Review

Author(s): Thomas B. Rudmose-Brown

Review by: Thomas B. Rudmose-Brown

Source: *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 6, No. 2 (Apr., 1911), pp. 230-240

Published by: [Modern Humanities Research Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3713407>

Accessed: 19-12-2015 23:27 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Modern Humanities Research Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Modern Language Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

After one fashion, this is shewn in the lectures on Wordsworth, on 'The Long Poem in the Age of Wordsworth,' on Shelley's view of Poetry, and on the Letters of Keats. After all that has been said on these subjects, he has found something original to say, and something which the best of those who have previously written upon them will be the readiest to admire. And he has done all this without ever striving to startle or surprise the reader; by his sheer skill in grappling with all the complexities of the matter, and letting the facts—the experience of a keen and clear-sighted imagination—speak for themselves.

After another fashion, it is shewn in the two lectures on 'The Rejection of Falstaff' and on *Antony and Cleopatra*. After yet another, in those on 'Shakespeare the Man,' and 'Shakespeare's Theatre and Audience.' Of all the lectures, that on Falstaff is perhaps the most open to question. It might be argued that here, as in a few passages of his earlier volume, Professor Bradley is too eager to make his favourite author consistent and conscientious, too slow to admit that his creations, with all their vitality, are also figures in a stage-play and, as such, liable to be swept summarily aside at the bidding of theatrical necessity or convenience. Is it not probable, it might be asked, that Shakespeare, finding it necessary to get rid of Falstaff, made up his mind to do so without ceremony and without blushes? that his rejection, so far from serving to shew the seamy side of the King's character, is dictated mainly, if not solely, by theatrical convention? that it is an expedient on a level with the marriage of Isabella and the Duke, so 'scandalously' huddled up—the word is Professor Bradley's own—at the close of *Measure for Measure*?

But, where so much is supremely good, it is ungracious to hint doubts. Indeed, were they much stronger than they are, they would be nothing but small dust upon the balance. And it is only right that this notice should end, as it began, with an unstinted acknowledgement of the author's unique position as a critic, and to add the hope that this volume, which, if not more excellent, is certainly more varied than its forerunner, will be followed by many more. He has won his own results by mother wit and hard thought. It is to be wished that he may long continue to give the benefit of them to others.

C. E. VAUGHAN.

LEEDS.

Essai sur les Principes de la Métrique Anglaise. By PAUL VERRIER. 3 vols. Paris: H. Welter. 1909-10. 8vo. xi + 354, 232, 344 pp.

According to M. Verrier the raw material of metrics is 'le vers correctement prononcé.' After this, it is surprising to find that the English speakers on whose reading of verse he relies for the bulk of his experiments are, on his own showing, unlikely to pronounce correctly.

'M. La est philologue et s'occupe plus de grammaire que de poésie. M. Le n'est pas grand amateur de vers' (III, p. 214). Verse is an art-form: to rely on the pronunciation of the man in the street, where verse is concerned, is to show incapacity for scientific investigation. Where M. Verrier leaves the perilous guidance of these two incompetents, he falls back on M. Beljame. 'Ma thèse devait être lue par M. Beljame, qui s'intéressait à mon travail, et pour éviter toute discussion oiseuse sur l'accentuation je préférerais pouvoir me référer sur ce point aux indications qu'il a données dans son édition de ce poème [Enoch Arden]' (III, p. 271). The 'vers correctement prononcé' turns out to be, then, not the interpretation of an educated and artistically competent Englishman, but the garbling of two Toms or Dicks and the rendering of a distinguished foreigner.

Thus arises the fundamental and hideous error that disfigures M. Verrier's whole work: namely, that all English verse is correctly pronounced when it is pronounced in the style of everyday conversation—as the most pedestrian of prose. M. Verrier will deny that he believes this: but his scansion proves it. This fundamental misconception of verse as an art-form leads M. Verrier into the further confusion of two entirely different kinds of English verse, *alternating* and *non-alternating* (or accentual). No one with the least ear or with the slightest feeling for form in verse could possibly, for a single moment, apply the same principles of scansion to, say (I, p. 190):

What fields, or waves, or mountains?
What shape of sky or plain,

and (I, p. 188):

Suddenly flashed on her a wild desire,

And yet M. Verrier does so. He does not understand that the second example, a heroic verse, is not only, compared to the first, like 'une mélodie savante auprès d'un air populaire,' which is true (III, p. 259), but that, with its greater artistic complexity and sophistication, it belongs to a metrical form totally different and further removed from prose, a form in which the isochronism of prose and of accentual verse is subordinated to the higher artistic principle of alternation.

