CrossMark

Journal of Germanic Linguistics **29.1** (2017):85–99
doi: 10.1017/S1470542716000209

Manuscript Evidence and Metrical Authenticity: A Response to Seiichi Suzuki*

Rafael J. Pascual

Harvard University

The vast majority of the approximately 60,000 verses that constitute the surviving corpus of Old English poetry can be shown to have, despite their differing number of syllables, a basic structure of exactly four metrical positions.[1] Indeed, four-position verses are so numerous in the texts, and obvious scribal corruptions are so frequent, that Sieversian metrists have traditionally regarded the few verses that apparently consist of less than four positions as the mere products of scribal interference, even if those verses are unobjectionable in terms of grammar, sense, and alliteration.[2]

* I thank Daniel Donoghue, R. D. Fulk, and Leonard Neidorf for reading this essay in draft and offering valuable suggestions.

[1] On the relationship between syllables and metrical positions in Old English verse, see, for example, Sievers 1893:§§9–10, Fulk 2002:337–340, Pascual 2014:811–812, 2015:174–175. A full exposition of the four-position principle can be found in Cable 1974:84–93. For a historical account of this principle, see Pascual 2016.

[2] The following quote is illustrative of the traditional skeptical position of Sieversian metrists toward manuscript evidence:

> Die überlieferung ist also gerade für die dichtungen der classischen zeit, des 7. und 8. jahrhunderts, durchschnittlich um 200 bis 250 jahre jünger als die texte selbst und gibt alle anglischen gedichte in fremder dialektform wider. Es ist selbstverständlich, dass bei einer solchen art der überlieferung auch das metrum vielfach gestört worden ist, durch einsetzung jüngerer und dialektisch abweichender sprachformen, von eigentlichen textverderbnissen ganz abgesehen. Doch lassen sich die meisten fehler dieser art mit ziemlicher sicherheit erkennen und beseitigen. (Sievers 1893:§75)

> The attested remains of poetry from the classical period, of the seventh and eighth centuries, are thus on average about 200 to 250 years

© *Society for Germanic Linguistics*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542716000209 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The *communis opinio* against catalectic verses was recently challenged by Weiskott (2013). On the basis of a few verses from *Beowulf*, Weiskott postulated the rule that the three-position / x / contour is an authentic pattern of Old English meter. As I demonstrated in a subsequent response (Pascual 2013–2014), however, of all the verses that Weiskott gathered in support of his case, only l. 2150a, *lissa ġelong* 'of joys dependent on', can be unambiguously analyzed as an instance of the / x / contour. Such empirical insufficiency is a clear indication of the unreliability of Weiskott's argument. If it were credited, one would be compelled to believe that, in the more than 6,000 verses of *Beowulf*, there is only one unambiguous example of a verse type that was purportedly licensed by the metrical system. As mentioned above, scribes obviously have tampered with their exemplar during the process of transmission.[3] Given this, it seems more reasonable to regard *lissa ġelong* as a product of scribal interference (despite its appropriate sense and correct alliteration), rather than to introduce an ad hoc metrical rule to account for this instance alone. Thus, the scarce attestation of unequivocal instances of three-position verses in the manuscript poses an insurmountable obstacle to the case for their metrical authenticity.

In an article published in the present issue of *Journal of Germanic Linguistics*, Seiichi Suzuki has made a case for a three-position interpretation of seven verses from the text of *Beowulf* and 20 verses from that of *Genesis A*, on the grounds that they contain no defects of either sense or alliteration. Unlike Weiskott, he seriously engages with the problem of their relatively scarce attestation in the manuscripts, offering a sophisticated solution that deserves careful consideration.

---

younger than the texts themselves, and they put all Anglian poems into the form of an alien dialect. It is obvious that in manuscript remains of such a nature the meter also is frequently disrupted by the insertion of more recent and dialectally incongruous linguistic forms, quite aside from actual textual corruption. Yet most faults of this sort can be recognized and removed with a fair amount of certainty.

I thank R. D. Fulk for translating this passage for me.

