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This dissertation is an examination of the characteristics of Phillis Wheatley's couplet poems in the areas of meter, rhyme, and syntax. The metrical analysis employs Morris Halle and Samuel Jay Keyser's theory of iambic pentameter, the rhyme examination considers the various factors involved in rhyme selection and rhyme function, and the syntactic analysis is conducted within the theoretical framework of a generative grammar similar to that proposed in Noam Chomsky's *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* (1965). The findings in these three areas are compared with the characteristics of a representative sample of the works of Alexander Pope, the poet who supposedly exerted a strong influence on Wheatley, a black eighteenth century American poet.

Metrically, Wheatley's poems have a very low complexity rating. The mean number of Halle-Keyser correspondence violations per line is 1.9. She rigorously adheres to the standard ten-syllable line, making frequent use of elision to attain this syllable count. The initial trochee is a
frequent variation of the iambic stress pattern and the caesura expectedly appears after the fourth, fifth, or sixth syllable in the vast majority of her lines.

Judged in terms of modern English pronunciation, about 85 per cent of Wheatley's rhymes are phonetically exact, though she also considers semantic, metrical, and syntactic factors in selecting rhymes.

The most common type of sentence in Wheatley's poetry is the declarative, followed next by imperatives, then by questions and exclamations. Most of her sentences can be derived by the Aspects grammar, though some require modification of existing rules or special "poetic" rules. Violations of certain grammatical restrictions produce a few deviant sentences. Permutation and deletion rules are used frequently in transforming ordinary language into poetic language.

A comparison of Wheatley's poetic characteristics with those found in the Pope selections reveals several similarities and a few significant differences. Metrically, Wheatley's poems resemble Pope's pre-1730 poems but not his later works, which have a higher metrical complexity rating. Both poets typically write the standard ten-syllable line, both frequently substitute the trochee for the iamb in line initial position, and both generally
restrict the caesura to line medial position. Wheatley, however, exceeds Pope in the practice of eliding vowel sequences.

Syntactically, Pope and Wheatley are quite similar. Both write the different types of sentences in about the same proportion, make frequent use of permutation and deletion rules, and produce some deviant sentences by violating grammatical constraints. Pope's syntax, however, is more likely to reflect the tone, purpose, and theme of the poem. Wheatley effects syntactic changes principally to meet the demands of rhyme and meter. However, despite the fact that Wheatley does not exploit the possibilities of the heroic couplet as fully as Pope, she shares with him many characteristics in the areas of meter, rhyme, and syntax.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This paper, as a study of poetic style, is an examination of a linguistic and artistic phenomenon that has long fascinated readers, scholars, and critics. For centuries, attempts have been made to define and describe the style of poetry. Some of these efforts have been concerned with psychological, sociological, and physiological aspects of the poet's creation; others have focused on the linguistic features which distinguish poetry from so-called "casual" language. Yet these and other types of stylistic studies have all had a common goal: to capture the mysterious aesthetic that inheres in poetry.

Literary criticism, a discipline which has traditionally addressed itself to the study of style, has evolved in the twentieth century, according to Donald C. Freeman, in a pattern similar to the development of modern linguistics. The former has progressed from the anthropocentric and biographical work of men like A. C. Bradley through the text centered, autotelic studies of John Crowe Ransom, Cleanth Brooks, and
the 'New Criticism,' to attempts to reconstruct an author's conscious and unconscious motives in the work of Northrop Frye, Kenneth Burke, and Norman N. Holland. In like manner, modern linguistics has moved from anthropologically and philologically oriented study (Eduard Sievers, Franz Boas) to data-restricted empiricism and taxonomy (the so-called structural linguistics) to the concern of transformational-generative linguists with how the surface form of language arises from deeper, more universal forms. . . (1970b:4-5).

That literary criticism and linguistics would eventually converge was perhaps inevitable. The fusion began about mid-century when both literary critics and linguists realized that "there seems to be no reason to separate the literary from the overall linguistic" (Jakobson 1960:377). This union gave rise to a new area of study that has come to be called "linguistic stylistics." Almost simultaneously with its creation, this new discipline witnessed a shift away from the anthropological and philological methods which critics and linguists alike had so heavily relied upon for more than a century. The single work which, perhaps more than any other, signaled both the merger of the two disciplines and the change in methodology was Henry Lee Smith and George L. Trager's analysis of the English language entitled An Outline of English Structure (1951). Smith and Trager included in Outline a treatment of morphology and syntax, but the most valuable aspect of the work was their description of the phonemic system and the suprasegmental features of English (stress, juncture, and pitch). The analysis
presented, according to some, enabled the linguistic critic to describe with a new degree of formality and explicitness the rhythm and stress patterns in poetry.

Harold Whitehall, in his review of Outline, was the first to assess the impact of this work on stylistic criticism. Noting that there had long been a demonstrable need for a "sound linguistics" in English criticism, he observed that this need had not been met by the philological and etymological achievements of the 19th Century Neogrammarians [who failed to provide] the critics of their own time or this with a metrics that would analyse, a stylistics that would reveal, a grammar that would describe, or even a history of English sounds that would elucidate (Whitehall 1951:80).

The need for a sound linguistics, Whitehall insisted, continued unsatisfied during the first half of the twentieth century, with the failure of the Eastern European formalists and structuralists to achieve any significant progress in literary criticism. This shortcoming constituted a real limitation. And while Whitehall's statement that "no science can go beyond its mathematics, [and] no criticism can go beyond its linguistics" (80) was much too strong, the fact remained that literary critics had not been equipped with a critical linguistic theory adequate for the analysis of prosodic features of poetry. This need for a new linguistic methodology was, Whitehall
felt, at least partially satisfied by Smith and Trager's *Outline*, for they

unwittingly assembled for the critic some of the necessary linguistic tools [and provided] the kind of linguistics needed by recent criticism for the solution of its pressing problems of metrics and stylistics. . . (1951:80).

A new stage in the era of linguistic stylistics ushered in by Smith and Trager was initiated in 1957 with the appearance of Noam Chomsky's *Syntactic Structures*, a work that offered as an alternative to taxonomic description an analysis of English sentences in terms of their derivation by transformations from underlying structures. Critics who had been justifiably displeased with the inadequate syntactic theories of the traditional and structural grammarians could with Chomsky’s transformational techniques describe with increased precision such things as a writer's syntactic alternatives, patterns of syntactic deviation from the rules of Standard English, and lexical and structural ambiguity. Transformational-generative theory soon embraced phonology (most notably in Chomsky and Morris Halle's *The Sound Pattern of English* (1968) and in Halle and Samuel Jay Keyser's *English Stress: Its Form, Its Growth and Its Role in Verse* (1971) and proved equally valuable for the study of sounds in style.
Viewing the phonological component as a system of rules which operate in a transformational cycle to map surface structures into phonetic representations, the transformationalists provided literary critics with the machinery to describe both diachronic and synchronic phonological variation in literature. In addition, the transformationalists offered a concept of stress vastly superior to the earlier Smith-Trager analysis. Discarding the Smith-Trager assumption of four relative levels of stress (primary, secondary, tertiary, and weak), Chomsky and his followers postulated a small number of stress rules for the "most elementary phrases" and demonstrated how stress is assigned in more complex phrases by the interplay of these rules in accordance with the principle of the transformational cycle. The value of this phonological theory in prosodic analysis becomes more apparent in Chapter II.

Like Smith and Trager's Outline, the theories of the transformational-generative linguists were not motivated by the need for a critical apparatus to describe literary language. But, as in the case of Smith and Trager's work, many critics were attracted to these theories as a basis for the development of new techniques for the description of style. Critics such as James Peter Thorne, Richard Ohmann, and Curtis W. Hayes have, for example, relied on
the new grammatical model to explore the area of literary syntax; numerous others, like Halle, Keyser, and Joseph Beaver, have attempted to describe various phonological aspects of style within the framework of transformational-generative theory. Indeed, the profusion of phonological studies of poetic language has given rise to a kind of sub-discipline known as "generative metrics." Particularly appealing within this area are the metrical theories proposed recently by Halle and Keyser. As the transformational-generative model of grammar is revised and refined, it is certain to become more and more common as the theoretical base for the examination of style.

The method of linguistic analysis which has been followed in this study arises out of a set of basic assumptions about the nature of literary style and poetic language. It would be appropriate perhaps to preface these comments with a definition of "style." But either to formulate one's own definition or to adopt one of the many that have been advanced by others would be to ignore a central fact that emerges from a general survey of literary criticism: No definition of style offered thus far has

---

1See, for example, the syntactic studies of Thorne (1965:209-242), Ohmann (1962:209-242), Hayes (1966:279-296), and the phonological contributions of Halle-Keyser (1971a, 1971b) and Beaver (1968:427-447).
proven satisfactory. It may be that the critical apparatus necessary for the analysis that must inevitably precede definition is simply not yet available. Still, the study of style should not be impeded by the inability to define the term.

Regardless of what the term style may be thought to include, it may be fairly safely asserted that it does involve the use of language. The nature of this involvement is stated quite aptly by René Wellek and Austin Warren: "Language is quite literally the material of the literary artist. Every literary work . . . is merely a selection from a given language. . . ." (1942:177). This is a somewhat generalized statement of Roger Fowler's view of style as the "manipulation of variables in the structure of a language, or . . . the selection of optional or 'latent' features" (1966b:15). The presence of constants in the language, of course, facilitates the study of different styles within the language; the presence of variables enables a writer to achieve a style distinct from all others in the language. This is not to say that when a linguist describes a writer's "manipulation" and "selection" of linguistic features, he has been sufficiently exhaustive. It is merely to say that, as a linguist, he has performed his appointed task of "find[ing] out how certain examples of this language are characterized as
distinct styles" (Fowler 1966b:26). However, it must be admitted that beyond the linguistics of style lies a field of literary study, that of the purely artistic, in which the linguist has no special competence. He rests, as G. N. Leech indicates, on the assumption that style is linguistic in form (and thus the proper study of the linguist), that the study of content necessitates reference to language, and that the linguist can make an important contribution to the overall study of style by revealing its fundamental linguistic features (1966:156).

What is being suggested concerning the nature of literary style, then, is that it is essentially an overlapping of linguistics and art. Included as members of the class literary style are both the style of poetry and that of prose. The linguist may properly concern himself with the linguistic aspects of style and, ideally, the results of his analyses will correlate with the more intuitive methods of the literary critics employed in the study of the artistic (or non-linguistic) aspects.

Categorizing poetic style and delineating the role of the linguist in this manner permit some further, more specific, observations and clarifications relating to the language of poetry. A commonly held misconception concerning poetic language is the belief that the language of the poem and the performance of the poem are synonymous.
That there is a significant distinction between poem and performance can perhaps be made clear if one views poetic language in the same way he views natural language: i.e., it exists on several levels (syntactical, phonological, phonetic) which are unified by the relations that obtain between the levels. Edward Stankiewicz, in his type-token analogy, offers one of the most helpful descriptions of this difference:

Every poem constitutes a specific type, composed of invariable elements, whereas the various deliveries constitute its tokens. A poem is, in other words, an organized message, the elements of which must recur in any performance. The study of these constant elements alone constitutes the science of versification, whereas the study of the variations of delivery (where we may, in turn, discern certain dominant types) constitutes the art of declamation. To the modern linguist the distinction between these two branches appears similar to that between phonemics and phonetics (1960:75).

W. K. Wimsatt Jr. and M. C. Beardsley are equally emphatic in maintaining the importance of this distinction in the discussion of metrical problems:

A poem, as verbal artifact or complex linguistic entity, is, to be sure, actualized or realized in particular performances of it—in being read silently or aloud. But the poem itself is not to be identified with any performance of it or with any subclass of performances; that is to say, not everything that a reader does to the poem in speaking it is a property of the poem itself: a speaker with a Southern accent and a speaker with a Western accent give different readings but are reading the same poem (1959:193).
The realization that there does exist a difference between the language of poetry and the performance of this language is essential if the linguist is to succeed in his description of the relations between the various levels of the poetic language and in his assignment of certain features to delivery and others to the linguistics of the poem.

One other point remains to be clarified before leaving this discussion of the nature of poetic language. The language of poetry can be studied in terms of its patterns of conforming to and deviating from ordinary language. Yet the linguist who seeks to be exhaustive in identifying the linguistic features which distinguish poetic language from other types of discourse is likely to fall short of his goal. Linguistic examinations become much more meaningful and revealing when the language used by one poet is compared with that used by another. Thus, determination of the extent to which one poet's style deviates from another's is as worthy an objective as ascertaining the degree to which a poet's style deviates from ordinary language. The two goals are, of course, compatible, and the linguist's contribution to style analysis is more substantial when both are attained.

The purpose of this dissertation is to establish and describe the linguistic characteristics of the heroic verse of Phillis Wheatley, an eighteenth century American
poet. Specifically, attention is given to metrical characteristics, rhyme practices, and syntactic patterns. Since the core of the problem is to determine what is typical of Wheatley, the evidence presented is in part statistical. That which occurs with sufficient frequency to be judged characteristic of Wheatley's verse is described in terms of a methodology that reveals linguistically the manner in which the poet responds to the confines of the heroic couplet and of Neoclassical poetry. The methodology used is essentially eclectic. Some traditional techniques which have proven sound and useful in the examination of literary language have been retained, but much of the analysis in this paper draws heavily on linguistic theories and findings of the past decade.

One other procedural matter should be noted. Although this dissertation is not intended as a comparative study, the linguistic characteristics of Wheatley's couplets are related throughout to those of Alexander Pope. The decision to make this comparison was motivated by the assumption that "frequency of occurrence of any linguistic form in a text is significant only by comparison with its frequency in other texts" (Fowler 1966b:21-22) and by the expectation that one interested in the verse of an "imitative" poet, such as Wheatley, would wish to know how
this poetry compares with that of the "imitated" poet, Pope in this case.

The need for this study becomes apparent as one reviews the studies in literary criticism that have been devoted to either the heroic couplet in early American literature or the poetry of Phillis Wheatley. No major linguistic examination of the heroic couplet in eighteenth century American literature has ever been published. Certainly, much attention has been centered on the heroic verse of the major English Neoclassical poets, but the linguistic aspects of Neoclassical American writers have not been thoroughly studied. The data provided by this study will help fill this gap in the overall study of the heroic couplet in English and American literature.

Serious, extensive investigations of the poetry of Phillis Wheatley are also lacking. Nothing that resembles an in-depth examination of her poetic use of language has ever been attempted. Despite her status as a minor poet, this fact is somewhat surprising, since her craftsmanship in writing English couplets within the linguistic limitations of Neoclassicism has been repeatedly lauded. Vernon Loggins (1931:28), for example, exalts Wheatley's talent for absorbing the music of Neoclassical poetry, but declares that "in her ability to write with all the practical common-sense control demanded by the neoclassicists is
exhibited a still greater psychological puzzle than in her talent for music." And more recently, Julian Mason (1966:xxii), editor of the definitive edition of Wheatley's poems, evaluated the young poet as one who had a "remarkable spontaneous ability to re-create the neoclassical poetic mode of Alexander Pope and his followers, in diction, meter, rhyme, and syntax." In this study, the goal is not to support or refute such impressionistic judgments as those of Loggins and Mason, but rather to discover the specific linguistic features of Phillis Wheatley's heroic couplets and to relate these to the heroic couplet verse of Alexander Pope.

If the results of this paper prove useful to those interested in the heroic couplet as a verse form as well as to those interested in Phillis Wheatley as a coupleteer, they may also be of interest to the individuals who have succeeded in stimulating a new interest in Black Literature. The kind of concrete linguistic data which this study yields can be valuable to the literary critics who attempt to re-assess the nature of Phillis Wheatley's poetic talent and her importance as a Black writer and an American poet. Perhaps this objective description of Wheatley's poetic techniques will facilitate a more defensible estimate of her talents as a writer, an estimate that will likely fall somewhere
between the exuberant account written by Arthur A.
Schomburg (1915:19):

Phillis Wheatley is a jewel—priceless to the
literature of the Negro in America. Her name
stands as a beacon light to illuminate the path
of the young. . .

and the unbelievably narrow pronouncement of Thomas
Jefferson:

Among the blacks is misery enough, God knows, but
no poetry. Love is the peculiar oestrum of the
poet. Their love is ardent, but it kindles the
senses only, not the imagination. Religion, indeed,
has produced a Phillis Whatley [sic]; but it could
not produce a poet. The compositions published
under her name are below the dignity of criticism.
The heroes of the Dunciad are to her, as Hercules
to the author of that poem (Mason 1966:xliii).

Ideally, this analysis of the linguistic aspects of
Wheatley's poetry will complement an analysis of her
poetry as art. Because style is viewed here as a blend
of the linguistic and the artistic, no attempt is made
to capture the essence of the poetic style of Phillis
Wheatley. But a comprehensive analysis of a poet's style
cannot be completed without reference to poetic language.
It is the goal of this paper to provide linguistic data
for the poetry of Phillis Wheatley.

The remainder of this chapter is devoted to a brief
description of the poetic career of Wheatley and a list
and classification of the poems which are examined in the ensuing chapters.

Phillis Wheatley was born in either 1753 or 1754 in Africa, probably in the Senegal region of West Africa. When she was about seven years old, she was brought by slave traders to Boston, where she was purchased by a prosperous Bostonian tailor named John Wheatley. In the Wheatley household, the young slave girl was given the name Phillis and was permitted to adopt the surname Wheatley. That the youngster was precocious became evident at once, and the Wheatleys' eighteen-year-old daughter, Mary, began teaching her the Scriptures, astronomy, ancient and modern geography, history and the Latin classics.

Phillis soon began writing poetry, apparently when she was about thirteen years of age (Mason 1966:xiii). Her first published poem, an elegy on George Whitefield, the well-known evangelist, appeared in 1770. In 1773, to improve her failing health, Phillis made a journey with the Wheatley son, John, to London. Here she met several prominent members of English society, among them the Countess of Huntingdon, to whom she had dedicated the Whitefield elegy. Before returning to America in the fall of 1773, she had made arrangements for the publication of thirty-eight of her poems in a volume to be
entitled *Poems on Various Subjects, Religious and Moral.* It is this work for which she is known today.

The death of three members of the Wheatley family, the events of the war, and marriage to John Peters, an unsuccessful grocer, plunged the young black poet into severe poverty during the years following 1778. Although she continued to write poetry, only twelve of the poems written after the publication of her 1773 volume have survived. Phillis Wheatley died in abject poverty in an obscure part of Boston on December 5, 1784, at the age of thirty-one.

From reading what Phillis Wheatley wrote and what has been written about her and her poetry, two important observations can be made. One, as a young black writer living in eighteenth century Boston, Phillis Wheatley was definitely not the Negro's poet. Her biographers and critics, almost without exception, lament the fact that she seldom wrote about herself and never wrote about the misery and oppression of her enslaved race. Likewise, there does not appear in her poetic language any linguistic characteristics peculiar to Black English. Thus, the linguistic base for Phillis Wheatley's poetic language is the English spoken by eighteenth century Bostonians and that written by the writers who were popular during this era.

That Phillis Wheatley was basically a spontaneous poet is a second factor that possibly affects the nature
of the language in her poetry. Loggins (1931:26) finds her talent somewhat contradictory—sometimes spontaneous, sometimes self-conscious—but Mason (1966:xxx) notes that she "probably did not revise all of her poems, certainly did not revise most of them much. . . ." If Mason is correct in his assumption, the language with which this examination is concerned is, for the most part, the product of intuition and spontaneity, not laborious revision.

Of the fifty extant poems of Phillis Wheatley, only the forty-five for which the heroic couplet is the verse form are considered in this paper. The text used for forty-one of these is Julian Mason's 1966 edition, The Poems of Phillis Wheatley, which includes the thirty-three couplet poems in Wheatley's 1773 volume, Poems on Various Subjects, Religious and Moral, and eight poems published after 1773. The four remaining couplet poems were discovered and published in the New England Quarterly in 1970 by Robert C. Kuncio. Neither Mason nor Kuncio made any editorial changes which affect the results of the analysis in this dissertation.

Since Phillis Wheatley shows little or no chronological development in her brief career as a poet, it will be more useful to examine her poems by type, classified according to subject matter. These poems have not been satisfactorily categorized in this fashion by any of her
critics; thus, the following list will serve to classify the poems discussed in the remaining chapters. An asterisk (*) preceding a title indicates that the poem was not contained in the 1773 volume. The four poems published by Kuncio in 1970 are marked by two asterisks (**)..

Elegies

"On the Death of the Rev. Dr. Sewell, 1769"
"On the Death of the Rev. Mr. George Whitefield, 1770"
"On the Death of a Young Lady of Five Years of Age"
"On the Death of a Young Gentleman"
"To a Lady on the Death of Her Husband"
"To a Lady on the Death of Three Relations"
"To a Clergyman on the Death of His Lady"
"A Funeral Poem on the Death of C. E., an Infant of Twelve Months"
"To a Lady and Her Children, on the Death of Her Son and Their Brother"
"To a Gentleman and Lady on the Death of the Lady's Brother and Sister, and a Child of the Name Avis, Aged One Year"
"On the Death of Dr. Samuel Marshall, 1771"
"On the Death of J. C., an Infant"
"To the Honourable T. H., Esq.; on the Death of His Daughter"
"To His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, on the Death of His Lady"

**"An Elegy, to Miss Mary Moorhead, on the Death of Her Father, the Rev. Mr. John Moorhead"

**"An Elegy to Dr. Samuel Cooper"

**"To Mr. and Mrs. __, on the Death of Their Infant Son"

Occasional Poems Inspired by

Public Events

"To the King's Most Excellent Majesty, 1768"

**"To His Excellency General Washington"

**"On the Capture of General Lee"

**"Liberty and Peace"

"To the Right Honourable William, Earl of Dartmouth, His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for North-America, etc."

**"America"

Occasional Poems Inspired by

Minor Events

"To a Lady on Her Remarkable Preservation in an Hurricane in North-Carolina"

"On Being Brought from Africa to America"

"To a Lady on Her Coming to North-America with Her Son, for the Recovery of Her Health"
"To a Gentleman on His Voyage to Great-Britain for the Recovery of His Health"

"To S. M., a Young African Painter, on Seeing His Works"

"An Answer to the Rebus, by the Author of these Poems"

"To the Honble. Commodore Hood on His Pardoning a Deserter"

"On the Death of Mr. Snider Murder'd by Richardson"

**Biblical Verse Paraphrases**

"Isaiah lxiii. 1-8"

"Goliath of Gath"

**Verse Paraphrase of a Myth**

"Niobe in Distress for Her Children Slain by Apollo, from Ovid's Metamorphoses, Book VI, and from a View of the Painting of Mr. Richard Wilson"

**Poems on Abstractions**

"On Imagination"

"On Recollection"

**Hymns**

"An Hymn to Morning"

"An Hymn to Evening"
Poems in Praise of Living Persons

"To Maecenas"

"To the Reverend Dr. Thomas Amory on Reading His Sermons on Daily Devotion, in which that Duty Is Recommended and Assisted"

"To a Gentleman of the Navy"

"Phillis's Reply to the Answer in our last by the Gentleman in the Navy"

"To Captain H—d, of the 65th Regiment"

Philosophical Poems

"Thoughts on the Works of Providence"

"Atheism"

Of the chapters which follow, Chapter II deals with the history and development of the heroic couplet as a verse form and provides an introduction to the theory of prosody used in the metrical evaluation which comprises the third chapter. Chapter IV is an examination of Phillis Wheatley's rhymes, with particular emphasis on the semantic elements. The fifth chapter is devoted to Wheatley's couplet syntax, described in terms of transformational-generative grammar. The findings of this study are summarized in Chapter VI.
CHAPTER II

THE LINGUISTIC AND METRICAL ASPECTS
OF THE HEROIC COUPLET

The twofold purpose of this chapter is to glance briefly at the linguistic pattern of the heroic couplet and to explain the principles and procedures of a recent theory of prosody that facilitates greatly the evaluation of the metrical aspects of this linguistic pattern. Particular attention is devoted to the influence of the Ovidian elegiac distich on the heroic couplet during the early years of the Renaissance. Several of the linguistic characteristics of the heroic couplet that became fixed features during these formative years are identified and will be discussed in later chapters (metrical features in Chapter III, rhyme in Chapter IV, and syntactic features in Chapter V). Since most of these linguistic phenomena survive into the eighteenth century, no attempt is made to trace the development of the couplet in stages from the Renaissance to the Neoclassical period. Instead, the focus is merely shifted from the
sixteenth century couplet to the syntactic characteristics and metrical conventions that characterized the couplets which both Phillis Wheatley and Alexander Pope wrote. Included, of course, are Pope's famous rules of prosody contained in his letter to Cromwell.

The second part of this chapter is, in a sense, a preliminary to the discussion of metrics in Chapter III. (Syntactical features, as indicated earlier, will be discussed in Chapter V.) Inasmuch as the conventional eighteenth century concept of the heroic couplet and the prevalent metrical notions and practices constitute a kind of traditional or "standard" couplet theory, notice is taken of some of the deficiencies of this theory as a tool for the evaluation of couplet verse. A relatively new theory of prosody is available and is much more useful in accomplishing the objectives of metrical analysis. A rather detailed summary of the concepts and procedures of this theory, Morris Halle and Samuel Kay Keyser's theory of iambic pentameter, is provided as a background for the understanding and interpretation of the metrical data presented in Chapter III.

In very broad chronological terms, the history of the English heroic couplet has been divided into three
periods: the early period (1385-1585), the middle period (1585-1785), and the late period (1785 to the present).

In the early period, Chaucer, of course, was the chief practitioner of the decasyllabic couplet. Following Chaucer's death, this verse form declined in popularity. Lydgate's *The Troy Book* (c. 1420) and Spenser's *Mother Hubberd's Tale* (actually not published until 1590) are the only remaining instances of couplet works by well-known writers of this early period.

1In tracing the development of the couplet, I have relied chiefly on William Bowman Piper's *The Heroic Couplet* (1969) and George Saintsbury's *A History of English Prosody* (1923) and *Historical Manual of English Prosody* (1925). The tripartite chronological division is found in Piper (3-5).

2Saintsbury, (1926:321-22) who traces the earliest appearance of the decasyllabic line back to the thirteenth century (in the *Orison of Our Lady*), observes the likely ultimate origins of the line in French poetry before Chaucer's time and suggests that if Chaucer had not seen the advantage of this poetic line for the English language, someone else would have. However, for this discussion, focusing on the metrical characteristics rather than historical origins, it is necessary to note that what Chaucer wrote was actually decasyllabic couplets, couplets distinguished from the later closed couplets chiefly by the absence of a regular tripartite hierarchy of pauses. Chaucer's decasyllabic line was undoubtedly a strong influence in the eventual adoption of pentameter as the meter of the closed couplet and as a natural English measure.
The years 1585 and 1785 mark the boundaries of an era in which the heroic couplet flourished as the dominant verse form. It was used by practically all the English Renaissance poets: Donne, Jonson, Sandys, Waller, Denham, and, of course, Shakespeare and Milton. It is during the early part of this period that the so-called "closed" couplet appeared, a development significant in that it led to the couplet form of the chief eighteenth century poets: Dryden, Johnson, and--more importantly, for the purposes of this study--Pope, whose poetry Phillis Wheatley is said to have imitated. This closed couplet had its beginnings when several Elizabethan poets (Drayton, Marlowe, Heywood, Donne, Jonson, and others) tried to achieve in English the characteristics and flavor of the Latin elegiac distich. The models for these Renaissance poets were chiefly the verses in Ovid's Amores and Heroides and Martial's Epigrammation (Piper 1969:5).

The most recent phase of couplet history, that beginning in 1785 and continuing to the present, has

---

3Piper distinguishes the closed (or elegiac) couplet from two other couplet forms which developed in the first fifty years of the middle period: the early English couplet, a "stiffer, simpler, more assertive measure" (49) used chiefly by the weaker poets but also seen in Donne's Anniversaries; and the enjambed romance couplet which was to become popular in the early nineteenth century as a vehicle for "rejection of the eighteenth-century closed couplet sensibility" (55).
witnessed a severe decline in the use of this "staple of English verse." This era saw, of course, a revival of the enjambed form, which had been in vogue in the early part of the seventeenth century, but notable achievement in its use is limited almost exclusively to Keats' Endymion (Piper 1969:152, 438-440). Byron and Leigh Hunt also wrote in heroic couplets of the romance variety, but fortunately their reputations have not had to depend upon their success as coupleteers. Since the 1820's, heroic couplet poems have appeared only as "isolated out-croppings . . . some of which, like Browning's 'My Last Duchess' and Arnold's 'The Tomb,' are hardly recognizable as heroic couplet poems at all" (Piper 1969:4). The nearly unanimous rejection of the heroic couplet by poets of the past 150 years represents a mysterious, but marked, contrast to its enthusiastic acceptance by seventeenth and eighteenth century poets.

A better understanding of some of the characteristics of the closed couplet as it existed in the Neoclassical period can be gained by a glance back to the middle period, to the early stages of its development. It has been

---

4The verses in Browning's poem are more commonly referred to as "enjambed couplets." Piper uses "heroic couplet" in a broad sense to include the early decasyllabic couplets, closed couplets, and enjambed (or romance) couplets. In this dissertation, the term "heroic couplet" is used more narrowly to refer to the "closed couplet."
generally established that the couplet form which Pope used (and which Wheatley supposedly imitated) originated from the Latin elegiac distich found so commonly in the works of Ovid, Martial, and other ancient writers. It was between 1585-1600, during the early years of this middle period of couplet development, that certain Renaissance poets turned to the Latin writers as models for the kinds of verses they were attempting to write. The principal metrical characteristics of this Latin verse form were these:

1. It was characterized rhetorically by inversion, balance, and parallelism.

2. It consisted of a pair of lines, the first of which was comprised of six metrical feet, the second of which had five metrical feet; i.e., the first line was a hexameter, the second a pentameter.

3. It usually conformed to the following metrical paradigm:

```
```

4. It was strongly end-stopped.

---

5. The second (pentameter) line consisted of two equal metrical halves, divided by a marked pause.

6. The mid-line pause in the pentameter line always occurred at the end of a word and was, therefore, always prominent.

7. The mid-line pause of the hexameter was flexible, although it usually occurred after the long syllable of the third foot.

8. The pause at the end of the hexameter was subject to elimination, creating enjambment of the hexameter and the pentameter lines.

Before looking at the changes and adaptations that occurred when English poets (Christopher Marlowe will serve as an example) attempted to transfer the features of the elegiac distich into the English couplet, a few observations on this list of characteristics is in order. It should be noted, for instance, that the placement of the midline pause in the hexameter after the long syllable of the third foot (its most common position), has

---

6These are the characteristics of the elegiac distich presented in Piper (1969:32-48). It should be mentioned, perhaps, that Piper conceives the pauses in the elegiac distich as constituting "a regular hierarchy of pauses—the strongest at the close of the distich, the next strongest at the end of the first line, the third strongest at the midpoints of the two lines. . . ."
the effect of creating three metrical equal segments (the first half of the hexameter and the two halves of the pentameter). Thus, metrical precision, caesura placement, and balance—three significant features of the closed couplet form as it was received by Pope—all derive from the metrical characteristics of the parent elegiac distich. Concerning caesura placement, it should be emphasized that the medial caesurae in the elegiac distich are a vital part of the metrical structure of this couplet form. The role of the caesura in eighteenth century couplet verse, it will be seen, has been much more unstable. Finally, and obviously, the number of feet in each line of the English couplet has a parallel in the pentameter line of the elegiac distich, although its ultimate origin, as suggested earlier, probably pre-dates Renaissance translations of Ovid (Saintsbury 1926:320-322).

It was the practices of Christopher Marlowe, who translated the elegiac distichs of Ovid's *Amores* into English heroic couplets (c. 1597) that caused certain linguistic features to become fixed characteristics of the closed couplet. Marlowe remained very close to his Latin model, for example, in rendering patterns of inversion and balance in his English couplets. Ovid,
of course, typically employed inversion of nouns, adjectives, and verbs to achieve parallelism in the distich. In imitating this rhetorical device, Marlowe had to contend with the fact that English had far fewer inflections than Latin. Thus, being severely limited in the disposition of the essentially uninflected English nouns and adjectives, Marlowe faced the choice of either shifting inflected verbs to the line end or giving up the Ovidian inverted closure. That he chose to retain the Ovidian inversion becomes obvious as one observes the frequency with which not only he, but many later coupleteers (especially Sandys, Waller, Dryden, and Pope) maintained this practice of removing the verb to line end.

Rhetorical balance was another characteristic of Ovid's lines that Marlowe sought to reproduce. To illustrate his success, we may glance at one of the examples cited by Piper (1969:194), in which the balances in the second half of one of Ovid's pentameter lines ("Battiades sempter toto cantabitur orbe;/quamvis ingenio non valet, arte valet") are expanded into a balanced, antithetical full line ("The world shall of Callimachus ever speake,/His Arte excelled, although his witte was weake"). Such facility in reproducing
in one language the rhetorical effects of another language has established Marlowe's place in the closed couplet tradition as a writer who "led the way toward the even-flowing, bipartite couplet line" (Piper 1969:194).

Two other practices of Marlowe that survived and found their places as rules of eighteenth century prosody were his use of monosyllables and his use of zeugma. Monosyllabic lines and zeugmatic constructions were linguistically necessary because the couplet form in which Marlowe was writing consisted of two lines of ten syllables each, whereas the Latin distich offered the poet (by utilizing permitted foot substitutions) a maximum of seventeen syllables in the hexameter and fourteen in the pentameter. Hence, in the following passage from Ovid's *Amores*, the underlined polysyllabic words are rendered in English as monosyllables in Marlowe's translation:

```
vivet Maeonides, Tenedos dum stabit et Ide,  
dum rapidas Simois in mar volvet aquas  
vivet et Ascræus, dum mustis uva tumebit,  
dum cadet incurva falce resecta Ceres.  
```

..............................................
Homer shall live while Tenedos stands and Ida,
Or into Sea swift Simois doth slide.
Ascraeus lives, while grapes with new wine swell.
Or men with crooked Sickles corne downe fell. 7

This practice did not lead to a wholesale condemnation of polysyllabic words by later couplet writers, but Marlowe's preference for monosyllables is undoubtedly echoed, and used for special effects, for example, in Pope's lines "And now two nights and now two days were past" (Odyssey, v, 496) and "Then from the mint walks forth the man of ryme" (Epistle to Arbuthnot, line 13), 8 and in Donne's Holy Sonnet 14, in the first four lines of which one finds only three polysyllabic words in a

---

7 This comparison is cited by Piper (1969:41). Since I have used underlining to illustrate my point, I have deliberately refrained from using it as it is conventionally used for passages from foreign languages and for italicized proper nouns (as in Marlowe's translation).

8 Of course, Pope contended in his letter to Cromwell on prosody that monosyllabic lines, "unless very artfully manag'd, are stiff[,] languishing, & hard" and he voiced a poetic objection to such lines in Essay on Criticism: "And ten low words oft creep in one dull line" (II, 147). However, as Adler (1961:223) has noted, Pope quite frequently uses monosyllabic lines (about 1 per cent of the lines in Spring and more than 8 per cent in Eloisa and the Epistle to Arbuthnot are monosyllabic).
total of thirty-eight. And, implicit disdain for polysyllables is one factor which promotes later poet's frequent use of various types of elision. Economy in the use of a limited number of syllables was also achieved by Marlowe through the syntactic device called zeugma, defined by Adler (1964:17-18) as "any instance of one word serving several words, phrases, or clauses" in either a "normal" sense ("By Day o'ersees them, and by Night protects") or an "incongruous" sense ("Dost sometimes Counsel take—and sometimes Tea"). Thus, zeugmatic constructions enabled the couplet poet to communicate the sense of his lines in fewer syllables and carried the added advantage of promoting the much cherished rhetorical balance.

