



Old English Philology

Studies in Honour of R.D. Fulk

Edited by Leonard Neidorf, Rafael J. Pascual
and Tom Shippey

Anglo-Saxon Studies 31

OLD ENGLISH PHILOLOGY

Anglo-Saxon Studies

ISSN 1475-2468

GENERAL EDITORS

John Hines
Catherine Cubitt

‘Anglo-Saxon Studies’ aims to provide a forum for the best scholarship on the Anglo-Saxon peoples in the period from the end of Roman Britain to the Norman Conquest, including comparative studies involving adjacent populations and periods; both new research and major re-assessments of central topics are welcomed.

Books in the series may be based in any one of the principal disciplines of archaeology, art history, history, language and literature, and inter- or multi-disciplinary studies are encouraged.

Proposals or enquiries may be sent directly to the editors or the publisher at the addresses given below; all submissions will receive prompt and informed consideration.

Professor John Hines, School of History, Archaeology and Religion,
Cardiff University, John Percival Building, Colum Drive, Cardiff, Wales,
CF10 3EU, UK

Professor Catherine Cubitt, Centre for Medieval Studies, University of
York, The King’s Manor, York, England, YO1 7EP, UK

Boydell & Brewer, PO Box 9, Woodbridge, Suffolk, England, IP12 3DF, UK

Previously published volumes in the series are listed at the back of this book

OLD ENGLISH PHILOLOGY
STUDIES IN HONOUR OF R.D. FULK

Edited by
Leonard Neidorf, Rafael J. Pascual and Tom Shippey

D. S. BREWER

© Contributors 2016

All Rights Reserved. Except as permitted under current legislation no part of this work may be photocopied, stored in a retrieval system, published, performed in public, adapted, broadcast, transmitted, recorded or reproduced in any form or by any means, without the prior permission of the copyright owner

First published 2016
D. S. Brewer, Cambridge

ISBN 978-1-84384-438-9

D. S. Brewer is an imprint of Boydell & Brewer Ltd
PO Box 9, Woodbridge, Suffolk IP12 3DF, UK
and of Boydell & Brewer Inc.
668 Mt Hope Avenue, Rochester, NY 14620-2731, USA
website: www.boydellandbrewer.com

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available
from the British Library

The publisher has no responsibility for the continued existence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this book, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate

This publication is printed on acid-free paper

Contents

List of Illustrations	vii
Acknowledgements	viii
List of Contributors	ix
Introduction: R.D. Fulk and the Progress of Philology <i>Leonard Neidorf</i>	1
1 Sievers, Bliss, Fulk, and Old English Metrical Theory <i>Rafael J. Pascual</i>	17
2 Ictus as Stress or Length: The Effect of Tempo <i>Thomas Cable</i>	34
3 Metrical Criteria for the Emendation of Old English Poetic Texts <i>Leonard Neidorf</i>	52
4 The Suppression of the Subjunctive in <i>Beowulf</i> : A Metrical Explanation <i>Jun Terasawa</i>	69
5 Metrical Complexity and Verse Placement in <i>Beowulf</i> <i>Geoffrey Russom</i>	82
6 Alliterating Finite Verbs and the Origin of Rank in Old English Poetry <i>Mark Griffith</i>	103
7 Prosody-Meter Correspondences in Late Old English and <i>Poema Morale</i> <i>Donka Minkova</i>	122
8 The Syntax of Old English Poetry and the Dating of <i>Beowulf</i> <i>Aaron Eay and Susan Pintzuk</i>	144
9 The Anglo-Saxons and <i>Superbia</i> : Finding a Word for it <i>George Clark</i>	172
10 Old English <i>gelōme</i> , <i>gelōma</i> , Modern English <i>loom</i> , <i>lame</i> , and Their Kin <i>Anatoly Liberman</i>	190
11 <i>Worm</i> : A Lexical Approach to the <i>Beowulf</i> Manuscript <i>Haruko Momma</i>	200

Contents

12	Wulfstan, Episcopal Authority, and the <i>Handbook for the Use of a Confessor</i> <i>Stefan Jurasinski</i>	215
13	Some Observations on <i>e-caudata</i> in Old English Texts <i>Christopher M. Cain</i>	233
14	The Poetics of Poetic Words in Old English <i>Dennis Cronan</i>	256
15	<i>Dream of the Rood</i> 9b: A Cross as an Angel? <i>Daniel Donoghue</i>	276
16	The Fate of Lot's Wife: A 'Canterbury School' Gloss in <i>Genesis A</i> <i>Charles D. Wright</i>	292
17	Metrical Alternation in <i>The Fortunes of Men</i> <i>Megan E. Hartman</i>	311
18	The Originality of <i>Andreas</i> <i>Andy Orchard</i>	331
19	The Economy of <i>Beowulf</i> <i>Rory Naismith</i>	371
20	<i>Beowulf</i> Studies from Tolkien to Fulk <i>Tom Shippey</i>	392
	The Writings of R.D. Fulk	415
	Index	424
	Tabula Gratulatoria	427

Illustrations

Figures

2.1	Eight logically possible alliterative verse contours (taken from <i>Eight Old English Poems</i> , ed. John C. Pope. 3rd ed. Revised by R.D. Fulk. New York: Norton, 2001: 150)	35
7.1	Strength relations in the septenary line	137
8.1	Linear trend lines for dating criteria	164
12.1	Distribution of sections in extant witnesses (taken from "A Late Old English Handbook for the Use of a Confessor", ed. R. Fowler, <i>Anglia</i> 83 (1965): 4)	220
12.2	Detail from CCC 265, p. 74. Photograph: Courtesy of the Master and Fellows of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge	227

Tables

3.1	Three-position (or fewer) verses	55
3.2	Three-position (or fewer) verses in <i>Beowulf</i>	56
3.3	Five-position verses	57
3.4	Verses with alliterative defects	59
3.5	Verses with defective anacrusis	61
3.6	Violations of Kuhn's Law of Sentence of Particles	61
8.1	Frequencies for Pronoun-Related Criteria in Poetic Texts	167
13.1	Occurrence and frequency of <i>e</i> -caudata in <i>DOEC</i>	237
13.2	Forms of <i>cweðan</i> in the Lindisfarne gloss	241
13.3a	Forms of <i>cweðan</i> in Farman's gloss	242
13.3b	Forms of <i>cweðan</i> in Owun's gloss	243
13.4	<i>ȝ</i> -spellings of <i>cweðan</i> in Lindisfarne	244
13.5a	<i>ȝ</i> -spellings of <i>cweðan</i> in Farman's gloss	244
13.5b	<i>ȝ</i> -spellings of <i>cweðan</i> in Owun's gloss	245
13.6	<i>ȝ</i> -spellings in some Kentish texts	250
17.1	Distribution of normal verse types	316

The editors, contributors and publishers are grateful to all the institutions and persons listed for permission to reproduce the materials in which they hold copyright. Every effort has been made to trace the copyright holders; apologies are offered for any omission, and the publishers will be pleased to add any necessary acknowledgement in subsequent editions.

Acknowledgements

The editors thank everyone involved with the production of this book at Boydell & Brewer for their labor, support, and enthusiasm. We especially thank Caroline Palmer for her extraordinary diligence and efficiency. Naturally, we are also grateful to the contributors for turning in first-rate scholarship and thereby paying apt tribute to our book's honorand. Finally, we thank the William F. Milton Fund at Harvard University for financing the production of this book.

Leonard Neidorf
Rafael J. Pascual
Tom Shippey

Contributors

Thomas Cable is Jane Weinert Blumberg Chair in English, Emeritus, at University of Texas at Austin.

Christopher M. Cain is Professor of English at Towson University.

George Clark is Professor of English, Emeritus, at Queen's University, Kingston.

Dennis Cronan is Associate Professor of English at the University of Nevada, Reno.

Daniel Donoghue is John P. Marquand Professor of English at Harvard University.

Aaron Ecay is Postdoctoral Research Associate at the Centre for Language History and Diversity at the University of York.

Mark Griffith is Richard Ellmann Tutorial Fellow and Senior Tutor at New College, Oxford.

Megan E. Hartman is Assistant Professor of English at University of Nebraska, Kearney.

Stefan Jurasinski is Associate Professor of English at the State University of New York at Brockport.

Anatoly Liberman is Professor of Germanic Philology at the University of Minnesota.

Donka Minkova is Distinguished Professor and Associate Dean of Humanities at University of California, Los Angeles.

Haruko Momma is Professor of English at New York University.

Rory Naismith is Lecturer in Early Medieval British History at King's College London.

Leonard Neidorf is a Junior Fellow at the Harvard Society of Fellows.

Andy Orchard is Rawlinson and Bosworth Professor of Anglo-Saxon at Oxford University.

Rafael J. Pascual is a Postdoctoral Research Fellow at Harvard University.

Susan Pintzuk is Professor in English Language and Linguistics at the University of York.

Contributors

Geoffrey Russom is Nicholas Brown Professor of Oratory and Belles Lettres, Emeritus, at Brown University.

Tom Shippey is Walter J. Ong Chair of the Humanities and Professor of English, Emeritus, at St. Louis University.

Jun Terasawa is Professor of English at the University of Tokyo.

Charles D. Wright is Professor of English and Medieval Studies at University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Introduction: R.D. Fulk and the Progress of Philology

Leonard Neidorf

Many festschrifts begin with an introduction that contains personal anecdotes intended to shed light upon the private life and characteristics of the honorand. Were this volume to feature such an introduction, it would be a source of displeasure to our honorand, who has always preferred to let his work speak for itself and has never been comfortable with sentimental praise. The present introduction focuses on the scholarship of Robert D. Fulk not only because the editors believe he would prefer this, but also because there is no other kind of introduction that any of us could have written. One of the editors (Pascual) has never met the honorand in the flesh, while the other two editors have interacted with him in person at only a handful of conferences. Such limited interaction ensures that we are not working under the spell of personal charm or nostalgic affection. What gave impetus to this festschrift, rather, was deep admiration for Fulk's work and a shared conviction that he is the greatest Old English philologist to emerge during the twentieth century. That this conviction is not peculiar to the editors became apparent to us by the tremendous response we received when inviting scholars to contribute to this volume. The ability of this occasion to bring together the top philologists in the profession between the covers of one book is a sign of the respect that our honorand's work commands. Accordingly, one aim of this introduction is to present the rationale behind the widespread admiration that Fulk's scholarship has elicited.

The other aim of this introduction is to indicate how the contents of this volume reflect the themes and concerns that pervade the honorand's work. One of the most impressive properties of Fulk's corpus is its patent mastery of a multitude of technical disciplines. If the aims of the following essays appear diverse, it is not an accident, but the consequence of honoring a scholar who has contributed to our knowledge of so many different aspects of Old English language and literature. To characterize the scope of Fulk's scholarship, it is best to cite the description he offered in a recent interview in the *Journal of English Linguistics*:

Since I'm a philologist, the range of my interests has been similar to that of scholars who worked in the field in its heyday in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, such as Eduard Sievers, Henry Sweet,

Walter W. Skeat, and Karl Luick. Among the publications of that group you'll find some devoted to historical linguistics, phonetics and phonology, morphology, dialectology, orthographic systems, metrics, textual editing (usually in the form of editions of medieval texts), manuscript studies (including paleography, codicology, and scribal practices), and literary hermeneutics. That's a fair accounting of the topics I've touched on, too, though naturally I've had more to say about some of these topics than others. (Grant 2014: 359)

Reading this list of topics, one might wonder what all of these technical disciplines have to do with each other. Why should one scholar work on fields as apparently unrelated as dialectology, metrics, paleography, and literary hermeneutics? Is there a principled rationale for this intellectual promiscuity, or is it simply the product of a Faustian desire for unlimited knowledge? Fulk's description of himself as "a philologist" might point us toward the answer to this question. Definitions of philology vary within and between departments, but philology, at its core, represents an academic enterprise that aims to achieve a historically informed understanding of texts written in dead languages. If philologists master an array of technical disciplines, it is not because they delight in pedantry, but because these disciplines furnish the tools that enable scholars to constrain subjectivity and resist ahistorical understanding. The value of philological knowledge inheres in its ability to reduce the extent to which anachronism and ethnocentrism cloud interpretation. It clears a path for a more accurate understanding of works composed under linguistic and cultural conditions alien to the experiences of contemporary scholars.

