

REVIEWS

The Morphology of Dutch. By Geert Booij. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. Pp. xii, 253. Paper. \$29.95.

Reviewed by DAVID FERTIG, *University at Buffalo (SUNY)*

The Morphology of Dutch (henceforth MoD) is a comprehensive work covering all major areas of Dutch morphology, including the interfaces with phonology and syntax. It presents a thorough description and discusses a large number of interesting theoretical questions. MoD consists of seven chapters followed by a bibliography, both subject and author indices, and a useful index of affixes. Chapter 1 is preceded by a list of tables and figures, a guide to abbreviations and symbols, and a very brief preface.

Chapter 1, entitled “Preliminaries,” offers a short introduction to some aspects of morphological theory that are crucial for understanding the following chapters. Booij adopts a lexeme-based approach to morphology, and explains the nature of morphological rules and of the lexicon within such an approach. Other sections in this chapter are devoted to productivity and to “paradigmatic word formation,” where Booij explains that “the insight that paradigmatic relations between words form the foundation of morphology is a hallmark of the Dutch tradition of morphological research” (p. 6).

Chapter 2, “The inflectional system,” begins with an introductory section devoted largely to explaining the distinction between inherent and contextual inflection, and then continues with sections on nominal, adjectival, and verbal inflection. The account of noun plurals is especially thorough. Booij points out that a formulation of the basic principle for choosing between the two main plural suffixes, *-s* and *-en*, in terms of a (violable) prosodic output condition on the plural form (“A plural noun ends in a trochee,” p. 24) is explanatory in a way that the more usual input-based formulation (“*-s* after an unstressed syllable, *-en* after a stressed syllable,” p. 24) is not, since for the latter “it would make no difference for the complexity of the grammar if Dutch were just the other way round” (p. 25). He goes on to present a full Optimality-Theoretic account of the Dutch regular plurals, which helps explain several facts that do not follow from the basic prosodic condition itself,

such as the choice of *-s* over *-(e)n* in nouns that already end in a schwa, and then discusses various classes of exceptions to the regular pattern. The section on adjectival inflection includes insightful discussions of the nominalizing suffix *-e* and the partitive adjective + *s* construction.

The inflection chapter concludes with a section on the distinction between inflectional and derivational morphology and the related “split morphology” hypothesis, according to which derivation and inflection belong to separate (presyntactic versus postsyntactic) modules of the grammar. Booij argues that this hypothesis must be rejected since certain types of inflection can feed derivation. He presents various kinds of evidence for a functional continuum rather than a sharp distinction between derivation and inflection. He argues, however, that the fact that uninflected stems constitute the normal input for word formation means that a clear formal distinction between derivation and inflection must nevertheless be maintained.

Chapter 3, “Derivation,” begins with a long section on “Theoretical preliminaries,” which deals with questions such as the usefulness of the notion *head* in derivation, input restrictions on derivational operations (including those related to the native and non-native strata of the Dutch lexicon), blocking, and the semantics of derivation. The remainder of the chapter focuses on the productive prefixes and suffixes of Dutch as well as conversion (category-changing zero derivation). An especially interesting type of conversion in Dutch involves the (no longer productive) zero-derivation of nouns from complex verbs. The gender of these nouns is predictable based on the internal morphological structure of the underlying verb: nouns derived from verbs with separable particles are non-neuter, those from verbs with inseparable prefixes are neuter. Booij regards this pattern as evidence against a zero-affixation account of conversion, since all of these nouns would presumably contain the same zero suffix, which should assign them to the same gender. He does not mention that these data are even more problematic for the headless-derivation account of conversion embraced by dual-mechanism advocates, according to which words formed by conversion, being “headless,” automatically receive default inflectional properties and gender. This is also one of several phenomena that Booij regards as counterevidence to Anderson’s hypothesis that the internal morphological structure of a complex word is invisible to later morphological computations. Booij also includes discussions of middle verbs and of

intransitive use of fundamentally transitive verbs in the section on conversion on the grounds that these could be regarded as cases of zero derivation with “no change in category, but in subcategory” (p. 139).