[3] See, for example, Lapidge 2000 and Neidorf 2013, where a selection of notorious scribal errors in the transmitted text of *Beowulf* can be found. On the nature of the textual transmission of Old English poetry, see Sisam 1953:29–44, Orton 2000:200–208, and Neidorf 2017.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542716000209 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Suzuki defines catalexis as the result of an inherent tendency in the verse structure toward the deletion of a weak metrical position, or drop, especially if the drop is verse-final or follows two clashing lifts. According to Suzuki, Old English poets, on account of the normative status of the four-position principle, conscientiously resisted this natural tendency. Occasionally, however, when their vigilance against catalexis faltered, the poets composed three-position verses. From this point of view, the scarcity of catalectic verses is not an indication of their metrical inauthenticity, but a logical consequence of the poets' resistance to the composition of such verses. In support of this view, Suzuki argues that, among the three-position verses that he identifies, the catalectic type D- configuration / / x is the most frequent (nine instances in *Genesis A* and five in *Beowulf*), followed by type C-, x / / (five instances in *Genesis A*).[4] This is exactly what, according to his account of catalexis, should be expected. Both types D (/ / x x) and C (x / / x) contain second drops that are subject to the two conditions favoring their deletion. Because of that, Suzuki reasons, it must have been particularly difficult for poets to avoid the sporadic composition of verses with a three-position type D- or C- configuration.[5]

This response subjects Suzuki's theory of catalexis to critical analysis. First, I examine the verses identified by Suzuki as genuinely consisting of only three metrical positions. I demonstrate that many of them are either more susceptible to an alternative scansion or, despite Suzuki's contention to the contrary, present additional problems of sense and grammar that signal textual corruption. Most of these verses must obviously be excluded from the list of genuine instances of catalexis. Nevertheless, they are interpreted by Suzuki as types D- and C-, precisely the three-position verse types that, according to his account of catalexis, ought to have a higher incidence. Therefore, the definition of catalexis upon which Suzuki's theory is predicated appears to be

[4] The lower incidence of catalectic verses in *Beowulf* is interpreted by Suzuki as an indication of its author's greater success in resisting the tendency toward drop deletion.

[5] Of these two, type D- is, according to Suzuki, the most likely to undergo catalexis, since its verse-final drop follows a drop that has already undergone prominence reduction on account of the two adjacent lifts that precede it.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542716000209 Published online by Cambridge University Press

empirically unsatisfactory, since it makes the wrong predictions, as shown by the evidence.

Second, I examine the few unambiguous three-position verses that remain on Suzuki's lists after the abovementioned instances are excluded. Of these, the majority seem to have a type A- structure (/ x /) with impeccable sense and alliteration. Are they to be regarded as genuine manifestations of catalexis or as errors of transmission? The present response contends that the balance of probability supports the longstanding assumption that catalectic verses are invariably the result of scribal interference.

Careful examination of the five verses from *Genesis A* that Suzuki classifies as instances of type C- may lead one to the conclusion that they are not genuine instances of catalexis. The catalectic interpretation of three of them—1349a, *nū ofor seofon niht* 'now after seven nights', 1449a, *Hē þā ymb seofon niht* 'He then after seven nights', and 2322a, *ymb seofon niht* 'after seven nights'—hinges on the assumption that the manuscript sequence *seofon niht* 'seven nights' represents two simplexes, both of which receive primary stress. However, these two words constitute a compound in both Middle and Modern English (*seoueniht* and *sennight*, respectively), and so it is only natural to suppose that the reading *seofon niht* also represents a compound in Old English.[6] Consequently, *Genesis A* 1349a, 1449a, and 2322a are not catalectic type C- verses, as Suzuki maintains, but type A3 verses with a half-lift instead of a drop occupying the last metrical position of the verse, as in, for example, *Beowulf* 1995a, *þæt ðū þone wælgæst* 'that you the slaughtering creature'.[7] This scansion is corroborated by their

[6] The Middle English word *seoueniht* appears written together, as a compound, in Laȝamon (ca. 1205), see Fulk 1992:§199; see also Hutcheson 1995:159, note 13.

