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CHAPTER I

THE MODAL THEORY

An area seldom examined in the analysis of the literary style of poetry is that of the grammatical structure of the sentence. Josephine Miles has attempted such an analysis in her study explained in Eras and Modes in English Poetry in which she defines three basic forms or modes of sentence structure. She developed a method of distinguishing modes according to the relationship among adjectives, nouns, and verbs. The three styles she termed "balanced," "clausal," and "phrasal." The application of the modal theory involved the examination of thousand-line samples of the works of 200 poets whom Miss Miles chose as representatives of the past four centuries of poetry.¹ Her analysis, however, does not make the distinction some linguists make between the verb form and the "be" form. In addition, certain criteria for determining the part of speech of a particular word is based upon word structure, while other criteria is founded upon word function. As a consequence, this investigation will re-examine and evaluate in terms more linguistically

based, the modal theory of Josephine Miles.

First, the explanations given by Miss Miles in defining the three modes will be considered. She classifies the phrasal mode as dominantly qualitative, with many adjectival and phrasal modifications, whereas the clausal mode is dominantly predicative, with many active verbs and clausal subordinations. The third style, the balance between the previous two, contains an equal number of clausal and phrasal elements. To determine the mode of a particular sentence, the adjectives, verbs, and nouns are counted and a ratio is set up among them. A sample writing which has a proportion of one adjective and one verb per line illustrates a balanced structure. If a line contains more adjectives than verbs, the line is phrasal, whereas a line having more verbs than adjectives is clausal. For example, Langland 5A-21N-18V would indicate that the poet Langland is dominantly clausal in his writing, the cryptical figures indicating the number of adjectives-nouns-verbs in ten lines of poetry. A phrasal style is evinced by Keats, 12A-17N-8V, while an analysis of the poetry of Wordsworth reveals that his style, 10A-16N-10V, is exactly balanced.²

²Miles, op. cit., pp. 213, 226.
The basis for the numerical analysis of the style of each poet was determined by Miss Miles after a count study of one thousand lines of poetry for each author had been made. In some instances, the thousand lines constituted the whole of an author's work. However, in cases in which the mode of a poet varied, the most characteristic style was used for the count. The count of a classical poet would reveal in a thousand-line analysis about a thousand adjectives and an equal number of verbs, 10A-20N-10V. Miss Miles indicates, additionally, that nouns, though most stable, are least distinguishing as a characteristic of style.3

Specific criteria were followed for classifying nouns, adjectives, and verbs. Nouns used as adjectives were counted as nouns, thus "iron fence" would be counted as two nouns. All descriptive, numerical, and participial forms were counted as adjectives. "Rustling tree," then, would be considered as an adjective and a noun. Infinitives were counted separately, consequently "hope to go" would be counted as two verbs.4

3 Miles, op. cit., p. 216.
Josephine Miles chose ten poets to be representatives for each generation. Beginning with poets of the fourteenth century and considering a generation as a thirty-year time span, one hundred-thirty poets were amassed. A century is divided first into a forty-year period, then two successive thirty-year periods. A century, then, is referred to as a 40-30-30 progression. Miss Miles finds that in no one era do all ten poets agree in their emphasis but that in each era at least four poets agree. The mode upon which at least four poets agree then becomes the mode of the era.5

The results of the adjective-noun-verb analysis reveal that two similar periods, two phrasal periods or two clausal periods, are followed by a balanced period which emphasizes a balanced structure and innovation in language. A definitive delineation of the literary eras and modes of the past four centuries reveals the following categories: sixteenth-century English clausal, English clausal, classical balanced; seventeenth-century metaphysical clausal, metaphysical clausal, classical balanced; eighteenth-century sublime phrasal, sublime phrasal, classical balanced;

5Miles, Eras and Modes in English Poetry, p. 217.
nineteenth-century romantic clausal, romantic clausal, classical balanced. As may be seen, the three terms "clausal," "balanced," and "phrasal" correspond to the more frequently used literary terms, "metaphysical," "classical," and "sublime," respectively.  

Words, too, Miss Miles finds, are indicative of style. The works of those poets whose style is clausal tend to contain humanly conceptualized terms as "blood," "word," "think," and "poor." Those whose style is balanced use words relating to outward relations: "foot," "head," and "look." Phrasal poets tend to use atmospheric words: "air," "light," and "sea." Not only has she found that certain categories of words are characteristic of certain modes, but also that certain types of poetry are characteristic of some modes.

Clausal poems, we find, tend to be stanzaic and active poems, working out an argument or narrative in clearly defined stages and formal external order. Phrasal poems, and phrasal eras... emphasize line-by-line progression, and cumulative participial modification in description and invocation without stress on external rhyming or grouping.