This excessive attention to Marlowe's contributions to the closed couplet form is not intended to exaggerate his importance in the closed couplet tradition. What it does indicate, however, is that Ovid, whose works were translated by a number of Renaissance writers in addition to Marlowe, was the "single largest influence" in the transformation of the elegiac distich into the closed couplet (Wallerstein 1935:166). An examination of Marlowe's preservation and adaptation of the metrical and syntactical features of Ovid's lines reveals the
significance of Latin influence upon the verse form that was to attain such prominence in English poetry.

It would be illuminating, of course, to trace the development of the closed couplet from these early beginnings in the Renaissance to the time when Pope began writing couplets, but such an ambitious undertaking is certainly well beyond the scope of this paper. Perhaps an acceptable alternative is to supplement the examination of the early closed couplet's syntactic and metrical characteristics with a look at these features of the couplet form as Pope inherited it from a long line of English poets.

Many of the syntactic features found in the early closed couplets of Marlowe and other Renaissance poets are present in more developed and refined forms in eighteenth century couplet verse. Antitheses are abundant in the works of Dryden, Pope and other Neoclassical couplet poets. The differences between these syntactic features of the early couplet and those of the later couplet are basically a result of the period of gradual development and refinement to which this verse form was subjected for over a century. The awkwardness typical of Marlowe's efforts at imitating the balance and parallelism of Ovid was slow in disappearing as a characteristic of the heroic couplet. Much of the poetry of
seventeenth century coupleteers John Denham and Edmund Waller, for example, was still characterized by a "sense and syntax [which] . . . generally seem either to limp behind or vault in front of the meter and rhyme, and phrases and clauses [which] aimlessly straddle the middle of the line" (Jones 1969:4). By the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, however, the syntactical clumsiness had vanished and the "later poets . . . systematically began to exploit the possibilities of the couplet both for the balance of sense and idea, as well as that of meter and syntax" (Jones 1969:3).

The relatively straightforward instances of antithesis common in the earlier couplets also gave way to later contrasts that were more complex and sophisticated. George Williamson relates the development of this aspect of couplet syntax to the cultural and literary concerns of the ages through which the couplet passed in this statement:

As the Elizabethan quibble on words passed into the Metaphysical quibble on sense, so the latter passed into a new style of wit which depended less upon the ambiguity than upon the antithesis of ideas, or less upon startling reconciliations and more upon surprising oppositions. From the surprising opposition of ideas wit passed into verse as oppositions of structure (1935:74-75).
Inversion, a third aspect of couplet syntax, remained as much a feature of the eighteenth century couplet as it had been of the early imitative couplets. In translating Latin poetry into English in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, English poets, it will be remembered, found it necessary to shift verbs to line-end positions with great frequency in order to achieve the Ovidian patterns of inversion with the vocabulary of a comparatively uninflected language. This scarcity of inflections in English persisted in restricting the couplet poets in their efforts to attain end rhyme, forcing them to continue the practice of shifting a verb into rhyme position with great frequency. Adler (1964:21-22) has observed that in addition to these patterns of inversion created solely for the sake of rhyme, the Neoclassical poets in general—and Pope in particular—often used inversion to heighten style or to emphasize a particular word, as in Pope's line:

Not on the Cross my eyes were fix'd, but you.

—Eloisa, 116

Variation and refinement in the use of syntactic inversion, however, were limited to a large extent by the very nature of the language in which the poets wrote.
In addition to improvements in the uses of balance, antithesis, and inversion, the later couplet poets also became more proficient in manipulating the English sentence within the rigid form of the couplet. Jones (1964:4), for example, notes that

. . . the verse of Dryden and Pope not only surpasses the work of the earlier masters in concise balance and parallelism but also in clear and graceful subordination. Dryden and Pope write effective sentences in the couplet form, and they form several couplets into the forceful verse paragraph of coherent artistic effect. They can fit a dazzling variety of long and short sentences into the rhyming iambic pentameter line so that both sentence and couplet emerge concisely and naturally.

Piper (1969:19) has suggested that it was this supra-couplet syntax that enabled Dryden and Pope to use the couplet as a medium for the discussion of the social and political issues of their time. As a result, he continues, the couplet became not a vehicle for "dramatic effects" or "meditation," but for "public discourse," principally because its "persistent order allowed a poet to define issues, to balance arguments, and, in the process, to give the impression of a clear and balanced mind" (23–24).

In effect, then, the syntactic history of the closed couplet is one of steady progression from an era of stiffness and clumsiness in early couplet verse to the period
of Dryden and Pope, in whose poetry "almost all of the couplet's structural possibilities reached their climax" (Jones 1969:4).

In turning from the syntactic features of the eighteenth century couplet to its metrical features, one must note not only the general metrical conventions of the time, but also the specific comments Pope himself made concerning the heroic couplet.

It is impossible, within the scope of this dissertation, to discuss in detail the numerous opinions on prosody that prevailed during the eighteenth century. Besides, such a recitation would be largely irrelevant here. What is needed is a summary of the generally acceptable metrical practices. Adler (1964:7-12), after surveying the principal treatises on eighteenth century metrics, lists four dicta which he feels "would have come nearest to general acceptance":

1. The initial trochee is permissible.
2. The spondee may be used either with the pyrrhic or without it.
3. Trisyllabic feet, if all syllables are pronounced, are admissible only if they can be reduced to dissyllables by elision (either syncope, synaeresis, or apocope).
4. The use of a "broken light third foot" (a foot which has a metrical accent in a position where there would not normally be a prose accent) is acceptable.

In an earlier work, Adler (1961:218-226) mentions these metrical conventions, which are not included in the above list:

1. The Alexandrine must be used very sparingly, and, according to Johnson, whose position is probably representative, "there ought to be some stated mode of admitting them."

2. The caesural pause may be variously placed, although the preference is for a central position.

These conventions, of course, merely represent the permissible methods of varying the closed couplet's rigid basic form, made up of two ten-syllable lines arranged in a rising (iambic) stress pattern, possessing end rhyme, and punctuated with a regular system of pauses.

Beyond these approved metrical variations, with which both Wheatley and Pope would certainly have been familiar, are the more specific pronouncements of Pope himself on prosodic matters. Although it has been convincingly demonstrated that Pope violated most of the
metrical precepts stated in his letter to Cromwell, the principles contained in the Cromwell epistle have come to be regarded as the formal statement of his critical position on the couplet. Therefore, a more comprehensive understanding of the metrical theory which served as the foundation for Pope's couplet composition, and probably indirectly for Wheatley's, can be gained by supplementing the general metrical dicta above with Pope's seven "rules":

1. The hiatus is to be avoided; it is permissible only when the only way to avoid it is by awkward elision.

2. Verbal expletives (particularly do, did, and does) are objectionable (as "meer fillers up of unnecessary syllables") and should not be used to place the desired word in rhyme position.

3. "Monosyllable-Lines, unless very artfully manag'd, are stiff languishing, & hard."

4. The repetition of the same rhyme within four to six lines is to be avoided.

See, for example, Adler (1961:218-226).
5. The excessive use of Alexandrines is objectionable; they are acceptable only when they add "Majesty" to the verse or when they contain absolutely no superfluous words.

6. A "Smooth" English ten-syllable line should have a pause either after the fourth, fifth, or sixth syllable.

7. The sounds and the words should be adapted to the things the poet "treats of."\(^{10}\)

The inherent weaknesses in a theory of prosody such as this, stated as a prose definition supplemented by a list of approved variations, has led Morris Halle and Samuel Jay Keyser to develop a new theory of iambic pentameter which is at once stronger and more advantageous in several respects than the older theory.\(^{11}\) According to

\(^{10}\) These rules are from the Cromwell letter as it appears in The Correspondence of Alexander Pope, ed. George Sherburn (1956:1, 100-107). For the complications on the date and addressee of the letter, see Adler (1961: 218-219).

\(^{11}\) This theory was initially presented by Halle and Keyser in an article in 1966, "Chaucer and the Study of Prosody," College English (28:3.187-219). It was subsequently revised and expanded by Halle and Keyser in English Stress (1971a). More recently, they have defended their theory in "Theory of Prosody, Continued: Illustration and Defense of a Theory of the Iambic Pentameter," College English (33:2.154-76). The "insufficiencies" cited above are discussed in English Stress, 164-180.
to Halle and Keyser, the "standard" theory of iambic pentameter\textsuperscript{12} is objectionable because

1. It defines allowable deviations in terms of metrical feet.

2. It merely lists allowable deviations but fails to establish criteria for membership in this list.

3. It fails, in its list, to account for certain features of English verse that an adequate theory of prosody must account for.

4. It does not allow for measuring the tension or metrical complexity of the iambic line, since there is no provision or motivation for ordering the permitted deviations.

5. It makes no provision for judging some lines of poetry unmetrical.

Halle and Keyser's theory succeeds in the areas where the traditional theory fails, but the exact manner in which this feat is accomplished requires a brief review of

\textsuperscript{12} This is Halle and Keyser's tag for the theory of prosody outlined above, although they refer to a definition and list of deviations contained in Robert Bridges' Milton's Prosody (1921:1).
the principles of generative phonology. Specifically, it will be helpful at this point to examine the relationship between poetic meter and linguistic stress by comparing the current generative approach to this matter with an earlier approach based on structural phonology.

The structural account of stress holds that there are four levels of stress—primary (/), secondary (^), tertiary (\), and weak (\^) —and that each of these levels has phonemic status. Primary stress is the loudness heard in such monosyllables as yes and go and in the first syllable of disyllabic words like under and going, when pronounced in isolation. Weak stress, the phoneme

---

13 For a detailed discussion of the superiority of the new theory over the "standard theory," see Halle-Keyser (1971a:164-185). It has been assumed that an explanation of the theory itself will clearly demonstrate its value in this type of investigation. The explanation in this chapter follows very closely the summary of the theory of iambic pentameter (modified) in Halle-Keyser (1971b:154-160).

14 The structural view of stress has its origins in Smith and Trager (1951:35-41), but may also be found in a number of other structural grammars, such as Hill (1958:14-21) and Gleason (1965:179-183).

15 The term "phonemic" is used to describe sounds which native speakers consistently distinguish. The representations of phonemically distinct sounds will, of course, differ. In this dissertation, virgules are used to enclose utterances or sounds that contrast phonemically; brackets are used to enclose phonetic segments.

16 Examples of the four levels of stress are from Smith-Trager (1951:35ff).
presenting the greatest degree of contrast to primary stress, is realized phonetically in the second syllable of animal /ˈænɪməl/ and in the first and last syllables of terrific /ˈtɪrɪfɪk/. Because there is also a contrast between the weak stress on the last vowel of effigy, for example, and the weak stress on the final vowel of refugee, a third stress phoneme—tertiary stress—must be established (thus, /ɪʃ/ in /ˈrefjuːjɪʃ/ contrasts phonemically with /ɪʃ/ in /ˈɛfəjɪʃ/). The fourth stress phoneme, secondary stress, is found in extended sequences containing plus juncture (+). For example, in the compound elevator operator /ˈɛləˈveɪtərˌɒpəˈreɪtər/, the stress on the /ap/ syllable is stronger than that on any other syllable within the word but not as strong as the stress level of the /el/ syllable of elevator. In isolation, of course, operator has the same stress contour as elevator, i.e., /ɒpəˈreɪtər/.

Structuralists' comments on stress occurrence typically take the form of generalizations arrived at by observing the stress patterns in actual speech. Smith and

17Plus juncture (+) is a non-terminal juncture, a type of transition from one phoneme to another, which occurs, for example, in night-rate /ˈnʌɪt+reɪt/ to distinguish it from nitrate /ˈnʌɪtreɪt/. Thus, plus juncture differs from terminal junctures, which typically occur at the ends of sentences, phrases, and words and which are usually accompanied by a pause.
Trager, for instance, observe the following stress patterns in English utterances:

1. A primary stress may be preceded by only one occurrence of weak stress at the beginning of an utterance.

2. As many as three or four weak stresses may occur after a strong stress within an utterance, although the occurrence of one or two weaks is more common.

3. Only one primary stress may occur between any two terminal junctures.

4. The occurrences of secondary stress may not exceed the number of plus junctures in an utterance; however, there may be more plus junctures than secondary stresses since pluses also occur with weak and tertiary stresses.

5. Contrastive stress (emphasis placed on one particular part of an utterance) is essentially an unsegmentable phenomenon and, hence, a matter for metalinguistic, not microlinguistic, analysis (35-41).

Of these points, only the second needs clarification, and it becomes clearer if it is turned around. What it means
is that the loudest stress within a phonological phrase—i.e., a span of speech between terminals but containing no terminals—is arbitrarily assigned primary stress, all other syllables thereafter being assigned weaker stresses.

That the structural theory of stress advanced by Smith and Trager and others had value for English metrical analysis was quickly recognized. In his 1951 review of Smith and Trager's Outline of English Structure, Whitehall (81) insisted that one of the most attractive features of the new stress theory was that it permitted a description of the poet's "orchestration" of a two-level metrical contract (stressed and unstressed) with "the actual four-level contrast of speech." Whitehall's "rules" for adapting the four linguistic stress phonemes to binary metrical stress were as follows:

The primary stress (′) indicates a metrically stressed syllable and the weak stress (◦) a metrically unstressed syllable; the two medial stresses (∧) and (\), however, indicate metrically stressed syllables if surrounded by weaker stresses and metrically unstressed syllables if surrounded by stronger stresses (81-82).

For purposes of illustration and later comparison, it is useful at this point to indicate how stress is marked in poetry, according to structural (Smith-Trager) analysis.
Since the occurrence of primary stress is governed by the placement of terminal junctures (see page 46), terminals are marked with the symbol /T/ in the analysis. The following couplet by Phillis Wheatley serves as an example:

The latent foe /T/ to friendship makes pretence,/T/
The name assumes /T/ without the sacred sense!/T/

--"On the Capture of General Lee," 3-4

It should be emphasized that this analysis represents only one of several possible readings. A more deliberate reading, for example, might insert a terminal after friendship, which would alter the assignment of primary stress.

The structural theory of stress, though widely praised and used by many in poetic analysis, has been attacked by several. Basically, the attackers object to the limitation of stress levels to four and to the structuralists' insistence that each of these levels is phonemically significant and that stress assignment is, therefore, unpredictable. One of the most recent critics to challenge the structural theory of stress is Chatman (1965:71), who asks "If disestablish is said to have, say, four levels of stress (\textsuperscript{\circ}dis\textsuperscript{\circ}est\textsuperscript{\circ}ablish\textsuperscript{\circ}), what is to prevent us from saying that antidisestablishmentarianism has eight?"
Earlier, Chomsky, Halle, and Lukoff (1956:65-80) had refuted the structural system of stress on detailed linguistic grounds and posited, instead of four levels of phonemically significant stress, only one binary phoneme (accented-unaccented) and demonstrated that this single entity is sufficient to mark the various levels of stress, which are not, they felt, necessarily limited to four.

The thesis developed by Chomsky, Halle, and Lukoff (1956) foreshadowed the phonological tenets that have since emerged as part of an overall transformational-generative theory of grammar. The structuralists viewed stress as one of the phonemes of English and then proceeded to discover the different levels inherent in the organization of the various phonemes, both segmental and suprasegmental, into larger, meaningful utterances. In the late 1950's, Chomsky, convinced that this was not the appropriate goal for linguistic analysis, announced that the central task confronting grammarians was to describe the intuitive ability of native speakers of English to utter sentences (including those never before heard or spoken) and to judge the grammaticality of these utterances (1957:13-17,23). A phonological aspect of this task was the provision of an explanation for the ability of native speakers to assign new stress patterns, uniformly and consistently, to new
utterances (Halle-Keyser 1971a:xii-xiii). Progress in accomplishing this established goal has resulted in a model of grammar which describes phonetically uttered sentences via their derivation through surface structures from basic underlying structures (deep structures). Fundamental to this view of grammar is a finite set of rules which operate within a transformational cycle to "generate" the surface structure from the underlying deep structure.

The general assumptions and a few of the specific rules of stress assignment in the phonological component of this model of English grammar are relevant to the metrical analysis which comprises a part of this dissertation. First of all, it is assumed by generative phonologists that there is no upper limit on the number of levels of stress in a given utterance (Halle-Keyser 1971a:17n). This assumption is motivated by the observation that speakers of English can distinguish in compound nouns, like radio station /ˈreɪdiəʊ stɛstʃən/ , as many as three levels of stress (including stressless), but in more complex compounds, like labor union president, are unable to distinguish the strength of the main stress in union /juːˈwʌnˈʃən/ from that in president /ˈprɛzədənt/. Second, acoustic factors, on which the structuralists relied primarily in making phonemic distinctions, are assumed to have less
influence on stress assignment than grammatical and syntactic factors (Halle-Keyser 1971a:17n). In addition, generative phonologists insist that stress assignment in English is predictable (not phonemic) and is governed by a small set of relatively simple rules.

These rules are to be interpreted in light of the fact that stress, per se, is a binary entity in English; i.e., a vowel either bears stress or is stressless. The fact that a vowel is stressed, however, does not mean that it necessarily bears primary stress. The stress may occur in any number of gradations. The three rules that are of most direct concern in relating linguistic stress to poetic meter are the Main Stress Rule, the Compound Stress Rule, and the Nuclear Stress Rule.

The primary stress in a large number of English words is, according to Halle-Keyser (1971a:3), assigned by the Main Stress Rule to a particular vowel within a given word on the basis of the phonological structure of the word and its syntactic status (noun, verb, etc.). This is the rule, for example, which places primary stress on the antepenultimate vowel in America, on the penultimate vowel in

---

18 Chomsky-Halle (1968) and most other transformational-generative grammarians use numerals to indicate the different levels of stress. Primary stress is indicated by "1"; as the stress increases, the numbers decrease.

19 For a detailed account of these rules, see Chomsky-Halle (1968:240) and Halle-Keyser (1971a:60).
museum and amalgam, and on the final vowel in such words as caprice and parole. The assignment of stress under this rule is closely related to the distribution of tense vowels, as the examples indicate.

When words occur as compounds or as parts of larger syntactic units, the main stress of one (or more) of the words is normally subordinated to that of another word. The rule accomplishing this reduction is the Compound Rule, which assigns primary stress to a primary-stressed vowel which is followed by another primary-stressed vowel in "lexical category" words (nouns, adjectives, and verbs). In applying this stress rule, as well as others, the following convention is observed: When primary stress is placed in a certain position, all other stresses in the string under consideration at that point are automatically weakened by one (Halle-Keyser 1971a:16). The manner in which this rule operates can be seen by considering the compound radio station. If the words which comprise this compound occur in isolation, the primary stress falls on the first syllable of each: radio, station. In the compound, however, primary stress is assigned to the first vowel in radio and the primary stress in station is reduced by one, resulting in the following stress pattern: /reydiow steyən/. The stress assignment for larger compounds is accomplished by the
repeated (cyclical) application of this rule, applying it first to the smallest, innermost compound, then, step by step, to larger constituents until the limits of the compound are reached. This cyclical principle can be illustrated by the use of brackets, stress numerals, and the symbol $N$ (noun) for the compound labor union president election:

$$\begin{align*}
&\text{l l l l} \\
&[[[\text{labor union}]_N\text{president}]_N\text{election}]_N
\end{align*}$$

According to the rule, the stress is assigned first to the innermost compound $[\text{labor union}]_N$, which, by the stress weakening convention, becomes $[\text{labor union}]_N$. The innermost brackets are now erased and the Compound Rule is applied to the larger constituent

$$\begin{align*}
&\text{l 1 2 1} \\
&[\text{labor union president}]_N
\end{align*}$$

which now becomes $[\text{labor union president}]_N$. Finally, the brackets are again erased and the rule applied to the entire compound

$$\begin{align*}
&\text{l 1 2 1} \\
&[\text{labor union president election}]_N
\end{align*}$$

converting it into $[\text{labor union president election}]_N$. In effect, what this rule illustrates is that the "phonetic form of a compound of arbitrary length . . . is determined by the very same rules that determine the form of its component

\[20\] The example is drawn from Halle-Keyser (1971a:18).
parts, and, moreover, that these component parts are identical with the syntactic constituents of the word" (Halle-Keyser 1971a:17-18).

The third rule to be considered is the Nuclear Stress Rule, which applies to nonlexical syntactic categories; i.e., to noun phrases, verb phrases, and sentences. This rule assigns primary stress to a primary-stressed vowel which is preceded by another primary-stressed vowel in any syntactical collocation not a lexical category. For example, this rule assigns the stress contours in these constructions:

- [elementary proposals] Noun Phrase
- [Jesus wept] Sentence
- [very difficult] Adjective Phrase
- [explain theorems] Verb Phrase

Since this rule and the Compound Rule apply to mutually exclusive categories, they must be ordered so that the Nuclear Stress Rule follows the Compound Rule. The operation of the Nuclear Stress Rule can be seen by applying it to the noun phrase black board, with the stress contour [black board] Noun Phrase. The application

\[2^1\]The examples are from Halle-Keyser (1971a:23).
of the rule and the stress weakening convention produce the stress contour [black board] Noun Phrase.

It becomes apparent when one reads the formal statement of the Halle-Keyser theory of prosody (which follows directly) that certain adaptations are made by the authors in relating linguistic stress to poetic meter. For instance, though a vowel may possess any of a number of levels of linguistic stress, for the purposes of their theory, Halle and Keyser classify all vowels into two categories: stressed and unstressed. By so doing, they are saying, in effect, that it is not which level of stress a syllable bears that is metrically significant, but whether the syllable is stressed or unstressed. Stressed vowels occur in "major category" words: nouns, verbs, adjectives, non-clitic adverbs (e.g., therefore, however, quickly), and verbal particles (e.g., up in eat up). All other vowels are unstressed; i.e., those occurring in other categories of words, such as conjunctions, prepositions, pronominal adverbs (e.g., how and when), pronouns, and copular verbs (e.g., is, are, have, do, etc.). Contrastive stress is treated as if the vowel occurred in a major category word. Only one stressed vowel is considered metrically strong in a major category word having more than one stressed vowel; however, in compound words both stressed vowels are
metrically strong. Thus, only the antepenultimate vowel in anticipate is metrically strong, but both vowels in blackbird are. In this theory, then, stress is a binary entity and is assigned on the basis of a word's membership in a lexical category.

One of the more notable features of this theory of prosody is that it permits metrically stressed vowels to bear any level of linguistic stress. Therefore, if the constituent The labor union president election occurred as a line of poetry (say, as an iambic pentameter line with an optional final weak syllable), the linguistic stress of 4 on the first vowel of union would count as a metrically strong stress since union is a major category word having only one stressed vowel. This increased precision in identifying the relationship between the stress system of meter and that of the language which fulfills the meter is not possible, of course, in the structural account of stress. For example, the Smith-Trager theory, though it recognizes that the stress level of a syllable may change from its pronunciation in isolation to its pronunciation as part of a larger utterance, does not provide a systematic method, such as the cyclical application of stress rules, for the assignment of stress within larger constituents.
One further merit of the rule cycle in generative phonology is that it identifies the manner in which linguistic stress cooperates with rhyme, pause, and meter in structuring a line of poetry. Heroic couplets, for example, are characterized by lines which are end-rhymed and punctuated with potential or actual line-end pauses. Meter reinforces this "closed" line-ending by signaling a strong metrical stress in final position.

Linguistically, the Nuclear Stress Rule contributes to this effect by assigning the primary stress to the final vowel in the phrase or sentence which comprises the line. Thus, the term "closed" as applied to couplets refers to the product resulting from the convergence of rhyme, pause, meter, and linguistic stress.

Perhaps a fitting way to summarize these digressive comments on stress and meter is to repeat the structurally-marked Wheatley couplet given earlier, adding, for comparison, the stress pattern that results from the application of generative phonological rules:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CH</th>
<th>0 2 0 1</th>
<th>0 2 3 2</th>
<th>0 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>ᴻ ᵴ ᵴ /</td>
<td>ᵴ ᵴ \ /</td>
<td>ᵴ /</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The latent foe /T/ to friendship makes pretence, /T/

\(^{22}\)Since the line-end in couplet composition typically coincides with a syntactic (phrase or sentence) boundary, the involvement of the Nuclear Stress Rule is likely.
The name assumes /T/ without the sacred sense! /T/

(The CH line contains linguistic stress assigned by (Chomsky-Halle) generative stress rules; the ST line, linguistic stress assigned by the structural (Smith-Trager) theory.) It is important to remember that in the Smith-Trager system only one primary stress is allowed per phonological phrase; i.e., within a span bounded by terminal junctures. Different readings might find fewer or more junctures and, therefore, different placement of primary stresses. The point of significance in this comparison, however, is the fact that four levels of stress—the limit, according to Smith-Trager—are inadequate for a phonological description of these lines. Five levels are required, as the CH lines indicate. The role which this generative system of stress assignment plays in determining the metrical complexity of iambic pentameter lines such as these is made apparent in the formal statement of the Halle-Keyser theory given below.

Halle and Keyser view meters as "rudimentary linear arrangements of abstract entities which are embodied in linguistic material by virtue of specific conventions (correspondence rules) that establish correspondences between the abstract entities of the meter and particular (phonetic)
properties of words" (1971b:155). Abstract metrical entities are to be regarded as linear patterns actualized by "sequences of words having particular phonetic properties" (1971b:155). The theory of iambic pentameter, then, as conceived by them consists of two parts: an abstract metrical entity and a set of correspondence rules which relate linguistic material to this entity. For convenience, the theory is reproduced below exactly as stated by Halle-Keyser:

(1) (a) Abstract Metrical Pattern

(W)*SWSWSWSWS(X) (X)

where elements enclosed in parentheses may be omitted and where each X may be occupied only by an unstressed syllable

(b) Correspondence Rules

(1) A position (S or W) corresponds to a single syllable or to a sonorant sequence incorporating at most two vowels (immediately adjoining or separated by a sonorant consonant)

Definition: When a stressed syllable is located between two unstressed syllables

23The asterisk following the parenthesized (thus optional) W means that the W is normally realized.
in the same syntactic constituent within a line of verse, this syllable is called a "stress maximum".

(ii) Stressed syllables occur in S positions only and in all S positions or Stressed syllables occur in S positions only but not in all S positions or Stressed maxima occur in S positions only but not all S positions (1971b:155-156).

The application of the theory to actual lines of poetry will illustrate how the theory works. The first step in checking to see if the syllables in a given line of poetry correspond to the abstract metrical entity (la). In the following line the syllables do correspond as indicated:

(2) When tyrants' crests and tombs of brass are spent

\[ W \cdot S W \ S W S W S W S \]

--Sonnet 107:14

Having established the correspondence between the syllables and the abstract metrical pattern, the second step is to check the correspondence between the stress pattern in the line of poetry with the stress pattern indicated in the

\[ ^{24} \text{For convenience, the application of the theory is illustrated with lines (from Shakespeare's sonnets) provided by Halle and Keyser (1971b:154-160).} \]
abstract entity (correspondence rule lbii). The conditions in the correspondence rule are met:

\[(3) \text{ When tyrants' crests and tombs of brass are spent}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
W & S & W & S & W & S & W & S
\end{array}
\]

Unstressed syllables occur only in W positions and stressed syllables occur in S positions only and in all S positions. This line, then, is judged metrical, since the correspondence between the abstract metrical entity and the actual line of poetry has been established.

This operation may seem at a glance to be overly simple, as indeed it is since the illustrative line is what Halle and Keyser call the "most neutral sort of iambic pentameter line" (1971b:157). The theory, however, has a number of alternatives not brought into play by (2). The metricality of a line which fails to meet the first alternatives of the correspondence rules can be illustrated by scanning this line:

\[(4) \text{ Supposed as forfeit to a confined doom}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
W & S & W & S & W & S & W & S
\end{array}
\]

--Sonnet 107:4

The underlinings in (4) are a convention for showing the failure of the line to meet certain correspondence rules.
For example, "to" is underlined because it is an unstressed syllable occurring in an S position in violation of correspondence rule (lbii). The syllable occurring in the fourth S position is underlined for the same violation. The double underline in the fifth W position indicates that the syllable which occurs in this position violates two of the correspondence rules, the first and second alternatives of (lbii). Finally, a check must be made to see if there is a correspondence between the poetic line and the third alternative of (lbii); i.e., to see if the stress maxima in the line occur only in S positions. (It will be recalled that if a stress maximum occurs in a W position, the line is judged unmetrical.) The two stress maxima in the line, it is found, occur in the first and second S positions. The stressed syllable in confined occurs in a W position, but it is not a stress maximum since it does not occur between two unstressed syllables. Thus, the line is judged metrical and is assigned a "tension rating" of 4 (derived by counting the underlines).²⁵

²⁵I have coined the term "tension rating," which I will henceforth abbreviate TR, as a convenience. Halle and Keyser (1971b:158) note that this number represents the "metrical complexity," or "traditional notion of tension," but do not employ the term "tension rating" as a technical term.
A few digressive comments are in order concerning this TR and its value as an indicator of the metrical complexity or tension of a line of poetry. It will be noted that, although not specifically indicated, the TR of (2) is 0. This system of scansion then reveals that (4) is metrically more complex than (2) because (4) violates more of the correspondence rules than does (2). Ordering the rules as Halle and Keyser have ordered them is a particularly attractive aspect of their theory, since the later alternatives are generalizations of the earlier ones by virtue of the fact that later alternatives not only treat as metrical the class of lines so treated by the preceding alternatives but widen the class of metrical lines somewhat (1971b:158).

Thus, the theory will, by invoking early alternatives, accept as metrical such lines as (2) and, by invoking later alternatives, judge metrical such lines as (4) and an even more complex line such as

\[
\text{(5) Of the wide world, dreaming on things to come} \\
\text{WSWSWSWSWSWS} \\
\text{---Sonnet 107:2}
\]

with a TR of 6. Lest the theory be thought too accommodating, however, the illustration below shows a line
which is unmetrical because a stress maximum occurs in a W position:

(6) In pursuit of the thing she would have stay

W S W S W S W S W S

--Sonnet 143:4

The barred triple underline is the convention for indicating the unmetricality of the line, since the syllable violates every alternative of the correspondence rules, but especially the third alternative of (1b11).

The Wheatley couplet used for illustration earlier can serve at this point as a helpful summary example. Shown as (9) below is the Halle-Keyser scansion provided for this couplet, which, according to generative analysis, has five levels of linguistic stress. (For convenience, the couplet with structural (Smith-Trager) stress markings is repeated as (7); with generative (Chomsky-Halle) stress markings as (8).)

(7) The latent foe to friendship makes pretence,

0 2 0 1 0 2 3 2 0 1

The name assumes without the sacred sense!

(8) The latent foe to friendship makes pretence,

0 2 0 1 0 4 0 3 0 1

The name assumes without the sacred sense!
The latent foe to friendship makes pretence,

\[ WSW SWS WSWS \]

(9) The name assumes without the sacred sense!

\[ WSW SWS WSWS \]

The metrical complexity of the couplet's first line is 2; that of the second line, 1. The first-line correspondence rule violation results, of course, from Halle and Keyser's stipulation that both stressed vowels in a compound are metrically strong. The second-line violation is attributable to the Halle-Keyser method of assigning stress on the basis of lexical classification: the vowels in prepositions are unstressed.

The superiority of the Halle-Keyser theory of prosody over the structural theory resides primarily in the former's provision for distinguishing linguistic stress which is metrically significant from that which is not, i.e., by "rewarding" the poet for actualizing a metrically strong syllable with a linguistically stressed syllable and "penalizing" him for a failure to do so. The structural theory of stress, applied to poetry, does not permit a reader or analyst to make such a distinction, since the metrical significance of the stress on a particular syllable is determined arbitrarily by the stress level of the surrounding syllables. Therefore, both stressed (except
primary stressed) and unstressed syllables may count as metrically weak syllables, yet the theory provides no way of distinguishing the poet who habitually encodes his meter in this manner from the poet whose practices are different.

For the analyst who wishes to explore the metrical features of poetry, this theory is desirable for several reasons. Implicit in this view of iambic pentameter is the recognition of the distinction—a crucial distinction—between the poem and the performance of the poem, or, more specifically, between the meter and the realization of the meter with linguistic material. The maintenance of this distinction in the theory facilitates the task of the analyst in describing the variety of ways in which different poets actualize the iambic pentameter meter. Further, by providing the means whereby a numerical TR may be assigned to each line of poetry, the theory enables the prosodist to measure with mathematical exactness the interplay between the meter of the poem and the rhythm and stress of the language which actualizes this meter (this quality, which has been referred to in this paper as metrical complexity or tension, is frequently called "counterpoint"). Finally, as Halle and Keyser note (1971b:159-160), this theory has the unique advantage of placing the prosodist in the same relationship to a poem that a grammarian holds...
in relation to a natural language. Much in the same way that a grammarian must "describe" speech but not "legislate" it, so must the prosodist describe, but not dictate, what poets do. Similarly, the prosodist must distinguish between lines that are metrical and those that are not, just as the grammarian distinguishes grammatical utterances from ungrammatical ones. This role for the prosodist seems far superior to one which merely places him in awe of the poet, unequipped to judge the metricality of the poet's lines except in vague, subjective terms. For these reasons, this theory has been selected as the basis for an analysis of the metrical features of the lines in Phillis Wheatley's couplet poetry. The results of this analysis are presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER III

METRICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF WHEATLEY'S POETRY

The primary purpose of this chapter is to establish the metrical features of Phillis Wheatley's couplet poetry in terms of metrical complexity, line variations, stress variations, and elision and caesural practices. In each of the five areas, of course, Wheatley's techniques and characteristics are related to those of Alexander Pope. Of specific concern are the following questions, all of which, directly or indirectly, involve metrical phenomena accounted for by the Halle-Keyser theory of prosody:

(1) What degree of metrical complexity is typical of Phillis Wheatley's verses?

(2) Which line options in the Halle-Keyser theory does Wheatley select most often in varying the syllable count in her lines?

(3) Which of the permitted stress variations are most common in her poems?

(4) To what extent does Wheatley rely on poetic elision in avoiding hiatus and adjusting the syllable count in her lines?
(5) What is characteristic of Wheatley's use of the caesura?

As indicated in Chapter I, Wheatley's forty-five couplet poems have been divided for the purposes of this paper into nine categories. Following are the categories, with the number of poems and lines for each.

TABLE I

WHEATLEY'S POEMS BY CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No. of Poems</th>
<th>No. of Lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biblical Paraphrases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poems on Abstractions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth Paraphrase</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hymns</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical Poems</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional Poems on Public Events</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional Poems on Minor Events</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poems in Praise of Living Persons</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elegies</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These poems have a combined total of 2186 lines, all of which are iambic pentameter with these exceptions: the two iambic tetrameter couplets which conclude one of the
minor occasional poems ("An Answer to the Rebus, by the Author of these Poems"); a three-foot iambic line which begins "To the King's Most Excellent Majesty," a public-occasional poem; an Alexandrine in "On the Death of Samuel Marshall"; and a fourteen-syllable line in "America." Thus, 2179 of the lines scan by the Halle-Keyser theory of prosody.

As a preliminary to the discussion of specific metrical characteristics of Wheatley's lines, a reiteration of one or two points concerning the Halle-Keyser theory and the results its application yields will be helpful. The TR (tension rate), it will be recalled, represents generally the interplay between the meter and the rhythm and stress of the language which realizes the meter. More specifically, the TR indicates how many of the correspondence rules in the Halle-Keyser theory the poet has violated in mapping the language onto the meter. Or, stated another way, the TR is an indicator of the poet's use of permitted deviations in actualizing the meter, an abstract entity. The TR for an entire poem is, of course, computed by totaling the line TR's and dividing the sum by the number of lines in the poem.

From category to category, the TR in Wheatley's poetry varies very little, as the following table indicates:
TABLE II
METRICAL COMPLEXITY
IN WHEATLEY'S POEMS: BY CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No. of Poems</th>
<th>No. of Lines</th>
<th>Category TR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Biblical Paraphrases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Poems on Abstractions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Myth Paraphrase</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hymns</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Philosophical Poems</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Occasional Poems on Public Events</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Occasional Poems on Minor Events</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Poems in Praise of Living Persons</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Elegies</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The line numbers for elegies, occasional (public) poems, and occasional (minor) poems are less than those shown on the previous table since there are poems in these categories containing non-iambic pentameter lines.

