XIII.—THE OLD ENGLISH ALLITERATIVE LINE.

By Prof. H. FRANK HEATH, Ph.D.

[Read at a Meeting of the Philological Society, June 2, 1893.]

The references to Beowulf throughout this paper are taken from M. Heyne's edition, 1888; the references to other poems from Grein's *Bibliothek der A-S. Poesie*, 1857.

WHEN Dr. Furnivall first asked me to read a paper before this Society I had recently formed a new theory about the construction of the Old English "Expanded Lines," "Longer rhythms" as Guest calls them, *Streckverse*, or *Schwellverse*, as they are named by German scholars. It struck me that I might make this theory the subject of my paper, and Dr. Furnivall approved of my suggestion. But as time went on, and I began to think my paper out, I remembered that I held heretical views about the construction of the *Normal* alliterative line, views which, so far as I am aware, are only shared in England by one friend and fellow-student, and that it would therefore be necessary for me to at least give an introductory section upon the *Normal* line, as I conceive it, or rather as my most honoured master, the late Prof. Ten Brink, conceived it to be constructed.

Then came the publication of Prof. ten Brink's fragmentary posthumous contribution to Paul's "*Grundriss*" upon O.E. literature, containing a very condensed account of his theory of O.E. metric, and without the explanatory notes which he had intended to add. I found upon enquiry that men of the very highest rank amongst English philologists had found some difficulty in understanding this cramped and incomplete presentation of the case, and I felt that, this being so, I could not better honour the memory of my master, nor better advance the cause of truth than by an exposition of his views, as I understand them to have been, after hearing a course of lectures from him on the subject, and taking an active part in the *Seminar* which he held in connection with it. The first part of this paper, therefore, lays little claim to

originality, other than that small measure of it which lies in the method of presenting the subject.

First, then, I hope you will allow me to remind you of one or two general truths, about which there is no doubt, but of which we must grasp the full importance, if we are not to wander from the right track into the many pitfalls which beset the study of this very difficult subject. To begin with—What is the essential difference between Prose and Verse? The difference, of course, is that verse is speech with a *definite Rhythm*, whilst prose has properly no definite Rhythm; though corrupt prose styles such as that found in some of Aelfric's Homilies show a very near approach to a Rhythm both continuous and definite.

Rhythm, of course, means regular movement causing a sensation in one of the organs of sense; movement, the law of which can be appreciated by the senses. This is universal. In dancing, in music, in a swinging pendulum, when travelling in a railway-train, we have this phenomenon called Rhythm.

“ Wer theilt die fließend immer gleiche Reihe
 Belebend ab, dass sie sich rhythmisch regt?

 Des Menschen Kraft im Dichter offenbart.”

—Faust. Prol.

Rhythm, then, more exactly, is a regular sequence of Movements, each group of Movements constituting the sequence being divided into equal periods of Time (morés) of which one period receives a preference according to some principle.

Now Metre is Rhythm realised in speech. Metric is, therefore, only a part of Rhythmic. Metric is the *particular*, Rhythmic the *general*. All poetry is necessarily rhythmical, and the ordinary distinction between rhythmical and unrhythmical measures is due to the fact that the classical languages made use of a particular form of Rhythm in their verse. There are, I need scarcely remind you, *three varieties of Metre*. (1) The *Syllabic*, where every rhythmical time-period coincides with a syllable. This is nowhere found in strict use, but the Vedas are a near approach to it. (2) The *Quantitative* measure—in which the time-period which receives the preference (Thesis) has a definite duration in *Speech* relative to the other time-periods. Thus the length of time taken to pronounce the long syllable of a dactyl is exactly

twice that taken in speaking each of the short ones which follow. That is why a spondee can be substituted. This is the measure of Greek and Latin. (3) The *Accentuated* measure. Here the relation of stressed to unstressed syllables in the line corresponds, on the whole, to the relation between time-periods, or morès, which receive a preference and those which do not, *i.e.* the stressed syllables coincides with the Tact or beat of the rhythm.

We see then that Rhythm is the essential, and it may be the same though the *metrical realisation* differs. Thus, in the classic Elegiac verse, the rhythm of the Hexameter and that of the Pentameter is the same, but the *Metre* is different; or, again, the Rhythm of the lines in a stanza of the Nibelungen-Lied is the same throughout though the *Metre* differs.

This being so, I should like to assert the two following *dicta* with regard to any theory of O.E. Metric. (1) No explanation of O.E. verse can be satisfactory which does not prove a unity of Rhythm. (2) No explanation is satisfactory that does not give us a Prosody which a poet could easily carry in his head.