Correlating poetic forms with modes and eras,

---

6 Ibid., p. 7.
7 Ibid., p. 217.
8 Ibid., p. 11.
Miss Miles concludes that

...the strongly stanzaic verse of the sixteenth century became moderated in the more skillful blank verse and couplet of its last generation, just as in the next century the metaphysical stanza narrowed to the neoclassical couplet, carrying its linear organization partly inward by caesural balances. Then the eighteenth century aimed for the other extreme, not only a blank verse freer from end-stop emphasis, but even the irregular lines and motions of the ode forms, settling again into such couplet moderations as Goldsmith's... before turning back in the nineteenth century to the clausal ballad stanza and in the twentieth century to the more metaphysical involutions of Cummings, Frost, and Auden.9

Although the statistical application of the modal method and many of the resultant theories are original to Josephine Miles, the basic idea of the modal theory is not. Demetrius, in the third century in Alexandria, discussed three styles of grammatical construction, labelling them "elegant," "plain," and a third which he characterized as

...one between styles energetic on the one hand and polished on the other: between short and harsh phrases, broken, loose, and spontaneous as if under great stress, with a choice of terms symbolic like the eloquent, though not so elaborated, and without the interconnected qualifying structures; and the polished, smoothly connected, aesthetically pleasant in reference and tone, which embellishes the familiar with charm and grace.10

9Ibid., p. 11.
10Miles, Style and Proportion, p. 9.
A. L. Kroeber, in an article in *PMLA*, discusses the results of some research he has done using ideas from the Miles modal theory. In his analysis he considers only those writers who are clausal or phrasal, eliminating those whose writing is balanced. He finds, as a result, two trends which seem to him to support the modal theory. He determines a drift in writing from thought to image and part way back again. He also notes an occasional temporary surge of the expletive attribute. Although, concurs Kroeber, these two factors do not specifically support Josephine Miles' theory, he thinks they "would underlie such generational cycles as there may be, somewhat as a melody underlies a modulation." He concludes that the major value in the modal theory is that the theory provides "convincing delimitation of long-term specific trends in literature." \(^{11}\)

A similar theory is expressed by Robert Ray Aurner in an article entitled "The History of Certain Aspects of the Structure of the English Sentence." In this article he has proposed to

...determine by what successive steps the structure of the typical sentence ceases to follow naively

---

the drift of the author's thinking, and gradually becomes shaped by logic and by a cumulative tradition of form; to follow the sentence into the modern stage in which the flow of ideas is molded according to deliberate and studied patterns of a new syntax, giving evidence of repression, revision, and control.12

Aurner finds the same trends as Kroeber. He finds periods in which logic and reasoning are stressed and contrasting periods in which an elaborate form of description arises. The periods of a particular stress coincide with the same stressed periods determined by Kroeber and Miles, giving added strength to the modal theory.

An excellent comment on the importance of form, the fundamental aspect of the modal theory of Miss Miles, is expressed by Alexander in his book entitled Notes on the Synthesis of Form:

The form is the solution to the problem; the context defines the problem. In other words, when we speak of design, the real object of discussion is not the form alone, but the ensemble comprising the form and its context.13

Aurner and Miles would probably then say that the form of the form, the choice of using a balanced, clausal, or phrasal style would be the real solution. An author must decide which form will best solve the problem, which form will best express what he


wishes to say. As the form determines to some extent not only how something is expressed but also what is expressed, the selection of the most appropriate form is a moot one. A comment pertinent to this idea is expressed by Pierre Guiraud, which Miss Miles has included in her study:

Je crois que toute œuvre comporte un cohesion et une économie internes que se reflètent dans le style; et que certains traits du langage, convenablement choisis, sont révélateurs, selon l'expression de M.L. Spitzer, de cet 'étymon spirituel' vers lequel ils doivent nous conduire.\textsuperscript{14}

Once again, the idea that form has control over content appears. The same idea is present in the comments of Josephine Miles, Robert Aurner, A. L. Kroeber, and now in Pierre Guiraud. There are others, not enumerated here, who express the same thought. Benjamin Lee Whorf projects this idea to a larger scale in his thoughts that the structure of the Navaho language controls the thoughts of the Navaho people. The following comment by Josephine Miles reveals her thoughts about the importance of form:

\ldots an art gives shape and stability to valued materials of life, in order that they may be stressed, attended, preserved. I think that their shapes and emphases are limited and intensified not only by valued materials but

\textsuperscript{14}Miles, \textit{Eras and Modes in English Poetry}, p.213.
also by the habitual forms in which they are conveyed: in language, by the standard structures within the language itself. 

"Their shapes and emphases are limited and intensified...in language." The mode expresses the idea. The mode is the communicator of ideas; thus the more we know about the mode, the more we know about ideas. Miss Miles forms the hypothesis that

Perhaps poetry gives us history in an intensified form—the shape of values selected and stressed by artistic forces. Perhaps the terms and structures which a poet most cares about tend to be those which a group, even an era, most cares about, as they represent the basic choices of the time. The language we speak, and even more the language we versify, may be seen to be a loaded language, carrying the weight of chosen values.