We need not follow M. Verrier step by step through his phonetic prolegomena. The 'groupe accentuel' constituted by the 'accent grammatical' (I, p. 41) and modified by the 'accent expressif' or by 'une tendance manifeste à l'alternance' (p. 53) is a familiar conception. Professor Lewis, in his remarkable *Principles of English Verse* (1906), has accustomed us to the idea that prose falls into isochronous segments and that this isochronism is increased in oratorical and poetic diction. M. Verrier holds also, like Prof. Lewis, that the difference between verse and prose 'consiste essentiellement dans la forme des segments' (p. 70) and in their combinations (p. 86). But throughout his book, M. Verrier lays stress, not so much on these characteristic differences of verse and prose but, illogically, on the very isochronism which is, in his opinion,

common to both and cannot therefore differentiate them. He would have spent his space more profitably in clarifying the expression of his own ideas than in abusing his predecessors in metric research¹.

We now reach M. Verrier's specific treatment of verse as verse. His insistence (p. 148) on stress as the sole exteriorisation of ictus, and his assertion that 'on ne doit pas employer comme forte une syllabe moins accentuée que les syllabes voisines, en tout cas que *la suivante*' seem to me to be particularly dark spots in a tissue of errors.

M. Verrier does not distinguish verse that is alternating from verse that is not. And, consequently, since the distinction of *rising* and *falling* exists only in alternating verse, he insists on confusing these two species of rhythm². Of falling rhythm, his dictum as to the relation of 'forte' and succeeding syllable is no doubt true. In rising rhythm the reverse is certainly the case, as e.g. in the line,

Was master: then would Philip, his blue eyes...

the word 'his' is certainly more accented than the second syllable of 'Philip,' but it is *less* accented than the succeeding syllable 'blue.' Of course M. Verrier, who does not consider the heroic verse strictly alternating, scans this line

Was máster: thén would Phílíp, his blúe éyes,

—a scansion to me absolutely absurd³.

In non-alternating verse, it is no doubt true that the 'temps marqué' always corresponds to an increase of intensity. In alternating verse, it is as certainly false. The 'temps marqué' is frequently (in

¹ E.g. A long list of metrists including Mr Omond, Mr Thomson and Prof. Lewis are (p. 145 note) deficient in 'une connaissance suffisante du rythme en général, de la phonétique, de la physiopsychologie et de l'histoire de la versification anglaise,' and (on p. 200 note) the present reviewer is misrepresented as finding Shelley 'peu harmonieux' in certain verses of *Epipsychidion* and considering that he has 'mal rythmé ses vers.' What he *did* say: 'Shelley ne soigne pas trop sa versification, qui échappe à toutes les règles,' M. Verrier repeats himself in other words and more fully (pp. 206, 300).

² Of course on pp. 153 sqq. he speaks of 'La marche du rythme' as being 'croissant,' 'décroissant,' 'croissant-décroissant,' 'décroissant-croissant,' and gives several marvellous examples, telling us, for example, that the line: 'And the sheen of their spears was like stars on the sea' is 'croissant,' but the line: 'And his cohorts were gleaming in purple and gold' is 'croissant-décroissant.' But all that is apparently in the air, for, when he comes to scansion, he rejects (pp. 196 sqq.) any except the 'décroissant' as being useless and inexact.