[7] Suzuki argues that the A3 scansion for 2322a, *ymb seofon niht* 'after seven nights', is problematic, because the initial drop of type A3 tends to be occupied by more than one syllable. Nevertheless, it is not improbable that manuscript *ymb* stands for disyllabic *ymbe*, as a glance at the two surviving versions of *Soul and Body* demonstrates. L. 10a, which reads *sy(m)le ymb seofon niht* in the Exeter version, appears as *symble ymbe seofon niht* in the Vercelli one. The fact that each version of the poem contains a different form of the preposition suggests that the scribes felt free to replace whichever form of the preposition

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542716000209 Published online by Cambridge University Press

distribution: These and similar verses, like *Exodus* 63a, *Heht þā ymb twā niht* 'He commanded then after two nights', and *Andreas* 185a, *Nū bið fore þrēo niht* 'Now it will be before three nights', always appear in the on-verse, while type C is more frequent in the off-verse.[8] Therefore, Suzuki's claim that these three instances from *Genesis A* are derived from a type C verse through deletion of the final drop is undermined by the evidence.

Suzuki's type C- analysis of l. 2142b, *nis woruldfeoh* 'isn't worldly wealth', is likewise inadvisable, because this verse probably became deficient in the course of textual transmission, as a glance at its context suggests:

(1) wordum mīnum nis woruldfeoh
þe iċ mē āgan wille
'by my words there is no worldly wealth that I wish to possess'
(*Genesis A* 2142–2143)[9]

As can be seen, l. 2143, *þe iċ mē āgan wille* 'that I wish to possess', apparently an unpaired type A half-line preceded by three anacrustic syllables, is anomalous. If *nis woruldfeoh* 'isn't worldly wealth' were taken at face value, as Suzuki's analysis requires, one would have to believe that the co-occurrence in the manuscript of this aberrant verse with two other metrical irregularities (an unpaired verse and trisyllabic anacrusis) is accidental. In order to avoid crediting such an improbable coincidence, it seems better to concur with Eduard Sievers that there is a lacuna after *woruldfeoh* 'worldly wealth' (Sievers 1887:476). The advantage of this hypothesis is that it provides a unitary explanation for the three contiguous metrical aberrations, conceiving of them not as three

---

ymb(*e*) they found in their exemplar with its alternative, and so the type A3 scansion for *Genesis A* 2322a cannot be easily ruled out.

[8] Moreover, verses like these appear only clause-initially, as is required of type A3. For more supporting evidence for interpreting a numeral plus a noun as a compound, see Fulk et al. 2008:323.

[9] In citations of Old English from editions other than *Klaeber's Beowulf*, macrons and other visual cues, such as dots for palatalization, have been silently added.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542716000209 Published online by Cambridge University Press

separate authentic exceptions to metrical norms, but as the defective outcome of the accidental loss of a portion of text. Even if the original reading is now irrecoverable, on account of its suspect text-critical character l. 2142b should not be adduced as genuine evidence for catalexis in *Genesis A*.

The remaining instance on Suzuki's list of type C- verses, l. 2600a, *Hīe dydon swā* 'They did so', is especially problematic. As Sievers indicates (1885:498; see also Fulk 1992:§355.4), the presence of the West-Saxonism *dydon* 'did' often generates metrical problems both in *Genesis A* and elsewhere in Old English poetry, as in, for example, *Genesis A* 142a, *drugon and dydon* 'they carried out and did'; *Daniel* 196b, *cūð ġedydon* 'they made known'; *Beowulf* 1828b, *hwīlum dydon* 'formerly they did'. In all of them, the substitution of the Anglian poetical form *dēdon* systematically restores metricality. So, if one wants to account for this regularity, one cannot avoid the conclusion that *Genesis A* 2600a is, in actuality, a four-position type B verse, with scribal substitution of *dydon* for *dēdon*. This verse does not, therefore, constitute legitimate evidence for the authenticity of catalexis. The exclusion of this instance from his body of evidence leaves Suzuki with no genuine examples of catalectic type C- verses. If the *Genesis A* poet could not resist the tendency to delete the verse-final drop after two clashing lifts, as Suzuki maintains, it is remarkable that the entire text of the poem does not contain a single unambiguous instance of type C-, such as the hypothetical **ond sinċfæt* 'and a precious object'. It follows that type C- is not a reality of the meter. The inauthenticity of type C- in turn casts serious doubts on the reliability of Suzuki's definition of catalexis as a whole. Indeed, as the analysis of the alleged type D- verses from *Genesis A* and *Beowulf* confirms, there seems to be no reason to postulate the natural tendency toward drop deletion upon which Suzuki's theory of catalexis is predicated.

