APPENDIX - III

A Selection of Essays of G. K. Hopkins
ON THE ORIGIN OF BEAUTY : A PLATONIC DIALOGUE-
(From note-book dated 12 May 1865)

It was at the beginning of the Long Vacation, and Oxford was nearly empty. The Professor of the newly founded chair of Aesthetics, whose lectures had been unattended during the term, came one day in the evening to New College gardens and found John Hanbury a scholar of the college walking there. They knew each other, and had taken two or three turns under the chestnuts together, when a stranger came up to them and asked if these were Worcester Gardens.

"This is New College" said Hanbury ; 'may I direct you to Worcester?' No, the stranger said, he had only wished to know the name; and, then shewing a sketching-block, he asked if there would be any objection to his sketching there. 'Not at all' said Hanbury : 'shall I bring a chair? My rooms are close by'. He always drew standing, he said, and Hanbury and the Professor moved away.

'What was that paradox I heard of yours?' asked the Professor: 'about criticism it was.'

'O it was nothing' said Hanbury drawing back.

But let me hear it defended. Everybody likes a good paradox. The Frenchman said the marriage-tie was in every case a bad thing, for if the married died of each other it bound them together
against their will, and if they did not it was superfluous. I like that: do not you?'

'But mine is not a good paradox' said Hanbury; 'it is hardly one at all: at all events I do not see how to avoid the conclusion it brings me to. I was saying that in poetry purely common-sense criticism was not enough by itself: that is true, is it not?'

'Certainly.'

'And criticism is not advocacy: it is rather judicial, is it not?'

'Judicial, it should be.'

'And judgments depend on laws, on established laws. Now taste has few rules, and those not scientific and easily disputed, and I might add, often disputed. Am I right?'

'At least, go on' said the Professor.

'If a man disputes your judgment in taste, how can you prove he is wrong? If a man thinks beautiful what you think bad, you must believe he is sincere when he tells you so; and if he is educated how are you to say that his judgment is worse than yours? In fact de gustibus non est disputandum. Criticism therefore in matters of taste cannot be judicial. And purely common-sense criticism is not enough, we agreed. So criticism in matter of
taste has no weight at all. That was it; do not be severe on it.'

'I will respect it, my dear Hanbury, I will respect it, though I do not quite think you have proved your point. However I will not answer you directly, for do you know I am not sure about de gustibus, which is going further back?

'Indeed' said Hanbury. 'Well if you think there are ascertainable laws, I should be glad of it for one; for when one is morally sure that one is right, it is a pity not to be able to refer to a logical ground for one's belief.'.

'I have my theory' said the Professor; 'but I am afraid -'

'Do let me hear it' said Hanbury; 'I shall be a disciple I am sure.'

'My first' said the Professor 'it will be then. But may I pursue the Socratic method? May I take up the dialectic battledore which you have just laid down?'

'The dialectic battledore do you call it? I shall be so glad to be the - what is that called now? I have been about thirteen years out of the nursery. The shuttlecock, of course, - to be the shuttlecock to it.'

'Now where shall I begin?' said the Professor. ' I will begin here', and he pulled off one of the large lowest fans of the chestnuts. 'Do you think this beautiful?'
'That? The chestnut-fan? Certainly; I have always thought the chestnut one of the most finely foliaged of trees.'

'You see it consists of seven leaves, the middle largest, diminishing towards the stalk, so that those nearest the stalk are smallest.'

'I see' said Hanbury 'I had never noticed there were seven before.'

'Now if we look about we shall find - yes there is one. There is a fan, do you see? with only six leaves. Nature is irregular in these things. Can you reach it? Now which do you think the more beautiful, the one with six, or the one with seven, leaves? Shut out, if you can, the remembrance that the six-leaved one is an anomaly or imperfection: consider it symmetrical.'

'Well I daresay the six-leaved one may improve the foliage by variety, but in themselves the seven-leaved one is the handsomer.'

'Just so' said the Professor; 'but could you give any reason?'

'I suppose, as they are like in all other respects, it is that seven is a prettier number than six, and that would agree with the mystical character attached to the number seven.'

'Yes, but let me understand' said the Professor. 'Now is 101 a prettier number than 100?'

'101? I do not know. No, I think 100 is. No; of course in fact it depends on 100 or 101 or what.'
'Suppose then I had two great chestnut-fans, one with 100, one with 101, leaves, which would be the handsomer? You will say you could not tell till you saw them. But now, following the arrangements of these six-leaved and seven-leaved fans, in the 100-leaved there would be 50 radiating leaves on either side and a gap in the middle, in the 101-leaved 50 on either side and one, the greatest, in the middle. Do you see?

'Perfectly. And I think the 101-leaved, or in fact the odd-leaved one whatever its number of leaves, would be the handsomer; not, as you seem to shew, from the abstract excellence of an odd number, because - well, I suppose because to have the greatest leaf in the middle is the handsomer way.'

'But which is the more symmetrical?' asked the Professor. 'Is not the six-leaved one?'

'Both have symmetry, yet, as you say, the six-leaved one seems the more so, supposing it of course to be really symmetrical, which this specimen is not.'

'Is not this' asked the Professor 'because it is naturally divided into two equal parts of three leaves which, while the seven-leaved is not, and cannot be symmetrical in the same way unless we physically cut the greatest leaf down the middle.'

'Yes that is it; I see' said Hanbury.

'And so you judge the less markedly symmetrical to be the
handsomer. Still the seven-leaved one has much symmetry. But
now look at the tree from which I pulled it. Do you like it better
as it is, or would you have the boughs start from the trunk at the
same height on opposite sides, symmetrical pair and pair?

'As it is, certainly.'

'Or again look at the colouring of the sky.'

'But,' put in Hanbury 'colouring is not a thing of symmetry.'

'No: but now what is symmetry? Is it not regularity?'

'I should say, the greatest regularity' said Hanbury.

'So it is. But is it not that sort of regularity which is
measured by length and breadth and thickness? Music for instance
might be regular, but not symmetrical ever; is it not so?'

'Quite so' said Hanbury.

'Let us say regularity then. The sky, you see, is blue
above, then comes a pale indescribable hue, and then the red of the
sundown. You admire it do you not?'

'Very much' said Hanbury.

'But the red is the richest colour, is it not?'

'Now it is; yes.'

'Should you than like the whole sky to be of one uniform
rich red?'
'Certainly not.'

'Of the red and blue to end sharply with a straight line, without anything as a gobetween?'

'No: I like the gradation.'

'Again then you approve of variety over absolute uniformity. And variety is opposed to regularity, is it not? while uniformity is regularity. Is it not so?'

'Certainly. I am to conclude then that beauty is produced by irregularity' said Hanbury.

'Ah! you run on very fast' said the Professor. 'I never said that. Once more, if you please, I must send my shuttlecock up to the sky. You will no doubt with your feathers of vantage see better than I can, considering how my view is cut off by the buildings of the College, that rows of level cloud run along with west of the sky.'

'At all events' said he 'I can see them'.

'Do you think they would be better away?' asked the Professor.

'No: they add to the beauty of the sunset sky.'

'Notice however that they are pretty symmetrical. They are straight, and parallel with the sky-line and with each other, and
of a uniform colour, and other things in them are symmetrical. Should you admire them more if they were shapeless?'

'I think not' said Hanbury.

'Again when we say anyone has regular features, do we mean praise or blame?'

'Praise.'

'We were speaking of the chestnut-trees, of their unsymmetrical growth. Now is the oak an unsymmetrical tree?'

'Very much so; 0 quite a rugged boldly-irregular tree; and this I should say was one of the things which make us invest it with certain qualities it has in poetry and in popular and national sentiment' said Hanbury.

'Very observant. You mean of course when it grows at liberty, rather than when influenced by confinement, cutting and so forth.'

'Yes; what I say will of course be truest of the tree when uninfluenced by man.'

'Very good. Now have you ever noticed that when the oak has grown to its full stature uninfluenced, the outside of its head is drawn by a long curve, I should think it would be that of a parabola, which, if you look at the tree from a little way off, is of almost mathematical correctness?'
'Dear me, is it indeed so? No, I had never noticed it, but now that you name it, I do seem to find something in me which verifies what you say.'

'Do you happen to remember' asked the Professor 'that fine oak at the top of the hill above Elsfield where you have such a wide view?'

'Of course I do. Yes a very fine tree.'

'If you had analysed your admiration of it I think you would have had to lay a good deal of it to that strict parabolic outline. Or again if one of the three side-leaves of this seven-leaved chestnut-fan be torn off, it will be less beautiful, will it not? And this, I am sure you will now say, because the symmetry is destroyed.'

'Yes' said Hanbury. 'Then beauty, you would say perhaps, is a mixture of regularity and irregularity.'

'Complex beauty, yes. But let us inquire a little further. What is regularity? Is it not obedience to law? And what is law? Does it not mean that several things, or all the parts of one thing, are like each other?'

'Let me understand' said Hanbury.

'I fear I ply my battledore so fiercely that the best of shuttlecocks has not time to right itself between the blows; but
I will be steadier. Is not a straight line regular? and a circle?

'Nothing can be more so' said Hanbury.

'And any part of a straight line or of a circle is exactly like another of the same size, is it not?'

'Exactly.'

'They are in fact consistent with themselves, and alike throughout.'

'Yes they are,'

'Regularity then is consistency or agreement or likeness, either of a thing to itself or of several things to each other.'

'I understand the first part of what you say, but - I am very sorry again to trouble you - not quite the second.'

'It is my fault' said the Professor. 'I mean that although a leaf might have an outline on one side so irregular that no law could be traced in it, yet if the other side exactly agreed with it, you would say there was law or regularity about the leaf to make one side like the other. Of if the leaf of a tree were altogether irregular, supposing such a thing were to be found in nature, yet all the leaves on the tree were exactly like it, having precisely that same irregularity, then you would recognise the presence of law about the tree.'
'Yes: I understand perfectly now.'

'Then regularity is likeness or agreement or consistency, and irregularity is the opposite, that is difference or disagreement or change or variety. Is it so?'

'Certainly.'

'Then the beauty of the oak and the chestnut-fan and the sky is a mixture of likeness and the difference or agreement and disagreement or consistency and variety or symmetry and change.'

'It seems so, yes.'

'And if we did not feel the likeness we should not think them so beautiful, or if we did not feel the difference we should not think them so beautiful. The beauty we find is from the comparison we make of the things with themselves, seeing their likeness and difference, is it not?'

'Yes. But let me think a little. This may be the nature of the beauty in the things you have spoken of and of many others, but I do not at all yet see how it applies to all things, and I should like to ask you to account for some of them. Let me collect some instances.'

He stood looking out through a loophole in one of the towers of the old wall. Meanwhile the sketcher, who had long beer.
drawing in a desultory way, moved from the stand he had taken up, as though meaning to walk about. He had become more interested in this philosophy of the Gardens than in his sketching, in the clear air of the evening he had heard almost everything that was said, and the questioner and answerer had raised their voices; he was loath to lose the end of the debate. Hanbury hearing him move turned and asked if he would come in and have some tea. He thanked him and accepted the offer. It was then debated whether the party should go in at once or no, and it was agreed they should for the present at least continue to walk about. Hanbury in courtesy began to talk on indifferent subjects, but the stranger begged the discussion might be continued.

'I am afraid' he said 'I have heard more than I had any business to do, but I have become so interested that I — one's fondness for painting will be the best excuse for the interest a discussion on beauty has for one. Perhaps I might serve as alternative shuttlecock, while Mr. Hanbury' — he had heard the name from the Professor's mouth in the course of the talk — 'is collecting his instances. I hardly think I entirely understood the last of what was said.'

'If you will be so kind' said the Professor. 'But I fear that in the ardour of the game I thump the shuttlecock far too hard, in order to bring out the more resonant answers. I know quite well what sort of things Hanbury is going to bring forward,
and in the meantime I would gladly fortify my first ground, which I took only with regard to things of abstract beauty. Of course everyone would allow as a truism that in making beautiful shapes (and the same will hold for the other kinds of abstract beauty) we must not have things too symmetrical; and most would allow we must not have them too unsymmetrical and rugged; but what this means and leads to they do not so much seem to consider. Now let me take an instance from those excellent frescos which are being added to the new smoking-room at the Union -'

'Excuse me' said the painter; 'I have come up to paint those frescos, so perhaps you would find me too much prejudiced, for them to serve your purpose as examples.'

'Indeed' said the others 'then your name is Middleton, we are to presume.'

'Yes' said he; 'but pray do not let the discussion be interrupted on account of my frescos. You will, I am sure, find another instance.'

'I will return then to the chestnut-fan' said the Professor. Hanbury went in to make tea, promising soon to be back, and the Professor continued. 'Each leaf is symmetrical is it not? Counting from the rib or spine which runs down the back of the middle leaf, each side of the fan answers to the other, does it not?'

'Quite so.'
'With the exception' went on the Professor 'of such slight inequalities or imperfections as are always to be found in nature. And these would not be expressed at all in an idealised chestnut-fan used in Art, would they? I mean of course not. in a landscape picture, but in such a formalised and conventionalised shape as the chestnut-fan would have in decoration and architecture and so on.'

'Yes' said Middleton; 'It would then be quite symmetrical.'

'But yet it would not have lost its beauty, would it? - But I am really ashamed to ask these questions.'

'Not at all, not at all' said Middleton; 'I beg you will not be so. No, it would not have lost its beauty. It is in fact one of the most beautiful natural shapes at the disposal of Art.'

'And what was said of the whole fan is also true of each leaf of it, that it is symmetrical; but now let us see that this symmetry comes to. For first one side answers to the other, but yet there is a leaf, the middle one, which belongs to neither one side nor the other. Hanbury and I had agreed that this contrast of two opposite things, symmetry and the violation of it, was here preferable to pure symmetry. Next it radiates, but the radiation of leaves is not carried all the way round. Would it be improved by more regular radiation, do you think?'