An example from *Beowulf* can illustrate the pivotal role that philology continues to play in Old English studies. Fulk opens his article on Unferth's name, which reconsiders the relationship between etymology and characterization in the poem, with the following remark: "It is as true now as ever that most of the larger issues in Anglo-Saxon literary scholarship cannot be resolved independently of their philological basis" (1987b: 113). The meaning of this statement becomes clear over the course of his article, as competing interpretations of Unferth's name are scrutinized and falsified in the light of evidence drawn from the fields of onomastics, dialectology, phonology, metrics, and textual criticism. The entire tradition of interpreting Unferth's name as an allegorical indication of the characteristics the poet intended him to possess is called into question, as Fulk demonstrates that every presumed etymology of this name (e.g., 'mar-peace' = 'discord,' 'un-intelligence' = 'folly,' etc.) is linguistically implausible, since *un-* (the negative prefix) and *-ferhð* ('spirit') were never used to form early Germanic personal names. Comparative onomastic data indicate that *un-* is a continental form of the Anglo-Saxon *hūn-* element (which probably means 'bear cub'), while *ferhð* represents the West Saxon metathesis of Anglian *frið*,

‘peace.’ Etymology thus appears to have no relationship to characterization. The presence of a continental name-element suggests, moreover, that the name is not a literary invention, but an inheritance from earlier heroic-legendary tradition. The name is used for the simple reason that “*Ūnferð* happened to be the man’s name” (1987b: 127).

What unites the eclectic forms of evidence Fulk adduced is their ability to direct our attention to various historical considerations that must inform and constrain our understanding of Unferth and his name. Without the constraints imposed by philological knowledge, modern scholarship can easily succumb to meretricious interpretations that, although they cannot be reconciled to the facts, accord well with anachronistic and ethnocentric assumptions held by contemporary readers. For scholars who were raised on literary works where names possess characterological significance, the assumption that names in *Beowulf* were invented to reveal character traits seems plausible enough. The improbability of this assumption becomes apparent only after acquaintance is made with an array of pertinent facts drawn from technical disciplines. Reasonable observers then discard naïve assumptions and revise their understanding in light of the philological evidence brought forward. That scholars should need to revise their views in the aftermath of Fulk’s article is not incidental, but is rather a programmatic consequence of philological scholarship, which arrives at the most probable hypothesis through the systematic elimination of improbable alternatives. As Fulk observed, philology’s commitment to falsification renders it “at odds with what many literary scholars believe, because the purpose of philology is to narrow the range of possible interpretations rather than to treat all reasonable ones as equal” (2014b: 23). This methodological imperative encourages intellectual promiscuity in the philologist, since the more a philologist masters ancillary disciplines, the more apparent the relative probability of competing hypotheses becomes.

Another reason for the diversity of technical disciplines pursued by philologists is their utility in the realm of textual criticism. The establishment of reliable texts by distinguishing genuine readings from scribal corruptions is sufficiently central to the activities of philologists that some consider textual criticism the defining pursuit of philology. Indeed, Fulk has remarked, “In classical studies philology is generally regarded as an aggregate of the various modes of inquiry required for the editing of texts in extinct languages” (Grant 2014: 364). To detect and emend corruptions, the textual critic must often embrace considerations pertaining to paleography, dialectology, metrics, literary hermeneutics, and every branch of historical linguistics. Textual criticism thus provides a coherent rationale for the disparate pursuits of philologists, and the need to conduct textual criticism arises not merely when philologists decide to edit medieval works. Rather, critical

scrutiny of the authenticity of linguistic data is a defining feature of philological scholarship – it is, in fact, the feature that is generally held to distinguish philology from linguistics, where data tend to be adduced without suspicion. For the philologist, a text transmitted in a tenth-century manuscript cannot be uncritically regarded as a specimen of tenth-century language. Signs of textual transmission must be pursued alongside indicators of the work's date of composition, and this evidence must be combined to reconstruct a textual history. If an eighth-century work is regarded as a product of the tenth century, the error is bound to obscure our understanding of linguistic and cultural history. The philologist strives to see through the extant manuscript in order to replace naïve apprehension of the evidence with historically informed understanding.

Fulk's magnum opus, *A History of Old English Meter* (1992), represents arguably the most comprehensive and strenuous effort in the history of the discipline to arrange our chaotic evidence into a coherent chronology. The corpus of Old English poetry is preserved in various contexts: much of it is recorded in vernacular manuscripts from the tenth and eleventh centuries, though some poems were recorded in Latin manuscripts from the eighth and ninth centuries (e.g., *Cædmon's Hymn*, *Bede's Death Song*, *Leiden Riddle*), while others were recorded in archaic runic inscriptions (e.g., *Dream of the Rood*, *Franks Casket*). Nineteenth-century philologists recognized that the mass of poems transmitted in manuscripts from ca. 1000 could not all be contemporaneous with each other. Linguistic and metrical differences between these works suggested that they were composed at various dates over the course of several centuries. Transcription errors, meanwhile, confirmed that the manuscripts contained copies of works that, in some cases, must have been committed to parchment well before the year 1000. The presence in late manuscripts of works demonstrably composed centuries earlier (such as *Dream of the Rood* and *Leiden Riddle*) also made it clear that dates of extant manuscripts had no connection to dates of composition. For Old English poems to be adduced responsibly in studies pertaining to the history of the English language or the history of Anglo-Saxon literature, it is necessary to dissociate them from their haphazard contexts of preservation and resituate them in their probable contexts of composition.

A History of Old English Meter carved the corpus of Old English poetry into four periods (archaic, Cynewulfian, Alfredian, late) by tracking the distribution of metrical archaisms and innovations (1992: 348–51). The metrical system remained stable – the basic four-position principle of verse construction obtained throughout the Anglo-Saxon period – but the ability of poets to fill metrical positions with linguistic material changed as the spoken language evolved. *Beowulf*, *Genesis A*, *Daniel*, *Exodus*, *Guthlac A*, and *Christ III* rank among the

earliest compositions (ca. 675–750?) because these works contain the highest incidence of verses requiring archaic phonology for scansion. The works of Cynewulf, along with *Andreas*, *Phoenix*, and *Guthlac B*, belong to a later period (ca. 775–850?) of classical poetry, since they conform to the traditional conventions of versification, but exhibit a measurable decline in the use of archaic forms. Works belonging to the Alfredian period, meanwhile, combine the loss of archaisms with the introduction of several linguistically conditioned innovations. Poems composed during the tenth and eleventh centuries continue this trend, evincing few archaisms alongside a wider array of innovations. Earlier philologists, such as Richter (1910) and Sarrazin (1907), had reached similar conclusions in less comprehensive studies, but the critique of their arguments mounted by Amos (1980) rendered many scholars skeptical of linguistic dating criteria. Fulk effectively turned the tide by demonstrating that such skepticism was not intellectually defensible: the concentration of archaisms in some works and the concentration of innovations in others cannot reasonably be regarded as a coincidence.

Although it resuscitated an earlier tradition of philological research, *A History of Old English Meter* represented a genuinely new development in the discipline. Advances in Indo-European linguistics, as well as in Old English phonology and morphology, consistently informed Fulk's argumentation and distinguished it from that of his predecessors. The comprehensive scope of the book – the fact that it assessed the chronological significance of every proposed archaism and innovation – was likewise unprecedented, having been neither achieved nor attempted in any previous study. The book's comprehensiveness has doubtless been instrumental in creating a consensus among philologists that Fulk's central argument is correct. When examining one dating criterion in isolation, it is possible to dismiss its distribution as an accident of dialectal or stylistic variation, but when more than six criteria conspire to adumbrate the same chronology, it becomes difficult to doubt their reliability. Subsequent philological research has repeatedly validated Fulk's conclusions and materialized independent support for the relative chronology (e.g., Russom 2002, Cronan 2004, Lapidge 2006, Neidorf 2013–14, Bredehoft 2014). Subsequent research has, in fact, generated no compelling reason to doubt that Fulk's relative chronology is essentially correct, as B.R. Hutcheson observed when explaining his views on the dating of *Beowulf*:

I myself believe *Beowulf* is probably an eighth-century poem, and that the weight of all of the evidence Fulk presents in his book tells strongly in favor of an eighth-century date. This weight is considerable. In the now over ten years since *A History of Old English Meter* appeared, I have yet to see a scholarly argument that succeeds in meeting or even attempts to meet his arguments head-on, never mind refute them (2004: 299).

More than a decade later, Hutcheson's statement remains accurate, and it might be added that credence in Fulk's relative chronology has increased with the proliferation of studies that independently corroborate his conclusions. Objections can be raised here and there, but it is doubtful that a superior holistic explanation for the distribution of archaisms and innovations in the extant corpus will ever materialize. Until an alternative hypothesis is shown to explain these regularities more effectively, Fulk's conclusions will continue to provide the chronological framework for all serious research on Old English poetry.

The one aspect of *A History of Old English Meter* to engender detailed disputation was its argumentation concerning Kaluza's law (1992: 153–68, 381–92). Building on the work of Kaluza (1896) and Bliss (1967), Fulk demonstrated that the application of resolution under secondary stress in *Beowulf* alone is governed by etymological length distinctions that became phonologically indistinct early in the Anglo-Saxon period. The conditioning behind this regularity had eluded previous investigators, but Fulk proposed that it was phonologically conditioned: the *Beowulf* poet distinguished between etymologically long and short desinences because he composed while such distinctions remained audible in the language he spoke. If this explanation is correct, then it is probable that *Beowulf* was composed prior to 725, since distinctions crucial to the operation of the law had collapsed in Mercia by that time. The emergence of such a firm *terminus ad quem* for *Beowulf* naturally made Kaluza's law the subject of controversy, and some researchers went on to argue that it was conditioned by morphology, semantics, or oral tradition. A weakness common to these explanations is their inability to account for the diminished observation of Kaluza's law in later poems – a phenomenon collaterally explained under Fulk's chronological interpretation. The alternative explanations have received few adherents, and a recent review of the literature on Kaluza's law vindicated Fulk's position, concluding that the hypothesis of phonological conditioning provides the only tenable explanation for this regularity (Neidorf and Pascual 2014). Consequently, the impression that Fulk is the scholar who conclusively dated *Beowulf* appears justified.

Fulk's achievements extend far beyond the study of Old English poetry, however. In recent years, he has successfully queried the long-standing assumption that most Old English prose works were composed during or after the reign of King Alfred (2010a, 2012b). The surviving prose works, like much of the poetic corpus, are preserved predominantly in manuscripts from the tenth and eleventh centuries. Scholars have been inclined to assume chronological parity between composition and preservation, but Fulk has demonstrated that there are strong linguistic reasons to doubt that a substantial portion of the prose corpus was composed in the later Anglo-Saxon period. Mercian

features pervade the language of many anonymous, undated works, including *Alexander's Letter to Aristotle*, *The Wonders of the East*, *Bald's Leechbook*, *Scriftboc*, and various homilies and saint's lives. The concentration of Mercianisms in these works distinguishes them from all works known to have originated after the year 950, which are invariably composed in an unmixed form of the West Saxon literary language (2012b). The virtual absence of Mercian features from the corpus of verifiably late works suggests that the composition of works containing myriad Mercianisms substantially antedated the middle of the tenth century. Fulk concludes that although these works cannot be narrowly dated, it is most natural to regard them as products of the century-long hegemony of Æthelbald (r. 716–57) and Offa (r. 757–96). Certainly, that period is likelier to have witnessed the cultivation of a Mercian prose tradition than periods where power and learning in the region had been decimated (2010a: 71–9).