Now the most elaborate system of recent times, and the one universally adopted in England, is that laid down by Prof. Sievers in the tenth volume of Paul and Braune's "Beiträge," and more recently in Paul's Grundriss, and in his "Altgermanische Metrik," Halle a/S, 1893. Sievers has undoubtedly added very considerably to our knowledge of the O.E. verse-system, and his work marks a great advance on the results of Wackernagel and Max Rieger, but does it stand the tests I have just formulated? I think *not*. Sievers believes, as you all know, that there are *five* Types with Variations:—

Typus A. $\leq x | \leq x ||$

Typus B. $x - | x \leq ||$

Typus C. (a). $x \leq | \leq x ||$ ^{Full Type.}

(β). $x \leq | \cup x ||$ ^{Shortened Type.}

Typus D. (a). $\leq | - \underline{\leq} x ||$

(β). $\leq | \leq x \underline{\leq} ||$

Typus E. $\leq \underline{\leq} x | - ||$

Examples from *Bêowulf*.

- A. (a) *gomban gyldan*, l. 11 || (b) *leôfne þeôden*, l. 34.
 B. (a) *âlê | don þâ*, l. 34 || (b) *ond Hâl | ga til*, l. 61.
 C. (a). (a) *oft Seyld Scêfing*, l. 4 || (b) *ond grîmhelmas*, l. 334.
 (β). (a) *of feorwegum*, l. 37 || (b) *in geardagum*, l. 1.
 D. (a). (a) *bearn | Healfdenes*, l. 469 || (b) *feônd | mon cynnes*, l. 164.
 (β). (a) *fyrst | forð gewât*, l. 210 || (b) *holm | ûp ætbær*, l. 519.
 E. (a) *healærna | msêst*, l. 78 || (b) *weorðmyndum | þâh*, l. 8.

Here I can find no unity either of Rhythm or Metric. Here are half-lines of Trochaic and Iambic form, and that even in the two halves of the same line; cf. *âlêdon þâ || leôfne þeôden |*. Not only that, but in Typus C we find an Iambic foot immediately followed by a Trochaic one, i.e. absolutely no Rhythm at all. It is quite impossible to speak such a line without either lengthening the first stressed syllable or putting a pause after it; thus the line must either be $x | \overset{\curvearrowright}{\leq} x | \leq x$ or $x \leq \wedge | \leq x$.

If we analyse Typus D in the same way we should get $\overset{\curvearrowright}{\leq} \wedge | \leq \wedge | \leq x$, i.e. *Three Chief Accents*; and similarly with E.

When we turn to the Variations the matter is worse. I only give the Variations of A as a specimen:

A.	$\leq x \leq x$	Original Type.	} All	$x \leq x \leq x$	
	$\leq xx \leq x$			occur	$x \leq xx \leq x$
	$\leq xxx \leq x$			with	$x \leq xxx \leq x$
(Rare)	$\leq xxxx \leq x$			Ana-	$x \leq xxxx \leq x$
(Still rarer)	$\leq xxxxx \leq x$			krusis.	$x \leq xxxxx \leq x$

Further, there are five Variations of A caused by the addition of a third and even a fourth (subordinate) Accent to the line in different positions.

I have already shown that this scheme does not satisfy my first requirement. I do not think any one will contend that it satisfies the second. No poet could possibly carry so complicated a system in his head. To compose with such a Prosody would imply at once the greatest crudity and the greatest subtlety in the ancient 'scop.'

Old English verse is accentual, and can only be explained from the Rhythmical standpoint. Even Sievers, in his article in Paul's Grundriss (s. 870, Bd. II.), acknowledges that the Germanic verse is to be traced back to a four-accent type, with a constant Iambic Rhythm, such as we find in a number of the Vedic songs. But he believes that at the time when the earliest Germanic poems were composed, musical recitation had completely disappeared, and, further, that the poets had lost all sense of Rhythm. His arguments to prove this are, to me, completely inconclusive. And the constant recurrence of such phrases as 'swutol sang scopes,' and reference to the 'glêo-beâm' as one of the chief joys of the banqueting hall would be meaningless if we are to suppose that simple recitation was the method of delivery. Besides, though Möller¹ has failed to show that 'Beowulf' was originally written in a four-lined strophe, yet he has, I think, conclusively proved that a tendency is traceable in O.E. poetry to fall into a four-lined stanza-form as a reminiscence of an older phase of composition. If this be so, it is clear that the Germans must have used the musical delivery, and that at the time of the popular epic (as we know it), even if song had given way to intoned recitation, which is quite possible, yet the old sense of rhythm still survived.

To turn to the constructive side of my argument, the following is Ten Brink's scheme of the O.E. Rhythm, viz. One Fundamental Type, with Four Variations, as follows:—

- F.T. x)ǿxǿ xǿxǿ ||
 Var. 1. x)ǿxǿ xǿxǿ ||
 Var. 2. x)ǿxǿ xǿxǿ ||
 Var. 3. x)ǿxǿ xǿxǿ ||
 Var. 4. x)ǿxǿ xǿxǿ ||

¹ H. Möller "das A-E. Volks-epos in der urspr. stroph. Form," Kiel, 1883.