One can see that the implications of the modal theory are indeed intriguing. However, the present study intends to concern itself with a re-examination and re-evaluation of the grammatical analysis, the basis of the modal theory. Though much of the study of Josephine Miles is sound, there are several points in the work with which a modern linguist would take issue. The questionable areas include the grouping together of verbs and the forms of "to be" and the designating of numerical and participial forms as

---

15 Miles, Style and Proportion, p. V
16 Miles, Eras and Modes in English Poetry, p. 212.
adjunctives. As the modal theory is based upon the ratio of adjunctives to nouns to verbs, the proper designation of words into these categories is most important to the validity of the theory. Miss Miles has used traditional definitions to determine the various parts of speech. The definitions of traditional grammar, however, sometimes define a word according to structure and sometimes according to function. A more consistent analysis would define words only in accordance with their structure.

In the Miles study, nouns used as adjunctives are counted as nouns. Thus the phrase, "barn door" is counted as two nouns, the part of speech being determined by the basic structure of the word, rather than by the function. One would suppose similarly, that verbs which function as adjunctives would also be classed according to their structure, rather than their function. However, Josephine Miles terms participles "adjunctives" because of their function as qualifiers of nouns. Compare the two sentences: "John wanted a fishing boat." and "John wanted a shrimp boat." The Miles analysis would define "fishing" as an adjective because of the word's function despite the fact that the word is structured as a verb. However in the second sentence, the
word "shrimp" would be classed in the Miles analysis as a noun because of the structure of the word rather than as an adjective which would reflect the word's function. One can see the inconsistencies in such a method of analysis. In a study whose basis is founded upon classifying words as particular parts of speech, a more consistent method ought to be adopted.

The numerical form, like the participial form, is categorized in the study of Josephine Miles as an adjective. In the sentence "One boy is in the room," the word "one" is functioning as an adjective and in the Miles method would be classified as an adjective. However, the word is structured as a noun, once again revealing an inconsistency in the method of classification used by Miss Miles.

Unlike many modern linguists, Josephine Miles did not distinguish between the verb form and the "be" form. Instead, both forms were grouped in one count labelled "verb." Nearly all linguists recognize that the basic verb form may be divided into several categories, but that the divisions all have certain characteristics in common. The "be" form, or more precisely the "be + pred." form varies from the verb in so many areas that a separate category is usually made for the form.
As the actual counting of parts of speech is such an essential part of the theory of Josephine Miles, a study with more exacting linguistic methods could have a serious effect upon the results of her work. The present study proposes to correct the inconsistencies found in the work of Miss Miles. To this end, new criteria have been set up for the determination of parts of speech. All parts of speech will be defined as to their structure, as a word's structure is more primary than a word's function. If a word by structure is a noun, the word will be classed as a noun, regardless of the word's function. A word which is structured as a verb but is functioning as a focuser for a noun will be classed as a verb.

This analysis, consequently, differs from the Miles analysis in two ways. First, the emphasis is placed on structure at all times, never allowing a word's function to determine the part of speech. Second, the form "be + pred." will be considered distinct from the regular verb form. The analysis of those sentences of the "be + pred." form will be kept separate from those of the verb form. The phrase "verb form" includes the following sentence patterns: transitive verb plus noun phrase, intransitive verb, and copulative verb plus complement. The present
study does not purport to re-examine all the poets and all the lines included in the first analysis. Instead, the intent is to ascertain sufficient data from the re-examination of the poet, Percy Bysshe Shelley and the one thousand lines of his work which Miss Miles analyzed. From the results of this more linguistic investigation, the validity of the Miles work may be determined. Shelley is classed as having the modal ratio of $9A-19N-8V$, an almost balanced form.

The following three chapters explain the definitions of the parts of speech which are pertinent to this paper. The fifth chapter will discuss the points of contrast and correlation in the count analysis of the modal theory of Josephine Miles and the re-examination formed in this study. If the resultant figures in the present study correspond to those figures derived by Josephine Miles, her study may then be considered

17 Shelley was chosen arbitrarily. The lines analyzed were those found in the following poems written in 1820: "The Sensitive Plant," 309 lines; "A Vision of the Sea," 169 lines; "The Cloud," 84 lines; "To a Skylark," 105 lines; "Ode to Liberty," 285 lines; "To---," 8 lines; "Arethusa," 90 lines.

18 Miles, Eras and Xodes in English Poetry, p. 227.
more linguistically valid. The scope of the modal theory will therefore be enhanced as the results will not only be accurate in the terms of traditional grammar but also in those of linguistic grammar.
CHAPTER II

THE ADJECTIVE

As that part of speech termed the "adjective" is an integral part of the modal theory of Josephine Miles, attention now will be given to a discussion of the adjective. Both linguistic and traditional views will be explored and evaluated as the criteria for this investigation are defined. Comparisons will be drawn between the Miles treatment of adjectives and that accorded the adjective by the present study.

The first opinion considered is that of linguist Nelson Francis. The adjective, he contends, represents a class of words so structured as to have the "exclusive ability to fit into both the environments left blank in a structure such as:

the ... man seems very ...

