

- ① from William. Empson *Seven Types of Ambiguity* 3rd. ed. (New York: New Directions, 1966)
- ② Helen Vendler. *The Art of Shakespeare's Sonnets* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 1997)
- ③ Paul Edmondson & Stanley Wells. *Shakespeare's Sonnets* (Oxford: Oxford U.P, 2004)
- ④ Andrew Gurr. 'You and Thou in Shakespeare's *Sonnets*,' *Essays in Criticism* 32.1 (Jan 1982), 9-25
- ⑤ MacD.P.Jackson. 'Punctuation and the Compositors of Shakespeare's *Sonnets*, 1609,' *Library* 30.1 (Mar 1975), 1-24
- ⑥ Stanley Fish. '*Lycidas*: A Poem Finally Anonymous,' in C.A.Patridges (ed.) *Milton's Lycidas: The Tradition and the Poem*. New and Rev. ed. (Columbia: U. of Missouri P, 1983)
- ⑦阿部公彦『スローモーション考』(南雲堂 2008)

may say that between thought and feeling) between the fact stated and the circumstance of the statement, but very often you cannot know one without knowing the other, and an apprehension of the sentence involves both without distinguishing between them. Thus I should consider as on the same footing the two facts about this sentence, that it is about a cat and that it is suited to a child. And I should only isolate two of its 'meanings,' to form an ambiguity worth notice; it has contradictory associations, which might cause some conflict in the child who heard it, in that it might come out of a fairy story and might come out of *Reading without Tears*.

In analysing the statement made by a sentence (having, no doubt, fixed on the statement by an apprehension of the implications of the sentence), one would continually be dealing with a sort of ambiguity due to metaphors, made clear by Mr. Herbert Read in *English Prose Style*; because metaphor, more or less far-fetched, more or less complicated, more or less taken for granted (so as to be unconscious), is the normal mode of development of a language. 'Words used as epithets are words used to analyse a direct statement,' whereas 'metaphor is the synthesis of several units of observation into one commanding image; it is the expression of a complex idea, not by analysis, nor by direct statement, but by a sudden perception of an objective relation.' One thing is said to be like another, and they have several different properties in virtue of which they are alike. Evidently this, as a verbal matter, yields more readily to analysis than the social ambiguities I have just considered; and I shall take it as normal to the simplest type of ambiguity, which I am considering in this chapter. The fundamental situation, whether it deserves to be called ambiguous or not, is that a word or a grammatical structure is effective in several ways at once. To take a famous example, there is no pun, double syntax, or dubiety of feeling, in

Bare ruined choirs, where late the sweet birds sang,

but the comparison holds for many reasons; because ruined monastery choirs are places in which to sing, because they involve sitting in a row, because they are made of wood, are carved into knots and so forth, because they used to be surrounded by a sheltering building crystallised out of the likeness of a forest, and

coloured with stained glass and painting like flowers and leaves, because they are now abandoned by all but the grey walls coloured like the skies of winter, because the cold and Narcissistic charm suggested by choir-boys suits well with Shakespeare's feeling for the object of the Sonnets, and for various sociological and historical reasons (the protestant destruction of monasteries; fear of puritanism), which it would be hard now to trace out in their proportions; these reasons, and many more relating the simile to its place in the Sonnet, must all combine to give the line its beauty, and there is a sort of ambiguity in not knowing which of them to hold most clearly in mind. Clearly this is involved in all such richness and heightening of effect, and the machinations of ambiguity are among the very roots of poetry.

Such a definition of the first type of ambiguity covers almost everything of literary importance, and this chapter ought to be my longest and most illuminating, but it is the most difficult. The important meanings of this sort, as may be seen from the example about the cat, are hard to isolate, or to be sure of when you have done so; and there is a sort of meaning, the sort that people are thinking of when they say 'this poet will mean more to you when you have had more experience of life,' which is hardly in reach of the analyst at all. They mean by this not so much that you will have more information (which could be given at once) as that the information will have been digested; that you will be more experienced in the apprehension of verbal subtleties or of the poet's social tone; that you will have become the sort of person that can feel at home in, or imagine, or extract experience from, what is described by the poetry; that you will have included it among the things you are prepared to apprehend. There is a distinction here of the implied meanings of a sentence into what is to be assimilated at the moment and what must already be part of your habits; in arriving at the second of these the educator (that mysterious figure) rather than the analyst would be helpful. In a sense it cannot be explained in language, because to a person who does not understand it any statement of it is as difficult as the original one, while to a person who does understand it a statement of it has no meaning because no purpose.

"he rose," and of course we know that the sun drops into the western bay only to arise at last attired in its blue mantle.¹⁴ We may expect that in the evening the swain will lie down and that the sun will do no more than drop into the bay, but in the economy of *this* poem one sinks only to mount yet once more, at long last to the "fresh Woods, and Pastures new" of the Chief Shepherd. The uncouth swain, like Lycidas and the sun and the Son and (hopefully) the reader, sinks in order to rise "at last"; that these parallels "work" seems to imply a rare kind of imaginative integrity in the poet. Milton, with "this over and above of being a Christian," speaks across the years to the "choicest wits" of pagan pastoral and exemplifies what it means to pronounce "yet once more" in the poetic syntax of Christian time, moving from "shadowy Types to Truth."

¹⁴ As in lines 169–70 where "*his*" refers exclusively to the "day-star" or sun. (*His* was the original genitive neuter, and while *its* was coming into general use during the early seventeenth century, it was apparently regarded as rather colloquial or newfangled, for it was avoided by the writers of the King James version of 1611. In his poetry Milton tends to avoid *its*.) The "we" of line twenty-three also reveals functional ambiguity, although it refers, logically, to the pastoral singer and Lycidas, its nearest grammatical antecedent is "he" ("some gentle Muse"), which means that "we" includes past and future, as well as present, pastoral singers, emphasizing the continuities that are the subject of the passage and, ultimately, the poem as a whole.



Lycidas: A Poem Finally Anonymous

Stanley E. Fish

I. THE SWAIN SPEAKS

Much of *Lycidas* criticism is an extended answer to those who, in the tradition of Dr. Johnson, see the poem as an "irreverent combination" of "trifling fictions" and "sacred truths," or as a lament marred by intrusive and unassimilated digressions, or, more sympathetically, as "an accumulation of magnificent fragments,"¹ or simply (and rather notoriously) as a production more "willful and illegal in form" than any other of its time.² This last judgment—it is John Crowe Ransom's in his famous essay "A Poem Nearly Anonymous"—indicates the extent to which the poem has been brought before the bar. The indictment has included, among others, the following charges: the tenses are inconsistent and frustrate any attempt to trace a psychological progression; there are frequent and unsettling changes in style and diction; the structure is uncertain, hesitating between monologue, dialogue, and something that is not quite either; the speaker assumes a bewildering succession of poses; the lines on Fame are poorly integrated; the procession

From *Glyph: Johns Hopkins Textual Studies*, 8, ed. Walter B. Michaels (Baltimore, 1981), Ch. 1.

¹ G. Wilson Knight, *The Burning Oracle* (London, 1939), 70.

² "A Poem Nearly Anonymous," above, 75; first published in 1933.

of mourners is perfunctory; the Pilot's speech is overlong and overharsh; the flower passage is merely decorative; the Christian consolation (beginning "Weep no more, shepherds") is unconvincing and insufficiently prepared for; the shift to the third person in the final lines is disconcerting and without any persuasive justification. Together and individually, these characterizations constitute a challenge to the poem's unity, and it is as an assertion of unity that the case for the defense is always presented.

Typically, that defense proceeds by first acknowledging and then domesticating the discontinuities that provoke it. Thus William Madsen observes that the voice that says "Weep no more, shepherds" at line 165 does not sound at all like the voice we have been listening to; but no sooner does he note this breach in the poem's logic than he mends it by assigning the line and what follows to the angel Michael,³ although he fails to explain, as Donald Friedman points out, why among all the speakers in *Lycidas*, Michael is the only one who "is introduced without comment or identification."⁴ Friedman himself is concerned with another moment of disruption, occasioned by the voice of Phoebus whose unexpected appearance as a speaker in the past tense blurs the narrative line and creates a "confusion about the nature of the utterance we are listening to." That confusion, however, is only "momentary," at least in Friedman's argument, where it is soon brought into a relationship with "the coda in which Milton subsumes the entire experience of the swain." That coda, of course, brings its own problem, for as Stewart Baker observes, the appearance, after 185 lines, of a third person narrator constitutes a "surprise"; but after acknowledging the surprise in the opening sentence of his essay, Baker proceeds to accommodate it, and by the time he finishes, it has been removed, along with St. Peter's dread voice, as a possible threat "to the poem's unity."⁵ Defending the poem's unity is also the concern of H. V. Ogden, who writes in part to refute G. Wilson Knight's characterization of *Lycidas* "as an effort to bind and clamp together a universe trying to fly off

³ *From Shadowy Types to Truth* (New Haven, 1968), 13.

⁴ "*Lycidas*: The Swain's Paideia," *Milton Studies* 3 (1971): 33 (condensed above, 281 ff.).

⁵ "Milton's Uncouth Swain," *Milton Studies* 3 (1971): 35-50.

into separate bits."⁶ Ogden cannot but acknowledge that the poem abounds in "abrupt turns in new directions," but these turns are explained or explained away by invoking the seventeenth-century principle of "aesthetic variety," and one can almost hear Ogden's sigh of relief as he declares triumphantly that "*Lycidas* is a disciplined interweaving of contrasted passages into a unified whole."⁷

Examples could be multiplied, but the pattern is clear: whatever *Lycidas* is, *Lycidas* criticism is "an effort to bind and clamp together a universe trying to fly off into separate bits." It is, in short, an effort to put the poem together, and the form that effort almost always takes is the putting together of an integrated and consistent first person voice. Indeed, it is the assumption that the poem is a dramatic lyric and hence the expression of a united consciousness that generates the pressure to discover a continuity in the narrative. The unity in relation to which the felt discontinuities must be brought into line is therefore a *psychological* unity; the drama whose coherence everyone is in the business of demonstrating is mental. In the history of the criticism that coherence has been achieved by conceiving of the speaker as an actor in one of several possible biographical dramas: he may be remembering a past experience from a position of relative tranquility (the position of the last eight lines); or he may be performing a literary exercise in the course of which he creates a naive persona (the uncouth swain); or he may be in the process of breaking out of the conventional limitations imposed on him by a tradition; or he may be passing from a pagan to a Christian understanding of the world and the possibilities it offers him. The readings are written in opposition to one another, but in fact they all share an assumption that is made explicit by John Henry Raleigh when he declares that "*Lycidas* is an existential poem. . . . It is about 'becoming,' the emergence of the ego to its full power."⁸ Given this assumption, the poem can only be read as one in which the first person speaker is a seventeenth-century anticipation of a Romantic hero.

⁶ Knight, *The Burning Oracle*, 70.

⁷ "The Principles of Variety and Contrast in Seventeenth-Century Aesthetics and Milton's Poetry," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 10 (1949): 159-82.

⁸ "*Lycidas*: 'Yet Once More,'" *Prairie Schooner* 42 (1968): 947.

The notorious exception to this way of dealing with *Lycidas* is John Crowe Ransom, who explains the discontinuities in the poem as evidence of a failure to *suppress* the ego, a failure to realize the proper poetic intention of remaining "always anonymous." In Ransom's account, the "logical difficulties of the work," the shifts in tense, the changes in tone, the interpolations of different speakers, the roughness of verse, are the intrusive self-advertisements of a poet who cannot keep himself out of his poem, who is "willful and illegal" so that "nobody will make the mistake of not remarking his personality." In general the Milton establishment has not been impressed by Ransom's argument which is now viewed as something of a curiosity. In what follows, I will attempt to revive it, but with a difference. Ransom is right, I believe, to see that the shifts and disruptions in the poem reflect a tension between anonymity and personality; but I do not think, as he seems to, that the personality in the poem is triumphant because it is irrepressible. Indeed, it will be my contention that the suppressing of the personal voice is the poem's achievement and that the energy of the poem derives not from the presence of a controlling and self-contained individual, but from forces that undermine his individuality and challenge the fiction of his control. If the poem records a struggle of personality against anonymity, it is a struggle the first person speaker loses, and indeed, the triumph of the poem occurs when his voice can no longer be heard.

That voice, when we first encounter it, is heard complaining about the task to which it has been called by "sad occasion." The complaint is all the more bitter because it takes the form of an apology. "I am sorry to have to do this to you," the speaker says to the apostrophized berries, but what he is really sorry about is something that has been done to him. The double sense of the lines is nicely captured in the ambiguity of "forc'd" in line 4 ("And with forc'd fingers rude"), which can be read either as a characterization of his own action or as an indictment of that which has made the action necessary (he is forced to do the forcing). In the same way, "rude" is at once a deprecation of his poetic skills and an expression of anger at having to exercise them prematurely: his fingers are rude because they have been forced to an unready performance. The pretense of an apology is continued through line 5, where it is once again

undermined by the phrase "the mellowing year." Thomas Warton objected to an "inaccuracy" here because the "the mellowing year" could not affect the leaves of the laurel, the myrtle, and the ivy . . . characterized before as 'never sere.'"⁹ Just so. The "inaccuracy" is there to call an ironic and mocking attention to the inappropriateness of the apology: the laurel, the myrtle, and the ivy have no "mellowing year" to shatter; what has been shattered, in different ways, are the mellowing years of *Lycidas* and the speaker; and it is in response to the violence (interruption) done to them that these lines are spoken. By the time we reach line 7 it is impossible to read "disturb your season due" as anything but a bitter joke. It is the speaker's season that has been disturbed and by a disturbance (the death of *Lycidas*) even more final; and it is with the greatest reluctance that he is compelled to give voice to this "melodious tear" (14).

This posture of reluctance is one often assumed by Milton's characters, most notably by the Attendant Spirit in *Comus*, who is more than a little loath to leave the "regions mild of calm and serene air" (4) for the "smoke and stir of this dim spot, / Which men call earth" (6). It is also the posture in which Milton likes to present himself in the prose tracts, so that, typically he will declare with what small willingness he leaves the "still time" of his studies to engage in "tedious antiquities and disputes,"¹⁰ or he will announce that only in response to the "earnest and serious conjurements" of a friend has he been "induc't" to break off pursuits "which cannot but be a great furtherance . . . to the enlargement of truth."¹¹ The labor to which he is called in these tracts is always an *interruption*, something that comes between him and a preferred activity, a discontinuity that threatens the completion of his real work.

This is especially true of *The Reason of Church Government*, in which his situation, as he characterizes it, exactly parallels that of the speaker in *Lycidas*. He writes, he tells us, "out of mine owne season when I have neither yet compleated to my minde the full circle of my private studies."¹² "I did not," he

⁹ Milton's *Lycidas*, ed. Scott Elledge (New York, 1966), 259.

¹⁰ *An Apology against a Pamphlet in The Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, gen. ed. Don M. Wolfe (New Haven, 1953 ff.), 1:953.

¹¹ *Of Education in Prose Works*, 2:363.

¹² *Prose Works*, 1:807. The ensuing quotations are from 808, 810, 830, and 821-22.

says, "choose this manner of writing, wherein knowing myself inferior to myself . . . I have the use . . . but of my left hand." He would rather be "soaring in the high region of his fancies with his garland and singing robes about him," where, in response to the "inward prompting" of thoughts that have long "possest" him, he "might perhaps leave something so written to aftertimes, as they should not willingly let it die." It is from those exalted "intentions" that he has been "plucked" by the "abortive and foredated discovery" of the present occasion ("sad occasion dear") and he knows that the reader will understand how reluctant he is "to interrupt the pursuit of no less hopes than these . . . to embark in a troubled sea of noises and hoars disputes, put from beholding the bright countenance of truth in the quiet and still air of delightful studies." In *Lycidas*, the still and quiet air of studies is punctuated by the "Oaten Flute" and by the song beloved of "old Damoetus," but as in *The Reason of Church Government*, this is a lost tranquility now recollected from the vantage point of a present turmoil, of a "heavy change" (37). In both contexts the change is the occasion for premature activity, for the hazarding of skills that are not yet ready in the performance of a task that is unwelcome.

