31. Single versus double alliteration in Px#Px in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* — **262**

- Table 4.32. Single versus double alliteration in P#xPx and P#x#Px in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* — **262**
- Table 4.33. Single versus double alliteration in type A1 with the polysyllabic first drop in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* — **262**
- Table 4.34. Single versus double alliteration in type B1 according to the size of the first drop in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* — **263**
- Table 4.35. Single versus double alliteration in type C according to the size of the first drop in *Genesis A1*, *Genesis B*, and *Genesis A2* — **264**
- Table 5.1. A metrical stratification of the Old English *Genesis* — **268**
- Table 5.2. A simplex metrical stratification of the Old English *Genesis* (corresponding to a conventional conceptualization) — **268**

List of Figures

Figure 4.1. Bivariate analysis of sections and double alliteration in *Beowulf* — 241

Figure 4.2. Bivariate analysis of sections and double alliteration in the *Heliand* — 242

Figure 4.3. Bivariate analysis of sections and double alliteration in *Genesis B* — 244

Figure 4.4. Bivariate analysis of sections and double alliteration in *Genesis A* — 245

Symbols and abbreviations

a	alliterating lift in contrast to 'x' (nonalliterating lift)
acc.	accusative
adj.	adjective
adv.	adverb
anom.	anomalous verb
<i>Beo</i>	<i>Beowulf</i>
C	consonant
dat.	dative
fem.	feminine
<i>GenA</i>	<i>Genesis A</i>
<i>GenB</i>	<i>Genesis B</i>
Go.	Gothic
<i>Hel</i>	<i>Heliand</i>
ind.	indicative
neut.	neuter
nom.	nominative
OE	Old English
ON	Old Norse
OS	Old Saxon
<i>OSG</i>	Old Saxon <i>Genesis</i>
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

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 (Golancz 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

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 \backslash by metrical strengthening (to be treated fully in due course), thereby leading to the configuration $\backslash \times /$, classified as type E (see below).

Two questions arise at this point. First, why was $/ \times \backslash /$ not allowed to occur as an improved alternative? Second, why was the verse-initial sequence $\times \times$ immune to a comparable drop promotion creating $*\backslash \times / /$? 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 $\times \times$, 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 $\backslash (\times) /$ 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: $/ \times / \times$

Type B: $\times / \times /$

Type C: $\times // \times$

Type D: $// \times \times$

Type E: $\backslash \times /$

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 $/ \times / \times$ 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