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2 Meter and Linguistic Theory

Chapters 2–5 are concerned with 'metrical form', a kind of literary form which is an adaptation of the type of linguistic form called prosodic phonological form. Texts have metrical form when they can be divided into lines which are governed by a rule system called a meter ('meter' is the American spelling for this term; the British spelling is 'metre'). The account of meter in these chapters draws primarily on the approach called generative metrics, which is a sub-part of generative linguistics; however, the aim is also to give a reasonably comprehensive overview of kinds of metrical practices, not all of which have been discussed in a generative framework.

2.1 The metrical text

2.1.1 Identifying a text as metrical

A text has a prosodic phonological structure, which consists of its sounds, organized into syllables, organized into words, organized into phonological phrases, and so on. Some texts are organized into sections (which we'll call lines) where some part of the prosodic phonological structure conforms to a pre-existing pattern. Texts of this kind are called metrical texts. Consider for example the ending of Milton's Paradise Lost, viewed as a continuous text:

Some natural tears they dropped, but wiped them soon; the world was all before them, where to choose their place of rest, and Providence their guide: They hand in hand with wandering steps and slow, through Eden took their solitary way.

This text can be divided into five sections – five lines:

Some natural tears they dropped, but wiped them soon; the world was all before them, where to choose
their place of rest, and Providence their guide:
They hand in hand with wandering steps and slow,
through Eden took their solitary way.

The prosodic phonological structure of each line conforms to a pre-existing pattern (called `iambic pentameter`), and it is this which identifies it as metrical. We'll return to a more detailed analysis of this pre-existing pattern later in this chapter, but it can for the moment be stated as: stressed syllables in polysyllabic words tend to be even-numbered syllables in the line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLYSYLLABIC WORDS</th>
<th>STRESSED SYLLABLES IN THE WORD</th>
<th>POSITION IN THE LINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>natural</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>second syllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before</td>
<td>fore</td>
<td>sixth syllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>pro + dence</td>
<td>sixth and eighth syllables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wandering</td>
<td>wan</td>
<td>sixth syllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>second syllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solitary</td>
<td>so + ta</td>
<td>sixth and eighth syllables</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this case the pattern refers to some of the even positions within the line (here stated in terms of which number syllable is involved, but this will be restated later), and to a specific aspect of the prosodic phonological structure of the line: the stressed syllables which are in some of the words. The important point is that the meter's control over the text is only partial: some but not all of the positions relate to some but not all of the components of phonological structure. Thus it is possible for iambic pentameter lines to vary considerably from one another in their prosodic phonological structure, while nevertheless all sharing the same basic pattern. This is typical of all meters: a meter controls some aspect of the prosodic phonological structure of a text while not completely controlling it, and thus allows for prosodic phonological variation between lines.

### 2.1.2 Para-metrical phenomena

A meter is a set of rules which constrain some aspect of the prosodic phonological structure of the line of text. However, many genres of metrical text are also characterized by additional kinds of regularity which are not themselves metrical but which relate to the meter and to the meter's division of a text into lines. These are para-metrical phenomena. In chapter 5 we look in detail at the two most common kinds of para-metrical phenomena, which are sound-patterning
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rules and word-boundary rules. Sound-patterning rules (mostly kinds of alliteration and rhyme) are sensitive to the division of a text into lines and may connect lines together. Word-boundary rules are rules which stipulate that a word boundary must or must not fall between two metrical positions in the template. A caesura rule is the most common kind of word-boundary rule, which requires a word boundary between two constituents; this means that a polysyllabic word cannot be spread across these two positions in the line. A bridge rule has the opposite effect - forbidding a word boundary between two positions, which means that a polysyllabic word must be spread across these two positions. Sound-patterning rules and word-boundary rules are rules which supplement the metrical rules, and at the same time are sensitive to them (or - putting it another way - parasitic on them). These para-metrical rules can be illustrated from the following metrical text:

Dob liomhur ar leig an locha
were numerous on plain of the loch

laoch ládir is òigheair oll
hero strong and young man great/tall

iomdha um thriabh Tatha taoiseach
many a about the Lord (of-) Tay leader

sgiath flatha agus craoiseach corr.
shield of prince and spear pointed

‘Numerous on the lakeside were the stalwart heroes and tall young men; around the lord of Tay was many a leader, many a shield of prince and taper spear’ (from the elegy on Sir Duncan Campbell of Glenorchy, who died in 1603; cited by Watson 1959: xxxvii)

This text is governed by stádha, a medieval Irish/Gaelic metrical system (see Knott 1957: 16), which includes a meter, a word-boundary rule, and sound-patterning rules. The meter counts syllables into lines: it requires the first and third lines to have eight syllables and the second and fourth lines to have seven syllables. There is a bridge rule operating in the first and third lines, which requires the seventh and eighth syllables to belong to the same word (i.e. a word boundary is forbidden between seventh and eighth positions). And there are several sound-patterning rules, including the requirement that the second and fourth lines must rhyme. In this text, oll rhymes with corr: notice that even though the sounds are different they are counted as equivalent in this tradition for the purposes of rhyme. This phenomenon of equivalence of different sounds is one of the more interesting problems in the linguistics of sound-patterning, and we discuss it
in 5.5. Another sound-patterning requirement in séadna is that there must be alliteration within each line - for example in the repetition of [l] in leirg and locha - and across lines in specified cases such as between the first and second lines, where locha alliterates with laoch. In addition to sound-patterning rules which relate individual sounds with other individual sounds, there is a patterning between the sequence of sounds in line 3 and the sequence of sounds in line 4: this might be thought of as a kind of sound-pattern parallelism (and we discuss it in 6.3). Both word-boundary rules and sound-patterning rules have some effect in shaping the prosodic phonology of the texts which they apply to, and thus have an effect which is similar to meter: however, we will treat them as distinct from the meter and explain why in chapter 5.

A metrical text is divided into lines, but in some texts different lines conform to different meters. Where all lines conform to the same meter (as in Paradise Lost) the text is called isometric; where different lines conform to different meters the text is called heterometric. The Greek genre of ode is typically characterized by heterometric structure, and more recent imitations often have a similarly heterometric structure as in these lines from Coleridge's 'Dejection. An Ode':

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Those sounds which oft have raised me, whilst they awed,} \\
\text{And sent my soul abroad,} \\
\text{Might now perhaps their wonted impulse give,} \\
\text{Might startle this dull pain, and make it move and live!}
\end{align*}\]

The first of these four lines has ten syllables, the second has six, the third has ten and the fourth has twelve; the basic 'iambic' rhythm is the same in each line, but the lines are of different lengths, thus making this heterometric. One of the questions which arises for heterometric texts is whether the rules which regulate the sequence of meters are themselves sensitive to linguistic structure (and thus might be thought of as extensions of the meter in some way).