The bulk of chapter 4, “Compounding,” is devoted to the very productive operations of nominal and adjectival compound formation. The short section on verbal compounds begins by explaining that “verbal compounding is unproductive in Dutch” (p. 161), but then goes on to discuss a number of interesting compound-like verb types in Dutch, including converted compound nouns such as *voetballen* ‘to play football’, and back formations such as *stofzuigen* ‘to vacuum-clean’ from *stofzuiger* ‘vacuum cleaner’. The chapter concludes with a brief section on the numeral compounds in Dutch.

The next two chapters are devoted to the interfaces of morphology with phonology (chapter 5) and with syntax (chapter 6). Chapter 5 deals with three topics: the relation between morphology and prosody, allomorphy, and phonological constraints on word formation such as phonological conditions on the choice between competing affixes, a topic that was already discussed at considerable length in chapter 2 and is here extended to apply to derivational morphology. Again, Booij shows that the choice between competing affixes is best understood primarily in terms of output constraints on the shape of the derived word, although he acknowledges that phonological constraints on the bases do play a role in some cases (p. 184).

The largest section in chapter 6 deals with separable complex verbs. The other main topic covered is the relation between morphological derivation and syntactic valency, as, for example, when the addition of a prefix such as *ver-* or *be-* turns an intransitive verb into a transitive one.

The three-page final chapter, “Conclusions: The architecture of the grammar,” is a very useful summary of what Booij regards as the key theoretical points of MoD.

I find much to praise and little to criticize in MoD. One of the features that impresses me most about the book is the generally very successful integration of synchrony and diachrony in the accounts of several phenomena. Because my own specialization is in historical Germanic, however, I do find a few details in the diachronic accounts that might benefit from clarification or reconsideration.

In discussing the historical origins of the two primary Dutch noun plural suffixes, *-s* and *-en*, Booij states the following:

The historical source of the *s*-suffix is West Germanic: this suffix was used in Germanic dialects along the North Sea coast, and may thus be qualified as Ingvaemonic. The English plural suffix is a reflex of this situation. The suffix *-en*, on the other hand, can be qualified as more continental Germanic (compare present-day German that has a variety of plural suffixes with schwa). In the course of time both suffixes became part of the morphological system of standard Dutch, and thus a division of labor between the two suffixes developed (pp. 23–24).

This account is misleading on a couple of minor points. First, Booij seems to be equating West Germanic with Ingvaeonic (North Sea Germanic) but Dutch and High German, where the *-s* ending was historically lost, are just as much a part of West Germanic. Second, there is nothing “continental” about the *-en* ending, which plays a major role in all of the older Germanic languages, including Old English and the other Ingvaeonic dialects. Finally, contrary to what Booij seems to be implying, there is no historical connection between *-en* and the other German plural suffixes with schwa. None of this, however, invalidates the substance of Booij’s main diachronic point here, namely that the co-existence of *-en* and *-s* in present-day standard Dutch is a result of a mixture of features from different dialects and the current prosodically determined “division of labor between the two suffixes” has only taken shape quite recently.

Booij attributes the alternation between short /*a*/ in the singular and long /*ā*/ in the plural of certain strong verbs to “open syllable lengthening which is due to Prokosch’s law” (p. 59). In fact, however, this is a reflex of an ancient ablaut alternation. Most of the classes of strong verbs originally had an ablaut alternation between the singular and the plural in the preterite indicative. In the verbs of classes IV and V, the alternation was between Indo-European (short) *o* and (lengthened grade) *ē*. After *o* > *a* in Germanic and *ē* > *ā* in West Germanic, this came to look like a purely quantitative alternation. Open syllable lengthening is only relevant here in the indirect sense that the survival of this old alternation in present-day Dutch may well have much to do with its coincidental resemblance to the much younger alternations that resulted from open syllable lengthening elsewhere in the language.