³ M. Verrier is not even consistent. In Vol. II, p. 315, *à propos* of the line,

But néver mérrily beat Ánnie's héart

(which he prefers to scan as shown—for once happily and convincingly) he declares that 'beat est moins accentué que la forte suivante' and seems to urge this undoubted fact as a proof of his scansion. This is inconsistent. Since the scansion is (to him) falling, the relation of 'beat' to the following syllable should be (to him) of little or no consequence. He should have asked, on his own theory, whether 'beat' was more or less accented than the last syllable of 'merrily.' To justify his scansion, 'beat' would have to be *less* accented than the last syllable of 'merrily.' It obviously is *not* so. Either M. Verrier's theory or his scansion is wrong. And the scansion is certainly right.

the case of so-called inversions) marked by an increase of what M. Verrier calls 'acuité,' i.e. pitch, e.g. in the lines,

Suddenly flash'd on her a wild desire,
Take your own time, Annie, take your own time,
From the dread sweep of the down-streaming seas.

Examples abound. All these lines are strictly alternating, but the prose-stress does not in all cases correspond with the verse ictus, which is, once in the first line, three times in the second, and twice in the third, marked by a rise of pitch. This pitch accent exists potentially and is used occasionally in prose to bring out some particular ethos, but is much more frequently met with in verse, especially in alternating verse, a very high art-form, in which very delicate shades of emotion are brought out (cf. Saran, *Deutsche Verslehre*, *passim*). Read such verses as unemotional prose and their full meaning disappears. Read them as strictly alternating verse, with the proper pitch accents, and the emotional values are at once brought out.

The facts seem to be these: (1) Under certain circumstances of emotion, dissyllables normally accented on the first syllable, with a short second syllable which is capable of lengthening, tend to an equalisation of length, and possibly of stress also, over both syllables, with a rise of pitch on the second syllable; (2) proparoxytonic trisyllables behave in similar circumstances in the same way, so far as the first two syllables are concerned; (3) groups of two closely related monosyllables¹ fulfilling the same conditions behave similarly. This rise of pitch, or pitch-accent, may then serve, instead of the normal stress-accent, to mark the verse ictus. Indeed, when such a pitch-accent arises in this way, in English alternating verse, it is usually preferred as ictus-marker to the stress-accent immediately preceding it². (4) In lines like

Felt the light of her eyes into his life

or

This precious stone set in the silver sea,

I have no doubt that a somewhat similar process affects the groups 'felt the,' 'light of,' 'set in,' although these are not dissyllables of the kind mentioned or closely related monosyllables. It is less easy to dogmatize here, but I think that here also there is an equalisation of length as between the two syllables, possibly of stress also, with a rise of pitch on the second, and that this rise of pitch is used by the poet to mark the verse-ictus. All difficulty of nomenclature might be very easily avoided by adopting Saran's term 'weight' for the quality in a syllable (whatever its cause) that makes it capable of marking the verse-ictus. We may ask also, indeed, whether the isochronism of prose and of non-alternating verse, far from being the basis of alternating verse, does not even, to some extent, disappear in such lines as

¹ E.g. the first two words of the line, 'Show me the fair would scorn to spy.'

² Cf. Draat, *Rhythm in English Prose*, 1910, pp. 11—12.

these, whether indeed, this non-isochronism of the 'temps marqués' is not a feature of the supreme verse-form—the alternating? It seems probable that the prose isochronism persists more or less as between stress and stress, but not as between ictus and ictus, in so far as any ictus is marked not by prose stress but by pitch. Isochronism is obviously less necessary in strictly alternating verse than in non-alternating (or *mixed*) verse.

Most, if not all, of M. Verrier's mistakes arise from these fundamental confusions. Nearly all his scansion is vitiated thereby. His whole treatment of 'anacrusis' becomes the merest and most pernicious nonsense, if we do not accept his non-differentiation of rising and falling rhythm and his denial (for it amounts to that) of alternating verse in English. In so far as English verse is 'mixed' or non-alternating, i.e. in lyric measures at least, he is, on the whole, correct and illuminating. Here it can with justice be contended that rising and falling rhythms are more or less undifferentiated, and that isochronism is more or less stringently carried through, the 'temps marqués' being accompanied by prose stresses: for, paradoxical as it may seem, lyric measures are much nearer prose than the heroic verse and other alternating forms. Popular verse is never alternating.