In fact, it is seldom that lines occur in which all the unaccented syllables are expressed, and, to put the matter shortly, *Old English verse*, as we shall see, *in common with all Germanic verse*, *only requires that every "preferred Time-period" (Thesis or Gutes Zeittheil) shall correspond with the beginning of a syllable.* Thus, in the Fundamental Type, all the unaccented syllables may be wanting, thus:— $\Lambda \underset{\text{"}}{\text{g}}\underset{\text{"}}{\text{o}}\text{m} \underset{\text{"}}{\text{b}}\text{án} \Lambda \underset{\text{"}}{\text{g}}\underset{\text{"}}{\text{y}}\text{l} \underset{\text{"}}{\text{d}}\text{án}$, Beow. 11^a, or $\Lambda \underset{\text{"}}{\text{br}}\underset{\text{"}}{\text{e}}\text{ost}$

hórd blóð hréow,¹ Beow. 1720^a.

The syllables able to stand in the Thesis or verse-tact are determined partly by Lachmann's Law, which deals with the word-stress, and partly by the law of Sentence-stress, which, in O.E., was not logical, as now, but purely conventional.

Lachmann's Law, I may remind you, is as follows:—That there are two grades of Stress in words besides the unstressed syllables, though the Chief Stress is not different in kind from the Sub-stress. Further, that after a long syllable, bearing a Chief Stress, follows a sub-stressed syllable; after a long syllable, bearing a Sub-stress, follows a sub-stressed syllable; also after an unstressed syllable (short or long) follows a Sub-stress. On the other hand, after a *short* syllable, bearing either a Chief Stress or a Sub-stress, follows an unstressed syllable.

This may be formulated thus:—

[illegible]

Scholars have denied that Lachmann's Law applied to the spoken language. But this is 'a priori' improbable, for it neglects the very close connection between verse and the spoken tongue in Early Germanic times—besides which, if it only applied to the verse, this highly conventional system of accentuation

¹ The dot • expresses a short pause.

(as it then would be) would certainly strike an audience as unnatural and fail to catch on. But it can be proved that Lachmann's Law applied to the O.E. *spoken* language.

In words of the following form:— $\acute{u} \ \underline{u}$; $\acute{u} \ \underline{u}$; $\acute{u} \ \underline{u}$; $\acute{u} \ \underline{u}$; it can be shown that the syllables in the second place are either weakened or disappear. In words of this form:— $\acute{u} \ \underline{u} \ \underline{u}$, this must occur even in compounds in which a chief accent had fallen there in the simple word, *e.g.* $\acute{z}eátwe$ (Armour) < $\acute{z}á + tawu$ (cf. $\acute{z}á-mol$ for $\acute{z}a-mâl$, which shows that $\acute{z}a-$ was accented), or, again, $\acute{f}rætwe$ (Ornament) < $\acute{f}rá + tawu$.

Other examples, which prove the validity of this Law, are:—the disappearance of the Reduplication in the Praet. of Red. vbs., *e.g.* $\acute{h}et$ < $\acute{h}éhat$, and the early disappearance of the connecting vowel in the Praets. of weak verbs, *e.g.* $\acute{tealde}$ for $\acute{talde}$ < $\acute{tálida}$; $\acute{sealde}$ for $\acute{salde}$ < $\acute{sálida}$. In these last cases, as also in $\acute{zeatwe}$ and $\acute{fretwe}$, the disappearance of the middle-syllable insured the survival of the suffix-syllable, which was of the utmost importance, by transferring the Sub-stress to it.

The conventional Law of Sentence-stress, as is well known, was shortly this: That certain Parts of Speech naturally took a stronger stress than others. (1) The Substantive, certain notional Adverbs, and the Pronouns *self*, *begen*, and perhaps *ôðer*. (2) The Verb. (3) Pronouns and Particles. In addition to this, when two words of the same rank stood together, the first took the Chief Stress. Thus *we* should say 'Shakespeare's mother' but 'the mother of Shakespeare,' *i.e.* Logical stress. In O.E., on the other hand, they said ' $\acute{E}cglafes$ bearn' but 'beárn $\acute{E}cglafes$.' In the second half-line, however, a certain amount of freedom was allowed in this respect. Thus in Beow. 1129^b " $\acute{w}únode$ mid *Fin*," the chief accent falls upon ' $\acute{w}unode$,' and not on '*Fin*,' because the first syllable of the verb is the alliterative one.

I can now proceed to give the rules for Quantity and Accent in the O.E. verse.

Rules for Quantity.