The actual difference between the lowest category TR (1.76) and the highest (2.02) is .26. If the TR's are rounded to only one decimal place, then the range for Wheatley's poems, by category, is 1.8-2.0. For two of the categories (1 and 8), the TR is 1.8; for three others (3, 4, and 5), 1.9; and for the remaining four (2, 6,
7, and 9), 2.0. In view of the fact that the metrical complexity in Wheatley's lines exhibits so little variance from category to category, it appears that the demands of the categories of these poems have little, if any, effect upon the metrical complexity of the lines. That is, when one groups the poems in terms of subject matter and tone and divides the total number of correspondence rule violations in each category by the number of lines, the resulting TR's span a remarkably narrow range.

A clear picture of the range of TR's for the forty-five individual poems, not grouped by types, is reflected in the chart below. The total number of lines represented is included in parentheses. It should be noted that the TR's are rounded to one decimal place. Thus, 1.5 includes TR's ranging from 1.45 to 1.54.

TABLE III

METRICAL COMPLEXITY IN WHEATLEY'S POETRY: BY POEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TR</th>
<th>1.4</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>1.6</th>
<th>1.7</th>
<th>1.8</th>
<th>1.9</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>2.2</th>
<th>2.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. Poems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(70)</td>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>(453)</td>
<td>(672)</td>
<td>(254)</td>
<td>(308)</td>
<td>(218)</td>
<td>(86)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the chart indicates, the TR occurring with the greatest frequency is 1.9. More specifically, the mean
TR (derived by dividing total correspondence rule violations by total number of lines) for Wheatley's poems is 1.933. The standard deviation—i.e., the average variation of the number of violations in a line from the mean TR—is 1.471. This means that, on the average, the number of correspondence rule violations within Wheatley's lines falls within a span the boundaries of which are 1.471 greater than the mean and 1.471 lower than the mean.

The following poem, "On Being Brought from Africa to America," illustrates fairly well the metrical complexity that is typical of Wheatley. The number of correspondence rule violations is included in parentheses at the end of each line.¹

¹To avoid confusion with underlines which mark correspondence rule violations, capital letters are used in the place of underlines to indicate italics in the poem.

1 'TWAS mercy brought me from my PAGAN land, (1)
   W  S  W  S  W  S  W  S  W  S

2 Taught my benighted soul to understand (4)
   W  S  W  S  W  S  W  S  W  S

3 That there's a God, that there's a SAVIOUR too: (2)
   W  S  W  S  W  S  W  S  W  S

4 Once I redemption neither sought nor knew. (2)
   W  S  W  S  W  S  W  S  W  S

5 Some view our sable race with scornful eye, (2)
   W  S  W  S  W  S  W  S  W  S

To avoid confusion with underlines which mark correspondence rule violations, capital letters are used in the place of underlines to indicate italics in the poem.
6 "Their colour is a diabolic die." (2)  
\[ W S W S W S W S W S \]

7 Remember, CHRISTIANS, NEGROES, black as CAIN, (0)  
\[ W S W S W S W S W S W S \]

8 May be refin'd, and join th' angelic train. (2)  
\[ W S W S W S W S W S W S \]

Correspondence rule violations in this poem total 15; therefore, the TR for the poem is 1.88, a rate near the mean TR of 1.93. The poem is also characteristic in that it earns its TR not by violating a single correspondence rule consistently, but by violating different correspondence rules with varying frequency. Line 7, for example, contains no violations; lines 1, 3, 4, and 6 violate only the second alternative of (1bii); line 5, only the first alternative of (1bii); line 2, both alternatives of (1bii); and line 8, the first alternative of (1bi).

To sum up what is characteristic of Wheatley in terms of metrical complexity, it can be said that the TR's in her poetry (1) range in individual poems between 1.44 and 2.31 and from category to category between 1.76 and 2.02; (2) have as a mean, 1.93; (3) are apparently influenced little, if any, by subject matter and tone; and (4) result from violations of different correspondence rules rather than repeated violations of the same rule.
Let us turn now from metrical complexity, per se, to the second major question: Which options in the Halle-Keyser theory does Wheatley select in varying the syllable-count in her lines?

The abstract metrical pattern for iambic pentameter, it will be recalled, is represented as

\[(W)^*SWSWSWSWSWS\]

where elements enclosed in parentheses are optional and where each \(X\) may be occupied only by an unstressed syllable. (The asterisk after the initial \(W\) indicates that this syllable is normally realized.) Theoretically, the following appear to be the line possibilities indicated by the abstract pattern:

1. \(WSWSWSWSWS\)
2. \(SWSWSWSWS\)
3. \(SWSWSWSWSX\)
4. \(SWSWSWSXX\)
5. \(WSWSWSWSX\)
6. \(WSWSWSWSXX\)

In reality, however, 3 and 4 above are not possibilities since a "headless line" (2 above) does not take extra-metrical syllables in final position. If an extra-metrical syllable were added to a headless line, the result would
be a ten-syllable line which would theoretically be scanned according to the pattern in (1) above. If two extra-metrical syllables were added to a headless line, an eleven-syllable line would result and would theoretically be scanned according to the pattern in (5). In effect, then, there are four possibilities for achieving syllable-position correspondence in constructing an iambic pentameter line (1, 2, 5, and 6 above).

The basic line pattern, as the formula indicates, is WSWWSWSWSWS, and it is this pattern which the pentameter line takes in Wheatley's poetry, with no exceptions. Wheatley's reluctance to vary her pentameter lines within the options available in the abstract pattern is matched by the infrequency with which she achieves line variety by moving outside the pentameter line. Two cases have already been mentioned: her use of four iambic tetrameter lines to conclude "An Answer to the Rebus, by the Author of these Poems" and her use of a three-foot line to begin "To the King's Most Excellent Majesty." The two remaining examples of such variation are her use of an Alexandrine in line 12 of the elegy "On the Death of Dr. Samuel Marshall":

The hapless child, thine only hope and heir,
Cling round his mother's neck, and weeps his sorrows there. —lines 11-12
and a line containing fourteen syllables in "America":

New English force, thou fear'st his Tyranny and
thou didst frown[.].--line 30

The scarcity of Alexandrines in Wheatley's poetry may
be evidence that she shares Pope's aversion to this type of
line. Pope would perhaps allow Wheatley's Alexandrine, not
on the basis of its "majesty," but possibly on the grounds
that it possesses no words not "absolutely needful"
(Sherburn 1956:1, 107). A higher percentage of Alexandrines
in Wheatley's poems would not be surprising, though, in view
of the fact that the works of Pope which supposedly in-
fluenced her most (the translations of Homer) reflect a more
extensive use of the Alexandrine than any of his other works

Although Wheatley was almost totally successful in
maintaining a syllable count of ten in her lines, she very
wisely (Pope would say) did not insist upon a rigid alter-
nation of stresses within each line, the phenomenon with
which our third major question is concerned. According to
Adler (1961:220-221), in the eighteenth century the "central
and majority position" concerning permitted variations of
stress regularity was this:

. . . use of the initial trochee is acceptable, but
not the medial trochee and certainly not the final
trochee, for which Milton was roundly condemned;
. . . the spondee is acceptable, either with the
pyrrhic or without. . . .
Because the initial trochee occurs so commonly in iambic pentameter verse, Phillis Wheatley's use of this pattern of stress has been carefully noted. The initial trochee appears in all of Wheatley's couplet poems except two ("To a Gentleman and Lady on the Death of the Lady's Brother and Sister, and a Child of the Name Avis, Aged One Year" and "To the Honble. Commodore Hood on His Pardoning a Deserter"). The total occurrences of the initial trochee number 2^0, or about one occurrence per nine lines of her poetry. In one poem, "To the Right Honorable William, Earl of Dartmouth, His Majesty's Secretary of State for North America," the inverted foot is used to initiate three successive lines:

```
/ ^
Soon as appear'd the Goddess long desir'd,
Sick at the view, she languish'd and expir'd;
Thus from the splendors of the morning light
```
--lines 11-13

but this is the only instance of such a concentrated use of this foot.

---

2 Close attention has not been devoted to her use of the pyrrhic and the spondee, since the absence of both metrical restrictions and critical disapproval concerning their usage have not seemed to justify a detailed analysis. What Adler (1961:221) said of Pope's use of the spondee could be said of Wheatley's use of the spondee and the pyrrhic: she uses them "frequently, variously, and naturally."
The use of an initial trochee has, of course, a direct effect on the metrical complexity of a line scanned by the Halle-Keyser theory of prosody. A line, such as the following, with no other correspondence-rule violations would, for example, receive a TR of 3:

Freed from a world of sin, and snares, and pain.

W S W S W S W S

"On the Death of a Young Lady of Five Years of Age," 25

The occurrence of a stressed syllable in the initial W position violates both the first and second alternatives of (lbii); i.e., it violates the correspondence rule which states that fully stressed syllables must occur in all S positions, and it violates the rule which requires that fully stressed syllables occur in S positions only. The appearance of an unstressed syllable in the first S position violates only the first alternative of (lbii).

It is apparent, then, that increased use of trochaic substitutions would increase the metrical complexity of a line as scanned by the Halle-Keyser theory.

The medial trochee was, one gathers from Adler (1961:220-221), apparently tolerable only if not used frequently and indiscriminately. According to Halle and
Keyser (1971a:174-175), the trochee may occur (in addition to verse initial position) in only two metrical environments: after a major syntactic boundary and after a fully stressed syllable. Wheatley's use of the trochee in medial positions suggests that she was aware both of the strictures against its excessive occurrence medially and of the metrical environments in which it was permitted. She uses the medial trochee sparingly: three times in the second foot position and nine times in third foot position. There is one occurrence of the trochee in the fourth foot position but none in the fifth in her poetry.

One of the trochees in second foot position occurs in an anaphoric pattern in line 9 of "To a Gentleman on His Voyage to Great-Britain for the Recovery of His Health":

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{I sing not now of green embowering woods,} \\
\text{I sing not now the daughters of the floods,} \\
\text{I sing not of the storms over ocean driv'n} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\begin{align*}
\text{W S W S W S W S W S}
\end{align*}

--lines 7-9

In addition to providing a variation from the iambic stress pattern, the trochee in line 9 contrasts sharply with another permitted stress deviation--the spondee--which occurs in the second foot of lines 7 and 8. The
unstressed syllable in the second S position does not, of course, constitute a stress maximum in line 9 since it does not occur between two unstressed syllables. The stressed syllable occupying the first S position prevents the trochee from rendering the line unmetrical.

One other instance of trochaic substitution in the second foot position is also interesting, for a number of reasons. It occurs in line 114 of "Thoughts on the Works of Providence":

\[ \text{REASON let this most causeless strife subside.} \]

This line, at a glance, might appear to be unmetrical since "let," a stressed syllable, seems to constitute a stress maximum (i.e., it is a fully stressed syllable occurring between two unstressed syllables). However, in their revised theory (1971a:169), Halle and Keyser redefined their concept of stress maximum by adding the stipulation that the fully stressed syllable must occur "between two unstressed syllables in the same syntactic constituent" (underlining mine). Thus, by the revised theory, this line is metrical, since there is a major syntactic break between "Reason" (a personification
of an abstraction, used in direct address) and the verb "let."  

Wheatley's practice of utilizing both permitted metrical environments for the medial trochees continues in her placement of this inverted iamb in the third foot position, where the trochees in these six lines appear following major syntactic boundaries:

When thus the king: "Dar'\st thou a stripling go,
\[ W S W S W S W S \]
--"Goliath of Gath,"  92

To him the king: "Say of what martial line
\[ W S W S W S W S \]
--"Goliath of Gath,"  213

Cease then, my song, cease the unequal lay.
\[ W S W S W S W S W S \]
--"On Imagination,"  53

While Homer paints lo! circumfus'd in air.
\[ W S W S W S W S W S \]
--"To Maecenas,"  7

---Conventional punctuation rules would necessitate a comma after this direct address; however, Wheatley is not always lucky with her commas and apostrophes. Since the line is not ambiguous, the syntactic boundary is there, despite her failure to signal it conventionally with a comma.
He in his death slew ours, and, as he rose,
W S W S W S W S W S

"To a Clergyman on the Death of His Lady," 27

And in her Train Commerce and Plenty shines
W S W S W S W S W S

"Liberty and Peace, a Poem," 56

and three appear following stressed syllables:

Fair mourner, there see thy lov'd Leonard laid,
W S W S W S W S W S W S

"To a Lady on the Death of Her Husband," 11

What sighs on sighs heave the fond parent's breast?
W S W S W S W S W S W S

"To a Lady and Her Children . . ." 4

What sudden pangs shot thro' each aching heart
W S W S W S W S W S W S

"On the Death of J. C., an Infant," 7

Before comparing Wheatley's poetry with Pope's in terms of the three metrical phenomena discussed thus far (metrical complexity, variations in syllable-count, and

It might be noted that in the first six lines cited, a stressed syllable also precedes the trochee as it does in the last three examples. For the sake of illustration, precedence has been given to syntactic boundaries in segregating the first group of examples.
the use of permitted stress deviations), let us summarize briefly Wheatley's practices in these areas. It has been shown that Wheatley is basically a "conservative" couplet poet. Her lines are relatively uncomplicated metrically: the mean TR for all her couplet poetry is 1.9 correspondence rule violations per line and all of her poems have a TR falling within a low, narrow range (1.4-2.3). There is apparently no relationship between the categories of the poems and the metrical complexity of the lines, since the lowest category TR is separated from the highest by only .26 correspondence rule violations. In addition, she relentlessly maintains the basic ten-syllable line, never writing "headless" nine-syllable lines nor lines with extra-metrical syllables. She seldom varies the iambic pentameter by injecting non-pentameter lines. And, finally, she is quite discriminate in her use of the trochee to achieve stress variation. She employs the inverted iamb moderately in the approved initial position, infrequently in the precarious second, third, and fourth foot positions, and never in the forbidden fifth foot position. In all cases, she makes the foot substitution within the permitted metrical environments, avoiding the unmetricality which would result from a disregard for these environments. The pyrrhic and spondee she uses with frequency and ease,
presumably because no particular stigma is attached to their presence.

As indicated earlier in this paper, a comparison of Wheatley's poetic practices with those of Pope is motivated for several reasons. He is the poet whose language and techniques she supposedly sought to imitate, and he is generally regarded as the "master" of the heroic couplet. In addition, the linguistic characteristics of Wheatley's verses will attain greater significance by comparing them with the presence and frequency of the same features in Pope's poetry. Because the quantity of Wheatley's extant poetry is so small in comparison with the massive body of verse left by Pope and because a detailed analysis of all of Pope's verse would well exceed the scope of this paper, representative poems and passages have been selected from Pope for use in the comparison. In order to do justice to both Wheatley and Pope, a dual approach has been used in choosing the Pope passages.\(^5\)

One group of poems has been selected on the basis of similarity to the types, or categories, of poems Wheatley wrote. This group includes eight poems, listed below,

\(^5\)All Pope passages are from John Butt's 1963 one-volume edition of the Twickenham Text.
which correspond as closely as possible to the categories into which Wheatley's poems are divided:

### TABLE IV

**POPE'S GROUP I POEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wheatley's Category</th>
<th>No. of Lines</th>
<th>Pope's Poems</th>
<th>No. of Lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biblical Paraphrases</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>&quot;Psalm XCI&quot;</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poems on Abstractions</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>&quot;Lines on Solitude and Retirement&quot;</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth Paraphrases</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>&quot;The Fable of Dryope&quot;</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hymns</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Windsor Forest (ll. 1-42)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical Poems</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>Essay on Man (ll. 113-172)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional Poems</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>&quot;To Mr. Addison&quot;</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poems in Praise of Living Persons</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>&quot;Epistle to James Craggs, Esq.&quot;</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elegies</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>&quot;Elegy to . . . an Unfortunate Lady&quot;</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because Pope did not write a great number of works which belong to the categories in which Wheatley wrote, for convenience, no distinction has been made, in the case of Pope, between the two types of occasional poems which were distinguished in classifying Wheatley's poems. As a result, there are eight categories instead of nine.
it was not possible to obtain for each Wheatley category a complete poem by Pope which corresponded in subject matter, tone, and purpose. Accordingly, some of the Pope selections are excerpts, and the total number of lines for the group (457) is somewhat less than is desirable for a reliable comparison. Nonetheless, it seemed relevant to determine, as far as possible, the similarities and differences that resulted when the two poets attempted the same type of poem. For convenience, this list of poems is referred to as Pope's "Group I" poems.

Since such a small group of poems, which omits several of Pope's major poems, may not reflect the poet's "typical" techniques, a second group of poems, selected as representatives of the major categories in which Pope wrote, has been included. These "Group II" poems are shown in the table below: 7

7 The first hundred lines of each poem have been analyzed as a representative sample. The total number of lines in this group, however, is 1002, since two of the poems have triplets. When the poems within a category varied greatly, two works were chosen. For example, "Rape of the Lock" is intended as a representative "light" mock-heroic; The Dunciad, "dark" mock-heroic. Both The Iliad and The Odyssey are included because there was no logical basis for preferring one to the other.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Poems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Didactical-Critical Poems</td>
<td>Essay on Criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didactical-Philosophical Poems</td>
<td>Essay on Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mock-Heroic</td>
<td>Rape of the Lock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Dunciad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Essays</td>
<td>Epistle to a Lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epistle to Burlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistolary Satire</td>
<td>Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The First Epistle of the First Book of Horace Imitated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translations</td>
<td>The Iliad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Odyssey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total number of Pope's lines analyzed for this study is 1459 (457 in Group I; 1002 in Group II). The same pattern or organization used in discussing the Halle-Keyser analysis of Wheatley's poems is used here; i.e., the discussion of metrical complexity is followed by a discussion of Pope's syllable-position correspondence and his use of metrical foot substitutions. Some reference to pertinent secondary material is made, although no attempt

---

8 This is the version published in 1743, "printed according to the complete copy found in the year 1742 with the prolegomena of Scriblerus and Notes Variorum. . . ."
has been made to be exhaustive in seeking out the opinions of literary critics.

Although the number of lines in Pope's Group I poems is not large enough to establish any firm statistical relationships between their TR's and Wheatley's category TR's, a charting of these two sets of TR's, provided below, does permit some observations on the metrical complexity of the two poets within the same poetic categories.

TABLE VI

COMPARISON OF WHEATLEY'S POEMS AND POPE'S GROUP I POEMS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wheatley's Categories</th>
<th>Wheatley's Category TR's</th>
<th>Pope's Corresponding-Poem TR's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abstractions</td>
<td>1.97 (103)</td>
<td>2.26 (  39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional Poems</td>
<td>2.00 (472)</td>
<td>1.85 (  72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblical Paraphrases</td>
<td>1.76 (252)</td>
<td>1.90 (  42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth Paraphrases</td>
<td>1.90 (224)</td>
<td>1.32 (103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hymns</td>
<td>1.89 (  38)</td>
<td>1.91 (  42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical Poems</td>
<td>1.89 (189)</td>
<td>2.45 (  60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise Poems</td>
<td>1.83 (183)</td>
<td>1.41 (  17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elegies</td>
<td>1.98 (718)</td>
<td>2.15 (  82)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The number of lines represented is shown in parentheses.

First of all, the mean TR for Pope's Group I poems (457 lines) is 1.90, as compared with a mean TR of 1.93 for
all of Wheatley's poems (2179 lines). Assuming, then, that the Group I TR's represent the metrical complexity that would have resulted had Pope written more extensively in these categories, one might conclude that, in general, when the two poets have subject matter, tone, and purpose in common, they achieve TR's that vary only slightly.

The two instances of greatest variance in Table VI, those TR's in Philosophical Poems and Myth Paraphrases, can be attributed for the most part to the fact that Pope's early poems (those written before 1730) exhibit a much lower metrical complexity rate than his later works. In view of this, the low TR of 1.32 for "The Fable of Dryope," written in 1702, and the much higher TR of 2.45 for the excerpt from Essay on Man, written between 1730-1732, are not surprising.

That Pope did, indeed, become metrically more complex as his poetic career developed chronologically can be illustrated by considering the following table, in which his "Group II" poems, representing his major genres, are arranged in "Early" (written before 1730) and "Late" (written after 1730) categories:
TABLE VII
POPE'S GROUP II POEMS: BY PERIOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TR</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Poem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1711</td>
<td>Essay on Criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td>Rape of the Lock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1718-1720</td>
<td>The Iliad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1725-1726</td>
<td>The Odyssey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1731</td>
<td>Epistle to Burlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>Essay on Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>Epistle to a Lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1738</td>
<td>The First Epistle of the First Book of Horace Imitated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>The Dunciad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A glance at the TR's for the different poems in the two categories suggests a pattern of increasing metrical complexity. More substantial proof can be seen if one compares the mean TR for the early poems with that for
the later poems. Statistically, this comparison, referred to as the determination of the "significance of the difference between two means," reveals whether the difference between two means is a result of chance (Arkin and Colton 1970:150). The TR for Pope's early Group II poems is 1.75; that for his late poems, 2.38. The difference between the two TR's is .62, a difference which yields a t-ratio of 6.013. If this t-ratio had been only 2.58, the likelihood that sampling error could have been responsible for the difference in the two mean TR's would be 1 in 100. Thus, the higher t-ratio means that the possibility that chance could have produced the difference is considerably less than 1 in 100. In other words, the difference between the mean TR for Pope's early poems and that for his later poems is statistically significant.

The mean TR for the Group II poems, as a whole, is 2.13, a rate slightly higher than Wheatley's mean TR of 1.93. Comparing Wheatley's poems with Pope's Group I and Group II poems indicates that in her couplet poetry, she was metrically more complex than Pope was in his early poems, but less complex than Pope in his works written after 1730.

Like Wheatley, who is generally careful to insure a syllable count of ten in her pentameter lines, Pope also is hesitant to depart from the basic heroic line of ten
syllables. But unlike Wheatley, who does not use any of
the options provided in the Halle-Keyser theory for
varying the syllable count, Pope has two nine-syllable
lines and more frequent eleven-syllable lines. No
instances of a twelve-syllable line containing two extra-
metrical syllables were found in the passages examined.
And, although the Alexandrine does not appear in these
passages, Pope's use of this classical line as a varia-
tion of the pentameter line is well known.9

One of the nine-syllable lines encountered is
puzzling in a number of respects:

\[ \text{To view a thousand real Blessings rise} \]

"Lines on Solitude and Retirement," 9

It falls short of the ten-syllable count by one syllable,
but, because of the stress pattern, cannot really be
considered a "headless" line, which would result in the
Halle-Keyser theory by the failure to actualize the
initial W in the abstract pattern:

\( (W)*\text{SWSWSWSWS} \)

It is clear by the Halle-Keyser (1971a:173) discussion
of this option that their concept of the headless line
is in accord with the traditional definition: "a line

\(^9\)See, for example, Adler (1961:222-223).
of verse from which an unstressed syllable has been dropped at the beginning" (Thrall and Hibbard 1960:218). (Such a line may also be referred to as being "catalectic" (Saintsbury 1926:274-275).) By opting not to actualize the verse-initial unstressed syllable, a poet would theoretically open his line with a stressed syllable, one which would actualize the first S position in the abstract pattern. Halle and Keyser (1971a:173), for example, cite these headless lines from Chaucer and Yeats:

---Twenty bookes clad in blak or reed
(W)*S W S W S W S S

--Chaucer, A. Prol., 294

---Speech after long silence; it is right
(W)* S W S W S W S W S

--Yeats, After Long Silence, 1

Both of these lines, as the scansions indicate, are metrical by the Halle-Keyser theory. Pope's line, however, does not have a stressed syllable occupying the initial S position:

---To view a thousand real Blessings rise
(W)*S W S W S W S W S

Two possibilities are available in evaluating this line. The line can be dismissed as unmmetrical on the assumption
that it is indeed a "deformed" headless line with a verse-initial slack syllable omitted. This scansion would produce unpermitted stress-maxima in W positions:

\[
\text{--To view a thousand real Blessings rise}
\]
\[
(W)\text{*S W S W S W S S W S}
\]

Another possibility, one offered by linguist-critic Donald C. Freeman (1968:454-455), would judge the line metrical by supposing that the underlying long vowel in "real" counts metrically for two positions. This alternative is possible but unlikely, since it does not account for any other Pope lines in which "real" occurs. In terms of the Halle-Keyser theory, the line does not appear to be metrical. Interestingly, Pope's failure to initiate his line with a stressed syllable has at least one parallel in Chaucer, who frequently wrote headless lines. Robert Bridges (1921:5), in his important treatise on Milton's prosody, cites the following headless line from Chaucer, quite similar to Pope's line in that it, too, begins with an unstressed syllable:

\[
\text{--For to delen with no swich poraille}
\]
\[
(W)\text{*S W S W S W S W S}
\]

"Prologue to the Tales, 247"
The difference between this line and Pope's, however, is apparent. Chaucer's line is not rendered unmetrical by a scansion assuming the omission of a verse-initial slack syllable; Pope's line is. Pope, then, careful as he is reputed to have been with syllable count, has apparently, in this instance, written a line which is unmetrical, at least in terms of the Halle-Keyser theory of prosody.

The other nine-syllable line in the Pope selections examined is line 42 of *Essay on Man* (I):

Why JOVE'S satellites are less than JOVE?

(W) S W S W S W S W S

The fact that Pope encoded the second S position with a linguistically stressed syllable (which is judged a metrical strong since it is a primary stressed syllable in a major category word) prevents this line from being ruled unmetrical. That is, the syllable which actualizes the second W position does not constitute an unpermitted stress maximum since it is bounded on the right by a metricaly strong syllable. The frequency and metricality of headless lines in Pope's verses other than those examined for this study have apparently not been determined.

As a variation of the basic ten-syllable line, Pope more commonly uses the eleven-syllable (sometimes called
"hendecasyllabic") line with a single extra-metrical syllable in verse-final position. This line realizes the option

\((W)^*SWSWSWSWS(X)\)

in the Halle-Keyser abstract pattern. These lines, which always occur in pairs because of the rhyme demands, appear in the following poems:

**Epistle to Arbuthnot:**

'Thě Piece you think is incorrect: why take it, (45)
I'm all submission, what you'd have it, make it. (46)
Pitholeôon libell'd me--'but here's a Letter
Inform's you Sir, 'twas when he knew no better. (52)

**The Dunciad (I):**

(Pomps without guilt, of bloodless swords and maces, (87)
Glad chains, warm furs, broad banners, and broad faces) (88)

**Epistle to a Lady:**

Whêther thě Charmêr sînner it, or saint it, (15)
If Folly grows romantic, I must paint it. (16)
Now deep in Tavîlôr and thê Book of Martyrs, (63)
Now drinking citron with his Grace and Chartrês. (64)
and *Epistle to Burlington:*

For what has Virrō painted, built, and planted? (13)
Only to show, how many Tastes he wanted. (14)

These lines, it should be pointed out, do not violate the
Halle-Keyser syllable-position correspondence rule (Halle-
Keyser 1971a:170n). Thus, if no correspondence-rule
violations exist elsewhere in the line, a TR of zero would
be assigned to each line. It is interesting to note that
Pope reflects a great deal of variety in actualizing this
final unstressed syllable, relying on monosyllabic pro-
nouns in two pairs of lines and on inflectional and non-
inflectional morphemes in the remaining lines. In writing
such lines as these, he exhibits a willingness (not found
in Wheatley) to vary the basic heroic line within the
prosodic options schematized by Halle and Keyser.

Pope's utilization of non-pentameter lines as a
device of variety is apparently limited to the Alexandrine,
which, of course, he expressed some prejudice against in
his letter on prosody.10 Although no Alexandrines were
contained in the lines examined, Pope does use Alexandrines

---

10 The use of the Alexandrine was a controversial
aspect of prosody during most of the Neoclassical period.
Pope, as Adler notes, objected principally to the too-
frequent use of the Alexandrine, but as his letter on
prosody indicates, he would accept the twelve-syllable
line if it added "majesty" and had no syllables not
"absolutely needful" (1959:223).
in several of his works, more frequently in his translations of Homer than elsewhere (Adler 1961:223). In the use of the Alexandrine, as in so many other aspects of prosody, Pope occasionally violates his own metrical rules (sometimes intentionally) by admitting lines neither "Majestic" nor void of superfluous words. An example, cited by Adler (1961:223), is line 373 of Essay on Criticism:  

Flies o'er th'unbending corn and skims along the main

In the third metrical area, the use of different metrical feet as a technique for varying the iambic stress pattern, Pope is strikingly similar to Wheatley. Like the American poet, Pope uses the trochaic foot in verse initial position in less than 15 per cent of his lines.  

---

11 Adler seems rather insensitive to the fact that Pope is not offering this line as a "model" or acceptable Alexandrine. Rather, Pope is comparing the line with line 369, "When Ajax strives, some rocks vast weight to throw," to demonstrate how the manipulation of syntax and consonants influences the sense of motion in a line.

12 In the whole of Pope's works, this rate might be slightly higher. Adler (1961:221n), for example, says:

Initial trochees occur in Pope's works from such low figures as 10% of the lines in the Messiah and 15% in Spring to such high figures as 25% in the first half of Arbuthnot and 33% in the First Satire of the Second Book [of Horace].

It is not clear exactly how many works were included in Adler's prosodic analysis; however, the total number of lines is likely greater than what has been examined for
increased use of the trochee corresponds expectedly to his pattern of increased metrical complexity; i.e., his use of the initial trochee increases as he grows progressively more complex in metrics. (More frequent use of the trochaic foot would, of course, contribute to the increased TR in the later poems.)

Pope uses the medial trochee, as does Wheatley, much less sparingly. Only eight occurrences of a trochee in the second foot position and a similar number in the third foot position were found in the approximately 1500 lines examined. Adler (1961:221) encountered four additional lines with medial trochees and speculates that Pope, in employing them, is striving for a special "starting" effect. He concludes that Pope placed "representative

this study. The list of works analyzed for his 1964 study (p. 6n) is probably the basis for the above figures. In his 1964 work, Adler notes that Pope's latter poems use the initial trochee "more frequently, in a very irregular progression" (10).

13 The lines cited by Adler are:

And the pale Ghosts start at the Flash of Day!
--Rape, V, 52
And Beaus' in Snuff-boxes and Tweezer-Cases
--Rape, V, 117
Jumping, high o'er the shrubs of the rough ground
--Iliad, XXIII, 142
The wheels above urg'd by the load below
--Dunciad, final version, I, 184.
meter [meter appropriate to the subject matter] ahead of metrical normality, though he seldom required such unorthodox irregularity to achieve it" (221n). Pope, like Wheatley, however, is careful to employ the medial trochee in the appropriate environments in order to avoid the creation of an unmetrical line. In juxtaposing two trochaic feet in the first and second foot positions, Pope, for instance, avoids unmetricality by placing the trochees on either side of a major syntactic boundary, as in

\[
\text{Jumping, high o'er the shrubs of the rough ground}
\]

\begin{align*}
\text{W} & \text{S} \\
\text{W} & \text{S} \\
\text{W} & \text{S} \\
\text{W} & \text{S} \\
\text{W} & \text{S}
\end{align*}

--Iliad, XXIII, 142

A comparison of this line with the use of two trochees in Wheatley's

\[
\text{Reason let this most causeless strife subside}
\]

\begin{align*}
\text{W} & \text{S} \\
\text{W} & \text{S} \\
\text{W} & \text{S} \\
\text{W} & \text{S} \\
\text{W} & \text{S}
\end{align*}

suggests that both poets were well aware of the metrical and syntactical intricacies involved in the use of trochaic substitutions.

It appears, on the basis of the passages examined for this dissertation and the results of the close prosodic analysis of Adler, that Pope does not extend his
use of the trochee to the fourth and fifth foot positions. Although his use of the inverted foot in the fourth foot position would not be too surprising, its appearance in final foot position in a Pope poem would be startling.\footnote{Interesting for comparison is Bridges' statement that in Milton's \textit{Paradise Lost}, inversion is "most common in the first foot, next in the third and fourth, very rare in the second, and most rare in the fifth" (1921:40). In Wheatley, and presumably in Pope, the pattern in descending frequency would be: first, third, second, fourth, and fifth foot. Milton, of course, sometimes inverts the fifth foot, as Bridges (1921:41) illustrates with these lines from \textit{Paradise Lost}:}

\begin{quote}
Beyond all past example add future. X,840
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Which of us who beholds the bright surface. VI,472
\end{quote}

In summary, then, it can be said that in the metrical matters considered thus far, Wheatley's techniques are remarkably similar to Pope's. In terms of metrical complexity, the two poets exhibit little variation when writing poems similar in tone and subject matter. Overall, though, Pope presents a pattern of metrical complexity that ranges from a very low TR (about 1.3) in his early works to a much higher TR (about 2.4) in his later poetry. For Wheatley, whose poetic career was cut short by her early death, a pattern of increasing metrical complexity cannot be discerned. With a mean TR of 1.9 for all her couplet poetry, however, Wheatley is closer to the metrical complexity found in Pope's early works (1.8) than to that in
his later works (2.4). Departures from the basic ten-
syllable heroic line are rare in both Wheatley and Pope.
Wheatley concludes one poem with two octosyllabic
couplets, begins another with a six-syllable line, uses
one Alexandrine and one anomalous fourteen syllable line.
Pope achieves variation with the use of the hendecasyll-
labic line, less frequently with the nine-syllable
"headless" line and Alexandrine. The similarities in
line variation and metrical complexity extend to the
stress pattern variations typical of each poet. Both use
the initial trochee with about the same frequency in
their lines, occasionally make use of it in the third
foot position, more rarely in the second and fourth foot
positions, and apparently never in the fifth foot position.
In the poems of both the American poet and the English
poet, the trochee appears only in the permitted metrical
environments (initially, after stressed syllables, and
following a major syntactic break). And, finally, both
poets vary the iambic stress pattern with the pyrrhlic and
spondee with about the same degree of fluency and frequency.

Before reaching any firm conclusions, however, on
the metrical similarities of these two poets, let us
consider the last two major questions, concerned with
their uses of elision and caesurae.
Elision, of course, was important to the Neoclassical poets since it functioned in a practical sense as a device for reducing trisyllabics and for adjusting the syllable count within a line. A second, and related, function of elision was its role in enabling the poet to avoid hiatus (the juxtaposition of vowels, either within a word or across a word boundary). That the use of hiatus was a matter of debate among poets and prosodists is perhaps attested by the fact that it is the subject of Pope's first "rule" in his letter on prosody: the hiatus is sometimes, as in "The Old have Intrest," [sic] preferable to elision (Sherburn 1:107). Pope is at once voicing the prevalent prejudice against hiatus (or "gappage") and warning against the ridiculous extremes to which some of the seventeenth century poets had carried elision (Adler 1961:219). Interestingly enough, though, Pope is stating his rule at the phonological rather than the phonetic level. Phonetically, hiatus is very rare because a vowel occurring before another vowel or before

---

15 Pope confusingly uses "caesura" for "elision" in stating his rule. Saintsbury (1926:274) perhaps explains this by noting that "at one time . . . there grew up a strange habit of using the term 'caesura' to express elision or hiatus—to neither of which it has the least proper reference."
a word boundary is usually tense and subject therefore to the diphthongization rule (Chomsky and Halle 1968:243). An exception occurs, of course, in phrases like "the apple," pronounced [oʊ æ̆pəl]. At the phonological level, however, vowels do occur side by side. Thus, the deep phonological structure for "create" is /kreeæt/. Pope is not alone in confusing the phonetic and the phonological levels, as will be seen directly.