In verse M. Verrier calls the 'segments rythmiques' by the name of 'pieds' or feet, which he defines (p. 158) as 'la durée comprise entre deux temps marqués successifs.' He adds: 'En tout cas, c'est seulement la division du vers en intervalles compris entre deux temps marqués qui fournit une scansion rationnelle, une *scansion normale*.' And so we are landed in a wilderness of anacrusis and of feet overlapping lines.

M. Verrier's distinction between dissyllabic, trisyllabic and mixed rhythms involves him (I, pp. 314, 318) in the implication that lines like:

There is a path on the sea's azure floor,

or

When night makes a weird sound of its own stillness,

are instances of mixed rhythm. It may be asserted that heroic verse is at all times dissyllabic, never mixed in any way at all, save in certain modern imitators of their own false reading of older poets, e.g. of Milton, who wrote no trisyllabic feet in *Paradise Lost*, though he has been credited with many. A few stray trisyllabic feet in some otherwise irreproachable writers may also be due to a lingering taint of Old English accentual versification totally out of place in alternating verse, however suitable to non-alternating measures.

M. Verrier's answer to the question: *Qu'est-ce qu'un vers?* is not quite satisfactory, the more so as it leads him to malign the verses:

Had I been any god of power, I would
Have sunk the sea within the earth or ere
It should the good ship so have swallowed and
The freighting souls within her.—Be collected.

'C'est là tout simplement une prose rythmée, qu'on persiste à diviser machinalement en groupes plus ou moins égaux de pieds ou de syllabes.' Why this unfortunate passage should be declared devoid even of final melodic cadence (one of his verse-end criteria), and why it should therefore become mere prose, and be hanged forthwith, is very difficult to understand. If it is verse and if its author meant it as verse, as I suppose, it can be read as verse, and this reading will bring out its full ethos and will show the final melodic cadence, and also, if I am not mistaken, a tolerably strong accent on the final syllables.

The whole chapter is not particularly convincing, but its concluding words are the least convincing of all:

Dans les vers libres de Southey, de Coleridge, de Shelley, de Tennyson, et surtout de Walt Whitman, la division en vers se confond presque toujours avec la division logique et phonétique en phrases, membres de phrases, etc. En pareil cas, les vers se distinguent bien les uns des autres. J'ai fait remarquer qu'en divisant d'après le sens et les silences bien des passages du *Paradise Lost* on obtient des vers analogues à ceux de Whitman.

But surely such lines are *not* verses. A verse is more than this and especially it is not this. A verse is in the first place a *metrical* entity. It may or may not be also a logical or phonetic entity. But the one thing is not necessarily the same as either of the other two. Moreover the rearranged lines from Milton (p. 182) are mere rhythmic prose, for the line cadence or whatever it is that constitutes the line, carefully fitted by the poet to the sense, falls in the rearrangement in the wrong place, confusing the whole ethos of the passage.

We come now to the application of the theory to the scansion of actual verses. Here the fundamental errors of M. Verrier work havoc with all sanity. We find a passage from Tennyson's *Vision of Sin* (evidently trochaic) classed with a number of heroic lines (as evidently iambic) as 'Vers commençant par une forte.' 'Les vers de ces deux séries commencent exactement de la même manière et présentent exactement les mêmes formes rythmiques' (p. 187). If M. Verrier's ear cannot distinguish

	Gathering up from all the lower ground,
or	
	Woven in circles: they that heard it sighed,
from	
	Knowledge enormous makes a God of me,
or	
	Suddenly flash'd on her a wild desire,

he must be proclaimed incompetent to judge of English verse, with or without the aid of M. Beljame. The first two verses are alternate-falling while the last two are alternate-rising: there is no getting away from that.

M. Verrier's reasons (I, p. 198) for rejecting rising scansion are no better than his theory. 'Elle créé une distinction inutile et inexacte.... L'anacrusse est presque toujours plus ou moins facultative.' The latter

is particularly false. Alternating trochaics never (or almost never) begin with what he calls an anacrusis: alternating iambics always (or almost always) do. Why, on M. Verrier's theory, is a nine-syllable blank without this supposed anacrusis so very rare as to be, in modern verse, almost an impossibility, while a ten-syllable blank is good and usual whether beginning with an unaccented syllable or with an apparent inversion? Why is the line:

Down in the blue-bells, or a wren light rustling,

a good blank verse, but the same line shorn of its first syllable a very bad one? If the anacrusis is a matter of moonshine, one should be as good as the other.