1. Absence of Anakrusis is replaced by a Pause.
2. When the unaccented syllable (*senkung*) is wanting after a Chief Accent, its value is replaced by lengthening the preceding Chief-accented syllable, *e.g.* $\acute{x} \acute{x} \acute{(x)} \acute{x}$.

3. When the unaccented syllable (*senkung*) is wanting after a Sub-accent, its value is replaced partly by lengthening the preceding syllable, partly by a Pause.
4. Syllables to be lengthened must be long. Here is to be noticed that Germanic verse occasionally allows the freedom that syllables which in the spoken language are short, are, for the purposes of versification, treated as long, *e.g.* words of this form $\text{C} - \text{C}$, when they come at the end of a verse and are preceded by $\overset{|}{\text{C}}\text{C}$, are accented $\text{C} \text{ } \text{C}$ instead of $\text{C} - \text{C}$. The word 'cýning' is specially to be noticed in such lines as *feórh cýningès, heðfon cýningès* (where the 'n,' instead of beginning the second syllable, is counted as closing the first, and consequently lengthened in accordance with the universal custom in O.E.).¹ Also the Pres. Parts. *berende* and *wesende* in lines such as *sweórd béréndé* and *ræd béréndé* and *cniht wéséndé*, *Beow.* 372^b.
- (5) In conclusion, a rhythmical *More* can in general be filled by either a long or a short syllable—though in practice this freedom is very restricted—especially by the action of Lachmann's Law.

Rules for Accent, i.e. Relation of Verse Accent to Word Stress.

- I. The two chief Accents fall upon the two most strongly stressed syllables, and in the second hemistich the alliterative letter should coincide with the strongest stressed syllable in the line—except in cases like "wunode mid Fin" referred to already.
- II. (a) Every syllable capable of bearing a stress, if it comes before a less strongly stressed syllable which fills a *More* (*i.e.* is not capable of being slurred), or if it comes at the end of a line, must bear a Verse Accent. Thus the second syllable of 'Burgendum' and the third syllable of 'Gifca' in the line '*Burgendum Gíficá.*' Again, 'fólca geondférdé ||'

¹ Cf. *wið-dom*; see Ten Brink *Chaucer's Sprache und Verskunst*, § 87.

(b) Every syllable capable of bearing a stress is accented when it follows a less strongly stressed syllable which fills a *More* (*i.e.* is not capable of being slurred), *e.g.* *Eðrmanríe Götum*.

III. If a syllable capable of bearing a stress stand between two which are more strongly stressed, it may or may not receive a Verse Accent. If it is a sub-stressed syllable, and a Suffix, it can only bear a Verse Accent when, by so doing, it forms a Dipodie, *e.g.* 'Eðrmanríe Götum.' The 'an' must be unaccented, because, if accented, it would not form a Dipodie. On the other hand, in *leófné þeódén*, the syllable *-ne* does bear a sub-accent.

Of the normal line scanned, according to these rules, there are plenty of examples—the vast majority are such. I have already given an example of each variation, and I have no time for more.

Katalectic Lines.—One of the Sub-accented syllables may be replaced by a pause—but never a Chief-accented. As a rule it is the fourth verse Accent which is wanting. Only the Fundamental Type and Variations 1 and 4 can be Katalectic. A Katalectic verse can end either with (*α*) an unaccented or (*β*) an accented syllable. In the former case the Pause is a short one, in the latter long (cf. *scheme supra*, p. 9).

Examples—

F.T. *α*. frūmcýn wítan $\wedge$ Beow. 252^a.

Hrúntíng náma $\wedge$ Beow. 1458^b.

β. mǫrnénde móð $\overline{\wedge}$ Beow. 50^a.

wórd hórd onléac $\overline{\wedge}$ Beow. 259^b.

It is to be noticed that in case *β* an unaccented syllable occurs between the second and third Accents almost invariably. And when this is not the case then there is invariably Anakrusis, *e.g.* *Gecýsté þá* $\overline{\wedge}$ Beow. 1871^a.

Var. 1. *α*. wé þurh höldne hýge $\wedge$ Beow. 267^a.

þæt wæs góð cýning $\wedge$ Beow. 11^b.

β. þæt fram hám gefrægn $\overline{\wedge}$ Beow. 194^a.

ónd Húlgá tǫl $\overline{\wedge}$ Beow. 61^b.

The omission of an unaccented syllable between the first and second Chief Accent is much commoner in the second hemistich than in the first.

Var. 4. *a.* swūtol sǫng scōpes $\wedge$ Beow. 90^a.

wōp ūp āhāfen $\wedge$ Beow. 128^b.

β. fýrst fōrþ ȝewát $\overline{\wedge}$ Beow. 210^a.

hōlm stōrme weól $\overline{\wedge}$ Beow. 1132^b.