Such a test is capable of determining all adjectives by structure. The word "yellow" conforms to the pattern as "The yellow cat seems very yellow," indicating that the word "yellow" is an adjective. "The tired man seems very tired" is another example. Francis also divides adjectives into two groups: base adjectives and

---

derived adjectives. The first of these groups, base adjectives, contains words which are mostly of one syllable, though some have two or three. These words have no derivational suffixes, and usually form their comparative and superlative degrees through the addition of the inflectional suffixes "-er" and "-est."

Base adjectives form nouns by adding the derivational suffix "-ness," and adverbs by adding "-ly." Derived adjectives, on the contrary, are formed from bound stems, nouns, and verbs by means of quite a large group of derivational suffixes including: "-ous," "-al," "-able," and "-ing." Illustrating the effect such derivational changes have upon adjectives, the adjective "deep" may be transformed into the noun "deepness," the adverb "deeply," and the noun "depth." 20

Agreeing with the definitions of Francis, Baxter Hathaway explains why the traditional definition of adjectives, describing them as "modifiers," is invalid. "Modifiers can be many things besides adjectives; nouns, prepositional phrases, participles and dependent clauses." 21 Adjectives might, however, be described functionally as those words which denote

20 Ibid., pp. 268-277.
qualities or attributes. The safest definition, though, is one describing structure, such as the definition of Francis.

Other linguists determine adjectives solely by position in the basic sentence pattern. Owen Thomas recognizes adjectives as those words which occur in the patterns "be + Pred" and "Vc + Comp." All pre-nominal adjectives, he concludes, have been transformed from the basic "be + Pred" position during the process of embedding an insert sentence in a matrix sentence. 22

Although regard was not given to the grammatical definitions of 1820 in determining the parts of speech used by Shelley, a grammar book of his era was consulted. The definition therein, is quite similar to the traditional definitions of today. An adjective, the grammar asserts, is "a part of speech joined to a noun or pronoun to qualify, describe, or limit its signification." 23

From these various linguistic and traditional definitions, a set of criteria was determined for use in this investigation. The basic test given all words

---

suspected of being structured as adjectives was the "seems" test described by Francis. Participles and numerals do not meet this test and therefore are not counted as adjectives. Words which appeared to be functioning as adjectives were always checked in the "seems, very" pattern before being termed adjectives. Consequently, nouns denoting the quality of other nouns were eliminated as they did not meet the criteria. The word "stone" in the sentence "The stone fence is high" does not fit in the test sentence, "The stone fence seems very stone," proving that "stone," though functioning as an adjective, is actually structured as another part of speech. A participle would similarly be rejected. The word "fallen" in the sentence, "The fallen angel is beautiful," fails to meet the "seems" test: "The fallen angel seems very fallen."

Since the standards for determining an adjective vary, the results of the two count analyses should similarly differ. Not only are the definitions different, but also the point of reference for considering a word is at variance in the two analyses. One method, that of Josephine Miles, shifts indiscriminantly with respect to the function and structure of a word. The other, that method used in the present analysis, relies
on the definitions concerning structure, alone.
The structural definitions were adopted, for, according to Nelson Francis, the structural basis of classification is "the one most amenable to objective description and analysis of a rigorously scientific sort."24 Form will again be the basis upon which a definition is founded in the next chapter concerning nouns.

CHAPTER III

THE NOUN

Nouns, according to Baxter Hathaway, may be identified as those words that make reference to concrete, physical objects of one kind or another. Nouns, he contends, may, like adjectives, be divided into base and derivational forms. The derivational forms are usually more abstract; not falling into the traditionalists' definition of naming a "person, place, or thing." The abstract derivational nouns may also be called "nominals." Nominals are formed, then, through the addition of a derivational suffix to another part of speech. The derivational suffix "-ness" converts an adjective into a noun: "tininess"; as does "-th": "warmth." Similarly, the suffixes "-al" and "-ance" convert some verbs into nouns: "arrival" and "acceptance." 25

Linguists George Trager and Henry Lee Smith also define a noun in relation to inflectional criteria. They have set up a class system which identifies a word as a noun if the qualifications of four inflections, "man," "man's," "men," and "men's," can be met. Nouns, then may be considered capable of

25 Hathaway, op. cit., p. 54.
plurality and possession.  

Harold Gleason proposes that a noun may be defined structurally in two ways; the criteria may be found within the word or outside the word. The first position is similar to the categories of Trager and Smith, indicating that the types of inflection, derivational suffixes or other features determine the part of speech. The second, however, is more related to Francis' "seems" test for the adjective. Accordingly, a frame is derived, such as: "The .... is/are good." Yet these two methods are not sufficient to distinguish all nouns, Gleason readily admits.  