'O no; whatever the beauties of regular radition may be, the particular beauty of the chestnut-fan depends on its not being so radiated.'
'Here again then contrast is preferred to agreement. Then the leaves are pretty much alike but not of the same size. You would not have them of the same size. I am sure, thus again preferring contrast to agreement. And one sees that, although differing, they differ by a law, diminishing as they do towards the stalk; and this I presume is more beautiful than if they differed irregularly, so that the contrast of regularity with variety is once more preferred to agreement, the agreement it would be in this case of entire irregularity. Is it not so?'

'I think so, yes.'

'Although from their diminishing they do not form part of that most regular of figures the circle, yet in their diminishing they shape out another figure, do they not? Partly regular, though containing variety; I mean that of a Greek Omega.'

'Yes, I see how you mean.'

'Furthermore, although leaf answers to leaf on each side of the central one, you will see that the equal leaves are not diametrically opposite to each other — I use "diametrically" in its strict sense, opposite as the one half of a diameter is to the one on the other side of the center —, with the exception of two of them.'

'No, I see' said Middleton: 'the greatest is opposite the stalk, which is the slimmest thing belonging to the fan; then the two next greatest, which are nearest to the middle one, are opposite
to the two smallest, which are nearest to the stalk, only the two between these two last-mentioned pairs are both opposite and answering to each other. All this I see; and I understand that you would point out the contrast made by the regularity of the continuous diameter with the irregularity of the unequal opposite radii.'

'That is just what I would say' said the Professor. 'Then it is not the radiation which is the beauty of the fan, but the radiation heightened by its cessation near the stalk.'

'Yes'.

'Nor the agreement of side with side, but that agreement as reflected on by the one dominant leaf which belongs to neither side.'

'Yes'.

'Nor the likeness of the leaves, but their likeness as thrown up by their difference in size'.

'Yes.'

'Nor their inequality, but the inequality is tempered by their regular diminishing.'

'Yes.'

'Nor their each having a diametrical opposite, but that opposite being the least answering to themselves in the whole fan.'
'Yes.'

'I might say even more. It seems then that it is not the excellence of any two things (or more) in themselves, but those two things as viewed by the light of each other, that makes beauty. Do you understand.'

'I think so, but might I ask you still further to explain?'

'I had reserved what I think will be my best proof for the last' said the Professor. 'The leaves of most trees may be roughly described as being formed by the intersection of two equal circles, in fact the figure called vesica piscis, but the leaves of this fan are not so. They are narrow near the stalk, they pass outwards with a long concave curve, then more than half-way up they turn, form a pair of round shoulders, so to speak, and then come round sharply to the point. Look here for instance,' and he pulled one off the tree.

'Yes, the curve is more complex than in most trees; but I am not sure I do not admire the commoner shape better in leaves.'

'Yes!' said the Professor, 'but now would you have the fan made of that commoner sort? I have made a mock fan, see, with lime leaves.'

'Certainly not' said Middleton. 'The more complex curve is far more beautiful in the fan, for it leaves long narrow slits
of light between the leaves, and in other respects the composition is finer and richer.'

'Ah! that is the pith of the matter - "it's composition."

But I am afraid to go on; I am talking to one who will laugh to see me fall into some snare as I trespass over his own grounds.'

'Pray go on' said Middleton.

'If I am to do so' said the Professor 'I shall put these next questions in fear and trembling. Do not paints speak of balancing mass by mass in the composition of their pictures.'

'They do.'

'If they balance mass by mass, the mass in one part of a picture must be unbalanced until that in another part is put in.'

'Of course.'

'If unbalanced then, the picture is unbeautiful.'

'Yes, in that respect.'

'Now suppose when the picture was finished with two masses balanced, a copy were made from it, and one mass put in, not the one that was put in the first in the original picture but the other, and then the copying stopped; the picture would then be unbalanced as before, would it not?'

'Just as the first picture was, yes.'
'And it would be unbeautiful, would it not?'

'Yes.'

'But the finished picture was beautiful.'

'Yes.'

'The picture that had only one mass put in was unbeautiful; now as it was to be beautiful when both masses were put in, we might suppose the beauty must lie all in that mass which was yet to come: when however we in our second picture, anxious to have our beauty as soon as possible, put the second mass in fast, pregnant as it was with graces, lo and behold! the result was as uninteresting as when we had the first mass alone put in. What are we to say then? The beauty does not lie in this mass or in that, but in what? In this mass as supported by that, and in that as supported by this. Is it so?'

'Exactly.'

'And artists call this composition. Does not then the beauty lie in the relation between the masses?'

'It seems it does.'

'Beauty then is a relation.'

'I suppose it is.'
'And things which have relation are near enough to have something in common, but not near enough to be one and the same, are they not?'

'Yes.'

'And to perceive the likeness and difference of things, or their relation, we must compare, must we not?'

'Yes.'

'Beauty therefore is a relation, and the apprehension of it a comparison. The sense of beauty in fact is a comparison, is it not?'

'So it would appear.'

'I have not yet said what the relation is' said the Professor, when he was interrupted by Hanbury who had returned some time since.

'Well' said he 'I must own, with all my wish for the logical ground I spoke of in discussions of taste, I feel it very unworthy to think that beauty resolves itself into a relation. However, it may be that the particular kind of beauty in a chestnut-fan, which seems after all a geometrical sort of thing, may be explained as you say, and you seem to have pulled it to pieces to exhibit that, so that I am either convinced or I really do not know what to say to the contrary; but I am sure there is in the higher forms of beauty - at least I seem to feel -
something mystical, something I don't know how to call it. Is not there now something beyond what you have explained?'

'Oh! my dear friend, when one sets out with a priori notions - I am afraid I have lost the only chance of a disciple I ever had.'

'Not at all, I hope' said Middleton.

'No, no' said Hanbury; 'if you will explain on your theory what I am now going to put forward I will then believe it will apply to everything else. But now where is the relation you speak of, and the comparison, in this for instance? 

O blithe New-cover! I have heard,  
I hear thee and rejoice.  
O Cuckoo! Shall I call thee Bird  
Or but a wandering voice?

Now is there not something mystical there, or is it all in plain broad daylight?'

'A mathematical thing, measured by compasses, that is what you think I should make it, do you not?'

'Well yes, if you put the words into my mouth.'

'But' when on the Professor 'if I am to undertake the analysis of so subtle a piece of beauty as you have tasked me with, might I do it by the aid of candlelight? For it is now
dark, you see, and wet underfoot and one is almost cold, I think, I hope the tea is not.'

'Ah! the tea' said Hanbury; and they went in.

'Now' said the Professor, when they were settled down at the tea-table, 'am I to consider the stanza you have quoted by itself or with reference to the rest of the poem?'

'How do you mean?' said Hanbury.

'It is rather an important point, and I must explain a little. You would say that The Tempest is beautiful (I mean Shakespeare's play) would you not? and you would say that Tennyson's poems are beautiful, and I will suppose for argument's sake that you like them all without exception; now do you mean the same thing in saying The Tempest is beautiful and that Tennyson's poems are beautiful?'

'Except for a difference in the degree of my admiration I suppose I do.'

'No difference in kind?'

'I see none'.

'Suppose from the volume of Tennyson's smaller poems there were a dozen taken away. Should you admire the remaining ones less?'
'Of course not. It could make no difference in them,' said Hanbury.

'And your estimate of Tennyson would be much the same without them; and so in any other like case, except as far as each fresh poem might be a proof of a wider range and greater versatility; and, other things being equal, I suppose versatility would put one great man above another. That by the way however, In any case the remaining poems would seem neither more nor less beautiful. But now if from a play you leave out two or three scenes, should you admire the remainder as much as when taken together with them?'

'No. But of course the pilot would be destroyed by their being left out, or mangled at all events; and a plot is so necessary to a play that - but in fact it is plain a play is almost nothing at all without its plot worked out.'

'Ah yes, but it is a great deal more than that' said the Professor. 'What I mean would apply to omissions which would not harm the plot, and I could make such omissions in many plays. For instance one hears a great deal about the tragic irony of the Greek playwrights, and the spirit which is meant by that phrase will run through a play and be developed in particular scenes, but yet have so little directly to do with the story, that a child would understand the play just as well if all expressions of this spirit were left out. The misconceptions, the unconsciously produced double senses, the prophecies and so on, of the characters
are favourite channels of pathos and other dramatic effect with the poets. They are not needed by the plot or the bare statement of them only is needed, but dramatically considered their loss would be great, would it not?

'Certainly, yes.'

'The unity which is needed for every work of art and especially for a play is enforced on us by many other things besides the plot. For instance, you remember Dido's curse on Aeneas and his children in Virgil. Nothing more than the fact of the curse was needed for the story, if that. The first part, that referring to Aeneas, is fulfilled, you know, but in another sense than that meant by Dido. This seems to me, though as I say nothing to do with the intelligibility of the story, to give more and grander unit to the book than any other touch in it. The latter part,

Exoraire aliquis nostris ex ossibus ultor,

and so on, looks beyond the time of the Aeneid to Hannibal's war, quite external therefore to the plot. You feel, I am sure, how great its loss would be.'

'Oh yes' said Hanbury.

'This of course' went on the Professor 'implies a knowledge in the reader; but almost all works of art imply knowledge of things external to themselves in the mind of the critic - in fact all do; but this is a wide field I must not
now enter on. All I want to shew is that there is a relation between the parts of the thing to each other and again of the parts to the whole, which must be duly kept. If from the volume of poems we take a dozen away, we agreed there is no difference, the remainder are neither better nor worse. But if from one single work of art, one whole, we take anything appreciable away, a scene from a play, a stanza from a short piece, or whatever it is, there is a chance, it must be better or worse without it; in a great man's work it will be—there are of course exceptions—worse. Is it not so?

'Yes, it must be so' said Hanbury, 'I see'.

'And' said Middleton 'is not this to be explained in the same way? I mean the oddness or new character a passage has which we have seen quoted and now come on with its context. It is not in this case that we imagined the thing to be a whole in itself and found it was only a part of the whole, because one generally sees at once that a quotation is something detached, but that our vague conception of what the drift of the context must be is found wrong. I must say that Wordsworth often disappoints me when I come upon a passage I knew by quotation: it seems less pointed, less excellent, with its context than without.'

'It is the case with Virgil, I think' said Hanbury.
'With regard to that' said the Professor, 'you see the few words of a quotation are impressed on us with a much greater intensity than the text of a long piece we are reading continuously. This intensity therefore is incongruous, it makes the quotation almost shine out from the page; it seems a new patch on an old garment, a purpureus pannus. As you read a poet you are more and more raised to his level, you breathe his air, you accustom yourself, till things seem less striking and beautiful than when sharply contrasted with a lower, at all events a different, style, as they were in the quotation. All this is intimately akin to what I have been thinking about beauty. I need do no more than ask you to see it is again a question of comparison, for we must not wander on to first principles just now, till our present point is settled!'

'Yes there is a comparison of a certain kind, I see' said Hanbury.

'Sometimes however, said Middleton 'one does not imagine a quotation to be a whole when it it is only a part. The effect is curious. I think what I mean would be explained by what you were saying. I have noticed sometimes this effect with regard to those quotations and tags of poetry and so on one sees added to the titles of pictures in the catalogue of the Academy. Suppose one saw this stanzia of Shelly's chosen -
Music when sweet voices die
Vibrates in the memory
Odours when sweet violets sicken
Live within the sense they quicken.

Now if one imagined this stanza was a single thought and the whole poem, or what though opposite to that, would in another way be as bad, four lines namely out of some piece in the metre of his lines written among the Euganean hills, how greatly would the effect lose, unless I am mistaken of that beauty it has when you add the next stanza –

Rose-leaves when the rose is shed
Are heap'd for the beloved's bed
And so thy thought when thou art gone
Love himself shall slumber on.

You then know the poem is complete in these two stanzas. In proportion to the shortness of a finished poem one may say is the emphasis of each verse. It seems to me that the feeling what is the precise due emphasis, though a less important point, is almost as truly a point of noble poetry as the words on which the emphasis is to be laid. Pathos or majesty. I should imagine, demand some considerable emphasis; you could hardly have them given casually; while on the other hand over-emphasis is painful, sensational, if you understand me.'

'Quite' said the Professor, 'Sonnet-writing demands this feeling you speak of. A sonnet should end, or at all events may very effectively end with a vigorous emphasis. Shakspere's end with an emphasis of pathos impressed in a rhyming couplet. I would
use these as a strong instance of the relative character of beauty. On the one hand the sonnet would lose if you put two other lines instead of that couplet at the end, on the other the couplet would lose if quoted apart, so as to be without the emphasis which has been gathering through the sonnet and then delivers itself in those two lines seen by the eye to be final or read by the voice with a deepening of note and slowness of delivery. Wordsworth's sonnets seem to me sometimes to end too casually.'

'I must not allow anything against Wordsworth' said Hanbury: 'otherwise I agree. Yes, I have noticed there is a proper character belonging to beginning and ending lines which should not be misplaced; I have noticed it, as Mr. Middleton says, in the Academy catalogue. If you attribute by mistake the emphasis to a beginning line, or to an ending line that - I don't know what to call the feeling I have about the beginnings of some poems.'

'It is a sort of pleasurable expectancy, I think, sometimes' said the Professor, 'and sometimes an artificial low pitch which you feel will be deserted by a flight or rise into a higher one presently.'

'Yes, that is very much it. In either case if you attribute the peculiar character of the one to the other you misapprehend it and the beauty is partly lost - I allow.'

'Well' said the Professor to Middleton, 'you and Hanbury
have worked this out for me and I have had the pleasure of hearing my system developed in my silence.'

We can't say that, I fear' said Middleton.

'And now' went on the Professor 'I need not ask Hanbury that question, whether I am to consider the stanza he quoted by itself or with reference to the rest of the poem, any more, for I am sure he would say he had meant with reference to the rest of the poem.'