A meter involves the division of a text into metrical lines, but metrical texts can also have a structure larger than the metrical line. Thus metrical lines can often be paired or grouped into larger units which we can call stanzas or strophes (and texts organized in this way can be called strophic texts, as distinct from stichic texts where the line is the largest unit of structure). This grouping into larger units is dependent on metrical structure in several ways. First, the possibility of grouping lines depends on the division into lines, which is an effect of the meter. Second, the grouping of lines into stanzas may relate to sound-patterning rules such as rhyme, which are themselves dependent on metrical structure. Third, lines may be grouped into stanzas according to a particular heterometric pattern. Thus the organization of lines into larger constituents can be thought of as another para-metrical phenomenon.
2.2 Prosodic phonological structure

The prosodic phonology of a language gives an utterance its rhythm; its pattern of more and less prominent parts. The prosodic phonology of an utterance also gives the utterance its constituency, its shape as a sequence of units interrupted by pauses. Prosodic phonology is a characteristic of all spoken utterances, and is not itself a part of verbal art—but metrical texts are a case where verbal art exploits the pre-existing prosodic patterns of the language to develop specifically literary ways of organizing utterances into literary texts. This section is a brief overview of some issues in prosodic phonology which will have particular relevance for the study of meter, word-boundary rules and sound-patterning rules.

Utterances have both prosodic phonological structure and syntactic structure. At the level of syntactic structure, an utterance consists of words which in turn are grouped into syntactic phrases and into sentences. The prosodic phonological structure is a parallel but distinct organization of the utterance as a sequence of sounds which are grouped into other kinds of constituent structure, parallel to the organization into words and sentences, but distinct from it. The relevant levels of prosodic phonological structure for our purposes are: (i) the segment: the smallest prosodic unit corresponding roughly to the individual sound; (ii) the syllable and its component parts—onset, nucleus and coda, and morae; (iii) the word and its permeable or flexible boundaries; (iv) the organization of words into phonological phrases; (v) the organization of syllables into strong and weak members of a hierarchical structure which expresses rhythmic patterns such as stress.

2.2.1 The phonological segment

The basic building-block of prosodic phonological structure is the phonological segment. A segment can be thought of as a sound-carrying unit. Which sound the segment carries is determined by the articulatory instructions attached to the segment. For example we can think of the word *fortification* as a sequence of segments:

- sequence of segments: $\text{X X X X X X X X X}$
- identity of the sounds: $f o t i f i k e i s n$

The first segment is defined by articulatory instructions which make the sound consonantal, labial, voiceless and continuant (i.e. the sound $[f]$, as indicated
here). The second and third segments are co-defined by the articulatory instructions which make the sound a vowel which is back and mid-height (i.e. the sound [o]). The fact that the same vowel is spread over two segments means that the vowel is ‘long’ here. In comparison the vowel [i] seen later in the word is attached to single segments and so is always short. The difference between long vowels (taking up two segments) and short vowels (taking up one) is important for syllable weight, as we see below.

2.2.2 The syllable and its component parts

Segments are grouped into syllables. At the centre of each syllable is a segment with a high degree of sonorance: in English, high sonorance usually means a segment which is a vowel but can also mean a semivowel, a liquid (like [l] or [r]) or a nasal (like [n] in fortification). The segment or segments (where two segments in a row are matched with a long vowel or diphthong) which are at the centre of the syllable are called its nucleus. If we take a word like gentlemen we can identify three highly sonorant segments, and hence three syllable nuclei (and hence three syllables):

```
syllables     α     α     α
nuclei        n     n     n
sequence of segments     X   X   X   X   X   X   X
identity of the sounds    dʒ e n t l m ə n
```

The less sonorant segments which come between nuclei are contained within the syllable, either grouped with the following nucleus as the onset of the syllable, or grouped with the preceding nucleus as the coda of the syllable:

```
syllables

onsets, nuclei, codas     o n c   o n o n c
sequence of segments     X   X   X   X   X   X   X
identity of the sounds    dʒ e n t l m ə n
```
syllable is based on the number of segments in the nucleus and coda combined (i.e. in the rime), and is measured in morae. A mora is a prosodic unit, made from segments in the nucleus and coda of the syllable, and itself forming part of the syllable: morae can be argued to be part of the prosodic phonological structure because they directly contribute to the rhythmic structure of an utterance. In English, morae are calculated from a syllable as follows: (i) count the first segment in the nucleus as one mora; (ii) if there are any further segments in the syllable (in either the nucleus or the coda) count these as totalling one further mora. Thus a syllable can have one or two morae. The molaric structure of *gentlemen* can be represented as follows:

```
syllables:          σ  σ  σ
                 /   /   /
               r   r   r

rimes:            o  n  c  o  n  c
                     /     /   /
                o  n  c  o  n  c

onsets, nuclei, codas: X  X  X  X  X  X
                           /     /   /
                      X  X  X  X  X  X

sequence of segments:              X  X  X  X  X  X
                                 /     /   /
                      X  X  X  X  X  X

identity of the sounds: Ø ɛ ɛ ɛ ɛ ɛ
                               /     /   /
                          e  n  t  l  m  a  n

sequence of segments: X  X  X  X  X  X
                                 /     /   /
                      X  X  X  X  X  X

morae:              μ  μ  μ  μ  μ
                        /     /   /
                  μ  μ  μ  μ  μ

syllables:          σ  σ  σ
                 /   /   /
               r   r   r
```

In this diagram, the organization into morae has been distinguished from the organization into onset, nucleus and coda. This is because these appear to be related but distinct dimensions of organization of the syllable, which can therefore be understood as simultaneously organized in the two different dimensions. In most theoretical accounts, the syllable is formulated either as fundamentally organized into onset, nucleus and coda (the top part) or as fundamentally organized into morae (the bottom part): for discussion see Hayes (1995). In this word, the first syllable has two morae and is thus heavy, the second has one and is thus light, while the third has two and is thus heavy.

Languages vary in how they calculate morae from segments. Each segment in a nucleus counts as a mora, with the consequence that a long vowel always
counts as two morae. However, segments in the coda are sometimes counted differently. For example, in Somali a syllable with a CVC structure would contribute one mora (i.e. the single consonant in the coda counts for nothing), while in Arabic the same syllable structure CVC would contribute two morae, with the consonant contributing to the weight. The calculation of morae is very important in some kinds of verse – particularly mora-counting and quantitative verse. Here, the exact number of morae in a line is what makes the line metrical. In practice, each language must be approached on its own terms to decide how the sequence of segments are organized into morae.

