

message that the rhétoriciens were paid to promote. In recent decades, a more balanced view has emerged, justifying the cohort's flamboyant figuration by connecting it with the requirements of epideictic *inventio* (see EPIDEICTIC POETRY). Building on a trad. initiated in the early 15th c. by Alain Chartier, the successive Indiciaires de Bourgogne (Chastelain, Molinet, Lemaire) and their Fr. imitators (La Vigne, Saint-Gelais, Cretin, Marot, Bouchet) indeed strove to combine (not confuse) the resources of "first" and "second" rhetoric (i.e., prose and verse: see SECONDE RHÉTORIQUE), as well as those of hist. and "poetry" (allegorical fiction), in order to illustrate, interpret, and justify the glory of the prince as exemplary ruler and image of God. Should the prince fail to live up to this standard, however, the rhétoricien could advise him to mend his ways, typically by giving voice to symbolic representatives of his people or to entities such as Counsel and Truth. This syncretic notion of political rhetoric as the noblest form of verbal art also allowed for some celebration of creative power, at least by peers, as the author himself invariably struck a humble pose in his own work. All this developed at first within the bounds of mss. composed for the prince's and the court's enjoyment and then entered into the larger stage of print (some rhétoriciens did not care to see their works printed; others, such as Lemaire, exploited the new technology with gusto). The holistic art of the Grands Rhétoriciens soon fragmented, however, as hist. and poetry began to separate again; it was the son of Jean Marot, Clément, who quietly gave up the historiographer's duties as well as the grand style's signature effects and thus reinvented Fr. poetry as an autonomous art, aesthetically exalted but, in a way, rhetorically diminished. Nevertheless, the grands rhétoriciens played a key role in the devel. of poetic forms and ideas in the early Fr. Ren.; conversely, many 16th-c. poets who touted their own sophistication while proclaiming that their art had nothing to do with hist. or immediate persuasion also retained a keen sense of what poetry had lost, in terms of rhetorical authority and social status, by renouncing the political calling of their "ignorant" predecessors.

■ P. Jodogne, *Jean Lemaire de Belges* (1972); P. Zumthor, *Le masque et la lumière* (1978); C. J. Brown, *The Shaping of History and Poetry in Late Medieval France* (1985); J. Britnell, *Jean Bouchet* (1986); F. Cornilliat, *Or nemens* (1994); J. Devaux, *Jean Molinet, indiciaire bourguignon* (1996); M. Randall, *Building Resemblance* (1996); D. Cowling, *Building the Text* (1998); A. Armstrong, *Technique and Technology* (2000); E. Doudet, *Poétique de George Chastelain* (2005); V. Minet-Mahy, *L'automne des images* (2009).

F. CORNILLIAT

**RHOPALIC VERSE** (Gr., "clublike," i.e., thicker toward the end, from *rhopalón*, the club of Hercules). "Wedge verse," in which each word is a syllable longer than the one before it, e.g., *Iliad* 3.182, "o makar Atreide, moiregenes, olbiodaimon" which begins with a monosyllable and closes with a fifth word of five

syllables, or Virgil's "Ex quibus insignis pulcherrima Deiopeia" or Richard Crashaw's "Wishes to His Supposed Mistress."

See CONSTRAINT.

■ Morier; T. Augarde, *Oxford Guide to Word Games*, 2d ed. (2003).

T.V.F. BROGAN

## RHYME

### I. Origin and History of Rhyme in World Poetries

### II. Rhyme in Western Poetries, Particularly in English

#### I. Origin and History of Rhyme in World Poetries

**A. Introduction.** There have been two chief views on the origin and devel. of rhyme. The derivationist position is that rhyme originated in one locus and was disseminated to all others. Turner argued as early as 1808 that rhyme originated in Chinese or Sanskrit (but not Ar.; for Ren. arguments about the Ar. origin of rhyme, see Dainotto), whence it spread via the trade routes to Europe. Draper claimed China as the single point of origin (according to him, the earliest attested rhymes in Chinese date from ca. 1000 BCE; according to Kenner, 1200 BCE), from which it spread to ancient Iran by means of Mongol hordes and westward to Rome with Persian mystery cults; but, as McKie has argued, Draper's ambiguous evidence suggests dual sources in Iran and China. The alternate view, set forth as early as 1803 by Swift, is that rhyme does not take its origin exclusively in any one lang. but is a natural ling. structure that can arise in any lang. having the right set of features. The fact that rhyme originated once shows that it can originate at any time. It is a simple ling. fact that the number of sounds available in any lang. is limited, and its many words must, therefore, be combinations of only a few sounds. There is considerable evidence that children manufacture rhymes spontaneously as one basic form of sound permutation; also conspicuous is rhyme in the \*chants and \*charms of many primitive cultures. Systematic rhyming has appeared in such widely separated langs. that its spontaneous devel. in more than one of them seems a reasonable assumption. We should not seek to find the ultimate "origin" of rhyme in Western poetry by tracing rhyme forms back through langs. to some common source. Still, it is a thundering fact that most of the world's 4,000 langs. lack or avoid rhyme in their poetries altogether (Whitehall).

In the hist. of the world's poetries, those cultures that have most extensively developed rhyme have been Chinese in the East and in the West, Ar., Ir., Occitan, Fr., Ger., Eng., and Rus. Note that rhyme is not originally native to any Eur. lang. or even IE. Regardless of whether rhyme had one source or several, it is indisputable that, both in ancient and med. lits., there are several discernible routes of transmission, the tracing of which is neither impossible nor unimportant, merely difficult. It is obvious that specific rhyme forms, like meters and stanzas, have been imported into langs. via trans. or imitation of famous poets and canonical

works in another lang. (Homer, Virgil, Dante, Petrarch, Shakespeare), even where rhyme was already indigenous.

What can be said reliably at present about the earliest rhyme trads., Chinese and Ar., is as follows.

**B. Chinese.** Rhyme is an essential element of Chinese versification; it has been largely ignored by Western translators and readers because it cannot be fully reproduced in trans. Because Chinese is a tonal lang., not a stress-based lang., and because every Chinese character is pronounced as one syllable, Chinese rhymes more readily than most other langs. (though the distribution of tones may complicate the rhyme patterns). End rhyme occurs in all traditional verse, with rhyme schemes varying according to different forms of poetry. In the open-ended ancient-style verse (*gushi*), rhyme generally occurs at the end of each \*couplet; and the rhyme, in either the level or the oblique tone, may change in the course of the poem. But in a more rigid form such as the eight-line regulated verse (*lushi*), the same rhyme should be used throughout the poem and is almost always in the level tone. This level-tone rhyme falls at the end of each couplet, but it is also permissible at the end of the first line of the poem. Compared to regulated verse, the \**ci* (lyric) is relatively more complex and varied. In composing a song in *ci* style, the poet chooses a tune, out of some 825 tunes, and writes words for it. Each tune pattern determines the tonal category of the end rhyme and \*internal rhymes, as well as the number of lines and the number of syllables per line. For the historical evolution of rhyme, see CHINA, POETRY OF.

**C. Arabic and Persian.** Until the 20th c., rhyme (*qāfiya*) was one of two primary features in the Ar. definition of poetry itself; in the famous dictum recorded by Qudāma ibn Jaʿfar (d. 934), the author of *Kitāb naqd al-shiʿr*, a manual on poetics, poetry is “discourse with rhyme and meter.” The central position accorded rhyme in Ar. and Persian poetics leads to the devel. of a theoretical science of rhyme parallel to though separate from that of prosody, with the Basran scholar Al-Khalil ibn Aḥmad (d. 791), as its alleged founder. In these trads., as indeed in most others, rhyme is based on \*sound; there is no visual rhyme. Thus, it may be said that critical writing on rhyme in Ar. dates from the 8th or 9th c.; rhyme itself is already present in the first extant exemplars of Ar. poetry (6th c.), its origins lost in the unrecorded beginnings of oral trad. The question of whether rhyme exists in the Old Iranian Avesta (ca. 1500 BCE) is disputed.