Because elision was considered such an important aspect of metrics, its use has been frequently noted in discussions of eighteenth century versification. Typically, these discussions are weakened by the fact that no distinction is made between the abstract nature of meter and the phonetic nature of poetic recitation. As a result of the failure to recognize this distinction, which is a fundamental one, scholars and critics have propagated false notions and half-truths about the poetic use of elision in the eighteenth century. Saintsbury, perhaps the foremost modern critic on prosody, reveals his failure to grasp the distinction in his definition of "elision":

Perhaps the most useful phraseology in English indicates 'elision' for actual vanishing [italics his] of a vowel (when it is usually represented by an apostrophe), and 'slur' for running of two into one (1926:278).
Earlier in his discussion of elision, Saintsbury gives even more compelling evidence that he thinks elision is a prescription for pronunciation by listing the ways in which syllables may be omitted or fused: **crasis** ("mixture"), **thlipsis** ("crushing"), **syncope** ("cutting short"), **synaloepha** ("smearing together"), **synizesis** ("setting together"), and **synecphonesis** ("combined utterance"), as well as others (1926:278). Robert Bridges (1921), in his study of Milton's prosody, displays a similar confusion. He notes, for instance, that in English verse when there is poetic elision of the terminal vowel of one word before the initial vowel of the next word, the sound of it is not lost, the two vowels are glided together, and the condition may be called synaloepha (9).

More recently, an American literary scholar, Gay Allen Wilson, demonstrated the same false concept held by both Saintsbury and Bridges. Wilson (1966:xxix) maintains that in the elision process

all the syllables are pronounced, but pronounced so lightly and quickly that two syllables may be equivalent in weight and time to only one syllable. Therefore it can take place only under certain phonetic conditions. . . .

What usually accompanies such statements as these on elision is a crude attempt to classify the types of elision. Lacking in each case is the recognition that
elision is a metrical process for relating the syllables of the linguistic material to the abstract metrical positions in the heroic line. Halle and Keyser (1971a: 171-172), in correcting the viewpoint of former prosodists, are quite emphatic on this point:

The assignment of syllables to positions is, of course, strictly metrical. It does not imply that the syllables assigned to a single position should be slurred when the verse is recited. The correspondence rules are not instructions for poetry recitations. They are, rather, abstract principles of verse construction whose effect on the sound of the recited verse is indirect.

Elision is accounted for, of course, in the Halle-Keyser theory of prosody by the correspondence rule which states:

A position (S, W, or X) corresponds to a single syllable OR to a sonorant sequence incorporating at most two vowels (immediately adjoining or separated by a sonorant consonant).

In other words, in the following linguistic environments, the poet may elect to have the underlined syllables occupy one metrical position:

(1) #XVSVX# (as in "popular") TYPE A
(2) #XVXX# (as in "Indian") TYPE B
(3) #XV#VX# (as in "to astonish") TYPE C

The symbol X is a cover symbol for whatever occurs in that particular position; V represents vowel; S represents a
sonorant segment, and # indicates a word boundary. The sonorants in English are the nasals ([m], [n], and [ŋ]), the liquids ([l] and [r]), the glides ([y] and [w]), and the vowels. For some poets, the rule is modified so that two vowels separated by a fricative ([f], [v], [s], [z], [ç], [ʃ], [ʒ], or [z]) may also be elided (Halle-Keyser 1971a:172).

Since the terminology describing the elision process is rather unstable and confusing, it is best here to refer to the eliding processes distinguished in Wheatley's and Pope's poetry as Type A, Type B, and Type C, as indicated above.

It is perhaps well to note here two cautions that must be exercised in any analysis of elision. The process is, first of all, an optional one; i.e., the poet may elect to have the two syllables occurring in the specified linguistic environments occupy one metrical position or two. Thus, Wheatley, for instance, chooses to elide "overwhelming" in "To a Lady and Her Children . . ." (line 1):

\[
\text{O'erwhelming sorrow now demands my song:}
\]

\[
\text{W S W S W S W S W S W S}
\]

but elects not to elide the same word in the next line:
From death the overwhelming sorrow sprung.

A second point to be remembered in considering elision is that the orthographic practices of the poet are not a reliable indicator of the poet's elision intentions. In the following lines from Wheatley, elision occurs but is not signaled by an apostrophe, the conventional orthographic device for indicating elision in eighteenth century heroic verse.

O friend belov'd! may heaven its aid afford,

From bondage freed, the exulting spirit flies

Heaven usually is regarded as a monosyllable in eighteenth century verse; thus it normally occupies one metrical
position and appears orthographically as "heav'n."

Type C elision, in both Pope and Wheatley, would typically be indicated by the apostrophe: "th' exulting."

The two poets being considered here, despite their likenesses in other aspects of metrics, are not very similar in their use of elision. Wheatley makes much more extensive use of this process than does Pope. In her poems, for example, elision occurs in about 26 per cent of the lines, as compared with an occurrence rate of about 19 per cent in those from Pope (Group I and Group II). The range of elision occurrence is also wider in Wheatley than in Pope. Wheatley's reliance on elision varies from a low of 11 per cent of the lines in the elegy "On the Death of Dr. Samuel Marshall" to a high of 56 per cent of the lines in "Liberty and Peace." In most of her poems, however, elision occurs in from 15 to 40 per cent of the lines. On the other hand, Pope, in his Group II poems, exhibits a narrower elision range of from a low of 12 per cent of the lines in Epistle to Arbuthnot to a high of only 24 per cent in Epistle to Burlington and Dunciad.16

16 These figures might vary slightly with the examination of a larger portion of Pope's corpus. No one seems to have made an extensive investigation of his elision practices. Adler's comments are helpful but insufficient, since he took note of only one type of elision (apocope, or my Type C). Of Pope's use of this device, he notes that "elision by apocope occurs more frequently in more formal poems" (1964:10).
In the construction of lines with multiple instances of elision, Wheatley exceeds Pope by a ratio of 3 to 2.

The only aspect of elision in which the two poets resemble each other is the frequency patterns for each of the types of elision (A, B, and C). In descending order, each poet relied most extensively on Type A, then Type B, then Type C, as the following table indicates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of A Elisions</th>
<th>% of B Elisions</th>
<th>% of C Elisions</th>
<th>Total Elisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheatley</td>
<td>52 (347)</td>
<td>38 (251)</td>
<td>10 (68)</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pope</td>
<td>57 (166)</td>
<td>35 (103)</td>
<td>8 (23)</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table makes apparent the fact that both poets more frequently elide two syllables when a sonorant intervenes (neither Type B nor C allows for an intervening sonorant segment).

The greater use of elision reflected by Wheatley is in general accord with her practice of constructing

---

17 The number of lines analyzed for Wheatley was 2179; for Pope, 1459. Thus, the elision figures represent Wheatley's frequency in all her couplet poetry but represent the frequency in only a sampling of Pope's poetry. The figure indicating Pope's infrequent use of Type C agrees generally with the findings of Adler (1961:220), who says that this type of elision is "never really very frequent in Pope."
only ten-syllable lines. The device is indeed indispensable in regulating the syllable count within a verse form so rigidly refined in this respect. To what extent Wheatley uses the device to avoid hiatus, per se, is difficult to know, since the avoidance or use of hiatus necessarily affects the syllable count also. Wheatley does not resort to the "awkward elisions" Pope warns of in attempting to avoid hiatus, certainly none as objectionable as these, cited by Adler (1961:219):

If sight b'emission or reception be.

---Dryden, **Hind and the Panther**, II, 75

The husband is the head, as soon's n'unlocks.

Adler notes that some cases of awkward hiatus that could be avoided only by an equally awkward elision were placed at the caesura. Thus, he conjectures, the caesura served to "cancel the gappage" (1961:220n), as, for instance, in Pope's line:

Or for an **earthly**/or a **heav'nly** love

---**Iliad**, XIV, 360

But, exactly what linguistic conditions were thought to produce undesirable elision is still not clear. It appears that elision was considered awkward before a
monosyllable, as in "The old," and after a trochee, as in Dryden's line "Drown'd in the abyss of deep idolatry" (Adler 1961:220). In addition, there seems to have been an objection to eliding identical vowels; for example, "b'emission" in "If sight b'emission or reception be." However, in the line "The husband is the head, as soon's h'unlocks," it is not clear whether the objectionable condition is the juxtaposition of two elisions, the awkwardness produced by eliding "he" and "unlocks," the elision of "soon" and "as," or all of these combined. Further study of the elision practices of eighteenth century poets is needed to define precisely the linguistic environments in which elision is an approved method of avoiding hiatus.

All of Wheatley's elisions occur within one of the four linguistic environments specified in Type A, Type B, and Type C elision. Whether Pope, Wheatley's "model," would accuse her of being "too dependent" on elision (as her most recent editor, Julian Mason, has done) will remain a matter of conjecture. That Pope would level such a charge, however, seems doubtful, since his objection

---

18 Mason qualifies his generally favorable view of Wheatley's work with the observation that "her work was subject to the uncertainties of eighteenth century spelling and punctuation, and she was too dependent on elision for regulating her meter" (1966:xxix).
to elision seems to have been directed at its occurrence in certain environments rather than the frequency of its use. Speculation aside, it is sufficient for the purposes of this discussion merely to note that Wheatley uses the different types of elision in the same proportions as Pope, but she exceeds Pope rather considerably in the use of elision in general.

The caesura, the final metrical aspect of Wheatley's couplets to be considered here, is by far the most difficult to treat in an objective manner. It could even be argued that, since the caesura is syntactically motivated, it would be more appropriately handled as a syntactic phenomenon rather than a metrical one. The caesura is treated here as a metrical entity primarily because it is essentially synonymous with the major syntactic breaks which serve as boundaries for the syntactic constituents, within which, under specified conditions, the Halle-Keyser stress maxima occur. Among other things, the presence of these breaks, or pauses, has a significant effect, it will be recalled, on the poet's use of trochees in an iambic line. (The absence of a syntactic break between two successive trochees will render a line unmetrical.)

\[19\] See, for example, Adler (1961:220).
Because of the problems inherent in describing caesura, the only real advantage that can be gained by consideration of caesural techniques in the overall treatment of Wheatley's metrics is the revelation of how she compares with Pope, her model, in terms of both his rigid caesural doctrine and his own practices in placing the caesura. But first, a few brief comments are in order on the origin and development of the caesura.

The belief that the English heroic line must have a caesura can be traced back at least to the sixteenth century. As early as 1575, George Gascoigne had stated that this type of line should have ten syllables and a medial pause (Piper 1969:26), and a few years later George Puttenham wrote: "The meeter of ten sillables is very stately and Heroical, and must have his Cesure fall upon the fourth sillable" (Piper 1969:26).

In the late years of the sixteenth century, when several English poets achieved a "closed couplet revolution" by writing pentameter couplets in imitation of the classical elegiac distich, the practice of placing a pause in the middle of the heroic line received an added impetus. This reinforcement can be attributed to the

---

20 The problems will be discussed directly.
fact that the second (pentameter) line of the elegiac dis-
tich was composed metrically of two equal parts separated
by a break. Many English poets, bent on following their
classical models, continued relentlessly to observe this
mid-line break in their heroic lines. As a matter of fact,
the entire "hierarchy of pauses" which characterized the
elegiac distich was in a sense transferred to the English
closed couplet. Characteristically, some of the
eighteenth century poets and prosodists imposed even more
severe limitations on the use of this system of pauses,
especially in regard to the use of the mid-line pause.
Thus, Pope, in his letter on prosody, insists that "in any
smooth English Verse of ten Syllables, there is naturally
a Pause either at the fourth, fifth, or sixth Syllable . . .
[and] that to preserve an exact Harmony & Variety, none of
these Pauses shou'd be continu'd above three lines together
... (Sherburn I:107).22

21 For example, compare Piper's description of the
hierarchy of pauses characterizing the Latin elegiac dis-
tich—"the strongest at the close of the distich, the next
strongest at the end of the first line, the third strongest
at the midpoints of the two lines"—with the pronouncement
of eighteenth century critic John Dennis: "The pause at
the End of a Verse (that is, at the end of the first line)
ought to be greater than any Pause that may precede it in
the same Verse (that is, the mid-line pause), and the Pause
at the end of a Couplet ought to be greater than that
which is at the End of the first Verse" (Piper 1969:34, 6).

22 For a variety of eighteenth century views on caesura
placement, see Adler (1961:222n).
From a linguistic point of view, it is at present virtually impossible in caesural analysis to do any more than observe whether a poet places his caesura within the "sacred" medial range and whether he avoids placing the pause at the same point in successive lines. And even these observations are weakened by the uncertainties of subjective readings and interpretations. Ideally, linguistic research would have produced a method for describing the variation in the realizations of each of the three couplet pauses. It would be helpful, for example, to be able to describe in explicit terms the different actualizations of the secondary pauses (at the ends of the first lines) of these non-consecutive couplets from Pope's *Windsor Forest* (cited by Piper 1969:8-9):

Here in full Light the russet Plains extend;
There wrapt in Clouds the blueish Hills ascend.
Here waving Groves a chequer'd Scene display,
And part admit and part exclude the Day.
The Groves of Eden, vanish'd now so long,
Live in Description, and look green in Song.
There, interspers'd in Lawns and opening Glades,
Thin Trees arise that shun each others Shades.
Let India boast her Plants, nor envy we
The weeping Amber of the balmy Tree.
In other words, what is being suggested is that the hierarchy of pauses could be considered an integral part of the couplet as an abstract entity, illustrated in a manner similar to this:

\[
\begin{align*}
(W)^* & \quad S \quad W \quad S \quad W \quad S \quad W \quad S \quad (X) \quad (X) \quad (P) \\
(W)^* & \quad S \quad W \quad S \quad W \quad S \quad W \quad S \quad W \quad (X) \quad (X) \quad P
\end{align*}
\]

(The symbol P represents "pause," either primary, secondary, or tertiary; enclosure of P in parentheses indicates that it may be actualized optionally; and the subscript and superscript indicate that the tertiary pause (the caesura) may not be actualized at all or may be actualized following any syllable, or syllables, one through nine.)

Evidence seems to suggest that the phenomenon is theoretically possible. Seven of the nine potential pauses, for example, are actualized in a line from Chaucer: "wylugh,/ elm,/ plane,/ assh,/ box,/ chasteyn,/ lynde,/ laurer" (Halle-Keyser 1971a:174). In addition, Adler (1964:4-5) quotes from Pope, lines with the tertiary pause after the first syllable, after the second syllable, after the third, the eighth, and the ninth. The tertiary pause after syllables four, five, six and seven are, of course, the most common practice. And, as the analysis for this study shows, multiple tertiary pauses occur in about 10 per cent of Wheatley's lines and in about 18 per cent of the lines examined in Pope.

\[23\text{While poetry may not attest the occurrence of all nine tertiary pauses in a single line, the phenomenon is theoretically possible. Seven of the nine potential pauses, for example, are actualized in a line from Chaucer: "wylugh,/ elm,/ plane,/ assh,/ box,/ chasteyn,/ lynde,/ laurer" (Halle-Keyser 1971a:174). In addition, Adler (1964:4-5) quotes from Pope, lines with the tertiary pause after the first syllable, after the second syllable, after the third, the eighth, and the ninth. The tertiary pause after syllables four, five, six and seven are, of course, the most common practice. And, as the analysis for this study shows, multiple tertiary pauses occur in about 10 per cent of Wheatley's lines and in about 18 per cent of the lines examined in Pope.}\]
couplet entity need not allow for the occurrence of the tertiary pause either before or between extra-metrical final syllables. Given this entity and the linguistic techniques for describing the various means of actualizing these pauses in terms of syntactic, semantic, phonetic (or perhaps even orthographic) phenomena, a significant advance would be achieved in understanding the linguistic makeup of the heroic couplet.

Unfortunately, this advance is not likely to be made in the near future. The present state of linguistic scholarship and research is characterized by a woefully inadequate knowledge of linguistic juncture. The transformational-generative grammarians have had little to say about "juncture," and even the systems of classification and the definitions of the different types of juncture in such structural works as G. L. Trager and H. L. Smith's *An Outline of English Structure* (1951) and H. A. Gleason's *An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics* (1955), helpful as they are in the description of natural languages, are

24 Chomsky and Halle (1968:300), for example, in their classification of phonetic features, list pitch (juncture) under the subdivision "prosodic features." Concerning these features, they say, "Our investigations . . . have not progressed to a point where a discussion in print would be useful" (329).
of very little use in the analysis of poetic language. Very few attempts to equate linguistic juncture with the poetic caesura have been made, and of those which have, most are inaccurate or inadequate. Ronald Sutherland, for instance, in an article entitled "Structural Linguistics and English Prosody" (1958:181-190), observes that Gleason's "fading juncture," which occurs "at the end of a statement [and] is usually accompanied by a lowering of pitch and a fading of the voice into silence," is known to "conventional prosodists" as the "caesura" (184). This is surely a mistaken notion. The caesura, a term which normally means the phonetic realization of a potential tertiary (medial) pause by a speaker reciting lines of verse, does not in the closed couplet typically occur at the end of a statement, since statements do not normally terminate in mid-line position. But even if this equation were valid, there is still lacking the ability to distinguish the finer gradations in the different realizations of the caesural pause.

In view of the absence of linguistic machinery necessary to effect a satisfactory description of the caesura, the following general description of Wheatley's caesura placement practices are offered and related to Pope's theory and practices. It is to be understood that any
frequency-of-occurrence figures on caesura placement are necessarily the product of a subjective reading and should, therefore, be received with some caution. In general, however, this analysis assumes that the caesura will be realized in lines such as these, having lists or series:

Behold ye rich,/ ye poor,/ ye fools,/ ye wise
—"On the Death of the Reverend Dr. Sewell," 32

nonrestrictive elements:

That Saviour,/ which his soul did first receive,
—"On the Death of the Reverend Mr. George Whitfield," 24

verb-object inversion:

Their noble strains/ your equal genius shares
—"To Maecenas," 5

or coordinated structures:

But here I sit,/ and mourn a grov'ling mind,
That fain would mount,/ and ride upon the wind.
—"To Maecenas," 29-30

As a rule, in determining the location of the potential pauses, syntax has been the principal guide.
Broadly speaking, Wheatley followed Pope's dictum of placing the mid-line pause either after the fourth, fifth, or sixth syllable. It occurs in one of these three positions in approximately 72 per cent of her lines. Multiple caesurae occur in about 10 per cent of her lines. About 1 per cent of the lines, like the following example, have no caesura at all:

To show the lab'ring bosom's deep intent,

"To S. M., a Young African Painter, on Seeing His Works," 1

She is also generally careful to observe Pope's admonition to avoid monotony by varying the placement of the caesura in successive lines. In nine passages she maintains the same caesural point for four successive lines, in seven passages for five successive lines, and in only the following passage for six lines consecutively:

Columbia too, beholds with streaming eyes
Her heroes fall—'tis freedom's sacrifice!
So wills the Power who with convulsive storms
Shakes impious realms, and nature's face deforms;
Yet those brave troops innum'rous as the sands
One soul inspires, one General Chief commands.

"On the Capture of General Lee," 59-64
In all the passages, the caesura occurs either after the fourth or fifth syllable, never after the sixth.²⁵

Enjambment, a topic not specifically mentioned in Pope's letter on prosody but one which should perhaps be included in a discussion of couplet pauses, is relatively rare in Wheatley's poetry. Sometimes, in an inversion pattern she achieves enjambment (failure to observe the secondary pause in a couplet) by delaying the verb or verbal to verse-initial position in the second line, as the following examples illustrate:

His eye the ample field of battle round
Survey'd, but no created succours found;

—"Isaih LXII," 19-20

The acts of Long departed years, by thee
Recover'd, in due order rang'd we see:

—"On Recollection," 5-6

²⁵This practice may be related to the eighteenth century view concerning the placement of the caesura after the sixth syllable. Adler (1964:6) observes that in Pope the "sixth-place caesura is used for special purposes, in certain passages." Later he notes that Johnson regarded the caesura after the sixth syllable as "majestic" and adds: "they should occur more frequently only when an actual majesty of thought is to be clothed in verse suitable to it" (35).
A less pronounced enjambment also occurs occasionally when she removes the direct object or a modifier to the beginning of the second line:

For he who wins, in triumph may demand
Perpetual service from the vanquish'd land:

—"Goliath of Gath," 36-37

Knit to my soul for ever thou remain
With me, nor quit my regal roof again.

—"Goliath of Gath," 221-222

In short, Wheatley's enjambment techniques do not depart radically from those one would expect to find in Pope's poetry or in any typical closed couplet verse of the eighteenth century. And her occasional lapses in varying the point in successive lines do not represent serious infractions of Pope's rule. The failure to locate the caesura within the prescribed boundaries in approximately 28 per cent of her lines is indeed a deviation from Pope's doctrine, but it must be admitted, though, that Pope's position on this matter is rather narrow and rigid, and,

26 Adler (1961:222), for example, observes that this rule is "at odds with all observable facts of English versification" and Saintsbury labels the attempt to restrict caesura placement as "the cause of some of the worst mistakes about English prosody, especially when it takes the form of prescribing that the pause should always be as near the middle as possible. Variety of pause, is, in fact, next to variety of feet, the great secret of success in our verse" (1926:289).
significantly, it is a rule which Pope himself violates with a frequency that perhaps exceeds Wheatley's.

Interestingly, if the lines from Pope's Group II poems (representing his major genres) are representative, Pope violates his own rule on caesura placement in about 31 per cent of his lines, as compared with a figure of 28 per cent for Wheatley's poems. As in Wheatley, lines with no caesura at all appear very infrequently in Pope, in only 1 per cent of the lines. Both poets place multiple caesurae in less than 20 per cent of their lines (Wheatley in 10 per cent; Pope, 16 per cent).\footnote{27 Though we have not examined the same passages necessarily, Adler's statistics on Pope's caesura placement appear to be in general agreement with mine. He says that Pope places the caesura in the fourth to sixth foot position in 88 per cent of the first hundred lines of Eloisa, in 84 per cent of the lines in Spring, and in as few as 65 per cent of the lines in the late satires (1961:222).}

Wheatley's failures to observe Pope's rule on varying the caesural position in successive lines also have parallels in Pope. In the passages examined, for instance, he places the caesura after the fourth syllable in eight consecutive lines at one point in the Iliad (I, 86-93). Adler (1961:222) cites a nearly identical violation occurring in the Iliad, 201-208, and quotes one passage (Rape, II, 7-18) of twelve lines, each with the caesura
after the fourth syllable. Apparently, neither Pope nor Wheatley considered the rule inviolable.

Pope's practice concerning the pause at the end of the first line is usually to observe it; however, enjambed lines are certainly common enough in his poetry. In Essay on Man (I), for example, the first few lines produce these nonconsecutive cases of enjambment:

Wake, my St. John! leave all meaner things
To low ambition, and the pride of Kings. 1-2
Gradations just, has thy pervading soul
Look'd thro'? or can a part contain the whole? 31-32
Ask if thy mother earth, why oaks are made
Taller or stronger than the weeds they shade? 39-40

Both poets, of course, typically observe the primary pause at the end of the second line of the couplet.

In conclusion, the metrical characteristics of Phillis Wheatley's couplets in the five areas examined can perhaps best be summarized by relating them individually to those of Alexander Pope. In terms of the metrical complexity of their lines, the two poets are quite similar. Both write lines that are relatively uncomplicated, Wheatley's poems having a mean TR of 1.9 and Pope's poems (Group I and II combined), a mean TR of
2.1. The analysis does not suggest for either poet the existence of a relationship between metrical complexity and the type of poem being written, although there is a correlation between Pope's metrical complexity and his chronological poetic development. He moves from a mean TR of 1.8 in his early works to a higher rate of 2.4 late in his career.

An examination of the syllable-count variations in the lines of each poet reveals that Pope is apparently more tolerant of deviations from the basic ten-syllable line than is Wheatley. The headless lines, hendecasyllabic (eleven-syllable) lines, and Alexandrines in Pope's poems are not duplicated (with the exception of one Alexandrine) in the poetry of the young American poet. No instance of the twelve-syllable line ending in two unstressed syllables is found in either poet. Of the 2179 iambic pentameter lines in Wheatley's couplet poetry, none would be judged unmetrical by the Halle-Keyser theory of prosody. One (catalectic) line in the Pope passages is rendered unmetrical. In general, it can be said that Pope occasionally varies his syllable-count within the confines of the couplet tradition, whereas Wheatley apparently views a syllable-count of ten as a strict prescription.

---

As noted earlier, Wheatley does, of course, have seven lines which do not scan by the Halle-Keyser theory.
In the third area examined, stress variations within the iambic line, the techniques of Pope and Wheatley are virtually identical. Each substitutes the trochee for the iamb in the approved verse-initial position with about equal frequency. Medial trochaic substitutions occur rarely in the poetry of each, and no instances of a trochee in the fifth foot are found. The pyrrhic and spondee are used by both poets as common and natural variations of the iambic stress pattern. Both Wheatley and Pope appear to have been rather sensitive to the prosodic conventions governing the methods of varying the stresses within their lines.

The strong similarities in stress variation contrast somewhat with the differences between the two poets in the matter of elision. Here Wheatley departs both from the spirit (if not the letter) of Pope's epistle on prosody and the practices of Pope himself. At least one instance of elision characterizes 26 per cent of Wheatley's lines, whereas Pope elides vowel sequences in only 19 per cent of his lines. Moreover, lines with multiple elisions are more common in Wheatley than in Pope. The only similarity between the two poets within the area of elision lies in their preferences for the same types of elision: both are more likely to elide a vowel sequence
possessing an intervening sonorant and are least likely to elide by apocope.

Finally, in the use of couplet pauses, Wheatley's position can best be described as falling somewhere between Pope's theory and his practice. She does not always place the caesura (or tertiary pause) within the magic boundaries, but she does so 72 per cent of the time (as compared with his 69 per cent). Both poets write few lines without a caesura at all and are not reluctant to use multiple caesurae when necessary for variety or effect. In restricting the continuance of the caesural point to three consecutive lines, neither Wheatley nor Pope is totally successful; however, their violations are relatively infrequent, and her most serious violation, a six-line passage, is exceeded by even longer passages in Pope. Both the primary pause (after the second line of a couplet) and the secondary pause (after the first line) are typically observed by both poets, although enjambment is utilized when appropriate to the purpose and language of the passage.
CHAPTER IV
WHEATLEY'S RHYME

A discussion of the poetic language of Phillis Wheatley, since she was a couplet poet, must necessarily account for her use of rhyme. That rhyme plays a prominent role in English verse in general and in the closed couplet in particular has long been recognized. Phonetically, rhyme affords a sensory satisfaction by returning the reader to the same stressed vowel-consonant(s) sequence in much the same way that a musical melody pleases by returning to the keynote. Further, rhyme serves to organize the linguistic material into separate entities in accordance with the syntactic and metrical demands of a verse form, such as the closed couplet. Finally, as certain critical studies have shown, rhyme in the closed couplet not only fulfills phonetic, metrical, and syntactic functions, but also acts semantically to represent the ideas and thoughts expressed in the couplet.¹

These functions of rhyme constitute a natural four-way division for a discussion of Phillis Wheatley's use of rhyme. The first section is a view of Wheatley's

¹See, for example, Wimsatt (1944) and Covington (1967).
rhymes in terms of their similarity in pronunciation, focusing not only on the extent to which her rhymes are "true" rhymes, but also on her use of "false" rhymes and rhyme identities (i.e., syllables pronounced the same: rose-arose; knew-new). A consideration of the metrical and syntactical involvement in rhyme constitutes, respectively, the next two sections of this chapter. Of particular concern is the relationship between the stress pattern of the rhyme partners and the poet's manipulation of syntax for the purpose of attaining the desired rhyme word. The last section of the chapter is devoted to an examination of the semantic elements in Wheatley's rhymes. In each section, the rhyming practices of Wheatley are related to Pope's rhyming techniques. Since Pope's rhymes have been so extensively studied, it has not been deemed necessary to duplicate earlier investigations. Hence, the remarks concerning Pope are based on the results of the works of scholars who have studied the linguistic nature of his rhymes.²

The discussion of the phonetic aspects of Wheatley's rhymes is concerned, of course, only with end rhyme, defined as the agreement in vowel sounds and terminal consonants of two syllables occupying the final positions

²In addition to the studies of Wimsatt and Covington, noted earlier, I have relied in varying degrees on the investigations of Adler (1961 and 1964), L. M. McLean (1891), Tillotson (1950), and Jones (1969).
of metrical stress in paired lines. Such sound patterns as alliteration, assonance, and internal rhyme are excluded from consideration principally because they are not as directly related to the structure of the heroic couplet as end rhyme is. Thus, restriction of the examination to end rhyme permits a greater level of detail in revealing the similarities and differences in Wheatley's and Pope's responses to this verse form constraint.

Phonetic Aspects

It has been the general practice in pre-twentieth-century criticism to evaluate rhyme solely on the basis of pronunciation of the rhyme words. Typically, eighteenth and nineteenth century scholars and critics have deplored excessive reliance on false rhymes (i.e., rhymes not agreeing in either the vowel sounds or the terminal consonants, or both) and rhyme identities, preferring the predominant use of true rhymes (i.e., rhymes which agree in the vowels and terminal consonants but differ in their initial consonants).

For a number of reasons it is difficult to assess with certainty the extent to which false rhymes are present in eighteenth century poetry. From the standpoint of the modern reader one can judge fairly accurately whether rhymes are exact or inexact, but the phonetic instability of certain vowels during the eighteenth
The eighteenth century makes it extremely difficult, if not impossible in some cases, to determine whether rhymes were false to the eighteenth century reader. The discovery, therefore, that to the modern reader approximately 15 per cent of Wheatley's rhymes are false is not particularly meaningful, except in the sense that it perhaps indicates that even fewer of her rhymes were false in the eighteenth century. Yet, one must also recognize that sound changes can cause rhymes which were false in an earlier period to be judged true in the present age.\(^3\)

Not only the effects of sound changes, but also such matters as dialectal variations must be considered in evaluating rhymes phonetically. Are the rhymes to be judged against the pronunciations in the standard dialect and ruled false if the poet uses a contemporary nonstandard pronunciation? A similar problem exists in judging a rhyme which has one pronunciation in the standard dialect and a different "poetic" pronunciation. In again, for example, the final vowel is usually pronounced \([\varepsilon]\) in

---

\(^3\)For example, McLean (1891:139) notes that in at least one instance Pope, who usually rhymes the vowel in tea with \([\varepsilon]\), pairs tea and decree in what would have been false rhymes in the eighteenth century but are not in the twentieth. Similarly, Wheatley rhymes sea with free in "On the Death of a Young Lady of Five Years of Age," 33-34.
Modern English, but retains a poetic pronunciation with the value [e].

There is little doubt that some of Wheatley's rhymes that would be classified false by the modern reader were true in her own time. For example, join and brine were exact rhymes to her because the diphthong in join (Middle English ui, written oi) and the vowel in brine (Middle English ë) fell together as [AI] and eventually (after 1700) became [aI]. Rhymes such as sea-lay, though false today, were not so in Wheatley's era since the early Modern English vowel in sea had by then shifted from [ɛ], its Middle English value, to [e].

In another group of the Wheatley rhymes that are false to the modern ear, there is a possibility that sound changes have been responsible. These are the rhymes involving the central unrounded vowel [æ].

---

4Kenyon and Knott (1953), for instance, include [O'gen] as a "less frequent or poetic" pronunciation in present day English. All phonetic symbols are from the alphabet of the International Phonetic Association.

5As Pyles (1964:173) notes, join, poison, and boil still retain the [AI] in current folk pronunciation. The Modern English standard pronunciations are spelling pronunciations.

6The [e] still survives in Modern English in such words as great, break, and steak.
Wheatley frequently pairs this vowel with \([o]\), either in rhymes terminated by \(r\) plus consonant (e.g., *mourn-return*) or in rhymes ending in consonant plus \(e\) (e.g., *drove-above*). Another common rhyme for \([\wedge]\) is \([u]\) (e.g., *prove-love*). In general, the rhyme words in this group had either the Middle English vowel \(\ddot{a}\) or \(u\). As the long (or tense) vowels shifted, \([o]\) raised to \([u]\) and eventually shortened to \([\wedge]\). Short \(u\) \([\wedge]\) unrounded to \([\wedge]\). The chronology and distribution of these developments is quite uncertain, but if Shakespeare's rhymes (e.g., *good-food*; *flood*, *mood* with *blood*; and *reprove* with *love* and *dove*) are an indication of his pronunciation, one must conclude that "the distribution of \([u]\), \([\wedge]\), and \([\wedge]\) was not in early Modern English the same as it is in current English" (Pyles 1964:171). E. J. Dobson (1968: II, 508), in discussing these same developments, voices a similar opinion: "In the seventeenth century any one word may have \([\wedge]\), \([u]\), or \([\wedge]\)." It is not unreasonable to speculate that these conditions prevailed some sixty or seventy years later, when Wheatley was composing her poems. If such is indeed the case, the eighteenth century pronunciation for a substantial number of her rhyme words would differ from the present pronunciation.
Many of Wheatley's "false" rhymes must be evaluated in the face of similar uncertainties; therefore, it becomes virtually impossible to establish the ratio of true to false rhymes as the words were pronounced in the eighteenth century. It appears that Wheatley generally attains exact rhymes, certainly in more--perhaps considerably more--than 85 per cent of her total rhymes.

In the use of rhyme identities, Wheatley adheres rather closely to the approved practice of her time by avoiding this sound pattern almost completely. Only the following three nonconsecutive couplets are characterized by identical rhymes:

E'er vice triumphant had possessed my heart,
E'er yet the tempter had beguil'd my heart,

"A Funeral Poem on the Death of C. E., an Infant of Twelve Months," 15-16

Against thy Zion though her foes may rage,
And all their cunning, all the strength enrage,

"Isaiah LXII," 27-28

Shall not th' intelligence your grief restrain,
And turn the mournful to the Chearful strain?

"On the Death of J. C., an Infant," 26-27

Judging from the studies of scholars who have evaluated Pope's rhymes on the basis of pronunciation,
the rhyming techniques of the English Neoclassical poet differ only slightly from those of Wheatley, the American poet. L. Mary McLean (1891:134), the first scholar to do a close study of Pope's rhymes, found, for example, that 1027 (about 13 per cent) of Pope's 7874 rhymes were false, a frequency rate only a little less than Wheatley's 15 per cent. McLean describes Pope's most common false rhymes in this passage:

Long and short sounds of the same vowel are often united in the same rime, as a glance at the list of false rhymes [included in the article] shows; and this is much oftener the case than the union of different vowels, although many instances of this latter occur, the most frequent example of this being in the riming of the o and u and oo, and u and oo. The i and oi sounds are rimed together indiscriminately (139).

McLean does not conclude that Pope is excessively careless with his rhyming. She feels that not only the percentage of false rhymes, but his rhyming practices in general are accounted for by a "poverty of pliable material [,] the resources of the language, the subjects with which the poet dealt, [and] the prevailing thought of the time" (135).

7These figures represent all of Pope's poetry, not just his heroic couplet works. However, since the vast majority of Pope's poems are written in heroic couplets, the ratio should not be greatly distorted by the inclusion of poems in other verse forms. The rhymes, of course, are false from the point of view of the modern reader. McLean admits that the list contains "false rimes [which] may, in Pope's time, have been true" (139).
Adler, a more recent critic, echoes the position of George Sherburn on the issue of Pope's false rhymes: "In rhyme Pope is much less an artist...[,] and even allowing for changes in pronunciation since his day... he is too often careless and inexact in his sound identities" (1964:24n). Although Adler, unlike McLean, does not offer the rhyme data for inspection, he reports that as many as 13 per cent of the rhymes in Essay on Man and 12 per cent in Spring and Eloisa are false. Poems having the fewest number of false rhymes are the First Satire of the Second Book of Horace (3 per cent), Dunciad (4 per cent), and Arbuthnot (6 per cent).¹ Adler's conclusion is that false rhymes "are all too frequent in Pope, probably more frequent than in any other important eighteenth-century [sic] poets of the heroic couplet tradition; just how frequent is difficult to know, since pronunciations have changed" (1964:24).