The intellectual force behind Fulk's work on the dating of poetry and prose is the philological conviction that accurate treatment of an extant text requires informed conjecture about its composition and transmission. As Fulk remarked in the methodological introduction to *A History of Old English Meter*, the positivistic desire to eliminate conjecture from scholarship surrenders the possibility of accuracy for the certainty of error (1992: 18). Treating a classical Latin work as a ninth-century composition merely because its earliest witness is a Carolingian manuscript guarantees a gross distortion of linguistic and literary history. What licenses this dubious practice in Anglo-Saxon studies is the false binary that positivists have erected between certain and uncertain knowledge: the date of a manuscript is considered to be certain, while the date of composition is regarded as a matter of paralyzing uncertainty. In his brilliant methodological treatise "On Argumentation" (2003), Fulk demonstrated the illogic of this epistemological paradigm, contending that relative probability, not absolute certainty, must be the criterion for validation in philological research. Fulk also expounded his views on probabilism in a series of illuminating essays on textual criticism, which emphasize the need for reasoned conjecture in the editing of medieval works and expose the contradictions inherent in textual conservatism (1996b, 1997b, 2004b, 2007b). Conjectural emendation is a rational response to indications of textual corruption, whereas the refusal to emend obscures history and denies the material realities of manual reproduction.

A claim that recurs throughout Fulk's writings on textual criticism is that theory must not supplant practice. In earlier scholarship, "the debate over textual emendation was waged vicariously in the form of editions themselves" (1997b: 43), whereas recent decades have witnessed the proliferation of theoretical manifestos that aim to prescribe editorial practice. Fulk is a forthright critic of this trend:

Enunciating larger principles of textual editing is perhaps more gratifying; it is certainly more congenial to literary studies as they are now practised. But the temptation to develop larger editorial principles in a textual vacuum should be avoided: it is only in the act of editing that the issues which should determine those principles come into sharp focus (2007b: 153).

Fulk's prodigious editorial output leaves no doubt that he practices what he preaches. Perhaps his most celebrated achievement in this realm is his herculean revision of *Klaeber's Beowulf* (2008), which has become the standard edition of the poem cited in professional scholarship. This book won the International Society of Anglo-Saxonists' 2009 Award for Best Edition, an honor that Fulk earned a second time in 2013 for co-editing *The Old English Canons of Theodore* (2012) with Stefan Jurasinski. Further accolades may follow the publication of Fulk's critical edition (currently in preparation) of a collection of hitherto unpublished Old English anonymous homilies. Another extraordinary editorial feat is Fulk's contribution of hundreds of pages of skaldic verse to the monumental *Skaldic Poetry of the Scandinavian Middle Ages* project (Whaley 2013). Editorial competence beyond the domain of Old English is likewise evinced in Fulk's preparation of an anthology for his *Introduction to Middle English: Grammar • Texts* (2012a). And the editorial labor informing Fulk's two major contributions to Old English pedagogy – his revision of Pope's *Eight Old English Poems* (2001) and his own *Introductory Grammar of Old English* (2014a) – should not be underestimated. A laudable feature of these pedagogical resources is that they do not shelter students from philology, but introduce them to its achievements with learned textual commentary.

The confidence required to embrace such daunting editorial undertakings surely derived, to a large extent, from Fulk's mastery of Indo-European linguistics. Before he turned his attention to the editorial projects that appeared throughout the latter half of his career, Fulk made distinguished contributions to historical language study. In addition to a monograph on *The Origins of Indo-European Quantitative Ablaut* (1986), Fulk wrote articles on English and Welsh etymology (1978, 1979), Celtic phonology (1980), the evolution of the Germanic language family (1987a, 1988, 1993b), and numerous aspects of the history of the English language, including verb morphology (1993a), syllable structure (1997a, 1998b), open syllable lengthening (1996a), Anglo-Frisian sound change (1998a), and high vowel deletion (2010c). Detailed summary is not possible, but Fulk offered the following characterization of his linguistic work: "My contributions ... have mostly been devoted to examining the ways that phonology and morphology interact to produce change" (Grant 2014: 360). Other characteristic features of Fulk's linguistic scholarship are its philological concern

with the authenticity of the pertinent data (particularly evident in his reassessment of high vowel deletion) and its incorporation of insights derived from metrical scansion. Meter naturally informs discussion of syllable structure and sound change, but it is also the source of several morphological insights registered in *A Grammar of Old English*, Vol. II: *Morphology* (2011).¹ Originally conceived by the late Richard M. Hogg, Fulk brought this volume to completion after Hogg's death by revising his drafts and composing the chapters on verbs. The Hogg-Fulk grammar is now the authoritative standard in both linguistic and philological research.

Scholars immersed in editorial and linguistic scholarship tend to recuse themselves from questions of literary history and interpretation, but not Fulk, who is evidently a fearless polymath. With Christopher M. Cain, Fulk co-authored *A History of Old English Literature* (2002; 2nd ed. 2013), which is far more comprehensive in its coverage of texts and its bibliographical guidance than any preceding literary history. The book is easily the best available survey of the interpretive controversies generated by the corpus of Old English literature. For the student interested in *Beowulf* criticism in particular, though, Fulk's *Interpretations of Beowulf: A Critical Anthology* (1991) offers excellent guidance. Since translation is a form of continuous interpretation, it is fair to regard Fulk's translation of all of the texts in *The Beowulf Manuscript* (2010b) as one of his greatest interpretive works. On account of its immense philological authority, this translation is the first place to turn when wrestling with an interpretive crux in *Beowulf*. It is the culmination of Fulk's longstanding interest in understanding the poem, registered beforehand in lexical studies (2005a, 2005b) and in interpretive articles focusing on Unferth (1987b), Scyld Scefing (1989), Offa's queen (2004c), and *Beowulf* (2007a). Other significant interpretive works in Fulk's corpus include studies of morality in *Hrafnkels saga Freysgoða* (1986–9), myth in the Anglo-Saxon royal genealogies (2002b), and homoeroticism in the *Canons of Theodore* (2004a). An article that only Fulk could have written is his synthesis of "Rhetoric, Form, and Linguistic Structure in Early Germanic Verse" (1996c), which explains stylistic differences between West Germanic and North Germanic poetry as consequences of their divergent language histories.

Some of Fulk's most remarkable achievements, however, are to be found in his contributions to the study of English historical metrics.

¹ In his *JEL* interview, Fulk commented on the relationship between metrical and linguistic studies, writing: "poetic meter is the best source of information we have about the prosody of languages no longer spoken, yielding information about stress, vowel quantity, syllable weight, and even the etymology of words of unknown derivation in the case of certain disyllabic stems that take monosyllabic scansion in Old English verse. For example, *symbol* 'feast' has been derived from *sumbil- or *sumil-, but because the word is usually to be scanned as monosyllabic in verse, *sumli is much likelier" (Grant 2014: 361).

In addition to its chronological arguments, *A History of Old English Meter* vindicated the metrical theory of Eduard Sievers (1893) in its discovery of the Rule of the Coda (i.e., Fulk's law) and its defense of ictus at the tertiary level. On several issues where Bliss and Sievers disagreed, Fulk demonstrated that Sievers' position is superior (see R.J. Pascual's essay in the present volume). Fulk also observed that the fact that Sieversian metrics permitted the detection of Kaluza's law – a linguistic regularity that is motivationally independent – provides firm confirmation that Sievers' views must be essentially correct (1992: 26–7). Conversely, any metrical system whose tenets obscure such regularities must fail to describe the principles of Old English verse construction (Pascual 2014: 809–11). Fulk elaborated this point in a particularly brilliant article where he adduced new evidence for the veracity of Sieversian metrics from the Early Middle English *Poema Morale* (2002a). Scansion of this work indicates that its author made use of the device known as resolution, wherein the placement of ictus on a light syllable absorbs the following syllable into a single metrical position. The discovery of resolution in *Poema Morale* offers stunning confirmation of Sieversian metrics, since Sievers postulated the existence of resolution as a metrical reality for the sole purpose of enabling his four-position analysis of Old English verse. Yet Fulk's demonstration of the actuality of resolution in early English metrics is only his most dramatic vindication of Sievers. Every chapter of *A History of Old English Meter* furnishes reasons to believe that Sievers is correct and that the edifice of knowledge erected upon his system possesses secure foundations.

Surveying Fulk's accomplishments, one cannot help but wonder how one man managed to generate such an impressive corpus of philological scholarship. Of course, his achievements would not be possible without immense natural gifts, tremendous energy, and a commitment to lifelong learning. But another *sine qua non* responsible for the extraordinary quality of Fulk's work is his clear-sighted conception of the scholarly enterprise. There are abundant indications in Fulk's writings that he regards scholarship as a cooperative effort to understand reality. For him, the purpose of scholarship is not the expression of individual subjectivity, but the generation of insights into common objects of study. This perspective distinguishes Fulk from many contemporary humanists, and it explains why co-authorship is a common phenomenon in his corpus. Fulk's willingness to co-author works where one author's contributions cannot readily be distinguished from another's (e.g., Pope-Fulk 2001, Fulk and Harris 2002, Fulk, Bjork, and Niles 2008, Hogg and Fulk 2011, Fulk and Jurasinski 2012, Fulk and Cain 2013) indicates that his sole concern is the transmission and advancement of knowledge. If he regarded scholarship as an opportunity to offer insights into his mind and personality, these works would

never have been written. Their existence is the clearest sign that what motivates Fulk's work is the desire to contribute to a body of knowledge that is both progressive and impersonal. The conception of scholarship informing these works is noble, inspiring, and indispensable for reaching accurate conclusion about reality.

Fulk is a true Popperian, interested principally in the explanatory merits of hypotheses, not in the circumstances in which they were first generated. To Fulk, it does not matter whether an idea was conceived in the last year or the last century – all that matters is whether it possesses stronger claims to probability than its competitors. This conviction is apparent in Fulk's readiness to vindicate positions held by philologists during the nineteenth or early-twentieth century. Fulk's research is strikingly original, but the original dimensions of his work differ from the kinds of originality sought in much contemporary scholarship. For him, the discovery of new reasons to maintain older views constitutes a sufficiently original contribution. Fulk is far from the first scholar to argue that *Beowulf* is an archaic poem, but he is the first scholar to ascertain the most compelling linguistic reason for this conclusion. Much recent Old English scholarship, on the other hand, seeks to reach conclusions that no other human being ever previously reached (e.g., Kiernan 1981), but Fulk's concern with probability has protected his work from this vice. The desire to position oneself as the unique possessor of insights that overturn an entire research tradition is obviously incompatible with Fulk's understanding of scholarship as a cooperative and collaborative enterprise. There is wise humility in Fulk's work, in its recognition that at some point in the past two centuries of scholarship, some predecessor is likely to have hit upon the truth. Strengthening that scholar's position with new evidence or argumentation is a more meaningful contribution to knowledge than propounding wholly original views that are manifestly improbable.