Moreover I cannot admit, as M. Verrier seems to wish (I, p. 200), that the falling nature of English accentuation is a reason for adopting falling scansion. There is no obvious connection between the two. Metrics and phonetics do not necessarily divide speech into the same groups or in the same way. The derivation of English alternating iambic verse from French, and through French from a certainly rising Latin verse, makes for the rising scansion of iambic alternating verse¹. But a believer in alternating verse cannot argue convincingly with a non-believer. I fear M. Verrier will only shrug his shoulders at my criticisms and repeat that I am deficient in knowledge of rhythm in general, phonetics, physiopsychology and the history of English versification. So be it: I shall not follow M. Verrier through his forest of false scansions². Suffice it to say that all he has to say about 'coupes' and internal anacrusis is really beside the point. The 'coupes' are in no wise really metrical. They may on his own showing

¹ On p. 201 M. Verrier shows how rising scansion disfigures certain trochaic and dactylic verses. Of course it does. Nothing is proved. No one wants to scan trochaic verse with rising scansion. I do not think his argument (pp. 202—3) from the lines,

So these were wed, and merrily rang the bells,
Merrily rang the bells and they were wed,

is in any way conclusive. The word 'merrily' in the first line is intended to be read as a dissyllable. In the second line the alternation demands just that higher pitch on the second syllable of 'merrily' which a proper reading of the line with due regard for its ethos secures. To scan the two 'merrily's' in the same way as 'merrily' would make of Tennyson's repetition a mere repetition and nothing more. The case becomes even stronger if the next line is included:

But never merrily beat Annie's heart.

Here 'merrily' has its normal accentuation. Anyone who cannot hear that these three 'merrily's' are *not* mere repetition but have three separate emotional values corresponding to three different accentuations, is devoid of the necessary equipment for writing on English verse.

² One further example will suffice: M. Verrier, on p. 218, scans Shelley's line,

Rugged and dark, winding among the springs

as part of a greater asclepiad, because *read as prose*, it matches part of Swinburne's real greater asclepiad,

Ah! thy lúminous éyes! Ónce was their light féd with the fire of dáy.

But the ethos of Swinburne's line, because he was a competent if not a great poet, demands just this accentuation and scansion. The line was written as a greater asclepiad. Shelley's line was written as a heroic, and was intended to be read with alternating rhythm. The rhythm of the two verses is very far from being 'identique.'

occur anywhere in the verse. Of course the silences at the 'coupes' count in the isochronous intervals (if these exist) but the 'coupes' are not, in general, real *cæsuras* and are not analogous to real *cæsuras*.

The second volume is, in the main, devoted to a discussion of the nature of rhythm. Much is irrelevant. The most interesting chapter of the relevant part deals with 'l'origine et évolution des mètres poétiques.' Passing over such interesting topics as Persian and Chinese versification, we reach M. Verrier's discussion of French verse, a most important preliminary to any consideration of the origin of English alternating verse.

Old French verse was, he declares, 'incomplètement accentuel... L'accent et le temps marqué ne coïncident forcément qu'à la fin du vers et, dans certains mètres, à un autre endroit' (II, p. 135). And he scans

Gránz fu li dóls fórt marriménz,

the accents 'granz' and 'fort' not corresponding to the 'temps marqués' which fall on 'fu' and the first syllable of 'marrimenz.'