(Note: in some descriptions heavy and light syllables are referred to instead as long and short syllables respectively, with syllable weight referred to instead as syllable length. In this book, the terminology of weight is used to differentiate syllables, with the terminology of length used to differentiate vowels.)

2.2.3 The word and its boundaries

Central to the notion of a word is that it is a linguistic unit which can exist in isolation and which has some independent meaning: this characterizes what are called lexical words, such as nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs. We also use the term ‘word’ to describe various grammatical units whose function is to enable lexical words to be put together into meaningful sentences: this characterizes what are called grammatical words, such as articles, quantifiers, pronouns, auxiliaries, modals, negators, and prepositions. The notions of lexical word and grammatical word are dependent on domains of linguistic structure such as the lexicon and syntax; when we look at phonological structure, we can formulate a notion of phonological word. Prototypically, a phonological word is coextensive with a lexical word, but understood in terms of the word’s phonological structure: it is another side of the same object. However, there is a complication when it comes to grammatical words; sometimes a grammatical word can be understood as a phonological word on its own, but at other times a grammatical word attaches to a lexical word and together they constitute a larger kind of phonological word sometimes called a clitic group.

There is another problem with the notion of word, which relates to the syllable structure of a word (and for that matter also the identity of the segments in a word). When words follow one another in an utterance, they can affect each other’s phonological shape. In particular, a syllable in one word can lose one of its component segments to a syllable in a neighbouring word, thus potentially changing the pattern of morae and thus syllable weights. This is best illustrated by a Greek example (which is discussed again in 5.2.1). The Greek word eridi has the following syllable structure in isolation:
And the Greek word *ksune eke* has the following structure in isolation:

However, when the two words are put together, the initial [k] of *ksune eke* re-attaches to become the final segment in the preceding word; and thus adds a mora to that syllable, making it heavy. Thus the overall number of morae in the sequence increases because the segment has moved from an onset where it had no weight to a coda where it does have weight.
2.2.4 Phonological phrases

The word is a lexical and syntactic notion and also a phonological notion – and the two coincide for the most part, though not always. The same is true of the phrase. When words are organized into syntactic structures, they are first organized into phrases – so that a sentence is a structure made from phrases which ultimately contain words. The same appears to be true of utterances, where phonological words are organized into phonological phrases. The phonological phrases are sometimes coextensive with syntactic phrases and sometimes not.

One of the most important characteristics of a phonological phrase from the perspective of verbal art is that it can typically be followed in performance by a pause. Thus Dresher (1994) discusses a transcription system used by tenth-century editors of the Hebrew Bible; this involves a complex system of diacritic symbols which were intended to preserve the ancient pronunciation and performance of the Biblical text. Some diacritics appear to be used as an indication that two or more words belong together in the same phonological phrase. Dresher suggests that other diacritics are intended to indicate the length of pauses between phonological phrases. He suggests that phonological phrases are hierarchically grouped, with shorter pauses between phrases lower down on the hierarchy and longer pauses between phrases higher up in the hierarchy. The hierarchical complexity of a particular text is its ‘grain’. Drawing on this hypothesis, he suggests that the edited text of the Bible indicates when the performer should speak deliberately (with a greater quantity of pauses) and when less deliberately.

2.2.5 Rhythm and stress

In most languages there is a fairly salient rhythmic pattern to an utterance, which is composed partly of the inherent rhythmic patterns of words, and partly of the rhythmic decisions made by the speaker in putting the utterance together. In English, the rhythmic pattern is realized as relative stress on syllables. Stress is a rhythm within the word, which is realized by a combination of several features: stressed syllables are typically louder, longer and higher in pitch. (See Hayes 1995, chapter 2 for a very detailed discussion of what stress is.)

In thinking about English stress, it is necessary to distinguish between stress within a lexical word and stress within the utterance as a whole. The latter is constrained primarily by performance considerations, and can be very variable:
the same sequence of words can be given very different patterns of stress within the utterance as a whole. This is called the postlexical stress pattern of the utterance.

Stress within a lexical word, on the other hand, is rigidly constrained by phonological rules of the language, and is part of the basic identity of the word. Thus the words *differ* and *defer* are differentiated in their sound-patterns primarily by the different patterns of stress (*differ* has a stressed–unstressed pattern, while *defer* has an unstressed–stressed pattern). Lexical stress of this kind is not variable at the whim of the speaker (unlike postlexical stress). The various lexical stress patterns of English words are regular, but are also subject to complex rules: a considerable amount of work has been put into trying to understand these in a generative framework since the 1960s, and the matter is still not fully settled. Thus I will present a very simplified account of how stress works within a lexical word.

The basis of stress within a word is that the syllables of the word are organized into constituents (called phonological feet). Consider for example the word *fortification*. The syllables are organized into phonological feet as follows:

```
                  o
                 /\  
                /   \ 
               o     o
              /   \  / \
             /     \o
            /       / / \
           /       /o   o
          /         /   / \
         /         /   /o
        /         /    /o
       /         /     /o
      /         /      /o
     /         /       /o
    /         /        /
   /         /         /
  /         /          /
 /         /           /
/         /             /
```

The phonological foot typically contains two morae – either a two-mora (heavy) syllable as in the first and third feet, or two one-mora syllables as in the second foot. The final syllable is 'extrametrical', and appended to the preceding foot. Where there is more than one syllable in a word, some syllables are stronger than others: in a two-syllable word like *differ* the first syllable is said to be a strong constituent relative to the second syllable which is a weak constituent. Where there is more than one phonological foot within the word, the feet also differ from one another in strength. Stress is attracted to strong constituents. Where there are three or more syllables in a word, there will often be more than one strong constituent, and here the strong constituents are strong or weak relative to one another. The patterns of strength in this word are as follows:
ent patterns of stress within lexical stress patterns of the

The first syllable containing [ɔ] has stress because it is in a strong foot relative to the neighbouring weak foot containing [tʃɪ]. This pair of feet are then weak relative to the foot containing [ɛɪ], which therefore has the strongest stress. Stress within a polysyllabic lexical word is thus dependent on the relations of strength between the syllables.

However, stress can also be assigned where there is no relation of strength: this happens in lexical monosyllables such as see. This word has stress on its single syllable, but not because this syllable is relatively strong – there is no other syllable in the word for it to be strong in comparison with. The distinction between stress which is assigned to a monosyllable directly, and stress which is assigned on the basis of strength within a polysyllable, is very important for understanding stress-based meters in English verse, as we now see.