In Ar., the essential part of rhyme is the word-final consonant called *al-rāwī*, which remains constant throughout the poem (this consonant will sometimes be preceded by a further consonant that is also part of the rhyme). Rhyme in Ar. can be of two sorts: fettered (*muqayyada*), i.e., ending with a consonant; or loose (*muṭlaqa*), i.e., ending with a vowel. While occasional examples of \*assonance or \*near rhyme are known in Middle Persian poetry, the intricate rules and conven-

tions for rhyme in Islamic Persian were adapted from Ar. practice. Rhyme in Persian may comprise from one to four syllables, the last ending with the same consonant preceded by the same vowel, e.g., *bām / kām*; *sardam / mardam*; *revāyati / shekāyati*; *pāyandagān / āyandagān*. Some variation is allowed in the longer rhymes but no license.

The majority of cl. \**qaṣīda* and \**ghazal* poetry is composed of verses in \*monorhyme, with the rhyme at the end of the second of two \*hemistichs (*miṣrāʿ*). More often than not, the rhyme is called to the attention of the poem’s audience by being used at the end of both hemistichs of the first line of the poem, a process called *taṣrīf*. A rhyme word should not be repeated except at distant intervals. A special feature of Persian rhyme is the *radif*, a syllable, word, or phrase repeated verbatim following the rhyme, e.g., *yār dānam / khomār dāram*, where the rhyme is *-ār* and the *radif* is *dāram*. Some typical rhyme schemes are the following: *qaṣīda* and *ghazal*, *aabaca*; quatrain, *aaaa* or *aaba*; *masnavi* or rhyming couplet, *aabbcc*, etc.; *qeṭa*, *bacada*. Strophic forms have more complicated schemes. This can be seen most notably in the Andalusian, *muwashshah*, where, within a series of \*strophes, one section (usually termed *ghuṣn*) will normally have an independent rhyme for each instance, while the other (termed *simṭ* or *qufl*) will retain the rhyme of the final segment of the poem, the \**kharja* (see AL-ANDALUS, POETRY OF).

Since World War II, rhyme has lost its formerly privileged position and become but one of a number of features of poetic discourse as poets and critics have abandoned the dictates of cl. Ar. poetics in favor of new (and often imported) genres such as \*free verse and the \*prose poem. For more information, see ARABIC POETICS (CLASSICAL), ARABIC POETRY, ARABIC PROSODY.

**D. Western European.** In the West, while rhyme is rare in all cl. poetry, it is rarer in Gr. than in Lat.: still, it is not unknown in Homer (*Iliad* 2.87–88, 9.236–38) and the Gr. dramatists (Aristophanes’ *Clouds* 709–15, *Wasps* 133–35, and *Acharians* 29–36); Euripides in the *Alcestis* has a drunk Hercules speak in rhyme (782–86), a passage clearly meant to be comic. Rhyme can be found in the Alexandrian poets and, among Lat. poets, in Ennius and Ovid (a fifth of the lines in the *Tristia* show \*leonine rhyme), Virgil (*Aeneid* 1.625–26, 2.124–25, 2.456–57, 3.549, 3.656–57, 4.256–57, 8.620–21, 8.646–47, 9.182–83, 10.804–5), and Horace (*Ars poetica* 99–100).

The emergence of rhyme in the West had to await the devel. of accent (Clark remarks that “the history of the adoption of rhyme is almost exactly parallel to, and contemporaneous with, the history of the substitution of accent for quantity”); the shifting of word accent from the root syllable rightward; and, progressively, the transition from inflectional to positional syntax. But since rhyme obviously appears in inflected langs., we must say that, insofar as it is to be distinguished from \*homoeoteleuton, it should be seen as arising in response to the decay of the inflectional system and, therefore, growing stronger only as like endings dis-

appear (Whitehall). Langs. that retain inflections but use rhyme (e.g., Fr.) will, therefore, impose extensive constraints on rhyme forms so as to differentiate the two systems.

The earliest indigenous rhyme trad. in Europe was apparently Ir., and elaborate canons of rhyme have remained a central feature of \*Celtic prosody up to the 20th c., though it is necessary to distinguish between Celtic vernacular and Ir.-Lat. verse (McKie). The Ir. missionaries apparently brought rhyme with them to the continent (the older view was that this influence worked in the opposite direction). Assonantal precursors of rhyme first appear in the Christian Lat. hymns of Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose, and Augustine (late 3d through 4th cs.); and McKie calls arguments in favor of a Christian Lat. (incl. Ir.-Lat.) source of rhyme in OE “decisive.” Meyer thought the source for this practice to be Semitic, a view not now followed. In Byzantium, Romanus and Synesius were exploiting its possibilities in hymnology by the 6th c.

Except for the intervention of med. Lat., the Eur. langs. would have developed their prosodies in opposing directions. The Germanic langs., with forestressing of words, developed structural \*alliteration for their prosody, as in OHG and OE, less ornate than the elaborately interlaced sound patterns of the Celtic poetries, i.e., Ir. and Welsh, but more closely linked to meter (see Árnason for the argument that “in-rhyme” in ON could have developed inherently in ON lit., not as the result of Ir. influence). The Romance langs., in which word stress was weaker and phrase stress stronger, developed first assonance then rhyme; the great flowering of short-lined, rhymed stanzas in \*Occitan poetry by the \*troubadours directly influenced every other vernacular on the continent, and even med. Lat. \*Goliardic verse. Occitan was itself influenced, perhaps strongly, by Ar. sources, though the nature and extent of this influence is still disputed.

Ger. early fell under the influence of med. Lat. versification, as Eng. did of Fr. after the Norman Conquest. Rhyme first appears in the Germanic vernaculars in the 9th c. in the work of Otfrid (*Evangelienbuch*, ca. 863–71), directly influenced by med. Lat. versification. There are also some vestiges of rhyme in OE as a result of Celtic influence, chiefly the “Rhyming Poem.” \*French prosody itself was an outgrowth of med. Lat. principles. Northern Fr. exerted enormous influence on ME from the 12th c. (*The Owl and the Nightingale*, the Harley lyrics) through Chaucer (who also knew Boccaccio) into the 15th c. The collapse of the OE inflectional system had left numbers of monosyllabic words in early ME, but the large number of Romance loan words imported, most of them polysyllabic and oxytonic or paroxytonic, readily encouraged rhyme: many of them kept their Romance end-stressing in ME and even influenced the stressing of other Eng. words. Chaucer takes advantage of a variable final *e*, which was in the process of disappearing during his own lifetime, for both meter and rhyme. After Chaucer, the loss of final *e* and the Great Vowel Shift in the 15th c. sounded the end of ME versification; mod. Eng. prosody was reinvented by Thomas Wyatt and by Henry Howard, the Earl of Sur-

rey, though even here on Romance principles of rhyme and stanza (e.g., the \*sonnet).

Since the Ren., the emergence of standardized varieties of the mod. langs. has worked to restrict the canons for permissible rhyming in literary verse, but three other forces have exerted pressure against this trend: (1) oral and popular trads., along with literary imitations of them, esp. folk poetry such as the \*ballad in the 18th c., have strongly influenced or, more recently, arisen to challenge literary verse, particularly in \*romanticism (e.g., *Lyrical Ballads*); in the 19th-c. Ger. cult of the lit. of the Volk (see ORAL POETRY); in \*dialect poetry, once extensive and important, as in Scottish, southern Ger., and It., but subsequently marginalized from literary verse even while it flourishes in oral trad.; and, beginning in the late 20th c. in the U.S., in many public performances of poetry (see, e.g., PERFORMANCE, POETRY SLAM, NUYORICAN POETS CAFÉ); (2) song lyrics, such as those of W. S. Gilbert in the 19th c. or Cole Porter, Ira Gershwin, and Stephen Sondheim in the 20th, and the lyrics of many hip-hop artists in the 20th and 21st cs. present vigorous, inventive, often comic challenges to the more limited rhyming of much literary verse (see SONG, HIP-HOP POETICS); and (3) in literary verse itself, the devel. of variant forms of rhyme in the 19th and 20th cs., such as near and \*eye rhyme, continues to offer poets many possibilities.

## II. Rhyme in Western Poetries, Particularly in English

Philip Sidney in the *Defence of Poesy* calls rhyme “the chiefe life” of mod. versifying; indeed, so it must still seem, despite the advent of the great trad. of Eng. \*blank verse from Shakespeare to Alfred, Lord Tennyson, and even the advent of the several free-verse prosodies after 1850: the first edition of the *Oxford Book of English Verse* (1900) contains 883 poems of which only 16 lack rhyme. And what is true of Eng. is even more true of Rus., where the trad. of rhyme is more extensively developed, and esp. Fr., where rhyme is truly fundamental to the whole system of versification. Rhyme is, as Oscar Wilde said, “the one chord we have added to the Greek lyre.”