All this is very doubtful. But when (p. 142) M. Verrier asserts that Modern French versification takes no account of the 'temps marqué' except at the end of the line (and in certain verse forms at the *cæsura*)—there can be no doubt that, in spite of his contemptuous dismissal (p. 142, note 3), Tobler and Professors Wulff, Stengel and Saran are right and M. Verrier (following Becq de Fouquières, Prof. Grammont and most French metrists) is wrong. 'Dans une versification incomplètement accentuelle, comme l'était à l'origine celle du français, il y a souvent conflit entre le temps marqué et l'accentuation ordinaire. C'est celle-ci qui a fini par l'emporter chez nous, malgré sa faiblesse relative, probablement au XVII^e siècle. Il en résulte qu'aujourd'hui le rythme de nos vers repose sur l'accentuation; il n'a plus rien à voir avec le rythme primitif.' In other words the alexandrine has to-day the metre (more or less) of

The Assyrian came down like a wolf on the fold

mingled (to taste) with that of:

Thus, rolling in her burning breast, she strait to Acolia hied,

in other words, is a hash of irreconcilable fragments.

M. Verrier declares that 'M. Saran a tort de tenir compte des accents secondaires, qui s'effacent pour notre oreille; il faut scander,

Je viens selon l'usage...
...à peine un petit nombre.'

Whatever M. Verrier says, these hemistichs *cannot*, even as everyday prose, be pronounced without a slight stress (the least will be sufficient) on one or other of the unstressed syllables between the stresses marked. Rhythmical considerations would suggest the second of the three unstressed syllables as the one to be slightly stressed. It is true that in an everyday prose reading this stress will be very slight indeed.

But in an emotional reading, a reading calculated to bring out the full ethos of the line, it will be far from negligible. No one will assert that it is as great as that of the syllables which M. Verrier has stressed: but it exists. The word 'petit,' for example, must, to make sense, to bring out the emotional value of the word, be read with the first syllable stressed (I have Rousselot and Passy with me). The 'temps marqué' corresponds in French, as in English verse, frequently to a quite small increase of intensity.

All that Molière did, if, as M. Verrier says, he substituted 'une diction naturelle à la déclamation de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne,' was to introduce into the theatre an unrhythmical and inartistic prose reading of verse—in other words to speak verse as if it were prose, a taint which the French stage has unfortunately preserved not only in light comedy, where it may be in its place, but in the highest forms of tragedy, to such an extent that many (if not most) Frenchmen imagine this merely bad prose to be verse, and are deaf to the finer harmony of the real alexandrine. Many poets have even been led astray into writing alexandrines (so-called) on this basis. All that M. Verrier's attack on Professor Saran and his attempted justification of it prove is that M. Verrier too is tainted with this abomination of desolation that scans

Le soléil le revêt d'éclatantes couleurs.

The third volume is a record of experimental work, devoted to an attempted proof of isochronism in verse. Its value, even granting freedom from error, is doubtful. When M. Verrier has proved, if he does prove, that stresses in verse are separated by equal intervals or approximately equal intervals of time, or has shown how, when this is not the case, various influences militate against the expected and normal isochronism—and M. Verrier is a little too clever at that—nothing is really proved at all with regard to the metre of verse that does not depend entirely on stress. M. Verrier ignores, as in the first two volumes, the possibility of alternation as a principle of verse. His experiments on alternating verse are therefore valueless. Before they can offer any interest, he must prove that the principle of this verse is not alternating but accentual. This he has not tried to do: he has assumed it: for the *petitio principii* of showing that the intervals between the stresses are isochronous and deducing the accentual nature of the verse from that is, of course, no proof. He reads the verses as prose: they will naturally show the isochronism of prose. Even if, read as verse, they were still isochronous, this would be no proof that their metre depends on isochronism.

The experiments on admittedly accentual verse are of considerable value—but even here M. Verrier has done little more than to show that the isochronism of prose persists in them, possibly somewhat strengthened and regularized; and even here, of course, Messrs La and Le's unemotional and incompetent reading of verse must be reckoned with, but the source of error is not so great as in the case of alternating verse.

When we at last, after many preliminaries, reach the experiments on verse proper, we are brought up (p. 189) by the assertion, in reference to heroic verse: '*Puisque le rythme du vers est accentuel*' (the italics are mine), 'le temps marqué ne saurait correspondre à un phénomène quelconque, mais seulement à un phénomène accentuel, tel que le maximum ou l'accroissement maximum de l'intensité, qui se trouvent toutes deux dans la voyelle'—as fine an example of *petitio principii* as one could meet with.