2.3 Shakespeare’s iambic pentameter: the problem of rhythmic variation

Iambic pentameter is a meter which is found throughout English poetry, and characterizes some of the major works of the tradition: for example, much of
Chaucer's, Shakespeare's, Milton's and Wordsworth's verse is in this meter. However, despite its familiarity, the meter remains difficult to characterize, and there are disagreements between analysts about the best way to understand its structure. To illustrate the issues which arise, this is a text by Shakespeare in iambic pentameter:

Let me not to the marriage of true mindes
Admit impediments, love is not love
Which alters when it alteration findes,
Or bends with the remover to remove.
O no, it is an ever fixed marke
That lookes on tempests and is never shaken;
It is the star to ev(e)ry wand(e)ring barke,
Whose worths unknowne, although his highth be taken.
Lov's not Times foole, though rosie lips and cheeks
Within his bending sickles compasse come,
Love alters not with his breefe hours and weake,
But beares it out even to the edge of doome:
If this be error and upon me prov'd,
I never writ, nor no man ever loved.

The rhythm of this text is manifested as a pattern of stressed and unstressed syllables. However, this text can be quite adequately performed with almost every line having a different pattern of stressed and unstressed syllables. Thus the text can be performed with stresses on the underlined syllables below:

Let me not to the marriage of true mindes
Admit impediments, love is not love
Which alters when it alteration findes,
Or bends with the remover to remove.
O no, it is an ever fixed marke
That lookes on tempests and is never shaken;
It is the star to ev(e)ry wand(e)ring barke,
Whose worths unknowne, although his highth be taken.
Lov's not Times foole, though rosie lips and cheeks
Within his bending sickles compasse come,
Love alters not with his breefe hours and weake,
But beares it out even to the edge of doome:
If this be error and upon me prov'd,
I never writ, nor no man ever loved.
This rhythmic variation from line to line in performance is entirely typical of iambic pentameter, and of many other meters as well. There are basically two ways of understanding it.

One approach, which is more or less the traditional one, is to formulate iambic pentameter as a pattern of stressed and unstressed syllables which is approximated to by actual lines of text, with a certain degree of allowed variability. Thus iambic pentameter might be formulated as a pattern of ten syllables with every even syllable stressed.

\[ \sigma \overset{\text{be taken.}}{\overset{\text{hkes}}{\overset{\text{of stressed and unstressed y performed with almost unstressed syllables. Thus} \text{lined syllables below:}}{\overset{\text{tue}}{\overset{\text{not}}{\overset{\text{tion}}{\overset{\text{re}}{\overset{\text{xed}}{\overset{\text{ver}}{\overset{\text{d(e)ring}}{\overset{\text{hth be ta ken.}}{\overset{i and cheeks}}{\overset{n passe come,}}{\overset{ma and weckes,}}{\overset{e of doome;}}{\overset{me proved,}}{\overset{ver loved.}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}

Actual lines would then correspond approximately to this pattern.

The alternative approach is associated with a theoretical approach called generative metrics, presented in detail by Halle and Keyser (1971), and subsequently developed by other phonologists working in the generative linguistics tradition (which includes generative grammar and generative phonology). The notion of a generative grammar was formulated by Noam Chomsky, with the parallel notion of a generative phonology formulated by Chomsky with Morris Halle. The generative grammar of a language is a set of rules which can characterize any sentence as grammatical or ungrammatical: the grammar generates all and only the grammatical sentences in the sense of being able to create just these sentences. The generative phonology of a language is a set of rules which can characterize a word as having a phonological structure which is acceptable in the language. Similarly, a generative metrics for a meter is a set of rules which can characterize any line’s rhythmic pattern as metrical or unmetrical: it should be able to specify that a particular line is metrical or unmetrical – and hence the vast majority of actual iambic pentameter lines should be specified as metrical by the rules.

Whereas the traditional approach to metrics is based on a notion of ‘approximation’, the generative approach is based on the notion of ‘abstraction’. The generative approach formulates iambic pentameter at a sufficiently abstract level such that all the rhythmic variations in actual performance in fact have an identical rhythmic pattern if examined at that level. Generative metrics exploits the linguistic structure of the utterance, to show that once we have a better understanding of the linguistic structure we can also see the underlying regularities which are hidden beneath the apparently random variations of rhythmic patterns. In the case of iambic pentameter, the fundamental insight (as formulated for example by Kiparsky 1977) is that while the meter involves stress, it involves some kinds of stress and not others. We saw that it is possible to distinguish three kinds of stress in an English utterance: (1) the stress
within a polysyllable which depends on strength relations between the syllables in the word, (2) the stress on a monosyllable which is assigned directly (and not on the basis of strength), and (3) postlexical stress, the stress pattern of the utterance above the level of the word, which is dependent on the communicative aims of the speaker and is not fixed for a particular sequence of words. Of these three kinds of stress, it is primarily (1) which is relevant to iambic pentameter.

Consider for example postlexical stress. The same sequence of words can be given different patterns of postlexical stress when uttered, sometimes with clear communicative consequences, and sometimes without. Thus if we take the sonnet cited above, the postlexical stress patterns assigned to it could have been different in a different performance. Take for example the first line. Perfectly acceptable alternative realizations of the postlexical stress patterns of this line include:

Let me not to the ma rriage of true mindes
Let me not to the ma rriage of true mindes
Let me not to the ma rriage of true mindes
Let me not to the ma rriage of true mindes

And so on. This variability in possible postlexical stress patterns means that the meter must be formulated to ignore postlexical stress: it is simply irrelevant to the meter. This is because the meter controls the composition of the text rather than its performance, and thus is able to control only those aspects of the prosodic phonology of the text which are invariant (i.e. lexical stress but not postlexical stress).