Here two things are to be noticed. (1) This type of verse is not so beautiful in form as those above, for a Pause, following upon a Sub-accent, is not natural. The poet is, therefore, careful to ensure that the Sub-accent coincides with a Chief stress. (2) In case *β* there is always an unaccented syllable between the second and third Verse Accents.

In var. 1 *only*, the first Sub-accent is sometimes absent, thus: ' | " " ', and this form generally occurs in the second half-line, *e.g.* $\overline{\wedge}$ ȝewāden hæfdé, Beow. 220^b.

How can we distinguish ' | " " ' from " " ' | ', *i.e.* var. 4, Katatalectic?

Easily, for in the case of var. 4 " " ' | ', the last Verse Accent, as we have seen, always coincides with a *Chief Stress*, whilst in this particular variety of Katalectic, var. 1, the last Verse Accent always coincides with a Sub-stress (Nebenton); moreover, in this case, the line *always* begins with an unaccented syllable, which looks like Anakrusis.

Finally, there is an occasional Katalexis of the *Fundamental Type* where the first chief-accented syllable in the line is lengthened so as to cover the following unaccented and accented Morè, thus:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} x \rangle \acute{x} x \acute{x} & x \acute{x} x \acute{x} \\ \wedge \quad \underline{\quad} & \underline{\quad} \quad \underline{\quad} \end{array}$$

Ex. ^{'''}ōr āstēlidæ (Cædmon's Hymn).

hām ȝesōhté, Widsið 7^b.

þrýmm ȝefrúnón, Beow. 2^b.

ȝūđ-ȝewæddú, Beow. 2618^b.

The prolonged syllable at the opening, it must be noticed, is not only always long and bears a Chief Accent, but it is generally followed by a Continuant Consonant. In addition to which, this particular form of verse nearly always occurs in the second hemistich, which makes the matter easier; for the first accent in this hemistich is naturally the strongest in the whole line. This form of line, I may say, presupposes and points towards a musical form of delivery—to *song*, for it would be difficult to *speak* such a line without destroying the Rhythm.

It is possible, of course, to find shorter lines than even these, but all scholars, including Sievers and Rieger, look upon them as corrupt.

Hyperkatalectic lines proper, i.e. lines ending in an extra *unaccented* syllable, there are not many of. Most of them are to be reduced to the right measure by slurring, which was apparently allowed freer play in the Caesura than elsewhere. *e.g.*

Wōrd wæron wýnsumē, Beow. 613^a.

Eárd ón eórlscípe, Beow. 1728^a.

Séllíce sǣdracan, Beow. 1427^a.

EXPANDED LINES, called by German scholars *Schwell-verse* or *Streck-verse*, are hypercatalectic, in that they possess a larger number of Verse Stresses than the normal line. Either, or both, hemistiches may be expanded. The half-line is either (1) expanded by a half; the method in the great majority of cases, or (2) it is doubled in length, which is a peculiarly characteristic form of the expanded line in the younger Genesis.

Now is it possible to discover any principle in the way in which these verses are expanded? Because if not, then it will be impossible to say which part of the verse is expansion, and which not, and it is equally impossible to see how such a line was understood to be expanded by an Old English audience.

Ten Brink does not seem to have come to any final conclusion about the matter. Certainly the view taken by my old friend, Dr. Gregory Foster, in his *Studies on Judith* (Q. and F. 1892); a view with which Ten Brink was then inclined to agree, I believe, does not coincide with that which he seemed to hold in the winter of 1889-90.

I will quote Foster's theory verbatim, as it gives what was practically Ten Brink's last opinion on this matter.

"Such lines," he says, "are 'expanded' by *prefixing* to each hemistich a chief-stressed syllable, thus raising the number of chief-stresses in each hemistich to three, and one or more either secondary or un-stressed syllables. In the first hemistich, this prefixed syllable should alliterate, but not in the second hemistich, in which the syllable having the chief-letter becomes the second chief-stressed, but remains the first, and only, rime-letter of the hemistich."

Now, though as a matter of fact, this account of the construction fits the majority of the lines in *Judith*, yet even in a poem, the author of which has shown such marvelous skill in the use of these expanded lines (as Foster has proved), and who, in other respects, was evidently a most polished and skilful versifier—even in this poem there are at least two lines which will not fit in with Foster's theory, and he remarks that "the irregular form of these lines in the *Cynewulf* poems is remarkable."

Besides which, one does not see why in such a line as *beálofúl his béddés neósán*, *Judith* 63^a, the word *beálofúl* should be expansion rather than *neósán*. There is nothing in the reason of things, according to this theory, why the first element should be expansion. Foster makes no attempt to explain the construction of hemistiches which are *double the normal measure*.