Following A. N. Doane's second edition of the poem, Suzuki reads *Genesis A* 907a and 2876a as instances of type D- (*bearm tredan* 'walk the bosom' and *dæġes þriddan* 'of the third day', respectively). In fact, however, these are regular verses that Doane failed to interpret correctly. The traditional reading of ll. 906–907, as printed in Krapp 1931, is the following:[10]

[10] This is also the reading adopted in, for example, Klaeber 1913, Holthausen 1914, Wells 1969, and Anlezark 2011.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542716000209 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(2) Þū scealt wīdeferhð wēriġ þīnum
brēostum bearm tredan brādre eorðan.

'You shall always, weary, on your
'belly walk the bosom of the broad earth.'

According to the traditional interpretation, l. 907a is a regular expanded type D*2 with double alliteration on *b*. The editorial reading *wēriġ* 'weary' at 906b, which stands for manuscript *werg* 'accursed', is introduced in order to avoid the catalectic verse *werg þīnum* 'accursed on your (belly)'. Unwilling to accept either editorial *wēriġ* or manuscript *werg þīnum*, Doane decides to place *brēostum* 'belly.DAT' at the end of 906b, thereby generating the three-position verse *bearm tredan* 'walk the bosom' at 907a, which Suzuki takes as an instance of type D-.[11] Nevertheless, as Fulk (2004) has demonstrated, l. 906b is probably a standard four-position type A verse with scribal substitution of *werg* for Anglian **werge*, a *ja*-stem meaning 'accursed'. Thus, the relocation of *brēostum*, upon which Suzuki's catalectic analysis of l. 907a is predicated, is unnecessary.

In regard to l. 2876a, which has traditionally been printed as *dæġes þriddan up* '(the beginning) of the third day (rose) up', Doane believes that the adverb *up* is the first word of the second half-line rather than the last word of the first.[12] This lineation causes problems in both halves of the line. L. 2876b as printed by Doane, *up ofer dēop wæter* 'up over deep water', must be analyzed as a type A2b with alliteration on the second lift.[13] This is implausible because type A2b requires double alliteration, which is strictly forbidden in the off-verse (Bliss 1967:§§54, 79). The placement of *up* in 2876a not only restores metricality to both verses, but also corrects the line's alliteration: Both *dæġes þriddan up* and *ofer dēop*

[11] Doane, aware that the three-position *bearm tredan* is irregular, accepts Ludwig Ettmüller's (1850) emendation of *bearm* to *bearme*, which is nonetheless anomalous, since it contains a short lift after an inflectional ending.

[12] The reading adopted in Holthausen 1914, Krapp 1931, Wells 1969, and Anlezark 2011 is *dæġes þriddan up*.

[13] The adverb *up* is ictic elsewhere in *Genesis A* and in *Beowulf* (compare *Beowulf* 1373b, for example).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542716000209 Published online by Cambridge University Press

wæter are regular four-position verses (type D4 and type C, respectively) with predictable *d* alliteration on the first lift of the off-verse. Thus, ll. 907a and 2876a as interpreted by Suzuki do not reflect the metrical practice of the *Genesis A* poet, and hence they should be excluded from his list of instances of catalectic type D-.

There are compelling linguistic reasons to believe that another two verses from *Genesis A* on Suzuki's list, 2058b, *ēað mihte* 'could more easily', and 2668a, *sprecan sīne* 'his counsellors', are originally four-position verses that have been corrupted in the process of transmission. The manuscript reading at l. 2058b, *ēað mihte*, is regarded as grammatically deficient by the vast majority of editors. Doane, following Stanley 1986:195, reads the verse as *ðe ēað mihte* 'could more easily', since the comparative expression *ðe ēað* and the verb *magan* not infrequently co-occur in Old English, as in, for example, *Andreas* 368a, *þæt hīe þe ēað mihton* 'that they could more easily'. Nevertheless, as Sievers indicates (1885:513; see also Wells 1969:211), comparative *ēað* is meaningless in this context, in which the poem's narrator, without establishing any comparison, merely reports Abraham saying that God will help the Israelites. Most editors accordingly emend *ēað* to *ēaðe* 'easily', the positive form of the adverb, on the reasonable belief that the failure of a scribe to copy the final letter of authorial *ēaðe* resulted in a verse that is defective in terms of both meter and sense.