**A. Definition.** In the specific sense of the term as used in Eng., *rhyme* is the linkage in poetry of two syllables at line end (for internal rhyming, see below) that have identical stressed vowels and subsequent phonemes but differ in initial consonant(s) if any are present—syllables that, in short, begin differently and end alike. This is the paradigmatic case for Eng.; but in the half-dozen other langs. where rhyme has been developed as a major poetic device, many other varieties have been developed, resulting in more expansive definitions admitting any one of several kinds of sound echo in verse. More broadly, however, we must say that *rhyme* is the phonological correlation (see EQUIVALENCE) of differing semantic units at distinctive points in verse. It is essential that the definition not be framed solely in terms of sound, for that would exclude the cognitive function.

Rhyme calls into prominence simultaneously a complex set of responses based on identity and difference. On the phonic level, the likeness of the rhyming syllables (at their ends) points up their difference (at

their beginnings). The phonic semblance (and difference) then points up semantic semblance or difference: the equivalence of the rhyme syllables or words on the phonic level implies a relation or likeness or difference on the semantic level. Rhyme in this sense, i.e., *end rhyme*, is, with \*meter, a primary form of sound patterning in mod. verse and deploys sound similarity as the means to semantic and structural ends.

Crucial to these ends, as with all others in \*prosody, is segmentation. As with the clausulae of late antique \*prose rhythm, rhyme marks the ends of runs of syllables in speech and thereby segments the sound stream into equal or perceived-equal units or sections: this segmentation, in turn, establishes equivalence, which is essential to \*repetition and the effects it is capable of. Lotman says that, if all equivalences in the poetic line are classed as either positional (rhythmic) or euphonic (sonal), then rhyme is created at the intersection of the two sets.

From the usual sense of the term *rhyme*—i.e., the sound common to two or more words or a word that echoes another word—other senses derive by \*synecdoche, i.e., (1) a poem in rhymed verse or (2) rhymed verse in general; or by \*metonymy, i.e., (3) any kind of sound echo between words (e.g., alliteration, assonance, \*consonance) or (4) more generally, any kind of correspondence, congruence, or accord (cf. J. R. Lowell's "of which he was as unaware as the blue river is of its rhyme with the blue sky" from *The English Poets*, 1888).

The spelling *r-h-y-m-e* became common in Eng. in the 17th c.; the earlier Ren. and ME spelling, *r-i-m-e*, derives from OF *rime*, *ritme* (< Med Lat. *rithmi* < Lat. *rithmus*, *rhythmus* < Gr. *rhythmos*). The OF form gave the Occitan, Sp., Catalan, Port., and It. cognates *rima* and MHG, ON, and Old Icelandic *rim*, later *rima* (rhymed poem, ballad; see *RÍMUR*). This form of *rim* is not to be confused with (though it is related to) OHG, OE *rim* (number) or with OE, ON *hrim* (hoar-frost, rime-frost). The term *rim* in the mod. sense of *rhyme* first appears in an Anglo-Norman rhymed sermon of the early 12th c.; in this century, rhyme became a central feature of short-lined lyric poetry in Occitan and came to replace assonance in the \**laisses* of the OF \**chansons de geste*. In Eng., the spelling *r-i-m-e* / *r-y-m-e* for vernacular, accentual, rhymed verse was preserved to ca. 1560, when spelling reform based on the classics brought in *r-i-t-h-m-e* / *r-y-t-h-m-e* (pronounced to rhyme with *crime* and spelled *r-i-'m-e* by Ben Jonson), current to 1700, after which time *r-h-y-t-h-m* became the spelling for that concept in the mod. sense. About 1600, however, *rhime*/*rhyme* appears, presumably to distinguish rhyming from rhythmical/metrical effects; *r-h-y-m-e* subsequently won out, though the (historically correct) spelling *r-i-m-e* has never entirely disappeared.

In med. Lat., *rithmus*/*rhythmus* denotes *versus rithmici* (rhythmical verse), meaning verse whose meter is based on \*accent, not \*quantity (*versus metrici*) and that employs end-rhyme. Lat. rhythmical verse, appears as early as the 3d to 4th cs. CE and reaches its culmination in the 12th c., though verse written on quantitative principles continued to be written throughout the

Middle Ages. This fact—two metrical systems side by side in med. Lat.—is responsible for the mod. phrase "without rhyme or reason," meaning neither *rhythmus* nor *ratio*, i.e., not any kind of verse at all. In short, the word for accentually based and rhymed verse in med. Lat. vacillated between an *i* and *y* spelling for its vowel; the Ren. distinguished these two criteria and, hence, terms for them. Ren. spelling reform affected the visual shapes of the words; pronunciation diverged later. *Rhythm* and *rhyme* are, thus, intimately related not only etymologically but conceptually.

There are two final points about definition. First, the definition of what counts as rhyme is conventional and cultural: it expands and contracts from one national poetry, age, verse trad., and genre to another. Hence, definition must shortly give way to a taxonomy of types (below). Second, there is the issue of positing rhyme at line end itself (see *LINE*). Žirmunskij, looking at rhyme as not only sound echo but the marker of line end, sees that function as having an effect on the rhythmic organization of the line. Indeed, it is commonly assumed that rhyme exerts a metrical function in marking the ends of the lines. But, of course, rhyme is not restricted to line end, suggesting that "any sound repetition that has an organizing function in the metrical composition of the poem should be included in the concept of rhyme" (1923). Further, as de Cornulier argues, rhyme does not exactly reside at line end: its positioning shapes the entire structure of the line, so that we should more accurately say that the rhyme resides in the entire line. Removing rhymes from lines does not merely render them rhymeless; it alters their lexical-semantic structure altogether.

**B. Taxonomy.** Rhyme correlates syllables by sound. We may describe the structure of the \*syllable as initial consonant or consonant cluster (the so-called support or prop consonant [Fr. *consonne d'appui*]; this may be in the zero state, i.e., absent) + medial vowel (or diphthong) + final consonant (or cluster, if present), which we may schematize as CVC. If we ask which elements of a syllable can be repeated in a second syllable in correspondence with the first, letting underlining denote a sound repeated identically, then seven configurations are possible (the eighth possibility is null; these are simply the permutations of a set of three elements), having these forms and Eng. names:

1. C V C alliteration (*bad* / *boy*)
2. C V C assonance (*back* / *rat*)
3. C V C consonance (*back* / *neck*)
4. C V C reverse rhyme (*back* / *bat*)
5. C V C [no standard term] frame rhyme, para-rhyme (*back* / *buck*)
6. C V C rhyme strictly speaking (*back* / *rack*)
7. C V C Rich rhyme, rime riche, or identical rhyme (*bat* [wooden cylinder] / *bat* [flying creature])

This schema presumes that both syllables are identical in all other respects, i.e., their phonological and morphological characteristics—e.g., that both syllables are stressed monosyllables. But, of course, this is not

usually the case, certainly not for Fr. or It. or Rus., not even for Eng. A more elaborate taxonomy would subsume all such variants. To date, no such inventory of rhyme structures has yet been given. When it is, it will explain a number of effects as yet unaccounted for, clarify relations between forms in the same or different langs. hitherto thought unrelated or remote, and provide a comprehensive and synthetic overview of the structure of the system, showing how rhyme processes function as an integral system. It will also, presumably, correlate with the schema of rhetorical figures and processes given by Group  $\mu$ .

As a preliminary to such a taxonomy, we may distinguish 12 criteria for the analysis and categorization of rhyme types:

(1) By the *number of syllables* involved in the rhyme:

(a) single, monosyllabic, or masculine. This is the norm or zero state of rhyme, at least in Eng.—two stressed monosyllables, e.g., *Keats / beets* (John Crowe Ransom's examples from "Surveying Literature," here and below). Whether this is the norm in any given lang. depends on the morphological and syntactic structure of that lang., i.e., whether it is inflectional or positional or mixed. All other more complex forms of rhyme are generated by *extension*, either rightward into syllables following the rhyming syllable or leftward to the consonant or syllables preceding the vowel, esp. proclitics and separate words (Ger. *erweiterter Reim*).