Thus we are left with lexical stress – on polysyllables and on monosyllables. These kinds of stress are invariant: the stress pattern on marriage for example does not vary at the whim of the performer. This means that iambic pentameter must be understood at a more abstract level: as a meter which controls the placement in the line of lexical stress patterns. The basic intuition about iambic pentameter is that there is a difference between odd and even positions: even positions in the line are somehow related to stressed syllables. We now see that this must specifically be the stressed syllables in lexical words. If we look at the sonnet, however, we find that lexical monosyllables are not obviously constrained to appear in either odd or even syllables. In this first line, true appears in an odd position (the ninth), for example. But the lexical polysyllables are constrained in their location: it turns out that all the polysyllables are placed in lines so that their stressed syllables are in even positions. In the diagram below, polysyllables are boxed:
relations between the syllable, which is assigned directly the stress pattern, is dependent on the for a particular sequence (1) which is relevant to sequence of words can uttered, sometimes with without. Thus if we take assigned to it could have example the first line. Per-

patterns means that the it is simply irrelevant to position of the text rather those aspects of the i.e. lexical stress but not

and on monosyllables. in marriage for example that iambic pentameter meter which controls the intuition about iambic ed even positions: evenables. We now see that 1 words, If we look at are not obviously con-

first line, true appears lexical polysyllables are syllables are placed in In the diagram below,
it. A generative meter attempts to formalize exactly which patterns in the line fit the meter and which do not, and this is achieved by formulating sometimes quite abstract rules for matching the metrical template with the line of poetry. Thus a generative meter has two parts: the metrical template and the rules which match the template to the lines.

2.4.1 A metrical template

A metrical template is fundamentally a series of positions. For iambic pentameter there are ten positions. In rhythmic meters like iambic pentameter, the positions are differentiated as strong and weak positions. The series of positions in iambic pentameter is a sequence of weak–strong–weak–strong . . . etc. The template can thus be formulated initially as:

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

There are at least two reasons for thinking that the template might also have a hierarchical constituent structure. The first is that the pattern of positions is periodic, repeating a weak–strong sequence. Thus we could formulate the template as five weak–strong constituents. The second reason for positing a hierarchy is that notions such as strength and weakness are relative notions: the first position is weak relative to the second which is strong. This can be formalized by organizing the line into five binary constituents characterized by the second part of each constituent being stronger than the first. For these two reasons, the template can more fully be represented as organized in constituents: the pairs of metrical positions are called metrical feet, symbolized with F:

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
F & F & F & F & F \\
\\
W & S & W & S & W & S & W & S
\end{array}
\]

For the moment, we will have relatively little to say about the internal constituency of the metrical template, and we will think of iambic pentameter more simply as a sequence of weak and strong positions.

2.4.2 Matching the template to syllables: a first formulation and extrametricality

The template must correspond to all lines which instantiate the meter. In the case of iambic pentameter, the majority of lines have ten syllables and so as a
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preliminary attempt we could formulate a matching rule: each syllable in the line must fit into a metrical position in the metrical template. This means that all ten-syllable lines are, at least in this sense, metrical.

However, just as there is variability in the stress pattern of lines, so there is also variability in the number of syllables in a line, and so if these variable-length lines are to be considered metrical, our matching rule must be reformulated to accommodate these lines. One kind of variation is where there is an eleven-syllable line ending on an unstressed syllable: this can be interpreted as resembling a typical ten-syllable line but with an extra syllable at the end. There are two such lines in the sonnet, of which this is one:

That looks on tem pests and is ne ver sha ken;

Lines where there is an extra syllable after the final stressed syllable can be interpreted as involving 'extrametricality' (a possibility discussed in detail by Kiparsky 1977). The final syllable is extrametrical which means that it is permitted not to match a position in the metrical template. This possibility of extrametricality must be incorporated as part of the matching rules.

If extrametricality was allowed freely, there would in effect be no meter. In fact, there are two characteristics shared by extrametrical syllables which limit their occurrence: they are always unstressed, and they are always found in certain kinds of position. The most common position is at the end of a line, as here. In Shakespeare's iambic pentameter, extrametrical syllables can also appear in the middle of a line, but preceding a pause. These two positions turn out to have something in common: they are both at the end of the large prosodic phonological constituent called the phonological phrase. Thus the rule permitting extrametrical syllables is sensitive to phonological constituent structure at this level.

The following line (cited by Kiparsky 1977: 231) illustrates two extrametrical syllables, one at the end of the line and one in the middle. Both are at the end of a phonological phrase (indicated by square brackets):

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
| & | & W & S & W & S \\
\sigma & \sigma & \sigma & \sigma \\
| & | & W & S & W & S & S & W & S \\
\sigma & \sigma & \sigma & \sigma & \sigma & \sigma & \sigma & \sigma \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{[ That is the madman. ] [ The lover, ] [ all as frantic ]}
\]

Kiparsky suggests that in iambic pentameter the extrametrical syllable must come after a syllable which corresponds to a metrical strong position, as it does in the line quoted above. A line-final extrametrical syllable in iambic pentameter will of course always be in this position (because the final metrical position is strong); the generalization is more interesting when it comes to line-internal
extrametrical syllables. Notice that this generalization means that in iambic pentameter there will not be two extrametrical syllables one after another, though as the above example shows there might be two in the same line after different metrical positions. Finally, Kiparsky points out that English poets differ in what kinds of syllable they will allow to be extrametrical. For example Shakespeare, as here with madman, permits the second half of a compound word to be extrametrical, while Milton does not.

2.4.3 The metrical template and stress

There are three kinds of stress in the line of poetry: stress within a lexical polysyllable, stress on a lexical monosyllable, and postlexical stress (including stress on grammatical words). It is basically the first kind of stress which is controlled by iambic pentameter. If for the moment we just think of this as 'polysyllabic stress', we might consider how exactly it is matched with the metrical template. The template has S and W positions, and where there is polysyllabic stress it is found only in S positions. But S positions are not devoted entirely to polysyllabic stress - other kinds of stress are found here, and there may also be an unstressed syllable in an S position. For example, the following line has the and to matching strong positions, but neither word carries polysyllabic stress, and in fact on most performances of the line neither word carries any (postlexical) stress at all.

```
W S W S W S W S W S
```

Or
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This suggests that the matching constraint is not a constraint on S positions but should be seen from a different angle as a constraint on W positions: specifically, that a W position within the metrical template must not match a 'polysyllabic stress'.

How does the meter differentiate between polysyllabic and monosyllabic stress? The difference is that a polysyllabic stress pattern is derived from the relative strengths of syllables within a lexical word; there is no relative strength pattern within a monosyllable because there is nothing for the single syllable to be strong relative to. Hanson and Kiparsky (1996) suggest that this therefore means that the matching constraint should be reformulated so that it does not directly refer to stress at all, but instead refers to strength. A stressed syllable in a polysyllabic word is also a strong syllable, and is the only example of a syllable which is strong within a word. Thus the matching constraint can be reformulated like
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2.4.4 The metrical template and the phonological foot

One of the variations in the iambic pentameter line involves extra syllables
within the line, which cannot be considered extrametrical because they are in
the middle of phonological phrases. It is common to find two light syllables
between two strong syllables: this situation must be accounted for by the meter,
but cannot be accounted for by the matching rules which exist so far. Consider
for example this line from Othello (cited by Hanson and Kiparsky 1996):

\[
\begin{align*}
W & S & W & S & W & S & W & S & W \\
\sigma & \sigma & \sigma & \sigma & \sigma & \sigma & \sigma & \sigma & \sigma
\end{align*}
\]

This for ti fi ca tion gent le men, shall we see it?