Booij claims that the *r* in *verloor/verloren*, past tense of *verliezen*, is “the reflex of rhotacization of an intervocalic /z/” (p. 177). However, West Germanic rhotacization, unlike the Latin development involving similar phenomena, actually has nothing to do with intervocalic position, as we can see from the fact that it does not occur in the infinitive *verliezen*. Instead, West Germanic rhotacization was triggered by Verner’s Law, a change that led to a voicing alternation for all Germanic fricatives depending on the position of the Indo-European accent in the word. This is also the source of the $\emptyset \sim g$ alternation (where $\emptyset < h < x$) in *slaan-sloeg/geslagen*, which Booij does not discuss.

In discussing the dual-mechanism theory of morphological processing, Booij argues that “storage of frequent regular forms is also something we have to allow for in order to be able to explain that the effects of once regular phonological rules can survive after the loss of such rules” (p. 10, note 6). If this were true, it would be very problematic for the dual-mechanism theory, but the diachronic mechanism by which a once regular rule becomes irregular is generally assumed to involve the transmission of a language to new learners. A given speaker/learner either interprets a rule as regular, in which case s/he has no need for lexical storage, or s/he reinterprets the once regular pattern as an irregularity and stores the inflected forms in the lexicon. Since learners have no direct access to other speakers’ mental grammars or lexicons, nothing is gained by positing an intermediate stage at which speakers store the inflected forms in their lexicon even though they still interpret the pattern as regular.

In his discussion of separable and inseparable complex verbs (SCVs and ICVs), Booij proposes a historical account of the elements that occur as both separable particles and inseparable prefixes in Modern Dutch, which include *aan*, *achter*, *door*, *mis*, *om*, *onder*, *vol*, *voor*, and *weer*. He claims that the inseparable prefixes are more grammaticalized than the separable particles in terms of both their fusion to the verb stem and their semantics. He then presents evidence of cases where SCVs attested in an earlier stage of Dutch correspond to ICVs in the present-day language, and argues that these show that the particle-to-prefix development is a case of grammaticalization that has been occurring in Middle and Modern Dutch, corresponding to the second step in the cline: “word > part of SCV > prefix” (p. 218). A full critique of this account, the key points of which have now been repeated in several publications (see, for

example, Booij 2001, Blom and Booij 2003, Blom 2004), would go beyond the scope of this review, but I would like to raise a couple of questions about its historical plausibility.

In the “Old” period of the West Germanic languages (roughly 700–1100 A.D.), the cognates of Modern Dutch *achter*, *door*, *over*, *om*, *onder*, and *weer* were used much more often as inseparable prefixes than as separable particles. The modern SCVs (and English particle verbs) arose in a later round of grammaticalization, of which we see only the beginnings in the Old period (Brinton 1988, Harrison 1891). Most of the specific ICVs that Booij lists as innovations of Middle or Modern Dutch are attested many centuries earlier, often with exactly the same semantic and syntactic properties, in one or more of the older West Germanic languages. Thus, Dutch *omringen* corresponds exactly to the frequent Old English ICV *ymbhringan* and Old High German (8th century) *umbihringen* ‘surround’ (OED; Pfeifer 1993), Dutch *overbruggan* ‘to bridge’ to OE *oferbrycgian*, MHG *überbrücken*; *overvallen* to OE *oferfeollan*, MHG *übevallen* ‘attack’; *voorkomen* ‘to prevent’ to OE *forecuman* (OED; Lexer). The preverb *æfter* does not occur often as an inseparable prefix with most OE verbs, but the very common ICV *æfterfylgean* (= Dutch *achtervolgen* ‘to run after’) is a notable exception (Harrison 1891:15). Similarly, Dutch *overkomen* ‘to happen to’ (Blom and Booij 2003:82) corresponds to the early Old English ICV *ofercuman* and 8th century OHG *ubarqueman*, and exact counterparts of Dutch *overzien* ‘to survey’ occur as ICVs in all three branches of “Old” West Germanic: OE *oferséon*; OHG *ubarsehan*; OS *ovarsehhan* (OED; Cordes 1973:70).