'Yes' said he 'I thought you knew the poem well; everybody does; and so I quoted only one verse. It is the spirit which I want to hear treated on your system, and that runs through all the poem. However, that being understood, I suppose it will be shorter to examine one stanza than the whole poem.'

'Well then' said the Professor, 'before we pass on, we understand that the collective effect of a work of art is due to the effect of each part to the rest, in a play of each act to the rest, in a smaller poem each stanza to the rest, and so on, and that the addition or loss of any act or stanza will not be the addition or loss of the intrinsic goodness of that act or stanza alone, but a chance on the whole also, either for the better or for the worse necessarily. It depends however on the nature of work what will be the importance of the gain or loss of this kind; I suppose that it will be greatest where the connection is strong,
where the unity is strongly marked, that is a unity not of spirit alone but a structural one, -'

'Stay' said Hanbury, 'what is structural unit?'

'Well, a sonnet is an instance. It must be made up of fourteen lines: if you were to take a line out, that would be an important loss to the structural unity.'

'Ah yes. That sort of unity everyone could preserve, I suppose, and also at all events enough unit of plot to make a play intelligible. Unity of spirit to be well kept needs power, you would say.'

'Yes. In the particular case before us I do not mean to say perhaps that the unity of the poem would lose much by the loss or addition of a stanza, beyond -'

'Oh!' cried Hanbury.

'Beyond, my enthusiastic friend, the loss of the intrinsic value of the stanza, which would be very great, I was going to say. And now I must come to closer quarters. I am going to make a swoop, Hanbury, fell swoop, at rhythm, metre, and rhyme.'

'Ah, if you were to have everything structural your own way, the main point would still be untouched,' said Hanbury.

I suppose however' said Middleton 'every admission widens the circle of things accounted for by the theory.'
'Yes: well let him swoop.'

'We must be dialectical again then' said the Professor.
'You think these things beautiful, do you not, rhythm, metre, and rhyme?'

Of course I do; everybody does. Swoop away' said Hanbury.

'And what is rhythm? Is it not the repetition of a regular sequence of syllables either in accent or quantity?'

'The repetition of a regular sequence of syllables. If I understand, yes.'

'Well' said the Professor 'a trochee is a sequence of long and short; an anapaest is a sequence of short and short and long. These sequences are technically called feet, are they not? The repetition of them makes language rhythmical. The repetition of trochees gives a trochaic rhythm, of anapaests an anapaestic rhythm, and so on.'

'I understand.'

'You remember we agreed that regularity was the consistency or agreement or likeness either or likeness either of a thing to itself or of several things to each other. Rhythm therefore is a instance of regularity, is it not?'
'Yes.'

'Of exact, absolute regularity?' asked the Professor.
'Must each anapaest be exactly like the next?'

'Why yes. If it were not, one of the two would be an anapaest no longer but some other foot.'

'Let us see. We will try some English trochees, accentual trochees.

Odours when sweet violets sicken
Live within the sense they quicken.

Is each foot there like the next exactly?'

'Yes, with certain allowances. Although our English poetry is accentual, quantity does play some not very well recognised part in it, and this makes it perhaps less regular than classical poetry, though indeed very likely accent may have played the same part in that. For this reason and also because it is made of two words, the foot when sweet is not exactly the counterpart of odours or sicken.'

'That is very good, but I did not mean that, I will consider them as strictly regular as you like. Nothing else?'

'Except that violets is not a trochee at all but a dactyl. That is a licence.'

'An alternative foot merely' said the Professor; 'much as in the hexameter you may use the dactyl and spondee as alternatives
in the first four places. I do not mean that either. Now you remember I wished beauty to be considered as regularity or likeness tempered by irregularity or difference: the chestnut-fan was one of my instances. In rhythm we have got the regularity, the likeness; so my aim is, as rhythm is agreed to be beautiful, to find the disagreement, the difference, in it. Do you still see none?'

'No, none. What is it?'

'This, my dear Hanbury. The accentual sequence (which we call a trochee) in odours is the same as in when sweet or in sicken, but the foot is not exactly like them simply because it is made of a different word. Odours is not the same word as sicken, therefore, the foot odours is not the exact counterpart of the foot sicken. It has the same sequence of accentuation, but illustrated in different syllables. Rhythm therefore is likeness tempered with difference, is it not?'

'Yes, it is so. Well but - No: you are right, How could I not see that. I wonder.'

'And the beauty of rhythm is traced to the same causes as that of the chestnut-fan, is it not so?'

'Yes, it is.'
"Now for metre," said the Professor. "Metre is the repetition of certain regular sequences of rhythm, is it not? the combination of pieces of rhythm of certain lengths, equal or unequal."

"Oh yes, if you define metre that way. A metre is a whole of which each rhythmic foot is a part, or if you like feet are the members of lines and lines of metre. But I give up metre; go on to rhyme."

"What is rhyme?" said the Professor. "Is it not an agreement of sound ---?"

"With a slight disagreement, yes" broke in Hanbury. "I give up rhyme too."

"Let me however" said the Professor "in the moment of triumph insist on rhyme, which is a short and valuable instance of my principle. Rhyme is useful not only as shewing the proportion of disagreement joined with agreement which the ear finds most pleasurable, but also as making the points in a work of art (each stanza being considered as a work of art) where the principle of beauty is to be strongly marked, the intervals at which a combination of regularity with disagreement so very pronounced as rhyme may be well asserted, the proportions which may be well borne by the more markedly, to the less markedly, structural. Do you understand?"

"Yes" said Middleton. "In fact it seems to me rhyme is
the epitome of your principle. All beauty may by a metaphor be called rhyme, may it not?'

'Indeed' said the Professor, 'when explanation is added, I have not thought of any way so compendious of putting my principle. Thank you for it.'

'Well and I will make a clean sweep' said Hanbury. 'Assonance is not an English practice, and in this particular stanza of Wordsworth's what alliteration there is is perhaps scarcely alliteration for alliteration's sake, but I will give up those things to save you any further trouble, and whatever else is structural in poetry. You will account for them all your own way, I see. Structure is artificial and does not require genius: The expression and spirit of my stanza are Wordsworth's own and these have to be explained yet. I would put it if you liked in an arrhythmical, unmotrical, unrhyming shape, and it would then be beautiful prose, except so far as my clumsiness might spoil it in the conversion.'

'Ah, that is more than I ever asked of you' said the Professor. 'No one's thoughts need be expected to look well if the channel he chose to convey them by be changed for another.'

'Wordsworth's will however' said Hanbury. 'He held that good poetry, if the structural part were taken away, would make good prose. Suppose I try, -
Blithe New-cover, I have heard thee, even now I hear thee and my heart rejoices. O Cuckoo! is it Bird I must call thee or a wandering Voice?

'You are generous' said the Professor. 'The changes necessary to make it unrhymical have inevitably destroyed some of the grace of expression, but not so much of it, I fear, as I shall hope to make you give up before we come to the ultimate feeling and spirit of the poem.'

'Well, attack it your own way.'

'First then I must ask you whether it is necessary in things of sense that the parts of every whole must either pass into one another or else be divided from one another.'

'Yes they must; logically, I mean, I answer that all things must of course either be close to other things or not close to them. But I do not understand the drift of the question.'

'No, I will explain' said the Professor. 'Take some simple figures, circle and triangle. The circle is made by a continuous line, the triangle by three lines which meet each other. And so arabesques must be made either of a continuous line, or if you like to say so, lines, or else of non-continuous lines.'

'Or both' said Hanbury.

'Or both; that is, the arabesque or picture or whatever
it is may be compounded of continuous and non-continuous lines; all but the simplest shapes are so, generally speaking. Only you understand that all figures must be composed of continuous or of non-continuous lines or of both.'

'Have you not forgotten dots?' asked Middleton. 'You may ornament by means of dots alone, and though you might not be able to do much that is complex in that way, you may help and touch up and emphasise more elaborate pictures by means of dots.'

'How could one ornament in dots?' asked Hanbury.

'Out of five dots arranged in a particular way you make a cross, may you not? There is -- what I was thinking of in especial - a very simple and pretty pattern to be made out of dots, by arranging them, as it were, at the three angles of a triangle, thus' - and he dotted his meaning down on paper --'. "In fact making the sign of because in Mathematics. This is the pattern on a girl's dress in an etching of Rossetti's, the frontispiece to Miss Rossetti's Goblin Market, if you have seen it.'

'Ah, I had forgotten the pattern' said Hanbury.

'I had not thought of dots certainly' said the Professor, 'but I think they need give us little trouble. They may be regarded as the extreme case of non-continous or disjoined lines, may they not? And when they are grouped into patterns they shape out or suggest the figures of which they are the extremities, as your five dots suggest a cross and your three a triangle, which might be
represented respectively by two straight lines at right angles cutting each other, and three straight lines — well I need not go on. Might I stop for a moment to point out the exemplification of my theory given by an analysis of the triangle dot pattern? You will, of course, say that the dots thus arranged are prettier on the girl's dress than actual triangles would be. And why is this? I should like to consider it as being because, while whatever beauty a triangle may have is suggested to the eye, there is added the further element of beauty in the contrast between the continuity, the absolutely symmetrical continuity, of the straight lines which are the sides of the suggested triangle and the discontinuity, if I may use the word, the emphasised extreme discontinuity, of the three dots.'

Hanbury said with a smile ' You would raise the whole country to bring grist to that mill.'

'A very harmless excitement' said the Professor opening his hands outwards 'if I compel nobody to buy my flour.'

'It seems to me we are getting it as fast as we can. But go on.'

'Yes. We may consider then that all figures are made of continuous or of non-continuous lines or of both. And the same will apply to colours; they must either pass into one another or else be immediately contrasted without transition; and to shading: we must either grade or immediately oppose black and
white, or at all events two different shades. Stop me if you disagree."

'It is your results I disagree with' said Hanbury.

"Thanks. "Her very frowns are sweeter far" --. And of music I may say the same. Sounds must either pass from note to note, as wind does in a cranny or as may be done with the string of a violin, or notes may follow each other without transition as on the piano. Well this will apply to all things I suppose. Never mind for the time what this has to do with my theory: you can allow, whatever theory is true about beauty, and whatever theory is true about beauty, and whatever importance you attach to the fact, much or little, that it is a fact, namely that any change in things, any difference between part and part, must be either transitional or abrupt."

"Yes it is."

"Then of the many divisions one might make of beautiful things, I shall consider that there is one, never mind how unimportant, of transitional and abrupt. I think I would call it, though I am afraid you will laugh at the terms, a division into chromatic and diatonic beauty. The diatonic scale, you know, leaves out, the chromatic puts in, the half-notes. Of course in Music the chromatic scale is not truly chromatic; it is only nearer to a true chromatic scale than the diatonic is; but that
you will understand. Now therefore we may arrange under these two heads many artificial forms, especially, as we are particularly on that subject, poetical forms, which belong to either of them: for I think you will see that the division is not in truth unimportant, when we have made this distribution. But first I must ask some more questions. All like things are also unlike, are they not?

'I suppose they are.'

'And all unlike things are also like, are they not?'

'Let me see' said Hanbury.

'Well, things are like by virtue of their having some property in common, are they not? Now any two things, however unlike, have something in common, if only we take a wide enough basis of comparison: one knows that from Logic. And in the same way any two things, however like, have some difference from each other, as, if they are absolutely like in all other respects, they cannot be in the same place at the same time. Is it not so?'

'Quite so.'

'Likeness therefore implies unlikeness, does it not, and unlikeness likeness?'

'Yes.'
'And we may compare things in three ways, first, things that we regard as like to find their difference, next, things that we regard as unlike to find their likeness, and last, things about which we are not wholly decided to find both their likeness and unlikeness. This third is the way of comparison proper to philosophy, to science; the other two to art. You may in art mark the likeness of two things, as in simile, or the difference, as in antithesis, but you do not bring them together to say they are partly like, look, and partly unlike, do you?'

'No, certainly not.'

'There are no doubt in poetry' went on the Professor 'instances of comparisons of that third sort in which both likeness and unlikeness are deliberately regarded, but these are far from shewing the opposite of what I have just said, namely that poetry delights in single likeness or single unlikeness, if we look into them; for it will be found that they make of each resemblance a reason for suprise in the next difference and of each difference a reason for surprise in the next resemblance; and yet or such words run before each new point of comparison, and resemblances and antitheses themselves are made to make up a wider antithesis. One remembers such things in Pope, but I cannot give a better instance than Denham's well-known couplet. He wishes to compare the majestic qualities of the river Thames to the same qualities in other things, and yet shew that they are in this case unaccompanied by those kindred or contingent
qualities which lessen their value where they are found. He says it is

Though deep yet clear, though gentle yet not dull,
Strong without rage, without o'erflowing full."

'Yes I understand.'

'By the way' said the Professor 'what makes those lines doubly ingenious is not generally known and is lost by their being quoted alone. It is that there is a further comparison: he says he wishes his verse might be like like his theme, though deep yet clear' and so on. But to return. When two things are marked as being like in poetry they are understood to have been considered unlike before, and when they are contrasted they are understood to have been viewed as like before. Is it not so?'

'Yes I see. If I may interrupt, is not this a good instance of that third kind of comparison you spoke of? - facies non omnibus una,
nec diversa tamen, qualis decet esse sororum.'

'It is. Then there are practically only these two kinds of comparison in poetry, comparison for likeness' sake, to which belong metaphor, smile, and things of that kind, and comparison for unlikeness' sake, to which belong antithesis, contrast, and so on. Now there is a convenient word which gives us the common principle for both these kinds of comparison - Parallelism. Hebrew poetry, you know, is structurally only
distinguished from prose by its being paired off in parallelisms, subdivided of course often into lower parallelisms. This is well-known, but the important part played by parallelism of expression in our poetry is not so well-known; I think it will surprise anyone when first pointed out. At present it will be enough to remember that it is the cause a metaphor, simile, and antithesis, to see that it is anything but unimportant. Parallelism then, that term being now understood, we put under the head of diatonic beauty; under that of chromatic beauty come emphasis, expression (in the sense it has in Music), tone, intensity, climax, and so on. When I say emphasis and intensity I am speaking incorrectly in strictness, for they may be given abruptly of course, so as to come under the other head; but terminology in this baby science is defective; perhaps tone or expression best gives the field of chromatic beauty.