(b) Double, disyllabic, or feminine (see MASCULINE AND FEMININE), e.g., *Shelley / jelly*. Two contiguous syllables that rhyme. In the paradigmatic case in Eng., both words are disyllables and have a trochaic word shape, and both rhyming syllables (the first in each word) are stressed and stand in the last metrical position (\*ictus) of the line. The post-rhyming syllables are pronounced but not stressed and are identical; metrically, they do not count: they are *extrametrical*. (It is also possible for the second syllables themselves also to rhyme, e.g., *soreness / doorless*.) But these conditions do not apply in other langs., and even in Eng., many other complex and variant forms are possible. Indeed, Eng. is probably not a good norm: in It., nearly all rhymes are double or triple. Scherr usefully treats syllabic variance of the rhyming syllable in Rus. poetry under the rubric of "heterosyllabic" forms.

(c) Triple (Ger. *gleitender Reim*, "gliding"), also called compound and multiple, e.g., *Tennyson / venison*; two extra (identical and extrametrical) syllables after the rhyming syllable. Triple rhymes are, of course, rarer; usually they are \*mosaic rhyme, since rhyming of more than two successive syllables is difficult in any lang. The effect in Eng. since Lord Byron has almost always been comic. See TRIPLE RHYME.

(2) By the *morphology* of the words that the rhyming syllables inhabit. The zero state is that the rhyming syllables are each monosyllabic words—i.e., that the rhymes do not breach a word boundary. In double and triple rhymes, the words being rhymed are normally di- or polysyllabic or a series of short words (*stayed with us / played with us*) or ends of words followed by one or more whole words (*beseech him / impeach him*),

but it is also possible to rhyme several short monosyllables with one polysyllable, known as mosaic rhyme in Eng. (*poet / know it*). In Welsh \**cywydd* couplets, one of the rhymes must be a monosyllable but the other a polysyllable. But if rhyme depends for its distinctive effects on the morphology of the particular words involved in the rhyme, it also, therefore, depends on the morphological structure of the lang. itself as the ground against which the pattern becomes visible.

Inflectional endings are, as it were, the antithesis or reflex of rhyme, though it is not accurate to say, as did Whitehall, that langs. in which like endings result automatically from inflection will never use rhyme as a structural device in verse. Rhyme is occasionally to be found, consciously used, in the lit. of the cl. langs. The notion of like endings (Gr. *homoeoteleuton*, Lat. *similiter desinens*) is discussed by the ancients—Aristotle (*Rhetoric* 3.9.9–11), Dionysius of Halicarnassus (23), and Quintilian (9.3.77)—under the rubric of "verbal resemblance" or sound correspondence between clauses (*paromoeosis*). Late antique \*rhyme-prose continues this trad.; the \*grammatical rhyme of the *Grands Rhétoriciens* (see RHÉTORIQUES, GRANDS) takes a different slant. But the two systems—case endings and rhyme—overwrite the same space and so in the main are mutually exclusive. And when, in any lang., rhyming is relatively easy, poets will tend to complicate it by employing forms of \*rich or \*identical rhyme (as in Fr.) or complex stanza forms (as in Occitan and Fr.) or both, or else by eschewing rhyme completely (as in \*blank verse). Poets who choose to rhyme, in fact, walk a tightrope between ease and difficulty: too easy rhyming or too difficult rhyming eventually produce the same result—the poetic disuse of rhyme. In some verse systems, the rules in a prosody survive sometimes for centuries after the ling. facts on which they were originally based have disappeared. One of the chief instances of this process is the mute *e* suffix in Fr., which disappeared from pronunciation in the 15th c. but was preserved in a set of elaborate rhyme rules into the 19th.

Since Eng. dropped nearly all its inflectional suffixes about a thousand years ago, the sets of rhyming words in Eng. are smaller and different in character as well. How much smaller, however, is an interesting question, for it is often claimed that rhyme is much more difficult in Eng. than in other langs. But accurate statistical information about the relative poverty of rhyme in one lang. vs. another has yet to be assembled. Owing to the large number of ways in which Eng. words can terminate, the number of words that rhyme on a sound, on average, is certainly under three, but the distribution is extremely uneven. The number of words that rhyme strictly (in the manner of no. 6 in the taxonomy table above) with only one other word is large (*mountain / fountain, babe / astrolabe*), and those that cannot rhyme strictly is as large or larger—e.g., *orange* or *circle*, which one could "rhyme," by consonance (no. 3 in taxonomy table above) with *flange* (paired with the unstressed syllable of *orange*) or *snorkel*, respectively, (though not strictly with any one-word mate). But the rhymes on words like *day* are legion.

One other way of approaching this issue, however, is to point out that rhyme depends less on the structure of the lang. than on the semantic field presently relevant in the poem: only some of the available rhymes for a given word are possible candidates for use in a poem on a given subject. What this means, most generally, is that it is dangerous to discuss rhyme as an abstract entity divorced from the constraints imposed on it in each individual poem. The subject of morphology and rhyme is a large and complex one that still remains to be mapped out.

(3) By the *position of the stress* on the rhyming (and adjacent) syllables. Normally, single rhymes are ictic and stressed; double rhymes add an extra unstressed syllable. Rhyming masculine with feminine words, i.e., a stressed monosyllable with a disyllable the rhyming syllable of which is unstressed (e.g., *sing* / *loving*, *free* / *crazy*, *afraid* / *decade*) Tatlock called “hermaphrodite” rhyme (an odd term, since male mating with female in love would not be thought so). Others have called it “apocopated” or “stressed-unstressed” rhyme; it was popular in the 16th and 17th cs. and is used by John Donne and by Ezra Pound (*Hugh Selwyn Mauberley*). There is also “unstressed rhyme,” where the rhyming syllables are both unstressed or weak: e.g., *honey* / *motley*, *mysteries* / *litanies*, *wretchedness* / *featureless*. But there is some question whether this constitutes rhyme at all. Scherr calls all such cases in Rus. poetry “heteroaccentual” forms and cites the taxonomy given by Markov.

A related type rhymes a stressed syllable with one bearing only secondary speech stress, which is promoted under metrical ictus, e.g., *sees* / *mysteries*. Many rhyme pairs of this sort formerly differed in pronunciation and were good rhymes in their time, though they are not now; others were not so, then as now. Rhymes like *eye* / *harmony*, *eye* / *symmetry* (William Blake), or *flies* / *mysteries* force the critic to call on the researches of historical phonology.

Perhaps the most interesting case of all is the pair *die* / *poetry*, common in the Ren. There is some evidence (e.g., Alexander Gill in *Logonomia Anglica*, 1620) that, for words like *poetry*, alternative pronunciations existed as late as the first quarter of the 17th c., one form pronounced as the word is today, to rhyme with *me*, the other to rhyme with *die*. If so, rhyme pairs like *poetry* / *die*—and others like *majesty* / *eye*, *crie* / *graciously*, and most others ending in *ty* or *ly*—may well have been good rhymes for Shakespeare and the Ren. sonneteers, as they were for John Milton. But the diphthongal ending apparently lost out, so that sometime after 1650 *poetry* and *die* ceased being a good rhyme and became merely conventional. They may well have continued to be used by poets but only on account of their having precedent. Whether poets after 1650 actually altered their pronunciation of *poetry*, in reading aloud their verses, so as to rhyme with *die*, is unknown; one may speculate that their acceptance of convention did not extend so far. If so, the reader would be expected to recognize such rhymes as poetic \*convention, a kind of \*poetic license admissible on the

grounds that they were so in a former state of the lang. A mod. instance appears in W. H. Auden’s elegy on Yeats: “Let the Irish vessel lie / Emptied of its poetry.” But the evidence is very complex and uncertain, and the number of cases where later poets knowingly reproduce such archaic rhymes must be few: far more important is the fact that, in earlier stages of the lang., they were apparently good rhymes.

(4) By the *lexical category* of the rhyming words. In much verse, the rhymes are commonly words of the same grammatical category, noun rhyming with noun, verb with verb. The phonic echo highlights semantic differences certainly, but not functional ones. More striking effects are to be had by extending the differentiation, so that the words not only mean different things but function differently as well. The predominance of substantives for rhymes creates a verse of a distinctive texture, whereas the use of function words gives a radically different texture and virtually demands \*enjambment: thus, John Donne’s “Love’s not so pure and abstract as they used / To say who have no mistress but their Muse” (“Love’s Growth”). Even within substantives, the use of nouns for rhymes gives a markedly different texture from the use of verbs, which, as the conveyors of action, energy, state, and change, take on even greater power when positioned at line end. Wimsatt in his classic 1944 essay discusses the importance of this strategy, but detailed data have only very recently begun to be collected. Cohen, e.g., reports that the 17th-c. Fr. classicists used different category rhymes only 19% of the time, the romantics 29%, and the symbolists 31% (1966); one would like to see Eng. data for comparison.