Concerning l. 2668a, Doane, following the manuscript, prints it as *sprecan sīne*. As he mentions in the commentary to his edition (Doane 2013:388; see also Sievers 1885:453), however, the word *sprecan*, 'counselors', which translates Latin *servōs*, is a *hapax legomenon*. Since the Old English idiomatic term for 'counselor' is *ġespreca*, it appears reasonable to concur with the majority of the poem's editors that a scribe accidentally failed to copy the prefix *ġe-* (as is assumed, for example, in *Beowulf* 652a, [*Ġe*]*grētte þā* 'Then (one man) addressed'); therefore, l. 2668a is, in actuality, a regular four-position type C verse with resolution of the first lift.

The addition of an extra syllable to another two verses classified by Suzuki as type D-, *Genesis A* 1098b, *wāt ġearwe* 'I know readily', and 2629a, *heht bringan* 'he commanded to bring', not only improves their meter, but also renders them more idiomatic in Old English. The co-occurrence of the adverb *ġearwe* and different forms of the verb *witan*, which is very common both in *Genesis A* and elsewhere in poetry,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542716000209 Published online by Cambridge University Press

frequently involves the presence of a pronominal subject for *witan*, as in, for example, *Genesis A* 2626a, *þȳ hē wiste ġearwe* 'because he knew readily'; *Beowulf* 2656b, *Iċ wāt ġeare* 'I know readily'; *Azarias* 170b, *Þæt iċ ġeare wiste* 'That I readily knew'. Accordingly, most editors of the poem (Holthausen 1914, Krapp 1931, Wells 1969, Anlezark 2011), following Friedrich Graz's original suggestion (Graz 1896:70–71), emend l. 1098b to *Wāt iċ ġearwe*, thus assuming that a scribe unintentionally failed to copy the subject of the verb.[14] Without this addition, the passage seems defective, since the verb lacks a subject, and *wāt* is not distinctively first person.

In regard to l. 2629a, *heht bringan*, Suzuki's analysis is a particularly questionable one, because the passage in which this verse occurs is defective (Wells 1969:227, Doane 2013:386). One of its several defects is the absence of an object for the verb *heht*, which is otherwise very common (see *Genesis A* 2667b, *Heht him fetiġean tō* 'He commanded (them) to fetch him'; 943b, *hēt hīe from hweorfan* 'he commanded them to depart from'). As a result, many editors emend this verse to either *heht hīe bringan* (Krapp 1931, Anlezark 2011) or *heht him bringan* (Doane 2013), thereby improving both its sense and its meter. Regardless of whether these emendations are accepted, the textual problems that attend l. 2629a render Suzuki's catalectic analysis suspect.

As can be seen, there are good nonmetrical reasons to believe that six of Suzuki's nine instances of type D- in *Genesis A* are more likely to be regular verses; they have either been misinterpreted by Doane or suffered some kind of corruption in the course of transmission. I turn now to the verses from *Beowulf* that Suzuki identifies as instances of type D-. Three of them (1889a, 1926a, and 1129a) present problems of sense or grammar, which suggests that these verses are not authentic. The first, l. 1889a, *hæġstealdra* 'of young men', is part of a clause that lacks a grammatical subject. This absence is particularly questionable because the genitive plural *hæġstealdra* and its apposite *felamōdiġra* 'of very courageous men', in the previous verse, require a nominative head (as in, for example, *Genesis A* 1862b, *hæġstealdra wyn* 'pleasure of young men'). It is therefore probable that a word in the nominative case is missing after *hæġstealdra*, and so l. 1889a as it appears in the manuscript

[14] Sievers (1885:512) proposes *wāt nū ġearwe* 'I now know readily' or *wāt þēah ġearwe* 'I nevertheless know readily'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542716000209 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is incomplete. The editors of *Klaeber's Beowulf* supply *hēap* 'band', which rectifies both the meter of this verse (rendering it a type E with double alliteration on *h*) and the grammar of the clause.