Furthermore, as Kemenade and Los (2003) point out, the particle > prefix development is only likely to occur “if the morphosyntax of the language allows it” (p. 90). Conditions were right in the early Germanic period, when verbs generally still occurred in final position in all clause types, but the rise of V2-movement, resulting in frequent separation of the verb from its particle in main clauses, means that a repeat of the “development from SCV to ICV [...] would not be likely for the continental West Germanic dialects” (p. 99).

The historical Germanic evidence thus suggests a diachrony for the SCVs and ICVs of Dutch that is quite different from that proposed by Booij. The modern Dutch ICVs are an inheritance from early West Germanic and represent an older layer of the language than the SCVs.

Since *omringen*, *overbruggan*, *overvallen*, *æfterfylgean*, *overkomen*, and *overzien* can all be confidently traced directly back to early West Germanic ICVs, the SCV forms of these words that are attested in Middle Dutch represent, if anything, changes from ICV to SCV (and then back again). It is much more likely, however, that these old Germanic ICVs simply showed some variation in Middle Dutch times, and surviving texts (or at least those that have been examined so far) happen to preserve only SCV tokens.

I found about two dozen minor typographical errors, few of which created any difficulty for comprehension. Several of the errors consist of missing hyphens at the ends of lines. Other apparent editing errors include page 185, where Booij repeats exactly the same point (“Alternatively, we may assume that there is no stem truncation [...]”) in the main text and in note 7 (with different wording).

Several of Booij’s English glosses are likely to cause some confusion for readers who do not know Dutch. He glosses *defterig* as ‘solemnish’ and *zuinerig* as ‘thriftyish’ (p. 134). These words are not in any dictionary, and as a native speaker I have no clear intuitions as to what they would mean if they were English words. In example 63 on the same page, Booij gives the glosses ‘rather fresh’, ‘rather common’, etc. (without *-ly*) under the “adverb” column. Similarly, the glosses in 34 on p. 155 should all have superlative endings (‘very nicest’, etc.). He glosses *domweg* as ‘simply’ rather than ‘stupidly’ (p. 134), and commits one classic false-friend error in glossing *voorbehoedsmiddel* as ‘preservative’ rather than as ‘contraceptive’ (p. 146). A few other glosses use such uncommon or ambiguous words or expressions that many readers are likely to misinterpret them. The verb *biggen*, for example, which means ‘to give birth to piglets’ is glossed as ‘to pig’ (p. 136).

None of the problems mentioned in this review amounts to much, however, compared to the many impressive virtues of MoD. It is comprehensive, well organized, and extremely well written. In addition to its obvious usefulness for anyone interested in Dutch, I think this book deserves serious consideration as a text for general introductory morphology courses. The explanations of theoretical concepts are models of clarity, and the range of topics covered is ideal for an introductory course.