This line has an extrametrical syllable at the end, \(\text{it}\). The syllable \(\text{men}\) could also
be accounted for by saying that it is extrametrical. But this is not the case for
the extra syllable in the word \(\text{fortification}\). Here there are two syllables between
the two strong syllables, but only one weak position for these two syllables \(\text{ti}\)
and \(\text{fi}\) to fit into. Hanson and Kiparsky suggest that this problem is resolved by
looking at the prosodic phonological structure of the word (as shown in 2.2.5),
where \(\text{ti-fi}\) constitutes a single phonological foot (comprising two light syllables).
They suggest that it is the phonological foot rather than the syllable which is
matched to the metrical position.

The problem with \(\text{fortification}\) arose not from Shakespeare's compositional
decision but from the structure of the word: this word always has two light
syllables between two strong syllables. However, extra syllables can also arise
from the composition of the line, where for example two grammatical words
come between two strong syllables, as in the following line:

\[
\begin{align*}
W & S & W & S & W & S & W & S & W \\
\sigma & \sigma & \sigma & \sigma & \sigma & \sigma & \sigma & \sigma & \sigma
\end{align*}
\]

A sample to the youngest; to the more mature
This line has two extra syllables in it (it has twelve syllables). One extra syllable, the -est of youngest, is extrametrical: it is at the end of a phonological phrase. However, to and the must be considered as two light syllables belonging to a phonological foot, and are permitted to combine to fill a single metrical position because of this.

These are examples where the two-syllable phonological foot is matched to a weak metrical position. However, it is also possible for a two-syllable phonological foot to match a strong metrical position. In the following line from Henry V, the two syllables in many fill a single strong position: they are both light syllables, even though one is stressed. Note that in this line the pair of light monosyllables in one, which constitute a single phonological foot, also fill a single metrical position:

```
| W | S | W | S | W | S |
```

\[ \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \]

*Come to one mark, as many ways meet in one town*

Thus the structure of English words and the compositional practice of Shakespeare both suggest that in his iambic pentameter, the metrical position, while it will normally match a syllable, may also match a phonological foot (i.e. a prosodic phonological constituent containing two light syllables).

### 2.4.5 Initial freedoms

We have seen that strong syllables may not match weak positions. However, there is a position in the line where this requirement appears to be relaxed: the first position of the line. Here it is not uncommon to find a polysyllabic word with initial stress, even though the first metrical position is weak. Thus a strong syllable matches a weak position. We might expect this phenomenon to be incorporated into the matching rules for the meter. However, there are some reasons for thinking that it manifests a general principle for metrical texts and thus that it should not be incorporated into specific rules. In most meters, and most strikingly in meters in the Indo-European tradition, the metrical matching rules appear to be relaxed at the beginning of a line – but adhered to firmly in the later part of the line. This phenomenon in iambic pentameter might be a reflex of this general phenomenon.

Hayes (1983: 382) suggests that in fact in iambic pentameter the principle of relaxation of matching rules at the beginning relates not to the line but to the phonological phrase: thus `inversion' of the foot occurs at the beginning of the line and after a pause in the line – both are the beginnings of phonological phrases.
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\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
W & S & W & S & W & S & W & S \\
\sigma & \sigma & \sigma & \sigma & \sigma & \sigma & \sigma & \sigma \\
\end{array}
\]

Thus again it seems that certain kinds of variation which are permitted in the matching rules are sensitive to the boundary of a phonological phrase (this was the case also for extrametricality): phonological phrase boundaries appear to allow certain kinds of metrical looseness.

2.4.6 In summary: the metrical rules for Shakespeare's iambic pentameter

In summary, we can formulate Shakespeare's version of iambic pentameter as follows:

1. There is a metrical template:
\[
W S W S W W S W S \]

2. There is a set of matching rules:
Each metrical position must be matched with a phonological constituent no larger than a phonological foot (and normally with a syllable);
A weak position in the metrical template must not be matched with a strong syllable within a word.

3. There are stipulated exceptions to the matching rules, which apply at the edges of phonological phrases:
A syllable at the end of a phonological phrase may be ignored by the matching rules (= extrametricality);
A weak position in the metrical template may match a strong syllable within a word when that syllable is at the beginning of a phonological phrase.

This is a simplified account of the meter, which nevertheless expresses the basic ideas (for example it does not indicate the foot structure within the metrical template). Other poets modify the meter in various ways, as Hanson and Kiparsky (1996), Hanson (1996) and others have argued.

What, finally, is the relation between this formulation of iambic pentameter and any line of iambic pentameter poetry? The meter fully constrains certain aspects of the prosodic phonological structure of the line: specifically, it constrains the number of syllables, and the placement of strong syllables. Other
aspects of the phonological structure of the line are not constrained by the meter: these include the postlexical stress patterns. Thus the meter partially determines the prosodic phonological structure of the line. This will be true of all meters: the problem for analysis is to decide which aspects of prosodic phonological structure are determined, and how they are determined.

2.5 Generative metrics and the formulation of a meter

Thus a meter is a template and a set of matching rules and other rules: the meter is a description of the regularities in a certain kind of linguistic behaviour (the composition of a metrical text). This formulation of a meter is associated with generative linguistics, and generative linguistics takes a specific view of the reason for regularities in linguistic behaviour: regularities in linguistic behaviour arise because linguistic behaviour is generated on the basis of linguistic knowledge. Linguistic knowledge in turn can be formulated in part as a set of rules for building linguistic structures. Thus linguists look at regularities in linguistic behaviour in order to discover the nature of the knowledge which underlies linguistic behaviour, a knowledge which is understood in terms of rules. The same principle carries over to metrics: the regularities in a metrical text are understood as arising from the 'metrical knowledge' of the composer of the text. This metrical knowledge is the meter, consisting of the template and the set of rules.