In the final analysis, it appears that McLean, who attempted to account for the fact that 13 per cent of Pope's rhymes are false by invoking the language, the

¹Adler's and McLean's calculations obviously are not in agreement, since he found the heaviest concentration of false rhymes in a single poem to be only 13 per cent, the same figure McLean gives for an average. The difference is difficult to explain since Adler does not present his data and fails to specify whether he examined all of Pope's poems.
subjects, and the "times," and Adler, who determined that false rhymes in Pope are "too frequent" while admitting that he could not determine just "how frequent," are both rather naive in evaluating the rhymes solely from the viewpoint of the modern reader. Only when the percentage of a poet's rhymes that were false in his own time has been established can one begin to consider whether the ratio is tolerable. Linguistic research may perhaps make this determination possible in the future; until then it is probably wiser to reserve judgment.

Although the exact number of identical rhymes in Pope's works has apparently not been determined, he certainly does not avoid identities. Adler (1964:25), for example, cites these three identities, the last of which he labels "an unquestionably inaccurate" identity:

Well might I wish, could mortal wish renew
That strength which once in boiling youth I knew,
---Iliad, IV, 370-371

Unfinish'd Things, one knows not what to call,
Their generation's so equivocal,
---Essay on Criticism, 42-43

What future bliss, he gives not thee to know,
But gives that Hope to be thy blessing now.
---Essay on Man, I, 93-94
The second example is, of course, a light-rhyme identity, a rhyming pattern which has no parallel in Wheatley.

While it is not the purpose of this chapter to judge the rhyming skill of either Wheatley or Pope, it is perhaps appropriate to comment here on some of the factors that may account for the pronunciation dissimilarities in the two poets’ rhyming patterns, patterns which, as has been seen, deviate in varying degrees from the theoretical "ideal" of true rhyme. First of all, to demand only true rhymes from a poet writing in the English language is perhaps an unreasonable linguistic restriction. The English language, a relatively uninflected language, offers for several words very few rhyme possibilities, as G. S. Fraser (1970) illustrates in his remarks on English rhymes:

English is less rich in rhymes than many other languages. Amore in Italian rhymes with cuore, but love in English perfectly only with the undignified word shove or the trivial word glove (itself a disguised rime riche). The word God, as full of richness as love in meaning, has its aptest rhymes in odd ('How odd/ Of God/ To choose/ The Jews') and sod (under which one is buried, hoping to meet one's God, or rest in His bosom). Death monotonously suggests breath, moon equally monotonously June. Stream, gleam, dream are another set that cling too obviously together. This is one reason why a number of modern poets, from Wilfred Owen onwards, have sought out some substitute for the traditional concept of rhyme (61).
In addition to resorting to imperfect rhymes because of the relative scarcity of true rhymes in the English language, eighteenth century poets possibly avoided rhyming perfection for fear of being labeled too "correct." Tillotson (1958:182) suggests as much in a statement defending Pope's rhymes: "All things considered, it is possible that Pope planned his rimes to vary between false and true, so that he should not appear too vulgarly exact." And perhaps Saintsbury (1926:289) would not object too strenuously if one added "rhyme" to "pause" and "feet" in his statement: "Variety of pause, is in fact, next to variety in feet, the greatest secret of success in our verse."

Finally, as will be seen later in this chapter, most of the critics who have deplored the use of inaccurate rhymes have falsely assumed that rhyme played only a sensory role in verse. Factors other than pronunciation must be accounted for in judging a poet's choice of rhyme words. Meter, rhetoric, semantics—all of these phenomena may have been regarded in many cases as more crucial than mere sound in the selection of rhymes.

One additional phonetic matter remains to be considered: the extent to which both Wheatley and Pope deviated from Pope's stated position on rhyming. As Adler (1964:24) notes, Pope did not say anything about "accurate
rhyming" and had very little at all to say about rhyme in general. In his letter on prosody, he cautions against "The Repeating the Same Rhimes within 4 or 6 lines of each other: which tire the Ear with too much of the like sound" (Sherburn, I:107). The only other comment on rhyme, a criticism of rhyme cliches, appears in Essay on Criticism:

And ten low Words oft creep in one dull Line,  
While they ring round the same unvary'd Chimes,  
With sure Returns of still expected Rhymes.  
Where-e'er you find the cooling Western Breeze,  
In the next Line, it whispers thro' the Trees;  
If Chrystal Streams with pleasing Murmurs creep,  
The Reader's threaten'd (not in vain) with Sleep.  
(347-353)

Pope's rule on rhyme repetition seems a reasonable enough restriction, one which should be both easy and desirable for poets to observe. Such is apparently not the case however, for Wheatley, as well as Pope, frequently repeats rhymes in violation of this rule. Eight of her poems have two or more instances of the same rhyme sound repeated within four to six lines, and seventeen poems record one instance of such repetition. Twenty of the poems, however, contain no violations of Pope's rhyme rule. In the vast majority of the infractions, the vowel sound
repeated is either [e], [eː] or [o:]. In at least two cases, Wheatley repeats the same rhymes twice within the same brief passage. For example, in "Goliath of Gath," one couplet separates reply'd-side (108-109) from aside-untry'd (112-113), which is in turn separated from defy'd-deny'd (118-119) by two couplets. An identical pattern of repetition appears in "Niobe in Distress . . . ," where the [o] sound in woe-foe (175-176) is repeated once in slow-woe (179-180) and again in foe-flow (185-186). A passage which does not technically constitute a violation of Pope's restriction, but which certainly reflects a lack of variety in rhyme sounds, is also found in "Niobe in Distress . . . " (109-120):

Near Cadmus' walls a plain extended lay
Where Thebes' young princes pass'd in sport the day:
There the bold coursers bounded o'er the plains,
While their great masters held the golden reins.
Ismenus first the racing pastime led,
And rul'd the fury of his flying steed.
"Ah me," he sudden cries, with shrieking breath,
While in his breast he feels the shaft of death;
He drops the bridle on his courser's mane,
Before his eyes in shadows swims the plain,
He, the first-born of great Amphion's bed,
Was struck the first, first mingled with the dead.
Since only two vowel sounds ([£] and [£:]) appear in the six consecutive couplets, the only variety present is that achieved by alternating the long vowel with the short and manipulating the terminal consonants.

Pope was apparently no more respectful of his rule on rhyme repetition than was Wheatley. He may, in fact, have been guilty of more frequent violations than the American poet. In almost half of her poems, it will be recalled, she does not violate the rule at all. Pope, on the other hand, has apparently few, if any, poems not containing his own forbidden rhyme repetition (Adler 1964: 26). Examples of offending passages may be found in

- Autumn, 83-84 and 87-88 (move-love; remove-love)
- Eloisa, 221-222 and 225-226 (away-day; day-away)
- Winter, 41-42 and 45-46 (lies-replies; skies-arise)\(^9\)

Whether Pope is likely to repeat one rhyme sound more often than another has apparently not been determined; however, it is interesting to note that, of the rhyme sounds with which Wheatley most frequently violates the repetition rule ([e], [£:] and [£]), [£:] and [e] are included in the list of "sonorous vowel colors . . . that

\(^9\) The first two passages are noted by Adler (1964:26), the last by Adler (1961:224).
occur most frequently” in Pope and that ([ɔI]) occurs in
the sequence [ɔIZ] at an extremely high frequency rate of
once in thirty-six rhymes in Pope (McLean 1891:134, 138).

Further, Pope's rhymes obviously are as likely as
Wheatley's to result in monotony short of actual violation
of his own precept. McLean (1891:138), for example,
notes that in Pope the "succession of the same vowel
sound . . . is of frequent occurrence" and cites several
passages in illustration. A few years earlier, another
nineteenth century critic, Charles MacKay, included in his
attack on Pope's rhyme the observation that in "ten con-
secutive lines of the 'Rape of the Lock' his resources are
so poor that he rhymes them all on the same vowel sound
. . ." (1881:851). Additional evidence is not difficult
to locate, but the conclusion becomes apparent: Pope's
guilt in violating his own rule on rhyme repetition is at
least equal to—possibly greater than—Wheatley's.

The extent to which the two poets use rhyme cliches
is more difficult to assess. Trite rhymes, as Adler
indicates, are difficult to avoid and in "so overwhelming
a number of heroic couplets, it was inevitable that cer-
tain rhymes should have become commonplace . . ." (1964:26).
Hence, in both Wheatley and Pope, God more often than not
rhymes with abode, breath with death, and eyes with either
rise or skies. One of Wheatley's false rhymes, mourn-
return, would perhaps also be classified as a hackneyed rhyme. Both poets were obviously limited in their choice of rhyme words by both the scarcity of rhymes in the English language and by a particular literary vocabulary approved in their own age. Therefore, they sometimes repeat rhymes more frequently than desired or allowed by "rules of prosody," and they, understandably, permit certain rhyme pairs to be used with considerable frequency.

Metrical Aspects

Almost as significant as the phonetic features of couplet rhymes are the metrical aspects. Rhyme words are, of course, intricately related to meter since the metrical stress pattern of the couplet, with a strong stress position at the end of each line, demands a rhyme syllable containing a vowel with heavy phonetic stress. The result is a number of restrictions affecting the stress patterns and the syllable count of the rhyme words selected to actualize the meter.

Couplet poets, in order to observe the iambic stress pattern, are likely to choose for their rhymes either monosyllables, which necessarily contain a vowel with primary stress, or polysyllabic words carrying heavy stress on the last vowel. (Such pairings, in which final stressed syllables are rhymed, are referred to as masculine,
or single, rhymes.) Wheatley's rhymes reflect these preferences with very little deviation. Monosyllabic rhyme words outnumber polysyllabic ones in her poetry by a ratio of 3 to 1, and rhymes words of more than two syllables account for less than 1 per cent of the total rhymes. She completely avoids feminine (or double) rhymes, those in which a sound agreement is present in both the penultimate (stressed) syllable and the final syllable (e.g., lighting, fighting). This avoidance is likely motivated not only by her desire to fulfill the metrical stress requirements, but also by the fact that feminine rhymes were frowned upon during the eighteenth century. Triple rhymes (e.g., glorious, victorious), practically non-existent in eighteenth century verse, also do not occur in Wheatley's verse. Light rhymes, which were apparently accepted with reluctance during the eighteenth century, ¹⁰ Wheatley resorts to in only six instances:

sigh-jealousy ("Thoughts on the Works of Providence," 89-90)
eyes-deities ("Niobe in Distress . . . ," 61-62)

¹⁰ Adler (1961:224) reports that "there was considerable difference of opinion on this matter" and notes that light rhymes were acceptable to some only if the polysyllabic word carried a secondary stress on the final syllable.
defy'd-deny'd ("Niobe in Distress . . . ," 75-76)
given-sacrifice ("On the Capture of General Lee,"
59-60)
one-Washington ("On the Capture of General Lee,"
65-66)
born-Unicorn ("An Answer to the Rebus . . . ," 5-6)
fly-Felicity ("Atheism," 23-24)

The metrical aspects of Pope's rhymes are, in general, quite similar to those of Wheatley. Piper (1969:14) observes that one-syllable rhymes occur more frequently in Pope than two-syllable iambic rhymes and notes that the ratio varies considerably even among passages in the same poem (e.g., from a ratio of 15 to 11 in Windsor Forest [7-32] to a ratio of 11 to 1 in lines 135-146 of the same poem).

Pope is also similar to Wheatley in that he relies predominantly on masculine rhymes throughout his poetry (McLean 1891:134); however, he does make occasional use of feminine rhymes, chiefly in his satires (Adler 1964:24). Pope, as does Wheatley, avoids triple rhymes altogether (Adler 1964:24). The exact frequency with which light rhymes appear in Pope's poems has apparently

---

11 McLean (1891:134) found that of Pope's 7874 rhymes, 115 were feminine, and Tillotson (1950:23) notes, for example that Pope's Rape of the Lock has only three feminine rhymes.
not been calculated, but he clearly does not avoid them entirely. Adler (1964:25), for instance, cites these three: call-equivocal (Essay on Criticism, 42-43), own-
Addison (Dunciad, II, 139-140); and Lyes-Blasphemies (Arbuthnot, 321-322).

Both Wheatley and Pope, it appears, in considering the metrical implications of rhyme, were sensitive both to the metrical demands of the couplet verse form and to the critical opinions of their time.

**Syntactic Aspects**

Couplet syntax is, perhaps to as great an extent as either sound or meter, intricately involved with practically every aspect of couplet production, including rhyme. Because rhyme is important to the sound, the meter, and the meaning of a couplet, a poet's practices in manipulating the syntax of the couplet in order to achieve the desired rhyme are an important part of his overall poetic technique. Couplet poets, in particular, resort to several kinds of syntactical maneuvers in order to place in rhyme position a word which belongs to the appropriate grammatical category, which offers an

---

12 The syntactical features of Wheatley's couplets are discussed fully in Chapter V. The syntactic elements of her rhymes are included here in order to provide a more comprehensive treatment of rhyme.
acceptable sound correspondence, and which achieves the desired semantic and rhetorical effects.

With the possible exception of Dryden, eighteenth century critics apparently did not object to shifting syntactical elements for the purpose of rhyme (Adler 1961:224n). Still, these critics, in discussing poetic language, typically observe whether violation of normal word order is more likely to occur in the first or second line of the couplet and whether rhyme words are more likely to be nouns, verbals, etc.

Wheatley alters the word order in her couplets to achieve rhyme in over a fifth of her lines, the shift usually involving some type of inversion. The syntax is as likely to be inverted in the first line of the couplet as in the second, but, more frequently than not, she does not violate the natural word order in both lines of a couplet. Couplets such as these are fairly typical examples of her syntactic manipulation in that they exhibit either verb-object, adjective-noun, or verb-modifier inversion in one (but not both) lines, thus placing a verb or modifier in rhyme position:

Attend my lays, ye ever honour'd nine,
Assist my labours, and my strains refine;

--"An Hymn to Morning," 1-2
Night seals in sleep the wide creation fair,
And all is peaceful but the brow of care.

"Thoughts on the Works of Providence,"
55-56

The dreadful scenes and toils of war I write,
The ardent warriors, and the field of fight:

"Goliath of Gath," 3-4

Thrice happy saint! to find thy heav'n at last,
What compensation for the evils past!

"On the Death of the Rev. Dr. Sewell,"
15-16

On each pale corse the wretched mother spread
Lay overwhelm'd with grief, and kiss'd her dead,

"Niobe in Distress . . . ,"177-178

Couplets with neither line having natural word order may, however, be found without difficulty in Wheatley's verse. Following are three, selected at random, which reflect inversion in both lines:

Tho' I unhappy mourn these children slain,
Yet greater numbers to my lot remain.

"Niobe in Distress . . . ," 187-188

Cerulean youths! your joint assent declare,
Virtue to reverence, more than mortal fair,

"To a Gentleman of the Navy," 33-34
O may your sceptre num'rous nations sway,
And all with love and readiness obey!

"To the King's Most Excellent Majesty,"

Although Wheatley very often shifts sentence elements to achieve a verb rhyme, verbs are, in the whole of her poetry, considerably less common as rhymes than substantives. About 53 per cent of her rhyme words are substantives; 38 per cent, verbals (of which 32 per cent are verbs); and 9 per cent, modifiers (with adverbs being slightly more common than adjectives). Taken together, then, nouns and verbs comprise over 90 per cent of Wheatley's rhymes. In this respect, Wheatley is no different from her contemporaries, for such proportions as these "run fairly constant throughout closed-couplet history" (Piper 1969:14).

Strangely enough, Wheatley's preference for nouns as rhyme words does not result in a preponderance of noun-noun rhymes. The most common rhyme pairing in her poetry is the noun-verb rhyme, which accounts for over 40 per cent of her total rhymes. Rhymes consisting of two nouns terminate slightly more than one fourth of her couplets. The next most common are verb-verb rhymes, which occur only half as frequently as noun-noun rhymes.
Pope's techniques of manipulating syntax for rhyme are, for the most part, quite similar to Wheatley's. Like the American poet, Pope uses inversion, as well as other syntactic devices, for a number of reasons, including the attainment of the desired rhyme. Adler says that Pope "violates normal word order less often for rime than for rhetoric," and observes that when "he does shift for the sake of rime, the shift is very often in the first line of a couplet only—so often and with such good effect, that this seems like a special Popean device" (1961:224n). In a later work, Adler cites the following couplets as illustrations of his point (1964:22-23):

But we, brave Britons, Foreign Laws despis'd,
And kept unconquer'd, and unciviliz'd,

--Essay on Criticism, 715-716

I shriek, start up, the same sad prospect find,
And wake to all the griefs I left behind,

--Eloisa, 247-248

That not in Fancy's Maze he wander'd long,
But stoop'd to Truth, and moraliz'd his song,

--Arbuthnot, 340-341

Blockheads with reason wicked wits abhor,
But fool with fool a barb'rous civil war.

--Dunciad, III, 175-176
Pope's efforts to achieve rhyme by word shift are not always with "good effect," however. Like Wheatley, and undoubtedly like most other coupleteers, he sometimes "sacrifices the grace, clearness, and harmonious flow of the verse to force the riming word to the end of the line," as McLean (1891:138) demonstrates with these lines from *Essay on Man*:

Cease then, nor order imperfection name.
--I, 281

Respecting man, whatever wrong we call

May, must be right as relative to all.
--I, 51-52

Made for his use, all creatures, if he call,

Say what their use, had he the powers of all?
--I, 177-178

The different kinds of syntactical devices used at least occasionally by Pope for rhyme purposes are more numerous and more complicated than those found in Wheatley. Adler includes rhyme among the effects attained by Pope's use of zeugma, chiasmus, anaphora, antithesis, and inversion (1964:16ff). Apparently, Pope's practice of removing a verb from its normal position to rhyme position is quite common. Covington (1967:44), for example, in his survey of the criticism of Pope's rhyme,
quotes Whitwell Elwin, a nineteenth century editor of Pope, as saying that with Pope "the transposition of the verb for the sake of rhyme was the rule. . . ."

Tillotson, almost a century later, observed a further dimension in this pattern: Pope's rhyming of the verb that terminates the first line with its object at the end of the next line (1950:124). More recently, Jones has refuted Tillotson in what is probably the most defensible position yet taken on Pope's rhymes:

It would be more accurate to say that Pope preferred a noun, instead of a verb, for at least one of the rhyme words in a couplet; and it is not true that 'a verb at the end of the first line is often followed by its object in the next line.' What actually happens is that when the first line ends with a verb, it will more often be followed with some other completion than its object in the next line, or it will be an intransitive verb. In a poem or passage with considerable inversion, the verb which ends the first line has its object or other completion in the first line also. The grammatical and formal principle of Pope's rhymes, if there is one, or several, is much more elusive than Tillotson makes it appear. Pope rhymes nouns more than any other part of speech, with verbs a not-so-close second, but he rhymes any part of speech in a variety of structures, especially in the Dunciad and later poems (1969:210).

As this statement indicates, it is difficult to identify specifically the rhyming principles of a poet, but an examination of Wheatley's rhymes reveals that at least in her extensive use of nouns as rhyme words and in
her frequent reliance on different types of inversion for rhyme, she was remarkably similar to Pope.

Semantic Aspects

The traditional view of rhyme as a purely phonetic matter prevailed through the nineteenth century and perhaps reached its zenith in Henry Lanz's statement that "rime is one of those irrational satellites that revolve around reason" (1931:293). Eventually, however, this attitude gave way to a broader consideration of rhyme which included the role of metrics and grammar.

In 1940, T. Walter Herbert, for instance, identified the three forces inherent in rhyme as (1) "The recurrence of an identical sound. . . . [2] the customary position of rining words in the metrical structure. . . . [and 3] grammar" (365-366). The critical thesis which emerged from Herbert's study was that poets, to be successful rymers, should vary the grammatical constructions used as rhymes (377).

Alogical Elements

Recognition of the importance of grammar in rhyme led quickly to a further expansion of rhyme theory. Only four years after Herbert's article appeared, W. K. Wimsatt, Jr., called for a view of rhyme which focuses on the idea that rhyme functions semantically to "give
poetry a quality of the concrete and particular" and to impose "upon the meaning a counterpattern [which] acts as a fixative or preservative of the sensory quality of words" (1944:63). Wimsatt's chief argument was for the "alogical character of rhyme," that phenomenon created by the contrast between the structural parallelism of the couplet and the semantic disparity of the rhyme words.

Wimsatt's view of rhyme, unique as it was in the 1940's, has become a point of reference for more recent rhyme scholarship. Accordingly, his rather brief look in 1944 at the alogical elements in the rhymes of Chaucer and Pope has sparked more extensive re-examination of the rhyme reputation of certain poets, notably Pope.13 The change in attitude toward Pope's rhymes, for instance, is aptly summarized by Covington (1967:55):

Certainly a half century ago Pope was reputed to have been careless of rimes both because they were hard to come by in English and because they were supplied him by the tradition of his own form so completely stereotyped that no special artfulness was necessary for him to perform the business of end-words. Today it is customary to

---

13Covington (1967:55n) lists two unpublished dissertations on Pope's rhymes and one on Dryden's, all of which "have grown directly or indirectly from Wimsatt's study, all applying the view more extensively than Wimsatt did. . . ." In his own dissertation (brining the total to four), Covington includes a one-chapter discussion of Wimsatt's rhyme theory (68-87).
remark his brilliant rime usages—with no phonetic qualifications at all—as vital in the effects of wit and rhetoric.

In the following discussion of the semantic elements in Wheatley's rhymes, attention is given not only to the extent to which her rhymes constitute an alogical contrast to the structure of the couplet, but also to their semantic correlation, i.e., their tendency to form "miniaturizations" of the couplet sense. Thus, the approaches and techniques of Wimsatt (1944:63-84) and Covington (1967:88-164) have been utilized in this analysis.

Wimsatt's examination of the semantic elements in rhyme entails a classification of rhyme words according to part of speech. He insists

that difference in meaning of rhyme words can be recognized in difference of parts of speech and in difference of functions of the same part of speech, and that both of these differences will be qualified by the degree of parallel or of oblique sense in the pair of rhyming lines. We may distinguish (I) lines of oblique relation having (a) rhymes of different parts of speech, (b) rhymes of the same part of speech; (II) lines of parallel relation having (a) rhymes of different parts of speech, (b) rhymes of the same part of speech (1944:68).

These "alogical" rhyme patterns are not found in Wheatley's poetry to any noticeable degree. A few of the rhymes in "Niobe in Distress . . ." exhibit a
contrast similar to that designated by Wimsatt's class IIb. The following couplet, for example,

No reason her imperious temper quells,
But all her father in her tongue rebels;

—"Niobe in Distress . . .," 97-98

produces semantic effects quite similar to those generated by Pope's rhymes in this couplet:

Some are bewildered in the Maze of Schools,
And some made Coxcombs Nature meant but Fools.

—Essay on Criticism, 26-27

Although Wheatley's lines do not exhibit Pope's "deft twist," (semantic reverberation between fools, schools, and then fools in a different sense), other semantic similarities between the two couplets are apparent. In each couplet, the parallelism resides more in line meaning than in strict parallel structure. The disparity between the rhymes quells—rebels contrasts with the parallel meanings in Wheatley's lines, although, at a glance, the rhyme difference appears to complement this parallelism. (The "No . . . But" pattern simulates semantic antithesis.) The rhyme difference in Pope's case is more chiastic in nature, contrasting the surprising juxtaposition of schools (suggesting learning, wisdom,
etc.) and fools who lack these qualities) with the sense of the couplet: some schools (of false learning) merely produce a more pretentious fool. According to Wimsatt (1944:77), rhyming patterns such as these, producing "with their curious harmony of sound and distinction of sense . . . an amalgam of the sensory and the logical," are fairly common in Pope. With the exception of the one couplet discussed above, semantic interplay between rhyme differences and structural parallelism is not found in Wheatley.

Semantic Correlation

Semantic correlation, a rhyming phenomenon which Covington (1967) explores in Pope's poetry, is, on the other hand, quite common in Wheatley in a variety of patterns. Covington's format is used in discussing Pope's statistics, by type and frequency of occurrence, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Types of Semantic Pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essay on Criticism (1-148)</td>
<td>Ia  Ib  IIa  IIb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape of the Lock (I:1-148)</td>
<td>26  11  21  9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot (1-148)</td>
<td>24  10  22  10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunciad (IV:1-148)</td>
<td>27  8  22  10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Wimsatt 1944:68n, 69n, 70n)

Covington's study is based on these "major poems representing major genres": An Essay on Criticism (didactic-critical) and An Essay on Man (didactic-philosophical); The Rape of the Lock (mock heroic-light) and The Dunciad (mock heroic-dark); Epistle to a Lady and Epistle to Burlington (moral essays); and Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot and The First Epistle of the First Book of Horace Imitated (epistolary satire, original and imitative).
the presence of these patterns. A definition and, for comparison, illustrative couplets from Pope (both drawn from Covington's 1967 dissertation) are given for each type of rhyme.

Covington's contention is that Wimsatt's "alogical" patterns of rhyme are complemented by a substantial number of Pope's rhymes in which there is not a contrast between rhyme disparity and structural parallelism, but in which a consonance of meaning prevails, the rhymes being "so semantically coordinated with his verse logic that they stand as glosses, direct or oblique" (1967:88). His chief goal is to show how Pope's rhymes "miniaturize" (either by restatement or counterstatement) the couplet sense. Broadly, Covington establishes two semantic categories for Pope's rhymes: semantic concord rhymes and semantic discord rhymes.\textsuperscript{16}

\textbf{Semantic concord.}—Rhymes in the first of these categories exhibit some type of semantic agreement, either

\textsuperscript{16}He includes in an appendix (134-140) a discussion of a third class, rhymes of free association. Rhymes in this class, he says, are "of comparatively minor significance and very infrequent occasion," do not reflect a "clear relation between rime expression and couplet statement," but do contain "a nuance clearly intended as a rhetorical point" (90). Since Covington's justification for isolating these rhymes in a separate category is rather weak, this facet of his analysis has been disregarded in the examination of Wheatley's rhymes.
restating or contradicting the couplet logic. These types of agreement include synonymy, grammatical correlation, and connotational affinity.

Of the first, Covington says that "such rimes are bound by denotative concord in much the same way they are bound by phonetic concord; that is, the rime meaning is self-generating, not necessarily dependent on the couplet statement" (1967:91). This couplet from Pope is provided in illustration:

Shines, in exposing Knaves, and painting Pools,
Yet is, whate'er she hates and ridicules.

—Epistle to a Lady, 119-120

In his commentary on this couplet, Covington observes that the rhyme words though different parts of speech, and though concluding verses that stand in statemental contrast, yet share . . . an ultimate denotative commonground, and one not after all unrelated to the couplet sense. If Atossa is ridiculing herself when she thinks she is ridiculing knaves and fools, then fools and ridicules tend to converge in their import and to provide a kind of rime reprieve of the couplet statement. There is another, and more obvious, way in which these rime-words converge and exhibit concord; fools are after all the objects of ridicule: one ridicules fools. But the couplet induces a wry turn to the proposition—sometimes the ridicule recoils and exposes a fool behind it as well as before it. The rime, at any rate, tends to reflect, by its proximate synonymy, the two-way sense of the couplet logic (1967:92-93).
Wheatley does not exhibit a strong preference for rhyme synonymy which echoes the sense of the couplet, but does on occasion achieve such a rhyme-couplet relationship. In the two couplets following, for instance, the synonymous rhymes echo the statemental sense:

In vain she begs, the Fates her suit deny,  
In her embrace she sees her daughter die.  

—"Niobe in Distress . . .," 211-212

It cannot be—unerring Wisdom guides
With eye propitious, and o'er all presides.  

—"To the Rev. Dr. Thomas Amory," 21-22

In the first example, the verb rhymes constitute parallel expressions of the same sense: for Niobe to have her suit denied means death for her daughter. Interestingly, the final three words of each line also simulate a structural parallelism, a pattern attained by Wheatley's inversion of the verb in the first line. The second example also contains verb rhymes, in this case the compound verbs of Wisdom. This rhyme pattern, also achieved by syntactic inversion, encapsulates the chain of thought developed in the preceding couplets—"the idea that God

[17] "The Atheist sure no more can boast aloud
Of chance, or nature, and exclude the God;
As if the clay without the potter's aid
Should rise in various forms, and shapes self-made,
Or worlds above with orb o'er orb profound
Self-mov'd could run the everlasting round."
is a being concerned not only with the welfare of individual man but also with the laws of the universe, of which man is a part. As in the case of Pope, Wheatley is not so much concerned in these lines with attaining exact synonyms as she is in creating a parallelism of meaning between the rhyme partners. Pope, according to Covington (1967:95), does not use rhyming synonyms frequently and rarely as just "verbal pranks." Wheatley likewise avoids verbal trickery, although her rhymes are sometimes merely synonyms and do not echo the sense of the couplet, as, for example, in this case:

Say, parents, why this unavailing moan?
Why heave your pensive bosoms with the groan?

"A Funeral Poem on the Death of C.E., an Infant of Twelve Months," 25-26

The second type of concordant rhymes found in both Wheatley and Pope are those in which semantic concord is generated by a simulation of grammatical structures, usually verb-object or modifier-noun constructions. These Pope couplets cited by Covington (1967:105, 102) illustrate these types of constructions, respectively:

Learn hence for Ancient Rules a just Esteem;
To copy Nature is to copy Them.

"Essay on Criticism," 139-140
The verb-object rhyme construction in the first couplet, as Covington observes, repeats the sense of the couplet and simultaneously reiterates the idea in the first line (1967:105). Simulation takes the form of modification in the second example, where fine-line serves as an accurate echo of the spider's web, "both in respect to itself and in respect to its place in the Chain of Being" (Covington 1967:102). Sometimes this type of construction reads backward, resembling the object-verb inversion so common in heroic verse. This Popean couplet exemplifies such a reversal:

Just as absurd, to mourn the tasks or pains
The great directing MIND of ALL ordains.

---Essay on Man, I, 265-266

Instances of semantic rhyme patterns involving grammatical simulation are abundant in Wheatley's poetry. The following couplets are cited only as representative examples. (The first two couplets illustrate verb-object simulation; the third, modifier-noun simulation.)

When wants and woes might be our righteous lot,
Our God forgetting, by our God forgot!

---"Thoughts on the Works of Providence," 102-103

Mneme in our nocturnal visions pours,
The ample treasure of her secret stores;

---"On Recollection," 9-10
Let placid slumbers sooth each weary mind,
At morn to wake more heav'niy, more refin'd;
—"An Hymn to the Evening," 13-14

Simulated verb-object rhyme partners, which typically re-enact the sense of the couplet by imitating the transitive relationship between a verb and its object, may simply restate the action expressed in the couplet (as pours-stores does in the second example) or may effect, in a more complex fashion, a kind of commentary. The forgot-lot pattern in the first example is not just a restatement of what has actually been expressed in the couplet, but is the postulation of a condition (if God forgot man's lot), the results of which ("wants and woes") are voiced in the first line of the couplet. In the third example, the simulation of an attributive-noun relationship provides a similar reflection on the sense of the couplet but states the result ("refin'd mind") instead of the condition (sleep).

The two types of semantic relationships examined thus far have been denotative in nature, appearing as pairs of synonyms or as simulated grammatical constructions. In a third type of semantic relationship, concord is achieved through a connotational affinity between the rhyme words. In the more complex instances of this pattern, not only do
the rhyme words evoke similar connotative responses, but this similarity interacts with the couplet statement, usually augmenting it. Among Pope's rhymes, Covington (1967:110) found couplets in which this connotative closeness was achieved almost totally by the rhyme partners, exclusive of couplet context, as in the lines:

> For her th' unfading rose of Eden blooms,
> And wings of Seraphs shed divine perfumes;
> --Eloisa to Abelard, 217-218

In other couplets, those in which in connotational affinity of the rhymes involves the couplet sense, Covington observed that "there is a connotative remembrance of the first rime-word induced by the second and a couplet context in which the rime's interaction yields point" (1967:113). Included among the examples cited are these consecutive couplets:

> Twin'd with the wreaths Parnassian lawrels yield,
> Or reap'd in iron harvests of the field?
> Where grows?--where grows it not?--If vain our toil,
> We ought to blame the culture, not the soil:
> --An Essay on Man, IV, 11-14
The concord in yield-field and toil-soil results, therefore, from the placement of connotatively similar rhymes in an agricultural metaphor, a context which supports the similarity.

Wheatley's couplet rhymes often converge connotatively in much the same manner as Pope's. Accordingly, the semantic unity is in many cases attained chiefly through the rhyme words. The connotative linkage between Sails in

Auspicious Heav'n shall fill with favoring Gales,
Where e'er Columbia spreads her swelling Sails:

"Liberty and Peace," 61-62

exists because wind is a common connotative response for each word. The rhymes do not constitute an echo of the couplet sense. These two conditions characterize the majority of Wheatley's connotatively related rhymes. The following can be cited as representative examples:

Resign thy friends to that Almighty hand,
Which gave them life, and bow to his Command;

"To a Gentleman and Lady . . .," 21-22

The Northern milder climes I long to greet,
There hope that health will my arrival meet.

"To a Lady on Her Coming to North-America . . .," 11-12
How sweet the sound when we her plaudit hear?
Sweeter than music to the ravish'd ear,
—"On Recollection," 21-22

In each case the context is appropriate to the connotational relationship between the rhymes, but does not really augment it. Hand-command connotes "authority" without a context. Similarly, greet-meet and hear-ear suggest "encounter" and "sound," respectively.

In a very few couplets, however, Wheatley achieves a greater degree of semantic complexity. Interestingly, one case of rhyme concord in her poetry contains the same rhyme words Pope uses in a relatively simple manner in the couplet from Eloisa to Abelard (217-218, supra). The Wheatley couplet appears in this passage from "An Elegy to Dr. Cooper":

Still live thy merits, where thy name is known,
As the sweet Rose, its blooming beauty gone
Retains its fragrance with a long perfume:
Thus COOPER! thus thy death-less name shall bloom
Unfading, in thy Church and Country's love,
While Winter frowns, or spring renews the grove.

—35-40
For both Wheatley and Pope, each member of the rhyme pair perfume\textcircled{s}-bloom\textcircled{s} functions connotatively to suggest "fragrance." In Pope's case, the semantic interaction extends no further. In Wheatley's couplet, however, the connotative relationship between the rhyme words is intricately related to both couplet and supracouplet context. Both words are used figuratively to compare Cooper with a rose (the essence of each remains after death) in a statement that spans six lines. The rhymes sustain the semantic pattern which is developed throughout the expanded context by a dual appeal to sight ("blooming beauty," "unfading") and smell ("sweet," fragrance).

The Wheatley rhymes discussed thus far have, when related to couplet context, exemplified a semantic concordance that restates the couplet sense. Occasionally, however, the semantic harmony between the rhyme partners functions as a counterstatement to the couplet sense, often through ironic refutation. Covington (1967:117-119) includes the following couplets in the examples of counterstatement found in Pope:

'Flow Welsted, flow! like thine inspirer, Beer,
Tho' stale, not ripe; tho' thin, yet never clear;

---The Dunciad, III, 169-170
When first that Sun too powerful Beams displays,
It draws up Vapours which obscure its Rays;

—An Essay on Criticism, 470-471

In his commentary on these rhymes, Covington (1967:117, 119) observes that "the rime is exactly opposite the modification intended" in the first example, while in the second couplet, "the rime would 'display' the sun, but the couplet 'obscures' it."

Instances of counterstatement in Wheatley's rhymes are not abundant, but there are a few couplets in which the rhyme clearly contradicts the couplet statement. In the opening lines of "An Answer to the Rebus," for example, the rhyme sense ("refuse-muse") is negated in the couplet:

The poet asks, and Phillis can't refuse
To shew th' obedience of the Infant muse.

The rhymes counterstate the couplet sense in a similar manner in the following lines:

In vain would Vice her works in night conceal,
For Wisdom's eye pervades the sable veil.