In still another linguistic approach, Nelson Francis details five criteria for identifying the noun. The points mentioned discuss the aspects of noun-determiners, any of a list of function words including the types, "a," "the," "two," and "my"; the two forms of inflection; derivational suffixes; position; and classification by superfix. While all the points discussed are valid for nouns, seldom does one noun meet all

---


27 Ibid., p. 117.
Francis does not consider the traditional definition of the noun as Thomas does. Countering the concrete-abstract approach of most school grammars, Thomas defines two categories: count and mass/abstract. Count nouns may be preceded by cardinal numbers, mass nouns may not. From these two groups, he then proceeds to the noun classifications of animate, inanimate, proper, common, masculine, feminine, and neuter. All of these forms may exhibit plurality and possession.

In summary, the linguists examined in this analysis seem in accord on several points concerning the definition of the noun as a part of speech. All the grammarians profess that the noun has two numerical qualities, singular and plural. Consequently, the first test given a word which was encountered in the analysis of Shelley's poetry and suspected of being a noun by structure was that of plurality. The questions of "more," "fewer," and "less" were used, taking the form of "more fish," "fewer problems," and "less energy."

The second determining factor was the issue

29 Thomas, op. cit., p. 73.
of possession. Nouns, these linguists assert, are the only part of speech which form the genitive. As a result, the second test given words presumed to be nouns was that of possession. Another characteristic upon which the linguists considered agree, is that of nominalization. The various derivational suffixes are the clues to determining these nouns.

One area closely related to the noun, yet not considered in this investigation is the pronoun. As pronouns were not a part of the Miles study, they are not included in this work. However, some sentences encountered in the count analysis of Shelley's poetry contained pronouns functioning as subjects, rather than nouns. In these sentences the verbs were counted but the pronouns were not. A future study might take this fact into consideration and eliminate this discrepancy.

As the traditional definition of the noun is actually an attempt to classify the word according to function, the difference, if any, in the noun count of the Miles work and of this study should not be great. Unlike the traditional adjective definition which applies solely to function, "an adjective modifies or limits..." the traditionalists, even in 1848, define a noun as "the name of all persons
The school grammar definition of the verb, though, is not as linguistic as that of the noun. Also, the traditional definition does not consider the possible separation of the verb and "be + Fred" form. These are the matters to be considered in the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV

THE VERB

Verbs, purports Francis, are a class of lexical words marked by their use of four inflections; by their appearance in verb-phrases with certain auxiliaries; by a small group of derivational affixes; by certain positions relative to clearly marked nouns; and occasionally by the superfix or stress mark. 31

Certain linguists, including Harold Gleason, assert that since "be" has so many peculiarities that classifying the form with the verb forms is not possible. Consequently, for the purposes of this paper, the "be" form will be considered separately from the verb form. To illustrate the variances, verbs have five forms, "be" has eight; verbs have two tenses, past and present, "be" has two past tense forms, "was" and "were," and three forms of common tense, "am," "is," and "are." Finally, the verb form agrees with the subject in the third person singular by the addition of an "s"; the "be" form agrees also with the first and second person singular, "I am," and "you are."

31 Francis, op. cit., p. 267.
Verbs, according to Francis, have four inflections. The first may be termed the "base" form and is used with all plural nouns and the pronouns "I," "you," "we," and "they" when they function as subjects. The second or "-s" form, is present in all verbs, permitting agreement with the third person singular form producing the inflected "he goes" to follow the base form "you go" of the second person. Following the "-s" form is the "-ing" inflection, also called the present participle which indicates the state of progressive action: "running," "jumping," "sewing." In many verbs, the third and fourth forms, "-ed" and "-en" are identical, producing the identically spelled "He played" and "He has played," rather than "He ran" and "He has run." The "-en" form is also termed the past participle and appears in a situation in which a verb functions as an adjective: "fallen angel."32

Thomas illustrates the complete verb phrase in the following notation: $V=$tense (modal) (have+-en) (be+-ing) verb. Not all verb phrases must contain the parts shown. The mandatory parts are those forms not in parentheses: tense and verb. The other

\[32\text{Francis, op. cit., p. 252.}\]
parts are optional. 33

Thomas purports that English has only two tenses, past and present; the base and "-s" form are used for the present tense, and the "-ed" form for the past. Although the present tense form is used, varying temporal situations may be indicated according to the context in which the form is placed. "The boy looks angry" indicates the present but "The boy fights John tomorrow," though constructed of the same verb form, "-s," implies the future. "John shows his age in that old picture" once again contains the present "-s" form yet depicts a past situation. As tense demands a choice be made between past and present, the word "verb" also requires a decision. 34

Four basic types of verbs are described by Thomas: to be, intransitive, transitive, and copulative. The first, the "be" form, consists of a form of "be," plus either an adjective, a noun, or an adverb of location. The pattern for the intransitive verb includes the noun phrase functioning as subject followed by the intransitive verb. The

33 Thomas, op. cit., p. 140.
34 Ibid.
third choice, transitive, permits first a noun phrase, then the transitive verb with a second noun phrase following the verb. The final type, copulative, requires that the verb be followed by a complement which is either a noun or an adjective; the complement always indicates a quality of the first noun phrase. 35