REFERENCES

- Blom, Corrien. 2004. On the diachrony of complex predicates in Dutch: Predicative and nonpredicative preverbs. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 16.1–75.
- Blom, Corrien and Geert Booij. 2003. The diachrony of complex predicates in Dutch: A case study in grammaticalization. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 50.61–91.
- Booij, Geert. 2001. From syntax to morphology: Separable complex verbs. *Naturally! Linguistic studies in honor of Wolfgang Ulrich Dressler presented on the occasion of his 60th birthday*, ed. by Chris Schaner-Wolles, John Rennison, and Friedrich Neubarth, 59–64. Torino: Rosenberg and Sellier.
- Brinton, Laurel J. 1988. *The development of English aspectual systems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cordes, Gerhard. 1973. *Altniederdeutsches Elementarbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Harrison, Thomas Perrin. 1891. *The separable prefixes in Anglo-Saxon*. College Park, MD: McGrath. [Reprinted edition, 1970.]
- Kemenade, Ans van, and Bettelou Los. 2003. Particles and prefixes in Dutch and English. *Yearbook of Morphology 2003*, ed. by Geert Booij and Jaap van Marle, 79–117. Boston: Kluwer.
- Lexer, Matthias. 1876. *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch*, vol. 2. Leipzig: Hirzel.
- OED = Oxford English Dictionary Online. 2005. Oxford University Press. (Available electronically at <http://dictionary.oed.com/>.)
- Pfeifer, Wolfgang. 1993. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Deutschen*. Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag.

Department of Linguistics
 University at Buffalo
 609 Baldy Hall
 Buffalo, NY 14260-1030
 USA
 [fertig@buffalo.edu]

The Metre of Old Saxon Poetry: The Remaking of Alliterative Tradition. By Seiichi Suzuki. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2004. Pp. xx, 505. Hardcover. \$90.00.

Reviewed by ROBERT D. FULK, *Indiana University*

One consequence of the renaissance of Sieversian metrics over the past twenty years is that Old Saxon poetic meter, to which few monographs had previously been dedicated, has now been thoroughly dissected in two mammoth and exhaustive works: first by Dietrich Hofmann in a two volume study of 1991 that brings to bear the insights of A. J. Bliss's analysis of Beowulfian metrics, and now by one of the leading researchers in Old English meter. Like Hofmann, Suzuki offers an exceptionally rich synchronic description of the metrical patterns of the *Heliand* and *Genesis*, though not within the analytic framework of Bliss (who in fact is cited just once in more than 500 pages), but on the basis of Suzuki's own 1996 study of the meter of *Beowulf*. Yet while Hofmann (who died in 1998) was determined to analyze Old Saxon meter on its own terms, without any preconceptions about its relation to other metrical traditions, Suzuki begins with the assumption that it derives historically from a system treated here as identical to that of *Beowulf*, and thus his chief aim, after describing the synchronic facts in detail, is to explain how the one system evolved into the other.

Regardless of whether one accepts this initial derivational premise, the account itself of the changes involved is acute and compelling. Studies of the Old Saxon language generally assume, *contra* Hofmann, reduction of stress as a way of accounting for various phonological developments, including the rise of anaptyctic vowels before post-consonantal resonants, the extensive, analogically motivated restoration of syncopated vowels, and (Suzuki proposes) the preservation of postconsonantal /j/, lost in the other West Germanic languages. The most general consequence of stress reduction for the meter was that stress came to play a smaller role, and syllable quantity a greater one. More specifically, some of the chief effects were "the obscuration of the three kinds of metrical positions (the lift, the normal drop, and the heavy drop); the neutralization of basic and increased metrical types; the reappraisal of parasitic weak derivative elements occurring before and after the first lift as full metrical positions; the increasing ambiguity and

partial merge[r] of normal and hypermetric verses; and the disruption of the unity between double alliteration and lift formation including resolution” (p. 340). The greater part of the book is a detailed study of these effects, documented statistically in table after table showing the separate incidence of the various verse types in the on-verse with and without double alliteration, and in the off-verse. Thus, after a linguistic introduction the chapters take up, in turn, Sievers’ five metrical types and their subtypes as represented in the *Heliand*, the distribution of anacrusis (with a separate, synthesizing section mopping up such diverse topics as the distinction between normal and heavy drops, the scansion of disyllabic inflections, and the treatment of quasi-compounds), resolution and its suspension, alliterative patterns, and the structure of hypermetric verses, with a superb summary and synthesis (pp. 330–344). The volume is rounded out by two appendices, on the scansion of foreign names and on the meter of *Genesis* (found to be similar to, but less historically developed than, that of the *Heliand*), a bibliography of just four pages (as opposed to the seven pages required to list all the tables in the book) and five indices, to the scansion of the two poems, and of authors cited, subjects, and verses discussed.