—"To the Rev. Dr. Thomas Amory . . .," 9-10

So shall the labours of the day begin
More pure, more guarded from the snares of sin.

—"An Hymn to Evening," 15-16
The good of man: yet man ungrateful pays
But little homage, and but little praise.

—"Thoughts on the Works of Providence," 128-129

The connotational affinity between veil and conceal contrasts ironically with the couplet's expression of Vice's futile efforts to conceal her deed. In the two remaining examples, begin-sin and pays-praise predicate actions denied in the couplet.

Semantic discord.—The discussion of the semantic aspects of Wheatley's rhymes has to this point been concerned with "alogical" relationships between the rhyme words and with semantically correlated rhymes which, through synonymy, simulated grammatical constructions, and connotational affinity, function as miniaturizations of the couplet by either restating or counterstating the couplet sense. In a third, and final, group of couplets, the rhymes are correlated not by semantic concord, but by semantic discord. The disharmony in rhymes in this group may operate in the same manner as rhyme harmony to either restate or counterstate the couplet expression. This type of rhyme bond is related to oxymoron, the rhetorical figure which juxtaposes two incongruous or contradictory terms. Like oxymoron, semantically discordant
rhymes usually present a contrast more apparent than real (Covington 1967:120).

Discordant rhymes are not as frequent as concordant rhymes in Pope's poetry (Covington 1967:141) or in Wheatley's. The following is an example of one of Pope's discordant rhymes which presents an apparent connotative contrast resolved in the couplet rhetoric:

Who breaks with her, provokes Revenge from Hell,
But he's a bolder man who dares be well:

—Epistle to a Lady, 129-130

The rhyme, according to Covington, contains the couplet's witty barb: well, which seems to suggest well-being, really means "getting along well with someone" and, therefore, suggests that "intimacy with her [the Duchess of Buckinghamshire] is even more hellish than animosity" (1967:121).

The operation of denotative contrast can be seen in this Popean couplet:

Puts forth one manly Leg, to sight reveal'd;
The rest his many-colour'd Robe conceal'd.

—Rape of the Lock, III, 57-58

Concerning the semantic disparity of the rhymes in this couplet, Covington (1967) has this to say:
The apparent contradiction between rime-words is an illusion of rime only; actually both conditions exist on the card simultaneously. Moreover, as it stands, the rime is suggestive of the way of the game, not of ombre only, but of love—playing some cards, concealing others—so that the rime contrast is symbolic (121).

Most of the cases discussed in Covington's treatment of Pope's semantically discordant rhymes exhibit a relationship to the couplet similar to that exemplified in the verses above.

That Wheatley was little concerned in achieving semantic disharmony between her rhyme words becomes apparent in light of the fact that antonymous rhymes account for only about 1 per cent of her total rhymes and that this antonymity is achieved with a very limited number of rhyme pairs (chiefly with night-light, give-receive, and fight-delight).

Wheatley's discordant rhymes, unlike Pope's, are not oxymoronic. The contrast between the rhyme words is more likely to be real than apparent. For example, in her use of the night-light rhyme, the inherent disagreement usually complements a contrast stated in the couplet, as these lines illustrate:

Thyself prepare to pass the vale of night
To join forever on the hill of light:

—"To a Lady on the Death of Her Husband," 29-30
Without them, destitute of heat and light,
This world would be the reign of endless night:

—"Thoughts on the Works of Providence," 33-34

See the bright beams of heaven's revolving light
Involved in sorrows and the veil of night!

—"To His Excellency General Washington," 7-8

In each case, there is an implicit heaven-earth contrast
which the rhyme antonymity brings into sharp focus. In
the first example, a widow in mourning is admonished to
prepare to leave this "vale of night" (earth) to be with
her husband on the "hill of light" (heaven). Then in
the second example refers to "solar rays" in the preceding
couplet, 18 which initiates a heaven-earth contrast by
declaring that the solar rays bear Jehovah's wisdom to
the earth. In the third couplet, the brightness of the
sun ("heaven's . . . light") contrasts with the turmoil
and the anguish of the war on earth.

In opposing fight and delight as rhymes, Wheatley
continues rather straightforwardly to rely on the rhyme
contrast to serve as an adjunct to the couplet sense. In
the following couplet, for instance, the connotative
incongruity between the rhymes parallels the poet's doubt,
expressed in an interrogative structure:

18"That Wisdom, which attends Jehovah's ways,/Shines
most conspicuous in the solar rays:"
SAY, muse divine, can hostile scenes delight
The warriors bosom in the field of fight?

"To Captain H--d . . .," 1-2

Similarly, a second occurrence of this rhyme pair serves, in a passage describing Goliath, to augment the contrast between David, a mere "stripling," and the awesome giant

Who all his days has been inur'd to fight,
And made its deeds his study and delight:

"Goliath of Gath," 94-95

The most compelling evidence of Wheatley's concern with the semantic elements of rhyme resides in her practice of coupling give and receive as rhyme partners. Semantic antonymity is obviously granted a higher priority than phonetic similarity in the selection of these rhymes in these couplets:

To-day the Lord of Hosts to me will give
Victory, to-day thy doom thou shalt receive;

"Goliath of Gath," 158-159

That Saviour, which his soul did first receive,
The greatest gift that ev'n a God can give,

"On the Death of the Rev. Mr. George Whitefield," 24-25
Delightful infant, nightly visions give
Thee to our arms, and we with joy receive,

"A Funeral Poem on the Death of C.E. . . . ,"

Expectedly, the contrastive rhymes in these verses function as a reiteration of an opposition stated in the couplet. In the first example, the semantic contrast in the rhyme parallels the "victory"—"doom" antonymity. In the other two couplets, the semantic opposition in the rhyme gives point to the contrast between man, a mortal recipient, and a supernatural benefactor ("God" and "nightly visions").

Wheatley's rhymes of semantic discord are, for the most part, like Pope's in only a fundamental sense. A simplicity and a singleness of purpose generally set them apart from Pope's rhymes, which typically reflect twists and barbs of irony and wit.

In retrospect, it is accurate to say that Wheatley generally does not select her rhymes solely to achieve the appropriate sound correspondence. Though phonotic demands are obviously given priority in the vast majority of her rhymes, there is clear evidence that she also considers metrical, syntactic, and semantic factors in choosing her rhymes.

Phonetically, about 85 per cent of Wheatley's rhymes have an exact correspondence for the modern reader. It is
likely that the percentage was even higher for eighteenth century readers. Unpopular rhyme identities are virtually nonexistent in her poetry. In about half of her poems, Wheatley observes Pope's "rule" on avoiding phonetic monotony in rhyming, but twenty-five of her poems have one or more instances of rhyme repetition within four to six lines.

It is apparent that phonetic concord in rhymes was as important to Pope as it was to Wheatley. Phonetically, he does not deviate in any important respects from the later American poet whose works he influenced. Over 85 per cent of his rhymes are exact to the twentieth century reader, and it is equally probable that many of these were true in his own day. Rhyme identities, though not avoided entirely in his works, are apparently used only sparingly. Like Wheatley, he too is not always successful in avoiding the monotony resulting from the frequent repetition of the same rhyme sound, this despite the fact that the "rule" was his own.

The influence of meter, like sound, is readily observable in Wheatley's rhymes. In meeting the foot and stress requirements of the iambic pentameter line, she relies heavily on monosyllabic rhymes. Disyllabic words with an iambic stress pattern account for approximately one-third of the rhymes. Light rhymes, those agreeing in
sound but not in stress, occur only rarely, and feminine and triple rhymes not at all. In these respects, Wheatley's rhymes resemble Pope's very closely, the only exception being the occasional feminine rhymes found in some of Pope's satires.

In terms of syntax, Wheatley's rhymes are achieved by an interruption of the natural word order in about one-fifth of her lines. She is not more likely to shift for rhyme in one line of the couplet than in the other, and usually does not alter the syntax of both lines. Pope's couplets differ in this syntactic respect chiefly in his tendency to alter word order more frequently in the first line than in the second. The proportions of Wheatley's rhymes belonging to various grammatical categories is in general accord with the ratio for couplet poets in general and Pope in particular. Over half of her rhymes (53 percent) are substantives, 38 percent are verbals, and 9 percent modifiers. In general, what has been said about Pope's syntactic techniques in rhyming also describes Wheatley's: both poets rhyme "nouns more than any other part of speech, with verbs a not-so-close second, but [they rhyme] any part of speech in a variety of structures" (Jones 1969:210).

That Wheatley considered (in addition to sound, meter, and syntax) the semantic relationship resulting from the
juxtaposition of particular rhyme words is evident in examining her poetry. Although many of her rhymes are not semantically motivated, a number of them correlate with the couplet sense, most commonly through a semantic concord between the rhyme partners. One of her favorite semantic techniques is the use of the rhyme words to simulate a grammatical construction that miniaturizes the statement in the couplet. Complexity and a wide variety of patterns are not characteristic of Wheatley's semantic rhyming practices. She typically utilizes the semantic elements in the rhymes to augment or reiterate the rhetoric of the couplet. In so doing, she differs considerably from Pope, whose bent for wit, irony, and satire results in a larger number of more sophisticated semantic patterns.

Perhaps the one significant principle which emerges from this examination of rhyme is the recognition that, for these two Neoclassical poets, Wheatley and Pope, rhyme is not merely a phonetic phenomenon. Rather, it is an amalgam of the phonetic, the metrical, the syntactic, and the semantic.
CHAPTER V
SYNTACTIC FEATURES OF WHEATLEY’S POETRY

In this chapter the topic of concern is the syntactic patterns that prevail in Wheatley's couplet poetry. Following a summary of the transformational-generative model of grammar which serves as a theoretical framework for the syntactic analysis, the chapter presents a discussion of the major sentence types written by Wheatley. Included for each sentence type is an explanation of its grammatical derivation, an assessment of its frequency of occurrence, and a consideration of the poetic requirements which appear to have prompted the grammatical operations involved in the derivation. This section on sentence types is followed by a brief analysis of the influence of the couplet form—its organization into hemistichs and balanced lines—on the poet's syntax. Specifically, we comment on Wheatley's use of symmetrical syntactic constructions to accommodate the organizational structure of the couplet. The focus shifts after this to an exploration of the relationship between the transformational component of English grammar and the surface sentences...
that appear in Wheatley's verse. In particular we examine permutation and deletion transformations, noting how these rules serve the poet in changing ordinary language to "poetic" language. Finally, the syntactic characteristics and processes peculiar to Wheatley's poetry are compared with those of Alexander Pope, acknowledged master of the Neoclassical form in which the young American poet wrote.

The syntactic analysis of Wheatley's couplets presented in this chapter draws on a transformational-generative grammar of the kind proposed by Noam Chomsky in his 1965 work entitled Aspects of the Theory of Grammar. According to Chomsky, a generative grammar of a natural language must specify what a native speaker knows about

---

1 Despite the fact that the Aspects model of grammar has undergone numerous revisions and refinements, it is still, in terms of theoretical consistency and scope, very useful as the grammatical base for stylistic analysis. The contributions to syntactic theory made by several grammarians are significant, but have not as yet been incorporated into a complete unified grammar. The work which comes closest to achieving this goal is Stockwell, Schachter, and Partee (1973), a comprehensive treatise integrating the theoretical framework of the case grammar of Fillmore (1968, 1968) with the lexicalist hypothesis of Chomsky (1965, 1968). The modifications made by such linguists as Bach (1967), McCawley (1970), and Ross (1969) are also recognized as important alternatives to the Aspects concept of English syntax. However, since most of these works have been concerned primarily with increasingly abstract structures, and since their differences have not been reconciled, they are not as useful as the Aspects model in this dissertation.
his language that enables him to use it in communicating with others. As a model which characterizes a speaker's intuitive knowledge, a generative grammar is formally organized into three components: a syntactic component, a semantic component, and a phonological component.

A look at the relationship among these components will illustrate how the grammar accomplishes its task of relating the phonetic representation of a sentence to its semantic interpretation. The syntactic component is the "creative" component in the sense that it generates deep structures of sentences (that is, it assigns structural descriptions to sentences). The remaining two components are "interpretive": they interpret "input" structures but do not generate new structures. In general, the process works in this manner. The base section of the syntactic component generates a deep structure. This structure then enters the semantic component, where it receives a semantic interpretation. Having been assigned this interpretation, the deep structure is then mapped by the transformational rules of the syntactic component into a surface structure, which, finally, is fed into the phonological component for phonetic interpretation.\(^2\)

\(^2\)Since the semantic and phonological aspects of Wheatley's poetry have been dealt with in earlier chapters, no further discussion of the operations of the semantic and phonological components will be presented in this chapter.
Since this chapter focuses on the syntax of Wheatley's poetry, the workings of the syntactic component in this generative grammar will bear closer scrutiny. The syntactic component consists of a Base Section (which, in turn, consists of a categorial subcomponent and a lexicon) and a Transformational Section. The dual function of the categorial subcomponent, which is made up of a sequence of rewriting rules of the form \( X \rightarrow Y \), is (1) to state the grammatical relationships (subject-predicate, verb-object, etc.) required for the semantic component to interpret the deep structure, and (2) to assign an abstract underlying order to the elements to permit the transformational rules to convert the deep structures into surface structures. The ability of this categorial subcomponent to generate an infinite number of structures is attributable to a fundamental capacity of the rewriting rules to insert recursively the initial symbol \( S \) (Sentence) into other base Phrase-markers in the deep structure (e.g., \( N(oun) P(hrase) \rightarrow NP \ S \)).

The lexicon is composed of a set of entries (a list of morphemes of the language) and certain redundancy rules. A lexical entry can be thought of as a set of features; some phonological (e.g., [+consonantal]), some

For further information concerning the functions of the semantic component, see Jackendoff (1972); for a detailed treatment of the phonological component, see Chomsky and Halle (1968).
syntactic (e.g., [+ ___ NP]), and some semantic (e.g., [+human]).\(^3\) Included among the syntactic (or perhaps semantic) features of each lexical entry are certain features called co-occurrence restrictions. These restrictions function to define the syntactic and semantic contexts in which morphemes may appear. For example, the verbs recognize and suspect would have features specifying that they require human subjects, whereas the verbs astonish and dismay would be marked as taking only human objects. Thus co-occurrence restrictions permit the derivation of grammatical sentences like His lies dismay the listeners and The soldiers suspect their leader, but prevent the derivation of such deviant structures as *The book suspected the man and *The man dismayed the book.\(^4\) Stated more generally, the co-occurrence restrictions facilitate grammatical derivations by establishing the syntactic and semantic constraints that must be observed when lexical entries are, through the Lexical Insertion Convention, substituted for abstract symbols in the pre-terminal string generated by the categorial subcomponent. The co-occurrence restrictions are of considerable interest in this dissertation since it is through the violation of

\[^3\]The feature [+ ___ NP] indicates that a verb so marked will occur in the linguistic environment preceding an object NP.

\[^4\]An asterisk (*) indicates a semantically or syntactically deviant structure.
these restrictions that poets produce many structures which characterize poetic language. For example, when Wheatley personifies music in the line The fault'ring music dies upon my tongue, she is violating the co-occurrence restriction which specifies that the verb die requires an animate subject. Similarly, the metaphorical comparison of joy and something which tastes sweet (nectar?) in Wheatley's line Converse with heav'n and taste the promis'd joy rests upon the violation of a selectional restriction which stipulates that any object occurring with the verb taste must be marked [-abstract].

In addition to the set of lexical entries, comprised of various features, the lexicon also contains a set of redundancy rules, which add or specify features not listed in the lexical entry.5

Upon these deep structures (termed generalized Phrase-markers or terminal strings), which have been generated by the categorial subcomponent and into which lexical items have been inserted, the transformations (called T-rules also) operate in the Transformational component. These transformations serve to convert the deep structures into surface structures. Since the operation of the transformational cycle is fundamental

5For example, since it is predictable that any Human noun is also an Animate noun, the feature Animate is not specified on each Human noun but is stated in a general rule for all Human nouns.
to the explication of "poetic license" and stylistic variation, the manner in which it operates must be made clear. T-rules are meaning-preserving rules which alter a deep structure through such processes as substitution, deletion, and adjunction. Thus, when the Passive transformation applies to Tom designed the cabin, yielding The cabin was designed by Tom, there is a structural, but not a semantic change; i.e., the sentences are synonymous, though some constituents have been added and others have been rearranged in the second sentence. In effecting these changes, transformations operate under the constraint that the deep structure (to which has been assigned a semantic interpretation) must be recoverable for the auditor. In exercising his "poetic license," then, a poet may not manipulate word order beyond the point of recoverability.

Transformations are of two types: obligatory and optional. Obligatory transformations must be applied to all "input" structures to which they can be applied. The T-rule insuring number concord in grammatical sentences is an obligatory transformation which, for instance, prohibits the derivation of such ungrammatical strings as *They is the ones and *The bell are ringing. An optional transformation, on the other hand, either may or may not be applied. The sentences John is not painting and John
isn't fainting are grammatically well-formed and synonymous except that the second, but not the first, has undergone the optional Contraction transformation.

Let us now examine a set of sentences to illustrate these generalizations:

(1) (a) Jane was speaking of the boys then.
    (b) Then Jane was speaking of the boys.
    (c) Jane then was speaking of the boys.
    (d) Jane was then speaking of the boys.
    (e) Jane was speaking then of the boys.
    (f) *Jane was speaking of then the boys.
    (g) *Jane was speaking of the then boys.

The first five sentences (la-le) are synonymous and differ structurally only in the placement of the adverb then. Thus, the transformation permitting the movement of this adverb to the various positions is apparently an optional T-rule. Sentences (1f) and (1g) are ungrammatical because they violate a syntactical restriction that prohibits the occurrence of this adverb between a preposition and its object.6

Now let us consider a related set of sentences which will illustrate the property of transformations to preserve the meaningful relationships between the major

6 Sentence (1g) is grammatical in one sense, but not in the sense that renders it synonymous with (la-le).
constituents of the deep structure (i.e., the "recoverability" property):

(2) (a) Mary was speaking of the books then.
    (b) Was Mary speaking of the books then?
    (c) Who was speaking of the books then?
    (d) What was Mary speaking of then?
    (e) When was Mary speaking of the books?

Although these five sentences all differ in surface structure and meaning, the application of T-rules to their common underlying structure has not altered the essential semantic relationships between the four main constituents—Mary (who), speak, books (what), and then (when). Thus, the deep structure, to which has been assigned a semantic interpretation, is recoverable in each instance.

One other function of transformations should be explained, a function made necessary by the fact that ungrammatical derivations will result if lexical items are inserted into deep structures without any constraints except lexical features. Some device is required which will "block" the derivation of deep structures which are so constituted that they do not underlie well-formed sentences. To insure that the grammar will generate only grammatical sentences, Chomsky (1965:137-141)
assigns this blocking power to transformations. T-rules cannot apply (i.e., they block the derivation) when their structural descriptions are not met. For example, consider these two strings:

(3) Jack saw the woman (#the girl is sick#)

(4) Jack saw the woman (#the woman is sick#)

Because the branching rules in the Base do not take account of the context into which an S is recursively inserted, it would be possible to generate terminal strings such as (3), in which the NP serving as the object of the matrix VP (woman) and the NP serving as the subject of the embedded S (girl) are not identical. Since the relative transformation can only apply when these two NP's (i.e., the Object NP of the matrix and the Subject NP of the embedded sentence) are identical, as in (4), it cannot apply to (3). Thus, the transformation blocks, or "filters out," (3) as a deep structure which does not underlie a well-formed sentence, but permits the derivation of (5) from (4):

7Perlmutter (1971) argues that not all ill-formed structures can be blocked by T-rules, that in some cases deep structure constraints (stated as constraints on lexical insertion) are required to filter out deviant structures. His argument seems to indicate a need for modifying Chomsky's filtering theory, but the matter is not crucial to our syntactic analysis. The comments of Stockwell, Schachter, and Partee (1973:15) indicate continued dissatisfaction with blocking transformations.
(5) Jack saw the woman who is sick.

Because word order is one aspect of surface structure that poets are most apt to modify in the attainment of "poetic language," a few remarks are in order on the constraints that appear to be operational on word order in English. The following diagram can be taken as a rough representation of the structure of the English sentence as it exists at some level in the model of grammar we have adopted:

(PRES represents Pre-Sentence; NP, Noun Phrase; Aux, Auxiliary; VP, Verb Phrase; and PP, Prepositional Phrase, i.e., P NP. Each NP is re-writable as N—a simple noun phrase—, NP S—a relative-clause bearing NP—, or N S—a noun phrase complement. Parentheses indicate that the enclosed symbol is optional; braces indicate that a choice must be made between the enclosed symbols.)

By simplifying the above diagram, we can illustrate the general relationship between this abstract underlying
structure of the sentence and various surface sentences which can be derived from it:

(7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NP</th>
<th>AUX</th>
<th>VP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Sam</td>
<td>was talking about the movies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) The man</td>
<td>had disappeared.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) She</td>
<td>will sing the song.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Something</td>
<td>-- happened.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Joan</td>
<td>was gullible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Jack</td>
<td>is the father.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It becomes apparent from an examination of the sentences in (7) that a VP usually begins with a verb. The two exceptions are (7e) and (7f), traditionally called predicate adjective and predicate nominative sentences, respectively. Further, it is clear that the constituent Aux is realized either as a form of the word be, one of the forms of the auxiliary verbs have or do, one of a class of auxiliary verbs called Modals (will, can, may, shall, must, ought), or nothing at all, as in (7d). The Aux is constrained in

---

3 The illustration which follows is adapted from one in Martin and Rulon (1973:75).
that it can dominate only one such verb form, which is always the left-most word in a poly-word auxiliary phrase. The sentences in (7) also illustrate another important aspect of English word order: the NP directly dominated by S, which is typically realized as the surface subject of the sentence, must appear to the left of the VP. This constraint does not hold for the Aux, which can occur to the left of the subject NP (as in questions) or be deleted altogether.

Now let us consider the effects of these constraints on poetic language by examining some of the possible reorderings of line 10 of Wheatley's poem "On Recollection," represented as (8a) below:

(8) (a) Now eighteen years their destin'd course have run,
(b) Eighteen years now their destin'd course have run,
(c) Eighteen years have their destin'd course run now,
(d) Eighteen years have now their destin'd course run,
(e) Eighteen years have run their destin'd course now,
(f) Their destin'd course eighteen years have now run,
(g) Eighteen years have now run their destin'd course,
(h) *Eighteen now years their destin'd course have run,
Those sentences all vary in surface word order, yet all (except (8h)) derive from the same deep structure and share a single semantic interpretation. Syntactically and semantically, Wheatley could have chosen any of the reorderings (8b-8g), since no transformations have been applied which make any of the deep structure relationships unrecoverable. That is, in each case years is the subject of have run; course is in each case the object of have run; and now is consistently a time adverbial. Wheatley's preference for (8a) is understandable: it is syntactically and semantically well-formed and it is phonologically metrical, with a TR of 2. Each of the sentences (8b-8g) is phonologically unmetrical in terms of the Halle-Keyser theory, since each has a stress maximum in a weak stress position. Sentence (8h), although phonologically metrical, must be ruled out because it is ungrammatical: it violates a syntactical restriction which forbids the placement of a time adverbial in the context Adj ___ NP. Thus, in writing poetic language, a poet is subject not only to the constraints imposed by poetry (meter, rhyme, etc.), but also to those inherent in the grammar of language itself. The extent to which this is true will become more apparent as we examine the types of sentences found in Wheatley's poetry.
The types of sentences to be distinguished are declarative, imperative, interrogative, and exclamatory. As (6) indicates, all English sentences are represented at some underlying level by at least three constituents: a Noun Phrase, an Auxiliary, and a Verb Phrase. All surface sentences which can be generated by the model of grammar sketched earlier in this chapter are related to some underlying (deep) structure containing these constituents. A declarative sentence may appear at the surface level as a simple, affirmative, active sentence, like (9):

(9) Norm sells houses.

It may also, having undergone the Negative transformation, appear as (10):

(10) Norm does not sell houses.

If the Passive transformation is applied to the structure underlying (9), the declarative surface sentence will take the form:

(11) Houses are sold by Norm,

and if both the Passive and Negative transformations are applied, the form:
Houses are not sold by Norm.

The fact that (9-12) are related structurally and semantically is, of course, a matter of interest to the poet, who is faced with communicating a particular meaning in a structural form that meets the demands of meter, rhyme, and stanza in his chosen verse form. Later in this chapter, we will see in detail how Wheatley relies on transformations to permute and delete the constituents of declarative sentences in meeting these verse requirements.

The vast majority of sentences in Wheatley's poetry are, expectedly, declarative sentences. The percentage of declaratives varies from poetic category to poetic category and occasionally from poem to poem within a category. Her paraphrases of Biblical material and the myth of Niobe—both narratives—naturally have a heavy concentration of declaratives. In other categories, certain poems made up totally or predominantly of declaratives contrast sharply with poems in which declaratives account for less than half of the total sentences. For example, in "An Elegy to Dr. Samuel Cooper," all of the sentences are declaratives, but in another elegy, "On the Death of a Young Gentleman," declarative sentences account for only about one third of the total sentences.
On the whole, however, almost three fourths of the sentences found in Wheatley's couplet are declarative.

One particular type of declarative, which we will call the "may" declarative, occurs with sufficient frequency in Wheatley's poems to merit special attention. More than thirty of these sentences, exemplified in (13), are scattered throughout some sixteen Wheatley poems, chiefly the occasional poems and elegies:

(13) (a) May George, belov'd by all the nations round,
      Live with heav'n's choicest constant blessings crown'd!
      --"To the King's Most Excellent Majesty," 10-11

(b) Still prosper, Amory! still may'st thou receive
      The warmest blessings which a muse can give. . . .
      --"To the Rev. Dr. Thomas Amory . . . ," 22-23

(c) To you his Offspring, and his Church, be given,
      A triple Portion of his Thirst for Heaven. . . .
      --"An Elegy, to Miss Mary Moorhead . . . ," 69-70
The decision to classify these as declarative sentences is rather arbitrary. In some ways they behave like imperatives, but they exhibit semantic and syntactic characteristics that are not found in imperatives. The sentence Still prosper, Amory! can hardly be interpreted semantically as a command for the preacher to succeed. And, syntactically, the structures in (13) do not take tags. We can have Eneme begin, will you, but not *Still prosper, Amory, will you? Although the kinds of sentences in (13) have been noted by generative grammarians, they have not been carefully studied and it is not at all clear how they are to be derived.  

More interesting syntactically than the declaratives in Wheatley's poetry are the imperatives. Transformationally, the imperative sentence (interpreted semantically as a command) is derived from a declarative sentence which  

---

9Stockwell, Schachter, and Partee (referred to hereafter as Stockwell) distinguish between sentences like Still prosper, Amory, which they term "wish-imperatives," and sentences like (13a), which are simply called "wishes." Presumably, (13c) would also be categorized as a wish, though may has been deleted in the surface form. Nonetheless, both wish-imperatives and wishes are excluded from consideration by these grammarians as "types of constructions [which] have not yet been carefully investigated from a generative point of view" (1973:636).
has the pre-sentence marker Imperative). The tree diagram for the imperative *Take the test* would be represented as (14):

(14)

```
S
  |--- Imp
  |     |--- NP
  |     |     |--- you
  |     |     |--- AUX
  |     |     |     |--- will
  |     |     |--- VP
  |     |     |     |--- take the test
```

It is assumed that in the underlying structure of an imperative the subject NP is *you* and the modal is *will*. The presence of the Imp marker triggers the deletion of both *you* and *will* to yield the surface sentence *Take the test*. An imperative sentence may also be marked with Neg(ative), another pre-sentence marker, which activates the Negative Placement transformation. This rule introduces *do* under the domination of Aux and adjoins the Neg marker to the left of the Verb Phrase, where it is ultimately replaced by the lexical entry *not* (which may optionally be contracted to *n't*). The resulting surface sentence is *Do not take the test*. If the Contraction transformation is applied, *n't* will be adjoined to the Aux by the Auxiliary Incorporation transformation, producing *Don't take the test*.\(^\text{10}\)

---

\(^\text{10}\)This analysis of the imperative is based on that found in Martin and Rulon (1973:69-70). The authors
Second only to declaratives in frequency of appearance, imperatives account for approximately one fifth of the sentences in Wheatley's poetry. They occur in practically every poem, although their use in the elegies is particularly extensive. In at least four elegies, almost half of the sentences are imperatives.\textsuperscript{11} Frequently, the imperative in the elegy is a command for the mourners to stop grieving and recognize the wisdom and omnipotence of a benevolent God, as (15) indicates:

\begin{quote}
(15) Cease your complaints, suspend each rising sigh, Cease to accuse the Ruler of the sky.

—"On the Death of J. C., an Infant," 28-29
\end{quote}

The two imperatives in the first line of (15) are derived in the same manner that Take your test was generated from the underlying structure in (14). The derivation of the imperative in the second line is more complex. The exact posit will in the underlying structure to account for two "imperative-like" structures: the positive tag question (e.g., Take the test, will you) and the negative tag question (e.g., Take the test, won't you? or Take the test, will you not?). For a more comprehensive analysis of the Imperative, see Stockwell (1973:633-671).

\textsuperscript{11}The particular elegies are "On the Death of a Young Lady of Five Years of Age," "To a Lady on the Death of Her Husband," "To a Lady on the Death of Three Relations," and "To a Clergyman on the Death of His Lady."
derivation, showing the transformations required to generate the surface sentence, is as follows:

(16) (a) Imp You will cease to accuse the Ruler of the sky (underlying form)
(b) Imp You will cease for you to accuse the Ruler of the sky (Complementizer)
(c) Imp You will cease you to accuse the Ruler of the sky (Complementizer Deletion)
(d) Imp You will cease to accuse the Ruler of the sky (Identical Noun Phrase Deletion)
(e) Imp Cease to accuse the Ruler of the sky (Imperative)
(f) Cease to accuse the Ruler of the sky (surface form)

The Complementizer transformation which operates on (16a) to produce (16b) actually embeds a separate sentence into an N (the head noun of the object NP, which is not shown in the underlying structure) and introduces into the underlying form the infinitival complementizer "for . . . to," placing for in front of the subject NP in the embedded sentence and to in front of the VP.\(^\text{12}\) Then the Complementizer Deletion transformation deletes the first part

\(^{12}\)For a fuller discussion of the transformations involved in (16), see Jacobs and Rosenbaum (1968:163-169).
of the complementizer (for), an operation which permits the Identical Noun Phrase Deletion transformation to remove the subject NP in the embedded sentence. Finally, the Imperative rule deletes you and will, the lexically empty Imp symbol is pruned, and the surface structure, as it appears in (16f), emerges.

The implications of (16) for the couplet poet are significant. First of all, the Imperative transformation, being a deletion transformation, assists the poet in compressing two surface sentences into a line of poetry allowing only ten syllables (in the first line of (15)). More importantly, the grammar of the language provides the poet, whether he realizes it consciously or not, several alternate surface forms for communicating the meaning in each of the three imperatives in (15):

(17) (a) Cease your complaints.
(b) Cease complaining.
(c) Cease to complain.
(d) Suspend each rising sigh.
(e) Suspend your sighing.
(f) Cease to accuse the Ruler of the sky.
(g) Cease your accusations (against the ruler of the sky).
(h) Cease accusing the Ruler of the sky.
Given these choices, the poet is then faced with the task of selecting from among the alternatives those which will best fit the metrical, rhetorical, and rhyme demands of the couplet. In a sense, then, a poet must consider the constraints in the grammar, which relates the intended meaning to surface structure, before he considers the constraints which operate in mapping the constituents in the surface sentence onto the abstract couplet form. In the case of (15), Wheatley, by choosing (17a), (17d), and (17f), concedes metrical regularity (the TR for the couplet is 7) in order to realize grammatical imperatives, syntactic balance, metrical balance (balanced initial trochees), and phonetically exact masculine rhymes. This relationship between grammatical constraints and poetic constraints is obviously fundamental to the process of poetic composition.

One particular imperative construction, which we shall call the "say" imperative, demands attention, both because it occurs quite often in Wheatley's poetry and because it apparently does not occur at all in current ordinary English. The following are typical "say" imperatives:

(19) (a) Say in thy breast shall floods of sorrow rise?

13 The "say" imperative appears more than a dozen times throughout nine of Wheatley's forty-five couplet poems.
Say shall its torrents overwhelm thine eyes?
--"To a Clergyman on the Death of His Lady,"

11-12

(b) Say, what the cause that in this proud array
You set your battle in the face of day?
--"Goliath of Gath," 31-32

(c) Say, art thou he, beneath whose vengeful hands
Our best of heroes grasp'd in death the sands?
--"On the Capture of General Lee," 31-32

The "say" imperatives in (18) have at least two things in common: each precedes either a "yes/no" or "WH" question and each requires comma intonation after the imperative verb.\(^1\) They appear to be related to sentences like the following:

(19) (a) Tell me, "Will you serve on the panel?"

(b) Tell me, "Why did you bug my phone?"

(c) Tell me, "Are you the one who quit?"

\(^1\)Comma intonation is required in (18a), despite Wheatley's failure to include the comma. More noticeable, however, is the failure to enclose the direct questions in quotation marks. In Modern English embedded direct questions, like embedded direct quotations, are enclosed in quotation marks.
The exact process by which "say" imperatives are to be derived has not been made clear. The basic problem involved centers on the relationship between say and the direct question which follows it. The machinery for deriving embedded (or indirect) questions obviously will not work, since the questions in (18) have undergone Aux-Shift (inverting the subject NP and the Auxiliary) and the Question Deletion transformation (deleting the empty Q node)—both T-rules which are required to generate direct, but not indirect, questions. It appears that the imperatives in (18) probably have an underlying structure containing to me, since (20a), which is synonymous but has to deleted, and (20b), in which to me emerges, are both possible surface alternatives for (18a), for example:

(20) (a) Tell me, "In thy breast shall floods of sorrow rise?"

(b) Say to me, "In thy breast shall floods of sorrow rise?"

The form in (20b) is perhaps questionable (at least in terms of current ordinary English), and it does not occur in Wheatley's poetry. Lexically, say in (18) should probably be marked as an intransitive verb which undergoes, obligatorily, both the Imperative transformation
and some type of optional transformation deleting to me. This entry for say would be distinguished from say as it appears in the lexicon of ordinary English, where it is specified negatively for the Imperative rule (see Stockwell's entry, p. 784). It would apparently also be distinct from the transitive verb say in such imperatives as (21):

(21) Say your multiplication tables (to me).

It would appear that a generative grammar which would produce the sentences in (19) could also yield Wheatley's sentences in (18). Thus, "say" imperatives are apparently not constructions which require the special machinery of a poetic grammar. However, the precise derivation of sentences like (18) and (19) is simply not yet known.

In addition to appearing quite frequently in elegies and other poems, the imperative is also typically the vehicle for the invocation which initiates several Wheatley poems. The practice is undoubtedly attributable to the young Neoclassical poet's desire to imitate the customs of the Greek and Roman poets. The following are typical examples of Wheatley's use of vocative imperatives:

(22) (a) Ye martial pow'rs, and all ye tuneful nine,
Inspire my song, and aid my high design.

"Goliath of Gath," 1-2
(b) MNELE begin. Inspire, ye sacred nine,

Your vent'rous Afric in her great design.

"On Recollection," 1-2

(c) INDULGENT muse! my grov'ling mind inspire,

And fill my bosom with celestial fire.

"To a Lady on Her Coming to North America . . . .," 1-2

The derivation of these imperatives is apparently different from that described for the example sentence Take the test, discussed earlier. The imperatives in (22a) and (22c) have obviously undergone a conjunction transformation and the word order in (22c) has been altered, but, more important, each of the imperatives in (22) has a so-called noun of direct address.