If l. 1926a, *hēa healle* 'lofty halls', is taken at face value, as Suzuki's analysis demands, then the noun *healle* must be interpreted as a nominative plural apposite to the singular noun *bold* 'building' in l. 1925a (Fulk et al. 2008:222). This is unidiomatic, however, both because the reference in 1925a is to a single hall, not several, and because nouns in apposition usually agree in number with each other. Indeed, the editors of *Klaeber's Beowulf*, crediting Ernst A. Kock's hypothesis (Kock 1918:116), emend *hēa healle* to *hēah on healle* 'exalted in hall', a regular four-position type A verse. In this case, *hēah* is a singular masculine adjective parallel to the singular noun phrase *bregorōf cyning* 'very valiant king' in l. 1925b.[15] Because this emendation, in addition to rectifying the meter of the verse, results in a grammatically correct appositive relation, *hēah on healle* is likely to be the original verse as composed by the author.

Suzuki's acceptance of the manuscript reading at l. 1129a, *unhlitme* 'not reluctantly', on which his catalectic interpretation of this verse is based, is likewise inadvisable. The immediately preceding word in the manuscript, *finnel*, is nonsensical. Therefore, virtually all the editors of the poem emend it to *Finne*, the dative of the proper name *Finn*, which this passage (part of the Finnesburh episode) unambiguously requires. The most logical way to make sense of this notorious corruption is to assume that l. 1129a as it stands in the manuscript is incomplete, and that some linguistic material preceding *unhlitme* was accidentally attached to *finne*, in the previous verse, in the form of an *l*.[16] The manuscript reading

[15] Kock conjectures that a scribe erroneously interpreted *hēahon*, written together in his exemplar, as an uncontracted weak plural form and subsequently altered it to a contracted strong one (see Fulk et al. 2008:222).

[16] The editors of *Klaeber's Beowulf* (Fulk et al. 2008:187–188) hypothesize that l. 1129a originally read *hē unhlitme* (a regular type C verse), and that, on account of damage in the exemplar, only the first upright of *hē* was legible to the scribe, who mistook it for an isolated *l* and attached it to the preceding *finne*, thereby generating both a nonsensical word in l. 1128b (*finnel*) and an irregular three-position verse at 1129a (*unhlitme*).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542716000209 Published online by Cambridge University Press

at l. 1129a, *unhlitme*, should be taken, therefore, not as the product of a metrical rule, but as the outcome of defective textual transmission.

What is common to all of the verses discussed so far, in addition to their peculiar metrical structures, is that they exhibit problems of a nonmetrical character, which would normally disqualify them as evidence for metrical argumentation (Pascual 2013–2014:65). Once these verses are excluded from Suzuki's lists of catalectic instances in *Genesis A* and *Beowulf*, the total number of three-position verses left is 13. Of these, eight are classified as type A- and five as type D-.[17] The ratio of type A- to type D- verses undermines Suzuki's conceptualization of catalexis as the result of the poets' sporadic failure to resist the natural tendency toward drop deletion in the structure of the verse. He argues that the second drop of type D (/ / x x), inasmuch as it follows a drop that has already been subjected to prominence reduction by the two preceding lifts, is most likely to undergo deletion. Therefore, if his conceptualization of catalexis were correct, it is type D-, not type A-, that should be the most substantially represented in the texts. The smaller number of three-position type D- verses indicates that there is no empirical basis for a strong tendency to delete a verse-final drop preceded by two clashing lifts. Consequently, Suzuki's hypothesis that the scarcity of catalexis is a principled consequence of the poets' resistance to such a tendency appears at odds with the evidence. Thus, even though the 13 three-position verses discussed above are acceptable in terms of sense and alliteration, the incidence of unambiguous instances in the texts is so low, and the probability of scribal error is so high, that they are better regarded as accidents of transmission devoid of metrical significance. Indeed, this is the view shared by the majority of editors of *Genesis A* and *Beowulf*, who have proposed reasonable emendations for most of them.[18]

[17] type A-: *Genesis A* 1308b, 1338b, 1515a, 1856b, 2227a, 2235a; *Beowulf* 1404b, 3102b. type D-: *Genesis A* 1112a, 1701a, 2290a; *Beowulf* 1546a, 3171b.