It is worth noting that the knowledge which underlies the regularities in our behaviour, and from which our behaviour is generated, is not necessarily explicit knowledge. This is clearly the case for language: most people can produce utterances which are fully regular, without having any ability to make explicit the rules which characterize those utterances. Furthermore, even where there is explicit description of the rules which characterize the regularities in linguistic behaviour, that explicit description may be incorrect: people have demonstrably false beliefs about their own linguistic behaviour. The work of linguistics is to discover what the actual rules are which determine the regularities in our linguistic behaviour. These comments can be carried over from linguistics to metrics. Thus an author may compose fully regular texts without being able to describe what he or she is doing, and on the other hand there are often detailed theories of metrical composition contemporary with practice (and sometimes formulated by practitioners) which are not fully accurate in their characterization of actual practice. The bottom line for generative metrics is that there can only be one correct characterization of a metrical practice – only one way of formulating a particular meter; the task of metrics is to work out what that formulation is, by
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2.5.1 Some terminological issues

One of the minor metatheoretical problems of doing metrics is that technical terms are used in different ways. In part this is a reflex of the fact that many traditions of metrical practice are accompanied by their own theoretical traditions, with their own terminologies – and as terminologies are adapted to new purposes, possibilities of confusion arise. The aim of this section is thus to clarify how some of the more complex terms are used in the present book.

We use the term ‘meter’ to describe the set of rules which consists of metrical template, matching rules and any related adjustment rules or permitted variations. ‘Meter’ is sometimes used to describe these rules plus rules of sound-patterning and other genre conventions, but the term is not used with this meaning here. For example, for us ‘iambic pentameter’ is a meter because it constrains just the prosodic phonological structure, but ‘blank verse’ is not a meter because it adds a constraint relating to sound-patterning (i.e. that there is no rhyme). Where we need to refer to meters plus other related rules, particularly rules of sound-patterning, we’ll use the term ‘metrical system’. Thus blank verse is a metrical system, as is śādā; the latter is a metrical system which includes a meter (which counts syllables) plus other rules of sound-patterning, etc. Word-boundary rules have a somewhat ambiguous status here – it is not clear whether they should be thought of as part of the meter or as part of the broader metrical system (we return to this in chapter 5). ‘Prosody’ is also sometimes used to describe metrical structure; we restrict the term here to an aspect of linguistic structure, and generally combine it with ‘phonological’ to make this clear. Thus we speak of the ‘prosodic phonological structure’ of an utterance, which in itself has nothing to do with literary structure (though it is exploited by a meter). The term ‘meter’, which we are restricting to literary texts, is itself sometimes used for purely linguistic structure (hence there is a theory of ‘metrical phonology’, which in itself has nothing to do with literary texts).

The terms ‘meter’ and ‘prosody’ are one terminological source of complications. The other relates to the names for metrical constituents, and here there is a clash between emic and etic approaches. The largest metrical constituent is called a ‘line’ here; a single metrical line can sometimes be thought of or written down as a long-line (German Langzeile) or a couplet. We define a line as the stretch of text which is matched with the metrical template, however it is conceived or written down. Within a line, the smallest metrical constituent above the metrical position is normally called a ‘foot’. If there is another intermediate level of constituency between the foot and the line, we’ll generally call it a
'half-line' or 'metron' (borrowing the term from Greek metrics); the two terms really mean the same and we could perhaps have a single term for both. However, we'll distinguish them for convenience by using 'half-line' when the line falls into two such constituents, and 'metron' in other cases.

There are some other terminological pitfalls. 'Caesura,' for example, is sometimes used to mean a pause in performance, and sometimes just a rule which requires that a word end at a particular place in the line: we will use the term in this second sense. Finally, there are complications involving classificatory terms such as 'verse,' 'poem' and 'song.' To some extent these terms are used interchangeably in this book; if a distinction can be made, we might perhaps use 'verse' to describe any text organized into lines (whether metrical or not), 'poem' to describe any text which is metrical, and 'song' to describe any text which is set to music (which may not be metrical or divided into lines).

2.6 Summary: linguistic form (prosodic phonology) and literary form (meter)

In this chapter we have seen one of the most extensively discussed examples of the adaptation of linguistic form to literary form. Metrical structure is a kind of literary form, involving the division of a text into constituents each of which has its prosodic phonological structure adapted to a certain pattern. The possibility of metrical structure, as a kind of literary form, is entirely dependent on prosodic phonological structure which is a kind of linguistic form that is found in all spoken language (whether literary or not). Thus the meter is sensitive to certain kinds of prosodic phonological constituency, both as the units which are matched (syllables, strong positions, etc.), and as constituents which have boundaries which are places of metrical variation (phonological phrases). Metrical structure is one of the few areas of literary linguistics where there may be some involvement of specialized cognitive mechanisms: thus the possibility of metrical verse may be based on aspects of human cognitive structure, just as the possibility of language is based on aspects of human cognitive structure.

2.7 Further reading

Prosodic phonology and its application to metrical theory is discussed by Nespor and Vogel (1986) and Hayes (1989). Kenstowicz (1994) is a comprehensive introduction to phonological structure; see also Hogg and McCully (1987).
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Ladefoged and Maddieson (1996) and Pullum and Ladusaw (1986) are useful reference works for phonetics. Generative metrics has consistently returned to the problems presented by iambic pentameter; key discussions which illustrate the development of ideas about the meter can be found in Halle and Keyser (1971), Kiparsky (1977), Hayes (1983, 1988, 1989), Youmans (1986) and Hanson and Kiparsky (1996). Hanson (1996) explores the history of iambic pentameter, both in its origins and in its development. Attridge (1982, 1995) and Tarlinskaja (1989) present influential alternative approaches to iambic pentameter; a traditional approach can be found in Fussell (1979); see also Cureton (1994). Kiparsky and Youmans (1989) is a useful anthology on metrics.

2.8 Exercises

2.8.1 Holinshed and Shakespeare

This exercise is intended to give you some practice in matching a metrical template to lines of poetry; it also offers an opportunity to look at the working methods of one of the major practitioners of the iambic pentameter meter, Shakespeare.

Instructions

Work on the text line by line (i.e. do all questions for the first line, then the second line). Lines particularly worth paying attention to are 12 and 13.

(a) Identify all the syllables in each line, and write o above each one.

(b) Identify polysyllabic words and work out which syllables have stress in each word.

(c) Match the iambic pentameter template to the sequence of syllables. There are some extrametrical syllables and some cases where two light syllables fit into one metrical position.

(d) Is each line metrical, according to the rule for Shakespeare's iambic pentameter formulated in this chapter?

(e) Discuss any changes which Shakespeare made to identifiable pieces of text in the source version (by Raphael Holinshed); can these changes be explained in terms of his need to reshape the lines into iambic pentameter? You might explore this by trying to rewrite parts of Holinshed's text in iambic pentameter and comparing your efforts with Shakespeare's.
Sample answer

As an illustration of what you should do, here is the analysis of the third line.