'But is that not rather begging the question' said Hanbury, 'to speak of diatonic beauty and chromatic beauty?'

'I will in future' said the Professor 'speak of diatonicism and chromatism, if you will pardon the words. Talking of the latter, it is hard from the nature of the thing to lay one's finger on examples; but I think you will feel it plays an important part in art.'

'Certainly' said Hanbury; 'But there is a question I want to ask. All these things, metaphor, simile, antithesis, tone expression, and the others you have named, are found in prose
as well as in poetry, as a rule more sparingly no doubt, but yet so that many prose passages have for instance more metaphor and antithesis than passages I could easily find of equal length in poetry. What difference of principle then is there between prose and poetry?'

'The plain difference which strikes all is what we call verse, is it not? It is that poetry has a regular structure and prose has not' said the Professor.

'O but you do not mean to say there is no more than that, no subtler difference than that. Upon my word that is a beggarly difference.'

'Ah, my friend, this is a point on which I know I must look for more pelting than on any other. I foresee I shall be told a string of sublime unlabourious definitions of poetry, that Poetry is this and Poetry is that, and that I am not to vex the Poet's mind with my shallow wit, for I cannot fathom it, and that the divine faculty is not to be degraded to the microscope and the dissecting knife, and that wherever a flower expands and dedicates its beauty to the sun there, there is Poetry, and that I am a Positivist (as I do not object to be called in a way), and that I am a fingering slave and would peep and botanise upon my mother's grave, and that I am a carrion vulture and wait, or do not wait, to tear the Poet's heart before the crowd, and that I am a Philistine
of an aggravated specious kind, and that Shakspere and Wordsworth and Tennyson and many others have uttered curses on me, and that my only reward will be that I shall be cankered and rivelled together and crisped up by the hate of hate, the scorn or scorn, which the Poet, the emphatic authentic ideal Poet, will treat me with. Dear me, I seem to myself to have become poetically and vividly descriptive of that last effect in my energetic forecast. Yes, I see it all with a glassy countenance. And you who made such flattering promises have cast the first stone. But do your worst: let me spell poet with a little p and perish. This is a shuttlecock that once did not disdain in the intervals of its flights to tread the vellum; now, flown with sublimities and "winged with desire", it has gone to its natural clouds. There, Hanbury, is my farewell tribute to you in half-rhythmical prose.'

'Remember please' said Middleton 'that I am alternative with Mr. Hanbury. I am anxious to hear the distinction between poetry and prose stated.'

'The lowest view of prose' said the Professor 'would make it stand to poetry as a trade to an art, or, if you like better, as an art to a fine art; but this view could only in face be true of the barest, most utilitarian prose. Beyond this all prose is in some degree or other artificial, aims at beauty. I presume, and uses, as our friend himself pointed out, the same unstructural forms as poetry does for that end. The truth I believe was that
Hanbury thought of noble verse (or as some people say poetry, who call what is inferior only verse), of noble verse, the work of genius, with common uninteresting prose the work of a commonplace or utilitarian pen; and with that view no wonder he thought my words unworthy and levelling. But at that rate one might just as fairly compare doggrel or commonplace verse with noble and eloquent prose, such as Burke wrote or Plato or as Shelley's preface to Adonais. No; in comparing prose and poetry, it must be commonplace prose and commonplace verse, or noble prose and noble verse. If therefore by poetry you understand all verse, we may define it as differing from prose by having a continuous and regular artificial structure, the nature of which we will consider in a minute; if by poetry you mean only noble verse, then let us define verse as above, and merely add that poetry is a particular case of it, namely the case of its being noble or successful. As for the nature of the artificial structure, from what we agreed before I think I may conclude you will say that rhythm, metre, rhyme, alliteration, assonance, and whatever other structural properties may belong to verse, are cases of strictly regular parallelisms. Is it not so?'

'Quite so' said Middleton.

'Verse and artificial prose then' said the Professor 'are arts using the medium of words, and verse is distinguished from prose as employing a continuous structural parallelism, ranging
from the technically so-called parallelism of the Psalms to the intricate structure of Greek or Italian or English verse."

'Of course' said Hanbury 'I do not object to this. All this is very true, I dare say. But there is one thing which you do not seem to allow or account for at all. You seem to think that the difference between the best prose, we will say, and the best verse is only that one has the advantage of a continuous artificial structure, in fact that the advantage of poetry over prose may be expressed by the intrinsic value of that structure, that is, of verse. But now is it not always assumed that the highest literary efforts, creative of course I mean, have been made in verse and not in prose? If you want examples of the deepest pathos and sublimity and passion and any other kind of beauty, do you not look for them in verse and not in prose? Surely this is not because one thinks one may as well have the pathos or sublimity or whatever it is with verse as without, just as one would say the best of tea was better with sugar that without.'

'I had not in fact overlooked this' said the Professor; 'but you are quite right to bring it forward. You see, as others have seen, that genius works more powerfully under the constraints of metre and rhyme and so on that without, that it is more effective when conditioned than when unconditioned. It is far too late tonight to enter on a discussion of this subject, but I think I shall be able to make good my defence for considering the difference between prose and poetry what I have done. I was giving,
if you remember, only a definition, a scientific definition, of poetry: now the fact you speak of is very striking no doubt, but it is either to be considered an accident of poetry or else, what is the truer way of putting it, the logical result of the conditions of poetry; to know about poetry we must know that, but we are not to put it in the definition, are we? It is too late, as I say, to discuss this now, but one may put the cause roughly like this, that the concentration, the intensity, which is called in by means of an artificial structure brings into play the resources of genius on the one hand, and on the other brings us to the end of what inferior minds have to give us.'

'In the lower levels of art' said Middleton 'all artists, great and little, as Sir Joshua Reynolds says, are alike; but every new level exhausts and distinguishes. Greatness is measured by the powerful action of mind under what we look on as difficulties.'

'Very true' said Hanbury, 'but what has the concentration to do with it?'

'It works thus, I suppose' said the Professor: 'everyone feels that it is useless to write in metre, for instance, if you are only to say the same as you might without it. Besides the emphasis which metre gives calls for point and emphasis of expression. I think this is enough for the present, and we may turn to our enquiries again. Let me see: where were we? O yes,
we were speaking of chromatism and diatonism in poetry. We agreed, if you remember, to place expression and all that that implies under the former head, and under the latter parallelism both structural and unstructural. I said, you know, that I thought the great frequency and importance of parallelism (the same which in a recognised, rather more artificial and structural, shape is the ground-plan of Hebrew poetry) was little understood. I wish I had time to shew this by analysing a number of examples, but—'

"Why, I hope" said Hanbury "if there is not time now you will do it another day, and explain some other things besides; for I have come so far that, even if I disagree, I should be anxious to hear how all things are accounted for on your system. Perhaps I might hear at any rate what I want to know in your next term's lectures, for I shall have leisure then.'

"Earlier, if you wish; as early as you like. We are all only too glad to get a listener. A listener though! I should say a shuttlecock, an interlocutor, an anything that has all the arduous part of the business of system-making, all the tossing to and fro, while I sit at ease and do myself the listening. But for these parallelisms: I may choose a few examples only tonight; but perhaps when I have shewn you how to look you will find yourself an abundance of them at home, especially in lyrical poetry which lives in them; and I think you will find they
increase in number and distinctness with the rise of passion. Not to look further, let us take Shelley's little piece, which has served us before now tonight. What idea does the poem express? To speak vaguely, it is the place of memory in love. But if we look closer we find the idea, which is summed in the last two lines, is shaped as an antithesis —

— they thoughts, when thou art gone,
Love itself shall slumber on.'

'Can you call it a deliberate antithesis?' said Hanbury. 'It is beautiful but so simple — "they thoughts, when thou art gone", I mean,— that it is doubtful whether it could have been put more simply.'

'Well' said the Professor, 'let us consider. In writing this poem Shelley must either have put before him mind an idea which he wishes to embody in words, namely, as we said before, the place of memory in love, or else the idea rose in the forms of expression which we read in the poem in his mind, thought and expression indistinguishable. The latter I believe to be the truer way of regarding composition, but be that as it may, one or the other must have been the case, must it not?'

'I suppose so.'

'Very well. Then if the first, out of all the conceivable ways which might have been taken to express a fertile idea he
chose this one: so the antithesis of "thy thoughts, when thou art gone" pleased him more than other imaginable less antithetical ways of expression, and was therefore deliberate. But if the second, then his thought rose at once into his mind in that form, which shews that a singularly beautiful expression of poetry has of its essence an antithetical shape; - for that the antithesis is essential to the beauty you can easily prove by seeing how you destroy the pathos by leaving out the words "when thou art gone". Try it in prose; which is more beautiful? - "Love itself shall slumber on thoughts of thee, when thou art gone" or "Love itself shall slumber on the memory of thee"."

'Reduction into prose' said Hanbury 'is a rough and ready sort of test, as you say. However I think you are right. Go on.'

'Yes. The idea of the piece then is thrown into the shape of an antithesis. Now this is illustrated in three metaphors, making with the couplet in which the idea is expressed a system of parallelisms in four members, the metaphors being taken from music, scented flowers, and rose-leaves. But now see further the subordination of parallelism to parallelism. Each of these metaphors contains an antithesis within itself - "Music, when sweet voices die", "Odours, when sweet violets sicken", and "Rose-leaves, when the rose is shed" and answer to the antithesis in "thy thoughts, when thou art gone." And you must not say that
the antithesis is necessary to their intelligibility, for one answers at once that it is part of the substance of their beauty besides.'

'Yes' said Hanbury, 'that poem is made up of parallelisms. All poetry however is not so artificially constructed, I am sure. Well, well, I remember you are at present only shewing their importance in poetry not their necessity. — I once saw that thing of Shelley's beautifully illustrated in the Water-colours Exhibition some few years ago. I forget the name of the painter.'

'Smallfield' suggested Middleton.

'Yes' said the Professor, 'it was Smallfield. It was an exquisite thing. It is seldom one sees a picture shewing so much imagination of the painter's own which yet in no way draws aside the expression of the sentiment of its text. It was full of what one calls poetry in painting and other arts: it is not in fact that the quality belongs to poetry and is borrowed by the other arts, but that it is in larger proportion to the whole amount there than anywhere else, and that, for reasons which would take some time to enquire into, the accessories without it collapse more completely and obviously than in the other arts.'

'It was full of beauty, you think' said Hanbury.

'Yes'.
'And closely expressing the spirit of Shelley's piece, you said, did you not?'

'Yes, I see you are setting a trap for me to walk into. Are you not?'

'Yes I am. Now where were the parallelisms?'

'O but' said the Professor 'it is very unreasonable of you, when it takes us so long to analyse but one stanza, to wish to make me plunge in illustration into the wide sea of another art. You know in illustrating one art by another we do not carry over the structure of the art to be illustrated. Now structurally painting is more chromatic than poetry. However let us return to our examples of parallelism of sense in poetry. Before we come to Wordsworth's poem I will take but one poem and that not at first sight fuller of parallelism than other lyrical poetry (when I say, at first sight, I mean that it really is not fuller of them than other lyrical poetry, not so full as much is; but I am using a moderate, not an extreme, instance). Do you know a poem called The Nix by Richard Garnett? I saw it in the collection by Coventry Patmore called The Children's Garland. I think I can repeat it.

The crafty Nix, more false than fair,
Whose haunt in arrowy Iser lies,
She envied me my golden hair,
She envied me my azure eyes.
The moon in silvery cyphers traced
The leaves and on the waters play'd;
She rose, she caught me round the waist
She said, Come down with me, fair maid.

She led me to her crystal grot,
She set me in her coral chair,
She waved her hand, and I had not
Or azure eyes, or golden hair.

Her locks of jet, her eyes of flame
Were mine, and hers my semblance fair;
'O make me, Nix, again the same
O give me back my golden hair.'

She smiles in scorn, she disappears,
And here I sit and see no sun,
My eyes of fire are quench'd in tears,
and all my darksome locks undone.

I wished to take this poem in place of better known things for several reasons. I presume the author is not very well known, so we shall estimate this piece -- I do not at all say this is what one should always do -- on its single merits without reference to the author's style; I at least am in the position
to do this. I must hope you will go along with me in my admiration, for of course, in case you should not see beauty in it, it will be no good to analyse it to shew how its beauty is brought into being. But if I am allowed to presume on your feelings, I say, as postulate for my after reasonings, that it is a charming poem. But the feeling that is borne in upon me first about it is this, that is so essentially poetry. I will explain; it is not the power of the writer that I am impressed with -- that is what one feels before all things besides in Dryden, who seems to take thoughts that are not by nature poetical, - stubborn, and opaque, but under a kind of living force like fire they are powerfully changed and incandescent: Dean Milman's poetry is of this kind --; nor is it the nobleness of the thoughts or the splendour of the images brought forward, which might except for their concentration and elaboration perhaps have been put in prose; but I seem to see that the author has things put before him in a light that is precisely that of poetry, that he is an absolute and unembarrassed instance of a poet, or if we may put it in another way that he is a workman come from his apprenticeship with the Muses skilled to perfection in his trade and having made himself master of all that the science has to give him. The poem is artificial, you see, but with that exquisite artifice which does not in truth belong to artificial but to simple expression, and which, except in point of polish, is found in natural and national ballad-making. This therefore is why I considered this piece a good and a typical example out of
many, because I seemed to feel it was what a poet expressed as a poet, in the transparent, almost spontaneous, artifice which alone can make a genuinely simple subject palatable, - for where this is not used so openly, as in some of Wordsworth's seemingly much more simple pieces, we shall find if we look a subtle complexity of emotion at the bottom, not simplicity, which is the secret of their beauty. Well, now let us pull the poem to pieces. You see it turns on an antithesis: if we put the central idea, that one central idea which critics say is what makes the essence of lyrical poetry, in its most concrete pictorial light, we shall find it is that of the transformation of the golden hair and azure eyes with the black hair and eyes of flame. This is the central idea and it is enforced also several times in the expression of the poem. Then let us see the parallelisms individually: first there is "more false than fair", heightened of course by the alliteration always an aid in that way. Then the latter two lines of that first stanza are a marked case; they are, to avail myself of what Mr. Middleton was saying, a rhyme — only the relative position of the parts being changed. Then the description in the next two lines is couched in a slighter parallelism,

    The moon in silvery cyphers traced  
    The leaves, and on the waters play'd.