The state of Old English philology has changed enormously on account of Fulk's manifold contributions. In the 1980s, in the aftermath of Amos (1980) and similar works, there was widespread skepticism about the reliability of philological methods, with the result that continuity with the earlier philological tradition appeared undesirable to many. A sense developed that conclusions reached in technical studies about the composition or transmission of a work could be dismissed as mere possibilities with no greater claims to probability than an untrained individual's speculations. With the prestige of the philological disciplines on the wane, the production of research vitiated by anachronism and ethnocentrism proliferated. The emergence of Fulk, signaled most dramatically by the publication of *A History of Old English Meter*, did much to reverse this trend and improve both the credibility and viability of philological scholarship. His work did more than change minds – it brought about something of a renaissance,

inspiring junior scholars to become philologists and rousing senior scholars to return to technical questions that seemed settled. Thanks to Fulk, the philological knowledge available to contemporary scholars vastly exceeds what was available in earlier generations. His linguistic and metrical work opened doors for much further research, and his editorial and pedagogical work provides the next generation with the tools required to undertake that research. The future of the discipline is brighter as a result of his labors.

The present volume is a testament to Fulk's extraordinary influence. It demonstrates the current vitality of the technical disciplines encompassed by philology, including metrics, phonology, morphology, syntax, etymology, lexicology, orthography, and textual criticism. The following essays also illustrate the essential role that philological knowledge plays when addressing questions of literary history and interpretation. Because Fulk's work revolutionized the contemporary study of Old English poetry, many of this book's authors contributed studies of individual poems, including *Beowulf*, *Andreas*, *Genesis A*, *Fortunes of Men*, and *Dream of the Rood*. The editors believe it would be a fitting tribute to Fulk if a volume in his honor were to become essential reading for students of Old English poetry. Yet the deeper purpose of this book is to pay tribute to a scholar whom many regard, with good reason, as the greatest philologist of the past century. Few scholars in the history of the discipline have generated bodies of work comparable to Fulk's, and his achievements demand recognition. In subsequent centuries, his name is sure to join the pantheon of great philological authorities alongside those of Sievers, Luick, and Klaeber. When admiring the monuments of Old English philology, *eald enta geweorc*, one often wishes to express gratitude to their authors personally. For the giants of yesteryear, this is no longer possible, but for the giant who still roams among us, this book is the field's way of saying thanks.

Bibliography

- Amos, A.C. 1980. *Linguistic Means of Determining the Dates of Old English Literary Texts*. Cambridge, MA: Medieval Academy of America.
- Bliss, A.J. 1967. *The Metre of Beowulf*. Rev. ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bredehoft, T.A. 2014. "The Date of Composition of *Beowulf* and the Evidence of Metrical Evolution." In *The Dating of Beowulf: A Reassessment*. Ed. L. Neidorf. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer. 97–111.
- Cronan, D. 2004. "Poetic Words, Conservatism, and the Dating of Old English Poetry." *Anglo-Saxon England* 33: 23–50.
- Fulk, R.D. 1978. "Old English *icge* and *incge*." *English Studies* 59: 255–6.
- Fulk, R.D. 1979. "Two Words in *Y Gododdin*." *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 28: 400–2.

- Fulk, R.D. 1980. "The Celtic Sonorants." *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 29: 1–16.
- Fulk, R.D. 1986. *The Origins of Indo-European Quantitative Ablaut*. Innsbruck: Universität Innsbruck.
- Fulk, R.D. 1986–89. "The Moral System of *Hrafnkels saga Freysgoða*." *Saga-Book of the Viking Society for Northern Research* 22: 1–32.
- Fulk, R.D. 1987a. "The Reduplicating Verbs and Their Development in Northwest Germanic." *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 109: 159–79.
- Fulk, R.D. 1987b. "Unferth and His Name." *Modern Philology* 85: 113–27.
- Fulk, R.D. 1988. "PIE Schwa in Germanic Unstressed Syllables." In *Die Laryngalthetheorie und die Rekonstruktion des indogermanischen Laut- und Formensystems*. Ed. A. Bammesberger. Heidelberg: Carl Winter. 153–77.
- Fulk, R.D. 1989. "An Eddic Analogue to the Scyld Scefing Story." *Review of English Studies* 40: 313–22.
- Fulk, R.D., ed. 1991. *Interpretations of Beowulf: A Critical Anthology*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Fulk, R.D. 1992. *A History of Old English Meter*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Fulk, R.D. 1993a. "Old English *dōn*, *dyde*, and the Verba Pura in Germanic." *Indogermanische Forschungen* 98: 241–51.
- Fulk, R.D. 1993b. "Paradigm Regularization and the Verschärfung." In *Comparative-Historical Linguistics: Indo-European and Finno-Ugric. Papers in Honor of Oswald Szemerényi, III*. Ed. B. Brogyanyi and R. Lipp. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 341–51.
- Fulk, R.D. 1996a. "Consonant Doubling and Open Syllable Lengthening in the *Ormulum*." *Anglia* 114: 483–513.
- Fulk, R.D. 1996b. "Inductive Methods in the Textual Criticism of Old English Verse." *Medievalia et Humanistica* 23: 1–24.
- Fulk, R.D. 1996c. "Rhetoric, Form, and Linguistic Structure in Early Germanic Verse: Toward a Synthesis." *Interdisciplinary Journal for Germanic Linguistics and Semiotic Analysis* 1: 63–88.
- Fulk, R.D. 1997a. "Ambisyllabicity in Old English: A Contrary View." In *Insights in Germanic Linguistics II: Classic and Contemporary*. Ed. I. Rauch and G.F. Carr. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 29–45.
- Fulk, R.D. 1997b. "Textual Criticism." In *A Beowulf Handbook*. Ed. R.E. Bjork and J.D. Niles. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. 35–53.
- Fulk, R.D. 1998a. "The Chronology of Anglo-Frisian Sound Changes." In *Approaches to Old Frisian Philology*. Ed. R.H. Bremmer, Jr., T.S.B. Johnston, and O. Vries. Amsterdam: Rodopi. 139–54.
- Fulk, R.D. 1998b. "The Role of Syllable Structure in Old English Quantitative Sound Changes." *NOWELE* 33: 3–35.

- Fulk, R.D. 2002a. "Early Middle English Evidence for Old English Metrics: Resolution in *Poema Morale*." *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 14: 331–55.
- Fulk, R.D. 2002b. "Myth in Historical Perspective: The Case of Pagan Deities in the Anglo-Saxon Royal Genealogies." In *Myth: A New Symposium*. Ed. G. Schrempp and W. Hansen. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 225–39.
- Fulk, R.D. 2003. "On Argumentation in Old English Philology, with Particular Reference to the Editing and Dating of *Beowulf*." *Anglo-Saxon England* 32: 1–26.
- Fulk, R.D. 2004a. "Male Homoeroticism in the Old English Canons of Theodore." In *Sex and Sexuality in Anglo-Saxon England: Essays in Memory of Daniel Gillmore Calder*. Ed. C.B. Pasternack and L.M. Weston. Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies. 1–34.
- Fulk, R.D. 2004b. "Old English *weorc*: Where Does It Hurt? South of the Thames." *ANQ* 17: 6–12.
- Fulk, R.D. 2004c. "The Name of Offa's Queen: *Beowulf* 1931–2." *Anglia* 122: 614–39.
- Fulk, R.D. 2005a. "Afloat in Semantic Space: Old English *sund* and the Nature of *Beowulf*'s Exploit with Breca." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 104: 457–74.
- Fulk, R.D. 2005b. "Some Lexical Problems in the Interpretation and Textual Criticism of *Beowulf* (Verses 414a, 845b, 986a, 1320a, 1375a)." *Studia Neophilologica* 77: 145–55.
- Fulk, R.D. 2007a. "The Etymology and Significance of *Beowulf*'s Name." *Anglo-Saxon* 1: 109–36.
- Fulk, R.D. 2007b. "The Textual Criticism of Frederick Klaeber's *Beowulf*." In *Constructing Nations, Reconstructing Myths: Essays in Honour of T.A. Shippey*. Ed. A. Wawn, with G. Johnson and J. Walter. Turnhout: Brepols. 131–53.
- Fulk, R.D. 2010a. "Localizing and Dating Old English Anonymous Prose, and How the Inherent Problems Relate to Anglo-Saxon Legislation." In *English Law Before Magna Carta: Felix Liebermann and Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*. Ed. S. Jurasinski, L. Oliver, and A. Rabin. Leiden: Brill. 59–79
- Fulk, R.D., ed. and trans. 2010b. *The Beowulf Manuscript: Complete Texts and The Fight at Finnsburg*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Fulk, R.D. 2010c. "The Roles of Phonology and Analogy in Old English High Vowel Deletion." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 108: 126–44.
- Fulk, R.D. 2012a. *An Introduction to Middle English: Grammar • Texts*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
- Fulk, R.D. 2012b. "Anglian Features in Late West Saxon Prose." In *Analysing Older English*. Ed. D. Denison, R. Bermúdez-Otero,

- C. McCully, and E. Moore. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 63–74.
- Fulk, R.D. 2014a. *An Introductory Grammar of Old English, with an Anthology of Readings*. Tempe: ACMRS.
- Fulk, R.D. 2014b. "Beowulf and Language History." In *The Dating of Beowulf: A Reassessment*. Ed. L. Neidorf. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer. 19–36.
- Fulk, R.D., R.E. Bjork, and J.D. Niles, eds. 2008. *Klaeber's Beowulf: Fourth Edition*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Fulk, R.D. and C.M. Cain. 2013. *A History of Old English Literature*. 2nd ed. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. 1st edition published in 2002.
- Fulk, R.D. and J. Harris. 2002. "Beowulf's Name." In *Beowulf: A Verse Translation*. Trans. S. Heaney. Ed. D. Donoghue. New York: W. W. Norton. 98–100.
- Fulk, R.D. and S. Jurasinski, eds. 2012. *The Old English Canons of Theodore*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grant, C. J. 2014. "Interview with Robert D. Fulk." *Journal of English Linguistics* 42: 359–79.
- Hogg, R.M. and R.D. Fulk. 2011. *A Grammar of Old English*, Vol. II: *Morphology*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hutcheson, B.R. 2004. "Kaluza's Law, the Dating of *Beowulf*, and the Old English Poetic Tradition." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 103: 297–322.
- Kaluza, M. 1896. "Zur Betonungs- und Verslehre des Altenglischen." In *Festschrift zum siebenzigsten Geburtstage Oskar Schade*. Königsberg: Hartungsche verlagsdruckerei. 101–34.
- Kiernan, K.S. 1981: *Beowulf and the Beowulf Manuscript*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. Reprinted with supplements in 1996 by Michigan University Press.
- Lapidge, M. 2006. "An Aspect of Old English Poetic Diction: The Postpositioning of Prepositions." In *Inside Old English: Essays in Honour of Bruce Mitchell*. Ed. J. Walmsley. Oxford: Blackwell. 153–80.
- Neidorf, L. 2013–14. "Lexical Evidence for the Relative Chronology of Old English Poetry." *SELIM* 20: 7–48.
- Neidorf, L. and R.J. Pascual. 2014. "The Language of *Beowulf* and the Conditioning of Kaluza's Law." *Neophilologus* 98: 657–73.
- Pascual, R.J. 2014. "Ælfric's Rhythmical Prose and the Study of Old English Metre." *English Studies* 95: 803–23.
- Pope, J.C., ed. 2001. *Eight Old English Poems*. 3rd ed. Revised by R.D. Fulk. New York: Norton.
- Richter, C. 1910. *Chronologische Studien zur angelsächsischen Literatur auf Grund sprachlich-metrischer Kriterien*. Halle: Niemeyer.
- Russom, G. 2002. "Dating Criteria for Old English Poems." In *Studies in the History of the English Language: A Millennial Perspective*. Ed. D. Minkova and R. Stockwell. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 245–66.

- Sarrazin, G. 1907. "Zur Chronologie und Verfasserfrage angelsächsischer Dichtungen." *Englische Studien* 38: 145–95.
- Sievers, E. 1893. *Altgermanische Metrik*. Halle: M. Niemeyer.
- Whaley, D., ed. 2013. *Skaldic Poetry of the Scandinavian Middle Ages, Volume 1: Poetry from the Kings' Sagas 1*. Turnhout: Brepols.