There is one great difference however. The Milton of *The Reason of Church Government*, like the Attendant Spirit in *Comus*, is soon reconciled to that task because he is able to see it not as an interruption, but as an extension of the activity from which he has been called away. He may be "put from beholding the bright countenance of truth," but it is as a witness to the same truth that he takes up the labor forced upon him by the moment. All acts performed in response to the will of God are equally virtuous, and "when God commands to take the trumpet and blow a dolorous or a jarring blast, it lies not in man's will what he shall say." Indeed, "were it the meanest underservice, if God by his secretary conscience enjoin it," then it is impossible for a man to draw back. It is the same reasoning that leads him in *Of Education* to accede to the entreaties of Hartlib, for although the reforming of education is not the pursuit to which the love of God was taking him, he is able to see the present assignment as one "sent hither by some Good providence" and therefore as an opportunity to manifest that same love. In *An*

Apology, he has decided, even before he descends to the disagreeable business of replying to slanders and calumnies, that it is his duty to do so, lest the truth and "the religious cause" which he had "in hand" be rendered "odious." "I conceived myself," he declares, "to be not now as mine own person, but as a member incorporate into that truth whereof I was perswaded."

This conception of himself as "not . . . mine owne person" is essential to his ability to see the disrupting activity as an instance or manifestation of the activity from which he has been *unwillingly* torn. That is, the disruption looms large only from the perspective of his personal desires—he would rather be writing poetry, or reading the classics, or furthering some long-term project—but from the vantage point of the truth whereof he is but a member incorporate, there is no disruption at all, simply a continuity of duty and service. It is here that the point of contrast with the speaker in *Lycidas* is most obvious: he takes everything *personally*, and as a consequence, whatever happens is seen only as it relates to the hopes he has for his own career. This, of course, is the great discovery of twentieth-century criticism, that in *Lycidas* Milton "is primarily taking account of the meaning of the experience to himself";¹³ but for Milton to be *primarily* doing this is for him to be doing something very different from what he does in the prose tracts where egocentric meanings are rejected as soon as they are identified. That is, the stance of the speaker in *Lycidas* is anomalous in the Milton canon; for rather than relinquishing the conception of himself as "his owne person," he insists on it, and by insisting on it he resists incorporation into a body of which he is but an extending member.

Indeed, insofar as the poem can be said to have a plot, it consists of the speaker's efforts to resist assimilation. He does this in part by maintaining an ironic distance from the conventions he proceeds to invoke. As we have seen, that irony is compounded largely of bitterness, and it takes the form both of questioning the adequacy of the conventions to the occasion and of claiming a knowledge superior to any the conventions are able to offer. Irony is itself a mode of superiority: the ironic voice always issues from a perspective of privilege and presents itself

¹³ James H. Hanford, *A Milton Handbook* (New York, 1926).

as having penetrated to meanings that have been missed by the naive and the innocent. The ironic voice, in short, always knows *more*.

In this case it knows more than the traditions of consolation; it knows that they are fictions, false surmises. The method in the opening sections is to let these fictions have their say, only so that the speaker can enter to expose their shallowness. "He must not float upon his wat'ry bier" seems as we read it to be the sentiment of someone who believes that there is something to be done, but that belief is dismissed and mocked by the first word of line 13, "Unwept." He will, in fact, continue to float on his watery bier, and the only thing that will be done is what the speaker is doing now, producing laments in the form of "some melodious tear" (14). This characterization of his own activity is slighting, but it does not mean that he is assuming a stance of modesty or self-deprecation; the criticism extends only to the means or tools, and not to the workman who finds them inadequate. It is their failure and not his that is culpable; and indeed, his recognition, even before he employs them, that they will not do the job, validates the superiority of his perception.

Even when the pastoral conventions are invoked they are invoked in such a way as to call into question their capacities. The elegy proper begins with an echo of Virgil's messianic eclogue: "Begin . . . and somewhat loudly sweep the string." That eclogue, however, specifically promises to transcend the genre, and therefore to invoke it is already to assume the insufficiency of the tradition in the very act of rehearsing its tropes. One of those tropes is the recollection of past delights, and it is given an extended, even lingering evocation in lines 25-36 (the lines to which Dr. Johnson so objected); but even as we listen, in the place of "old Damoetas," to this song, we are aware, with Douglas Bush, that it is "a picture of pastoral innocence, of carefree youth unconscious of the fact of death."¹⁴ We therefore hear it with *condescension* and with an expectation that it will be succeeded by a perspective less naive. As a result, when the speaker breaks in with "But O the heavy change" (37), the tone may be elegiac, but the gesture is a triumphant one, made by someone who is able to present himself as "sadder, but wiser." What he

¹⁴ A. S. P. Woodhouse and Douglas Bush, eds., *A Variorum Commentary on the Poems of John Milton* (London and New York, 1972), 2:2.647.

is wiser than is the pastoral mode and all of the ways by which it attempts to render comfortable what is so obviously distressing. One of those ways is the doctrine of natural sympathy, which would tell us that in response to the death of Lycidas, "the Willows and the Hazel Copses green / Shall now no more be seen" (42-43); but that assertion is allowed to survive only for the moment before the succeeding line at once completes the syntax and, in an ironic reversal, changes the meaning: "Shall now no more be seen / Fanning their joyous Leaves to thy soft layes." The willows and the hazel copses green will in fact be seen, but they will be seen fanning their joyous leaves to someone else's soft lays, for it is Lycidas who will be "no more." This new meaning does not simply displace, but mocks the old: "how foolish of any one to believe that nature takes notice of the misfortunes of man." Obviously, the speaker is not such a one, and as always, the superimposition of his perspective on the perspective of the convention has the effect of establishing him in a removed and superior position. He maintains this position even when he appears to be turning on himself. "Aye me, I fondly dream" (56) has the form of a self-rebuke, but the fondness is displaced onto the tradition and its representative figures, the nymphs, the bards, the druids, the Muses, Orpheus, and even Universal Nature. It is their ineffectiveness that has led the speaker to break off his performance and to exclaim, "for what could that have done; / What could the Muse herself that Orpheus bore" (57-58). What *he* can do, and very effectively, is to see and say just that and so disassociate himself from the failures he continues to expose.

I am aware that in the more orthodox accounts of the poem this questioning of pastoral efficacy has received another reading, and is seen not as evidence of egocentricity, but as a kind of heroism. B. Rajan, for example, reads the poem as the anguished discovery by the first person voice that ritual and tradition are inadequate when confronted by the "assault of reality."¹⁵ The poem is thus an attack on "its own assumptions," an attack that is "mounted by the higher mood against the pastoral form." In the struggle that ensues, "convention and mentality are the basic forces of contention," and for "elementality" we may read the personal voice, characterized by Rajan,

¹⁵ "Lycidas: The Shattering of the Leaves," above, 275.

as the "cry out of the heart of experience." His argument is more finely tuned than Raleigh's, but its point is the same: *Lycidas* is about becoming, the emergence of the ego to its full power; or in Rajan's more guarded vocabulary, "it is a voyage toward recognition," a recognition that is won to some extent at the expense of the claims to adequacy of pastoral and other ritual or public forms.

For Rajan, then, the contest between the conventional and the real or personal is the story the poem tells; what I am suggesting is that it is a story *the speaker* tells, and that he tells it in an effort to situate himself in a place not already occupied by public and conventional meanings. It is less "a cry out of the heart of experience" than a *strategy*, a strategy designed to privilege experience, and especially *individual* experience, in relation to the impersonality of public and institutional structures. That is why the efficacy of the pastoral is called into question so that the efficacy of the speaker, as someone who stands apart from conventions and is in a position to evaluate them, can be that much more firmly established. In other words, the characterization of the pastoral is deliberately low and feeble in order to display to advantage the authority and prescience of the speaker when he pronounces in his own voice, as he does at line 64: "Alas, what boots it with incessant care." Here, and in the lines that follow, the speaker is at the height of his powers, in the sense that he seems to have earned the questions he hurls at the world, questions whose force is in direct proportion to the claim (silently, but effectively made) to sincerity. Here is no mediated pastoral voice, heard through a screen of tradition and ritual; here is the thing itself, the expression of a distinctive perspective on a problem that many have considered ("Yet once more"), but never with such poignancy and perceptiveness. It is precisely what Rajan says it is, a cry out of the heart of experience, a cry which emerges from the wreckage of failed conventions to pose the ultimate question: in a world like this, what does one do?

II. THE SWAIN IS SILENCED

It is all the more startling, then, when that cry is interrupted by the voice of Apollo, a moment characterized by Ransom as

"an incredible interpolation" and "a breach in the logic of composition." These are strong words, but they are in response to a very strong effect given the extent to which the speaker has, to this point, asserted his control over the poem and its progression. Here the control is taken from him in so complete a way that we as readers do not even know when it happens. The identification of Apollo's voice occurs at the beginning of line 77 ("Phoebus replied"), but the identification is after the fact, with the result that there is no way of determining who has been speaking. Many editors add punctuation to make it "clear" that Phoebus enters with "But not the praise"; but as we read Milton's unpunctuated text, "but not the praise" seems to be part of a dialogue the first person voice is having with himself on the nature of Fame and its relationship to effort ("incessant care"). The correction supplied by "Phoebus replied" does not result in a simple reassignment of the half line, but blurs, retroactively, the assignment of the lines preceding. When does Phoebus begin to speak? Is this his first reply, or has he begun to respond to the first person complaint at line 70: "*Fame* is the spur . . ."? The first person would then return in line 73—"But the fair Guerdon when we hope to find"—and *then* Phoebus would be heard to reply "But not the praise." My point is not to argue for this particular redistribution of the lines, but to demonstrate that it is possible; and because it is just one among other possibilities, and because the matter cannot be settled once and for all, the question of just who is in charge of the poem becomes a real one.

This is not the only question raised by Apollo's intervention. Because "replied" is in the past tense, what had presented itself as speech erupting in the present is suddenly revealed to be recollected or reported speech. As Ransom observes, "dramatic monologue has turned . . . into narrative"; and the result, in Friedman's words, "is a momentary confusion about the nature of the utterance we are listening to."¹⁶ The confusion is not only generic (monologue or narrative), but extends to the kind of hearing we are to give to that utterance, for "if the memory of Phoebus's words is reported by the swain as part of the elegy, then what has happened to the pretense of spontaneity and present creation?" Friedman's question contains its own answer (although it is not

¹⁶ Ransom, "A Poem Nearly Anonymous," above, 83; Friedman, "Swain's Paideia," 33.

the one he eventually gives): it is here that the spontaneity begins to be exposed precisely as a pretense, as a claim elaborately made by the speaker from his very first words: "Yet once more." Although these words acknowledge convention (by acknowledging that this has been done before), they are themselves unconventional, because they are not produced within the frame or stage setting that traditionally encloses the pastoral lament. From Theocritus to Spenser, elegiac song is introduced into a situation that proclaims its status as artifice, as a piece of currency in a social exchange (song for bowl), or as a performance offered in competition. In *Lycidas*, however, the frame is omitted, and what we hear, or are encouraged to hear, is an unpremeditated outpouring of grief and anger. When Apollo's reply is reported in the past tense, the pastoral frame is introduced retroactively, and the suggestion is that it has been there all the while. Immediately the spontaneity of the preceding lines is compromised, and compromised too are the claims of the speaker to independence. At the very moment he dismisses the pastoral, he is revealed to be a narrated pastoral figure, no longer the teller of his tale, but told by it, identified and made intelligible, as it were, by the very tradition he scorns. Moreover, he is identified in such a way as to call into question his identity. When Apollo plucks his trembling ear, he repeats an action already performed in response to another poet who also has dreams of transcending the pastoral conventions:

When I tried a song of kings and battles, Phoebus
Plucked my ear and warned, "A shepherd, Tityrus,
Should feed fat sheep, recite a fine-spun song."
(Virgil, *Eclogue VI*, trans. Paul Alpers)

Apollo, in short, puts Virgil in his place, and by doing so establishes a place (or commonplace) that is now occupied by the present speaker. That is, the desire of the poet to rise above the pastoral is itself a pastoral convention, and when the speaker of *Lycidas* gives voice to that desire, he succeeds only in demonstrating the extent to which his thoughts and actions are already inscribed in the tradition from which he would be separate. Not only are his ambitions checked by Apollo,¹⁷ but they are not *his*

¹⁷ Friedman, "Swain's Paideia," 13.

ambitions, insofar as he is only playing out the role assigned him in a drama not of his making.

It is not too much to say, then, that the intervention of Apollo changes everything: the speaker loses control of his poem when another voice simply dislodges him from center stage (where he had been performing in splendid isolation), and, at the same time, the integrity of his own voice is compromised when it becomes indistinguishable from its Virgilian predecessor. Apollo poses a threat to the speaker not only as a maker, as someone who is in the act of building the lofty rhyme, but a self-contained consciousness, as a mind that is fully present to itself and responsible for its own perceptions. The speaker meets this twin threat by rewriting, or misreading, what has happened to him in such a way as to reinstate, at least for the moment, the fiction of his independence:

O fountain *Arethuse*, and thou honour'd flood,
Smooth-sliding *Mincius*, crown'd with vocall reeds,
That strain I heard was of higher mood:
But now my oat proceeds. (85-88)

The picture in these lines is of someone who has paused to listen, no doubt politely, to the opinion of another before proceeding resolutely on *his* way (the strong claim is in the *my* of "my oat"). There is no acknowledgment at all of the violence of Apollo's entrance, of his brusque and dismissive challenge to the speaker's sentiments, of the peremptory and unceremonious manner in which he seizes the floor. Moreover, the action Apollo performs is misrepresented when it is reported as an action *against* the pastoral ("That strain was of a higher mood"). In fact, it is an action against the speaker, a rebuke, as Mary Christopher Pecheux observes, to his "rebellious questioning."¹⁸ If Apollo's words are higher, they are higher than the speaker's own; rather than supporting his denigration of the pastoral, they are precisely pastoral words and mark the moment when the tradition interrupts the "bold discourse"¹⁹ of one who scorns it and exposes the illusion of his control.

It is in order to maintain the illusion that the speaker sets

¹⁸ "The Dread Voice in *Lycidas*," *Milton Studies* 9 (1976): 238.

¹⁹ See *Paradise Lost*, 5:803 ff.: "Thus far his bold discourse without control / Had audience, when, among the Seraphim, / Abdiel . . . / Stood up."

Apollo against the pastoral, for he can then present himself as the judge of their respective assertions. But no sooner has he reclaimed the central and directing role ("But now my oat proceeds") than it is once again taken from him:

But now my oat proceeds,
And listens to the Herald of the Sea
That came in *Neptune's* plea. (88-90)

Suddenly the voices competing for attention, and for the position of authority, multiply and become difficult to distinguish. Triton comes, but he comes in Neptune's plea, and therefore when we read of someone who "ask'd" the waves and felon winds (91), it is not clear whether that someone is Triton or Neptune, nor when that someone speaks (it could be that Triton reports the investigative queries of Neptune—he "ask'd"—or that Triton *now* asks in the present of the narrative, but is reported as having done so in the present of the narrator, i.e. the voice that tells us Phoebus "repli'd"). The one thing that is clear is that the questioner is not the speaker, who is now reduced to the role of a listener, as someone else conducts the investigation. Again, that someone else could be Triton or Neptune or the yet unknown third person voice of whose existence we have had only hints, or, after line 96, it could be the "sage Hippotades" who brings someone's (it seems to be everyone's) unsatisfactory answers. By the time we reach the most unsatisfactory answer of all—"It was that fatall and perfidious Bark"—there is absolutely no way of determining who delivers it. A poem that began as the focused utterance of a distinctive personal voice is by this point so diffused that it is spoken, quite literally, by everybody.

Not only is the original speaker now indistinguishable from a chorus, but he is not even the object of direct address, as he was when he listened to Apollo. Whoever it is that indicts the fatal and perfidious bark, he directs his remarks to Lycidas: "That sunk so low that sacred head of *thine*." Moreover, the indictment and the entire investigation are once again proceeding in a narrated past. The fading of the speaker from the scene of his own poem coincides with the almost imperceptible slide into the past tense, and both movements are complete when we hear (we have displaced the speaker, who is no longer even a prominent lis-

tener) that "last came, and last did go / The Pilot of the Galilean lake" (109).

It would seem that with this figure the poem is once again dominated by a single controlling presence, but his identity (in two senses) is perhaps not so firm as we have been taught to think. Taking up a suggestion first made by R. E. Hone, Mary Pecheux has argued persuasively that the Pilot of the Galilean lake (who significantly is not named) is not Peter, but a composite of Peter, Moses, and Christ. The speech thus dramatizes Milton's assertion in *Christian Doctrine* that revelation was disclosed in various ages by Christ even though he was not always known under that name: "Under the name of Christ are also comprehended Moses and the Prophets, who were his forerunners, and the Apostles whom he sent."²⁰ This splitting of the "dread voice" has the advantage, as Pecheux points out, of being "consonant with the extraordinary richness and ambivalence" of the poem, with the sense one has "of having heard a multitude of overtones difficult to disentangle from one another." The details of her argument are less important than the fact that it can be made (and others are now making it), for this means that the question is now an open one, and that the Pilot's speech too proceeds from a source that is not *uniquely* identified.