'Stay' said Hanbury: 'would not that make any two clauses coupled by and into a parallelism?'
'Of course' said the Professor 'they are so strictly, but we take no notice of it if it is, so to speak, only a utilitarian one. But you would say perhaps that this case is so — that the writer had no intention of giving beauty by that form of expression, but merely by the ideas. But I do not think so: it was quite possible to have drawn the look of moonlight in one clause, using more detail, but the nature of his subject, the instinctive feeling of the requirements of the precise pitch of idealism in which that poem is written, led him to put it into a parallelism. As soon as composition becomes formal and studied, that is as soon as it enters the bounds of Art, it is curious to see how it falls into parallelisms. Read for instance the Exhortation in the Prayerbook, which they say is full of repetitions, meaning by that, as we may now see, that it uses parallelism to attain dignity but attains, shall we say? only pomposity, because the members of the parallelism do not bear the just proportion to each other.'

'How do they not?'

'Because, if we were to keep up the metaphor of parallel lines, the expressions are not only parallel but equal, which they should not be, as a rule, to attain beauty — that is they are just the same thing in other words. Let me see: "acknowledge and confess", "sins and wickedness", "not dissemble nor cloke", "assemble and meet together", "requisite and necessary", "pray
and beseach" — these are not very artistic parallelisms. But let us go on. Another parallelism follows next, which I pass over; then in the third stanza two parallelisms play into one another; the first —

She led me to her crystal grot,
She set me in her coral chair,
She waved her hand,

and the other —

She waved her hand, and I had not
Or azure eyes or golden hair.

The last line being made of an independent parallelism of its own. And there we see why we use or and or and nor and nor in that way in poetry only and not in prose; for prose has need sometimes to express alternatives fully as strongly as poetry, but when it does it says either and or and neither and nor, which put the parallelism of sense strongly, but not so strongly the parallelism of expression.'

'Repeat the next stanza' said Hanbury; and when it was done he said 'One needs no analysis of that, I think, now; go on to the last.'

'It is not made up merely' said the Professor 'of detached consecutive parallelisms. Let us consider. The two terms of a parallelism makes a whole of beauty, but these wholes again may be the terms of a higher whole; as so many lines make up each speech in a scene, so many speeches each scene, so many
scenes each act, so many acts the play, and, on the Greek stage, four plays a tetralogy: I mean only that works of art are composite, having unity and subordination; are they not so?

'Certainly, and each of the coordinates having a unity of its own towards its subordinates.'

'Just so, and now for this carrion-vulture business and tearing the last stanza anatomically. Of the whole stanza we may make two unequal pieces, one being the first line, and the other the rest of the stanza. These make the antithesis between the nix and the maiden. Each piece may be dismembered again, the first into "She smiles in scorn" and "She disappears", and the second, that has more articulation, first unequally, one member being the second line of the stanza, the other the last two lines, and afterwards each line may be divided again.

And here I sit and see no sun

is just like

She smiles in scorn, she disappears

except that in that the absence of and gives more antithesis.

And then the antitheses of the last couplet how charming they are! how the irony of her unhappiness is summed up in the eyes of fire being quenched in tears! And for the darksome locks being undone, you know how much use poetry makes of negative words and just for the reason that they express an antithesis.

Unhouseled, disappointed, unannealed.
All words mean either things or relations of things: you may also say then substances or attributes or again wholes or parts. Eg. man and quarter.

To every word meaning a thing and not a relation belongs a passion or prepossession or enthusiasm which it has the power of suggesting or producing but not always or in everyone. This not always refers to its evolution in the man and secondly in man historically.

The latter element may be called for convenience the possession of a word. It is in fact the form, but there are reasons for being cautious in using form here, and it bears a valuable analogy to the soul, one however which is not complete, because all names but proper names are general while the soul is individual.

Since every definition is the definition of a word and every word may be considered as the contraction or coinciding-point of its definitions we may for convenience use word and definition with a certain freedom of interchange.

A word then has three terms belonging to it, or moments - its prepossession of eeling; its definition, abstraction,
vocal expression or other utterance; and its application, 'extension', the concrete things coming under it.

It is plain that of these only one in propriety is the word; the third is not a word but a thing meant by me, the first is not a word but something connotatively meant by it, the nature of which is further to be explored.

But not even the whole field of the middle term is covered by the word. For the word is the expression, uttering of the idea in the mind. That idea itself has its two terms, the image (of sight or sound or scapes of the other senses), which is in fact physical and a refined energy accenting the nerves, a word to oneself, an inchoate word, and secondly the conception.

The mind has two kinds of energy, a transitional kind, when one thought or sensation follows another, which is to reason, whether actively as in deliberation, criticism, or passively, so to call it, as in reading etc; (ii) an abiding kind for which I remember no name, in which the mind is absorbed (as far as that may be), taken up by, dwells upon, enjoys, a single thought; we may call it contemplation, but it includes pleasures, supposing they, however turbid, do not require a transition to another term of another kind, for contemplation in its absoluteness is impossible unless in a trance and it is enough for the mind to repeat the same energy on the same matter.
Art exacts this energy of contemplation but also the other one, and in fact they are not incompatible, for even in the successive arts as music, for full enjoyment, the synthesis of the succession should give, unlock, the contemplative enjoyment of the unity of the whole. It is however true that in the successive arts with their greater complexity and length the whole's unity retires, is less important, serves rather for the framework of that of the parts.

The more intellectual, less physical, the spell of contemplation the more complex must be the object, the more close and elaborate must be the comparison the mind has to keep making between the whole and the parts, the parts and the whole. For this reference or comparison is what the sense of unity means; mere sense that such a thing is one and not two has no interest or value except accidentally.

Works of art of course like words utter the idea and in representing real things convey the prepossession with more or less success.

The further in anything, as a work of art, the organisation is carried out, the deeper the form penetrates, the prepossession flushes the matter, the more effort will be required in apprehension, the more power of comparison, the more capacity for receiving that synthesis of (either successive
or spatially distinct) impressions which gives us the unity with the prepossession conveyed by it.

The saner moreover is the act of contemplation as contemplating that which really is expressed in the object.

But some minds prefer that the prepossession they are to receive should be conveyed by the least organic, expressive, by the most suggestive, way. By this means the prepossession and the definition, uttering, are distinguished and unwound, which is the less sane attitude.

Along with this preference for the disengaged and unconditioned prepossession in these minds is often found an intellectual attraction for very sharp and pure dialectic or, in other matter, hard and telling art-forms; in fact we have in them the two axes on which rhetoric turns.
MENTION of rhythm, 'number', as heard in periods, in prose, leads to treatment of rhythm and its belongings, the various shapes of speech called verse.

Definition of verse - Verse is speech having a marked figure, order of sounds independent of meaning and such as can be shifted from one word or words to others without changing. It is figure of spoken sound.

That it may be marked it must be repeated at least once, that is, the figure must occur at least twice, so that it may be defined / Spoken sound having a repeated figure. (It is not necessary that any whole should be repeated bodily; it may be sided off, as in the metres of a chorus, but then some common measure, namely the length of a or - or strength of a beat etc, recurs)

We must not insist on knowing where verse ends and prose (or verseless composition) begins, for they pass into one another — as for instance if rhymed but unmetrical doggrel is verse.

Beyond verse as thus defined there is a shape of speech possible in which there is a marked figure and order not in the sounds but in the grammar and this might be shifted to other words with a change of specific meaning but keeping some general
agreement, as of noun over against noun, verb against verb, assertion against assertion etc, e.g. Foxes (A) have (B) holes (C) and birds of the air (A') have (B — not B' here) nests (C'), or more widely even than this / with a change of words but keeping the grammatical and logical meaning — as / Foxes have holes and birds of the air have nests (that is / Beasts have homes to live in) but the Son of Man has not where to lay His head (that is / Man has not a home to live in): the subjects of the clauses being changed the one does no more than say yes, the other no. Hebrew poetry is said to be of this nature. This is figure of grammar instead of figure of spoken sound, which in the narrower sense is verse. However perhaps Hebrew poetry makes a nearer approach to verse than this. If for instance it is essentially musical, at least in origin, the music will supply the element of structure instead of verse and when it is no longer sung will be so far supplied by the reader in thought as to justify at least the poetic wording, stress, dwelling, impressiveness, formal antithesis etc. Besides the initial alephs, ghimels etc seem to imply some kind of alliteration, so that there might be some kind of verse closed at one end, the beginning, but open and variable the other.

As we have divided the kinds of composition according to the kinds of sentence we may find the kinds of possible verse by the kinds of resemblance possible between syllabus.
These are —

(1) Musical pitch, to which belongs tonic accent
(2) Length or time or quantity so called
(3) Stress or emphatic accent, \(\text{\textit{a}}\)\(\text{\textit{p}}\)\(\text{\textit{g}}\)\(\text{\textit{i}}\)\(\text{\textit{s}}\) and \(\text{\textit{\theta}}\)\(\text{\textit{\epsilon}}\)\(\text{\textit{\eta}}\)\(\text{\textit{\i}}\).
(4) Likeness or sameness of letters and this some or all and these vowels or consonants and initial or final.

This may be called the lettering of syllables
(5) Holding, to which belong break and circumflexion, slurs, glides, slides etc

These elements of verse then will be running, continuous (2. and, if marked, 1.) or intermittent (4. and, if marked, 3.) But 2. is especially running and 4. intermittent; 3. is between. Group together 1., 2. and 3., 5.

Other things are unimportant as ring or tang or grain (timbre), which would be personal or provincial etc accent; loudness and softness; accent of meaning, logical rhetorical, and ethical emphasis and intonation.

(1) We are talking of spoken syllables. Singing or vocal music has arisen from this same element of pitch but as heard not essentially in syllables but in breaths, which are something less than syllables. Once music and verse were one perhaps but were differenced by dwelling on the mere pitch and the lettering respectively. And vocal music scarcely
becomes wholly independent of words except in whistling (Singing without words is in Greek to go lala or ta ra. There is also humming).

This musical pitch therefore not an element of verse, because so far as dwelt on it gives rise to music, when not dwelt on of course it goes for nothing. However it is a great element of beauty in reading.

Here then on accent — Accent is any point of pronunciation over and above the standard sound of the syllable or word or sentence or discourse even in which it is found and the written mark of it. Thus a provincial, foreign accept is a turn given by country people or foreigners to what they say short of changing the letters of the words they use or, if they do that, short of disguising them beyond recognition, so that in any case they remain in themselves what they are in common usage. An accept of surprise, complaint etc is a turn given to what you say by which over and above its meaning it expresses your surprise, sorrow etc in saying it. The turn by which we make assertion into question is accept. The emotional or argumentative or matter of fact historical turn we give our words is accent. The slight variations of e, é, è, ô in French are treated as too small to make a change of letter and so go down to accept; it is all e. However this is a point of view. But more especially we speak of the accent
of words, that is of syllables; for the accent of a word means its strongest accent, the accent of its best accented syllable. This is of two kinds — that of pitch (tonic) and that of stress (emphatic). We may think of words as heavy bodies, as indoor or out of door objects of nature or man's art. Now every visible palpable body has a centre of gravity round which it is in balance and a centre of illumination of highspot or quickspot up to which it is lighted and down from which it is shaded. The centre of gravity is like the accent of stress, the highspot like the accent of pitch, for pitch is like light and colour, stress like weight, and as in some things as air and water the centre of gravity is either unnoticeable or changeable so there may be languages in a fluid state in which there is little difference of weight or stress between syllables or what there is changes and again as it is only glazed bodies that shew the highspot well so there may be languages in which the pitch is unnoticeable.

English is of this kind; the accept of stress strong, that of pitch weak — only they go together for the most part. In French they do not and as the accent of pitch, the tonic accent, is more marked in English people and others go by and follow this and represent it by the accent of stress in their own tongue. They say maison, chapelle, ami for maison, chapelle, a mi because the tonic accent is or often is maison, chapelle, ami. And so the French in talking English
— another, leprosy, élément. For the French accent of stress, putting aside ti and such half syllables and mute e’s, is commonly on the penultimate. Try this by whispering. The tonic accent is an attempt to bring out, light up, distinguish weak syllables — Napoleon, amitié, if I am not mistaken. So also probably in Greek

For the Greek name for accent is προφόνον, that is the tune sung to a word, the note or pitch of a syllable. The Latin translation is accentus, with the same meaning, but we cannot certainly say that the Latin accent was then tonic, not emphatic. Also the Greeks give their strong and weak accents the names ἄκρα ἁγχύα, ἀγεύϊα sharp or highpitched and flat or lowpitched; so do the French aigu and grave, shewing that they look on an e (the only letter which is accented for sound and not for distinction's sake) as being raised or lowered in pitch by its changes of pronunciation — whether it really is so is another question. The tonic accent then differs by high and low, sharp and flat. The emphatic differs by strong and weak, which easily passes into loud and soft. When we contract two or more syllables into one we try to give as far as possible the new syllable the properties which all the old had or when we make a word of one or fewer syllables stand for a word of more syllables; it thus comes to have the heights of two or three tonic accents or stress.
This is circumflex accent (not the same as circumflex vowelling, which is break, though this latter will involve the former) and there will be two kinds of it, for stress and for pitch.