Sievers, Bliss, Fulk, and Old English Metrical Theory

Rafael J. Pascual

Much of *A History of Old English Meter* (Fulk 1992) is concerned with chronological questions, and it is matters of chronology that have elicited the most fervent responses from critics and admirers alike. What has often been overlooked in its aftermath is the critical reassessment of Old English metrical theory that *A History of Old English Meter* also contains. In the introduction, for example, Fulk observed that the *Beowulf* poet's compliance with Kaluza's law provides firm indication that Sievers' positional analysis of Old English meter is essentially correct (1992: §§26, 65, 69).¹ Moreover, in chapter VII, in which he endeavored to gauge the chronological significance of the variable metrical behaviour of so-called tertiary stress, Fulk detected a regularity that led him to conclude that syllable quantity is more integral to the formation of metrical ictus than phonological stress (1992: §260), thereby making a significant revision to traditional Sieversian metrics. This conclusion, in conjunction with some distributional evidence from a large corpus of Old English poetry, allowed Fulk to demonstrate that Bliss's scansional system (for which see Bliss 1962 and 1967), despite its widespread use in the profession, is in actuality incompatible with Sievers' and therefore fundamentally erroneous.

This crucial aspect of *A History of Old English Meter*, however, has either passed unnoticed or been misunderstood by the majority of Old English scholars. In one of the most visible elementary essays on *Beowulfian* meter, for instance, Robert P. Stockwell and Donka Minkova describe Fulk's work as "a triumph of the Sievers-Bliss-Cable tradition" (1997: 58), a statement that is not quite accurate in the light of Fulk's conclusions about metrical theory.² A.J. Bliss cannot be regarded as the successor to Eduard Sievers if, as Fulk demonstrated, it is precisely Bliss's departures from Sievers that constitute the main

¹ For the formulation of the four-position principle, see Sievers 1893: §8; for an explanation of its psychological plausibility, see Cable 1974: 84-93 and Fulk 2002: 337-9.

² For a similar assessment, see also Bredehoft (2005: 7), who wrongly states that "Fulk adopts Bliss's scansion system wholesale."

flaws of Blissian metrics. Consequently, although it is fair to say that Fulk's work is a victory of Sievers, it is paradoxical to consider it also a triumph of Bliss. One factor that underlies the scholarly community's failure to apprehend Fulk's views on Old English metrical theory is the fact that *A History of Old English Meter*, in part because of its title, has been taken to be a chronological study exclusively, and hence its theoretical component has been relegated to a second place. Another probable factor is the linguistic complexity inherent in Fulk's theoretical discussion, which, despite the admirable clarity of his style, has rendered his conclusions inaccessible to some.³ Therefore, the aim of this essay is to explain in what ways Fulk has demonstrated Sievers' metrical theory to be superior to Bliss's,⁴ in the hope that the view that Blissian metrics constitutes a continuation of Sievers will be abandoned.

One reason for the general currency of the notion that Sievers' and Bliss's analyses form a harmonious, unitary interpretation of Old English meter is that Bliss himself called his work "a triumphant vindication of Sievers" (1967: v). The clearest sign of continuity with Sievers is Bliss's incorporation of the well-known five basic verse types into his metrical theory. As E.G. Stanley pointed out in his penetrating review of *The Metre of Beowulf*, however, Bliss clung to Sievers' verse notation only for reasons of practicality (1963: 49). Thus, although his conclusions were to a large extent at odds with Sievers', the five-type verse catalogue was so entrenched in the minds of Anglo-Saxonists that Bliss knew that this particular element of Sieversian metrics had to be retained in order for his theory to be accepted. Stanley, crediting Bliss's innovations, put it this way in his review:

Bliss, who is aware of his readers' dependence on Sievers, is not courageous enough to break with a system he has shown to be fundamentally faulty. As a result he encumbers the clear lines of his own system with debris saved from the wreckage of Sievers'. In his eagerness to make us accept a new system he tries to cajole us into thinking that we are still clutching to the old (1963: 49).

³ Thomas A. Bredehoft's remarks are perhaps revealing: "When I have told other medievalists, for example, that I was embarking on a project on Old English metre, more than one has asked me, 'So have you actually read Fulk's *A History of Old English Meter*?' as if merely reading it, to say nothing of reading it critically, were itself a monumental accomplishment" (2005: 4; see also 126, n. 16). Bredehoft argues that the complexity of Fulk's book is a sign of the unreliability of traditional metrics. For a detailed refutation of Bredehoft's argument, see Pascual 2014: 806–11.

⁴ Remarkably, some of the non-Sieversian features that Bliss proposed in *The Metre of Beowulf* had already been advanced by Erich Neuner in his 1920 doctoral dissertation *Ueber ein- und dreihellige Halbverse in der altenglischen alliterierenden Poesie*. His theoretical innovations were heavily criticized by James W. Bright in an incisive review of Neuner's work (1921).

When Stanley made the claim that Bliss had refuted Sievers' system, he was probably thinking of Bliss's rejection of Sievers' distinction between tertiary stress and absence of stress (Bliss 1967: §92), since it is this equation of tertiary stress with no stress that furnishes the basis for most of the unorthodox features of Bliss's metrical formalism. These include his theory of light verses, his theory of the caesura, and his acceptance of three-position verses, all of which are excluded from a Sieversian framework. As will be seen below, Fulk not only demonstrated all of these features of Blissian metrics to lack a sufficient empirical basis, but also corroborated Sievers' analysis beyond reasonable doubt.

A major point on which Sievers' and Bliss's theories differ is the analysis of verses like *Beowulf* 2888b, *syððan æþelingas*,⁵ which contain a single stress-word.⁶ According to Sieversian metrics, the structure of such verses is identical to that of verses like 11b, *þæt wæs gōd cyning*, with two stress-words. Since both must be scanned as standard type C verses, each of them is assumed to contain two clashing lifts. In l. 2888b, it is the medial long syllable *-ling-* that must furnish the second lift,⁷ as a result of which it is believed to receive tertiary stress (Sievers 1893: §8.2.). The central motivation for this two-lift analysis of *syððan æþelingas* is that type A3 verses, which unambiguously contain a single lift,⁸ are excluded from the off-verse (see, for example, Sievers 1893: §16.I.1.c). This regularity led Sievers to conclude that, regardless of its number of stress-words, a verse that occurs in the second half of the

⁵ All the verses from *Beowulf* are from Klaeber's fourth edition (Fulk, Bjork, and Niles 2008), henceforth cited as *Klaeber IV*.

⁶ Stress-words, as opposed to particles and proclitics, are those lexical items that, by virtue of their high semantic import, always receive both prosodic stress in the ordinary language and metrical ictus in verse. They include nouns, adjectives, non-finite verbs, and polysyllabic adverbs. On the metrical behavior of stress-words, particles, and proclitics, see Kuhn 1933 and Pascual 2015.

⁷ It is important to note that, whereas a single postvocalic consonant suffices to make a stressed syllable long, unstressed syllables are short unless they contain two postvocalic consonants. For example, the noun *col*, "coal," constitutes a long syllable, but the second syllable of the adjective *swicol*, "deceitful," is short. The rationale behind this behavioral difference is that quantitative distinctions among syllables are not as clear in the absence of stress as under stressed conditions (see Fulk 1992: §264 and n. 104; 1995: 495). Thus, the consonantal material in the coda of an unstressed syllable must be particularly heavy in order for that syllable to be perceived as long by speakers of the language.

⁸ The traditional view is that type A3 verses are two-lift verses with reversed alliteration, but this interpretation is incompatible with Geoffrey Russom's hierarchy of metrical prominence (Russom 1987: 71–3; 1998: 64–86; Terasawa 2011: 19–21), according to which alliteration is systematically assigned to the first of two lifts. In this essay, therefore, A3 verses are conceived of as containing only one full lift. Perhaps this verse type was formed on the analogy of standard four-position on-verses with ornamental alliteration. Poets might have compensated for the excessive weight of a non-ictic and yet alliterating finite verb at the beginning of a type B or C verse by eliminating the second ictic position from its coda, thereby giving rise to type A3. On non-ictic, ornamental alliteration, see Bliss 1967: §20; Pascual 2015; and Mark Griffith's contribution to the present volume.

line must contain two lifts. Bliss, by contrast, did not consider the distributional restriction on type A3 verses compelling enough to assign two metrical stresses to a single stress-word like *æpelingas*. Instead, he classified the off-verse *syððan æpelingas* as light – that is, as a verse with only one lift – thereby allowing one-lift verses in the second half-line. In order to justify this radical departure from Sieversian metrics, Bliss offered some statistical evidence: while normal type C verses with two stress-words are frequent in the off-verse, Sieversian type C verses with one stress-word are much more regular in the on-verse; and while double alliteration tends to appear in on-verses with two stress words, in one-stress-word on-verses it is very rare (1967: §70). Bliss maintained that these differences corroborate that a verse like *syððan æpelingas*, on account of its single stress-word, belongs to a different structural category than a verse with two stress-words like *þæt wæs gōd cyning*.

Although Bliss's evidence might seem strong at first, Fulk demonstrated that it does not support his interpretation of verses like *syððan æpelingas* (1992: §§200–1). The low incidence of double alliteration in verses consisting of one stress-word is devoid of metrical significance, as the Old English language is not well-supplied with single words with internal alliteration. Furthermore, because the syntax of the on-verse is different from that of the off-verse, the higher incidence of verses with one stress-word in the first half-line cannot be unquestionably attributed to meter. In other words, Bliss's evidence confirms the existence of linguistic differences between the two verse types, but it fails to disprove Sievers' interpretation that both *syððan æpelingas* and *þæt wæs gōd cyning* present the same metrical configuration. In fact, as Fulk pointed out (1992: §202), Bliss simply ignored the strongest argument in favor of Sievers' assignment of metrical ictus to *-ling-* in *syððan æpelingas*, namely that verses that unambiguously contain one lift are excluded from the second half-line. The incompatibility of Bliss's theory of light verses with such an incontrovertible distributional fact can only be taken as a sign of its unreliability. By exposing the descriptive insufficiency of this basic tenet of Bliss's system, Fulk corroborated the superiority of Sievers' competing interpretation of verses like *syððan æpelingas*, thereby putting Sieversian metrical theory on a firmer empirical footing.

Why did Bliss ignore the metrical evidence in support of ictus on the medial syllable of *æpelingas*? The main reason is that he found no evidence for the existence of tertiary stress in the phonology of Old English (1967: App. A). Although Bliss's unwillingness to admit the reality of this phonological entity lies behind his mistaken interpretation of verses like *syððan æpelingas*, it still draws attention to a serious deficiency in traditional Sieversian metrics. Sievers took it for granted that the sole linguistic reality to which metrical ictus correlates

is phonological stress. Such an assumption led him to deduce not only that an off-verse like *syððan æþelingas* features two metrical lifts, but also that both lifts are realized by phonological stress. Since this equation of ictus with stress was tacitly assumed by Bliss, his rejection of phonological stress on *-ling-* implied the rejection of metrical ictus. The logical consequence of this chain of assumptions is that Bliss had no other choice but to ignore the metrical evidence and classify off-verses like *syððan æþelingas* as light. In *A History of Old English Meter*, however, Fulk discovered a regularity that allowed him to conclude that Sievers was right to assume ictus on *-ling-*, but wrong to identify that ictus with stress. Had Bliss apprehended the regularity detected by Fulk, it is not improbable that he would never have devised his theory of light verses.