(a) Syllables are indicated:

\[ \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \]

\textit{Joined with an enemy proclaimed and fixed}

Note that the spelling of the words does not necessarily tell you how many syllables are in them: \textit{joined} is a monosyllable (the written vowel e is not pronounced).

(b) Lexical stressed syllables are marked with an accent:

\[ \acute{o} \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \]

\textit{Joined with an enemy proclaimed and fixed}\n
(c) There are no extra or missing syllables in this line. This is the matching of syllables to template:

\begin{align*}
\text{W} & \quad \text{S} & \quad \text{W} & \quad \text{SW} & \quad \text{S} & \quad \text{W} & \quad \text{S} & \quad \text{W} & \quad \text{S} \\
\acute{o} & \quad \sigma & \quad \sigma & \quad \sigma & \quad \sigma & \quad \sigma & \quad \sigma & \quad \sigma & \quad \sigma \\
\text{W} & \quad \text{S} & \quad \text{W} & \quad \text{SW} & \quad \text{S} & \quad \text{W} & \quad \text{S} & \quad \text{W} & \quad \text{S} \\
\end{align*}

\textit{Joined with an enemy proclaimed and fixed}

(d) This line is metrical: all syllables fit into the template, and there are no cases where stressed syllables in the polysyllables \textit{enemy} and \textit{proclaimed} (i.e. strong syllables) match weak positions.

(e) There is very little of this line in the Holinshed text with the exception of the word \textit{enemy}, which is placed here in a metrically acceptable position.

Texts

\textbf{King Henry:}

\begin{quote}
God \textit{quit} you in his mercy. \textit{Hear} your sentence.
You have conspired against our royal person,
\textit{Joined with an enemy proclaimed and fixed},
And from his coffers
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{5 Received the golden earnest of our death,}
\textit{Wherein you would have sold your king to slaughter,}
\end{quote}
His princes and his peers to servitude,
His subjects to oppression and contempt,
And his whole kingdom into desolation.

10 Touching our person seek we no revenge,
But we our kingdom's safety must so tender,
Whose ruin you sought, that to her laws
We do deliver you. Get ye therefore hence,
Poor miserable wretches, to your death;

15 The taste whereof, God of his mercy give
You patience to endure, and true repentance
Of all your dear offences. — Bear them hence.

This iambic pentameter text by Shakespeare (from Henry V, 1623 edition) is a development of a prose text from Raphael Holinshed’s Histories (1587):

Having thus conspired the death and destruction of me, which am the head of the realm and governor of the people, it may be (no doubt) but that you likewise have sworn the confusion of all that are here with me, and also the desolation of your own country. To what horror (O lord) for any true English heart to consider, that such an execrable iniquity should ever so bewrap you, as for pleasing of a foreign enemy to imbue your hands in your blood, and to ruin your own native soil. Revenge herein touching my person, though I seek not; yet for the safeguard of you my dear friends, and for due preservation of all sorts, I am by office to cause example to be showed. Get ye hence, therefore, ye poor miserable wretches, to the receiving of your just reward; wherein God’s majesty give you grace of his mercy and repentance of your heinous offences.

2.8.2 Monosyllabic adjective + noun sequences in Shakespeare and Milton

This exercise (based on a comment by Kiparsky 1976: 89) begins with a selection of unconnected lines taken from the first 500 of Book V of Milton’s Paradise Lost, in each of which there is a sequence of monosyllabic adjective plus monosyllabic noun. In ordinary speech, the postlexical stressing of such a sequence would tend to give both parts fairly similar stress, with a slight tendency towards stronger stress on the second member.

(a) Are the monosyllabic adjective–noun sequences (such as best gift, fresh field, etc.) consistently placed with regard to strong and weak metrical positions in the line? (Note: where there is a sequence of adjective–adjective–noun as
in *last best gift*, focus on the final adjective–noun sequence. Treat 'heaven' as a monosyllable.)

Heaven's last best gift, my ever new delight  
Awake, the morning shines, and the fresh field  
At such bold words vouched with a deed so bold  
Wild work produces oft, and most in dreams  
So cheered he his fair spouse, and she was cheered  
Their maker, in fit strains pronounced or sung  
And when high noon hast gained, and when thou fall'st  
With the fixed stars, fixed in their orb that flies  
Vary to our great maker still new praise  
To hill, or valley, fountain, or fresh shade  
Among sweet dews and flowers; where any row  
With pity heaven's high king, and to him called  
Left to his own free will, his will though free  
A phoenix, gazed by all, as that sole bird  
Of his cool bower, while now the mounted sun  
Of God inspired, small store will serve, where store  
Rough, or smooth rind, or bearded husk, or shell  
Mean while our primitive great sire, to meet  
At heaven's high feasts to have fed: yet what compare?  
Springs lighter the green stalk, from thence the leaves  
No inconvenient diet, nor too light fare

(b) The following lines have a monosyllabic quantifier + monosyllabic noun sequence: *all things* and *each hand*. How do these compare with the adjective + noun sequences in terms of their placement with regard to metrical constituent structure?

And nourish all things, let your ceaseless change  
On each hand parting, to his speech gave way

(c) Based on your findings in (a) and (b), how does Milton's iambic pentameter differ from Shakespeare's iambic pentameter (as described in 2.4.6)? Rewrite one of the matching rules to capture this difference.

(d) Now we look at some adjective + noun sequences taken from the first 500 lines of Shakespeare's *The Rape of Lucrece*. Kiparsky comments that Shakespeare allows greater variety in the placement of monosyllabic adjective + noun sequences. Based on this example, is Kiparsky right?
sequence. Treat 'heaven' as

Of Collatine's fair love, Lucrece the chaste
O rash false heat, wrapp'd in repentant cold
Which Tarquin view'd in her fair face's field
In their pure ranks his traitor eye encloses
In that high task hath done her beauty wrong
And decks with praises Collatine's high name
The silly lambs: pure thoughts are dead and still
That from the cold stone sparks of fire do fly
As from this cold flint I enforced this fire
Fair torch, burn out thy light, and lend it not
O impious act, including all foul harms!
Who fears a sentence or an old man's saw
And with good thoughts make dispensation
Fearing some hard news from the warlike band
Sad pause and deep regard beseech the sage
Full of foul hope and full of fond mistrust
But his hot heart, which fond desire doth scorch
He in the worst sense construes their denial
Huge rocks, high winds, strong pirates, shelves and sands
That his foul thoughts might compass his fair fair
In his clear bed might have repose still
Without the bed her other fair hand was
From this fair throne to heave the owner out
As the grim lion fawneth o'er his prey
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