Although vocatives like those in (22) have been included in calculating the percentage of imperatives in the sentences of Wheatley's poetry, it is not certain that the vocative is a true imperative. Until quite recently, transformational grammarians have regarded vocatives as somehow related to imperatives like Take the test, but Stockwell (635) specifically distinguishes vocatives "from other sentences which appear to be imperative." There are a number of problems yet to be

---

15 About 40 per cent of Wheatley's imperatives are vocatives.
solved in accounting transformationally for vocatives, the most significant of which involves the traditional assumption that you is the "understood," or deep structure, subject of imperatives. As Stockwell (640) notes, in imperatives such as those in (23) it is not certain that you is the underlying subject:

(23) (a) Nobody move.
   (b) Everybody get out as quick as he/you can.
   (c) Somebody pay the bill.
   (d) John, come here.
   (e) Sit down, boys.

Further, if in (23d), for example, John is considered the vocative subject, it should be, but is not, possible to refer to John with a third person pronoun (Stockwell: 640). But in some sentences, like the ambiguous (24):

(24) Somebody take off his coat,

which appears to use a third person NP to refer to the person being addressed, are apparently not related to sentences like (25):

(25) *Take off his coat, somebody,

which cannot take third person anaphora (Stockwell: 640-641).
It is possible that the alternatives sketched by Stockwell (648) will lead to an adequate account of the English imperative. The first of these approaches involves the assumption that a vocative exists in the deep structure of all sentences and that the second person subject of sentences marked Imperative results from the obligatory pronominalization of one of two referentially identical NP's. The other alternative is to assume that a vocative sentence "always contains a second person pronominal NP, marked in some way as co-referential with the vocative" (648). This would mean that the first imperative in (22b), Mneme begin, is derived via the Imperative transformation from the underlying structure Mneme you begin. The details and problems associated with these proposals have, of course, not been worked out. A satisfactory account of the relationship between the "true" imperatives in Wheatley's poetry, like (15), and the vocative imperatives, like those in (22), must await further study of the English imperative.

Questions, the third major type of sentence in Wheatley's poems, are much less common than declaratives and imperatives. Although they are present in more than half her couplet poems, representing every category

16Stockwell, unlike Martin and Rulon (1973), does not posit will in the deep structure of imperatives.
except one (hymns), questions actually account for less than 10 per cent of the total sentences. Most of the questions are rhetorical, a characteristic which, like frequent use of the invocation, signals Wheatley's admiration for the ancient Classical poets. She uses the question in different contexts—argumentative, narrative, elegiac—and displays a preference for WH-questions, which outnumber yes/no questions in her poems by a ratio of 3:2.

Before examining lines that typify Wheatley's questions, let us consider briefly some of the syntactic characteristics of this type of sentence. In the model of grammar we are using, the interrogative sentence is derived from an underlying structure which contains the hypothetical pre-sentence constituent Q(uestion). When

17This figure does not include, of course, indirect questions.

18Yes/no questions are those which elicit either "yes" or "no" as an answer (e.g., Are you going?). WH questions, which typically begin with a "Wh" word (like why or which) require more information (e.g., Why did you scream?). The two types of questions are also distinguished, phonologically, by different intonation patterns. WH questions have a falling intonation pattern; yes/no questions, a rising pattern.
such an underlying structure is fed into the semantic component, the $Q$ serves as a signal that the sentence is to be interpreted semantically as a question. Further, the presence of $Q$ on a deep structure indicates that the structure is to undergo Aux-Shift, a T-rule which changes the word order from that shown in (26) to that found in (27):

(26)  
```
S
  \--- Q
  \--- NP
  \--- AUX
  \--- VP
  \--- Mike
  \--- can
  \--- race
```

(27)  
```
S
  \--- Q
  \--- AUX
  \--- NP
  \--- VP
  \--- Can
  \--- Mike
  \--- race
```

The syntactic changes effected by the transformation are obvious. The subject NP and the Aux have been inverted. In addition, a separate deletion transformation would delete the node $Q$. The surface sentence represented in (27) is, of course, a yes/no question.\footnote{19Accounts of the T-rules involved in producing a negative question can be found in Jacobs and Rosenbaum (1968:20-21) and Martin and Rulon (1973:67-69).}
WH questions are derived in a slightly different manner. The "Wh" words, interrogative pronouns, have as their origin a deep structure Noun marked positively for the features Pronoun and Wh, although, as Jacobs and Rosenbaum (1968:135-154) indicate, pronouns in the lexicon must also be marked either [+WH] or [-WH] to distinguish the personal from the interrogative forms. Transformationally, WH questions are generated by two T-rules: Aux-Shift, which permutes the Aux and the subject NP (as in (28b)), and WH-Shift, which replaces the indefinite NP (anything) in (28c) with a noun marked [+WH]. Thus, the surface sentence (28c) is derived progressively as follows:

(28) (a) Q Sue can sing something. (underlying form)
    (b) Q Can Sue sing anything? (Aux Shift)
    (c) What can Sue sing? (WH-Shift)

The lines below are fairly typical, both syntactically and rhetorically, of Wheatley's use of the interrogative sentence:

20 For an interesting tentative analysis of the feature makeup of "Wh" words, see Martin and Rulon (1973:117).

21 "Atheism," one of the poems first published in 1970 by Kuncio, exhibits far more punctuation irregularities than any other Wheatley poem. Hence, needed punctuation marks have been supplied.
(29) (a) If ['twas not written by the hand of God [,]
Why was it sealed with Immanuel's blood [?]
---"Atheism," 13-14

(b) What felt these poets but you feel the same?
Does not your soul possess the sacred flame?
---"To Maecenas," 3-4

(c) Still do you weep, still wish for his return?
How cruel thus to wish, and thus to mourn?
---"To a Lady and Her Children, on the Death of Her Son and Their Brother," 25-26

In (29a) the WH question facilitates an effective adaptation of the conditional ("If . . . then") syllogism in a poem designed to refute the claims of atheism. Syntactically, the question is derived, by the process described above, from the underlying structure in (30):

(30) Q it was sealed with Immanuel's blood.

Couplet (29b), consisting of balanced questions (one WH, one yes/no), reflects Wheatley's tendency to use the rhetorical question to voice praise indirectly. The subject being addressed in this case is probably John Wheatley, her master, whom she seeks to exalt to the ranks of the poets by eliciting the obvious answers
"nothing" and "yes," respectively. The first line of (29b), a "poetic" version of the sentence What did these poets feel, but that you feel the same?, requires that the grammar provide some feature transfer mechanism for transferring the inflectional feature "tense" from the Aux, the normal tense-bearing constituent, to the stem of the verb.  This operation would have to precede the Aux Deletion transformation, of course.

The final, and least numerous, type of sentence in Wheatley's poetry is the exclamation. Exclamatory sentences, which make up less than 5 per cent of the total sentences in the poems, appear in fewer than half of the poems. They are fairly common in the elegies, although the single poem having the heaviest concentration of exclamations is the philosophical poem "Thoughts on the Works of Providence." "What" exclamations outnumber "how" exclamations by almost 2 to 1.

Before examining some Wheatley couplets containing exclamations, it is necessary to define the exclamatory sentence in syntactic terms. In traditional grammars, the label "exclamatory" has generally been used for those sentences which were marked at the orthographic level by an exclamation point (!). The term was essentially a

\[22\] A similar process is discussed by Stockwell (1973:359) in connection with certain conjoined sentences.
description of the manner in which the sentence was to be performed. Thus, each of the four sentences below would have been classified "exclamatory":

(31) (a) Stop it!
    (b) The President's been shot!
    (c) What gorgeous legs she has!
    (d) How nice you are!

In our analysis, based on syntactic features, (31a) would be considered an imperative; (31b), a declarative; and (31c-d), exclamations. Thus, we are restricting the label "exclamation" to those sentences which contain at the surface level either an adjective (or adverb) modified by an intensifier (like how, as in (31d)) or a Noun Phrase the indefinite determiner of which is preceded by a Pre-determiner (like what, as in (31c)).

Transformationally, the exclamations so described are generated by a WH-Shift rule (cf. Jacobs and Rosenbaum's WH Question transformation (1968:156)). The T-rule front-shifts the underlined elements in (32) and (33):

---

23I am indebted to Silas Griggs, Professor of English at North Texas State University, for this analysis of the exclamation.

24It should be noted that the article that precedes the NP in (33) must be indefinite.
(32) Your eyes are how beautiful! (Intensifier- Adjective)

(33) You have what a physique! (Predeterminer- Determiner-NP)

The results are, respectively, (34) and (35):

(34) How beautiful your eyes are!

(35) What a physique you have!

WH-Shift may also produce exclamations by being applied to subject, rather than object, NP's, as illustrated in (36):

(36) What scenes of horror came before us!

The words what and how, one of which appears in each sentence that we classify exclamatory, are members of a set of words in the lexicon that have the features [+N +PRONOUN -DEFINITE +WH]. It is perhaps possible to permit exclamatory sentences containing such (as an option for what) and so (as an option for how) by positing the choice in the deep structure and distinguishing such and so from what and how, respectively, by the feature [-WH].
The following lines (except (37a)) illustrate the manner in which Wheatley characteristically uses the exclamation:

(37) (a) They rais'd him up but to each present ear
What martial glories did his tongue declare [!] 
"On the Death of Mr. Snider Murder'd by Richardson," 9-10

(b) What heav'nly grandeur should exalt her strain!
What holy raptures in her numbers reign!
"On the Death of a Young Gentleman," 11-12

(c) Almighty, in these wond'rous works of thine,
What Pow'r, what Wisdom, and what Goodness shine!
"Thoughts on the Works of Providence," 25-26

An exception has to be made for (37a) because it is the only exclamation cited in which the WH-Shift rule has been applied to an object NP. Wheatley, in general, constructs sentences in which this T-rule is applied to the subject NP, as (37b-c) indicate. In "how" exclamations, such as (38):
(38) Who strung thy feeble arms with might unknown,
How great thy conquest, and how bright thy crown!

"On the Death of a Young Gentleman," 3-4

the "WH-ed" element is, of course, under the domination of VP. The exclamation, like the question, is a relatively flexible structure for Wheatley. It serves in a narrative context in (37a), for example, in addition to its more common use as mere exaltation. Its superlative nature is, perhaps, one reason why Wheatley uses the exclamation less frequently than the other sentence types. Excessive use would diminish its effectiveness.

Before we proceed to other aspects of Wheatley's syntax, let us pause briefly to summarize our findings on the types of sentences found in her poetry. The most common Wheatley sentence is the declarative. Though the proportion of declaratives varies from poem to poem and category to category, declaratives account for almost three fourths of the sentences, overall. The "may" declarative, which is especially noticeable in the elegies and occasional poems, occurs frequently enough to be regarded as "characteristic"; however, as we saw, this type of declarative poses some syntactical problems yet to be solved. The second most common sentence in Wheatley's
poems—the imperative also appears quite often in the elegies, though it can be found in practically all of her poems. About 20 per cent of the sentences are imperatives, two types of which (the "say" imperative and the vocative) also offer some syntactic problems. The "say" imperative, which is peculiar to poetic language, is seemingly closely enough related to "Tell me" imperatives to be generated by the grammar of ordinary English (though the exact derivational process is not clear). Vocatives, typically the sentence form found in Wheatley's invocations to the muses, are still pretty much a grammatical challenge. There appears to be no reason, however, why "poetic" vocatives cannot be generated by the grammar of ordinary English. Questions, a third sentence type, are only about half as common as imperatives in Wheatley's poetry. Most of the questions are rhetorical, evidence perhaps of the young American poet's attempt to mimic the techniques of Greek and Roman poets. Syntactically, the question takes one of two forms: the WH question and the yes/no question. The former occurs about twice as frequently as the latter. In adapting surface questions to the couplet form, Wheatley does occasionally construct sentences that require modification of the rules contained in the grammar.
of ordinary English. It is possible that it will ultimately prove more advantageous to account for sentences peculiar to poetry in a special "poetic" grammar, rather than complicate the grammar of English. Finally, exclamations, which we define as WH constructions, are the least prevalent of the four sentence types in Wheatley's poems. Though they are fairly customary in the elegies, they occur in fewer than half of the poems overall and account for less than 5 per cent of the total sentences. Of the two types of exclamations we distinguished, the "what" exclamations outnumbered "how" exclamations by a ratio of 2 to 1. Wheatley's exclamations, as defined, can be derived simply enough by the grammar that generates ordinary sentences.

Thus far in this chapter we have been concerned with the types of sentences Wheatley writes, and we have ignored, for the most part, her techniques of fitting these sentences into the couplet form. Now let us examine in the next few pages, first, her arrangement of the various sentence types into patterns of balance encouraged by the couplet structure. Following this, we note her use of two syntactic processes—permutation and deletion—in achieving surface sentences which meet verse demands.
The fact that the heroic couplet is constructed of two metrically similar, if not identical, lines joined phonologically by end rhyme, invites a poet to actualize this structure linguistically by balancing the syntax in one line of the couplet against that in the other. Further, the division by caesura of each line into hemistichs encourages the poet to balance the internal elements of the couplet line. Thus, the first hemistich in the first line of a couplet may be syntactically balanced with the second hemistich in that line, or with the first or second hemistich in the second line of the couplet. And, of course, it is not difficult to find passages in which poets ignore couplet boundaries and create larger patterns of balance, pitting couplet against couplet.

Some couplet poets—Pope is probably one of the best examples—demonstrate a strong sensitivity to the structure of both the line and the couplet. The syntax of their poetry is accordingly marked by frequent, elaborate, and often sophisticated patterns of balance. Though such constructions are present throughout Wheatley's poetry, it is apparent that she was not particularly concerned with achieving either frequent or complex patterns of balance. She counterposes line against line only occasionally. The construction most often involved in this arrangement is the complete sentence, as (39) indicates:
(39) There shall thy tongue in heav'nly murmurs
    flow,
    And there my muse with heav'nly transport
    glow. . . .
    --"To S. M., a Young African Painter, on
    Seeing His Works," 27-28

The near perfect grammatical symmetry of these lines,
however, is the exception rather than the rule in
Wheatley's poems. More typical are the loosely balanced
elements in this couplet:25

(40) What pangs excruciating must molest,
    What sorrows labor in my parent's breast?
    --"To the Right Honourable William, Earl of
    Dartmouth . . . ," 27-28

In lines 50-53 of "To Maecenas," Wheatley demonstrates
both the exception and the rule in successive couplets
by achieving a nearly exact correspondence of gram-
matical elements in the clauses of the first couplet,
followed by more loosely balanced clauses in the next
couplet:

25Here, as in several other places, Wheatley
punctuates an exclamatory statement with a question
mark.
(41) While Phoebus reigns above the starry train
While bright Aurora purples o'er the main,
So long, great Sir, the muse thy praise shall sing,
So long the praise shall make Parnassus ring.

Lines with perfectly symmetrical syntax are not characteristic of Wheatley's poetic language.

Much more common than line-to-line balance in her poems are instances of intraline balance, hemistich versus hemistich. In these, as in the cases of line-to-line balance, the correspondence is rarely exact. The balance is attained with a variety of syntactic units; sometimes with verb phrases, as when she speaks of one recently deceased who

(42) Has ceased to languish, and forgot to mourn.

"To the Honourable T. H. Esq.; on the Death of His Daughter," 26

sometimes with NP's, as when she describes Niobe's love which destroys

(43) Each blooming maid, and each celestial boy [ , ]

"Niobe in Distress . . . ," 36
and sometimes with sentences, as (44) illustrates:

(44) You best remember and you best can sing [.]
--"Goliath of Gath," 5

In Wheatley's extracouplet patterns of balance, as in the instances of line-to-line and half-line balance, the correspondence is likely to be approximate rather than exact. Extracouplet patterns, which are relatively rare in her poetry, are usually confined to passages of not more than six or eight lines and usually depend heavily on anaphora.26 An illustrative passage is the periodic construction in the elegy "To a Clergyman on the Death of His Lady" (1-5):

(45) Where contemplation finds her sacred spring,
    Where heav'ly music makes the arches ring,
    Where virtue reigns unsully'd and divine,
    Where wisdom thron'd, and all the graces shine,
    There sits thy spouse amidst the radiant thron.

The balance in this passage exists at a very general level (roughly parallel adverbial clauses) and admits a great

26 Anaphora is a rhetorical arrangement involving the repetition of the same expression at the beginning of successive lines.
deal of variation in detail. The same characteristics are present in another elegiac passage, except that in this case the balanced couplets, again adverbial clauses, follow rather than precede the principal clause:*

(46) The raptur'd babe replies,

"Thanks to my God, who snatch'd me to the skies,
"E'er vice triumphant had possess'd my heart,
"E'er yet the tempter had beguil'd my heart,
"E'er yet on sin's base actions I was bent,
"E'er yet I knew temptation's dire intent;
"E'er yet the lash for horrid crimes I felt,
"E'er vanity had led my way to guilt. . . . ["

"A Funeral Poem on the Death of C. E., an Infant of Twelve Months," 13-20

Somewhat more complicated than these relatively straightforward instances of extracouplet balance is the following shorter passage, relating the death of two of Niobe's sons, killed by Apollo's shaft while wrestling:

(47) Together they their cruel fate bemoan'd,

Together languish'd, and together groan'd:

27The spelling in this passage is confusing. Orthographically, e'er appears to be an elliptical form of ever. It is likely, however, that Wheatley intended the poetic form ere ('before'), a more satisfactory choice semantically.
Together too th' unbodied spirits fled,
And sought the gloomy mansions of the dead.

——"Niobe in Distress . . . ," 133-136

Here anaphora cooperates with an overall syntactic pattern in which the first lines of successive couplets are joined with a line having perfectly balanced hemistichs, in what is perhaps an attempt to reinforce the filial and physical relationship of the two brothers.

The types of balance examined above and the fact that balanced syntactic units are not extremely common in Wheatley's poetry suggest that she did not typically exploit the structural features of the heroic couplet for the attainment of syntactical symmetry. Of the three types of balance examined, intraline balance is much more common than either line-to-line balance or extracouplet balance. Rhetorically speaking, her balanced expressions serve quite simply to reinforce or emphasize; they are never witty, satirical, or epigrammatical.

Examination of Wheatley's poetry reveals that two other aspects of the couplet—rhyme and meter—exerted a much more direct influence on her syntax than did the organization of the line or the couplet as a whole. It would be tedious, if not outright impossible, to describe every syntactic maneuver which Wheatley made in attempting
to attain rhyme and meter, but one of her most characteristic reactions to these demands is distortion of normal word order.

The most logical method of analyzing altered word order in Wheatley's lines is to show how it differs from normal word order, i.e., the order of constituents that normally prevails in ordinary sentences generated by the grammar of English. To illustrate the concept of normal word order, let us consider some of the basic patterns of declarative sentences generated by the grammar from the underlying structure of the sentence as shown earlier in (6):

\[
\text{(48)}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} \\
\text{AUX} \\
\text{VP}
\end{array}
\]

(a) The car took off.
(b) The car didn't take off.
(c) Old ladies should go first.
(d) He has seen the problem.
(e) Something naughty was happening in there.
(f) The office is in Dallas.
(g) My colleagues were Methodists.
(h) The panel viewpoints were quite interesting.
(1) The father should have been giving Todd the shots.

As (48) illustrates, Aux dominates the first auxiliary verb in a poly-word verbal construction. This particular constituent (Aux) plays an important role in word order, especially in sentences involving permutation and deletion. The NP's in (48) are relatively simple constructions, consisting of either a noun (preceded by a determiner and, optionally, an adjective), a pronoun, or a relativized construction (i.e., a head noun followed by a reduced embedded sentence, as in (48e)). The Verb Phrases exhibit a great deal of diversity, a fact which will be of major concern in accounting for Wheatley's use of permutation rules.

It will be helpful, before discussing this process in poetry, to note the permutation rules that operate in ordinary language. In addition to optional transformations which specify the positions of certain classes of adverbs, there are T-rules which relocate the other constituents in the sentence. The WH-Shift rule, for instance, transports from its ordinary position in the sentence any constituent marked in the deep structure with the feature [+WH].\(^{28}\) It is by this rule that we derive relative clauses, information

\(^{28}\)Jacobs and Rosenbaum (1968) use separate, less general rules to account for the sentences in (49). WH-Shift incorporates their separate rules.
interrogatives (i.e., WH questions), indirect questions (as in (49c) below), and exclamations:

\[(49)\]
(a) That is the picture which I painted.
(b) Where did he work?
(c) He asked what I had written.
(d) What a character he is!

A second permutation T-rule is the Aux-Shift rule. It moves the Aux from its normal post-subject position to a pre-subject position in such sentences as:

\[(50)\]
(a) Are the Cowboys winning?
(b) Did you see that dirty movie?
(c) Had I been informed, I would have.
(d) Seldom have I been so humiliated.
(e) Will you please be seated.

Another permutation rule of interest is the Particle Shift rule, which transports an adverbial particle from its ordinary position before the object NP to a position following it, as in:

\[(51)\]
(a) The landlady threw out the lazy bum.
(b) The landlady threw the lazy bum out.

This rule is particularly helpful to poets, since it aids
them in altering the rhythm of a line and in securing an appropriate rhyme word.

Three more rules must be mentioned. The Indirect Object Shift rule relocates an indirect object from its final position to a position between the verb and the object, deleting the attached preposition in the process. The sentences in (52) illustrate:

(52) (a) Sam gave a petunia to Grace.
     (b) Sam gave Grace a petunia.

A fifth transformation, the Object Shift rule, frontshifts an object from its final position to sentence initial position. (This rule appears to be governed by the extra-sentential context.) Object Shift has been applied in:

(53) (a) That I doubt.
     (b) These questions the student must answer.

Finally, the Passive transformation permutes the subject and object NP's around the main verb, making certain other syntactic changes in the process, as in:

(54) (a) Louis smashed the door.
     (b) The door was smashed by Louis.

These six rules are in general quite well understood, and formal accounts of them may be found throughout the literature.
There is one other type of permutation that should be mentioned, since it apparently cannot be derived by the application of any single one of the six T-rules above. The wrenched word order that prevails in (55) may possibly involve two separate transformations:

(55) (a) Out the door stormed the angry son.
    (b) Calm are the waters of the Pacific.

These examples may be either intransitive sentences or copulative sentences in which the WH VP has either been partially or totally frontshifted. It is possible that (b), for example, is derived as follows:

(56) (a) The waters of the Pacific are calm.
    (underlying form)
    (b) Calm the waters of the Pacific are.
        (Adjective Shift Rule)
    (c) Calm are the waters of the Pacific.
        (Aux-Shift Rule)

Whether this account will ultimately prove satisfactory is not at all clear, but (55a-b) do occur in English and should therefore be included as a possibility for altering normal word order.

In arriving at lines that meet the demands of rhyme and meter imposed by the heroic couplet, Wheatley makes
frequent use of the permutation rules outlined above. She relies on these T-rules to provide more fortuitous reorderings of not only sentence constituents, but also the internal elements of Noun Phrases and Verb Phrases. Her use of an optional Adverbial Preposing transformation, one of the most common methods of altering word order for desired rhymes and metrical regularity, is illustrated in (57) (the shifted element is underlined):

(57) (a) Among the mental pow'rs a question rose,
--"Thoughts on the Works of Providence," 104
(b) The hosts on two opposing mountains stood...
--"Goliath of Gath," 11
(c) They fan in you the bright immortal fire...
--"To Maecenas," 34

In (57a) the PP is a locative adverbial which can (along with Time adverbial PP's) be transported by a PP Preposing rule to sentence initial position from a position under the domination of VP.\(^{29}\) The adverbial PP's in (57b-c)

\(^{29}\) As Jackendoff (1972:95) points out, it is necessary to order the PP Preposing rule, which moves sentence adverbials, and the preposing rule that moves time and locative PP's out of the VP. The former must be applied first to insure that time and locative adverbials occupy only the initial position when shifted.
undergo a similar preposing rule, but are not moved out from under the domination of VP. Such a rule can shift a time or locative adverbial from its normal post-verb position to a position before the verb (as in (57b)) and to various positions between the verb and other VP constituents (for example, between the verb and object NP, as in (57c)).

It is difficult to determine in these examples, and in many similar ones, whether rhyme or meter—or both—motivated the reordering. In (57a) rhyme appears to have been the stronger motive. Although pow'rs, the rhyme word if normal word order prevailed, is not a formidable rhyme, shows is obviously the best rhyme word in the second line of the couplet:

(58) What most the image of th' Eternal shows?

Metrically, the surface options for (57a) are either Wheatley's choice or the normal word order version (both yield TR's of zero), since moving the PP to a post-subject position would produce an excessively high TR of 10. In (57c), which is the second line of a couplet, the need for a word to rhyme with retire is likely the reason for the permutation, since you is a common rhyme and in you provides the iambic stress pattern needed. However, in (57b)
the decision to shift the PP appears to be motivated by both rhyme and meter, since mountains, with its unaccented final syllable, would violate the metrical pattern and fail to produce the favored masculine rhyme.

This type of permutation, involving the relocation of an adverbial PP, occurs throughout Wheatley's poetry. Its frequency is probably attributable to the fact that Wheatley is using a very common T-rule which is normally restricted to single-word adverbs, placing them in various positions in the sentence. For example, quickly can appear in sentence initial position, in auxiliary position (between the subject and main verb), and in final position, as (59) indicates:

(59) (a) Quickly, the hosts stood.
    (b) The hosts quickly stood.
    (c) The hosts stood quickly.

The T-rule Wheatley has applied cannot be used indiscriminately, as she may have assumed, although the assumption that adverbials and PP's exhibit similar syntactic behavior has some support (see Jackendoff (1972:94), for example). Certain adverbial PP's dominated by S (those designating time and place, for example) cannot occupy
the position between the subject and the main verb.

Thus, only (60a) is an acceptable paraphrase, or re-ordering, of (60a): 30

(60) (a) The man decided on the boat on the train.
(b) The man decided on the train on the boat.
(c) The man on the train decided on the boat.
(d) On the train, the man decided on the boat.

Also common in Wheatley's poems are lines in which the object NP has been moved by the application of Object Shift. The following lines exemplify the common surface form:

(61) (a) Your armies I defy, Your force
despise. . . .
--"Goliath of Gath," 37
(b) This mental voice shall man regardless hear,
And never, never raise the filial pray'r?
--"Thoughts on the Works of Providence,"

65-66

(c) Harmonious lays the feather'd race resume,
Dart the bright eye, and shake the painted plume.
--"An Hymn to the Morning," 9-10

30 The example is drawn from Chomsky (1965:101-102).
(d) How sweet the sound when we her plaudit hear? 
    Sweeter than music to the ravish'd ear. . . .
    "On Recollection," 21-22

In addition to facilitating the attainment of metrical regularity and phonetic identity in the rhyme words, Object Shift assists the poet rhetorically and semantically. It permits the foregrounding (focusing rhetorical emphasis on an item by placing it in initial position) of the object NP, as in (61a), and it may allow the poet to produce a semantic interplay between the rhymes (e.g., the connotative similarity between the verb hear, stating the action, and the noun ear, the instrument). In (61c) foregrounding and the phonetic similarity between resume and plume are apparently the motives for frontshifting the object NP, since the metrical pattern of the line would be unchanged if normal word order prevailed.

A poet, however, may not capriciously shift object NP's to initial position in satisfying poetic requirements. He must observe certain semantic constraints contained in the grammar. An examination of the normal word order version of these lines reveals the nature of these constraints:

(62) (a) I defy your armies, [I] despise your force.
(b) Shall man hear this mental voice regardless and never, never raise the filial prayer?
(c) The feathered race resume the harmonious lays,
Dart the bright eye, and shake the painted plume.
(d) How sweet the sound [is] when we hear her plaudit?
[It is] sweeter than music to the ravished ear.

For example, in (62b), (62c), and (62d) the object NP which has been shifted contains the feature [-Animate], but the subject NP with which it co-occurs is [+Animate]. This fact suggests that Object Shift is perhaps restricted to strings which have their subject and object NP’s so marked. The sentences in (63a) and (63b) appear to confirm this hypothesis:

(63) (a) The students surprised the teacher.
(b) *The teacher the students surprised.

In (63b) it is impossible to tell which is the subject NP and which is the object NP, since both are [+human]. In (62a), though, Wheatley has applied Object Shift to similar strings (i.e., strings with both subject and object
NP's marked [+human]) without producing an ambiguous sentence. The recoverability of the deep structure in (62a) is owing to a property of language called redundancy. The concord between I and defy, despise and the fact that I is not an objective pronoun form serve to identify I as the subject of the sentence. Thus, Wheatley can regard reordering by Object Shift as a possibility only for a sentence which has either (1) a subject NP marked [+animate] and an object NP marked [-animate] or (2) redundant signals which convey the syntactical relations between the constituents.

Another permutation pattern very popular with Wheatley also involves the relocation of the object NP, but to a different position in the sentence. By a T-rule (we will call it Pr(osodic)-Object-Shift) which is needed to account for certain poetic sentences, but apparently not any ordinary sentences, Wheatley quite often transports the object NP from its usual final position to a position immediately preceding the main verb. A line such as (64) results:

\[\text{Sentences having undergone this transformation seem to be peculiar to poetry. Native speakers would not normally regard such sentences as My wife the meal cooked as acceptable. One might speculate, on the basis of this, that the linguistic advantages offered by Pr-Object-Shift are purely poetic, whereas the changes made by Object Shift--especially foregrounding--serve as an impetus for its application in both poetic and ordinary language.}\]
(64) And now the youth the forceful pebble flung...

--"Goliath of Gath," 174

This sentence, which in normal word order reads "And the youth flung the forceful pebble now," resembles (61b-d) in that it contains a [+animate] subject NP and a [-animate] object NP. It appears that these feature specifications, which were a requirement for the application of Object Shift, must also be present in order for Pr-Object-Shift to apply. For example, consider (65a-b):

(65) (a) The man killed the bear.

(b) *The man the bear killed.

Again, as in (63b), it is not clear which is the subject NP and which is the object NP. Pr-Object-Shift, like Object Shift, can also be applied to strings having the feature [+animate] on both the subject and the object NP, as (66) indicates:

(66) But how shall we the British king reward!

--"To the King's Most Excellent Majesty," 6

The nominative form of the pronoun (we) cannot occur as an object NP and must, therefore, be the subject.
It is not surprising to discover that when this poetic transformation is applied to sentences not containing sufficient redundancy signals or not possessing the appropriately specified NP's, ambiguity results. Perhaps the best example of this appears in one of Wheatley's philosophical poems, "Thoughts on the Works of Providence" (93-94):

(67) What pow'r, 0 man! thy reason then restores,  
So long suspended in nocturnal hours?

Given the uncertainties of Wheatley's punctuation, one cannot easily tell in isolation whether this couplet is a WH exclamation in which the object NP has undergone WH-Shift or whether it is a WH question which has subsequently undergone Pr-Object-Shift. Technically, both NP's involved (reason, pow'r) are [-animate]; however, the verb restores demands an animate subject. One of the NP's must therefore be personified (i.e., it must be assigned the feature [+animate]), but it is not clear in (67) which one has. That (67) is indeed a WH question with pow'r as its subject and reason as its transposed object can be determined by considering the broader context, especially the following couplet:
What secret hand returns the mental train,
And gives improy'd thine active pow'rs again?

Except for the loss of foregrounding, the poetic advantages afforded by Pr-Object-Shift are essentially the same as those realized by Object Shift. It is obvious, for instance, that (64), repeated for convenience as (69a), is metrically less complex than (69b), and that **flung**, as a masculine rhyme, is superior to the feminine rhyme **pebble**, in the version shown in (69c):

(69) (a) And now the youth the forceful pebble flung. . . .
(b) And now the pebble the forceful youth flung.
(c) And now the youth flung the forceful pebble.

It should be noted that (69b) is the surface sentence which would emerge if Wheatley had applied Object Shift. Since (69b) has a high TR, it is obvious that Object Shift was, in this case, a less attractive reordering rule than Pr-Object-Shift, which produces a perfectly regular meter.

The application of a special poetic transformation or the regular permutation T-rules in the grammar is not the only way a poet may reorder the constituents of a sentence. One of the most prevalent patterns of
distorted word order in Wheatley's poems is the sequence Noun-Adjective (e.g., love divine), instead of the normal Adjective-Noun order (divine love). It is perhaps ironic that in one sense the Noun-Adjective sequence is less complex than its normal order counterpart. Transformationally, the adjective, which is derived via several T-rules from a separate source sentence in the deep structure, remains to the right of the noun until the final transformation, Adjectival VP Shift, is applied. This rule shifts the adjective to its normal position at the left of the noun. The Noun-Adjective sequence, then, is less complex than normal word order in that it does not undergo the final permutation transformation, which is obligatory in ordinary English. Thus, Wheatley permutes the internal elements of an NP by failing to apply an otherwise obligatory rule.

It appears that in the majority of cases, Wheatley seeks the Noun-Adjective sequence for metrical purposes. In the examples below, failure to apply Adjectival VP Shift decreases the metrical complexity of the line:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normal Order</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>Inverted Order</th>
<th>TR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>that divine grace</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>that grace divine</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W S W S</td>
<td>W S W S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For details on the transformational derivation of adjectives, see Jacobs and Rosenbaum (1968:199-212).
It becomes even more obvious that such sequences are metrically motivated when one encounters lines like (70), in which Wheatley refrains from transposing the adjective:

(70) But thou was deaf to the divine decree. . . .

"Goliath of Gath," 171

Since divine and decree both consist of a weakly stressed syllable followed by a strongly stressed one, there is no metrical advantage to be gained by reversing the order. This would not, of course, preclude an inversion to attain the desired rhyme.

The instances of permutation we have discussed thus far (displacement of adverbials, object NP's, and adjectives) recur with considerable frequency throughout the poetry of Wheatley. It is apparent that she found the T-rules which effected these reorderings quite useful. Some of the permutation T-rules which we enumerated earlier, however, are used sparingly by Wheatley. For
instance, there are very few lines like (71), in which the indirect object has been shifted from its usual final position to a position in front of the object:

(71) Who taught thee conflict with the pow'rs of night. . . .

---"On the Death of a Young Gentleman," 1

Lines containing indirect objects are just as likely to maintain normal word order, as (72) indicates:

(72) The judge of all the gods,

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Will give thine armies to the savage brood. . . .

---"Goliath of Gath," 126-128

And, in some cases, she retains the preposition which is normally lost in the application of Indirect-Object Shift:

(73) Who can to thee their tend'rest aid refuse?

---"To a Clergyman on the Death of His Lady," 42

Couplet containing sentences which have undergone the Passive transformation (e.g., (74a)) or the Particle Shift (e.g., (74b)) are also relatively rare in Wheatley's poetry:
(74) (a) He, the first born of great Amphion's bed,
Was struck the first, first mingled with
the dead.

--"Niobe in Distress . . . ," 119-120

(b) 'Till pitying Delos took the wand'rer in

--"Niobe in Distress . . . ," 78

It will be noted that in (74a) the agent-naming pre-
positional phrase (by Apollo) has been optionally deleted.

Lines like (74b) are scarce in Wheatley's poems, although
particles, which take a stress similar to that of adverbs,
are not particularly undesirable rhymes.

Although it became apparent in our discussion of
Wheatley's use of certain transformations that a poet is
not permitted absolute freedom in rearranging the con-
stituents of a sentence, the fact should be re-emphasized.

A brief examination of the lines below, which we classify
as grammatically unmetrical, will illustrate the nature
of word order boundaries within which the poet must
operate:

(75) (a) As a young plant by hurricanes up torn,
So near its parent lies the newly born--
--"To a Lady on the Death of Three
Relations," 19-20
(b) Eye him in all, his holy name revere,
Upright your actions, and your hearts sincere... 
"On the Death of a Young Lady of Five Years of Age," 31-32

(c) This great assembly too shall witness stand,
That needs nor sword, nor spear, th' Almighty's hand... 
"Goliath of Gath," 164-165

The matter in (75a) of interest is the inversion of the verb and particle in up torn. The normal word order reading of this sentence is: "The newly born lies so near its parent, as [if it were] a young plant torn up by hurricanes." As we have seen, it would be possible to derive (76) from the underlying sentence Hurricanes tore up a young plant by Particle Shift:

(76) Hurricanes tore the young plant up.