Fulk examined the metrical behavior of word-medial syllables, which are traditionally believed to receive tertiary stress,⁹ in a large corpus of Old English poetry (1992: §§221–45). He found that, while long medial syllables are always ictic, the behavior of short medial syllables is governed by their position within the verse. For example, the long medial syllable *-ling-* must be ictic both in *Beowulf* 2888b, *syððan æþelingas*, and in 33b, *æþelinges fær*, since **xx / xx* and **/ xx /* are not acceptable metrical structures.¹⁰ Short medial syllables, on the other hand, demand ictus only in the coda of the verse, not in the onset. For instance, in *Beowulf* 2897b, *Lȳt swīgode*, the short syllable *-god-* must be ictic, but it must be scanned as non-ictic in 1699b, *swīgedon ealle*, because the non-four-position configurations **/ / xx* and **/ \ x / x* are disallowed. In the classical poems analyzed by Fulk, there is, as a rule, neither a long medial syllable without ictus nor a short medial syllable that demands ictus in the onset (1992: §§238, 260). This means that the regular behavior of medial syllables can be explained by reference to syllable quantity alone: if long, they are ictic; if short, they are either ictic or non-ictic depending on their position within the verse. The governing role that syllable quantity plays at the tertiary level, which was first identified by Fulk, has significant implications for Old English metrical theory.

As can be seen, the phonological concept of tertiary stress is not required to explain the metrical behavior of medial syllables, which can mean only that tertiary stress is irrelevant to the formation of ictus at the tertiary level. It follows that the linguistic correlate of such an ictus is not tertiary stress, as Sievers assumed, but syllable quantity

⁹ This is the standard view, as laid out by Alistair Campbell (1959: §§88–90). Campbell does not distinguish between tertiary and secondary stress, but refers to both as “half-stress,” a term that translates German *Nebenton*. On the convenience of using the expression “tertiary stress” to refer to all the instances of half-stress that are not secondary, see Fulk 1992: §186.

¹⁰ On the unmetricality of catalectic patterns like these, see, for example, Sievers 1893: §§10.1, 180; Fulk 1992: §209; 1996: 5–6; Terasawa 2011: 49–52; and Pascual 2013–14.

(Fulk 1992: §260).¹¹ It seems that Sievers, like the majority of metrists who preceded him, never entertained the possibility that the linguistic realization of metrical ictus can be anything other than phonological stress. This assumption led him to confuse evidence for metrical ictus with evidence for tertiary stress.¹² Acting on the same assumption, Bliss decided to ignore the evidence for ictus, since he thought that it meant the acceptance of stress on a syllable like *-ling-*, which the phonological evidence disallows. Fulk found the solution to the problem: since ictus at the tertiary level is predicated on syllable quantity, it is possible both to avoid crediting a phonologically implausible hypothesis and simultaneously not to ignore the positive evidence for metrical ictus. Thus, in the off-verse *syððan æþelingas*, the sole factor responsible for the presence of ictus on the long medial syllable *-ling-* is its quantity. Awareness of this dissociation of metrical ictus from phonological stress would have made it unnecessary for Bliss to admit the presence of one-lift verses in the second half-line.

Even though Fulk's investigation into the linguistic realization of metrical ictus has earned little notice, its significance for metrical theory is profound. In addition to the conclusion that tertiary ictus correlates with syllable quantity, he found that, as Max Kaluza first suggested (1896), syllable quantity is the factor that governs the formation of ictus under secondary stress. For example, in a pair of verses like *Beowulf* 2357a, *fr̥zawine folca*, and 2042a, *eald æscwiga*, it is the etymological quantity of the inflectional suffixes *-e* and *-a* that determines whether the secondary ictus is borne by either one or two syllables.¹³

¹¹ This is not to say, however, that tertiary stress is not a reality of the Old English language, as Bliss believed. Fulk (1992: §§187–97) convincingly argued that the vocalism of certain derivational suffixes of some recognizable semantic import, like *-dom*, *-leas*, *-fæst*, and *-hwylc*, among a few others, indicates that they receive tertiary stress. In their otherwise praising review of *A History of Old English Meter*, Minkova and Stockwell raised the criticism that the notion of secondary stress is sufficient to account for the vocalism of those suffixes. As they put it, “there is no reason or justification for considering these suffixes to be different from the second elements of compounds” (1995: 365). In a similar vein, Bredehoft states that “Fulk fails to consider the very real possibility that [...] such words may well have had secondary stress on these elements” (2005: 126, n. 14). The occurrence of verses like, for example, *Beowulf* 2233b, *gumena nāthwylc*, in which the word containing the pertinent suffix does not alliterate, demonstrates this criticism of Fulk's analysis to be untenable, because true compounds with secondary stress ought to alliterate, as is required by Krakow's law (see Krakow 1903: 43–4).

¹² This confusion was inherited by Campbell, who based his account of Old English half-stress solely on Sievers' evidence for metrical ictus (1959: §§88–91). Thus, Fulk's redefinition of tertiary ictus also rectified, incidentally, the standard account of tertiary stress: apart from derivational suffixes like *-lēas*, which truly receive tertiary stress, all other derivational and inflectional suffixes are unstressed. Their ability to bear metrical ictus depends only on their quantity.

¹³ Since the nominative singular ending of masculine *i*-stems like *wine* was short in Pre-Old English (*-i, from Proto-Germanic *-iz; see Fulk 1992: 421; and Hogg and Fulk 2011: §2.60), the syllable *-ne* is etymologically short. This enables *-ne* to resolve with the preceding syllable, *wi-*, as a result of which *-wine* occupies a single metrical position. By contrast,

The results of Fulk's investigation make it clear that metrists had magnified, and continue to magnify, the metrical significance of phonological stress. The rationale behind such magnification is the active part of primary stress in the formation of ictus, which led many scholars, including Sievers, to the superficial conclusion that ictus must be equated with stress. But even primary stress, despite its important metrical function, is not the only linguistic agent responsible for the formation of primary ictus, inasmuch as syllables under primary stress, as a rule, must be long in order to be ictic. Since Fulk demonstrated that syllable quantity is the only linguistic entity that mediates the establishment of all the levels of ictus, the widespread belief among Old English scholars that stress is the essential correlate of ictus should be abandoned. Indeed, Fulk's reconsideration of the traditional notion of ictus disclosed the previously unnoticed affinity between Old English verse and other Indo-European metrical systems in which syllable quantity performs a comparable function (1992: §268).

Fulk's revision to Sieversian metrics might seem to face an obstacle: while the composition of verses like **æþelingas bearnum* was avoided by Old English poets, verses like *Beowulf* 1815a, *æþeling tō yppan*, with a long final syllable after the first lift, do occur in the surviving poetry. It appears that syllable quantity alone fails to account for the difference in metricality between these two verses, since in each of them the same long syllable evinces a distinct metrical behaviour. It would be unreasonable to credit the traditional view that *-ling* receives tertiary stress only if inflected (Campbell 1959: §89), since the phonological evidence does not support this analysis (Fulk 1992: §§261–3). In order to account for the different acceptability of the two verse types, Bliss, who denied the existence of tertiary stress, designed a theoretical artefact that he called "caesura" (1967: §§41–5). He defined it as the pause that divides the linguistic material of a verse into smaller syntactic units or "breath groups." In *æþeling tō yppan*, the caesura, which divides it into two breath groups, *æþeling* and *tō yppan*, falls in position (iii). In **æþelingas bearnum*, on the other hand, it falls in a different position. It is the different placement of the caesura, Bliss maintained, that explains the distinction in metrical acceptability (1967: §43). Fulk pointed out that verses like *æþeling tō yppan* occur too infrequently to pose a real problem to his redefinition of tertiary ictus (1992: §264), a conclusion that at the same time demonstrated Bliss's theory of the caesura to be irrelevant to such a distinction.

the Pre-Old English nominative singular ending of masculine *n*-stems like *wiga* was long (*-ō, from Proto-Germanic *-ō; see Fulk 1992: 422–3; and Hogg and Fulk 2011: §§2.84–5). The etymological length of *-ga* suspends resolution of *wiga*, which therefore fills two distinct metrical positions. As Fulk demonstrated (1992: §§271–89), quantity also determines resolvability in verse-internal position. For example in *Beowulf* 2382b, *sæcýninga*, resolution of *-cýning-* is suspended because *-ning-* is long.

Apart from verses containing proper names, like *Beowulf* 2434a, *Herebeald ond Hæðcyn*, for which some attenuation of the metrical rules is to be expected,¹⁴ there is in fact only one other pertinent verse in *Beowulf*, l. 2506a, *æpeling on elne*. The extreme rarity of this type of verse contrasts with the high incidence of words like *æpeling* in the lexicon of Old English. These include, among others, nouns ending in suffixes like *-ung*, *-ing*, and *-end*; adjectives in *-isc*; and superlatives in *-est* and *-ost*. Given this abundant supply, Fulk argued (1992: §264), it is clear that there must have been a stricture against a word-final long syllable after the first lift of the verse, since otherwise Old English poets would have generated a larger number of verses like *æpeling tō yppan*. Because the phonology does not support the presence of tertiary stress on syllables like *-ling*, it must be concluded that the placement of such syllables after the first lift was prohibited on account of the systematic presence of ictus on long medial syllables. That is to say, owing to the ictic nature of long medial syllables, it would have been difficult for the audience to scan a long final syllable as non-ictic. As a result, in order to avoid scansional ambiguity, poets excluded long final syllables from non-ictic metrical positions. The verses *æpeling tō yppan* and *æpeling on elne* are therefore better regarded as two marginal exceptions to an otherwise strict rule. Fulk also contended that the rarity of the type voids Bliss's theory of the caesura of explanatory power (1992: 192 n. 41). If a long syllable is prohibited only in verse like **æpelingas bearnum*, there is no reason why Old English poets should have refrained from the composition of verses like *æpeling tō yppan*, where the caesura falls in position (iii). It is thus reasonable to concur with Fulk that, to the extent that the caesura is a theoretical entity designed to account for only two exceptional verses, it must be considered empirically untenable.¹⁵

Fulk showed Bliss's theory of the caesura to be unreliable for yet another reason, namely that it demands resolution of a suffix like *-scipe* in a verse such as *Beowulf* 1727a, *eard ond eorlscipe*. According to Bliss, in expanded type D* verses, the caesura must fall immediately before the second lift (1967: §44). Since the caesura falls in a different position

¹⁴ In *Widsið*, for example, which abounds in proper names, the metrical rules are generally slackened in order to accommodate them. On this point, see Fulk 1992: §§235, 251, and 264.

¹⁵ Another reason for Bliss to insist on the metrical significance of the caesura is that variability in its position within the verse seems to correlate with the presence or absence of anacrusis in type A verses. Thus, when the caesura falls in position (i), immediately before the second lift, as in *Beowulf* 11a, *gomban gýldan*, anacrusis seems to be prohibited; by contrast, if it falls in position (ii), as in 1223b, *swā sæ bebūgeð*, anacrusis is frequent (1967: §43). As Fulk argued (1992: §248), however, the correlation that Bliss claimed to have identified is not real, because in verses like *swā sæ bebūgeð* it is the prefix *be-* that is extrametrical, as Donoghue demonstrated (1987). Thus, they should not be analyzed as anacrustic type A verses, but as special instances of type C.

in *eard ond eorlscepe*,¹⁶ Bliss argued that this is not an expanded type D* verse, but a type 1A1 with resolution of the suffix (1967: §45). This interpretation is problematic for two reasons. First, *-scepe* is in the coda, the location that favors a one-to-one correspondence between syllables and metrical positions. For example, as has been seen above, a short syllable that occurs in the coda of the verse receives ictus, thereby occupying a single metrical position. Disyllabic sequences governed by Kaluza's law in *Beowulf* evince the same behavior: the coda was reserved for only those sequences that the poet perceived as non-resolvable for phonological reasons, as in *eald æscwiga*, a type D verse in which verse-final *-wiga* occupies two metrical positions.¹⁷ This tendency of the coda to favor monosyllabic metrical positions, which is a feature common to all Indo-European poetic traditions,¹⁸ disallows Bliss's type 1A1 scansion for verses like *eard ond eorlscepe*. Inasmuch as such an unlikely scansion is dictated by Bliss's theory of the caesura, this theory must be regarded as an unreliable tool for the analysis of Old English meter.