(5) By the *degree of closeness of the sound match* in the rhyme. The standard definition for “true” or “perfect” rhyme (the usual Eng. terms; cf. Ger. *reiner Reim*, Rus. *tochnaia rifma*) is relatively narrow, with the result that the other collateral forms—near rhyme and eye rhyme—are problematized. But in other verse trads., this is not the case: Rus., e.g., admits “inexact rhyme” as part of the standard definition of canonical rhyme (see Scherr). \*Welsh poetry recognizes a very large category of “generic rhyme” in which sounds echo closely but not exactly. But it is misleading to frame the analysis in terms of “near” vs. “perfect” to begin with: exactness is not the only or even the most important criterion in some verse systems. As a number of critics (e.g., Burke, Small) have observed, sounds themselves are related to each other in phonology in categories; within these categories, individual sounds—such as voiced and voiceless fricatives—are interchangeable in some verse trads. To recognize this fact is to recognize that sounds come in “equivalence sets,” e.g., nasals (*m*, *n*, and *ng*) or sibilants (*s*, *f*, *z*, *sh*, *zh*), that a poet may use to expand the range of rhyming. This approach should neutralize mechanistic attempts to assess the “purity” of rhyme (Ger. *Reinheit des Reims*). In general, it may be said that the strictness of the definition of “true” rhyme in langs. varies in inverse ratio to the ease of rhyming in that lang., which is itself a function of morphology and syntactic rules: langs. in which rhym-

ing is relatively easy will impose additional constraints, such as the rules constraining the grammatical gender of rhymes in Fr.; langs. in which it is more difficult will admit wider variation.

(6) By the *relationship between the sonal figuration created in the rhyme and the semantic fields* of the words. Rhyme is a figure of sound; but, of course, words in poetry, as in lang., bear sense, and both levels of information are delivered to the auditor or reader not separately but simultaneously: rhyme, therefore, figures meaning. This is how rhyme is able to increase the amount of \*information carried in verse, despite the fact that the establishment of a \*rhyme scheme leads to expectedness, normally reductive of information load.

Of such semantic figuration, there are two possibilities: either sound similarity can imply semantic similarity in words otherwise so unrelated that, in prose, no relation would have ever been noticed; or sound similarity can emphasize contrast in two words that echo. As Lotman puts it, “[P]honic coincidence only accentuates semantic difference.” G. M. Hopkins held that the beauty of rhyme, for the Eng. reader at least, “is lessened by any likeness the words may have beyond that of sound” (*Note-books and Papers*). The “richness” or “sonority” of a rhyme is, therefore, not merely a function of the degree of phonic echo but of the semantic aspect as well (Lotman).

Wimsatt cites a classic example from Alexander Pope’s *Rape of the Lock*: “Whether the nymph shall break Diana’s law, / Or some frail China jar receive a flaw.” Wimsatt remarks the rhyme prompts us to ask in what way breaking Diana’s law is like marring a valuable vase. The answer we will be led to is that, in Belinda’s refined society, losing one’s virginity is simply an indiscretion, a clumsiness, equivalent to scarring a Ming porcelain—both signs of poor taste. In this way, study of the semantic effects of the phonic coupling in the rhyme augments the hermeneutic process, directing us toward a deeper and more powerful interpretation. Wimsatt calls rhyme, somewhat awkwardly, “alogical” and “counterlogical,” by which he means not asemanic but simply bearing semantic import that runs in addition to, and sometimes counter to, the lexicosyntactic, denotative “logic” or sense of the words in the lines. However one chooses to describe it, this sense borne by the rhymes is supplemental to the import the words would have borne were they merely set as prose (see VERSE AND PROSE), showing thereby the additional expressive resources of verse form.

At the same time, several poets and critics have remarked that rhymes, particularly in a long work, come to form a system of their own that is the correlate of an idiolect or, if it be influential, a dialect in natural lang. Clark remarks that, “when a poet rhymes well,” it is “as if he had invented a new lang., which has rhyme as one of its natural characteristics.”

Rhyme semantics is a vast subject only beginning to be explored. It was first charted by the Rus. formalists, esp. Žirmunskij, but his book was not known in the West until the 1960s: in the Anglo-Am. world, it was Wimsatt’s 1944 essay that paved the way, followed by Lotman’s 1970 book (trans. 1977) on the

stratification of the artistic text (see also Nemoianu). Shapiro applies the Saussurean paradigm influenced by Peircean semiotics, i.e., markedness theory, under which distinctive features appear in pairs of binary opposites, one present, one absent, with the present one, therefore, marked: he shows by phonological analysis marked features that seemingly remote rhymes have in common.

Study of rhyme semantics must examine both the semantic fields available in the lang. and those chosen for the poem. As every rhyming poet knows, choice of one word for a rhyme immediately constrains the range of words available for its mate(s), hence for extension or completion of the sense. In the lang., the sound shape, orthographic form, and semantic fields of each word are determined by the historical interaction of complex sets of ling. processes and accidents of hist. (wars, migrations, customs). These constraints affect the field of meaning in a given poem and are, in turn, affected by choices made by the poet. Some semantic contrasts are already coded into the lang. as rhymes, e.g., *light / night*, *Gehalt / Gestalt*: these are pairs that must be actively avoided by serious poets. These are rhymes so outworn that the (semantic) life has gone out of them altogether. Pope satirizes *breeze / trees* in the *Essay on Criticism*, but others—*anguish / languish*, *length / strength*, *death / breath*, *tomb / womb*—are easy to name. The fault in all these is that they seem to let the rhyme too obviously dictate the sense. A whole semantic field is coded into some rhyme pairs, e.g., *mad / bad*, *stranger / danger*.

One other consequence of the preceding is the expectedness or surprise of the rhyme: a common or unprepossessing first rhyme word followed by a startling or shocking mate from a radically different lexical category is almost certain to be used for either comic or satiric effect. Rhymes can also be constructed from nonsense syllables and nonce words, as in Lewis Carroll.

(7) By the effects of *further complication of sound patterning* in the rhyme words themselves. More than one pattern may be figured in the rhyming words: typically assonance or consonance is mounted on top of the rhyme scheme, not as a reduction but as a complication. In Milton’s sonnet “On the Late Massacre in Piedmont,” e.g., the octave rhymes are *bones / cold / old / stones / groans / fold / rolled / moans*. The rhyme scheme is thus *abbaabba*, but the vowel is held constant, assonating *aaaaaaa*. Milton’s “On His Deceased Wife” rhymes *abbaabba cdcdcd* but assonates *aaaaaaa bbbbbb*. “To the Lord General Cromwell” has for its octave rhymes *cloud / rude / fortitude / ploughed / proud / pursued / imbued / loud*, also *abbaabba*, but all eight lines are in consonance on final *-d*. Yeats achieves the same effect in “Among School Children,” reiterating the final consonant of *images / those / reveries / repose / presences / knows / symbolize / enterprise*. This is rhyme yet more interwoven and complete.

(8) By *participation of the rhymes in sound patterning nearby*. Part of the perceived effect of the rhyme also depends on the density of sound patterning in the lines surrounding the rhyme words. Here we enter the

realm of those larger constellations of sound that schematize the entire poem, over and above, though not apart from, the rhyme scheme. Like rhyme, these too impose a surplus of design on the verbal material, binding words together, promoting salient words, underlining significant semantic parallels between otherwise disparate words, punctuating the seriatim flow of text processing by repetition of significant sounds recently heard and remembered, and marking the text as aesthetic through the increase of attention required—and rewarded—in reading.

(9) By the *position in the line* of the rhymes. Normally rhyme is presumed to be end rhyme, i.e., sound linkage of lines by marking their ends (it is known that ends of members in series have special cognitive “visibility”), but more complex forms rhyme the word at line end with other words line-internally or rhyme two line-internal words in the same or successive lines, or both, thus opening up a spectrum of new possibilities for more complex sound figuration. Further, even the end-rhyme word itself may be hyphenated or broken over the line end to effect the rhyme (see *BROKEN RHYME*).