Or, if we maintain the passive version, with a shifted adverbial PP, we may derive (77):

(77) As a young plant by hurricanes torn up.

If the grammar permits (75a), however, it must also allow the following clearly deviant (and "unpoetic") strings:
(78) *God off turned the sun.

(79) *Nixon up threw his hands.

Wheatley, perhaps in an attempt to prevent up from occupying the rhyme position, has in this case exceeded the reordering limits imposed by the grammar by shifting a particle to a pre-verb position.

The portion of (75b) that concerns us is the deviant imperative construction Upright your actions, which probably has the underlying form:

(80) Imp You will keep your actions upright.

By applying the Imperative transformation and deleting the Imp node, we arrive at the ordinary imperative:

(81) Keep your actions upright.

Evidently the only other position in (81) to which upright (which has been called an objective complement by some traditional grammarians) can be shifted is the position to the immediate right of the main verb, although (82) is not very likely:

(82) ?Keep upright your actions.

However, a T-rule which permits (82) also admits (83) and (84):
Now if we apply (as Wheatley apparently does) a T-rule which under certain specified conditions deletes the main verb, we get from (82-84), respectively, (85-87):

(85) *Upright your actions.
(86) *Red your house.
(87) *Chaste the nuns.

All are clearly ungrammatical. Whether Wheatley's motive for this syntactic maneuver was to maintain a low TR or to construct some complex zeugmatic pattern is not apparent. What is obvious, however, is that she has once again exceeded permissible bounds in wrenching the word order of (75b).

The manner in which Wheatley has violated grammatical restrictions in (75c) is more complex. In normal word order, the line reads: "This great assembly shall stand witness too, that the Almighty's hand needs nor sword nor spear." Admittedly, the normal word order is far from poetic, but it does make apparent to us the syntactic relations that pertain. It is possible, perhaps, to arrive at (75c) by applying Pr-Object-Shift, which would yield in part:
(88) The Almighty's hand nor sword, nor spear needs.

In addition to the Complementizer transformation, there is apparently also some sort of NP backshifting T-rule required to transport the subject NP of the embedded sentence (the Almighty's hand) to final position. Such a transformation is not tolerated within the grammar, since it would place the subject NP of a sentence under the domination of VP, where it would be interpreted erroneously as the object of the sentence. It is possible, for example, to derive (75c), through a conjunction deletion rule, from the rough intermediate structure:

(89) This great assembly . . . that needs nor sword, nor spear, nor the Almighty's hand . . .

Thus, in effecting a permutation that is prohibited by the grammar, Wheatley has written a sentence the deep structure of which cannot be recovered.

Let us summarize briefly now what we have concluded concerning Wheatley's use of permutation rules to alter normal word order. In general, the desire for metrical regularity and rhymes with appropriate phonetic and semantic features are factors strongly influencing the most common of Wheatley's inversions, those involving the relocation of adverbial PP's and object NP's. In the
latter case, however, the semantic and rhetorical advantages gained by "foregrounding" are probably also a factor. To account for Wheatley's practice of shifting the object NP to a pre-verb position within the VP, a T-rule (Pr-Object-Shift) was postulated. This rule is apparently not required for the generation of ordinary (unpoetic) sentences. Further, we noted Wheatley often adjusts the rhythm in her lines by failing to apply the adjective shift rule. Finally, we observed that certain permutation rules (Passive, Indirect-Object Shift, and Particle Shift) are chosen less frequently than others in Wheatley's conversion of ordinary surface sentences into poetic lines.

In much the same way that a poet finds it necessary to reorder the constituents of a sentence for poetic reasons, he also finds it advantageous to delete certain items. The deletion process in a grammar is one that permits the generation of surface structures that are not fully represented syntactically. Technically, it can be thought of as a substitution process in which the null element is substituted for a full element. We have already seen the result of deletion T-rules in our earlier discussion of imperatives, for example. Obviously, such rules are of considerable interest to the couplet poet, who is concerned with communicating meaning through
surface sentences that do not exceed the permitted number of syllables.

Before examining deletion processes in Wheatley's poetry, let us look briefly at some pertinent deletion rules contained in the grammar. Our list is by no means exhaustive, for we have deliberately excluded those rules which operate at the intermediate level in the derivation of surface sentences (e.g., the Question Deletion rule posited by Jacobs and Rosenbaum (1968:152)), as well as some other rules of little interest in our analysis. The rules we comment upon are quite general, high level rules (i.e., they are applied late in the transformation cycle) which are usually optional.

Relative Pronoun Deletion is a good example of such a rule, since it is a late rule, optionally applied to delete a relative pronoun in a string which has undergone relativization. It can only be applied, however, to those strings in which the relative pronoun occurs between the head NP and the subject NP of the embedded sentence. Its effect is to convert (90), for example, into (91):

(90) The house that I rent sold yesterday.
(91) The house I rent sold yesterday.

If the relative pronoun functions as the subject of the embedded sentence, this rule cannot apply, as (93) indicates:
(92) This is the girl who won the crown.

(93)*This is the girl won the crown.

That Wheatley would be interested in the type of deletion afforded by this rule is obvious, since it can reduce the syllable count and assist in placing the appropriate word in the rhyme slot.

Another similar rule, Relative Clause Reduction, permits the deletion of the relative pronoun subject of an embedded sentence when it precedes a constituent (or segment) marked [+copula +present]. The copula segment, which is ultimately realized as a form of be if allowed to surface, is also deleted in the process of changing, for instance, (94) to (95):

(94) The blonde who is lying on the beach is gorgeous.

(95) The blonde lying on the beach is gorgeous.

A further restriction for Relative Clause Reduction is that the verbal following the copula segment must be realized as a verb, not an adjective (i.e., it must be marked [+verb]). Otherwise, the ungrammatical (97) will result from (96):

(96) Novels which are dirty fascinate Puritans.

(97)*Novels dirty fascinate Puritans.
This rule provides the poet even greater syllabic economy than Relative Pronoun Deletion.

A third deletion T-rule of interest is Complementizer Deletion, which deletes the clause complementizer (that), part of the infinitive complementizer (for . . . to), and part of the gerundive complementizer (a genitive noun plus an affix, usually represented orthographically as 's . . . ing). This rule, for example, converts the sentences in (98) to those in (99), respectively:

(98) (a) Kevin knew that Bill would be drafted.
    (b) Mother doesn't like for you to date him.
    (c) The judge didn't appreciate Joe's lying in court.

(99) (a) Kevin knew Bill would be drafted.
    (b) Mother doesn't like you to date him.
    (c) The judge didn't appreciate Joe lying in court.

The restrictions on applying this rule are difficult to generalize. The rule is blocked for (98a), for example, if the complement is shifted to sentence initial position. And the infinitive complementizer is fully represented at the surface level when the complementized NP is the subject NP, but may receive this deletion T-rule if the NP containing the complement is dominated by the VP (as in
(98b)). This rule, too, promotes linguistic economy, except when it is applied to gerundive complements containing a final consonant marked [-coronal -strident]. (The affix generated by gerundizing increases the syllable count in church's but not in Pat's, for example.)

Finally, we should mention the Gapping transformation, which deletes second and later verbs in conjoined sentences such as (100):

(100) The Smiths brought steak; the Martins, dessert; and the Joneses, booze.

In ordinary discourse, as well as in poetry, this rule is frequently applied to avoid the monotony of a succession of like structures. In poetry the type of sentence which has undergone this rule is frequently labeled "zeugma," a term which we will define in more detail momentarily. The usual formulation of this rule stipulates that in order to be eligible for deletion, the verbs in the non-initial sentences must be identical, lexically, to the verb in the initial sentence.

Now let us turn to some couplets in Wheatley's poetry to exemplify her use of these deletion rules. One of the most common types of deletion in her poems is that produced by the application of Relative Clause Reduction. In general, she applies the rule whenever it can be applied, as the lines below indicate:
(101) (a) May George, belov'd by all the nations round,

Live with heav'ns choicest constant blessings crown'd!

"To the King's Most Excellent Majesty," 10-11

(b) Lo, here a Man, redeem'd by Jesus' blood,

A sinner once, but now a saint with God. . . .

"On the Death of the Rev. Dr. Sewell," 30-31

(c) Fara'd for thy valour, for thy virtue more,

Hear every tongue thy guardian aid implore!

"To His Excellency General Washington," 27-28

In (101a) the metrical effect of the application of this reduction rule can be seen clearly: it reduces the number of syllables by two (who is). By effecting the reduction in the first line of the couplet, the rule also gives Wheatley some rhyme options. She can, for example, shift the PP by all the nations round to initial position in the embedded sentence, producing the iambic rhyme belov'd. The lines in (101b) illustrate the repeated application of this rule to multiple embedded sentences within an imperative. In (101c), another imperative, the reduced clauses
modify the subject NP, not represented at the surface level, though one instance of fam'd has been deleted by Gapping and Wheatley has exercised an optional rule shifting the reduced clauses to sentence initial position. (101c) exemplifies Wheatley's use of both permutation and deletion rules to alter surface sentences.

It is interesting to note that although Wheatley writes a large number of sentences to which Relative Clause Reduction can be applied, and generally does apply the rule, she constructs very few sentences that permit the application of Relative Pronoun Deletion. She does, however, normally delete the pronoun when possible, as in:

(102) (a) 'TWAS mercy brought me from my Pagan land, Taught my benighted soul to understand That there's a God, that there's a Saviour too. . . .
"On Being Brought from Africa to America," 1-3
(b) The fate you threaten shall your own become. . . .
"Goliath of Gath," 160

In (102a) the rule has been applied to embedded sentences of the more fully represented version: "It was mercy that
brought me from my Pagan land; [It was] mercy that taught my benighted soul to understand." (A conjunction rule has also obviously been applied.) A stronger motive than linguistic economy may have been, in this case, the desire to avoid the monotony produced by a succession of that's, since Wheatley opted not to apply Complementizer Deletion to remove the two that's in the third line. In the couplet below, Wheatley erroneously applies Relative Pronoun Deletion to a string which does not have the structural index that permits the rule to operate:

(103) Thus she on Neptune's wat'ry realm reclin'd
    Appeard', and thus invites the ling'ring wind.
    —"To a Lady on Her Coming to North-America . . . ," 7-8

Apparently, (103) derives from "Thus she, who reclined on Neptune's watery shore, appeared, and thus invites the lingering wind." Ignoring the tense confusion, we can see that this string does not permit Relative Pronoun Deletion since who serves as the subject NP of the embedded sentence. Wheatley, of course, compounds the problem by shifting the adverbial PP in the first line to a pre-verb position, thus juxtaposing the embedded verb and the main verb. This maneuver makes it possible then to hypothesize three separate source sentences: She reclined. . . .
She appeared., and She invites., The ungrammatical sentence in (103) results from Wheatley's violation of a restriction in the grammar which prohibits the occurrence of any constituent between the head noun and the subject relative pronoun of an embedded clause. The limitations which the grammar imposes upon poets is once again made manifest.

It is difficult to summarize Wheatley's practices concerning the use of Complementizer Deletion. She does not write many sentences containing noun complements, and in these few she retains the complement (that) about as often as she deletes it, as (104) and (105) illustrate, respectively:

(104) He prayed that grace in ev'ry heart might dwell. . . .

"On the Death of the Rev. Mr. George Whitfield," 20

(105) Remember, Christians, Negroes, black as Cain, May be refin'd, and join th' angelic train.

"On Being Brought from Africa to America," 7-8

Although no sentences containing gerundive complements were discovered in Wheatley's poetry, she has numerous lines possessing the infinitive complementizer. In all of these lines except two, for has been deleted by
Complementizer Deletion. Thus, (106) illustrates what is typical of Wheatley with respect to this rule, and (107) exemplifies the exceptions:

(106) To dry thy tears how longs the heav'nly muse!
   —"To a Clergyman on the Death of His Lady," 43
(107) Mark rising Pheobus when he spreads his ray [,]
   And his commission for to guide the day[;]
   At night keep watch, and see a Cynthia bright[,]
   And her commission for to guide the night[.]
   —"Atheism," 53-56

Though the deletion of for, as in (106), is common in most American dialects, there are dialects for which the application of Complementizer Deletion is not obligatory.33 There are no discernible clues for Wheatley's decision to apply the rule in (107), and one hesitates to attribute such notable exceptions to metrical motives. But, in view of (107), we have to assume that for Wheatley Complementizer Deletion applied to infinitive complementizers optionally.

The fourth deletion T-rule we mention above, Gapping, is applied most frequently by Wheatley to produce the type

---

33More specifically, Complementizer Deletion is normally obligatory for strings having undergone Identical Noun Phrase Deletion, though as Jacobs and Rosenbaum (1968: 163) point out exceptions must be made for certain dialects which permit, for instance, I want for to see.
of sentence known as zeugma. The term "Gapping" usually refers to a rule that permits "the deletion of verbs—and, in some cases, additional material—from non-initial members of sets of conjoined sentences" (Stockwell 1973: 298), though as we shall see directly, it is desirable in Wheatley's poetry to expand the category of deletable constituents to include nouns and pronouns. The particular type of zeugma that appears throughout Wheatley's poetry is illustrated in (108):

(108) When loss to loss ensu'd, and woe to woe. . . .

"To His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor,
on the Death of His Lady," 34

This is the same process by which unpoetic sentences like (109) are derived:

Zeugma, as used in this dissertation, includes the following types of sentences: (1) a sentence in which some part of a conjoined construction is deleted without adversely affecting the grammaticality (e.g., (109)); (2) an irregular construction in which the single word agrees grammatically with only one of the other words to which it refers (e.g., "Good Paulina / Lead us from hence, where we may leisurely / Each one demand and answer to his part"); and (3) a sentence in which two or more words are related in a manner that is syntactically acceptable but semantically deviant (e.g., "Hotchkins spied on his wife with interest and a telescope"). Traditionally, the first construction described is called zeugma; (2) and (3) are termed syllepsis. The distinction is rarely observed today, however.
(109) Sam brought the bread; Joan, the wine.

It appears that to be subject to deletion by Gapping, the verbs in non-initial members of the set of sentences must be lexical duplicates of the verb in the initial member, since (111) is not synonymous with (110):

(110) Sam brought the bread; Joan drank the wine.
(111) Sam brought the bread; Joan, the wine.

It is also apparent that, at least in ordinary English, the verb in the initial member is not deletable, for (112) would not be acceptable to native speakers:

(112) *Sam, the bread; Joan brought the wine.

In poetry, however, this restriction is relaxed, as (113) illustrates:

(113) For plunder you, and we for freedom fight.

"On the Capture of General Lee," 54

This may suggest that poets rely more heavily on redundant features of the language than is normal in ordinary discourse.

Although Gapping, as defined earlier, is typically used to delete verbs only, it seems feasible to modify the rule and add nouns and pronouns to the class of
deletable constituents. Observe, for instance, the following zeugmas from Wheatley's poetry:

(114) (a) Shall not th' intelligence your grief restrain,
And turn the mournful to the cheerful strain?
"On the Death of J. C., an Infant," 26-27
(b) No words could tell them, and no pencil paint.
"Niobe in Distress . . . ," 34

Modification of the rule is necessary in (114a), for instance, because the deleted item (strain) is not a verb and because the deletion does not occur in the specified non-initial member. Apparently, the modification would permit the deletion of one of a set of co-referential NP's dominated by the same symbol. When we speak of altering the rule, then, we are speaking specifically of Stockwell's Gapping rule, for the grammar obviously has a broader Gapping rule which generates such sentences as

(115) Fry can mold a losing into a winning team,
which is not a conjoined set of sentences, though it has had deleted from it the first of two co-referential sister NP's (team).

The deletion in (114b) could be effected simply by including these stated conditions and adding pronouns to the list of deletable items.

The zeugmas in Wheatley's poetry may have been motivated by several factors. The T-rules which produced the surface zeugmas generally facilitated the attainment of syntactic balance (through conjunction) and linguistic compression (through deletion). In addition, zeugma is an ancient rhetorical device, used by several Roman and Greek writers whom the Neoclassical poets admired. Wheatley, however, is unlike the ancient Classical writers and some of her contemporaries, who used zeugma for wit and satire. She restricts zeugma to the type of construction illustrated in (113) and (114), an indication perhaps that the syntactical advantages of zeugma held more attraction for her than rhetorical ones.

Though we have not attempted to account for every instance of deletion in Wheatley's poems, it has become apparent that Wheatley used the deletion rules in much the same way she used the permutation rules—to attain grammatical lines that fit the mold of the couplet. She found Relative Clause Reduction the most helpful rule, presumably,
since she used it more extensively than any of the other
coalescence rules. She quite often applies both deletion
and permutation rules to the same string to achieve a
satisfactory metrical line. Although she wrote few
sentences that permitted the application of Relative
Pronoun Deletion, she did apply the rule whenever possible.
Complementizer Deletion is applied most frequently by
Wheatley to lines containing an infinitive complementizer,
the net effect (with two exceptions) being the deletion
of for. Complementizer Deletion is, therefore, optional
for all three types of complementizer in Wheatley's poems.
In deriving zeugmatic sentences, a broadened and expanded
version of Gapping is brought into play, a rule which
deletes verbs, nouns, and pronouns under specified con-
ditions. In deletion, as in permutation, Wheatley
occasionally violates a restriction in the grammar and
produces a meaningless or ambiguous sentence.

A comparison of Wheatley's poetic syntax with Pope's
reveals some similarities but also several significant
differences. In their poetic language, both poets write
various sentence types in about the same proportion, both
make frequent use of the same types of grammatical opera-
tions, and both are influenced in their syntax by the
structural form of the couplet. Within these general areas
of similarity, however, exist several differences. Wheatley
relies on grammatical transformations principally to assist her in adapting ordinary normal-word-order sentences to the structural and metrical demands of the couplet. She does not, for the most part, allow such factors as the purpose and tone of the poem or rhetorical and semantic effects to influence her syntax. The syntactic patterns in her poems do not change appreciably from year to year or from one type of poem to another. For Pope, however, the couplet structure and metrical regularity are merely members of a large group of forces that determine syntactic arrangements within his couplets. Satirical poems, often invective in tone, call for sentences with a rhythm and structure radically different from that found in pastoral poems or Homeric translations. And the lines in early satires, when compared with those in later satirical works, often reflect notable syntactic differences. The nature of these similarities and differences will become more apparent as we compare the poetry of Wheatley with that of Pope.35

The types of sentences we distinguished in Wheatley's poetry (declarative, imperative, interrogative, and

35The conclusions on Pope's syntax are based on analysis of the Group II poems (representing his major genres) listed in Chapter III. Many of the findings of Jones (1969), whose syntactic analysis included a larger sampling of Pope's works, have also been included.
exclamatory) are present in Pope's Group II poems in about the same proportions. For both poets, the declarative is by far the most common sentence type, followed (in descending order) by imperatives, questions, and exclamations. Exclamations, as we defined them, appear to be more characteristic of Wheatley than of Pope. Not only does Pope write fewer exclamatory sentences, comparatively, but he rarely has any of them begin with the word what, as Wheatley often does (e.g., in "What Pow'r, what Wisdom, and what Goodness shine!"). The "may" declaratives which appeared quite frequently throughout Wheatley's poems are also rare in Pope's poetry, although they do occur, as (116) indicates:

(116) Ye Kings and Warriors! may your Vows be crown'd
And Troy's proud Walls lie level with the Ground.

—Iliad, I, 23-24

However, the "say" imperative, on which Wheatley relies so often, makes several appearances in Pope's lines. Those in (117a) and (117b) are representative; (117c) is cited because it appears to be a poetic instance of the "Tell me" sentence which we suggested was related to the "say" imperative:
(117) (a) Say what strange Motive, Goddess! cou'd compel
A well-bred Lord t'assault a gentle Belle?
--Rape of the Lock, I, 7-8
(b) Say how the Goddess bade Britannia sleep,
And pour'd her Spirit o'er the land and deep.
--The Dunciad, I, 7-8
(c) Oh ever beauteous, ever friendly! tell
Is it, in heav'n, a crime to love too well?
--"Elegy to the Memory of an Unfortunate Lady," 5-6

Questions, though less common than declaratives, appear in practically all of both Pope's and Wheatley's poems. Like Wheatley's questions, Pope's are often WH rhetorical constructions. With respect to the types of sentences in their poetry, then, Pope and Wheatley do not exhibit any great differences.

In changing normal to "poetic" word order, Wheatley and Pope both make frequent and acceptable use of the permutation transformations contained in the transformational component of the grammar. Pope, like Wheatley, often alters word order by shifting adverbial PP, as in (118):
Both must alike from Heav'n derive their light,

—An Essay on Criticism, 13

or by preposing the object NP through Object Shift:

Presumptuous Man! the reason wouldst thou find,

—"An Essay on Man," I, 35

or by relocating the object NP to pre-verb position, as in (120):

'Twas thus Calypso once each heart alarm'd...

—"Epistle to a Lady," 45

In several instances, however, each poet effects permutations which the T-rules in the grammar of English do not permit. Some of these sentences can be accounted for by modifying a T-rule already present in the grammar (recall suggested changes in Gapping to generate some of Wheatley's lines), though it appears that Pope's syntax necessitates extensive modification of existing rules and several additional rules that would perhaps have to be postulated in a special poetic grammar. Consider, for example, the wrenched syntax in the following lines:

Where Wigs with Wigs, with Sword-knots Sword-knots strive,
Beaus banish Beaus, and Coaches Coaches drive.

—Rape of the Lock, I, 101-102

While these lines may very well be an integral part of the mock-heroic tone and manner, the fact remains that syntactically they are exceedingly complex. Though the normal word order can be reconstructed ("Where wigs strive with wigs, [where] Sword-knots strive with Sword-knots, [where] beaus banish beaus, [and where] coaches drive coaches"), it is clear that several transformations are involved. The first half line of (121), for instance, has had the verb strive deleted by Gapping, a T-rule which is normally restricted to verbs in non-initial members of conjoined sentences. The adverbial PP in the first line of (121) has also been frontshifted. It is not clear whether the inversion appearing in the second line has resulted from the application of Object Shift or Pr-Object-Shift, since the two NP's are phonetically identical. This type of distortion is, of course, intolerable in ordinary English, and the desirability of positing rules (even in a poetic grammar) to account for such constructions seems questionable. Numerous examples of such syntactic manipulation (in some of which the semantic confusion is even more tantalizing and deliberate) exist in the poetry of Pope. And even if one assumes that
Wheatley's extreme wrenchings were motivated by metrical and rhyme requirements, and that Pope's are deliberately designed to evoke a certain tone or produce witty semantic effects, the grammar—some grammar—still has to provide for their derivation if they are to be regarded as acceptable sentences.

A similar pattern of comparison exists with respect to Wheatley's and Pope's use of deletion T-rules; that is, they frequently alter word order by applying a single transformation or by applying both deletion and permutation transformations. In (122), for example, Pope utilizes the Relative Clause Reduction rule which Wheatley found useful:

(122) Papillia, wedded to her doating spark,

         Sighs for the shades--'How charming in a Park!'

    —"Epistle to a Lady," 37-38

In (123) he applies the same transformation in the first line but alters the order in the second line by preposing an adverbial PP:

(123) She, tinsel'd o'er in robes of varying hues,

         When self-applause her wild creation views...

    —The Dunciad, I, 81-32
Gapping appears to account for a proportionately larger number of Pope's deletions than of Wheatley's. In the poetry of each, several instances of deletion in zeugmatic sentences can be accounted for by the Gapping transformation which operates in ordinary English. For instance, the verb deletion in the second sentence of (124a), a Wheatley line cited earlier, and (124b), a Pope line, is effected by this rule:

(124) (a) When loss to loss ensu'd, and woe to
woe...

(b) And now a bubble burst, and now a world,

--Essay on Man, I, 90

Both poets, however, as frequently delete the verb in the first member of conjoined sentences. (113), repeated here as (125a), and (125b) illustrate this tendency:

(125) (a) For plunder you, and we for freedom fight.

--Wheatley, "On the Capture of General Lee," 54

(b) Some few in that, but numbers err in

this...

--Pope, An Essay on Criticism, 5

To account for verb deletion in initial sets of conjoined sentences, which is apparently permitted in poetry but
not in ordinary discourse, the Gapping rule stated earlier would have to be modified or reformulated.

Presumably the restriction stipulating the deleted verb be lexically identical to the realized verb in later (conjoined) sentences would not be relaxed, however.

Although Wheatley's zeugmas typically take the form illustrated in (124-125), many of Pope's are a type of zeugma traditionally known as syllepsis (see note 34), the most famous example of which is (126):

(126) Or stain her honour, or her new Brocade.

—Rape of the Lock, II, 107

The matter of interest in (126) is not whether the deletion occurs in the first or a later sentence. Rather, it is the fact that, as a result of Gapping, stain appears to be a verb with compound objects, each related to it in a different sense. Specifically, the object NP in the first half of (126) is [+abstract]; thus the verb is used in a "figurative" sense, since the grammar contains a co-occurrence restriction stating that stain must occur with a [-abstract] object. In the second half of (126), the expected [-abstract] object appears. It is not exactly clear how the grammar is to account for such constructions. Stockwell (1973:360-367) examines similar
sentences in his discussion of conjunction and notes that "in a case grammar, the conjoined NP's of these sentences [like (126)] are marked for different underlying cases." However, he admits that it is not possible to prohibit all conjunctions of NP's of different cases, pointing out that while sentences like (127) are questionable, sentences like (128) are not:

(127) This key and that janitor can open the door.
(128) John and Mary respectively received and distributed the money.

In Fillmore's terms (1967), this key is in the instrumental case; that janitor, in the Agentive case. In (128), John is probably in the Dative case and Mary in the Agentive (see Stockwell:363). It is possible, Stockwell concedes, that sentences like (127) and (128) [and (126), as well] "are fully grammatical, but are anomalous because they violate the rule of surface-structure interpretation of the following general form, 'If constituents are conjoined, they necessarily have a semantic relation'" (364). Determining the exact manner in which (126), (127), and (128) are to be derived grammatically obviously poses some problems. If these are an indication of grammatical complexity, it appears that while some of Pope's zeugmatic lines are similar to Wheatley's, others (like (126)) are
more complex. Pope apparently recognized not only the syntactical advantages of Gapping (which Wheatley also recognized), but also the semantic effects that can be produced by violating certain grammatical constraints.

In their use of Complementizer Deletion, no noticeable differences appear to separate Wheatley from Pope. He takes advantage, as she does, of this T-rule for what are presumably purely metrical reasons, as in (129):

(129) Close to those walls where Folly holds her throne,
And laughs to think Monroe would take her down...

--The Dunciad, I, 29-30

This sentence has undergone both It Deletion, a T-rule which must be applied to delete the deep structure head noun if the complement is to appear immediately to the right of it, and Complementizer Deletion, deleting that before Monroe. Since no Pope lines were discovered (in the Group II poems) which contain the full infinitive complementizer at the surface level, we can perhaps assume that in his poetry Complementizer Deletion must obligatorily apply to delete for in this complementizer.

36 For a more complete discussion of this aspect of Noun Phrase Complementization, see Jacobs and Rosenbaum (1968:171-177).
It is uncertain that this obligation holds for Wheatley, who in two sentences fails to apply infinitive Complementizer Deletion.

Thus far in comparing Wheatley with Pope, we have seen that both write various types of sentences (declarative, etc.) with about the same frequency, and that both use the T-rules in the grammar to derive their poetic syntax. Although each has several sentences which cannot be generated by the grammar of ordinary English, Pope, because of his fondness for ambiguity and other semantic effects, often writes lines that are grammatically quite complex and difficult to account for. The two poets are different in one other respect. Wheatley's syntactic patterns within the couplet remain essentially constant regardless of the purpose or design of the poem; that is, she appears to have been influenced quite strongly by certain structural features of the couplet. Pope, on the other hand, was conscious not only of couplet form, but also of such larger, less tangible elements as theme and tone. To confirm this observation, let us compare the two poets' use of balance. In many of Pope's poems, as in several of Wheatley's, balance is very commonly a line arrangement in which the caesura acts as a pivot for balanced half-lines. Wheatley's instances of balance,
however, typically do not relate directly to the meaning or purpose of the poem. Often, they are merely parenthetical or repetitive, as in:

(130) He left the folds, he left the flow'ry meads...  
"Goliath of Gath," 45

(131) Forgive the muse, forgive th' advent'rous lays...  
"To His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, on the Death of His Lady," 43

Pope's balanced structures, on the other hand, function in the development of the poem's meaning. Many instances of his balance serve antithetically to develop one of the themes (art, judgment, genius, etc.) with which he concerned himself. In Essay on Criticism, numerous lines with balanced hemistichs point up this antithetical development. The following examples are typical:

(132) So vast is art, so narrow human wit.  
"line 61

(133) The rules of old discovered, not devised,  
Are Nature still, but Nature methodized...  
lines 88-89
(134) Learn hence for ancient rules a just esteem;
To copy Nature is to copy them.
--lines 139-140

The differences between Pope's use of balance and Wheatley's are obvious. Pope's balanced half-lines in (132) and the last line of (133) reflect the antitheses being developed in the poem as a whole. And in (133), the semantic contrast between devised (suggesting invention) and methodized (suggesting ancient models) and the simulated verb-object sequence (esteem-them) in (134) complete a couplet pattern that reinforces structurally and semantically the poem's principal themes.

Restricting a discussion of Pope's syntax to the syntactical features that are characteristic of Wheatley obviously does not account for the many syntactic intricacies of which he was capable. Nothing has been said, for example, of his use of puns, of his ability to compress language into memorable aphorisms, or of his many patterns of wit. But a complete assessment of Pope's linguistic techniques is well beyond the scope of this paper. Nonetheless, we have seen, even in this limited comparison, that though the two poets employ many of the same grammatical processes in responding to the structural features of the couplet, Pope's syntax
reflects a greater concern for attaining a language that will do more than just fit into the mold of the couplet. He adapts and exploits the numerous syntactic possibilities of the couplet to arrive at a language that is appropriate to the design and meaning of a particular poem. Wheatley, on the other hand, is more concerned with rhyme and metrical regularity.
CHAPTER VI
CONCLUSIONS

The foregoing analysis has established what is characteristic of Phillis Wheatley's couplet poetry in three specific areas: meter, rhyme, and syntax. In terms of the Halle-Keyser theory of iambic pentameter, the meter in these forty-five poems is quite regular. The mean Tension Rating (number of correspondence rule violations) for her couplet poems is 1.9. In all but 7 of the 2186 lines analyzed, she maintains a syllable count of 10, never writing the "headless" or extra-metrical lines permitted by the Halle-Keyser theory. One of the most common variations of the iambic stress pattern is the trochee, which occurs in line initial position in about 1 line in 9, but less frequently in medial and final position. None of the Wheatley lines that scan by the Halle-Keyser schema is phonologically unmetrical. In adjusting the rhythm and number of syllables in her lines, Wheatley quite frequently elides vowel sequences, especially those having an intervening sonorant. At least one instance of elision occurs in 26 per cent of her lines. In arranging the caesural point
in her couplets, the poet conforms to accepted Neo-
classical practice by locating the pause after either
the fourth, fifth, or sixth syllable in the majority
(over 70 per cent) of her lines. She generally avoids
a monotonous rhythm by varying the caesural position in
successive lines.

To attain appropriate rhymes, Wheatley considered
not only pronunciation, but also metrical and semantic
factors. She frequently alters normal word order in
securing the desired rhyme words. In terms of current
pronunciation, the vast majority of Wheatley's rhymes
(at least 85 per cent) are phonetically exact, or "true."
She typically avoids rhyme "identities" (knew-new, e.g.),
but is less deliberate in varying her rhymes in consecu-
tive couplets. As a rule, rhyme words are monosyllabic
nouns and verbs. Very few of her couplets have light
rhymes (e.g., fly-felicity) and none has feminine rhymes
(such as lighting-fighting). Semantic features also in-
fluenced the selection of rhymes. In several couplets,
the semantic concordance between the rhyme partners either
counterstates or (more frequently) restates the couplet
sense.

Syntactically, most of the sentences appearing in
Wheatley's poems can be derived by the rules contained
in a generative model of grammar of the type proposed by Noam Chomsky in his 1965 work entitled *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Some, however, require either modification of existing rules or special "poetic" rules, while a few are deviant as a result of violations of grammatical restrictions. Of the four types of sentences distinguished in her poetry, declaratives are by far the most common, followed in descending order of frequency by imperatives, questions, and exclamations. Several sentences within these categories (e.g., "may" declaratives and "say" imperatives) require further study before their exact grammatical derivation can be established. Wheatley exhibits no particular determination to arrange syntactic constituents in patterns of balance that complement the hemistichs and paired lines in the couplet structure. Intraline balance (hemistich versus hemistich) is more prevalent, however, than line-to-line or extracouplet patterns. Balanced constructions typically reinforce or emphasize the couplet sense; they are never witty, ironic, or epigrammatical. In transforming ordinary language into poetic language, Wheatley makes frequent use of permutation and deletion rules contained in the grammar of English. Some of the permutation rules, such as those specifying the placement of adverbials and those permitting the inversion of a verb and its object, are
utilized more often than rules effecting other changes (e.g., Indirect Object Shift and Particle Shift). The demands of rhyme and meter which motivate many of the permutations also encourage the application of certain deletion rules. Of these, Wheatley finds the Relative Clause Reduction rule most helpful, though several sentences (zeugmas, in particular) undergo some type of Gapping rule. Complementizer Deletion is for Wheatley an optional rule used quite often to delete noun, gerundive, and infinitival complementizers.

A comparison of Wheatley's poems with a selected group of poems from Alexander Pope, the English Neoclassical poet whom she supposedly imitated, reveals several linguistic similarities and a few significant differences. In terms of overall metrical complexity, the two poets are quite similar. Wheatley's poems have a mean TR of 1.9; Pope's, a mean TR of 2.1. However, there exists for Pope, but not for Wheatley, a correlation between metrical complexity and chronological poetic development. He moves from a mean TR of 1.8 in his pre-1730 works to a higher TR of 2.4 in his later poems. Thus, metrically, Wheatley's poems bear a closer resemblance to Pope's earlier poetry. Although both poets generally construct the standard ten-syllable line, Pope, unlike Wheatley, occasionally utilizes the line options provided by the Halle-Keyser theory
in varying the syllable count. In the Pope poems examined, only one line would be judged phonologically unmetrical. The two poets are remarkably similar in their use of the trochee to vary the iambic pattern and in their placement of the caesura. Pope, however, differs from the American poet in that he makes less use of elision in adjusting the syllable count in his lines.

The rhyme differences between the two poets are minimal. Both have a preponderance (over 80 per cent) of phonetically exact rhymes, both prefer monosyllabic noun and verb rhymes, and both are sensitive to the semantic relationship between the rhyme partners and the couplet sense. The semantic patterns in Pope's poetry, however, are, in comparison with Wheatley's, a bit more complex. They often relate to the couplet sense in complicated alogical, concordant, and discordant patterns.

Pope is like Wheatley syntactically in that he writes the various types of sentences (declaratives, etc.) in about the same proportion she does. He also makes extensive use of permutation and deletion rules in adapting ordinary language to the couplet form, and he contrives some sentences by violating certain rules in the grammar. Unlike Wheatley, though, whose syntax is altered principally to meet the demands of rhyme and meter, Pope allows the tone and purpose of the poem to influence
syntactic changes. The syntax in his later works also differs in several respects from that in earlier works. Balanced constructions, too, function differently in the works of the two poets. Wheatley's patterns of balance are less frequent and usually do little more than re-emphasize the couplet statement, but Pope's frequently serve in the development of the poem's major themes or function as a vehicle of wit or irony. Despite the fact that Wheatley does not exploit the possibilities of the heroic couplet as fully as her model, she shares with him many linguistic characteristics in the areas of meter, rhyme, and syntax.
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