That speech is also addressed to Lycidas ("How well could I have spar'd for thee, young swain"), and its "stern" message further shifts attention away from the first person voice by replacing his very personal concerns with the concerns of the church as a whole. That is, the complaint one hears in these lines is quite different from the complaint that precedes Apollo's interruption: it is not an answer to the speaker's questions ("What boots it . . ."), but a "higher" questioning in which the ambitions of any one shepherd or singer are absorbed into a more universal urgency, as rot and foul contagion spread (127). The focus of the Pilot's words is continually expanding, until it opens in the end on a perspective so wide that all of our attempts to name it are at once accurate and hopelessly inadequate. Whatever the two-handed engine is—and we shall never know—the action for which it stands ready will not be in response to any cry out of the heart of experience, and in this moment of apoca-

²⁰ "The Dread Voice in *Lycidas*," 235.

lyptic prophecy, the private lament that was, for a time, the poem's occasion is so much transcended that one can scarcely recall it.

This movement away from the personal is a structural component of Milton's work from the very beginning. It is seen as early as the Nativity Ode, where the poet begins by desiring to be first, to stand out ("Have thou the honor first thy Lord to greet"), and ends by being indistinguishable from the others (animals, angels, shepherds) who "all about the Courtly Stable / . . . sit in order serviceable." The glory he had hoped to win by being first is won when, in a sense, he no longer is, and is able to pronounce the glorious death of his own poetic ambitions ("Time is our tedious Song should here have ending"). While the career of the speaker in *Lycidas* is parallel, it is also different because he does not relinquish his position voluntarily. He holds tenaciously to his own song and must be forcibly removed from the poem by voices that preempt him or displace him or simply ignore him until at the end of the Pilot's speech he seems to have disappeared.

Indeed, so long has it been since he was last on stage (line 90) that when he suddenly pops up again he seems an interpolation more incredible than Apollo. He seems, in fact, a digression, a departure from what we have come to recognize as the poem's true concerns; and as a digression his gesture of reassertion is, in every sense, reactionary:

Return *Alpheus* the dread voice is past
That shrunk thy streams; Return *Sicilian* Muse,
And call the Vales and bid them hither cast
Their bells and Flourets of a thousand hues. (132-35)

Once again the return of the speaker is marked by a rewriting that is a misrepresentation. He acts as if all had been proceeding under his direction, as if the voices in the poem require his permission to come and go, a permission he now extends to the pastoral, which is characterized as if it were a child that had been frightened by the sound of an adult voice. His strategy is two pronged, and it is familiar. He opposes the pastoral to the speech of the Galilean Pilot (as he had earlier opposed it to Apollo) and thus denies it the responsibility for documenting ecclesiastical abuses, a responsibility it was given in the Scrip-

tures. In effect, it is he, not the Pilot, who shrinks, or attempts to shrink, the pastoral stream, and he does it, characteristically, in a denial of the extent to which his own stream has been shrunk in the course of the poem. In a classic form of displacement he attempts, for the last time, to project a story in which he is a compelling and powerful figure. It is as part of that story that he calls the role of flowers, a gesture intended not so much to "interpose a little ease" as to set the stage for still another assertion of pastoral inadequacy:

Let our frail thoughts dally with false surmise. (153)

As before, what is presented as self-deprecation is an act of self-promotion. The "frail thoughts" are detached from the speaker—he merely dallies with them—and identified with the failure of the convention: if, in some sense, he can do no better, at least he is able to recognize a false surmise when he sees one, and that ability in itself is evidence of a vision that is superior even if it is (realistically) dark:

Ay me! Whils't thee the shores and sounding Seas
Wash far away, where ere thy bones are hurl'd. (154-55)

This is, of course, exactly what he has said before, when he breaks off his address to the nymphs to exclaim, "Aye me, I fondly dream," and again, when his rehearsal of Orpheus's death (he also was hurled by shores and sounding seas) is followed by a bitter question: "Alas! What boots it with incessant care?" What is remarkable about the speaker is how little he is affected by those sections of the poem that unfold between his intermittent appearances. Higher moods and dread voices may come and go, but when he manages to regain the stage, it is to sing the same old song: Ay me, alas, what am I to do? What's the use? it's all so unfair. As the poem widens its perspective to include ever larger considerations (eternal fame, the fate of the Church, the condition of the Christian community, the last judgment), he remains within the perspective of his personal disappointment, remains very much "his owne person," and therefore he becomes, as I have said, a digression in (what began as) his own poem. While he has been busily exposing the false surmises of pastoral consolation, the poem has been even more insistently exposing the surmise that enables him (or so he thinks)

to do so, the surmise that his vision is both inclusive and conclusive, that he sees what there is to see and knows what there is to know.

What he sees is that there is no laureate hearse (only the "wat'ry bier" he saw at line 12), and what he knows is that there is neither justice nor meaning in the world. He seems to have heard in the Pilot's speech none of the resonances that have been reported by so many readers. His words remain determinedly bleak, and therefore, they are all the more discontinuous with the call that is sounded at line 165:

Weep no more woful Shepherds, weep no more,
For *Lycidas* your sorrow is not dead.

These are entirely new accents spoken by an entirely new voice. It is a voice that counsels rather than complains, that turns outward rather than inward, a voice whose confident affirmation of a universal benevolence could not be further from the dark and self-pitying questioning of the swain. Everything, in short, has changed, and it has changed not even in a line, but in the space between lines. It is at this point that the orthodox reading of the poem, in which "the troubled thought of the elegist" traces out a sequence of "rise, evolution, and resolution," founders.²¹ There is no evolution here, simply a disjunction, a gap, and the seekers of unity are left with the problem of explaining it. In general, their explanations have taken one of two forms. Either the change is explained theologically as "a leap from nature to revelation"²² and "a dramatization of the infusion of grace,"²³ or it is explained away by assigning the lines to another speaker. This is the solution of William Madsen, who notes the abrupt transition from the "plaintive" and "ineffectual" to the authoritative and concludes that the consolation is spoken not by the swain, but by Michael, who responds in a fuller measure than might have been expected to the speaker's appeal ("Look homeward, Angel, now and melt with ruth"). Madsen offers his emendation as an alternative to the theological reading; but in fact there is very little difference between them, since in either reading this point marks the appearance in the poem of "a new voice."

²¹ M. H. Abrams. "Five Types of *Lycidas*," above, 228.

²² Ibid., 233.

²³ Friedman, "Swain's *Paideia*," 19.

For Madsen that voice is Michael's; for Abrams and Friedman (among others) it is the voice of a regenerated (made new) swain. In either case there is agreement that the voice we had been hearing is heard no more, and that what takes its place is something wholly different. This is of course not the first time this has happened, and it is only because in Madsen's reading the event is unusual that he feels moved to assign the new voice a specific name (it is that assignment that has been objected to). In the reading that has been developed here, however, the appearance of new voices and the merging of old is occurring all the time; the speaker is repeatedly dislodged or overwhelmed or absorbed, and his disappearance at line 164 is just one in a series.

There is, however, a difference. This disappearance is the last; the speaker is never heard from again. Or if he is heard from again, it is not as his "owne person" but as a "member incorporate" of a truth from which he is now indistinguishable. That is to say, Madsen is right to hear the voice as different, but he is wrong to hear it as anyone's in particular. The accents here, as Marjorie Nicolson has observed, are "choral" as "all voices combine in virtuous crescendo."²⁴ If the speaker is among them, he is literally unrecognizable, since what allowed him to stand out was the "dogged insistence"²⁵ with which he held on to the local perspective of his own ambitions. In the end he is not even distinguishable as an addressee: the choral voice responds not to one, but to a mass of complaints; the consolation is for "woful Shepherds," the plural noun silently denying the speaker even the claim to have been uniquely grieving; the grief is as general as the consolation, and it simply doesn't leave room for anything personal. The distance that has been travelled is the distance from the melodious tear of line 14 to the "unexpressive nuptial Song" of line 176. The tear falls from a single eye; it is the poem as the product of one voice that demands to be heard, if only as an expression of inconsolability; but the nuptial song is produced by everyone and therefore *heard* by no one, in the sense that there is no one who is at a sufficient distance from it for there to be a question of hearing. That is why it is called "unexpressive," which means both inexpressible (can't be said) and

²⁴ John Milton: *A Reader's Guide to his Poetry* (New York, 1963), 110.

²⁵ The phrase is Madsen's, *From Shadowy Types*, 13.

inaudible (can't be apprehended): both speaking and receiving assume a separation between communicating agents; but this song is not a communication at all, but a testimony to a joy which, since it binds all, need not be transmitted to any. The mistake of the first person voice has been his desire to speak, to proclaim from an analytic and judgmental distance a truth he only sees; but in the great vision of these soaring lines the truth proclaims, because it fills, its speakers, who are therefore not speakers at all but witnesses. They are in the happy condition for which Milton prays at the end of *At a Solemn Music*:

O may we soon again renew that song
And keep in tune with heaven, till God ere long
To his celestial consort us unite
To live with him and sing in endless morn of light.

The wish that we may join that choir is the wish that we *not* be heard as a distinctive and therefore alienated voice, the wish that we might utter sounds in such a way as to remain silent (unexpressive). It is a wish that is here granted the would-be elegist, whether he wants it or not, as finally, he is no longer his own person, but a member incorporate into that truth whereof he has been persuaded.

I am aware that this might seem a back door way into the usual reading of *Lycidas*, for just like any other critic I have gotten the swain into heaven or at least into a position where a heavenly vision is available to him. But if he is now one of those who sing and singing in their glory move, he could not be picked out from among the other members of troops and societies, and therefore his "triumph," if one can call it that, is not achieved in terms that he would understand or welcome. As Friedman remarks, the speaker "fights *against* the knowledge" offered by the poem's higher moods; his experience is "one of active struggle." My point is that it is a struggle he loses, and that the poem achieves its victory first by preempting him and finally by silencing him. Rather than the three part structure traditionally proposed for *Lycidas*, I am proposing a structure of two parts: a first part (lines 1 through 75 1/2), where the first person voice proceeds under the illusion of independence and control, and a second, longer part, where that illusion is repeatedly exposed and finally dispelled altogether. In place of an interior lyric punctuated by

digressive interpolations, we have a poem that begins in digression—the first person voice is the digression—and regains the main path only when the lyric note is no longer sounded. We have, in short, a poem that relentlessly denies the privilege of the speaking subject, of the unitary and separate consciousness, and is finally, and triumphantly, anonymous.

It is anonymous twice. The last eight lines of *Lycidas* have always been perceived as problematic, because they insist on a narrative frame that was not apparent in the beginning, because the frame or coda is spoken by an unidentified third person voice, and because that voice is so firmly impersonal. One advantage of the reading offered here is that these are not problems at all: if the introduction of a narrative perspective suggests that everything presented as spontaneous was in fact already spoken, this is no more than a confirmation of what has long since become obvious; if the new voice is unidentified, it is only the last in a series of unidentified voices or of voices whose single identities have long since been lost or blurred; and if the unidentified voice is impersonal, it is merely a continuation of the mode the poem has finally achieved. In fact, the crucial thing about these lines is that there is no one to whom they can be plausibly assigned. They are certainly not the swain's, for he is what they describe, and they describe him significantly as someone who is "uncouth," that is, unknown, someone who departs the poem with less of an identity than he displayed at its beginning; nor is there any compelling reason to assign them to any of the previous speakers, to the Pilot, or Hippotades, or Triton, or Neptune, or Cambridge, or Apollo. The only recourse, and it is one that has appealed to many, is to assign the lines to Milton, but of all the possibilities, this is the least persuasive. No voice in English poetry is more distinctive than Milton's, so much so that the characters he creates almost always sound just like him. But these lines do not sound like anyone; they are perfectly, that is unrelievedly, conventional, and as such they are the perfect conclusion to a poem from which the personal has been systematically eliminated. Indeed, if these lines were written in accents characteristically Miltonic, they would constitute a claim exactly like that which is denied to the poem's first speaker, the claim to be able to pronounce, to sum up, to say it conclusively, and once and for all. Instead, Milton gives over the conclusion of the poem to a col-

lection of pastoral commonplaces which are not even structured into a summary statement, but simply follow one another in a series that is unconstrained by any strong syntactical pressures. (The lines are markedly paratactic and conform to what Thomas Rosenmeyer has called the "disconnective decorum" of the pure pastoral.)²⁶ In short, Milton silences himself, just as the first person voice is silenced, and performs (if that is the word) an act of humility comparable to that which allows him to call his nativity ode "tedious" at the very moment when its intended recipient falls asleep. Rosemond Tuve once observed that in Herbert's career we can see a lifelong effort to achieve the "immolation of the individual will." This has not usually been thought to be Milton's project, but the determined anonymity of *Lycidas* should remind us that the poet's fierce egoism is but one-half of his story.

²⁶ *The Green Cabinet* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1969), 33.



Postscript

M. H. Abrams

In the essay I wrote a quarter century ago (above, 216 ff.), I emphasized the drastic changes effected in our reading of *Lycidas* by alternative critical perspectives—in other words, by diverse hypotheses as to the principle which controls the choice, order, and interrelations of the parts of the poem and serves to account for the nature and degree of its poetic success. In the present critical climate, however, in which we hear frequent claims that all literary texts disseminate themselves into a range of undecidable and inescapably contradictory meanings, one needs to emphasize the other side of the matter; and that is, the uniformity of the interpretive premises that are shared by all the critics represented in this volume, whatever the diversity of their critical hypotheses, and including the authors of the six essays, published during the last two decades, which have been added to the present edition.

The most important of these premises is that the sentences of Milton's poem have a determinable meaning—even though in some instances that meaning is determinably ambiguous or multiplex—which qualified readers are capable of understanding in approximately the same way. To this view the essay by Stanley Fish might be regarded as an exception by those who know Fish's claim, in his theoretical writings, that there are a number of possible "interpretive strategies," each of which creates its own distinctive text by "constituting" both the formal prop-

You and Thou in Shakespeare's Sonnets

ANDREW GURR

SONNET 26 BEGINS proudly 'Lord of my love . . .'. The conceit on which the poem is based is the language of dedications and of the writer as the dedicatee's humble servant —

Lord of my love, to whom in vassalage
Thy merit hath my duty strongly knit,
To thee I send this written ambassage,
To witness duty, not to show my wit.

'Lord of my love' is a finely complex phrase. It takes up the conventional address 'my lord' and makes it more specific — the poet is not the dedicatee's servant except in the service of love. And so the poet performs all his servant-like duties in the service of love. The phrase simultaneously affirms the love-bond and asserts the respectful distance of the poet from the lord.

This distance is recorded in the sonnets in many places and in many ways. In those magnificent reproving sonnets, 33-35, for instance, the young lord is given the qualities of a king, whose 'sovereign eye' can cure the king's evil and which is equated with the health-giving sun as well as with the gold of more mundane sovereigns —

Full many a glorious morning have I seen
Flatter the mountain tops with sovereign eye,
Kissing with golden face the meadows green,
Gilding pale streams with heavenly alchemy.

. . .

Even so my sun one early morn did shine
With all triumphant splendour on my brow . . .

It is a sonnet of reproof, of hurt at an injury casually given, and so is properly put in the third person. 'My sun' is wholly personal and yet stiffly withdrawn. Not until the reproof has been acknowledged will the poet turn again to direct address, in the next sonnet. 'Why *didst* thou promise such a beauteous day/And make me travel forth without my cloak?' is a marvellous extension of the image, holding it simultaneously as splendid – the morning sun – and petty – getting caught in the rain without a coat. Again the mighty and the humble are juxtaposed.

This juxtaposition of the great and the humble is the background to my main subject, the use of second person pronouns in the sonnets. As we all know, 'thou' and 'you' were used differently then, more or less in the way the French and Germans still differentiate the singular and the intimate from the plural and the formal or respectful. *Tutoyer* is not good French except with family and intimate friends or children. In Elizabethan English the usage was broadly similar. There is a neat illustration of it in *Richard III* I. iv., the scene of the murder of Clarence. When Brackenbury talks to Clarence he properly addresses him as 'you', befitting a Duke and a king's brother. The murderers familiarly call each other 'thou', and when Clarence awakes they at first call him 'my lord', and 'you'. He of course addresses each murderer as 'thou'. The murderers stick to the respectful 'you' even after confessing that they have come to murder him, until Clarence's curses upset them too much, and they drop to the singular –

And that same vengeance doth (God) hurl on thee
For false forswearing and for murder too:
Thou didst receive the sacrament to fight
In quarrel of the house of Lancaster.