(10) By the *interval* between the rhymes. Without the space or gap between the rhyme words, no rhyme is possible: hence, the distance is no less significant than the repetition. In fact, repetition requires distance, the absence enabling the presence. The variance of distancing and of repetitions, of course, yields the patterning of rhyme in the stanza, i.e., the rhyme scheme; more interestingly, it also enables the distinction between “nonrhymes” and “antirhymes.” Abernathy points out that it is not sufficient to characterize some types of verse as “unrhymed,” for this fails to distinguish between “rhymeless” verse, wherein rhyme is neither required nor prohibited but merely unspecified, and “antirhymed” verse, such as blank verse, where rhyme is specifically proscribed. Rhyme schemes reveal intervals not only between rhymes but between unrhymed lines; and in some unrhymed verse, passages of deliberate rhyme may even appear (T. S. Eliot). It is also worth noting that rhymes that are very widely separated *are not rhymes* because they are not *perceived* so. There are, in fact, some hundred-odd rhymes in *Paradise Lost*, despite Milton’s strictures in his prefatory “Note” against “modern bondage” (his term for rhyme). But a rhyme not felt is not a rhyme.

(11) By the *order* or sequencing of the rhymes. The rhyme architectonics that is schematized in rhyme schemes binds lines into more complex stanza forms both \*isometric and \*heterometric. This is one of the chief pleasures of formal verse (see *STANZA*). Rhyme schemes also reveal links with identical kinds of order in other domains such as rhet. or meter. The scheme for the Petrarchan sonnet, e.g., is *abbaabba cdecde*, i.e., an octave of two sets of envelope rhyme followed by a sestet of two tercets whose rhyme is repeated seriatim. The orders here are \*envelope—a scheme of repetition in reverse—and sequence—repetition in order.

Normally, rhymed stanzas contain rhymes that have at least one mate inside the same stanza; other less common but still important elements of order in rhyming are monorhyme, i.e., iteration of the same

rhyme sound (as in OF assonance or triplets in couplet verse); lines whose rhyme is indeterminate or optional in the midst of other lines with obligatory participation in the rhyme scheme (marked with an *x* in the rhyme scheme); “isolated rhyme” or “thorn rhymes” (Occitan *rim estramp*, Ger. *Korn*—see *CLAVIS*); lines that have a mate only in following stanzas; and rhymeless lines without mates anywhere in the poem (Ger. *Waise*, “orphan” lines; more exploited in Rus.). All these devices structure the aesthetic space either by adding higher levels of order or by opening up spaces within the order for some amount of free play.

(12) By *sight versus sound*. In most poetry of all ages and langs., sound is the primary stratum, and rhymes are based on sound correspondence; strictly speaking, the spelling of words is irrelevant. Furthermore, spelling can mislead inattentive readers if they respond to the visual shape of the words instead of the aural. Still, this is a narrow view, and it is undeniable that literate poets of all ages have been aware to some degree of the visual dimension of poetry (Hollander’s “poem in the eye”). The relations of sound to orthography in a given lang. are more manifold than is usually supposed, and these must be attended to. The first point is that fundamental processes of sound change in a lang., such as the Great Vowel Shift in Eng., have altered the pronunciation that some words formerly had, but since orthography tends to ossify—to change much more slowly than sound and via differing laws—some words that formerly rhymed and were spelled similarly now retain only the orthographic similarity. Some writers have called these “historical rhymes,” but this is only to say that, in the original poem, they were authentic rhymes and should be so understood now. Conversely, orthography has itself exerted an influence on pronunciation at times, so that words spelled alike come to be pronounced alike despite former difference: this phenomenon is called “spelling pronunciation.”

An important related issue is that of rhyming in dialect poetry and dialect rhymes in standard-dialect poetry. Orthography and time conceal some of these rhymes, such as Keats’s Cockney rhymes, e.g., *thoughts / sorts* (with the *r* suppressed in Cockney slang; see *COCKNEY SCHOOL*), or the South Ger. dialect rhymes of J. W. Goethe, Friedrich Schiller, and others.

Some poets have exploited the visual forms of words to create visual analogues of aural rhyme: these maneuvers require rapid shifts in category recognition on the part of the reader to realize the nature of the sleight-of-hand. Finally, the invention of script and then printing has exerted so powerful an influence on mod. consciousness that poetry itself is now in effect a bivalent form wherein visibility comes to have, in the mod. world, equal legitimacy with sound as the mode of poetic form, leading to the several forms of pattern poetry, \*concrete poetry, \**lettrisme*, \*calligrammes, and \*visual poetry.

**C. Terminology.** The terminologies for rhyme, its varieties, and its analogues in the several Western langs. derive from the 12th c.; they are unsystematic and inconsistent. In med. Lat., rhyme emerges from the

Christian hymn trad. into the elaborate forms of rhyming in the silver-age poetry of the Carolingian Ren. (see Raby). In the vernaculars, rhyming achieves its first flowering in Occitan poetry, where the troubadours exhibited in their verse perhaps the most sustained interest in rhyme ever seen in the West, before or since. From Occitan, it passed to all the other Eur. vernaculars, with later efflorescence in northern France in the poetry of the *rhetoriciens* in the late 15th–early 16th cs., influencing even, through Ger., the poetries of the Scandinavian countries. From this thumbnail hist., one would think that Fr. rhyme terminology would have dominated all others, incl. Eng. But since Eng. prosody developed out of 19th-c. Ger. philology, itself based on cl. philology, the 20th c. inherited a confused and confusing apparatus.

Further, given the conservatism of traditional prosodists, one would think that rhyme terminology would be relatively consistent from one lang. to another. But all langs. do not admit the various morphological forms of rhyme with equal facility and so tend to develop one or another rhyme form more extensively. The practice of a major poet also has great effect. Thus, simple trans. of a term from one lang. to another gives a misleading impression, for the effects of a given structure are not precisely the same in two different langs. This is a significant constraint on building cross-ling. taxonomies and terminologies. It is not a constraint, however, on the more immediate problems of making the reference of terms clear and precise or of eliminating confusion. To date, no full and systematic analysis of the terminologies in the major Western langs.—med. Lat, Occitan, OF, OE, ON, ME, MHG, and mod. Ger., Fr., Eng., Sp., and Rus.—much less in the major Asian langs.—Chinese and Japanese—has yet been given. Since the most influential mod. prosodies have been Fr. and Eng., a brief discussion of terminological issues therein will be instructive.

(1) *French*. In 19th- and early 20th-c. Fr. prosody, rhyme classification distinguished between phonemic material following the tonic (rhyming) vowel and phonemic material preceding it:

- (a) rhyme of tonic vowel alone:  
*rime pauvre* or *faible*
- (b) rhyme of vowel + following consonant(s):  
*rime suffisante*
- (c) rhyme of vowel + preceding consonant(s):  
*rime riche*
- (d) rhyme of vowel + preceding syllable(s):  
*rime léonine*

Under (c), the homophony of the rhyme words' *consonne d'appui* (the consonant immediately preceding the tonic vowel) was a condition of *rime riche* (see RICH RHYME). The incidence of *rime riche* increased with the romantic poets and became an important plank in the aesthetic platform of \*Parnassianism: "Without the *consonne d'appui*, there is no rhyme and, consequently, no poetry" (Banville); but it should not be assumed that this increase in *rime riche* was designed to compensate for the concomitant increase in other metrical freedoms by shoring up the line end

(Cornulier). Among these poets, *rime riche* enriches the rhyming words, investing them with more resonance, color, and dramatic presence. To later 20th-c. analysts, however, this 19th-c. system of classification has seemed too crude, particularly in that it allows rhymes like *bonté / cité* to be rich, while denser accumulations of phonemes (e.g., *tordre / mordre, arche / marche*) are classed as merely *suffisantes*. Accordingly, a purely numerical approach to rhyme classification has been preferred, whereby the more identical phonemes there are, in whatever position, the richer the rhyme:

- (1) *rime pauvre* or *faible*:  
identity of one element, the tonic vowel  
(*bossu / vu*)
- (2) *rime suffisante*:  
identity of two elements, tonic vowel + consonant  
(*roc / bloc*) or consonant + tonic vowel  
(*main / carmin*)
- (3) *rime riche*:  
identity of three or more elements in the tonic syllable  
(*šabrite / šeffrite, tordu / perdu, charmes / larmes*)
- (4) *rime léonine*:  
identity of two or more syllables, the tonic syllable + one or more syllables preceding it  
(*tamariniers / mariniérs, désir, Idées / des iridées*).