Given Suzuki’s aim of tracing the historical development of the meter, it may seem an outlandish appraisal, but in a peculiar way the approach adopted is uniformly ahistorical. A characteristic of Old English meter that has come into particularly clear focus in recent years is its embodiment of metrical archaisms. In part this is a consequence of poets’ knowledge of verse traditions, so that, for example, although OE *wundor* ‘marvel’ and *sēon* ‘see’ were certainly a disyllable and a monosyllable, respectively, in the poets’ own speech, they could be used with just the reverse metrical values, which the words in fact normally had before the earliest surviving poetry was recorded. Archaisms may also be due to language change that intervenes between the date of a poem’s first having been recorded and of the later copy that is usually the sole witness to the poem. Thus, for example, just as in Old Saxon, syncopated vowels could be restored on an analogical basis, and though a late scribe might write a form like *mōdiga* ‘brave’, the meter of most poems will require the earlier, syncopated form *mōdga*. The latter variety of archaism is of lesser relevance to the *Heliand*, of which the best manuscript witnesses were made probably less than half a century after the poem’s composition, though small spelling differences in a language

with considerable orthographic variability can have significant consequences, especially in regard to the metrical treatment of restored and epenthetic vowels. The former variety of archaism, however, ought to have some considerable relevance, especially as it has been shown to play an important role also in Middle English alliterative meters (see, for example, Cable 1991:85–113) and in skaldic meters (for example, Sapp 2000). A meter of this sort is thus, in a sense, a diaphane, inasmuch as in the course of scansion one must look through the surface forms and take into account a historical dimension that underlies the recorded text.

It is in this sense that Suzuki's approach, like Hofmann's, is ahistorical, since the meter is for him not a diaphane but a printed page, flat and opaque. That is, regardless of the historical reasons for the form of the text (of which reasons Suzuki is of course very well aware), scansion is always based on the recorded forms, without acknowledgment of the possibility that the poet may have intended certain older forms preserved by poetic tradition. (Indeed, Suzuki frequently speaks of the *Heliand* poet as personally responsible for this or that metrical innovation, without recognizing the likelihood that his meter was crafted by a poetic *tradition*, that is by many poets working through the years.) Some will no doubt find it implausible that metrical archaisms should have played no role in Old Saxon meter, given their role in cognate metrical traditions, and given the remarkable conservatism of those traditions. At all events, certain scansional problems do arise from this practice. For example, Suzuki argues that a disyllabic desinence such as the adjective ending *-ana* (acc. sg. masc.) or *-aro* (gen. pl.) is to be treated metrically as a unit, capable of filling a metrical position (such as final position in type C) that cannot otherwise be filled by two unstressed syllables. This analysis may at first seem functionally indistinguishable from the assumption that the poet intended older, monosyllabic forms of these disyllabic endings, but the difference becomes apparent when Suzuki is obliged to stipulate exceptions to the unitary treatment of such endings, as in the scansion of *craftigana Crist* (*Heliand* 2804a), which he assumes (pp. 146–147) to have resolution of *-tiga-* rather than unitary treatment of *-ana*. That the focus on the surface form here is excessive becomes particularly plain when it is recognized that *-ana* is an infrequent, analogical variant of the ending, and every other of the ten or so instances of the word *craftigana* is spelt with an older, monosyllabic ending. Similarly, in regard to an excrescent vowel, he rejects (p. 65) the

possibility that the second vowel of *mêðomhord manag* (3261a, 3772a) should be ignored in scansion, even though the type is otherwise unparalleled, on the ground that *mêðom-* is demonstrably disyllabic in *mêðomhordes* (1643b). But surely some metrical variability must be recognized, as in the treatment of Old English *wundor* and *sēon* (above); and note that equivalent OE *-um* when it represents a syllabic resonant is never a metrical syllable, probably because it was syllabified later than the other resonants. This problem of invariability in Suzuki's analysis shows itself in a variety of ways that affect his classifications, and thus his statistics.