(204-7)

They stick to 'thee' and 'thou' until the shouting dies and Clarence starts to plead with them. Mention of Clarence's royal brothers brings back the respectful 'you'. During the whole scene only hot anger prevents the observation of rank and the proper use of the honorific pronoun.¹ As we all know, protocol and decorum tends in any society to insist on precision in the choice of the correct terms of address above all.

This being so, we should be rather surprised to see what pronouns Shakespeare uses in the first seventeen of the sonnets to the young man. In the first twelve sonnets the young man is uniformly addressed as 'thou'. These are the formal sonnets, the ones the young man's mother may have employed the poet to write, as is hinted in sonnet 3. They are the sonnets written in the knowledge that Erasmus had an epistle 'to persuade a young man to marriage', quoted in Thomas Wilson's *Art of Rhetoric* of 1553 which Shakespeare also made use of for Sonnet 129 and others.² Sonnets 1-17 are all directly on the theme of procreation, although the last three of them begin a transition by reducing the procreation argument and suggesting that there are other considerations in the praise of the young man's beauty which was the chief argument for procreation. This transition is marked by an increase in not just the warmth which goes with direct praise but in intimacy. The change is completed in the direct praise of Sonnet 18, 'Shall I compare thee to a summer's day,' which itself leads on to the 'Master-mistress' sonnet, 20, where the love of the poet for the young man is described as everything short of the physically sexual. The odd thing about the three transitional sonnets is that just as the warmth and intimacy begin to burgeon Shakespeare switches from 'thou' to 'you', and once the sequence is complete in Sonnet 17 he returns again to 'thou' — 'Shall I compare *thee* to a summer's day' Why the switch, and what effect does this switch have on our reading of the sonnets?

Altogether the 126 sonnets to the young friend ('dear friend' is the form of address in Sonnet 30) show a rather remarkable pattern of shifts between 'you' and 'thou'. The first twelve address him as 'thou', then there is some switching between 'thou' and 'you', and some which speak of him in the third person. Sonnets 18 to 51 — 34 in all — uniformly address him as 'thou'. Then 52-59 consistently employ 'you', except for 56, which begins 'Sweet love renew thy force', and is addressed to the god of love. Then come three 'thou' sonnets, six third-person sonnets (63-68), then a set of alternating pairs, two 'thou', two 'you', two 'thou' and two 'you', the last of which is the first of the rival poet sonnets. Seven of this group are to 'you' and three to 'thou'. There follows a series, 87-99, all 'thou' except for the third-

person 94 ('They that have power to hurt', another reproof sonnet) and 98, a poem about long separation. Of the last twenty-seven sonnets nine are addressed 'thou' – two runs of four and five – twelve are to 'you', four are in the third person and two (100-101) are to his Muse, addressed as 'thou'.

This looks like a remarkable display of inconsistency. In all, there are seventy-three 'thou' sonnets and thirty-four 'you' sonnets, and only one (24) which uses both 'thou' and 'you' – though only to differentiate personal 'thou' from general 'you'. Why? There are several possible explanations for the switches from singular to plural, or intimate to impersonal, but none of them readily satisfy the conditions that a complete explanation would call for. One might argue for instance that the need for rhymes dictates the choice of one or the other – 'you' to rhyme with 'true' in 114, for instance, or 'thine/mine' in 26, or even 'receivest/deceivest' in 40 – but this could only be the case in a very limited number of examples, and there are in all twenty switches of person in the 126 sonnets, besides the one run of thirty-four with no change.

In some cases we might argue that euphony would dictate the choice – 'thine eyes' for instance in 14 is obviously preferable to 'your eyes'. But on the other hand the very next sonnet, 15 ends

And all in war with time for love of you,
As he takes from you, I engraft you new,

which is a distinct cacophony sounding much better as 'I engraft thee new'. The sound 'you' might have a point of course if we take seriously the 'Willie Hughes' name for the young man in Oscar Wilde's entertaining fantasy, and see 'you' as a pun on 'Hugh'. Sonnet 20 is commonly taken to include a pun on the name –

A man in hew all *Hews* in his controwling.

Stephen Booth' admits a possible pun on 'you' in the first 'hue' here. But even that wild hypothesis couldn't explain many of the twenty switches between singular and plural.

Nor can we take seriously the idea that the sonnets as printed in the 1609 quarto are seriously disarranged, and that originally all the 'you' and all the 'thou' sonnets were grouped together. In the verse epistles written to a patron by a contemporary of Shakespeare, Samuel Daniel, there does seem to be such a grouping. The early epistles used 'thou' and the later ones 'you'. The latest editor of Daniel in fact has used this change as a basis for dating some of the epistles.⁴ But we can't easily use the same argument with Shakespeare's sonnets. The switching is manifest, for instance, in the first block of seventeen sonnets which everyone who has tried to find a new sequence agrees are a single unit. 1-12 use 'thou', 13 switches to 'you', 14 goes back to 'thou' and 15-17 take up 'you' again. Brents Stirling, author of the most substantial attempt at regrouping the sonnets, says that 'certain elements of the 1-17 block may be disarranged, but I can find no tangible evidence that this is so, or that anything is missing'.⁵

We can get a little closer to the truth of the matter, perhaps, by noting what seems to have been a shift in emphasis in the use of the two persons at about this time. It applies more to Daniel but may have had a bearing on Shakespeare too. This is the possibility that the use of 'thou' became rather self-consciously a 'literary' usage by the 1590s. The argument over the Daniel switch is that the earlier epistles used 'thou' because they were literary works written by the humble poet to his great patroness. Not until the relationship became *more* personal and intimate did he change to the more human, less conventional form of address. In Shakespeare's sonnets this might help to explain why Sonnets 1-17 start with 'thou' and change to 'you' and would also fit with the consistent address to gods and muses as 'thou' – the love-god of 56 is 'thou', and the muse of 100-101 is also 'thou' – invocations to such figures being an obviously literary device. E. A. Abbott's *Shakespearian Grammar* defines four main uses of 'thou' in Shakespeare which help to confirm this point. He says

*Thou . . . was . . . the pronoun of (1) affection towards friends (2) good-humoured superiority to servants, and (3) contempt or anger to strangers. It had, however, already fallen somewhat into disuse, and, being regarded as archaic, was naturally adopted (4) in the higher poetic style and in the language of solemn prayer.*⁶

He offers as an instance of this last point in Shakespeare's plays the French Herald's solemn address to King Henry in *Henry V*, IV. vii.74, after Agincourt, where the high style of courtesy makes him address Henry as 'thou'.

There is space here only to look at one of the switches between 'thou' and 'you' in the sonnets. I have chosen the change which appears in sonnets 1-17 for several reasons: first, that it is the group where there is least argument about the sequence; secondly, because it is the first switch, and therefore the one over which we might expect the poet to be most self-conscious. And thirdly, it seems to offer quite as many difficulties in deciding what was going on as any other switch.

Sonnets 1-12 all use the singular. The very first sonnet begins its second quatrain as direct address in the singular. The first quatrain makes the generalisation which broaches the subject of all twelve sonnets:

From fairest creatures we desire increase . . .

and in the second quatrain the fifth line addresses the young man in an emphatic singular:

But thou, contracted to thine owne bright eyes
Feed'st thy light's flame with self-substantial fuel,

and so on — for 12 sonnets. On average 'thou', 'thee' or 'thy' occur nine times in each sonnet (the actual number is 8, 10, 11, 14, 0 — linked with the next, 14, 4, 9, 7, 15, 11, 3). They are all elegant, forceful, witty, and literary in form, matching the 'literary' use of 'thou' which we find in so many of the sonnet sequences by other poets in the 1590s.

But then comes Sonnet 13. It switches to 'you', and makes the change so emphatically that we get 'you' or 'your' seventeen times in the one sonnet, eight in the very first quatrain, and six times in the first two lines:

O that you were yourself, but love you are
No longer yours than you yourself here live.
Against this coming end you should prepare,
And your sweet semblance to some other give.

Clearly, a change is being signalled. And the prime reason for the change is surely signalled chiefly in the very first line by that intrusive vocative. 'O that you were your self, but (*love*) you are/No longer yours than you yourself here live.' This is the first open declaration of a real intimacy, a casually (pseudo-casually) inserted endearment. There has been a jump in the level of intimacy between the poet and the young man. We can almost measure it, if we look back at Sonnet 10, where the first reference to love appears. Sonnet 10 begins with a faintly avuncular piece of chiding –

For shame deny that thou bear'st love to any –

and continues to develop consideration of love as a factor in the procreation argument:

Grant if thou wilt, thou art belov'd of many,
But that thou none lov'st is most evident.

And the third quatrain and final couplet read

O change thy thought, that I may change my mind.
Shall hate be fairer lodged than gentle love?
Be as thy presence is, gracious and kind,
Or to thy self at least kind-hearted prove.
Make thee another self for love of me,
That beauty still may live in thine or thee.

The theme is still procreation – make thee another self – but the argument is now that he should do it 'for love of me'.

Sonnets 11 and 12 retreat a little from this demonstration of assertiveness in the poet. Sonnet 12 is the most stately and impersonal of all this group – very largely an accumulation of images of ruinous time, ending very ominously

And nothing 'gainst time's scythe can make defence
Save breed to brave him when he takes thee thence.

So much for the argument that procreation is a duty for the young man. Now it is his only defence. Sonnet 13 then suddenly alters the tone, from the solemn and gloomy to an

urgently personal note of appeal. Six 'yous' in the first two lines and the vocative 'love' stress the new tone, and so do the last six lines, which start with the same ominous note of Sonnet 12 but end as a personal appeal.

Who lets so fair a house fall to decay,
Which husbandry in honour might uphold
Against the stormy gusts of winter's day
And barren rage of death's eternal cold?
O none but unthrifths, dear my love you know,
You had a father, let your son say so.

'Dear my love': now the claim the poet is making on the young man is in the open. It is signalled, quite properly, by that emphatic transfer from the singular pronoun to the plural. It marks the change from formal, 'literary', possibly even commissioned poems, written on someone else's behalf, to a wholly personal appeal, in the intimacy and urgency of a loving relationship.

But then we have Sonnet 14, and a brief reversion to the singular pronoun before the intimacy resumes in 15, 16 and 17. Perhaps it signifies a discreet withdrawal, just as 11 and 12 became more 'literary' and formal after the first declaration of love in 10. We can hardly blame the humble poet for tentativeness as he advances his claims in the relationship with the young aristocrat. Sonnet 14 still has a personal note in it, since there are more 'I's than in any of the previous sonnets. It begins

Not from the stars do I my judgement pluck,
And yet methinks I have astronomy . . .

but it openly refers backwards to the first sonnets, especially in line 9, where 'thine eyes' picks up 'thine own bright eyes' of Sonnet 1, 'thine own deep-sunken eyes' of Sonnet 2, and 'The lovely gaze where every eye doth dwell' of Sonnet 5. There is, too, a touch of self-consciousness now in the procreation argument itself, which makes the final couplet sound mannered, almost as if it is guying itself:

Or else of thee this I prognosticate,
Thy end is truth's and beauty's doom and date.

The inversion ('this I') and the polysyllable ending the first of these lines are self-consciously pompous.

The astrology conceit is of course superbly redeployed in the next sonnet, the first famous one from this group:

When I consider everything that grows
Holds in perfection but a little moment,
That this huge stage presenteth nought but shows
Whereon the stars in secret influence comment. . . .

It opens with a firmly personal declaration, 'When I consider . . .', and concludes:

Then the conceit of this inconstant stay
Sets you most rich in youth before my sight,
Where wasteful time debateth with decay
To change your day of youth to sullen night;
And all in war with time for love of you,
As he takes from you, I engraft you new.

These last six lines concentrate in themselves all the main points relevant to this switch from singular 'thou' to personal 'you'.

Firstly, the poet calls the whole theme of time and procreation his 'conceit': he acknowledges his poetic framework, what I have called the 'literary' element in these poems. And it is a poetic conceit which has done exactly what he then claims for it – set you most rich in youth before my sight. Most rich: we must never forget that the young man who is to become the 'master-mistress of my passion' in Sonnet 20, the 'Lord of my love' in 26, and the 'dear friend' of Sonnet 30, was indeed a wealthy aristocrat. Nor must we forget the poet's world, the 'outcast state' (Sonnet 29) which made him a motley to the view (Sonnet 110), of which we might be reminded in the third line of this poem, by the 'huge stage' which 'presenteth nought but shows'.

Secondly, the poet is writing out of love, not for any commission nor according to the theme in Wilson's *Art of Rhetoric*. He is 'all in war with time for love of you'. The battle is joined in poetry – 'my pupil pen' in the next sonnet – and he raises for the first time the thought that is to recur

throughout the whole sequence, that these sonnets will give the youth, or his beauty, a form of immortality alternative to procreation. 'I engraft you new' is the conclusion, a theme developed in the next two sonnets, which conclude that poetry is not so much an alternative form of immortality as a supplement —

But were some child of yours alive that time,
You should live twice, in it and in my rhyme.

Marvellously casual of course — 'some child of yours'. That in fact is the last we ever hear of the procreation argument. In the following sonnets Shakespeare is entering a relationship of infinitely broader scope. 'Love of you' is the new theme announced in Sonnet 15.

There is a third point in these concluding six lines of Sonnet 15 which has a rather special bearing on the switch from 'thou' to 'you'. The whole sonnet is one sentence, a when . . . then construction, in which the first two quatrains begin 'When . . . ' and the third 'Then'. The first use of the second person plural comes in line 10:

Then the conceit of this inconstant stay
Sets *you* most rich in *youth* before my sight.

The same construction is repeated in line 12 — 'To change *your* day of *youth* to sullen night'. Shakespeare is here twice making a link between 'you' and 'youth'. 'Youth' implicitly becomes 'you-ness', your essential characteristics (just as 'truth' equals 'true-ness'), which makes it akin to the 'your self' of the first line of Sonnet 13, the first poem to use 'you'. Elizabethan printers and readers always separated out 'your' from 'self', so giving the term an emphasis we have lost. The 'self' which is you, your 'youth', is one of the main quibbles Shakespeare is deploying in these lines. And at the same time he is emphasising something. He is stressing the new pronoun, as he did in the opening of Sonnet 13. And that stress justifies the triumphant cacophony of the conclusion,

As he takes from you, I engraft you new.

The last phrase is powerfully compact. 'Engraft' meant procreation in the familiar sense of grafting new stock from old. But it also can have the Greek meaning, which we retain in 'graph' and 'graphic', *graphein*, to write.⁷ It thus launches the immortalising-in-rhyme theme of the next two sonnets, establishing a further link between 15 and 16 to add to the astrology conceit, and in the process, by the obtrusiveness of the concluding vowel-sounds, it flaunts the new pronoun. I engraft 'you' new.

To put it crudely, I think we have to accept that the sudden and emphatic adoption of 'you' in Sonnet 13 signals a change which can only have been a new sense of intimacy, a feeling of real love being born, to be celebrated in the form of verse but not in its formalities. Only when the subject of the poems changes from the procreation theme and turns to pure praise does the formality of the form recall the poet to the literary singular pronoun, in Sonnet 18, a simple and beautiful celebration of love and beauty, and a much more public affirmation than Sonnets 15, 16 and 17.

So long as men can breathe or eyes can see,
So long lives this, and this gives life to thee.

Proud, exultant, even boastful – properly a 'thou' sonnet, because it has an eye on the third party who will read this immortalising address from lover to beloved. Shakespeare is trying his wings in a novel experiment, a love-sonnet to a man. One of the first tentative flights in this audacious version of the traditional Petrarchan form was the 'master-mistress' sonnet, with its 'one thing to my purpose nothing'. The use of 'thou' in the earlier stages of this development, in 18-51, is part of the form being adapted, and helps consistently to remind us that it is an old form.

Perhaps the ultimate reason for Shakespeare reverting to the 'thou' form of address once launched on this new venture can be seen recorded in Sonnet 23. It comes in the midst of that smallish group, 18 to 25, up to the one beginning 'Lord of my love', all of which seem to be testing different possibilities in the new mode. After the cheekiness of 20, the master-mistress sonnet, 23 seems a much more cautious approach to the new status quo. It expresses fear, and does so in terms of actors.