Now, in my opinion, no theory about these Expanded Lines—so far, at any rate, as they are found in the older verse, the poetry composed in recitation and not on parchment—can be the right one, unless it explains to us not only their actual form, but how an audience appreciated that they were listening to an expanded line. If the expansion was not *heard* by the audience, as in some way an integral portion of the line, the additional syllables would strike the ear as an impertinence, and as absolutely destroying, not only the Prosody, but the rhythm of the line.¹ Of course the rhythm of an expanded line must be the same as that of a normal line in *character*, though it should be felt to be an extension of the normal phrase. The law, then, if one is to be found, must be one which appeals to the ear, not to the eye.

Now, as we all know, the unity of the two hemistiches depends upon the alliteration. The first half-line, usually, though by

¹ They would in fact have an effect similar to the irregular verse of Southey for our ears.

no means always, has two alliterative letters; the second half only one. The existence of only one rime-letter in the second hemistich ensures the two halves being felt to form one whole, and makes it clear in the majority of cases whether we are listening to the opening or close of a line. This being the case, what would be the most natural place for a poet to make an addition to his hemistich? Surely if the expansion is to take place in the first hemistich, it would come between the normal hemistich and the verse pause. If the *second* hemistich is to be expanded it would receive an addition between the verse pause and the opening of the hemistich. In this way the ear could never be in doubt as to what was expansion and what not, nor as to which hemistich the expansion belonged to. The alliterative letters would fall in exactly the same places as in the normal line; the expansion would receive no rime-letters. On testing the expanded lines in the O.E. corpus from this point of view I have found that the vast majority of expanded lines conform to this type, which may, therefore, be taken as the normal, or Type I. Every line (about which there is no doubt that it is expanded), in *Béowulf* is constructed according to this type; but *no* expanded lines occur in the oldest part of *Béowulf*. Here is a line expanded in both hemistiches, though it is not necessary that one should always be expanded because the other is, indeed, as a rule, in *Béowulf* only one hemistich is expanded.

Beow. 2996. lándés ond löcénrá { beáǵá ||
 ne þórfte hím } ǣá léan oðwítán ||

Other examples are :—

Beow. 1167^a. æt fōtúm sæt fréan { Scýldingá ||
 Beow. 1708^a. fréode, swá wit fūrðúm { spræcón ||
 Beow. 2174^a. wræthlécne wúndúr- { máððúm ||

Two things are to be noticed here—(1) that when the first hemistich is expanded it *always* has two alliterative letters, at any rate in the older poetry. In *Judith*, which is modelled upon the old heroic poems, there is only one exception to this,

viz. 90^{a1}. (2) There is no objection to the second element of a compound forming the expansion of the first hemistich, especially when there is no unstressed syllable at the opening of the second element. The necessary pause, which must then take place between the two elements, helps to mark the commencement of the expansion. Several examples of lines, constructed like Beow. 2174^a, are to be found elsewhere, *e.g.* the Rood Poem, 47^a, 63^a, 68^a; Judith, 7^a, 11^a, 346^a.

All the expanded lines in the Seafarer (except one, which I shall come to presently), all the expanded lines in the Wanderer (except one, which I shall return to), all the expanded lines in the undoubtedly older portion of Widsið,² and the two examples of expansion in the Battle of Finnsburg (ll. 13 and 24), are constructed upon this normal type. Line 24 in the Battle of Finnsburg is interesting, because it is impossible to scan it at all upon Foster's theory, whilst it is quite easy on mine :- -

1. 24. Sífeférhð is mīn nāma ∧ {cwæð hē.

Two unaccented syllables together (*doppelte Senkung*) is by no means unknown in the first hemistich.³

To sum up—Every expanded line in the national epic and the lyrics (I have examined) are Type I. with two exceptions, which are Type II.

To turn to the religious epic—the work of the Cædmonian and Cynewulfian schools:

In Genesis A. *all* the expanded lines are of Type I. There are only three slight irregularities, viz. 2866^a, which is expanded, and only has one instead of two alliterative letters, and 2142^b and 2182^b, which have the alliterative letter in the expansion instead of on the first Chief Accent of the normal portion of the hemistich.

Gen. A. 2142^b. nis wōruld feóh, } ðe ic me ágan wíllé.

Gen. A. 2182^b. fésté } mýnteð íngeðāncúm.

¹ It is doubtful whether 9^a is expanded; if it is, then this is another exception.

² Müllenhof rejected ll. 75-87 and 131-134 as later interpolations, and I agree with him. I think we shall see that there is ground for regarding ll. 59-64 with considerable suspicion.

³ Cf. *gesáwon þá æfter wáteré ||* Beow. 1426^a.

It seems impossible, in either case, to consider the expansion as at the end. If the expansion *is* at the end, then they belong to Type III.