In English every word has its emphatic accent which is quite essential to it and which being changed the word becomes meaningless, as *never* to *never*, or changes meaning, as *present* to *present*. So far as a tonic accent is noticeable in single words it is on the same syllable. But besides the stress or emphasis and pitch or intonation of single syllables one against another there is stress or emphasis and a pitch or intonation running through the sentence and setting word against word as stronger or as higher pitched and though it may make every syllable of the emphatic word stronger still it is most felt on the accented syllable, the unaccented are often as weak as any other word in the sentence — 'I said my UNcle, not my GREATuncle'. But emotional intonation, especially when not closely bound to the particular words will sometimes light up notes on unemphatic syllables and not follow the verbal stresses and pitches. In French the rules are I think as follows — the accent of stress though weak is fixed or nearly and consequently is the distinguishing mark of the word and so receives any special or sentence-emphasis (logical emphasis) which is to be given; the tonic accent is employed as a counterpoise to
the other and this receives diffused emotional emphasis

(2) Quantity of a syllable the time it takes in saying. Only two times allowed, the long and short and the long reckoned as equal to two short. This is the rule for Greek and was borrowed and applied but easily and naturally in Latin. It holds for Tamil verse and, it is said, for Nagy. It is on the same principle as a minim = two crotchets or a crotchet two quaves etc. It is considered to lie in the vowel. The vowel may therefore be considered in point of quantity to end the syllable. It may be itself long or short, which is called being long or short by nature — as γιοί are long by nature. It may also be long by position, when two or more consonants follow in the same word or even at the beginning of the next. If the vowel by nature is short it is lengthened then by holding — μην θα, θεστήν as if the succeeding consonants held it up. We have in English scarcely anything answering to this. The meaning of it is that you can without clumsiness intress, throw a stress on / a syllable so supported which if it were unsupported would be drawling.

The length so called of syllables in English, by which wind in the ordinary way is short and as rhymed to bind long or sit, got, hat met short, sight, goat, hate, meet long, is rather strength than length of syllable. Undoubtedly there is
a difference of length and so also when you add consonants — thinkst is longer than thick, lastst than lass etc but not in the Greek way by ratios of 1:2.

(3) Accent of stress has been explained — It is the bringing out of the sound of a syllable, especially of its vowel-sound. It is also almost necessarily a heightening of the same syllable in loudness. Unaccented syllables on the contrary are both slurred and soft. An accented syllable is equal to two unaccented roughly speaking but no two weak accents in a word are exactly equal. Commonly those next to the strong are weakest. Perhaps in some people’s mouth the strong accent may be equal to all the other accents of the word — veterinary, say 4 = 1 + 1 + 1 + 1; incomparable 1 + 4 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 4 + 4, or perhaps 1 + 2 = 1 + 1 + 1, for the foregoing syllables either do not count or may be reckoned to the strong accent against those that follow it. But some words have a subordinate strong accent — understanding, overcome

Accentual verse arises from emphatic accent as quantitative from length of syllable. It is made by repeating the same figure of accentuation — as \( \text{WWWW} \) or \( \text{\|\|\|\|} \) or \( \text{\|\|\|\|} \) etc — instead of \( \text{- - - -} \) or \( \text{- - - -} \) or \( \text{- - - -} \) etc. But how we to tell whether to join \( \text{- - - -} \) or \( \text{- - - -} \) etc, \( \text{- - - -} \) or \( \text{- - - -} \) especially a long way from the beginning. In other words how are we to
determine the rhythm and the feet? In quantitative verse (which already has time) by the beat, in accentual (which already has beat / in accent) by the time. We must then define rhythm, foot, beat. Beat, Latin ictus, is metrical accent, the beat, that is the strong beat, as the accent is the strongest accent, is the strongest beat of a foot. A foot is two or more syllables, running to as many as four or five, grouped about one strong beat. The smaller feet are sometimes paired - two of the same or of different kinds, and make kind of double feet ΣΥΣΤΡΥΧΙΑΣ ΣΥΣΤΡΥΧΙΑΣ compound feet, or ΣΥΣΤΡΥΧΙΑΣ double feet, which are called in Greek ἙΣΤΡΥΧΙΑΣ. Thus the common metre of the Greek tragedies answering in the main to our ten syllable blank verse line has six iambic feet but in three pairs of and is called a trimeter. In the heroic measure on the contrary the longer dactyl or spondee is itself a ἙΣΤΡΥΧΙΑΣ and so the line is called a hexameter. The longer feet and the double have a secondary beat as some words have a secondary accent — incomprehensible, underneath.

The Greeks have given names to the feet from two syllables up to four and to one of five syllables. They are pyrrhich, ΠΥΡΡΗΧΙΑΣ — ; spondee, ΣΠΟΝΔΕΙΟΥΣ — ; iamb, ΙΑΜΒΙΟΣ — ; trochee, ΤΡΟΧΕΙΟΣ, ΧΟΡΕΙΟΣ, ΧΟΡΙΟΣ — for three syllables — tribrach, ΤΡΙΒΡΑΧΙΟΣ — ; bacchius, ΒΑΧΧΙΟΣ, ΒΑΧΧΙΑΚΟΣ, ΒΑΧΧΙΑΚΟΣ, ΚΑΠΕΛΛΙΑΚΟΣ, ΚΑΠΕΛΛΙΑΚΟΣ, ΚΑΠΕΛΛΙΑΚΟΣ.
cretic, amphimacer, αυτιστος anapaest, ὅρκενας
dactyl, ἀμφίμαστος amphibrach, μολόσσος molossus,
; for four syllables — προκτελευμάτικος proceleusmatic
- παίνω πτωτός first paen, πτωτός δεύτερος
second paen, πτωτός τρίτος third paen, πτωτός
tέταρτος fourth paen, υ πυρ ψικός a majore, long-to-short
 Ionic, — — ὑ — I a minore, short-to-long Ionic, ὑ — —
διαμβος double iamb, ὑ — — ὑ double trochee, — — — ὑ — —
ὑ ὑ ψικος ψικος choriamb, — — — (= trochee +
 lamb); αυτιστος antispast, — — — — (= iamb + trochee);
ἐπίτριτος first epitrite, — — — ; second, — — — —
third, — — — fourth, — — — ὑ ὑ ψικος double spondee,
— — — —. The dochmius, ὑ ψικος, with many variations
is sometimes counted a foot, but is rather a υ ψικος. Examples
— brevis, longi, breves, longus, brevia, canebant, longique,
perbreves, canerent, longaque, brevisque, longinqui, breviague,
plurimaque, brevissima, brevibusque, celeritas, longissima,
breviores, brevissimi, longiora, omnipotens, Alexander, Alexandri,
longitudo, longinquitas, longarumque, oratores

These feet are each divided into syllables from two to
four or into times from two to eight. Each also has its rising
and falling cadence, ὑ ψικος and θεσις levationem and positionem,
dividing it in the ratio \( \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}, \frac{2}{3}, \frac{3}{4}, \frac{3}{4} \). But the
division and so the ratio may sometimes be made in or more than
one way, as υ ψικος may be \( \frac{1}{2} \) or \( \frac{2}{3} \). θεσις and θεσις confusedly used,
sometimes for weak and strong, which is better, sometimes for strong and weak. They mean by rights the rise and falling of the hand or foot in beating time, the plausus or ictus in which the fall is the strong place, the rise the weak, but have been perhaps confused with the rise and fall of the voice, in which it is the other way.

Feet may be mixed but the beat must be commonly the same or nearly. The amphibrach repeated or mixed with other feet is considered unlawful because of its very unequal division — 1 + 3, to remedy which you must beat in the middle of the long syllable, which is unpleasant. St. Austin's pupil (de Musica) is made to consider this rhythm intolerable — 'Su mas op tima, faci as hone sta'

The repetition of feet, the same or mixed, without regard to how long, is rhythm. Metre is the grouping of a certain number of feet. There is no metre in prose though there may be rhythm. A verse according to the ancients is a metre or piece of metre consisting of two parts divided by a caesura. Caesura is the overlapping of words and feet, so that a foot contains parts of two words and a word of two feet. But in modern verse a verse means a complete metrical figure, a metrical unit, for as the foot is the rhythmic unit, which it repeats, so a verse is the metrical unit of repetition. It may be a line or couplet or triplet or stanza — quatrains, octet
A line is an intermediate division between foot and verse, like a clause and marked off by rhyme or other means— for we must judge by the ear not by reading and the eye.

We may now say of rhythm i.e. verse that it is the recasting of speech into sound-words, sound-clauses and sound-sentences of uniform commensurable lengths and accentuations. The foot is the rhythmic word with its strong beat for the emphatic accent, the \( \text{M} \) or bar the rhythmic sub-clause, the verse or stanza the rhythmic sentence. And music is the recasting of speech used in a wide sense, of vocal utterance, into words, clauses, and sentences of pitched sounds having uniform etc. as above. The musical syllable is the note, the musical foot or word the bar, the bars in double time stand for double feet or \( \text{M} \) and for, say, unverbal sub-clauses, the strains or phrases for wing-clauses, the passage or melody down to the cadence for the sentence, the movement for the paragraph, the piece for the discourse. One may add that the modulation into another key stands for the suspension, the return to the first key for the recovery. Also rests are allowed for in the verse of the ancients and, though not professedly, in ours (there are instances collected from Shakespeare) like the rests in music; see St. Austin de Musica bk.3.

Feet give their names to the rhythms that are made out of them. There is iambic, trochaic, dactylic, anapaestic, bacchic, paeonic, ionic, choriambic, antispastic, dochmiac
rhythm. Aristotle says that all \( \textit{μεταφοράς} \) is creative art, is imitation, reproduction, representation and he says this of verse, music, and dancing. The imitation or representation is of character, feeling and action (\( \textit{Και ηθος Καὶ Πάθη Καὶ Πράξεις} \)). And so in fact it is commonly felt and said that feet and rhythms have their particular character. In general when the short or light syllables go before the long or strong, as in the iamb, the anapaest, the ionic, a minore, the third and fourth paean, the rhythm is \textit{forward} and expresses present action. When it is the other way, as in the trochee, dactyl, the ionic \textit{a majore}, the first and second paeons, it expresses succession and suits narrative. In considering the character of a rhythm we must be careful to see what it really is, not the easiest or most obvious way of scanning it ("Now the hungry lion roars" is iambic though it begins with a trochee and "'t was when the seas were roaring" trochaic though it begins with an iamb). Also the even rhythms, anapaestic, dactylic, spondaic, ionic are more monotonous than the uneven, iambic, trochaic, cretic. More in detail the iambic is near the language of common talk, as Aristotle says of Greek and the same holds for English, and as modern verse is essentially spoken, not sung, it is the staple rhythm in the Teutonic and Romance languages; the ancients use it for dialogue. The trochaic is tripping, \textit{ut idem dicit}; it runs. It suits brisk narrative ("'Twas when the seas were roaring"), especially when not doubled. When doubled
it becomes grave and monotonous ('Ah distinctly I remember' and Hiawatha). The dactyl is like the trochee made graver without becoming heavier. It is the Greek epic foot and it should be remarked that it is fitted for this by its essence, for not only the verses go by dactyls and their alternative spondees but even the narrative goes by dactyl movements, a strong and two softs — that is / by first lodging a line of summary or preface and striking a keynote and then developing this and playing it off: you might underscore these lines through the Iliad and almost get the story from them —

The English hexameter does not closely represent the Greek, because its alternative feet are rather trochees than spondees; also there is no counterpoise to the marked rhythm: in the Greek and Latin there is the accent but you cannot use the quantity for this in English without spoiling the rhythm. The spondee is solemn and slow. The pyrrhich is very light: there cannot be an accentual pyrrhich is very light: there cannot be an accentual pyrrhich. The anapaest is grave and swift too. In English it is very hard to tell whether to scan by dactyls, anapaests or amphibrachs ('There came to the bech a poor exile of Erin' — 'One more unfortunate' — 'The Assyrian came down'): the
amphibrach has the most bound and canter—it leaps like waves. antipast is rocking and tumultuous: it gives a richer rhythm than all others and under whatever name is common in the Greek and Latin lyrical verse; it appears also in Shakespeare's blank verse. The cretic is brisk and tramping. The choriamb is liquid and eloping. In general then there are three descriptions of rhythm—upward or climbing (iamb, anapaest, downward or dropping (trochee, dactyl), and central or rocking (amphibrach, cretic, choriamb, antipast), the first suiting the drama, the second epic and narrative, the last lyric verse. We must remember that in modern verse part of the office of rhythm is thrown on rhyme and other things.