As an imperfect actor on the stage,
Who with his fear is put besides his part . . .

is a simile set against the reality of love:

So I for fear of trust forget to say
The perfect ceremony of love's rite.

The image is one of a memorised speech. The actor is 'imperfect' because he forgets his lines. The ceremony or rite of love requires a perfectly memorised speech – to *say* the *ceremony*. The homonymic pun on right, however, makes a further assertion. Love has rights, dues, as well as ceremonials, rites. It is those rights which, in the conclusion, 'plead for love and look for recompense/More than that tongue that more hath more expressed'. This phrase, 'the perfect ceremony of love's right', has compressed in it both the formalities of love put into words, and the bonds, the quasi-legal rights which love owes. This poem is in fact the only sonnet which is clearly addressed to the young man – its final couplet reads

O learn to read what silent love hath writ,
To hear with eyes belongs to love's fine wit

– and which yet employs neither 'thou' nor 'you' nor any of their cognate forms. The perfect ceremony of love's right cannot make a choice between the intimate and the literary forms of address.

In the so-called 'Dark Lady' sonnets the poet either addresses her with the singular 'thou' or speaks of her in the third person. The only exception to this practice is the wholly exceptional Sonnet 145, the so-called 'Ann Hathaway' sonnet, where the mistress addresses the poet as 'you'. In effect, therefore, Shakespeare's poems to his mistress or mistresses uniformly employ the conventional or literary form of address. This fact strengthens the view that Shakespeare chose his pronouns with some care, not only in the switch to 'you' in Sonnets 13 and 15-17, but in the reversion to 'thou' once he found himself launched in his novel and experimental sequence. How purposive was the return to 'you' in Sonnets 52-55, and in all the subsequent switches?

There is some support to be gained from other sonneteers for the view that choice of the singular or plural form could be made almost at random. Drayton's *Idea* begins its sequence of sixty-three sonnets by alternating singular and plural in a way which indicates either a deliberate set of variations or a startling degree of uncertainty.⁸ Altogether forty of the sixty-three use a second person pronoun, of which twenty-four use the singular, fourteen the plural, and two both. The first dozen alternate, then Drayton settles for 'you' except when an invocation demands the singular, as in Sonnet 13 ('O sweetest Shadow how thou serv'st my turne!'), 17 ('Stay, speedy Time, behold before thou passe'), and 26, addressed to Despair. Eleven of the sixteen uses of the plural are in Sonnets 1-27, while nine use the singular. Sonnets 28-56 all use 'thou' except for 37, which has both singular and plural forms, and 51, which probably adopts 'you' for the sake of a rhyme. 'You' reappears at the end, in 57, 58 and 61, the last of these using both singular and plural. The only positive indication of the thinking behind Drayton's usage is the invocatory 'thou' of 13, 17 and 26, and in 'Thou leaden braine' (49), and the three sonnets (34, 35, 36) addressed to the God of Love.

The hint of uncertainty over the correct usage implied by Drayton's alternations in the first twelve of his sonnets might well make us wonder about a general slackening in the rigour with which the traditional forms of address were used in the 1590s. Or possibly, since Drayton's Sonnet 40 echoes Shakespeare's 'Two loves' sonnet (144), which was in print in 1599, Drayton may have seen enough of Shakespeare's other sonnets to register the variance in his practice, especially in 51-126, and follow it. But of course there was a much more celebrated precedent for varying the pronouns, in *Astrophil and Stella*, which appeared in print in 1591.⁹

Sidney makes very distinct use of the invocatory 'thou'. Taking the one hundred and eight sonnets and eleven songs together there are twenty-five sonnets which use 'thou' in addressing such singularities as Reason, Virtue, Cupid, the Moon, Desire, and Morpheus. Another fourteen invoke Stella as 'thou'. Five, however (30, 45, 51, First Song, and 91), address her as 'you'. Two of these are striking because they immediately follow a sonnet addressing her in the

singular (50 and 90). More striking still are five which employ both singular and plural: 59, Fourth Song, 86, Fifth Song, and Eleventh Song. They suggest that Sidney knew what he was doing much better than Drayton, and that his uses are nearly as pointed as Shakespeare's in 1-17.

Sonnet 86 is interposed between the Fourth and Fifth Songs, which themselves initiate the run of six songs which are (more or less literally) the climax of the sequence. The fourth Song is a whispered dialogue when the lovers are together at night in a sleeping house, of nine stanzas altogether with the repeated refrain,

Take me to thee, and thee to me.
'No, no, no, no, my Deare, let be.'

Astrophil, despite the singular in his refrain line, opens with a plural:

Onely joy, now here you are . . .

The fifth, seventh, eighth and ninth stanzas similarly begin with plurals. Apart from the refrain line, in fact, there is only one use of the singular, in line 20 (stanza 4):

This small light the Moone bestowes,
Serves thy beames but to disclose.

The rest is urgently personal, human, full of incidental detail:

Your faire mother is abed,
Candles out, and curtains spread;
She thinkes you do letters write.

The seductive situation in other words evokes a realistic use of the plural form. Only the more 'literary' elements in the poem – the refrain line and the one reference to Stella's 'beames', the starlight which is the most repeated conceit in the whole sequence – use the singular.

The same shift from personal and human to 'literary' marks the other poems where both singular and plural appear. In 86 the octave has the singular and the sestet the plural. Sonnet 59 opens conversationally:

Deare, why make you more of a dog than me?

and the plural is repeated in line 12:

Alas, if you graunt only such delight
To witlesse things . . .

There are two singulars in the second half of the octave, 'thine owne voice', and the eighth line,

But I unbid, fetch even my soule to thee.

Apart from the need for a rhyme here, what is most marked about these switches is the way they assist in modulating from the dramatic speech, the slightly tetchy protest about Stella ('you') giving preference to her lapdog, into the conceit which contrasts lover and lapdog ('thine'/'thee'), and back to the human protest ('if you graunt'). Broadly the same pattern, of 'you' as conversational and 'thou' as literary, is apparent in all the poems of *Astrophil and Stella*.

Shakespeare never mixes singular and plural in the same sonnet, and his reasons for switching so frequently between them in 52-126 are not always easy to see. Most of the switches are recognisably more purposive than Drayton's, but they do not always have the function of modulating from one tone to another as do Sidney's when he changes within a single poem. In some cases, I think, Shakespeare does set a 'literary' singular against a more human and social plural, as in the two pairs of sonnets about the poet's death, 71-2 and 73-4. The first pair use the plural, and the second pair the singular as if they are alternative forms of the same thing, the first pair direct ('Noe longer mourne for me when I am dead'), the second pair more stylised ('That time of yeare thou maist in me behold . . .'). A similar switch is evident in 110 and 111. They belong in a series which seek to give reassurance to the young man. Sonnet 110 completes a small sequence of four poems which affirm him as 'my home of love' (109), and as the last of the run it is the most intense, beginning with the half-apology about the poet making himself 'a motley to the view', as a result of which 'worst essaies prov'd thee my best of love'. Sonnet 111 begins a run

of eleven 'you' sonnets, but is clearly linked in subject with 110. The 'Dyers hand' sonnet, it repeats the biographical hint of 110 with one marked shift of emphasis. While 110 uses the poet's 'motley' life as the means to assure the young man that he provides the poet's true 'home of love', 111 turns his attention from the reassurance to the poet:

O for my sake do you wish fortune chide,
The guilty goddess of my harmful deeds,
That did not better for my life provide
Than public means which public manners breeds.

All the magnificent sonnets which follow, up to the supreme 116, 'Let me not to the marriage of true minds/Admit impediments', have the same directness. They are not 'literary' compositions in that faintly trivialising sense which is implicit in Sidney's use of the singular. They have the same direct human force as Sidney's 'you', and the 'you' of Sonnets 13 and 15-17.

The fluctuation between literary and human intimacy signalled by the switch between sonnets 110 and 111 can be seen working in the opposite direction in the switch from 'you' in 59 to 'thou' in 60 and 61. The phrase 'your image' in 59 becomes 'thy image' in 61, in a change marking a distinct chill in the relationship. 'Your slave' of 57 and 58 changes to the theme of 'thy worth' in 60, and 61 ends chidingly with the complaint that the young man is

From me far off, with others all too near.

A similar flux, with the withdrawal now on the poet's side, is evident in the final sonnets to the young man. It is not surprising, therefore, to note that 122-126 all use 'thou', in a kind of withdrawal. 122 acknowledges a gift from the young man of 'tables', reversing the position of 77 which was written to accompany a gift, a table book, from the poet to the young man. Sonnets 123 and 124 are about time, and 123 has the invocatory thou ('No! Time, thou shalt not boast . . .'). Sonnets 125 and 126 are also invocatory, the last sonnet of all beginning 'O thou, my lovely boy . . .'. In a sense, they return us to the self-consciously poetic mode of the sonnets which preceded Sonnet 13.

University of Reading

NOTES

¹The anomalous use of the pronouns in the Sonnets was first noted by Karl Goedeke in 1877. Goedeke's is one of several inconclusive speculations about the reasons for the changes of pronoun, with which this essay must join company. My point of departure is an essay by Charles Barber, "‘you’ and ‘Thou’ in Shakespeare's *Richard III*", *Leeds Studies in English* n.s. XII (1981), pp. 273 – 89.

²See Stephen Booth, ed. *Shakespeare's Sonnets*, (New Haven 1977), p. 135.

³*Ibid*, p. 164.

⁴John Pitcher, private communication.

⁵Brents Stirling, *The Shakespeare Sonnet Order: Poems and Groups*, (Berkeley, 1968), p. 18.

⁶E. A. Abbott, *A Shakespearian Grammar*, (1879), p. 154.

⁷Stephen Booth, *op. cit.* p. 158.

⁸Quotations from *Idea* are taken from *The Works of Michael Drayton*, ed. J. William Hebel, 5 vols., (Oxford 1932-41), II, 309-42.

⁹Quotations from *Astrophil and Stella* are taken from *The Poems of Sir Philip Sidney*, ed. W. A. Ringler, jr, (Oxford, 1962), pp. 163-237.

commission on behalf of a patron who sought to persuade a young man, probably his or her son, to marry; in other sonnets he may have been writing love poems on someone else's behalf. Such a patron or sponsor is unlikely to have thanked him, let alone paid him, for some of the 'Dark Lady' sonnets. But there is a sense in which any poet is adopting a persona—even poets do not normally express their everyday thoughts in rhymed and structured verse. As John Kerrigan writes in the fine introduction to his edition, 'Shakespeare stands behind the first person of his sequence as Sidney had stood behind Astrophil—sometimes near the poetic "I", sometimes farther off, but never without some degree of rhetorical projection' (Kerrigan, p. 11). Oscar Wilde expressed a similar sentiment when he wrote, in *The Portrait of Mr W.H.* (see p. 140, below), of all art as 'an attempt to realise one's own personality on some imaginative plane out of reach of the trammelling accidents and limitations of real life' (Wilde, ed. Holland, p. 3). To write a poem, however heartfelt it may be, is to adopt a stance which distances the writer from spontaneity of utterance, even while trying to express deeper truths than can be conveyed in the language of ordinary speech. We can never know how much of Shakespeare's collection reflects his personal point of view, and if he were here to discuss the poems with modern readers, he would probably discover meanings that he had not been aware of. Even explicitly dramatic soliloquies such as those written by Robert Browning convey, however obliquely, something of the poet's own point of view.

Attempts to identify the young man have centred on the assumption that he is the 'Mr'—i.e. Master—'W. H.' of Thorpe's dedication, and that Thorpe's 'only begetter' means 'sole inspirer'. (A less likely possibility is 'only procurer of the manuscript'.) The established fact that Shakespeare dedicated his narrative poems to Henry Wriothesley has encouraged speculation that 'W.H.' is a deliberately cryptic inversion of the Earl's initials, with the added smokescreen of referring to him as a commoner. This would mean that the dedication was comprehensible only to the selected few. But W.H., uninverted, are the initials of William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke (1580–1630), dedicatee along with his brother Philip of the First Folio. Certainly, on the evidence of the sonnets that pun on the name Will (Nos. 135–6 and, less certainly, 143), a William seems more likely than a Henry. But

Herbert, too, was not properly addressed as M[aste]r, and he was embarrassingly young at the time that the earliest sonnets may have been written. Another candidate is Sir William Harvey, Southampton's stepfather, on the grounds that he might have been able to get hold of the manuscript and to pass it on to Thorpe. Some critics suppose that W.H. stands for William Himself, or is a misprint for W.S., and that Thorpe is dedicating his poems to their author. There is no way of either proving or disproving these convenient hypotheses, any more than the suggestion that W.H. means Who He?, awkwardly modern though this locution might appear to be.

Looking for internal evidence, the eighteenth-century scholar Edmond Malone took his cue from Sonnet 20: 'a man in hue all hues in his controlling', which he supposed to be a pun on the name Hughes. This idea was most famously, if not entirely seriously, espoused by Oscar Wilde in his short story *The Portrait of Mr W.H.* (1889, later revised), where he fantasized that Hughes was 'a wonderful boy-actor of great beauty' (Wilde, ed. Small, p. 57). And the novelist Samuel Butler succeeded in finding a real-life William Hughes who was appointed cook on a ship called *The Vanguard* in 1634 and who was dead two years later. The plethora of candidates—many more could be named—suggests that if Thorpe's use of initials was intended to conceal the truth from all but a selected band of readers in his own time he must be congratulated on his success.

What of the woman—or women—in the case? A few clues appear in the poems—she (if there was only one) was both literally and metaphorically 'dark', in whatever sense of the word, was married but promiscuous, and could play a keyboard instrument (Sonnet 131). Hundreds, if not thousands, of Elizabethan women could have fitted this bill. George Chalmers, reacting to his literary enemy Edmond Malone, proposed in 1797 that not only the last group, but all the sonnets were addressed to Queen Elizabeth (who could play the virginals but was neither dark nor married), explaining that she was often thought of as a man. He expressed astonishment at the very notion that 'Shakespeare, a husband, a father, a moral man, addressed a hundred and twenty, nay, a hundred and twenty-six *Amourous* Sonnets to a *male* object'.¹ Chalmers got into a terrible tangle trying to explain how Sonnet 20, with its puns on 'prick', might have been addressed to the Queen. A popular candidate during the late

8

MVfick to heare, why hear'st thou musick sadly,
Sweets with sweets warre not, ioy delights in ioy:
Why lou'st thou that which thou receau'st not gladly,
Or else rectau'st with pleasure thine annoy?
If the true concord of well tuned sounds,
By vnions married do offend thine care,
They do but sweetly chide thee, who confounds
In singlenesse the parts that thou should'st beare:
Marke how one string sweet husband to another,
Strikes each in each by mutuall ordering;
Resembling fier, and child, and happy mother,
Who all in one, one pleasing note do sing:
Whose speechlesse song being many, seeming one,
Sings this to thee thou single wilt proue none.



Music to hear, why hear'st thou music sadly?
Sweets with sweets war not, joy delights in joy:
Why lov'st thou that which thou receiv'st not gladly,
Or else receiv'st with pleasure thine annoy?
If the true concord of well-tunèd sounds
By unions married do offend thine ear,
They do but sweetly chide thee, who confounds
In singleness the parts that thou shouldst bear;
Mark how one string, sweet husband to another,
Strikes each in each by mutual ordering;
Resembling sire, and child, and happy mother,
Who all in one, one pleasing note do sing;
Whose speechless song being many, seeming one,
Sings this to thee, "Thou single wilt prove none."

IT IS NOT Shakespeare's use of the commonplace conceit *single life : married life : : single string : consort* (see Evans on its use in *Arcadia*, etc.) that here requires comment, but rather the increasingly fantastic prolongation of this commonplace through the last ten lines of the sonnet. The conceit is made the more fantastic by being elaborated not in solitary meditation or sustained public oratorical argument (where a conceit can easily take on a growth disproportionate to its origins), but rather in the intimate address of one person to another.