In Gen. B., which was written about two centuries later (latter half of ninth century), and has been proved to be based on the 'Heliand,' there is a *very* large number of expanded lines. Many of them belong to what I shall call Type II., and I pass these over for the present. Of the remainder, all, except two, are expanded in accordance with Type I. In two cases (338^a and 488^a) there is only one instead of two alliterative letters. The two exceptions to Type I. are 287^b and 301^b, but it is doubtful whether 287^b is an expanded hemistich at all. L. 301^b seems to be a case of what I shall call Type III., unless we may assume Elision of the 'e' in 'hæfde'; in which case we might possibly construe it as an unexpanded hemistich.¹

Of the four expanded lines in *Exodus* all are of Type I., viz. ll. 570-73.

There are many more expanded lines in *Daniel*. If we omit the clearly corrupt passages, every expansion is constructed according to Type I. There might be some doubt about 453^a, but this is, in all probability, a case of three-syllable Anakrusis.

In *Christ and Satan*, lines 260^b and 261^a belong to Type II., but all the rest belong to Type I. If l. 89^a is not corrupt, there is only one alliterative letter instead of two. Line 205^a seems irregular, but the 'mid ealra,' at the opening of the line, has evidently crept in from l. 203, and it is, therefore, a normal line. To sum up then: In the Cædmonian poems there is only one probable case of Type III.—at the very utmost only three in all. Of Type II., if we except 'Genesis B.,' there are only two hemistiches, both of which occur in 'Christ and Satan.'

We now come to Cynewulf and his school. All the expanded lines in the 'Christ' are clear examples of Type I., with the exception of five. 1163^b and 1515^b may possibly be examples of Type III., but possibly they are hemistiches with two-syllable *Senkung*—though it is true that this phenomenon is rare in the

¹ I. hýld hæfdé his | ferlörené or

II. hýld hæfde his ferlörené.

But case II. we should have two syllables together unaccented, a doubtful possibility in the second hemistich; besides, it occurs in the middle of a passage of expanded lines, and this speaks against the second method of scansion, though it is true that 302^b may also be a normal hemistich.

second hemistich. 1385^a I can make nothing of in any way unless we are to assume three-syllable *Senkung* between the first and second Stresses. 1496^a and 1425^b seem clear cases of Type III.¹ In the *Elene*, as in the *Christ*, there are but few alliterative lines, but they are all Type I. 582^a is slightly irregular, in having only one alliterative letter. Lines 163 and 610, which Foster takes to be expanded, seem to me normal lines.

In the *Dream of the Rood* the expanded lines are of two types—of the second Type there are about ten lines (quite certain), and about as many again where we cannot be sure whether they are Type I. or Type II. The remainder are clear examples of Type I. Three lines, 10^b, 47^b, and 83^a, offer some difficulties, but there are no clear cases of Type III. This is significant, as Ten Brink places this poem as the first of Cynewulf's religious epics.

The expansions in the *Andreas* are all Type I., but there are only a few.

In *Guthlac*, however, there are no less than eleven clear cases of lines constructed on Type III. (the least perfect form of the three), e.g. 163^a, 212^a, 347^a, 348^a, 436^a, 437^a? 440^a, 673^a, 674^a, 713^a, 350^a. This is very extraordinary, and it is worth notice that Ten Brink has placed this poem among the last of Cynewulf's productions.

Finally, let us turn to the '*Judith*,' which Foster has clearly shown to belong to the Cynewulf school, and to be later than his work. The poet, as Foster has proved, makes a most skilful use of the expanded line, and there are, relatively, a large number of them. The large majority are clear cases of Type I., but 9^a and 65^a seem evidently cases of Type III., and, on the analogy of those, I am inclined to interpret seven other cases, 11^a, 17^a, 19^a, 20^a, 33^a, 270^a, and 242^a. But I shall return to these. Suffice, for the present, that I believe there to be nine cases of Type III. in *Judith*.

Type II. This type is the double of the normal line, instead of half as long again. Here it would be impossible for the whole expansion to occur between the close of the normal line and the verse pause in the case of the first hemistich, because the

¹ Ll. 1305^a, 1378^a, 1410^a, 922^a, 1050^a, 1360^a, and 1666^a, which Foster considers to be irregular expanded hemistiches, I look upon as normal un-expanded ones.

line would then sound like a normal line without alliteration in the second hemistich.

The expansion, therefore, takes place in the best examples, half between the two rime letters and half at the close. This in the first hemistich.

The result, therefore, is equivalent to two hemistiches with one alliterative letter in each. As a rule the second alliterative letter occurs in the accented syllable fourth from the end, but sometimes on that third from the end, and occasionally on the second from the close. In the second hemistich the whole expansion occurs between the verse pause and the normal line. In the later poetry there are examples of the whole expansion occurring at the beginning of the hemistich, even in the first hemistich, but this is very exceptional.

There are no Type II. lines in *Beowulf* or *Finnsburg*, *i.e.* in the national epic

In 'Seefarer' is *one* clear example of Type II. in the first hemistich of l. 106.

dōl bið sé ȝe him | his dŕýhtén ne ondrædēð.