Returning to the rule for the verb phrase, Thomas explains that the parentheses in the formula note that the conditions contained within the marks are optional, though if the possibilities are used, the order is that shown in the formula. The first optional class, the "modal," contains the words "will," "would," "shall," "should," "can," "could," "may," "might," and "must." The choice of the "have + -en" slot requires that the "have" remain in the indicated position, but "-en" be moved one slot to the right and added to the end of the word in that slot. Consequently, "I have gone" is written rather than "I have + -en go." The expression "be + -ing" is used in the same manner as "have+ -en," therefore a sentence using "be + -ing" would be rewritten as "I am going" instead of "I am + -ing go." The two points to be remembered in applying the verb

35 Thomas, op. cit., p. 35.
phrase rule are first, the order of the parts must remain as shown in the formula, and, second, the affixes "-en" and "-ing" are added to the form one slot to the right. The formula in application would first appear as "past + shall + have + -en + be + -ing + read." Thomas then supplies a transformation rule which rearranges the parts into "should have been reading." Although three auxiliaries and one verb appear in the phrase, the criteria in both the Miles study and the present analysis would permit the counting of only one verb; auxiliaries are considered part of the verb and are not counted separately.36

Similarly, both analyses also would recognize the combination of two sentences in the phrase, "I hope to go," and would reveal two verbs in the count analysis. The only difference in the verb count in the two works is the matter of participles; classified as verbs in this study, but as adjectives in the Miles study. One slight difference is the treatment of the passive voice, although the verb count should not be affected. Though the "be" form and the accompanying adjectives and nouns are being counted separately, the totals of the "be" column

36 Ibid.
and the "verb" column will be added together for comparison with the other study. The ratio of the "be" column will be examined to determine whether the removal of the "be + Fred" sentences from the count study is a significant one.
CHAPTER V

CORRELATION AND EVALUATION

The variance in the results of the Miles analysis of Shelley's poetry and the results of this investigation was so significant as to place Shelley's writing in another mode. The Miles study recognizes a ratio of 9A-19N-8V, or a count of 900 adjectives, 1,900 nouns, and 800 verbs in the 1,000 lines of poetry considered, the count involving 3,600 words. Combining, for purposes of concord with the Miles study, the verb count with the "be" count, an identical total of 3,600 words is revealed. The proportion, however, is different: 5A-21N-10V, or 500 adjectives, 2,100 nouns, and 1,000 verbs. Shelley, then, must be moved from the balanced category to the clausal mode. Explanations for and implications of the divergence of the two count studies are the themes of this chapter.

Sentences containing the "be" form were analyzed separately from those with the verb form, assigning the accompanying adjectives and nouns to the appropriate column. The ratio of the verb column is 5A-19N-9V; that of the "be" column, 0.5A-1.5N-1V. When the "be" figures are added to the 5A-19N-9V
total, the ratio becomes 5A-21N-10V, producing a slight difference, yet the change does not alter the category classification. The raw scores reveal that in both ratios the relationship is equivalent to 1-4-2. The verb count is double that of the adjective, and the noun count is double that of the verb. The conclusion may be drawn, then, that the separation of the verb form from the "be" form has no bearing upon the resulting ratio. The Miles study may be deemed correct in combining the two forms.

The two studies vary greatly in the number of adjectives counted, one indicating 900 adjectives, the other, 500. The reason for the difference is directly related to the different criteria used in this study. In addition to those words which are structured as adjectives, Miss Miles also counted participles as adjectives, because of their function. To verify this statement, a passage was selected at random. In a 24 line segment, 14 adjectives by structure were counted as well as 24 participles functioning as adjectives. In listing the adjectives by structure together with the adjectives by function, the Miles analysis would note 38 adjectives. The present study, however, counting as adjectives only those words structured as adjectives, would record 14. Such a
pronounced difference in the number of adjectives counted in just 24 lines, 14 as compared with 38, would indeed make a substantial difference in the total ratio. The variance in the number of adjectives counted by the two methods is the significant factor in reclassifying Shelley as a clausal poet.

The results of the present work are more accurate as they rely solely on a word's structure, rather than shifting inconsistently between structure and function as determiners of parts of speech. If participles are to be considered adjectives because of their function, the laws of consistency would similarly require that nouns functioning as adjectives also be classed as adjectives, though this is not the case in the Miles study. This is not to say that an analysis could not be made which would determine parts of speech by function rather than structure, although, as mentioned earlier, analysis by structure is preferable. Either method would be valid; a mixture of the two, as employed in the theory this investigation is checking, is most questionable.

The noun count determined by the two methods is similar, nineteen nouns counted in one compared with twenty-one in the other. The reason for the increase in the number of nouns reflects the treatment
of instances involving verbs in the passive voice. A noun "actor" or subject was added to the noun count each time a verb of the passive voice was encountered, as the enumeration of a verb without an accompanying subject did not seem consistent. No explanation was given concerning this point in the Miles analysis, indicating that nouns were not added. If, however, one records the verbs and adjectives in a sentence, one also ought to make an allowance for the omitted subject; consistency should be the prime factor in any experiment.