The pretext for the conceit is the young man's uneasiness as he listens to sweet music. This untoward response gives Shakespeare the opportunity (more stringently practiced in sonnet 40) to give his speaker balanced half-lines enacting the figure of opposition. I show in parentheses the number of syllables per half-line:

<i>Music to hear</i> (4)	<i>why bear'st thou music sadly?</i> (7)
<i>Sweets with sweets war not</i> (5)	<i>joy delights in joy</i> (5)
<i>Why lov'st thou that</i> (4)	<i>which thou receiv'st not gladly</i> (7)
<i>Or else receiv'st with pleasure</i> (7)	<i>thine annoy?</i> (3)

It is clear that Shakespeare is here intent on deliberate caesural variation (which would be evident even if my placing of the caesura were slightly modified). The rocky disequilibrium of this quatrain could be charted metrically in the initial trochees of the first two (or three) lines and in the spondees of *sweets war not*; or it could be shown phonetically in the cacophony of *lovest thou that which thou receiv'st*, etc. The metrical and phonetic disequilibrium is meant to enact the dis-ease of bachelorhood. By contrast, the family harmony which would exist were the young man to marry and beget a child generates the flurry of puns on harmonic unison, the graphic anagram of "unions": *tunèd, unions, one string, all in one, one pleasing note, seeming one*. Bachelorhood contrasted with marriage generates the contrastive monodic pun on *single* and *sing* (*singleness, do sing, song, sings, single*). A fundamental appeal wants to turn the young man's *not* (line 2) to a *note* (line 12).

The "invention" at work in the elaborate conceit of harmony (lines 5–14) is the decision to divide music into its three parts: its *sounds* or aural effect (lines 5–8); its *strings* or medium (lines 9–12); and its *song* or content

(lines 13–14). This sort of logical division of a single entity into multiple (and therefore elaboratable) aspects is one of Shakespeare's most common inventive moves, widely shared with his contemporaries and borrowed of course from commonplace logical training. (For Shakespeare's most searching critique of the belief that everything can be classified by aspectual definition into parts, see sonnet 129.) Here, although the division of music into sounds, strings, and song is an intrinsically and materially rational one, the insistently developed conceit of married (and childbearing) strings is not. Shakespeare's procedure thus foregrounds the extent to which interpretation of a phenomenon (here, music) is determined by the context in which it is investigated. Were it not for the speaker's wish (whether commissioned or not) to incite the young man to marry, he would scarcely continue to insist, when hearing music, on the conceit of "married" sounds. As it is, his preexisting concern shapes his analysis of the aspects of music into his conceit. As sounds, the ingredients of music are simply *married*. As strings, one first becomes *sweet husband to another* and, as another instrument is added, they resemble *sire, and child, and happy mother* (where the happiness of the "mother" and the presence of the "child" are equally preposterous). Finally, as song, they are "lent" by the speaker a putative message for their literally *speechless* song, a message which taunts the young man for his nullity ("one," being *single*, cannot be a *number*; the concept "number" being regarded as solely plural). The projection of human motive onto the sounds (*They do but sweetly chide thee*) is a step up in invention from the young man's being (apparently irrationally but really understandably) annoyed by their "married" presence; and the projection into the sounds of chiding words (line 14)—words which, we are given to understand, they have been singing to the young man from the very beginning, causing his sadness and "annoy"—is a further escalation of invention.

The original dramatic situation of paradox (lines 1–4), in which sweets meet sweets sadly, seems more successfully worked than the rather tortured subsequent explanatory conceit. However, the resolution of many parts in one unison / (*being many, seeming one*) is of obvious relevance as an aesthetic principle for the Shakespearean sonnet, which, because of its four discrete parts, runs an inherently greater risk of disunity than does the Italian sonnet.

The assumed preestablished harmony between music and a harmoniously ordered human soul exists in the young man; he loves music, and normally receives pleasure from hearing it. Shakespeare (characteristically) gives several verbal formulations of reciprocity to the philosophical dissonance which provokes the sonnet:

1. The young man, though his effect is the same as that of music, *bears* music *sadly*.
2. The young man (a “sweet”) *wars with* another “sweet” (music).
3. The young man (a “joy” to others) normally would *delight in* music (a “joy” to him) [but does not].
4. The young man, hearing music, *receives pleasure*, yes, but along with it, *annoy[ance]*.
5. Concord *offends [his] ear*.

Equally characteristically, Shakespeare varies the rhetorical form: a single question, two proverbs, a double question, a hypothesis. Both of these tactics—giving several conceptually different formulations of a problem, and embedding them in different rhetorical formats—are well-known strategies in persuasive oratory. They are made fresh here by the psychological presence of the philosophical problem of the Many and the One, as embodied in the young man’s sulk at the prospect of his Oneness having to turn into Manyness. Shakespeare’s reconciliation of the problem via music (perhaps borrowed from the *Arcadia*) is not new, but his straddling of the solution is: the strings sing *one* note, in truth, but the *sound* they make only *seems* one, and *is* many. Both oneness and manyness exist, existentially, in the music, in equal dominance. This is (or ought to be) reassuring to the young man; it clearly is to Shakespeare.

Shakespeare’s strategies for unifying sonnet-parts into a true *concord* . . . *by unions married* are enormously varied, and can be clarified by a diagram. Here, one strategy of unification is to continue the musical lexicon

Structure of Sonnet 8

1)))
2	composition by)))
3	half-lines)))
4)))
5))	direct) direct
6)	musical)	address) address
7)	lexicon)	(speaker) (strings
8))	to young) to young
9)))	man)) man)
10))	marriage))
11	one/) sing/)	conceit))
12	none) single/)))
13) song)))
14))))

through all fourteen lines; another is to sustain till the end the initial speech-act of direct address. The conceit of married sounds chiding singleness unifies lines 5–14; lines 8–14 are connected by the pun on *single* and *sing*; and lines 9–14 are connected by the puns on *one/none*. This principle of overlapping connections is one of the strongest and most frequently used in the composition of the *Sonnets*. A map of 8 (see the diagram) will clarify its overlaps.

Shakespeare's persistent willingness to be fanciful (frequently criticized by modern critics in, e.g., 99) represents delight in invention for its own sake. Shakespeare is careless, almost, of where fancifulness might lead. Its whimsical excesses are an index to the nature of imagination in its most visually accessible form, the fanciful (the sublime imagination, by contrast, is harder to track). Dr. Johnson's acute remark in his *Preface* on Shakespeare's fondness for a quibble can be enlarged to extend to more than puns: Shakespeare, for a moment, can treat any fantastical element of invention as all-important. It could be a conceit, as here; it could be the talismanic letters in *car*; as in sonnet 7; it could be the fascination of a symmetrical word like *widdow* (Quarto spelling), as in 9; or it could be the false "etymological" resemblance of *sing* [*< singan*] to *single* [*< singulus*]. (For another instance of this latter practice, see 24, where *the sun delights to peep*, although *delight* [*< delectare*] has no etymology in common with *light* [*< lux, leukos*].) In short, any linguistic phenomenon can "distract" the verbal imagination from its supposed message.

Dr. Johnson's simile of Atalanta shows that he regarded as a distraction this glancing-aside of the Shakespearean imagination. I would suggest, by contrast, that the true intent of the verbal imagination is always to *make a chain of interesting signifiers*, with the "message" tucked in as best the poet can. My formulation is as exaggerated, in its way, as Dr. Johnson's, but it represents a serious view—that the verbal imagination lives in and by engagement with its medium. As the painter must serve color, and the sculptor volume, the poet must serve language. A poem that does not serve language is no poem, and when the opportunity for servitude to *w*—or mastery of the use of *w*, since the two come to the same thing—presents itself as a possible exercise, the verbal imagination cannot resist it, as we shall see in the next sonnet.

Couplet Tie: *sing*, [*song*], *sing* [*-s*] (12, 13, 14); *sing* [*-le*] [*-leness*] (8, 14)
one (9, 12, 13)



CASA EDITRICE
LEO S. OLSCHKI
PERIODICI

Cas. Post. 66 - C.C.P. 5/1020 50100 FIRENZE

ARCHIVIO STORICO ITALIANO. 1842
Trimestrale diretto da E. Sestan
Lire 7.000. Est. Lire 10.000

BELFAGOR. RASSEGNA DI VARIA UMANITÀ. 1946
Bimestrale, diretta da C. F. Russo
Lire 6.500. Est. Lire 11.000

BOLLETTINO DELL'ATLANTE
LINGUISTICO MEDITERRANEO. 1959
Annuario, diretto da M. Deanović - G. Folena
Il prezzo varia secondo la mole del volume

CHIGIANA. RASSEGNA ANNUALE DI STUDI
MUSICOLOGICI. 1964
A cura dell'Acc. Chigiana - Siena
Il prezzo varia secondo la mole del volume

IL PENSIERO POLITICO. RIVISTA DI
STORIA DELLE IDEE POLITICHE E SOCIALI. 1968
Quadrimestrale diretta da M. D'Addio -
M. Delle Piane - L. Firpo - I. Lana -
R. Manselli - S. Mastellone - N. Matteucci -
F. Tessitore
Lire 6.500. Est. Lire 10.500

LA BIBLIOFILIA. RIVISTA DI STORIA DEL LIBRO
E DI BIBLIOGRAFIA. 1899
Quadrimestrale, diretta da R. Ridolfi
Lire 11.000. Est. Lire 13.500

'LARES'. ORGANO DELLA SOCIETÀ DI ETNOGRAFIA
ITALIANA. 1912
Semestrale, diretto da P. Toschi. Vice
Direttore: G. B. Bronzini
Lire 6.000. Est. Lire 9.000

LETTERE ITALIANE. 1949
Trimestrale, diretta da V. Branca - G. Getto
Lire 7.500. Est. Lire 10.000

PAROLE E METODI
Bollettino dell'Atlante Linguistico Italiano.
1933
Semestrale, diretto da C. Grassi
Lire 5.000. Est. Lire 8.000

PHYSIS. RIVISTA DI STORIA DELLA SCIENZA. 1959
Trimestrale diretta da V. Cappelletti -
L. Cavini - F. Ogliari - V. Ronchi
Lire 7.500. Est. Lire 10.000

RASSEGNA STORICA TOSCANA. ORGANO
DELLA SOCIETÀ TOSCANA PER LA STORIA DEL
RISORGIMENTO. 1955
Semestrale, diretta da E. Artom
Lire 5.200. Est. Lire 8.000

RICERCHE STORICHE
Rivista semestrale del Centro Piombinese di
Studi Storici. 1973
Diretta da I. Tognarini
Lire 3.800. Est. Lire 5.000

RIVISTA D'ARTE. 1903
Annuario, diretto da U. Procacci - M. Salmi -
G. Fiocco
La pubblicazione è sospesa

RIVISTA DI STORIA E LETTERATURA
RELIGIOSA. 1965
Quadrimestrale, diretta da F. Bolgiani -
E. Passerin d'Entrèves - M. Pellegrino
Lire 8.500. Est. Lire 11.500

RIVISTA ITALIANA DI MUSICOLOGIA.
1966
Semestrale, diretta da N. Albarosa - A. Basso -
P. Petrobelli
Lire 6.200. Est. Lire 9.000

RIVISTA ITALIANA DI STUDI
NAPOLEONICI. 1962
Quadrimestrale, diretta da M. Bigotti
Lire 4.000. Est. Lire 5.500

SCRIPTORIUM. INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF
MANUSCRIPT STUDIES. 1946
Semestrale, diretta da F. Lyna, F. Masai
(escl. di vendita)
Lire 19.000

STUDI DI LETTERATURA FRANCESE
Rivista annuale a cura della Sezione Francese
del Seminario di Lingue e Letterature
Straniere dell'Università di Padova. 1967
Annuario, diretto da E. Balmas - G. Folena -
D. Valeri
Il prezzo varia secondo la mole del volume

STUDI ETRUSCHI. 1927
Annuario, diretto da M. Pallottino -
A. Neppi Modona
Il prezzo varia secondo la mole del volume

STUDI MUSICALI. 1971
Semestrale, a cura dell'Accademia Santa
Cecilia - Roma
Lire 7.200. Est. Lire 10.000

STUDI SECENTESCHI. 1960
Annuario, diretto da C. Jannaco -
U. Limentani
Il prezzo varia secondo la mole del volume

STUDI VENEZIANI
A cura dell'Istituto di Storia della Società e
dello Stato Veneziano e dell'Istituto
'Venezia e l'Oriente' della Fondazione
Giorgio Cini. 1966
già Bollettino dell'Istituto di Storia della
Società e dello Stato Veneziano
Annuario, diretto da A. Pertusi
Il prezzo varia secondo la mole del volume

THE LIBRARY

Fifth Series, Vol. XXX, No. 1, March 1975

Punctuation and the Compositors of Shakespeare's *Sonnets*, 1609

By MACD. P. JACKSON

IN his little book on *Shakespearian punctuation* Percy Simpson suggested that 'a lover of poetry, who prefers to read Shakespeare as he was printed and wishes for plain, practical direction in this matter of punctuation, cannot do better than take a work of moderate compass like the *Sonnets*, accessible in facsimile, and collate it with a standard edition of the present day till he has mastered the main points of difference. He will find', Simpson continued, 'even in these details a subject of poetic study, for the printer of the 1609 text was at great pains to indicate the rhythm by the punctuation.'¹ The lover of poetry who takes Simpson's advice may observe that, at least in some particulars, the punctuation of Shakespeare's *Sonnets* in the original Quarto varies markedly from page to page. For instance, on Sig. D3^v three quatrains end in commas, none in colons; the following page, D4, presents a striking contrast: five quatrains end in colons, none in commas. If the reader is concentrating closely enough upon the minutiae of the text before him, he may note that this change in punctuation is accompanied by a change in the spelling of the exclamation O/Oh: O on D3^v gives way to Oh on D4. Turning back to the previous gathering one finds that on C1 the exclamation O appears twice, while one quatrain ends in a colon and three end in commas; on C3^v, in contrast, the spelling Oh is used, while four quatrains end in colons and none in commas. Can it be mere coincidence that on the two O pages commas predominate over colons at the ends of quatrains, whereas on the two Oh pages the reverse is the case? Is it possible that the variable punctuation of the *Sonnets* reflects the conflicting personal habits of two compositors?

It is odd that despite all the scholarly controversy about Shakespeare's *Sonnets* nobody has provided us with a bibliographical analysis of the famous Quarto printed by George Eld for Thomas Thorpe in 1609. There has been much speculation about the provenance and textual quality of the manuscript which served as copy for the Quarto, there have been studies of the punctuation of the *Sonnets* and analyses of the supposed subtleties of the

¹ Oxford, 1911, p. 9.

accidentals in some of them, there have been many objections to the arrangement of the *Sonnets* in the 1609 Quarto;² and yet no scholar has examined the question of what modifications the manuscript may have undergone in the printing-house; in particular, we do not yet know anything about the characteristics of the compositor or compositors who set the Quarto.

This is especially regrettable in view of the fact that Eld printed the Quarto of *Troilus and Cressida* in the same year and the two compositors who set that text differed considerably in their treatment of it. Alice Walker, drawing on the work of Philip Williams, notes that in the *Troilus and Cressida* Quarto 'The two hands can be identified from their spelling habits as well as from the frequency of colons for periods in the stints of Eld A and from his inability to punctuate intelligibly.'³ Remarking that the loss of a word is 'one type of error very prevalent in Q', she notes that of thirty-four examples all but three occur within the stints of Compositor A, though he set only two-thirds of the Quarto.⁴ If Eld's Compositor A set any part of the Quarto of Shakespeare's *Sonnets* he is unlikely to have accurately reproduced his manuscript copy. An analysis of the presswork and of the setting of the Quarto may serve as a basis for informed speculation about other problems.

The headlines in the Quarto of *Troilus and Cressida* were analysed by Williams who concluded:

Q was printed by a rather unusual method. Three skeleton-formes (X, Y, and Z) were used. One (X) was used for printing and perfecting the inner and outer formes of gatherings A, C, E, and H. A second (Y) was used for printing and perfecting the inner and outer formes of gatherings B, D, G, and I. A third skeleton-forme (Z) was used for printing and perfecting the inner and outer formes of gatherings F and K. The final two gatherings (L and M) were each printed with two skeleton-formes (X and Y). The evidence suggests that two presses were employed, press I printing and perfecting in normal order the sheets of gatherings A, C, E, G, I, L, and outer M, while press II printed and perfected in normal order the sheets of gatherings B, D, F, H, K, and inner M.⁵

A similar method seems to have been employed for the *Sonnets*.⁶ Careful

² H. E. Rollins in volume ii of his New Variorum edition of the *Sonnets*, Philadelphia, 1944, summarizes earlier discussions of these topics. See Rollins also (ii, pp. 1-5) for a full bibliographical description of the Quarto with a list of extant copies and a discussion of the eight very minor press-variants (on C2^v, D2^v, E4^v two, F3, F3^v, H1, and I4). The fullest discussion of the punctuation of the *Sonnets* is by A. H. Carter, 'The Punctuation of Shakespeare's *Sonnets* of 1609', *Joseph Quincy Adams memorial studies*, Washington, 1948, ed. James G. McManaway and others, pp. 409-28. The most determined attempt to see subtleties in the accidentals of a sonnet is that of Robert Graves in *A survey of modernist poetry* (with Laura Riding), 1927, or *The common asphodel*, 1949, and the most recent proposals for rearrangement have come from Brents Stirling, *The Shakespeare sonnet order*, Berkeley, California, 1968.