The improbability of Bliss's interpretation of *eard ond eorlscepe* is also made apparent by the consideration that the application of resolution is restricted to stressed syllables, as Fulk has made clear (1995: 495). The rationale behind such a restricted application lies in the origin of resolution as a mechanism of prosodic compensation. Resolution first arose in the phonology of Northwest Germanic as a response to the lengthening of short final vowels in stressed monosyllables (Old Norse *þú*, Old English *þū*; cf. Gothic *þu*).¹⁹ This lengthening caused such a significant increase in the incidence of long stressed syllables that short stressed syllables, which remained only in word-internal position, came to be perceived as anomalous by speakers of the language. Resolution compensated for this anomaly by combining a short stressed syllable and its immediate unstressed successor into a phonological unit that was equivalent to a long stressed syllable. Since the final vowels of unstressed monosyllables escaped the lengthening,²⁰ however, the incidence of long unstressed syllables remained

¹⁶ The caesura falls immediately after the first lift: *eard | ond eorlscepe*.

¹⁷ As seen above, resolution is suspended by the etymological length of the nominative singular ending of masculine *n*-stems, which derives from trimoric **-ô* in Proto-Germanic. Remarkably, disyllabic sequences like *-wiga*, which suspend resolution in compliance with Kaluza's law, are, as a rule, restricted to the coda of the verse. Thus, the application of Kaluza's law is subordinated to the rule that requires monosyllabic metrical positions in the coda (see Fulk 1992: §237; 1995).

¹⁸ On this characteristic of Indo-European metrics, also known as right justification, see Lotz 1972: 5; Hayes 1983: 373; and Foley 1985: 12.

¹⁹ For more on this sound change and its effects, see Luick 1914–40: §103; Minkova 2014: 70–1; and Gordon 1957: §53.

²⁰ The low degree of quantitative contrast among unstressed syllables is a factor here (see Fulk 1995: 495; Campbell 1959: 34, n. 4; and footnote 7 above).

stable. Consequently, unstressed short syllables never became anomalous, which rendered their subjection to resolution unnecessary. In *A History of Old English Meter*, Fulk demonstrated the suffix *-scipe* to be unstressed (1992: §261).²¹ Bliss's theory of the caesura is therefore linguistically implausible, as it demands resolution from *-sci-*, a word-internal syllable for which the phonological evidence suggests absence of stress.

Yet Bliss's theories of light verses and the caesura are neither the only nor even the most problematic aspects of his metrical system. His rejection of tertiary stress, along with his inherited assumption that stress is the sole correlate of ictus, was also responsible for Bliss's most profound deviation from traditional Sieversian metrics: the acceptance of verses consisting of less than four positions. This unconventional feature was also addressed by Fulk, who concluded that the empirical basis of Sievers' four-position principle is so solid that Bliss's challenge to its authority constitutes the most serious flaw of his formalism. According to Bliss's theory, a verse like *æpelinges fær*, to which Sievers would attribute the four-position structure of a standard type E, must be scanned as a type 3E1, the basic configuration of which is the three-position / x / pattern. That verses like *æpelinges fær* feature a three-position configuration is unlikely, however, since three-position verses with structures that are in no way susceptible of a four-position interpretation, like **æpeling gōd*, are absent from the records. More important, of the 118 occurrences of type 3E1 in *Beowulf* (Vickman 1990: 43), not a single one is realized by three syllables. If Bliss's type 3E1 truly consisted of the basic three-position structure / x /, as he maintained, one should expect to find a significant number of ideal trisyllabic realizations of that type, like **dryhten frōd* (Fulk 1992: §208).²² It is precisely this virtual absence of unambiguous ideal instances that made Sievers exclude three-position verses from his theoretical account of Old English meter.

Of course, the rationale behind Bliss's interpretation of *æpelinges fær* is the same rationale that motivated his admission of light verses in the second half-line: he was unwilling to accept the reality of tertiary stress. Since Bliss did not apprehend the ability of a long medial syllable like *-ling-* to bear ictus by exclusive virtue of its length, his rejection of tertiary stress also implied the structural reduction of a verse like *æpelinges fær* to three metrical positions. This major departure from Sieversian metrics required, like his theory of light verses, the support of compelling evidence. Such evidence, he believed, was furnished by

²¹ The failure of the unstressed /i/ of *-scipe* to lower to /e/ is due to the palatal nature of the preceding consonant, /j/, as Fulk indicates.

²² On the virtual absence of trisyllabic verses and its theoretical implications, see Pascual 2013–14: 65–7.

the group of verses that he classified as 2E1, as they seem to refute the distinction between tertiary ictus and absence of ictus on which the four-position principle is predicated. For example, in order for a verse like *æbelinges fær* to comply with that rule, the syllable *-ling-* must be assumed to bear tertiary ictus, which Sievers equated with tertiary stress. But in a type 2E1 verse like *Beowulf* 2150a, *lissa ġelong*, the position after the first lift contains an inflectional suffix for which the possibility of tertiary ictus (stress-based or otherwise) is non-existent. If type 2E1 verses consist of only three positions, as *lissa ġelong* appears to indicate, there is no reason why 3E1 verses like *æbelinges fær* should not also present a three-position configuration. This analysis, which seems to undermine the empirical validity of Sievers' requirement of four positions to the verse, would justify Bliss's rejection of tertiary stress in type 3E1 verses.

The problem with Bliss's type 2E1 is that, as Fulk demonstrated, it cannot be an authentic metrical category, because *lissa ġelong* is the only verse in *Beowulf* (of Bliss's total of twenty-two) that can be adduced as unambiguous evidence for the genuineness of that type. Thus, one verse that Bliss classed as a 2E1 type, l. 747b, *ræhte onġēan*, is in actuality a spurious manuscript reading whose source of corruption is well-known in text-critical scholarship.²³ Another three, ll. 845a, *nīða ofercumen*; 881a, *ēam his nefan*; and 954a, *dædum ġefremed*, are not unambiguous, as they might have an unresolved second lift – a superior analysis, in view of the preference of the coda for monosyllabic metrical positions.²⁴ They should not, as a result, be offered in support of the authenticity of a given verse type. In regard to seventeen of the remaining eighteen verses, Fulk detected a regularity that seems to have escaped Bliss's notice: unlike *lissa ġelong*, which contains an inflectional suffix after the first lift, they all evince a morpheme with a recognizable lexical meaning in second position. Two representative examples are ll. 396b, *Hrōðgār ġesēon*, and 1720b, *drēamlēas ġebād*. In the first verse, the second name element *-gār* is as much a lexical morpheme as the common noun *gār* in, for example, l. 1846b, *þæt ðe gār nymed*. Similarly, the meaning of the derivational suffix *-lēas* in *drēamlēas ġebād* coincides with the meaning of the adjective *lēas* in l. 850b,

²³ There is an erasure immediately before *ræhte*, which coincides with another erasure at exactly the same place on the following leaf (Zupitza 1959: 37). This means that something was spilt on the vellum before *ræhte*, thereby obscuring the words preceding it (see Pope 1966: 372; Fulk 1992: 209; and Pascual 2013–14: 63). The editors of *Klaeber IV* supply *he him*, which, apart from rectifying the positional deficiency of this verse, makes for better syntax and sense.

²⁴ Besides, it is not improbable that the *Beowulf* poet treated *ēam* as disyllabic, corresponding to Pre-Old English **ēa-am* (Pascual 2013–14: 59), since its contraction into a monosyllable took place at some point between the late seventh and the early eighth century (Campbell 1959: §235.2; Hogg 1992: §5.13), very close to the composition date of *Beowulf* (on which see, for example, Fulk 1992: 381–92; Neidorf 2014; and Neidorf and Pascual 2014).

siððan drēama lēas. The same holds true for all the pertinent syllables in the remaining fifteen instances of Bliss's type 2E1, which consist of either second name elements or derivational suffixes similar to *-lēas*, like *-lang* and *-hwylc*, among a few others. Since a speaker of Old English could identify the connection between the meanings of these particular derivational suffixes and those of their associated lexical morphemes without difficulty, Fulk classified them as "semi-lexical morphemes," in order to differentiate them from full lexical morphemes, on the one hand, and derivational suffixes without lexical meaning, on the other.

The incidence of inflectional morphemes in the Old English language is higher than that of semi-lexical morphemes. That is to say, words like *lissa*, which ends with the inflectional marker for genitive plural, outnumber words like *drēamlēas*, with a semi-lexical morpheme at the end. Thus, if type 2E1 truly permitted the presence of an inflectional suffix in its second metrical position, one would expect the number of verses like *drēamlēas ġebād* to be inferior to the number of verses like *lissa ġelong*. Yet the tendency is exactly the opposite in *Beowulf*, where the overwhelming majority of instances of Bliss's type 2E1 feature either a second name element or a semi-lexical morpheme in second position, as seen in the previous paragraph. The same is true of a larger corpus of Old English poetry: in a total of approximately 22,000 verses, Fulk found only thirteen occurrences of type 2E1, of which ten present a semi-lexical morpheme after the first lift (1992: §210). These empirical data confirm the existence of a metrical stricture against inflectional morphemes in the second position of Bliss's type 2E1. Since the distinctive feature of inflectional morphemes, from a metrical point of view, is their inability to bear ictus, the rationale for such a stricture must be that their presence would reduce the pertinent verses to three positions. This conclusion is corroborated by the capability of the second position in the verse to accommodate semi-lexical morphemes, whose preservation of stressed vocalism unambiguously shows them to be able to receive metrical ictus.²⁵

Thus, verses like *Hrōðgār ġesēon* and *drēamlēas ġebād*, with a second name element and a semi-lexical morpheme in second position, do not support Bliss's three-position interpretation of 3E1 verses like *æbelinges fær*. His scansion is predicated on the hypothesis that the absence of ictus from the second metrical position of type 2E1 – to which Bliss assigned the configuration / xx / – renders the ascription of tertiary ictus to the medial syllable of *æbelinges* unnecessary. That Bliss's hypothesis is untenable is made clear by the large number of type 2E1 verses whose second positions contain

²⁵ The tertiary stress received by these elements could be ignored *ad libitum* by the *Beowulf* poet, as the occurrence of verses like 356b, *þær Hrōðgār sæt*, indicates.

stressed linguistic entities, in conjunction with the virtual absence of unambiguously non-ictic syllables from that metrical location. Since its second position demands ictus, Bliss's type 2E1 is in actuality the standard four-position type E of Sieversian theory, / \ x /. The inauthenticity of type 2E1 vitiates the empirical support for Bliss's three-position scansion of 3E1 verses. Therefore, both 2E1 and 3E1 verses – *Hrōðgār ġesēon* and *drēamlēas ġebād*, on the one hand, and *æþelinges fær*, on the other – present the metrical structure of a Sieversian type E. The only difference is that, while the linguistic correlate of the ictus on the long medial syllable *-ling-* is its quantity, the ictus on the morphemes *-gār* and *-lēas* is realized by phonological stress. In regard to verses like *lissa ġelong*, which feature an unmistakable three-position configuration, their incidence in the corpus of evidence analyzed by Fulk is so insignificant – four instances in a total of approximately 28,364 verses – that they must be ascribed to scribal corruption (Fulk 1992: §211). And indeed, this is the conclusion reached by the majority of metrists (see, for example, Russom 1987: 117–18; Pascual 2013–14).