Another element not treated by Josephine Miles is the dilemma incurred in instances in which a pronoun functions as a noun and becomes the subject of a sentence. The verb is counted but the noun, having been replaced by a pronoun, is omitted, producing one more inconsistency. A future investigation should resolve this matter, perhaps by counting pronouns as nouns when they function as the subject of a sentence, or by not counting the verbs which occur in such a situation. Adjectives have not been mentioned as the occasion is rare that an adjective focuses on or modifies a pronoun. If the decision is made in a future study to eliminate all verbs which appear with a pronoun as subject, any
adjectives found in the same situation should be similarly ignored to form a consistent study.

The third part of speech tabulated for comparison with the Miles study was the verb. The same basic criteria were used to determine verbs: infinitives were counted as two verbs; auxiliaries not included. The difference in the two verb counts relates to the appellation of the participle. The Miles count classed participles as adjectives, whereas this study classed them as verbs. Another point at issue in the verb tabulation was that of the "be" form, but as has been mentioned earlier, the separation of that form was irrelevant to the total ratio. To illustrate this, the results of the analysis including verbs is presented in Table I. Table II exhibits the tabulations of the "be" count. A sample analysis has been included in Tables III and IV to permit the reader to view the actual application of the methods set forth in this investigation.

As a result of this purely structural examination, the ratio count has been considerably altered. Consequently, Shelley is now classed as a clausal poet, rather than a balanced one. A complete re-examination is now necessary to determine the new categories of all the poets considered in the Miles analysis.
Perhaps a new pattern for the movement of eras and modes would be discovered. Although possibly a new pattern might evolve, the possibility also exists that the same melody line as in music might still appear, though the key would be different. The reason for this would be that the criteria used in a new analysis would be constant and consistent and would probably move each poet the same distance into a new category.

On the contrary, though, the analysis by structure of the poets considered in the Miles study might at times move a poet forward into a new class and at other times move him back into the preceding mode. Some poets, too, may vary not at all if their poetry does not contain any of the structural situations in which the Miles analysis and this investigation differed. As one can see, a definite projection of the effects of a further study formulated and carried out according to the criteria of this analysis is impossible.

Certain implications of a perfected method of analysis are possible, however. Just as the basis and instigating idea of the Miles study was the tantalizing prospect of discovering a definitive means of indicating style, so this more linguistic
study may also permit a new approach to the analysis of style. Currently, a style must have been in existence for many years before the thread of connection between authors and the peculiarities which differentiate their style from that of previous eras may be discovered. This investigator would like to say that the methods of modal analysis developed in this study will permit this new and needed interpretation of present literary styles, but cannot. This paper has only determined that the Miles interpretation is not consistent with a more structural grammatical analysis. A full re-examination of her study would be necessary to determine if the results of this study are correlative to the currently accepted theories of past literary styles. Projecting again, if the new analysis is valid, a significant means of viewing the style of a writer has been developed. Even if this structural analysis, when expanded to include the entire scope of Josephine Miles's work, proves not to coincide with the established ideas of the progression of literary style, an important point will have been made. If the severe structural criteria of this study cannot evaluate style, the inconsistent methods of the Miles work will also be invalid. The prospect is unlikely, however, as already such studies
as the one mentioned earlier conducted by A. L. Kroeber have already confirmed some aspects of her theory. Also, if the results of her function/structural technique have been validated, as she contends, as they correlate to the present conceptions of literary trends, the more objective grammatical approach of this study will also be true.

Accepting, for the moment, that the results of this analysis do coincide with the established opinions of the development of style, further implications are afforded. Josephine Miles conjectures that through a structural understanding of a mode, the reasons for the changes in modes may be determined. In the past, critics have described changes in style in terms similar to "a flowery style was replaced by a sinewy one." One may easily see that the terms the modal theory applies, "balanced," "clausal," and "phrasal," are more definitive and may be more closely analyzed as they themselves represent a closer analysis of literary style. The change in modes could then be specifically determined and discussed in terms of actual sentence construction, thus providing an objective base for formulations.

Another area in which the application of the modal theory would be relevant is that related to why
style change. Critics have suggested cyclical, action and reaction, and straight-line evolitional theories. Although the modal theory would not actually explain change, a criteria would be established on which to base hypotheses. In addition, the theory would also be useful to those who speculate upon the psychological aspect of change and style. Once again, the Miles theory would provide a definite foundation for such additional theories.