³ New Cambridge edition of *Troilus and Cressida*, 1957, p. 129.

⁴ *Troilus and Cressida*, p. 128.

⁵ In a private communication to T. W. Baldwin quoted in the New Variorum *Troilus and Cressida*, Philadelphia, 1953, ed. H. N. Hillebrand, p. 346.

⁶ I have worked from the facsimiles of the 1609 Quarto for the Elizabethan Club (Yale University Press, 1964), edd. James M. Osborn, Louis L. Martz, and Eugene M. Waith, and the Scolar Press (Menston, Yorkshire, 1968), but I have checked the nicer details in the two original copies in the Bodleian Library: Malone 34 and Malone 886. *Sonnets* refers to the whole quarto; *Sonnets* excludes *A lover's complaint*.

inspection and measurement of the headlines reveals that four skeleton-formes were used in the following manner:

B(i)	I	F(i)	II
B(o)	I	F(o)	II
C(i)	II	G(i)	III
C(o)	II	G(o)	III
D(i)	III	H(i)	I
D(o)	III	H(o)	I
E(i)	IV	I(i)	II
E(o)	IV	I(o)	II

I do not think that we can be sure precisely what this arrangement of skeletons implies in detail,⁷ and I shall postpone speculation to a later point in my article. In the meantime it seems fair to suppose that in this case too, more than one press must have been used and type must have been set by more than one compositor. The Quarto collates A² B-K⁴ L². The actual text of the sonnets occupies B1-K1. On K1^v-L2^v is printed *A lover's complaint*. Naturally a new skeleton was constructed for sheet K: here again the same skeleton was used for inner and outer formes.

Miss Walker mentions the following spellings as distinguishing between the two compositors who set the Quarto of *Troilus and Cressida*: Eld A used *Cressid*, *Cressida*, *Hellen*, *shalbe*, *wilbe*, *ritch*, and *els*; Eld B used *Cresseid*, *Cresseida*, *Helen*, *shall be*, *will be*, *rich*, and *else*.⁸ It seems highly probable that the same two men were concerned in the setting of the *Sonnets*. Naturally the names do not occur in the *Sonnets*, apart from one reference to 'Hellen's cheek' on D4, which I shall give other reasons for assigning to Compositor A, and *else* is invariable except for one instance of *els* in *A lover's complaint* on L1^v, but whereas Eld B's *rich* and *shall be* are associated on E2 and F2 and *shall be* and *will be* on F1^v, Eld A's *ritch* and *wilbe* are associated on F3 and G1. On the evidence of *shalbe*, *wilbe*, *ritch*, and *shall be*, *will be*, *rich* one might assign to Compositor A Sigs. B1, B2^v, C4, D1, F3, F4^v, G1, G1^v, G2, and L1, and to Compositor B Sigs. B1^v, B4, C1, C3, D3^v, E2, F1, F1^v, F2, F2^v, F4, H2^v, I1, and I3^v.⁹

Miss Walker remarks on the frequency with which Eld A uses colons for periods in *Troilus and Cressida*,¹⁰ and a comparison of the punctuation on the pages in the *Sonnets* which use the spellings *ritch*, *shalbe*, and *wilbe* with the punctuation on those pages which use the spellings *rich*, *shall be*, and *will be* reveals a difference that is in the expected direction, which tends to confirm the tentative assignment of pages to Eld A and Eld B. Almost all Shakespeare's sonnets are constructed as three quatrains followed by a couplet so there is normally a definite pause at the end of the fourth, eighth, and twelfth lines. In these positions full stops are most commonly used, but commas and colons also occur fairly often. On A's nine pages colons appear 24 times and

⁷ I am thinking of D. F. McKenzie's warnings in 'Printers of the Mind: Some Notes on Bibliographical Theories and Printing-House Practices', *SB*, xxii (1969), 1-75.

⁸ New Cambridge *Troilus and Cressida*, p. 129.

⁹ The evidence is tabulated in full at the end of this article.

¹⁰ New Cambridge *Troilus and Cressida*, p. 129.

commas 3 times in these positions; on B's fourteen pages colons appear 11 times and commas 18 times. Thus A seems to have a strong preference for the colon rather than the comma as an alternative to the full stop in these positions, whereas B slightly prefers the comma.¹¹ Colons generally are more common on A's pages (which contain forty colons altogether, or 4.4 per page) than on B's pages (which contain eighteen, or 1.3 per page).

Another notable difference between the pages upon which Eld A spellings occur and the pages upon which Eld B spellings occur concerns the spelling of the exclamation O or Oh. A uses Oh 9 times (including three instances on L1), O not at all; B uses Oh only once, but O 8 times. In *Troilus and Cressida* A used Oh 23 times, O 36 times, one or other spelling tending to prevail for several pages, while B used O exclusively, 29 times: it seems likely that O appeared throughout certain sections of the copy for that Quarto, Oh throughout other sections, and that while A reproduced his copy B tolerated O alone. Perhaps the copy for the *Sonnets* used Oh, which A reproduced but B changed. At any rate, in the *Sonnets* Oh and O both appear on the same page only once (L1^v), although there are fifteen pages on which the exclamation appears at least twice, so that it provides further evidence for distinguishing the shares of Compositors A and B. On seven pages where none of Miss Walker's test words appears the spelling Oh alone is used, and on twenty-three pages O alone is used under the same conditions. One of the Oh pages and four of the O pages belong to *A lover's complaint*, but the other Oh pages have 17 colons and only 2 commas at the ends of quatrains, whereas for the other O pages the ratio is 25 colons to 27 commas. This difference between Oh and O pages is similar to the difference between A's and B's pages as tentatively identified by Miss Walker's test-words, and it would seem to confirm the assignment of Oh pages to A and O pages to B. However, the rate of colons generally per page is a little lower than would be expected for the Oh pages (3.3 per page, 3.7 if L2 is included from *A lover's complaint*) and a little higher than would be expected for the O pages (2 per page, whether or not K2, K2^v, K4, and L2^v are included from *A lover's complaint*). Since L1^v of *A lover's complaint* has *els*, which A prefers in *Troilus and Cressida*, and as many as five colons, we should perhaps include it among A's pages, despite the ambiguous testimony of its Oh and O spellings.

We now have eighteen pages very tentatively identified as Compositor A's, and thirty-seven as Compositor B's. When these are examined closely further differences appear. A uses *dost* 5 times, a different spelling only once (*doest*); B uses *dost* 3 times, other spellings 13 times (*doest* 3, *doost* 9, *doo'st* 1). A twice has the plural *flowers*, but otherwise uses the *-re* ending exclusively in *powre*, *flowre*, and *houre* (13 times); B uses *flower* and *power* exclusively (14 times), and is indifferent over *hower* and *houre* (6 times each). A uses only the spellings *old* and *gold* (4 times); B has *old* and *gold* (13 times), but is also willing to use the spellings *ould* and *gould* (10 times). A seems to have no

¹¹ Either compositor may, of course, have been following his copy. I mean to imply only that in the setting of this particular text A seems to have had 'a strong preference' for colons rather than commas at the ends of quatrains, whereas B slightly preferred to set commas.

definite preference between *eie* (9 times) and *eye* (8 times); B prefers *eye* (36 times) to *eie* (9 times).

Each sonnet except the first is headed with its number in the Quarto's sequence. Compositor A is more consistent in his centring of these numbers. This becomes clear if one measures the distance between the left-hand margin and the centre of the number. There are thirty-five numbered sonnet-headings in A's pages: for all but two the distance is 39–43 millimetres, and for the two exceptions it is 37 and 38 millimetres; for twenty-two of the thirty-five it is 41–42 millimetres. B tends to place most of the headings slightly further right and some of them much further right. A total of seventy-nine numbered sonnet-headings appears in Compositor B's pages: for most of them the distance is 39–43 millimetres, as with A, but B's preferred distance is 42–43 millimetres (33 times), and eighteen times it is beyond A's limit: five times 44 millimetres, five times 45 millimetres, six times 46 millimetres, and twice 47 millimetres. Compositor B also tends to place signatures further right than A. Again, this becomes apparent if we measure the distance from the left-hand margin to the middle of the signature. A's range for six signatures is 42–46 millimetres. B places seven out of twelve signatures further right than this (the distance is 48 millimetres thrice, and once each 47, 51, 52, and 54 millimetres).

We can summarize the apparent differences found so far between Compositors A and B thus: A prefers the spellings *shalbe*, *wilbe*, *ritch*, *Oh*, *dost*, *gold*, *old*, *flowre*, *powre*, and *houre*, uses *eie* and *eye* indifferently, and strongly prefers colons to commas as an alternative to full stops at the ends of quatrains; B prefers the spellings *shall be*, *will be*, *rich*, *O*, *doost*, *eye*, *flower*, and *power*, is indifferent over *hower* and *houre*, uses *ould* and *gould* scarcely less often than *old* and *gold*, and slightly prefers commas to colons at the ends of quatrains; B places almost a quarter of the numbered sonnet-headings and about half of the signatures set by him further right than A ever places them.

When this information is applied to the whole text, most pages are found to bear fairly consistent evidence of one or other compositor, and a few additional differences emerge. On thirteen occasions the end of a sonnet coincides with the end of a page: seven times the catchword is the number which heads the next sonnet, six times it is the word with which the next sonnet begins. B uses both methods; A uses only the first (4 times). Ten sonnets end with a comma and three with no punctuation; all but one of these thirteen sonnets were set by B. A uses the spelling *tongue* exclusively (6 times; he also uses *tongu'd*); B has *tongue* twice, but 13 times uses some other spelling, preferring medial *ou*. B seems to be more tolerant than A of *noe* and *loe*: ten out of eleven examples appear on his pages, and the exceptional page is a doubtful one. Similarly, though endings in *-lesse* and *-nesse* are normal in the Quarto, *-les* and *-nes* occur ten times, only once on a page set by A. There are other differences, but the frequencies are much too small to provide reliable evidence.¹²

¹² The figures given in this paragraph are based on the assignments proposed in the next.

A table at the end of this article presents the evidence upon which my compositorial ascriptions are based. I should assign to Compositor A twenty of the sixty-five pages on which the Sonnets are printed, namely B¹, B^{2v}, C², C^{3v}, C⁴, C^{4v}, D¹, D⁴, D^{4v}, E¹, F³, F^{3v}, F^{4v}, G¹, G^{1v}, G², G^{4v}, I³, I⁴, and the other forty-five pages to Compositor B. The majority of these ascriptions are well supported, but the evidence for assigning C², C⁴, and D^{4v} to A, and D^{2v}, E^{1v}, F⁴, and G^{2v} to B is very slight. The pages on which *A lover's complaint* is printed are more difficult to assign, since they do not offer some of the kinds of evidence most useful in assigning the pages of sonnets. K², K^{2v}, K⁴, and L^{2v} are probably Compositor B's, L¹ and L^{1v} probably Compositor A's; on the other pages the evidence is slight or contradictory: it is possible that the first half of L² (with *Oh* twice and *ei* twice) is A's, the second half (with *loe* and a signature 48 millimetres from the left-hand margin) B's, though each half has three colons.

It seems, therefore, that B was the main compositor and that A merely helped him out sporadically, setting somewhat less than a third of the Quarto. The two men punctuated the text in widely different ways. As an alternative to full stops at the ends of quatrains, A on his twenty pages of sonnets used colons 51 times, commas only 6 times; B on his forty-five pages used colons 47 times, commas 67 times.

This difference between the two men is most marked in their treatment of the third quatrain: A ended it with a colon 10 times, a comma only once; B ended it with a colon 12 times, a comma 29 times, A further difference can best be presented in tabular form.¹³

Compositor A					Compositor B				
	:	,	.	?!o		:	,	.	?!o
Line 4	16	3	19	9	17	20	53	15	
Line 8	25	2	18	4	17	18	55	14	
Line 12	10	1	33	3	12	29	56	9	

In Compositor A's share a distinction appears between the third quatrain—the twelfth line, which immediately precedes the final couplet—and the other two quatrains. Compositor A employed a full stop for 70 per cent of the third quatrain endings, but for only 39 per cent of the first and second quatrain endings. He appears to have felt that the twelfth line tended to require a heavier stop than the fourth or eighth lines. Compositor B made no such distinction. He used a full stop for 53 per cent of the third quatrain endings and for 52 per cent of the first and second quatrain endings. And he made more use of the comma for third quatrain endings than for either first or second quatrain endings.

¹³ The six-couplet tail-piece, numbered Sonnet 126, has been omitted from these computations; and the first quatrain of the fifteen-line Sonnet 99 has been disregarded, with lines 9 and 13 being treated as lines 8 and 12. In the table the symbol 'o' stands for an unpunctuated line; question marks greatly predominate in the miscellaneous category.

Modern commentators take Compositor A's view of the matter. Enid Hamer, for example, claimed that in Shakespeare's sonnets, 'The most marked pause is generally at the end of the third quatrain',¹⁴ and Edward Hubler repeats, with slight modification, Tucker Brooke's assertion that 'in over two-thirds of Shakespeare's sonnets the chief pause is placed after the twelfth line, at the close of three quatrains which are themselves divided by distinct but less emphatic pauses.'¹⁵

Compositor A's greater use of the colon and avoidance of commas for his end-of-quatrain punctuation makes it more modern than B's. Edward Hubler, in his edition of the *Sonnets*, offers punctuation which is 'loosely modern, permitting the rhythms and ambiguities Shakespeare intended'.¹⁶ For end-of-quatrain punctuation he employs the same range of stops as the Quarto compositors used, but makes far greater use of the semicolon, which is almost absent from the Quarto. Within sheets B–D Hubler accepts 64 per cent of Compositor A's end-of-quatrain punctuation marks (40 out of 63 in eight Quarto pages), but only 39 per cent of B's end-of-quatrain punctuation marks (42 out of 108 in sixteen pages). The difference is largely due to the modern editor feeling the need at quatrain endings for a punctuation mark intermediate in weight between a comma and a full stop. Compositor A also felt this need, whereas B mostly made do with commas or full stops in a fairly indiscriminate fashion. So Hubler lightens about half of B's full stops to a colon or semicolon; whereas he retains almost all A's full stops. He also strengthens all but one of B's 30 commas to a semicolon, colon, or even full stop. All but 10 of the 49 colons ending quatrains in sheets B–D (27 on A's eight pages, 22 on B's sixteen) Hubler either retains or changes to semicolons. After sheet D the difference between Hubler's treatment of A's end-of-quatrain punctuation and his treatment of B's becomes less marked, but throughout his text Hubler adopts A's practice of almost completely avoiding commas at quatrain endings, and, like A, makes frequent use of a punctuation mark intermediate in weight between the comma and the full stop. The 'common-sensible modern punctuation' of A. L. Rowse,¹⁷ to cite one other modern editor, is more akin to Compositor B's than is Hubler's, though within sheets B–D Rowse retains more of A's end-of-quatrain punctuation (56 per cent) than B's (46 per cent): like Hubler, Rowse replaces all but one of B's end-of-quatrain commas with a heavier stop, but he makes greater use of the full stop than Hubler does, so that he strengthens more than half of both A's and B's colons to full stops and retains three-quarters of B's full stops as well as nearly all of A's.

However, in at least one respect B's punctuation is rather more modern than A's. Within his whole text of the *Sonnets* Hubler has 97 question marks: 63 fall into parts of the text set by B, the other 34 into parts set by A; B provides 47 and omits 16, while A provides 19 and omits 15. The difference

¹⁴ *The metres of English poetry*, 1930, p. 198.

¹⁵ Ed. C. F. Tucker Brooke, *Shakespeare's sonnets*, 1936, p. 3; compare Hubler, *The sense of Shakespeare's sonnets*, Princeton, New Jersey, 1952, pp. 17–18.

¹⁶ *Shakespeare's songs and poems*, New York, 1959, p. viii.

¹⁷ *Shakespeare's sonnets*, 1964, p. ix.

between the two men is not particularly striking, but B was certainly more inclined than A to set a question mark in places where a modern editor requires one: B set 75 per cent of the required question marks, A 56 per cent. Figures for *Troilus and Cressida* closely parallel those for the *Sonnets*. Miss Walker's edition of *Troilus and Cressida* contains 107 question marks in those parts of the text corresponding to B's stints, of which B provided 73, or 68 per cent, and 253 question marks in those parts of the text corresponding to A's stints, of which A provided 150, or 59 per cent. Over the first half or so of the *Troilus and Cressida* Quarto the difference between the two men in their provision of question marks is considerably greater, but Compositor B gradually became careless.