Rhythm of prose—Aristotle says (Rhet. III viii)—
"The shape (or figure) of the diction must not be metrical nor yet unrhythmical. The first of these breeds distrust: it seems artificial and moreover it stands out and catches the ear, making the hearer on the watch for resemblances, when the chime will come again. In fact it is like a public manumission, when the boys take the word out of the crier's mouth and when he asks / Whom does the emancipated man choose for his patron? shout Cleon. On the other hand what is unrhythmical is unbounded. Now it should be bounded, though not by metre, for the unbounded is unpleasant and unintelligible. Number puts a bound on everything and the number (or count) of the figure of the wording is rhythm: metres are sections of this. There should then be
rhythm in speaking but not metre (which would make it poetry), but not exact rhythm. Partial rhythm will be what we want. He then names three rhythms—the heroic (dactyls with alternative spondees), which has the ratio \( \frac{1}{2} \); the iambic and the trochaic, which are \( \frac{1}{2} \) and \( \frac{1}{3} \); and the paeanic, which is \( \frac{2}{3} \) or \( \frac{3}{2} \). He groups the rhythms in fact by their ratios. The heroic he rejects as too solemn for speaking and needing music. The iamb he says is actually what people talk in and chance verses are oftenest iambics: he rejects it for want of dignity—and the trochee for the same reason: it dances. The paean he says, the first paean, has been in use with orators since Thrasymachus, as it should be. 'The other rhythms must be put aside for the above reasons and because they are metrical and the paean adopted: it is the only one of those named which by itself does not make metre, so that it passes unnoticed the easiest.' Only they should use not only the first paean, as they do, which suits beginnings, as \( \Delta \alpha \lambda \gamma \epsilon \nu \varepsilon \), \( \varepsilon \tau \omicron \beta \omicron \kappa \iota \alpha \nu \kappa \iota \alpha \nu \) and \( \chi \rho \nu \sigma \mu \epsilon \kappa \omicron \kappa \alpha \) \( \varepsilon \kappa \alpha \tau \omicron \), \( \pi \alpha \iota \delta \omicron \) (notice the hiatus), but the other, the fourth, for the end, for the end should be different from the beginning, as \( \mu \acute{e} \tau \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha \, \gamma \alpha \nu \sigma \alpha \tau \alpha \, \tau \iota \omicron \kappa \iota \alpha \nu \omicron \, \eta \theta \omicron \alpha \omicron \omicron \) \( \nu \omicron \xi \). 'This gives an ending, for a short syllable being incomplete cuts words off short. Now they ought to break off with a long and the end be marked, not by a flourish of the pen or anything the writer does out by the rhythm.' We should notice that the paean is recommended by the complexity of its ratio,
which is hard to catch, and by its length, which makes the longs and beats wide apart and so also hard to catch the particular rhythm of, though rhythmical. Instances of English accentual paeons — 'is no more glory than a mum my is a man (fourth) — 'and such losses are irreparable' (first). Cicero did not agree with Aristotle about paeons; no wonder, for Aristotle was speaking of Greek, in which accent went for next to nothing in rhythm and was, if noticed, often on the last syllable, while in Latin it is an element to be considered and is never on the last so that Latin has essentially a dropping beat, which will not suit with the final paeon. The Asiatic school of oratory liked to end with the double trochee, which is free from the lightness or trip of the single, and undoubtedly the dropping cadence satisfies the ear. 'Lost, lost for ever' or 'and that loss everlasting'. Cretics — 'first the mutton overboiled, then the beef underdone' — brisk and resolute. Antispasts — 'Dulness perhaps often, at times sadness, regret never'.

We have said that rhythm may be accentual or quantitative, that is go by beat or by time. It may be both or it may be neither but only have what is common to both. This is count or number in a narrow sense. There is also bare beat without count. I am not aware of mere time without beat, unless in chanting perhaps. The count may be by the number of syllables,
each to count one, as in French, or it may be by the shortest syllable (the \( \delta_{\text{maj}} \) whence \( \pi\rho\omega\nu\) \( \gamma\rho\gamma\mu\nu\) \( \varepsilon\tau\) etc), as in Greek, or by the weakest syllable, as in English. For rhythm without count of syllable see Saturnian verse —

Marcus Publius Vertuleii, Gaii filii

Quod ré sua' diffident | áspere' afflicita
Paréns timens híc vóvít, | vóto hóc solúto,
Decumá factâ pollúcta, | líberi libéntes
Donúm ãnút Hérculi | máxime mérito,
Simúl te oránt se vóti | crébro cóndemnes

and

Cornélius Lucius | Scipio Barbatus
Gnaivód patré prognatus | fórtis vír sapíensque,
Quoiús fórmá vírút | tei parísuma fúit; (?)
Cónsul, censor, aidílis | quei fúit apúd vos, (?)
Taurásia, Cisáuna | Samnii cépit,
Subígit omné Loucánam | ópsidesque abdócut

or —

Fató Metellí fiúnt Romae conúles

or this —

March dust, April showers
Bring forth May flowers
or —

In April  
Come he will.

In May  
He sings all day.

In June  
He changes his tune.

In July  
He prepares to fly.

In August  
Go he must.

or Piers the Plowman —

What this mountain bemeneth / and this derke dale
And this feire feld, ful of folk / feire I schall ow schewe.

A lovely ladi on leor / in linnene iclothed

*   *   *

Al hou bisy thei ben / aboute the mase?

The moste parti of the peple / that passeth nou on eorthe

The beat varies for the most part between anapaestic and iambic
or dactylic and trochaic but it is so loose that not only the
syllables are not counted but not even the number of beats in
a line, which is commonly two in each half-line but sometimes
three or four. It almost seems as if the rhythm were disappear­
ing and repetition of figure given only by the alliteration.
The Saturnian is stricter: three beats to a half-line are
commonly reckoned but I suspect that two are allowed in the
ending in long words. It must have been chahted, as the beats
as often as not disagree with the word-accents. This beat-rhythm
allows of development as much as time-rhythm wherever the ear or mind is true enough to take in the essential principle of it, that bear is measured by stress or strength, not number, so that one strong may be equal not only to two weak but to less or more. In English great masters of rhythm have acted on this:

Shakespeare —

Toad that under cold stone

and —

Sleep thou first i'th charmed pot

and —

Why should this desert be?

and —

Thou for whom Jove would swear — ;

Campbell —

As ye sweep through the deep — ;

Hamilton —

Busk ye, busk ye, my bonny bonny bride
Busk ye, busk ye, my winsome marrow
Then build, then build, ye sisters, sisters sad,
Ye sisters sad, his tomb with sorrow —

It is the counterpointing upon an eight- or nine-syllabled four-beat iambic or trochaic line of a rhythm of six beats in two parts, unequal in length but balanced in strength, or if you like of six beats in the first and third lines and five in the others, and those beats so subtly hung and disturbed and balanced that scarcely any two are alike. In general the system of alternative feet can not be fully worked out in accentual verse, for when we put a three-syllable foot for a two-syllable we are changing not only the foot but the beat and the rhythm: arrowy Iser for rolling Iser or silvery ciphers for silver ciphers is not a dactyle for a spondee (2 + 1 + 1 for 2 + 2) but a dactyl for a trochee (2 + 1 + 1 = 4 for 2 + 1 = 3)

On the other hand there is verse reckoned by count alone, French. It has in fact an average rhythm, which is iambic in lines of even syllables, trochaic of odd, always abating the feminine rhymes. But this beat is so faint that it falls on the weak final e's, as —

À la porte de la salle
Ils entendirent du bruit ;
Le rat de ville detale,
Son camrade le suit.

This is made endurable by the lightness and by the marked pitch of the syllables.

In Italian both count and beat are employed but the beat is weaker than with us. Thus you may have trochees in the second foot of a five-foot iambic or indeed in any place but the last; in English commonly only in the first, as —

In the deep bosom of the ocean buried.

Thus —

C’anto l’arme pietose e ’l capitano

and

Questa selva selvaggia ed aspra e forte.

This arises from weakness or from equal strength of syllable accent rather than from counterpointing. The same holds for Spanish etc perhaps.

In Greek the scanning is by time and rhythmic beat, that is beat belonging only to the rhythm-words, not to the sense-words. The accent of the words, the sense-words, goes for nothing. It was probably tonic accent and so disappeared in chanting. Whatever emphatic accent there was would then also
disappear and being weak not be missed, besides that it would probably often agree with the beat of the verse. In course of time the tonic accent of Greek became emphatic accent and gave rise to accentual verse, the so-called political verse, which is in use now. At the same time the old time-verse became dead verse, verse of a dead language. Latin accent was probably both tonic and emphatic. It plays an important unacknowledged part in Latin verse, as will be noticed presently, by way of counterpoint.

In conclusion, quantitative verse, as Greek and Latin, is sung or chanted, accentual verse, as ours, is spoken. French verse is counted. Italian is counted and spoken too.

Bare rhythm would be monotonous. Monotony is prevented in the following ways —

(i) By the mere change of the words, like fresh water flowing through a fountain or over a waterfall, each gallon taking on the same shape as those before it —

(ii) By caesura, the breaking of the feet, or in other words the breaking up of the rhythm into sense-words of different lengths from the sound-words. When the caesura is fixed by rule we have rhythmic counterpoint. By counterpoint I mean the carrying on if two figures at once, especially if they are alike in kind but very unlike or opposite in species. The more marked the rhythm,
whether by quantity or beat the more need of a marked caesura to break it. Hence in the Greek and Latin hexameter it falls either so as to halve the third foot or the fourth foot; if it fell earlier or later it would divide the line too unequally, if between the third and fourth feet it would not break the rhythm. The same rule holds for the iambic trimeter. In the pentameter the break in the middle divides the line equally indeed but it leaves a foot unfinished, so as to give the equation $2\frac{1}{2} + 2\frac{1}{2} = 5$. (The hexameter and iambic trimeter have the equation $2\frac{1}{2} + 3\frac{1}{2} = 6$ or $3\frac{1}{2} + 2\frac{1}{2} = 6$). Yet even so it is too monotonous to be repeated twice running. The English ten-syllable iambic (made us of in Italian, German, and sometimes in French) may be divided three ways so as to avoid monotony and yet have balance — first between the second and third feet, which gives $2 + 3 = 5$, next between the third and fourth ( $3 + 2 = 5$ ), lastly breaking the third foot ( $2\frac{1}{2} + 2\frac{1}{2} = 5$ ). This last is not monotonous like the pentameter, because the foot is reversed after the break.

Of that forbidden tree whose mortal taste —

though the number of syllables is the same; in fact the number of beats is different. (Of say —

Without unspotted, innocent within —).

In the pentameter the order and number of beats is the same.
(In the hexameter it is usually equal, 3 against 3, sometimes
4 against 2 or rather 2 + 2 + 2 —
Nonne vides // ut praecipiti // certamine campi —;
in the iambic trimeter 2 against 4 or 3 against 3). The Sapphic
line is divided by Horace either into 9 times against 9 (Jam
satis terris // nivis atque dirae = 2 + 3 + 4 (=9) 2 + 3 + 4
( = 9 ) or 10 against 8 (Mercuri facunde // nepos Atlantis =
5 + 5 (=10)) // 3 + 5 (=8), but in either case there beats
against 2.

In the French alexandrine the caesura divides the verse
equally, without breaking either a word or a foot, but this is
in fact dividing it into two six-syllable feet and the beat is
so faint that without this it would be a pell mell of syllables.
In the English alexandrine Spenser commonly divides in the same
way but sometimes thus —
Wrapt in eternal silence, // far from enemies —
but Byron always in the other. However the Alexandrine as they
use it and as it is found in heroic couplets is exceptional.
For its nature as an independent rhythm one must consult
Drayton's Polyolbion and Browning's Fifine.

(iii) By the tonic accent of the words, especially in
French. It is an assistance to accentual verse by giving us
the means to weaken heavy syllables and heighten weak ones. In Greek the tonic accent would disappear in chanting but the remembrance of where it fell would give a certain variety, not regular but haphazard.

Here we may include the tonic accent of sense, the inflection of the voice to bring out the meaning

(iv) By the emphatic accent of the words. In Green this was probably so slight as not to be felt, in French it is felt but is haphazard. In Latin it was marked and was made use of by the poets, especially the great masters of metric as Horace and Ovid to give a counterpoint beat by which they produced forms, as especially the Latin Pentameter and Sapphic, though less flexible more organic than the corresponding Green ones or any others perhaps. That a difficulty about the working of the word-accent and the verse-accent together was felt can be shewn by this, that Propertius nowhere (in some thousands of lines) uses a word ending in an enclitic que etc and therefore accented '/-' in the dactyl at the end of a hexameter and only one such dactyl in the second half of the pentameter. But Ovid and Virgil use both —

\[
\text{Italiam fato profugus Lavinaque venit --} \\
\text{Lapsaque sub terras ortaque signa canam --},
\]

both in prominent places. The counterpoint of the pentameter is commonly this —
Cúm mála per longas convaluère moras /
Cujus non ánimo dulcia lucra forent

In the last the two accentings agree only on the syllable sig
in signa. The case of the Latin Sapphic is still more striking.
The word-accents are made to run —

Ján satís | terrís // nívís atque dirae
Grándinis | mist || pater et rubente —
or

Mécurí | facünde || népos Atlantis —
Díves et lasciva || tenetque grāta —
Muntium curvaēque || lyrae parentem —

They give in fact the so-called English sapphic of the Needy
Knifegrinder and a passage of Kehama. In English Milton made
experiments in accentual counterpoint, as —
Home to His mother's house private returned —

Here the beat of the line has to be carried in the mind: it is not expressed.

Under this head we may include emphasis of meaning.

(v) Smoothness or break of vowel sound, as in circumflex. In the first line of the Iliad are two circumflexes in strong places and a break (synizesis) also in a strong place. Dryden uses them to heighten his rhythm — as tyrant. Also strong consonants as the nasals and liquids — bound, 'we come' and 'drum' in Come if you dare.

(vi) All intermittent elements of verse, as alliteration, rhyme.

It should be understood that these various means of breaking the sameness of rhythm and especially caesura do not break the unity of the verse but the contrary; they make it organic and what is organic is one. All the parts of water are alike but the parts of man's body differ and man's individuality is marked by the individual being a waterdrop has is gone when it falls into water again. And in everything the more remote the ratio of the parts to one another or the whole the greater the unity if felt at all, as in the circle and ellipse, yet the ratio of its circumference to its diameter is undiscoverable, whereas there must be one ellipse in which
it is 3:1 and any number of others in which it is any ratio we like to take between $\pi$ and 2.

(4) Lettering of syllables (see above) —

To this belong rhyme, alliteration, assonance. They are all a sameness or likeness of some or all of the elementary sounds, the letters, of which syllables are made. Syllables so agreeing or resembling may be said to chime or widely rhyme but we keep rhyme for a more special or narrower sense. When they are used as intermittent figures of verse they must be emphatic syllables.