The essential correctness of Sievers' four-position analysis is corroborated, as Fulk has pointed out on a number of occasions, by the *Beowulf* poet's adherence to Kaluza's law.²⁶ In order to enable the regular application of his four-position principle, Sievers had to assume that the operation of resolution is variable. In a verse like *frēawine folca*, for example, the disyllabic sequence *-wine* must be resolved, since the verse would otherwise feature a five-position structure. The verse *eald æscwiga*, on the other hand, would present a three-position configuration if *-wiga* did not suspend resolution. Thus, Sievers' resolution is a theoretical device designed to regulate the number of metrical positions per verse. As early as 1896, just a few years after the publication of Sievers' main works on meter, Kaluza detected that there is in *Beowulf* a direct correlation between the variable operation of resolution and the etymological length of the second of the resolvable syllables: if it is short, like *-ne* in *wine*, resolution applies; otherwise resolution is suspended.²⁷ That Sievers' assumptions about resolution allowed Kaluza to detect a regularity that is itself independent from Sievers' system of scansion confirms that resolution, as conceived of by Sievers, is not merely an *ad hoc* artefact of his theory, but a reality of Old English verse. The reality of Sievers' notion of resolution implies the reality of the four-position principle, since Sievers posited the existence of resolution and its variable application for the sole purpose of ensuring that each verse contained no more and no less than four

²⁶ In addition to the references to *A History of Old English Meter* provided above, see, for instance, Fulk 1996: 6; 1997: 41–2; 2002: 339–40; 2007: 140.

²⁷ See footnote 13 above.

metrical positions, as seen above. Fulk's reasoning thus demonstrated the absolute superiority of Sievers' analysis over Bliss's.

Though its contributions to metrical theory must be abandoned, Bliss's *The Metre of Beowulf* will remain a valuable work, not least for its advocacy of the use of metrical criteria in the detection and correction of scribal errors (1967: §8). Nevertheless, in the light of Fulk's conclusions about his theory of light verses, his theory of the caesura, and his acceptance of three-position verses, Bliss's metrical theory should not be considered the vindication and continuation of Sievers that its author purported it to be. In his admirable *Old English Metre: An Introduction*, Jun Terasawa offers a comprehensive study of Sieversian metrics, which will no doubt contribute to its definite establishment as the pre-eminent method of scansion in the profession. Still, the preface to this book portrays Sievers' and Bliss's accounts as a single, uniform theory of Old English meter (2011: ix–xii), thus failing to indicate not only that Bliss differed from Sievers on a number of fundamental aspects, but also that, as Fulk demonstrated, Bliss's innovations are void of empirical sufficiency. Introductions like Terasawa's should therefore alert readers to the implausibility of Bliss's interpretation of verses like *syððan æþelingas, æþeling tō yppan*, and *æþelinges fær*. More important, in view of the correctness of Sievers' four-position principle, which Fulk also proved beyond reasonable doubt, general accounts of Old English meter must disallow Bliss's admission of verses like *ræhte onġēan* and *lissa ġelong*, since otherwise textual critics will be led to regard scribal corruptions as genuine authorial readings – a situation of which Bliss himself would have disapproved.

It is not improbable that, if Bliss had been aware of the dissociation of tertiary ictus from tertiary stress proposed by Fulk, his departures from Sieversian metrics would not have been so radical. This dissociation, along with its concomitant revaluation of the metrical role of syllable quantity, should likewise be acknowledged in future accounts of Old English versification, since it is essential to the correct understanding of the meter. As Fulk demonstrated, syllable quantity is a determining factor behind the formation of metrical ictus at the primary and secondary levels, and its sole linguistic correlate at the tertiary one. The connection between ictus and syllable quantity is corroborated by the behaviour of non-ictic metrical positions, which contain, as a rule, only short syllables, as the extreme rarity of verses like *æþeling tō yppan* suggests. Inasmuch as it is insufficient to account for the intricacies of Old English verse construction, the traditional description of Sievers' five basic verse types as patterns of stress should be abandoned. They are rather patterns of metrical ictus, for whose establishment syllable quantity plays a more pervasive role than phonological stress. Thus, Fulk's rectification of the traditional Sieversian equation between ictus and stress revealed that Old English meter is, in some fundamental

respects, more akin to the systems of versification of Classical Greek and Latin poetry than to those of later periods of English verse.

Bibliography

- Bliss, A.J. 1962. *An Introduction to Old English Metre*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bliss, A.J. 1967. *The Metre of Beowulf*. Rev. ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bredehoft, T.A. 2005. *Early English Metre*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Bright, J.W. 1921. Review of E. Neuner, *Ueber ein- und dreihebige Halbverse in der altenglischen alliterierenden Poesie*, 1920. *Modern Language Notes* 36: 59-64.
- Cable, T. 1974. *The Meter and Melody of Beowulf*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Campbell, A. 1959. *Old English Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Donoghue, D. 1987. "On the Classification of B-verses with Anacrusis in *Beowulf* and *Andreas*." *Notes and Queries* 34: 1-5.
- Foley, J.M. 1985. "The Scansion of *Beowulf* in its Indo-European Context." In *Approaches to Beowulfian Scansion: Four Essays by John Miles Foley, Winfred P. Lehmann, Robert Creed, and Dolores Warwick Frese*. Ed. A. Hernández and A. Renoir. Lanham: University Press of America. 7-17.
- Fulk, R.D. 1992. *A History of Old English Meter*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Fulk, R.D. 1995. "Kuryłowicz on Resolution in Old English." In *Kuryłowicz Memorial Volume, I*. Ed. W. Smoczyński. Cracow: Universitas. 491-7.
- Fulk, R.D. 1996. "Inductive Methods in the Textual Criticism of Old English Verse." *Medievalia et Humanistica* 23: 1-24.
- Fulk, R.D. 1997. "Textual Criticism." In *A Beowulf Handbook*. Ed. R.E. Bjork and J.D. Niles. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. 35-54.
- Fulk, R.D. 2002. "Early Middle English Evidence for Old English Meter: Resolution in *Poema morale*." *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 14: 331-55.
- Fulk, R.D. 2007. "The Textual Criticism of Frederick Klaeber's *Beowulf*." In *Constructing Nations, Reconstructing Myth: Essays in Honour of T.A. Shippey*. Ed. A. Wawn with G. Johnson and J. Walter. Turnhout: Brepols. 131-53.
- Fulk, R.D., R.E. Bjork, and J.D. Niles. eds. 2008. *Klaeber's Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg: Fourth Edition*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Gordon, E.V. 1957. *An Introduction to Old Norse*. Rev. ed. A.R. Taylor. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Hayes, B. 1983. "A Grid-Based Theory of English Meter." *Linguistic Inquiry* 14: 357–93.
- Hogg, R.M. 1992. *A Grammar of Old English*. Vol. 1: *Phonology*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hogg, R.M. and R.D. Fulk. 2011. *A Grammar of Old English*. Vol. 2: *Morphology*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Kaluza, M. 1896. "Zur Betonungs- und Verslehre des Altenglischen." In *Festschrift zum siebenzigsten Geburtstage Oskar Schade*. Königsberg: Hartungsche verlagsdruckerei. 101–34.
- Krackow, O. 1903. *Die Nominalkomposita als Kunstmittel im altenglischen Epos*. Weimar: Druck von R. Wagner Sohn.
- Kuhn, H. 1933. "Zur Wortstellung und -betonung im Altgermanischen." *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 57: 1–109.
- Lotz, J. 1972. "Elements of Versification." In *Versification: Major Language Types: Sixteen Essays*. Ed. W.K. Wimsatt. New York: Modern Language Association / New York University Press. 1–21.
- Luick, K. 1914–40. *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache*. Stuttgart / Oxford: Bernhard Tauchnitz / Basil Blackwell.
- Minkova, D. 2014. *A Historical Phonology of English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Minkova, D. and R.P. Stockwell. 1995. Review of R.D. Fulk, *A History of Old English Meter*, 1992. *Language* 71: 359–65.
- Neidorf, L. ed. 2014. *The Dating of Beowulf: A Reassessment*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer.
- Neidorf, L. and R.J. Pascual. 2014. "The Language of *Beowulf* and the Conditioning of Kaluza's Law." *Neophilologus* 98: 657–73.
- Neuner, E. 1920. *Ueber ein- und dreihebige Halbverse in der altenglischen alliterierenden Poesie*. Berlin: Mayer und Müller.
- Pascual, R.J. 2013–14. "Three-Position Verses and the Metrical Practice of the *Beowulf* Poet." *SELIM* 20: 49–79.
- Pascual, R.J. 2014. "Ælfric's Rhythmical Prose and the Study of Old English Metre." *English Studies* 95: 803–23.
- Pascual, R.J. 2015. "On a Crux in *Beowulf*: The Alliteration of Finite Verbs and the Scribal Understanding of Metre." *Studia Neophilologica* 87: 171–85.
- Pope, J.C. 1966. *The Rhythm of Beowulf*. Rev. ed. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Russom, G. 1987. *Old English Meter and Linguistic Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Russom, G. 1998. *Beowulf and Old Germanic Metre*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sievers, E. 1893. *Altgermanische Metrik*. Halle: M. Niemeyer.
- Stanley, E.G. 1963. Review of A.J. Bliss, *The Metre of Beowulf*, 1958. *English Philological Studies* 6–8: 47–53.
- Stockwell, R.P. and D. Minkova. 1997. "Prosody." In *A Beowulf*

Sievers, Bliss, Fulk, and Old English Metrical Theory

Handbook. Ed. R.E. Bjork and J.D. Niles. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. 54–83.

Terasawa, J. 2011: *Old English Metre: An Introduction*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Vickman, J. 1990. *A Metrical Concordance to Beowulf*. Binghamton: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, State University of New York at Binghamton.

Zupitza, J. 1959: *Beowulf: Reproduced in Facsimile from the Unique Manuscript British Museum MS. Cotton Vitellius A. xv*. 2nd ed. rev. N. Davis. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ictus as Stress or Length: The Effect of Tempo*

Thomas Cable

1. *The phonological and metrical correlates*

In an important section of *A History of Old English Meter*, R.D. Fulk points the way for a detailed analysis of specific patterns of Old English verse and the underlying principles of rhythm that rationalize those patterns: "Since before the time of Sievers the general assumption among metrists has been that the primary phonological correlate of ictus in Old English verse is stress. Syllable length plays a contributory role, inasmuch as short full lifts are exceptional; but otherwise the pattern of lifts, half-lifts, and drops in Sievers' five metrical types is determined solely on the basis of stress. ... Now it appears that syllable length plays a greater role than previously imagined ..." (1992: 223).

General handbook and anthology summaries of Old English meter usually fail to take up syllable length, even to the extent of noting its "contributory role." The most familiar rubrics give the game away: "accentual meter," "strong-stress meter." Textbooks for introductory language courses in Old English do indicate the role of syllable length in assigning metrical stress, but the student has to turn to technical books and articles to find that syllable length is an element not only of stress but also of something called a "position." (Pope-Fulk 2001: 149–50 is an exception in presenting the idea, and presenting it clearly.)

Even with the focus solely on stress (Fulk's reference to "lifts, half-lifts, and drops"), syllable length, or quantity, has a natural place, because metrical stress can occur only on a long syllable or its resolved equivalent. Therefore, at the very minimum, a bare-bones summary of Old English meter by the usual view must include both metrical stress (at three different levels) and syllable quantity.¹

* I am grateful to Natalie Gerber for the metrical expertise and keen editorial eye that she generously brought to a reading of this essay.

¹ "Syllable quantity" is a part of both the meter and the phonology of Old English. "Metrical stress," or "ictus," is a part of the meter. Attempts to extend metrical stress to the phonology of "half-stress," as by Campbell 1959: 34–5, are circular. See Fulk 1992: 226.