But in the assessment of the degree or relative richness of rhyme, other factors also need to be taken into account, e.g. the "amplification" of the rhyme (identical phonemes in the rhyme words but not involved in the rhyme itself, e.g. *rivage / image; galopin / maroquin*) and correspondence of the number of syllables in the rhyme words or rhyme measures.

(2) *English*. Eng. has never succeeded in codifying its terminology for rhyme forms. Surveys of usage even show very little consistency of treatment. The most common terms for rhyme in Eng. have been *end rhyme*, *full rhyme*, *perfect rhyme*, and *true rhyme*. The first of these simply denotes line position and, while unsatisfactory, seems least problematic; the second corresponds to Fr. *rime suffisante* and would be useful were that all it were taken to mean, i.e., meeting the minimum criteria for rhyme. The last two, however, imply that the one form of sound echo denominated "rhyme" is somehow the ideal or epitome toward which all other forms strive (and fail), whereas, in fact, end rhyme is but one of several related configurations of sound correspondence. The terms *perfect* and *true* should be avoided as prejudicing a priori the status of other forms of rhyme, whose own terms (*off rhyme*, *near rhyme*) are also objectionable.

But again, it is essential to bear in mind that, even for rhyme types directly appropriated from the Romance langs. and for which the Eng. terms are simply direct trans., the effect is not the same: rhyme is a markedly different phenomenon in inflectional langs., where identity of word ending is pervasive and often must be actually avoided, than in positional langs., where inflectional endings are almost entirely absent and where

sound similarity is more dependent on the historical evolution of the lexicon. Notwithstanding, this difference does not automatically make the Romance langs. rhyme "rich" and the Germanic langs. rhyme "poor," as has often been thought: it is not merely the quantity of like endings that is at issue.

**D. Analogues.** Inside poetry, there are a number of structures that have rhyme-like effects or functions or exceed the domain of rhyme, verging into repetition. The \*sestina, e.g., repeats a sequence of whole words rather than rhyme sounds. Several rhetorical devices generate comparable effects to those of rhyme even in unrhymed verse: in the 10,000 lines of *Paradise Lost*, there are over 100 cases of epistrophe, nearly 100 of \*anaphora, 60 of \*anadiplosis, 50 of \*epanalepsis, and 40 of epizeuxis, all of them, as Broadbent says, "iterative schemes tending to the effect of rhyme." Milton also weights words at line end (Broadbent calls this "anti-rhyme"), counterposing semantically heavy and contrastive terms at *Paradise Lost* 4.561–62, e.g.: "Tempt not the Lord thy God, he said and stood. / But Satan smitten with amazement fell"—an effect reinforced all the more by reiteration of these two terms via \*plocé ten more times in the following 21 lines, and echoed thereafter at 4.590–91 (cf. 9.832–33). In \*American Sign Language poetry, poets achieve rhyme-like effects using hand shapes.

Outside poetry, rhyme is commonly thought of as a "poetical" device, but, in fact, it is a broadly attested ling. structure used for marking the ends of important words and phrases to make them memorable. Rhyme is widely used not only for ludic and didactic purposes, as in rhymed and rhythmical calendrical mnemonics, children's counting-out and jump-rope rhymes, and jingles for ads (see Chasar) but for other types of memorable speech such as \*proverbs, \*epigrams, inscriptions, mottoes, \*riddles, puns, and jokes (Brogan). Children seem to be able to manufacture rhymes not only spontaneously and happily but more readily than the other six forms cited at the top of section II.B above, suggesting that the clausal or "final-fixed" structure that is rhyme is somehow more salient for cognitive processing (see Rayman and Zaidel), as the vast lit. on the role of rhyme in promoting children's phonemic awareness, lang. acquisition, and literacy suggests. Perhaps the most common form of rhyming in lang. is seen in mnemonic formulas, catch phrases that rhyme, e.g., *true blue, ill will, fender bender, double trouble, high and dry*. The list of such popular and proverbial phrases is astonishingly long, and the device is also used in poetry (Donne, "Song (Go and Catch a Falling Star)"; Eliot, *Four Quartets*; see CLOSE RHYME).

In an important study, Bolinger has shown that in every lang., words that begin or end alike in sound come to be perceived as related even when they have no etymological connection. This sort of paradigmatic or synchronic associativity is even stronger than the historical kinship of words, which is often concealed by spelling and pronunciation changes, and is extended naturally into poetry as rhyme without any alteration of form or function. The inevitability of rhyme sug-

gested by this study becomes harder to deny in light of evidence that rhyme-like structures apparently exist even in nonhuman langs., such as that of whales (Guinee and Payne), challenging those who think of rhyme as more artificial than natural to reconsider.

■ J. S. Schütze, *Versuch einer Theorie des Reims nach Inhalt und Form* (1802)—Kantian semantic theory; T. Swift, "Essay on the Rise and Progress of Rhyme," *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy* 9 (1803); S. Turner, "An Inquiry Respecting the Early Use of Rhyme," *Archaeologia* 14 (1808); A. Croke, *Essay on the Origin, Progress, and Decline of Rhyming Latin Verse* (1828); F. Wolf, *Über die Laus, Sequenzen, und Leiche* (1841), 161 ff.; W. Masing, *Über Ursprung und Verbreitung des Reims* (1866); T. de Banville, *Petit traité de poésie française* (1872); Schipper, 1.1.7, 1.4.1; E. Freymond, "Über den reichen Reim bei altfranzösischen Dichtern," *ZRP* 6 (1882); W. Grimm, "Zur Gesch. des Reims" (1852), rpt. in *Kleinere Schriften* (1887)—still the best Ger. survey; A. Ehrenfeld, *Studien zur Theorie des Reims*, 2 v. (1897–1904); P. Delaporte, *De la rime française* (1898); G. Mari, *Riassunto e dizionarietto di ritmica italiana* (1901); Kastner, ch. 3; Meyer, v. 1, ch. 2—med. Lat.; A. Gabrielson, *Rhyme as a Criterion of the Pronunciation of Spenser, Pope, Byron, and Swinburne* (1909); Schipper, *History* 270 ff.; Thieme, ch. 8 and 376, 379–80—full list of Fr. work to 1914; W. Braune, "Reim und Vers," *Sitzungsb. der Heidelberger Akad. der Wiss., phil.-hist. Klasse* (1916)—etymology; F. Zschech, *Die Kritik des Reims in England* (1917); O. Brik, "Zvukovie povtory," *Poetika* (1919); E. Sapir, "The Heuristic Value of Rhyme," *Queen's Quarterly* 27 (1920); B. de Selincourt, "Rhyme in English Poetry," *ES* 7 (1921); H. C. Wyld, *Studies in English Rhymes from Surrey to Pope* (1923); V. M. Žirmunskij, *Rifma, ee istoriia i teorii* (1923); W. B. Sedgwick, "The Origin of Rhyme," *Revue Benedictine* 36 (1924); Morris-Jones—Celtic; K. Wesle, *Frühmittelhochdeutsche Reimstudien* (1925); P. Habermann, "Reim," etc., *Reallexikon* I 3.25–44; J. W. Rankin, "Rime and Reason," *PMLA* 44 (1929); H. Lanz, *The Physical Basis of Rhyme* (1931); N. Törnqvist, "Zur Gesch. des Wortes Reim," *Humanistika Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund, Årsberättelse* (1934–35), v. 3—Celtic, Germanic, and Romance; Patterson—fullest source for the Rhétoriciens; K. Stryjewski, *Reimform und Reimfunktion* (1940)—near rhyme in Eng.; K. Burke, "On Musicality in Verse," *The Philosophy of Literary Form* (1941); F. W. Ness, *The Use of Rhyme in Shakespeare's Plays* (1941); U. Pretzel, *Frühgesch. des deutschen Reims* (1941); A. M. Clark, *Studies in Literary Modes* (1945); Le Gentil, v. 1, bk. 2; A. Oras, "Echoing Verse Endings in Paradise Lost," *South Atlantic Studies for S. E. Leavitt*, ed. S. A. Stoudemire (1953); Raby, *Christian*; W. K. Wimsatt, "One Relation of Rhyme to Reason" and "Rhetoric and Poems," *The Verbal Icon* (1954)—classic studies of semantics; J. W. Draper, "The Origin of Rhyme," *RLC* 31 (1957), 39 (1965); Beare—broad scope for Western; Raby, *Secular*; J. B. Broadbent, "Milton's Rhetoric," *MP* 56 (1959); Saintsbury, *Prosody*, v. 1, App. 8, and v. 3, App. 4; F. G. Ryder, "How Rhymed Is a Poem?" *Word* 19 (1963);