It is natural to begin with alliteration, which is the easiest. It is the beginning with the same sound, as may, must, man, mother with m; that is, with the same consonant or with any vowel, for all vowels alliterate, probably on account of the catch in the mouth (what people wrongly call the smooth breathing) or of the rustle (which is nearer), which is the same in all. Therefore the line —

And apt alliteration's artful aid —

alliterates but not for the reason the writer thought, for in the six alliterated syllables there are at least three vowels (reading and and alliteration without slur), not one only — the hard or dry short a, the long shut English a, the Italian long ə; and the long broad ą.)
Any vowels then alliterate but with a soft or imperfect alliteration, but in consonants only the same and those perfectly. Perhaps there is a very soft alliteration between a consonant and its belonging aspirate - $p$ and $f$, $b$ and $v$ etc. But the belonging pairs of sharps and flats, as $p$ and $b$, $t$ and $d$, $th$ in thick and $th$ (dh) in there, do not and offend the ear if represented as doing so, just because of their nearness. The best alliterations are in emphatic monosyllables or first syllables. Emphatic syllables later in the word will alliterate with consonants but not so well as the initial ones. When vowels alliterate in this way it is rather assonance than alliteration. All initial syllables alliterate, but faintly if unemphatic.

Alliteration was an essential element in Anglo-Saxon or old English verse, as Piers the Plowman, also in Icelandic. As a grace but unessential it is often used in prose and very thickly in Latin verse, more sparingly in Greek, thickly in modern English verse; one may indeed doubt whether a good ear is satisfied with our verse without it. It is common in proverbs of course (Faint heart never won fair lady).

In Icelandic verse an opposite kind of alliteration (skothending) is made use of, namely ending with the same consonant but after a different vowel, as bad led, find hand, sin run (from Marsh, who calls it half-rhyme). This also is a grace but less marked.
Between these two comes assonance. It is sameness of vowel in syllables. It may be single, as in meet and sleep, or double, as in meeting and evil.

This is made great use of in Spanish verse, sometimes with rhyme, sometimes instead of rhyme. The effect in English is faint, but still just appreciable. However we must be very careful that the syllables are really assonant; some of MacCarthy's are not, as matter and answer, entangled and many. When used with or for rhyme it must be in emphatic syllables etc., in fact in the same places as the rhymes would be in. Although pure assonance is, so far as I know, only used regularly in Spanish and Portuguese verse it plays a wide part as an unessential grace and finish in prose and verse elsewhere and gives a very subtle beauty to it or this is given by vowelling, which is either vowelling on (assonance) or vowelling off or changing of vowel down some scale or strain or keeping. Euripides is a great master of this vowelling. Marsh gives a beautiful piece of vowelling as an instance of imitative rhythm from 'Wild's celebrated nameless poem —

On that lone shore loud moans the sea

Let us distinguish in a syllable a beginning, middle, and end or its initial sound, its final sound, and its stem of sound, this middle or stem being essential, the others not. The middle or stem of the syllable will be a vowel sound, one
or more vowels, the other two parts consonantal, one or more consonants. 0 or owe has only the stem; no, know the stem and initial; own the stem and final; known all three. Rhyme then as defined for English will be an agreement or sameness of sound between strong syllables in different words, beginning with the stem or vowel of these syllables and continuing to the end of the corresponding feet, which must be the end of the words also or must end with words, whether the strong syllables have final sounds or not and whether they are followed by other, weak syllables or not. Commonly the rhymes end the line, sometimes a half-line, but in any case mark off certain bars or clauses. The words must be different both in sense and sound; know and no are not a rhyme. It followes therefore that one at least of the rhyming syllables must have an initial sound, as know and owe, and better if both have, as know and so. This initial sound by which the rhymes or rhyme-fellows differ is thus part of the rhyme or is essential to it. If one syllable rhymes or rhyme-fellows differ is thus part of the rhyme or is essential to it. If one syllable rhymes to one syllable, as know to owe the rhyme is single; if two or two, as knowing to owing, double; if three to three, as knowing it to owing it, treble; if four to four quadruple, as 'Mr Merryman is' to ceremonies in the Rejected Addresses

The following are imperfect rhymes — (i) when the
vowels differ: This may be as long and short, e.g. came and then, meet and it, etc, and this is very lawful and sometimes even graceful when we keep up the true correspondences but not when we make day rhyme to Africa, as Browning does, or lay to Cophetua, as Tennyson, which are no rhymes at all, or by to cruelly, which is a convention and licence but scarcely any rhyme: originally it was a rhyme; — or it may be by taking neighbouring vowels in one of the vowel scales, as love and of, for both are shut and long and circumflexed: but here English writers are not guided by the ear but by the eye, for love and prove is far commoner than luck and duke or even luck and shook, which is a bad principle — there is and should be more licence in double rhymes than in single and when consonants follow than when the vowels are open; — (ii) when the consonants differ: this may be as sharp and flat, e.g. as vice and size, breathe and wreath, and this is commonly practised with the sibilants and aspirates but is scarcely lawful for other single consonants, as met and said; or as nasal and hard, like women and trimming — this is n and ng is the only case lawful — here also English writers are faultily guided by the eye and here also there is more licence in double rhymes and when there are several consonants instead of one, as balance, talons, gallants, which are almost as good as perfect rhymes. — (iii) When one or both the rhyming syllables has a subordinate accent, as meant and innocent or government and innocent; (iv) when a letter is borrowed from a syllable before
to difference the rhyme, as member and di-smember, or thrown back on it, dism-ember; (v) when one word rhymes with two or more and those not enclitic the one on the other, as in minute and in it, but like chimney and slim knee in Rejected Addresses or instinct and quince-tinct in Browning's Flight of the Duchess, for then they do not agree in quantity and distribution of accent, (vi) when the rhyme ends in the middle of a word, if for instance the word is partly in one line, partly in another.

The so-called rhyme to the eye is when the syllables are spelt alike, as plough and though and cough and rough and enough, but this is no rhyme but to the ear; rhyme to the eye is the correspondence of parts in pictorial art or in an infinity of natural things as the two eyes and the two sides of the body generally, butterfly's wings, paired leaves, shadows in glass or water. Of the above words rough and enough are perfect rhymes, plough and though, cough and rough respectively imperfect, and plough and rough none at all. Rhyming to the eye in no way helps the rhyme, rather the contrary, for there are two elements in the beauty rhyme has to the mind, the likeness or sameness of sound and the unlikeness or difference of meaning, and the last is lessened by any likeness the words may have beyond that of sound. For this reason words of like grammatical form make poorer rhymes, participles etc, as going and knowing, sinest and wingest, ever and never, brother and mother, but mother and other is a rich rhyme.
Unlawful rhymes - We may notice (i) mere eye-rhymes; (ii) m and n, for though they are like enough roughly to satisfy the ear they offend the mind by the essential difference between a labial and a dental; (iii) open moist vowels and syllables ending in mute r, as higher and Thalia: this rhyme is perfect to the ear where, as commonly, the r is not trilled but the knowledge that it is there dormant in the one word and not in the other is very offensive to a trained taste and the fault cannot be excused by Keats' authority.

Licences in rhyme — (i) to treat different words of the same sound as true rhymes, as I and eye, eve and eave etc: this may perhaps be called a rhyme to the mind; (ii) assonances — as glory and for thee: Mrs. Browning and Miss Rossetti have used them among others; they are also found in ballads and Scotch native poetry: this and the former case are rather substitutes for rhyme than rhymes; (iii) in general, the use of any imperfect rhyme.

It will be seen that all these verse figures under no. 4 are reducible to the principle of rhyme, to rhyme or partial rhyme. Alliteration is initial half-rhyme, 'shothending' is final half-rhyme, assonance is vowel rhyme. There is a beautifully rich combination of them in Norse poetry, especially of initial and final consonant rhyme leaving out the vowel, the effect of which is not that the vowels go for nothing but that
they seem to be sided or intentionally changed, vowelled off.

Here is one instance —

Hilmir hjálma skúir
herðir sverði roðhu,
hjóta hvír askar,
hrynja brynjia spángir;
hnykkja Hlakkar eldar
harða svarðar landi,
remma rímmu głoðir
randa grand of jarli.

and of his own —

Softly now are sifting
Snows on landscape frozen.
Thickly fall the flakelets,
Feathery-light together,
Shower of silver pouring,
Soundless, all around us,
Field and river folding
Fair in mantle rarest. —

The peculiarity of this Norse verse is that the rhyme is not employed to mark off lines or bars or clauses. The same kind of rhyme combined with ours, the final rhyme, is employed in Italian; Marsh gives two beautiful specimens, a stanza of ottava
rima from Pulci and a sonnet from a note in the works of Redi, the first of vowel-less rhyme (casa cosa, bretta brutta), the other of full rhyme. In English he instances—

Lightly and brightly breaks away
The morning from her mantle grey —

from Byron and —

Her look was like the morning star —

from Burns. The instance from Byron is richly lettered

Rhyme is employed in the East as well as the West. Probably it tends to arise in any accentual language. The Chinese use it and the Arabs, and it occurs in Hebrew as an occasional grace. In the West it was and is employed in Celtic verse (though the instances of Gaelic verse I find in a grammar are rather assonance) and is thought to have entered Romance poetry from the Celts, appearing first, it is said, in the Latin hymns of the Milanese ritual and so spreading; but this seems unlikely. The Latin of that date as well as the late Greek was accentual and so naturally both gave rise to rhyme e.g. Dic nobis, Maria etc. The Icelandic verse, as above, is richly rhymed. In our times and for a very long time Teutonic as well as Romance verse is rhyming.
(5) **Holding of syllables** - This is the having pure or in any way broken vowel-sound, circumflexes diphthongs etc. Circumflexed or broken vowels and diphthongs make the syllable more than an ordinary syllable, between one and two, and so give it length or strength, weight, gravity. Thus the first line of the Iliad has two circumflexes and a break (the synizesis), all in strong places of the rhythm. In English the difference of strength between syllables is very great, as between *fit* and *fired*, *muck* and *mourned*, *whip* and *whelmed*.

In general all the elements of verse may be reduced to 

(1) Rhyme, in a wide sense, which depends on lettering; (2) Rhythm, which depends on strength or on length of syllable; and (3) if we like to include it, music, which springs from tonic accent or pitch. These are variously combined in metre, there should therefore here follow something on the principal metres.

And after that on the different kinds of poetry - epic, dramatic, lyric, elegiac etc.
Is all verse poetry or all poetry verse? — Depends on definitions of both. Poetry is speech framed for contemplation of mind by the way of hearing or speech framed to be heard for its own sake and interest even over and above its interest of meaning. Some matter and meaning is essential to it but only as an element necessary to support and employ the shape which is contemplated for its own sake. (Poetry is in fact speech only employed to carry the inscape of speech for the inscape's sake — and therefore the inscape must be dwelt on. Now if this can be done without repeating it once of the inscape will be enough for art and beauty and poetry but then at least the inscape must be understood as so standing by itself that it could be copied and repeated. If not / repetition, often, over-and-overing, aftering of the inscape must take place in order to detach it to the mind and in this light poetry is speech which afters and oftens its inscape, speech couched in a repeating figure and verse is spoken sound having a repeating figure.) Verse is (inscape of spoken sound, not spoken words, or speech employed to carry the inscape of spoken sound — or in the usual words) speech wholly or partially repeating the same figure of sound. Now there is speech which wholly or partially repeats the same figure of grammar and this may be framed to be heard for its own sake and interest over and above
its interest of meaning. Poetry then may be couched in this and therefore all poetry is not verse but all poetry is either verse or falls under this or some still further development of what verse is, speech wholly or partially repeating some kind of figure which is over and above meaning, at least the grammatical, historical, and logical meaning.

But is all verse poetry? - Verse may be applied for use, e.g. to help the memory, and then is useful art, not μουσική ("Thirty days hath September" and "Propria quae maribus" or Livy's horrendum carmen) and so is not pretty. Or it might be composed without meaning (as nonsense verse and choruses — "Hey nonny nonny" or "Wille wau wau wau" etc) and then alone it would not be poetry but might be part of a poem. But if it has a meaning and is meant to be heard for its own sake it will be poetry if you take poetry to be a kind of composition and not the virtue or success or excellence of that kind, as eloquence is the virtue of oratory and not oratory only and beauty the virtue of inscape and not inscape only. In this way poetry may be high or low, good or bad, and doggerel will be poor or low poetry but not merely verse, for it aims at interest or amusement. But if poetry is the virtue of its own kind of composition then all verse even composed for its own interest's sake is not poetry.
Kinds of Verse —

Verse then is speech wholly or partially repeating the same figure of sound. Partially as 'Jam satis terris nivis atque dirae' — that is /— O—/ — O—/ — O—/ for the common measure  =  is repeated throughout, wholly when you add 'Grandinis misit Pater et rubente'; or partially, taking the whole stanza, for it repeats the same figure for three lines but gives up in the fourth, but wholly if you take two stanzas. More clearly such an iambic as this —

— O—/ — O—/ — O—/ — O—/ — O—/ — O—/ — O—/ — O—/ — O—/ — O—/ — O—/ is a partial repetition only, for this is verse though you did not add another line, and this is a whole repetition —

— O—/ — O—/ — O—/ — O—/ — O—/ — O—/ — O—/ — O—/ — O—/ — O—/ — O—/ It is speech because we must distinguish it from music which is not verse. Music is composition which wholly or partially repeats the same figure of pitched sound (it is the aftering of pitched sound). Verse must be spoken or capable of being spoken

The figure may be repeated runningly, continuously, as in rhythm (ABABAB) or intermittently, as in alliteration and rhyme (ABCDABEFAEGBH). The former gives more tone, candorem, style, chasteness; the latter more brilliancy, starriness, quain, margaretting
There are three artistic tones — candor, chasteness, 'clear', which is diffused beauty; humour, which is diffused wit; and pathos, which is diffused