[18] Thus, *Genesis A* l. 1308b, *þrēohund lang* 'of three hundred long', is emended to *ond þrēohund lang*, a regular four-position type B verse (Holthausen 1914, Krapp 1931, Anlezark 2011; see Sievers 1885:512); l. 1338b, *ǣlċes twā* 'two of each', to *ǣlċes twēġen* 'two of each', a regular type A (Holthausen 1914, Sievers 1885:512); l. 1515a, *holmes hlæst* 'sea's burden', to *and holmes hlæst*, a type B (Holthausen 1914, Krapp 1931, Wells 1969, Anlezark 2011, Sievers 1885:512);

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542716000209 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The traditional notion that the exceptionally scarce attestation of a verse type in the manuscripts is an indication of metrical inauthenticity—and hence of scribal error—is confirmed by poems surviving in more than one copy. For example, while l. 8a of *The Capture of the Five Boroughs* is transmitted as a three-position verse in the A version of this poem (*dēora bȳ* 'Derby'), its three other versions preserve the four-position verse *ond dēora bȳ* instead; *Soul and Body I* 81b, *wilddēora* 'of wild beasts', a catalectic verse, corresponds to the regular type A *wildra dēora* 'of wild beasts' in *Soul and Body II*; at l. 52a, the *B* text of *Solomon and Saturn* reads *heofonrīċes* 'of the kingdom of heaven', a three-position verse, whereas the *A* text reads *heofona rīċes* 'of the kingdom of heavens', a regular type A; and the two-position *ond þurh help*, at *Daniel* 292a, appears as the regular type B *ond þurh hyldo help* 'and, by your favor, help' at *Azarias* 13a (Neidorf 2016).[19]

---

l. 2227a, *drihten mīn* 'my lord', to *Ea lā, drihten mīn* 'Alas, my lord', a type B (Holthausen 1914; see Graz 1896:75); l. 2235a, *ġeðafode* 'he followed', to *þǣr ġeðafode* 'he followed there', a type A3 (Holthausen 1914); l. 2290a, *wiðerbreca* 'adversary', to *and wiðerbreca*, a type C (Holthausen 1914, Krapp 1931, Anlezark 2011; see Sievers 1885:453 and Cosijn 1894:454; compare *Genesis A* 64a, *his wiðerbrecan* 'his adversaries'). For *Genesis A* 1112a, *sunu selfa* 'son.ACC himself.NOM', and 1701a, *samod sāmworht* 'together unfinished', some editors read *sealde selfa* 'gave himself.NOM' (Holthausen 1914, Krapp 1931; see Graz 1896:71) and *sāmworht samod* (Holthausen 1914; see Sievers 1885:513), assuming that the manuscript readings are the result of scribal transposition. In regard to l. 1856b, some editors read *lēofliċ wīf tō*, on the belief that the preposition *tō* is part of this verse rather than of l. 1857a, *tō his selfes sele* 'to his own hall'. Although this interpretation is not persuasive, the incidence of trisyllabic verses is so low that *lēofliċ wīf* is most probably the result of defective textual transmission. For *Beowulf* 1404b, *ġeġnum fōr* 'she went straight', 1546a, *brād brūnecg* 'broad brown-edged', 3102b, *searo-ġeþræc* 'heap of treasure', and 3171b, *kyning mǣnan* 'speak of king', the editors of *Klaeber's Beowulf* (Fulk et al. 2008) respectively read *þǣr ġeġnum fōr* 'where she went straight' (type B), *brād ond brūnecg* (type A2b), *searoġimma ġeþræc* 'heap of intricate jewels' (type E), and *ond cyning mǣnan* (type C).

[19] Since the surviving texts of both *Daniel* and *Genesis A* were written out by the same scribe, the demonstrably defective reading at *Daniel* 292a furnishes strong confirmation that the text of *Genesis A* should not be taken at face value.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542716000209 Published online by Cambridge University Press

These examples, of which many more could be found, demonstrate that it is the accidental omission of linguistic material from an original four-position verse that is responsible for the abnormal metrical structure of the catalectic equivalent. Note also that the effect of these omissions on grammar and alliteration is either insignificant or nonexistent. Therefore, the 13 remaining instances of catalexis on Suzuki's lists should be given the same treatment, as suggested by the editors of *Genesis A* and *Beowulf*: Even though these verses present no grammatical or alliteration problems, they have been generated by similar errors of transmission.

REFERENCES

Anlezark, Daniel (ed.). 2011. *Old Testament narratives*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bliss, Alan Joseph. 1967. *The metre of Beowulf*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.