The statistics are affected by some other debatable assumptions, some, again, related to the issue of invariability. The treatment of Kuhn's first law is unusual, excluding pronouns from the class of *Satzpartikeln* and treating a word such as *aftar* as consistently a preposition (hence unstressed) rather than variably a preposition or adverb (pp. 255–261). Oddly, then, a class 1 word such as the last in *faran folc manag* (1163a) is said to be too subordinated in the drop to be affected by suspension of resolution (p. 200), which is irrelevant to unstressed words. The distribution of heavy and resolvable syllables in type C is explained on the basis of an *ad hoc* principle of “minimum amount of prominence” (p. 115), without reference to Sievers' rule that a short lift may not follow a resolved one in type C, even though the rule is discussed elsewhere (p. 209). It is supposed that the second constituent of a true compound may form the final drop of a verse of type C (p. 123), but two of the three examples end in *ênfald* ‘simple, true’, and the cognate morpheme OE *-feald* is rather a derivational suffix; the remaining example is thus simply anomalous, not unlikely an error. Similarly, verses like *manag mârlic thing* (1295a) are assumed to bear secondary stress on *-lic*, even though the suffix is acknowledged to form a quasi-compound. (Nor should *-lic* be given a long vowel; OE *-līc* was certainly shortened after a stressed syllable, another sign that its stress was not secondary.) There is thus again a certain rigid determination against variability in the metrical treatment of individual elements. Suzuki is surprised (p. 131) that double alliteration should be greater in the type *al irminthiod* (1773a) than in the nearly identical *Uueros gengun tô* (4102b). Yet the general rule has often been remarked (first by Krackow 1903:43–4) that in Old English, true compounds must alliterate, exceptions in *Beowulf* (and in most other Old English poems) being exceedingly few. Certain conclusions about what

is permissible in Old English verse are predicated on the witness of verses in *Beowulf* that most metrists (though this is unacknowledged), to avoid assuming notable coincidences, follow Sievers in regarding as resulting from the kind of scribal modernization described above as excluded from Suzuki's ahistorical reckoning, such as *Sorh is mē tō secganne* (473a) and *hwīlum dydon* (1828b; see pp. 141, 196).

The statistics are accordingly affected by many particulars of a debatable nature, and arguments that depend on a very precise reckoning of subtypes and their distribution may not convince all. Indeterminacy thus presents a notable disincentive to the degree of detail lent Old Saxon meter by both Suzuki and Hofmann. Yet the larger patterns in Suzuki's data are plain enough, and his explanation for the general differences between the meters of *Beowulf* and the *Heliand* (regardless of whether the latter really derives from the former) are admirable and make excellent sense. The book is thus an important and useful contribution to the ongoing study of early Germanic meters, for which metrists will be grateful.

REFERENCES

- Cable, Thomas. 1991. *The English alliterative tradition*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hofmann, Dietrich. 1991. *Die Versstrukturen der altsächsischen Stabreimgedichte Heliand und Genesis*. 2 vols. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Krackow, Otto. 1903. *Die Nominalcomposita als Kunstmittel im altenglischen Epos*. Berlin: Mayer and Müller.
- Sapp, Christopher D. 2000. Dating *Ynglingatal*: Chronological metrical developments in *kviðuháttur*. *Skandinavistik* 30.85–98.
- Suzuki, Seiichi. 1996. *The metrical organization of Beowulf: Prototype and isomorphism*. (*Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs*, 95.) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Department of English
Indiana University
Ballantine Hall 442,
1020 East Kirkwood Avenue
Bloomington, IN 47405
USA
[fulk@indiana.edu]