- M. Masui, *The Structure of Chaucer's Rime Words* (1964); D. L. Bolinger, "Rime, Assonance, and Morpheme Analysis," *Forms of English* (1965); J. Cohen, *Structure du langage poétique* (1966); C. A. Owen Jr., "Thy Drasty Ryming," *SP* 63 (1966)—Chaucer; R. Abernathy, "Rhymes, Non-Rhymes, and Antirhyme," *To Honor Roman Jakobson*, v. 1 (1967); E. J. Dobson, *English Pronunciation 1500–1700*, 2d ed., 2 v. (1968); H. Whitehall, "Rhyme: Sources and Diffusion," *Ibadan* 25 (1968); M. Perloff, *Rhyme and Meaning in the Poetry of Yeats* (1970); L. Pszczółowska, *Rym* (1970)—Polish; V. Nemoianu, "Levels of Study in the Semantics of Rhyme," *Style* 5 (1971); E. H. Guggenheimer, *Rhyme Effects and Rhyming Figures* (1972)—cl.; T. Eekman, *The Realm of Rhyme* (1974)—comparative Slavic; V. F. Markov, "V zaščitu raznoudarnoi rifmy (informativnyi obzor)," *Russian Poetics*, ed. T. Eekman and D. S. Worth (1975); L. P. Elwell-Sutton, *The Persian Metres* (1976), App. 1; M. Shapiro, *Asymmetry* (1976), ch. 4; *Die Genese der europäischen Endreimdichtung*, ed. U. Ernst and P.-E. Neuser (1977); J. M. Lotman, *The Structure of the Artistic Text*, trans. G. Lenhoff and R. Vroon (1977); D. S. Worth, "Roman Jakobson and the Study of Rhyme," *Roman Jakobson: Echoes of His Scholarship*, ed. D. Armstrong (1977); W. E. Rickert, "Rhyme Terms," *Style* 12 (1978); G. Schweikle, "Reim," etc., *Reallexikon II* 3.403–31; D. Wesling, *The Chances of Rhyme* (1980); Scott; Brogan, 77 ff.—full bibl. for Eng. to 1981, with coverage of other langs. in appendices, extended in *Verseform* (1989); B. de Cornulier, "La rime n'est pas une marque de fin de vers," *Poétique* 46 (1981); Group μ; Mazaleyra; J. Molino and J. Tamine, "Des rimes, et quelques raisons," *Poétique* 52 (1982); D. S. Samoilov, *Kniga o russkoi rifme*, 2d ed. (1982)—fullest study of Rus.; R. Birkenhauer, *Reimpoetik am Beispiel Stefan Georges* (1983); B. de Cornulier, "Sur les groupements de vers classiques et la rime," *Cahiers de grammaire* 6 (1983); F. P. Memmo, *Dizionario di metrica italiana* (1983); Navarro—Sp.; Norden, 2.810 ff.; *The Old English Riming Poem*, ed. O. Macrae-Gibson (1983); D. Billy, "La nomenclature des rimes," *Poétique* 57 (1984); M. T. Ikegami, *Rhyme and Pronunciation* (1984)—ME; W. E. Rickert, "Semantic Consequences of Rhyme," *Literature in Performance* 4 (1984); Chambers—Occitan; "Rhyme and the True Calling of Words," in Hollander; W. E. Rickert, "B. de Cornulier, 'Rime 'riche' et fonction de la rime," *Littérature* 59 (1985); B. Nagel, *Das Reimproblem in der deutschen Dichtung vom Otfridvers zum freien Vers* (1985); Scherr, ch. 4; W. Harmon, "Rhyme in English Verse: History, Structures, Functions," *SP* 84 (1987); L. M. Guinee and K. B. Payne, "Rhyme-Like Repetitions in Songs of Humpback Whales," *Ethology* 79 (1988); C. Scott, *The Riches of Rhyme* (1988); J. J. Small, *Positive as Sound* (1990); G. Stewart, *Reading Voices* (1990), ch. 2; B. M. H. Strang, "Language, General," *The Spenser Encyclopedia*, ed. A. C. Hamilton et al. (1990); L. Mugglestone, "The Fallacy of the Cockney Rhyme," *RES* 42 (1991); J. Rayman and E. Zaidel, "Rhyming and the Right Hemisphere," *Brain and Language* 40 (1991); Gasparov, *History*; M. McKie, "The Origins and Early Development of Rhyme in English Verse," *MLR* (1997); Morier; W. Flesch, "The Conjuror's Trick, or How to Rhyme," *Literary Imagination* 3 (2001); K. Hanson, "Vowel Variation in English Rhyme," *Studies in the History of the English Language*, ed. D. Minkova and R. Stockwell (2002); H. Kenner, "Rhyme: An Unfinished Monograph," *Common Knowledge* 10 (2004); R. Dainotto, "Of the Arab Origin of Modern Europe: Giammaria Barbieri, Juan Andrés, and the Origin of Rhyme," *CL* 58 (2006); J. P. Hunter, "Seven Reasons for Rhyme," *Ritual, Routine, and Regime*, ed. L. Clymer (2006); K. Árnason, "On the Principles of Nordic Rhyme and Alliteration," *Arkiv for Nordisk Filologi/Archives for Scandinavian Philology* 122 (2007); A. Bradley, *Book of Rhymes: The Poetics of Hip Hop* (2009); S. Stewart, "Rhyme and Freedom," *The Sound of Poetry/The Poetry of Sound*, ed. M. Perloff and C. Dworkin (2009); M. Chasar, "The Business of Rhyming: Burma-Shave Poetry and Popular Culture," *PMLA* 125 (2010).
- **Chinese:** J. J. Y. Liu, *The Art of Chinese Poetry* (1962); H. Frankel, "Classical Chinese [Versification]," in Wimsatt.
- **Arabic and Persian:** G. W. Freitag, *Darstellung der Arabischen Verskunst* (1830, rpt. 1968); H. Blochmann, *The Prosody of the Persians according to Saifi, Jami and Other Writers* (1872, rpt. 1970); W. Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language* (1896–98); Shams al-din Moḥammad *Al-Mo'jam fima'āyer asb'ār al-'ajam* (1935); Al-Akhfash, *Kitāb al-qawāfi* (1970); L. P. Elwell-Sutton, *The Persian Metres* (1976); F. Thiesen, *A Manual of Classical Persian Prosody* (1982); S. Bonebakker, "Kafiya," *Encyclopedia of Islam*, ed. H. A. R. Gibb, 2d ed., v. 4 (1990); D. Frolov, *Classical Arabic Verse* (2000).
- T. V. F. BROGAN, S. CUSHMAN;  
K. S. CHANG (CHINESE); R. M. A. ALLEN,  
W. L. HANAWAY (ARABIC AND PERSIAN);  
C. SCOTT (FRENCH)
- RHYME COUNTERPOINT.** A phenomenon noted by Hayes in the verse of John Donne, Henry Vaughan, and esp. George Herbert (e.g., "Denial"): the pattern of line lengths in a \*heterometric poem is independent of the pattern of the rhymes. For example, a quatrain of lines of eight, seven, eight, and seven syllables has the metrical pattern *abab*, but the rhyme scheme is *abba*. Normally, rhymed verse is isometric (see ISOCHRONISM OR ISOCHRONY), and even in heterometric verse, lines bound together by rhyme are generally assumed to be isosyllabic. In the case of rhyme counterpoint, however, meter and rhyme are set in contrast, rather than in harmony, making the reader's expectations for both prosodic features act in concert. The distinctive and formally ambiguous effect of rhyme counterpoint is consonant with other features of \*metaphysical poetry.
- A. M. Hayes, "Counterpoint in Herbert," *SP* 35 (1938); R. Fowler, "'Prose Rhythm' and Metre," *Essays on Style and Language* (1966).
- T. V. F. BROGAN; M. WEINSTEIN