The line analysed is a perversion of Tennyson:

He passed his days in péace among his péople.

M. Verrier gets for this line feet respectively of 61, 54, 56 and 52 cs. 'Il y a une accélération continue. Par suite de cette accélération et du renforcement métrique initial...le premier pied est de beaucoup le plus long.' Dividing by ten M. Verrier gets 6, 5, 6, 5 or by dipodies 11, 11. I must protest against M. Verrier's arithmetic. The dipodies actually give 115, 108, or 11·5, 10·8, which are not correctly represented by 11, 11¹.

An interesting series is that analysed on pp. 231 sqq.:

Show me the fair would scorn to spy,
Close on the hounds the hunter came,
Mountain and meadow, moss and moor,
Pennons and flags defaced and stained.

These all show 'initial inversion,' are alternating, and are completely spoiled by accentual reading. The results for the four lines, calculating from accent to accent, are, respectively,

57·4	62·5	61	cs.
50·4	49·5	45·6	cs.
59·4	49·1	46	cs.
68·1	53·1	64·4	cs.

a series which M. Verrier (p. 241) finds 'tout aussi près de l'isochronisme que les plus réguliers de mes chansons.' Possibly. But the isochronism is not obvious to my prejudiced mind.

Did Mr La (the grammarian) read these verses accentually or alternately? He probably read them badly in any case. M. Verrier, to whom alternation is an impossibility, supposes them to have been read accentually. I doubt it. In the line,

Show me the fair would scorn to spy,

the second syllable 'me' shows a higher pitch than the first or third (III, pp. 235, 255). It is a pity M. Verrier does not give the pitch analysis for the other lines. It might help to suggest that Mr La

¹ M. Verrier's experiments bear (consistently with his theory) on *intervals* from accent to accent. A five-beat line has only 4 complete intervals, a four-beat line only 3. He measures in millimetres, which he converts, in accordance with his scale, to hundredths of a second.

read these lines alternately. It would not then be very surprising that isochronism is not marked in them.

The next verse analysed is:

A wét sheét and a flówing séa.

With the accentuation indicated the results were (III, p. 244) 42, 58, 54. Then M. Verrier (p. 245) uses the *same reading and the same record* to show that the scansion,

A wét sheet ánd a flówing séa,

gives 40, 50, 40, and is therefore less isochronous! The same record! Surely Mr La read either one way or the other! A fresh reading and fresh record were surely necessary. Nothing whatever is proved except M. Verrier's want of scientific method and common-sense.

I must protest that the series 59, 58, 43, 45 cs., as obtained for a parody of a line of Tennyson's read by Mr La,

He passed his days in peace among his sheep,

cannot, by any conceivable process consistent with scientific accuracy be reduced (p. 260) to 1, 1, 1, 1. The same applies to the line,

He sent abroad a shrill and terrible cry,

which, read by Mr La, gave 53, 60, 51, 59 cs., reduced unblushingly by M. Verrier to 1, 1, 1, 1. The line,

Dárk as a fúneral scárf from stém to stérn,

read thus accentually by Mr La, gave (p. 262) the series 67, 65, 74, 64. Mr Le's reading (he is the man who does not care for verse) gave 80, 77, 77, 70. I fail to see how isochronism can be inferred.

Mr Le's reading of

Énoch was hóst one dáy, Phlíp the néxt,

with the accentuation noted, gave 85, 85, 60, 67. M. Verrier has not the courage to reduce this to equality. But he does his best by suggesting (p. 266) that 'le temps change brusquement à la césure.'

All M. Verrier's experiments suggest the observation that, since he has analysed his records as if the lines recorded had been read with Prof. Beljame's accentuation (III, p. 271) and since there is absolutely no certainty that Messrs La and Le read them with that accentuation, the whole series of experiments is entirely devoid of value. 'Il n'y aura de définitive qu'une métrique expérimentale' (III, p. 184). Possibly. But the experimenter must rid his mind of prepossessions, must have his verses read by competent readers, and must analyse his records without reference to the pronunciation prescribed by any one at all.

THOMAS B. RUDMOSE-BROWN.

DUBLIN.