Cable, Thomas. 1974. *The meter and melody of Beowulf*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Cosijn, Peter J. 1894. Anglo-Saxonica. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 19.441–461.

Doane, Alger N. (ed.). 2013. *Genesis A: A new edition, revised*. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies.

Ettmüller, Ludwig (ed.). 1850. *Engla and seaxna scôpas and bôceras: Anglosaxonum poetae atque scriptores prosaici*. Quedlinburg and Leipzig: Gottfried Basse.

Fulk, Robert D. 1992. *A history of Old English meter*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Fulk, Robert D. 2002. Early Middle English evidence for Old English meter: Resolution in *Poema Morale*. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 14.331–355.

Fulk, Robert D. 2004. Old English *werg-*, *wyrg-*, 'accursed'. *Historische Sprachforschung / Historical Linguistics* 117.315–322.

Fulk, Robert. D., Robert E. Bjork, & John D. Niles (eds.). 2008. *Klaeber's Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Graz, Friedrich. 1896. Beiträge zur Textkritik der sogenannten Caedmonschen Genesis. *Festschrift zum siebzigsten Geburtstage Oskar Schade*, 67–77. Königsberg: Hartung.

Holthausen, Ferdinand (ed.). 1914. *Die ältere Genesis mit Einleitung, Anmerkungen, Glossar und der lateinischen Quelle*. Heidelberg: C. Winter.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542716000209 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Hutcheson, Bellenden Rand. 1995. *Old English poetic metre*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.
Klaeber, Friedrich (ed.). 1913. *The later Genesis and other Old English and Old Saxon texts relating to the fall of man*. Heidelberg: C. Winter.
Kock, Ernst A. 1918. Interpretations and emendations of early English texts, IV. *Anglia* 42.99–124.
Krapp, George Philip (ed.). 1931. *The Junius manuscript*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Lapidge, Michael. 2000. The archetype of *Beowulf*. *Anglo-Saxon England* 29.5–41.
Neidorf, Leonard. 2013. Scribal errors of proper names in the *Beowulf* manuscript. *Anglo-Saxon England* 42.249–269.
Neidorf, Leonard. 2016. Metrical criteria for the emendation of Old English poetic texts. *Old English philology: Studies in honour of R. D. Fulk*, ed. by Leonard Neidorf, Rafael J. Pascual, & Tom Shippey, 52–68. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.
Neidorf, Leonard. 2017. *The transmission of Beowulf. Language, culture, and scribal behavior*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, to appear.
Orton, Peter. 2000. *The transmission of Old English poetry*. Turnhout: Brepols.
Pascual, Rafael J. 2013–2014. Three-position verses and the metrical practice of the *Beowulf* poet. *SELIM* 20.49–79.
Pascual, Rafael J. 2014. Ælfric's rhythmical prose and the study of Old English metre. *English Studies* 95.803–823.
Pascual, Rafael J. 2015. On a crux in *Beowulf*: The alliteration of finite verbs and the scribal understanding of metre. *Studia Neophilologica* 87.171–185.
Pascual, Rafael J. 2016. Old English metrical history and the composition of *Widsið*. *Neophilologus* 100.289–302.
Sievers, Eduard. 1885. Zur Rhythmik des germanischen Alliterationsverses, II. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* X.451–545.
Sievers, Eduard. 1887. Zur Rhythmik des germanischen Alliterationsverses, III. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* XII.454–482.
Sievers, Eduard. 1893. *Altgermanische Metrik*. Halle: Max Niemeyer.
Sisam, Kenneth. 1953. *Studies in the history of Old English literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Stanley, Eric Gerald. 1986. Notes on the text of the Old English *Genesis*. *Modes of interpretation in Old English literature: Essays in honour of Stanley B. Greenfield*, ed. by Phyllis Rugg Brown, Georgia Ronan Campton, & Fred C. Robinson, 189–196. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
Weiskott, Eric. 2013. Three-position verses in *Beowulf*. *Notes and Queries* 60.483–485.
Wells, David M. (ed.). 1969. *A critical edition of the Old English Genesis A with a translation*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina dissertation.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542716000209 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Harvard University Department of English, Barker Center
12 Quincy Street
Cambridge, MA
02138
USA
[pascualr@g.harvard.edu]

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542716000209 Published online by Cambridge University Press