Consequently, the theory would be useful in many areas. A similar theory has not been developed which would be as useful a tool in deliniating as many facets of style as does the theory of Josephine Miles. Hence, any explicit validation of her theory would be extremely valuable. This paper was initiated to serve this end, but the conclusions reached were not conclusive. Only in one area was the Miles theory completely and concretely verified by this analysis, that of the grouping together of the "be" form and the verb form. To support her other ideas, a further study, as detailed earlier, would be necessary.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

To summarize, this study has challenged two areas of the criteria used in the modal theory of Josephine Miles. The points contested were grammatical ones which are instrumental in the proper application of the theory. Specifically, in the count study, the actual basis of the modal analysis, verbs were separated from the "be" form and structural definitions were used to determine all parts of speech relevant to the investigation. Structural definitions were selected as the structural approach is the most objective and scientific. Only the works of one poet, Percy Bysshe Shelley, were examined, as a test sample for the new, more linguistic criteria. As in the Miles analysis, the results of the count examination were defined in terms of the ratio among adjectives, nouns, and verbs. Shelley had been classed by Miss Miles as a representative of the balanced mode of writing. This analysis, however, re-classified him as clausal, as verbs were found to predominate substantially over adjectives. The variation in the resultant figures is related to the structurally based definitions, rather than to the separation of the verb form,
as the ratio determined in this examination remained the same with or without the addition of the ratio of the "be" count.

One portion, consequently, of the Miles thesis has been justified, the grouping of verb forms and "be" forms. The scope of this study, however, was not broad enough to determine concretely the accuracy of the mixing of structural and functional definitions to define parts of speech which were employed in the Miles investigation. A re-examination of the entire Miles work would be necessary in addition to the need to then compare patterns and modes found with those designated by literary critics.

The significance of such a future study is related to the scientific nature of the examination. Theorists, now, have no definite terms with which to describe literary patterns and styles. An examination based upon actual sentence structure as the present work has been, or as the necessary future work outlined might be, deals in specifics and thus develops conclusions in equally exacting terms. The results of even this research are significant as Shelley may be accurately described as a clausal poet because of his use of almost twice as many verbs as adjectives.
A full analysis would then not only provide the basis for a comparative study of literary eras and modes, but also enable the present literary trends to be viewed objectively. No longer would an interim period be needed before an accurate discussion of style be formulated. The mode of the day could be easily analyzed. Writers, as a possible consequence of a better understanding of style, could perhaps determine before writing, the best mode for the information they wish to express to their reader and hence be more successful in their efforts.

While the implications of an accurate modal theory are not endless, they are important and offer a new approach to any aspect of style. Although the conclusions of this investigation cannot establish that the methods employed represent a modal theory whose results are correlated with the results of past literary critics, the methods are consistent and are based upon logical definitions of parts of speech. Even though proof has not been found to invalidate the modal analysis of Josephine Miles, significant discrepancies have been determined which suggest that a complete reappraisal of her study be made.
Table I lists horizontally the number of adjectives, nouns, and verbs counted in the number of lines tabulated in the left-hand column. The totals appear in the last horizontal row and may be interpreted as $5A-19N-9V$ in 1,046 lines.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Adjectives</th>
<th>Nouns</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 1046 | 477 | 1947 | 930 |
Table II lists horizontally the number of adjectives, nouns, and forms of "be" counted in the number of lines tabulated in the left-hand column. The totals appear in the last horizontal row and may be interpreted as 0.5A-1.5 N-1Be in 1,046 lines.
## TABLE II
ADJECTIVE-NOUN-BE RATIO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Adjectives</th>
<th>Nouns</th>
<th>Be</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1046</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following two tables, Table III and Table IV, illustrate the method of tabulation used in this analysis. The symbols employed are: N=noun; V=verb; A=adjective; BE="be" form. The notation to the left indicates a noun has been added for a verb of the passive voice. The total count is represented at the bottom of the page.
I bring fresh showers for the thirsting flowers,
From the seas and the streams;
I bear light shade for the leaves when laid
In their noonday dreams.

From my wings are shaken the dews that waken
The sweet buds every one,
When rocked to rest on their mother's breast,
As she dances about the sun.

I wield the flail of the lashing hail,
And whiten the green plains under,
And then again I dissolve it in rain,
And laugh as I pass in thunder.

I sift the snow on the mountains below,
And their great pines groan aghast;
And all the night 'tis my pillow white,
While I sleep in the arms of the blast.

Sublime on the towers of my skiey bowers,
Lightning my pilot sits;
In a cavern under is fettered the thunder,
It struggles and howls at fits;
Over earth and ocean, with gentle motion,
This pilot is guiding me,
Lured by the love of the genii that move
In the depths of the purple sea;
TABLE IV
COUNT SAMPLE

Whether the Sensitive Plant, or that
Which within its boughs like a Spirit sat,
Ere its outward form had known decay,
Now felt this change, I cannot say.

Whether that Lady's gentle mind,
No longer with the form combined
Which scattered love, as stars do light,
Found sadness, where it left delight,

I dare not guess; but in this life
of error, ignorance, and strife,
Where nothing is, but all things seem,
And we the shadows of the dream,

It is a modest creed, and yet
Pleasant if one considers it,
To own that death itself must be,
Like all the rest, a mockery.

That garden sweet, that lady fair,
And all sweet shapes and odours there,
In truth have never passed away:
'Tis we, 'tis ours, are changed; not they.
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