Here if, as Sievers assumes, 'ne' can bear a stress, the Sub-accent should fall upon 'ne.'

The second hemistich of l. 106 is an expansion of Type I. A curiously similar line to this occurs in the *Wanderer*, l. 112—the only one:

T'īl bið sé ȝe him | tréowé ȝehéaldēð.

The second hemistich is also of Type I.

Now we come to the 'Widsið.' Here are two groups of very long lines which can only be explained as Type II., but they are very irregular in construction, viz. 59-64 and 76-87.

An example from each group is:

60. Mid Gēfdúm ic wæs | ānd mid W'inedúm || ānd mid Gūmġgum.

84. Mid Mōrdúm ic wæs | ānd mid Pērsúm || ānd mid Mýrgġngum.

Even if this scansion is right there are several irregularities.

Now Müllenhof rejects ll. 75-87 and 131-134 on other satisfactory grounds, as later interpolations.

It is certainly very tempting to reject group 59-64, which is exactly parallel in style and in syntax, and almost, though not, perhaps, quite so vile in versification.

If this is justified, we only have two examples of Type II. in the older lyric poetry. Of these, that in the Wanderer occurs in the second half of the poem, which Ten Brink, upon other grounds than those of metric, considered to be by a later hand, and I agree with him. We have thus reduced our ten little niggers to one. I suspect there will soon be proof that will dispatch even this one. Type II., indeed, is not made any considerable use of till we come to Genesis B., where there are a large number, and if we remember the source of the English poem we shall not feel surprised I think. Most of the examples are regular, but I have noted that the alliteration occurs in an irregular place in ll. 322^a and 708^a.

322^a. Lāgon ʒá óʒré | Fýnd ón ʒam Fýré ||

708^a is a similar case.

In some cases it is difficult to say whether we have a line of Type I. or II., though the constant undoubted cases of the latter make an *a priori* presumption in its favour.

Example 260^a. Wíʒ þóne hēhstán | heōfnés weáldénd

or

Wíʒ þone hēhstán heōfnés | weáldénd.

In *Christ and Satan* there are two hemistiches of Type II., viz. 260^b and 261^a.

260^b. Gʷd seōlfá hím | ríce heáldéʒ.

261^a is a regular example.

In the Cynewulfian poems we only find this type in "The Dream of the Rood," but here there are a good many, though, again, it is sometimes hard to say whether we have a Type I. or Type II.

An example of a second hemistich, as I have not yet given a regular one, is:

66^b. cūrfón hie ʒæt | on beʒrhtán stáné.

The conclusion to be drawn is that this is not so old as Type I., and probably arose after poems were composed on parchment and not by ear.

Type III. is the least perfect *and* the rarest. These could only arise when poets *wrote*, and did not compose in recitation. In the first hemistich expansion is by a half, but at the beginning of the hemistich instead of at the end. In the second hemistich expansion is at the *end* and not at the *beginning*. But this is rarer than Type III. in the first hemistich. The expansion can only be recognized as such by the *Syntax*.

Examples from the 'Guthlac':

163^a. eƿædon þæt | he ðn þám beðrgé ||

440^a. ealles ðú | ðæs wité áwúnné ||

Example from 'Christ':

1425^b. Læ̃g on hēardúm A { stāne.

If this is not right, then there is no alliterative letter. .

In Judith there are several examples of Type III., but they are peculiar in having alliterative letters in the expansion as a rule. This one has only *one* alliterative in the hemistich.

9^a. Gírwán | úp swæséndó ||

19^a. Fállé | flétt sýtténdúm ||

I do not see how else to scan this with 9^a in view.

In conclusion, we find none of these lines in the national epic, nor in the old lyric, and in the Cædmonian poems there are also none (for, of course, I do not include Genesis B.). This type, therefore, does not occur till the Cynewulfian time, *i.e.* a time well within that when composition took place on parchment, and the invariable appeal to the ear both by poet and public was gone. Cynewulf seems to have grown more lax in the use of this type as time went on, for in Guthlac are many more than in any poem of his I have examined. In Judith, too, as we should expect, since it was written after Cynewulf's time, there is a comparatively large number of these lines, but I attribute the poet's use of the first alliterative letter in the expansion to his study of the older schools of poetry. He saw a line like Beow. 2173^a—

Wrætlicne wúndór { mǣððúm ||

and did not recognize that 'mǣððúm' must necessarily be the

expansion. The appeal to the ear was gone—his imitation was a purely mechanical and therefore superficial one, and if we are to scan many of his lines we must assume the word with the first alliterative letter to be in the expansion at the beginning of the line.

In conclusion, I need only say that if this conception of the construction of the expanded line be correct, the occurrence, or non-occurrence, of the various types in O.E. poems may serve as a relative time test in deciding their dates.