If one compositor reproduced the punctuation of his copy for the *Sonnets*, the other obviously did not; perhaps neither did. William Empson quotes the first five lines of Sonnet 32 as illustrating 'one of those important and frequent subtleties of punctuation, which in general only convey rhythm, but here it amounts to a point of grammar':

IF thou suruiue my well contented daie,
 When that churle death my bones with dust shall couer
 And shalt by fortune once more re-suruay:
 These poore rude lines of thy deceased Louer:
 Compare them with the bett'ring of the time,

He remarks that 'Line 4 is isolated between colons, carries the whole weight of the pathos, and is a pivot round which the rest of the Sonnet turns'.¹⁸ Empson's comments on this and other sonnets are stimulating, but it is worth pointing out that line 4 is 'isolated between colons' because the page on which it appears was set by Compositor A. And although two modern linguists assert that 'One cannot but agree with George Wyndham's plea for the structural justification of the deviant punctuation in the 1609 Quarto and especially in "the magnificent 129"', I suspect that H₃^v, on which Sonnet 129 is printed, would have displayed a few colons had it been set by Compositor A instead of by Compositor B.¹⁹

J. Dover Wilson and Martin Seymour-Smith are among modern editors who have a high regard for the Quarto punctuation. Seymour-Smith realizes that 'Punctuation did not mean half so much to Shakespeare and his contemporaries as it does to us. And certainly it usually meant less to Shakespeare himself than it did to, say, Jonson or Donne.' Yet he refers to the Quarto's as 'Shakespeare's stopping' and considers it 'more sensitive to the usually complex meaning of the text than anyone else's attempt to correct or modernize it'.²⁰ Dover Wilson concludes that the only scholarly practice is to leave the Quarto punctuation virtually unchanged, 'on the hypothesis that

¹⁸ *Seven types of ambiguity*, 1930; 1961 ed., p. 51. Empson quotes the sonnet in a strange mixture of Quarto spelling, Elizabethan spelling which does not appear in the Quarto version, and modernization. I have quoted from the Quarto text, normalizing long s.

¹⁹ Roman Jakobson and Lawrence G. Jones, *Shakespeare's verbal art in 'Th' expence of spirit'*, The Hague, 1970, pp. 12-13.

²⁰ *Shakespeare's sonnets*, 1963, pp. 37-9.

the punctuation at best may be Shakespeare's, and at worst will pretty certainly be Thorpe's, when it is not palpably compositorial'.²¹ It is hardly likely that the publisher Thorpe himself took any interest in the punctuation of the manuscript he submitted to Eld, and if he did there would be little reason to preserve his work; so by 'Thorpe's punctuation' Wilson must, I suppose, mean the punctuation of the manuscript Thorpe had obtained, whatever it may have been. But I have tried to show that at least in some significant respects the punctuation of the Quarto is 'palpably compositorial'.

The question of which compositor made the fewer verbal errors is complicated by the striking disagreement among scholars in their efforts to determine these errors. I shall not attempt here a complete analysis of all the readings which have ever been emended. Rollins gives a convenient list of eighty-four words or phrases regarded as errors by the editors Beeching, Lee, or Brooke.²² Only fifty-three of these are emended or modernized in all the editions collated by Rollins, and he further reduces the list of supposed errors by eliminating fourteen which are merely unusual spellings, either recorded by the *OED* or at least conceivably Shakespearian. Of the thirty-nine remaining errors—which, with not more than one or two possible exceptions, really are errors—8 belong to A's twenty pages, 31 to B's forty-five pages. Thus on this evidence B, who set the greater part of the text, would seem to have been rather more prone to error than A.

The two men appear, however, to have perpetrated different kinds of error. Brooke made an intelligent attempt to categorize the readings which he felt bound to emend. He lists twenty-nine 'obvious misprints' or literals, sixteen cases where 'the compositor seems to have carelessly set one word for another' besides two more serious verbal confusions, and finally twenty-three readings which 'appear to be . . . faulty attempts to interpret the peculiarities of a difficult handwriting'.²³ These readings are distributed as follows:

	A	B
	20 pages	45 pages
Literals, etc.	7	22
Substitutions	10	8
Misreadings	3	20

Of course, some of Brooke's emendations would be rejected as unnecessary by Rollins and other editors, and his classifications are arguable, but it seems likely that A was more susceptible than B to 'memorial error' or the 'mis-carrying' of a word or phrase in his head, but that B was guilty of slightly more literals than A and was much more apt to misunderstand and hence misread his copy. It is interesting that twelve of the fourteen misreadings of *thy* as *their* occur in B's pages,²⁴ and that the two in A's pages (35.8, 37.7) are the only two which some editors retain: I think that they really are misreadings and that those editors who retain *their* in these two cases are mistaken, but obviously Compositor A did not misread his copy stupidly, as

²¹ *Shakespeare's sonnets*, Cambridge, 1966, p. cxxiv.

²³ *Shakespeare's sonnets*, pp. 58-60.

²² *New Variorum Sonnets*, ii. 11-16.

²⁴ I count *their . . . their* in 35.8 as one instance.

B did. From the *Sonnets* I get the impression that A was the more intelligent workman, but his susceptibility to memorial substitution may have caused more permanent damage to the text than B's dullness. A was, for example, responsible for the notorious crux in 146.2, 'My sinfull earth these rebbell powres that thee array' (13).

It would be interesting to know whether this impression of the two compositors could be confirmed by tracing their work in other texts printed by Eld. A's tendency to omit words from the *Troilus and Cressida* Quarto is perhaps in accord with his susceptibility to memorial substitution in the *Sonnets*, but I do not think that an 'inability to punctuate intelligibly',²⁵ which Miss Walker sees as a mark of his hand in *Troilus and Cressida*, is more evident on his pages of the *Sonnets* than on B's; of course, ideas about what is 'intelligible' in Elizabethan punctuation differ widely. Miss Walker also remarks in her edition of *Troilus and Cressida* that 'Errors due to foul case and the omission and transposition of letters are particularly rife in Q., especially in the work of Eld A.'²⁶ In the *Sonnets* A performed rather better, if anything, than B in this respect; it may or may not be significant that the roles of the two compositors were reversed in *Troilus and Cressida*, A setting the bulk of the text and B helping him out.

Several play Quartos, besides *Troilus and Cressida*, came from Eld's shop at about this time, such as *What you will*, *Northward ho*, *The puritan*, *The travels of the three English brothers*, *Lingua*, *The tragedy of Caesar and Pompey or Caesar's revenge*, and *The devil's charter* in 1607, *The conspiracy and tragedy of Charles, Duke of Byron*, *Your five gallants*, *A trick to catch the Old One*, and *The revenger's tragedy* in 1608. The last three Quartos have been studied by George R. Price.²⁷ All three seem to have been set by at least two compositors, one man setting the bulk of the text and another helping out according to no obvious predetermined pattern. Price does not, however, say much about the characteristics of the compositors involved in these texts, except that their shares are difficult to determine, which suggests some fidelity to the spelling of their copy. He deduces that *The revenger's tragedy* was printed on two presses, each press employing two skeletons, one for inner formes, the other for outer formes. *A trick to catch the Old One* was printed on one press by a similarly normal two-skeleton method. *Your five gallants* offers a closer parallel to the *Sonnets* and *Troilus and Cressida*. In *Your five gallants* one-skeleton printing was evidently adapted to the use of two presses; one skeleton was used for the inner and outer formes of sheets A, C, E, G, and I, a second skeleton for the inner and outer formes of sheets B, D, F, and H; the two groups of sheets were printed on different stocks of paper.

I think that the apparently rather haphazard distribution of labour between the two compositors who worked on the *Sonnets* can plausibly be related to the unusual skeleton pattern. The first point to note is that whenever

²⁵ New Cambridge *Troilus and Cressida*, p. 129.

²⁶ New Cambridge *Troilus and Cressida*, p. 135.

²⁷ 'The First Edition of *Your five gallants* and of *Michaelmas term*', *The Library*, V, 8 (1953), 23-9; 'The early editions of *A trick to catch the Old One*', *The Library*, V, 23 (1968), 205-27; 'The authorship and the bibliography of *The revenger's tragedy*', *The Library*, V, 15 (1960), 262-77.

Compositor A set three or more pages of a sheet (in sheets C, D, F, G, and I) he set the last page of the sheet—the last page of the outer forme; in sheets C, D, and I he also set the last page of the inner forme, and in F he may have done so. It is natural to suppose, therefore, that Compositor A, whose share in the actual setting of the text was subordinate to Compositor B's, imposed and prepared for the press both inner and outer formes of the sheets in which he was chiefly involved—sheets C, D, F, G, and I. Presumably, on the other hand, Compositor B imposed and prepared for the press both inner and outer formes of the sheets which he set alone or almost alone—sheets B, E, H, and (probably) K: Compositor A seems not to have set either 4 or 4^v of any of these sheets. Now if these assumptions are justified the following pattern results:

Forme	Imposed by	Skeleton	Forme	Imposed by	Skeleton	Press
B(i)	B	I				I
B(o)	B	I				I
			C(i)	A	II	2
			C(o)	A	II	2
			D(i)	A	III	I
			D(o)	A	III	I
E(i)	B	IV				2
E(o)	B	IV				2
			F(i)	A	II	2
			F(o)	A	II	2
			G(i)	A	III	I
			G(o)	A	III	I
H(i)	B	I				I
H(o)	B	I				I
			I(i)	A	II	2
			I(o)	A	II	2
K(i)	B	V				1/2
K(o)	B	V				1/2

This would mean that Compositor A used skeletons II and III for alternate sheets of which he imposed the formes and Compositor B similarly alternated with skeletons I and IV/V. The final column of the table is hypothetical, and represents but one of several possibilities.²⁸ The problem is to reconcile the

²⁸ I had hoped that I might be able to support all this guess-work by an examination of the watermarks in the Quarto; for if two presses used different stocks of paper a pattern such as I have postulated might appear. However, at least six watermarks can be distinguished in the Bodleian Library copies of the Quarto, and the two copies have them in different combinations, thus:

Sheet	Malone 34	Malone 886	Sheet	Malone 34	Malone 886
B	I	2	G	2	2
C	2	2	H	5	1?
D	I	3	I	6	I
E	4	5	K	6?	I
F	I	I	L	—	I

use of alternative skeletons by each compositor with the fact that for every sheet a single skeleton imposed both inner and outer formes. We seem to have an example of an essentially one-skeleton *method* of printing adapted to the use of two presses and to an unequal amount of typesetting by two compositors.²⁹ Presumably Compositor B constructed skeleton I for Press 1 and skeleton IV for Press 2 (the new skeleton V was, of course, required by the nature of the text and may have been machined by either press), while Compositor A constructed skeleton II for Press 2 and skeleton III for Press 1. If the association of skeleton II with Press 2 and skeleton I with Press 1 persisted, then the two presses would have been used as in the above table. If the association did not persist, it is possible to imagine the two presses simply printing alternate sheets within the second half of the Quarto as well as within the first. It is even conceivable that three presses were used, Compositor B constructing skeleton I for Press 1, and Compositor A constructing skeletons II and III for Presses 2 and 3; but if we entertain this theory we must explain Compositor B's now unexpected construction of skeleton IV by some *ad hoc* hypothesis.³⁰

Tantalizing glimpses of a pattern appear, but the evidence is contradictory. An examination of several copies of the Quarto, preferably with the help of beta-radiography, would doubtless throw some light on the matter.

²⁹ As Peter Davison has pointed out, the use of 'a pair of single skeleton-formes' (as he puts it) is quite common; see his Penguin edition of *1 Henry IV*, 1968, pp. 250-1; 'Marry, Sweet Wag', in *The Elizabethan theatre*, ii, Toronto, 1970, ed. David Galloway, pp. 138-9; and 'Science, Method, and the Textual Critic', *SB*, xxv (1972), 3, note 4. Peter W. M. Blayney, 'Compositor B' and the Pavier Quartos: Problems of Identification and their Implications', *The Library*, V, 27 (1972), 179-206, shows that in most of the Pavier Quartos of 1619 'the pattern is of two skeletons, alternate sheets using the same skeleton in both formes' (p. 202). Blayney provides an admirably cautious 'post-McKenzie' discussion of the inferences to be drawn from skeleton patterns. He tentatively associates the dominant pattern in the Paviers with the presence of two compositors. A very close parallel to the skeleton pattern of the *Sonnets* is afforded by the original Quarto of Middleton's *The phoenix*, printed by Edward Allde for Arthur Johnson in 1607. George R. Price, 'Setting by Formes in the First Edition of *The Phoenix*', *PBSA*, lvi (1962), 414-27, found that three skeletons were used in rotation: I for both formes of A, D, and G; II for both formes of B, E, and H; and III for both formes of C, F, and I. Price relates this pattern to the use of two presses. Unfortunately, he makes no attempt to determine how many compositors set the text. See also p. 24 for an additional note.

³⁰ For instance, the construction of a new skeleton for sheet E might be taken to imply that composition was at this point comfortably ahead of press work, and the minimal participation of Compositor A in the setting of sheet E might be thought of as supporting this view. Miss Walker gave reasons for thinking that in working upon the Quarto of *Troilus and Cressida* 'the two compositors combined could set sheets faster than two presses could print them off' (New Cambridge *Troilus and Cressida*, p. 130). A page of the *Sonnets* naturally tends to contain more white space than the average page of the *Troilus and Cressida* Quarto and could be set more quickly; so if Miss Walker is right about *Troilus and Cressida* Eld's two compositors could perhaps have kept three presses busy on the *Sonnets*, if (as one would expect) no fewer copies of the *Sonnets* were printed than of the play. Eld was returned as owning two presses on 9 May 1615; see Edward Arber, *Stationers' register*, 1875-94, iii, 699. But we cannot know how many presses he actually had operating in 1609. McKenzie, *SB*, xxii (1969), 54-7, gives reasons for thinking that the size of Elizabethan printing-houses 'has perhaps been a little too readily set at one or two presses and the "strict limitation" on their numbers over-stressed'. One further matter should at least be raised. I have suggested that Compositor A imposed both formes of sheets C, D, F, G, and I, on which he set the last page of the outer forme; he did not set the last page of the inner forme of G, and may not have set the last page of the inner forme of F. The implication would appear to be that outer formes were printed before inner formes, which would

However, these conjectures are incidental to my main purpose, which is to suggest that the unusual skeleton pattern of the *Sonnets* and the apparently erratic division of labour among the two compositors make sense of each other.

Now that the presence of two compositors in the *Sonnets* has been established, we can feel reasonably confident that features of the Quarto which cut right across the compositorial divisions derive from the printer's manuscript copy. For example, the number of internal commas—commas within the line, not at the end of it—bears no relation to the compositors' stints, but differs from one part of the sequence to another. In fact, if we count all the internal stops (the vast majority of which are commas), Sonnets 1-25 average 2.8 per sonnet, Sonnets 26-50 average 4.7, Sonnets 51-75 average 4.9, Sonnets 76-100 average 5.5, Sonnets 101-26 average 5.4, and Sonnets 127-54 average 3.6. Sonnet 126 is, of course, the last of those addressed to the Friend, and I am inclined to believe that the figures reflect chronological differences between groups of sonnets of differing metrical and syntactic complexity. Dover Wilson thinks that the manuscript of Shakespeare's *Sonnets* which Thorpe handed to the printers was 'good' and that 'if not autograph it must have been a tolerably competent transcript, perhaps copied out by more than one transcriber.' As he points out, 'This contingency has seemed likely to many because of the error of *their* for *thy* first noticed by Malone, which occurs fourteen times between sonnets 26 and 70 and only once later, in 128.'³¹ The other errors which Brooke classifies as misreadings tend to fall within roughly the same part of the text, and it is interesting that all but five of the forty-two parentheses in the *Sonnets* occur within numbers 26-98, and that two of the others occur within 126, which is close to 128 with its *their* error. This might be taken to support the theory that the printer's copy was in two hands. Upon such matters we can as yet only speculate. I have attempted to provide a more solid basis for speculation.

SUMMARY AND VERIFICATION

I want to conclude with a summary of the procedure I have adopted in this study. My aim is to suggest that statistical tests of significance, basic tools of scientific method, can usefully be applied to problems of compositor discrimination, and that such tests confirm the presence of two compositorial patterns in the *Sonnets*. Peter Davison has recently suggested that bibliography needs to adopt 'a combination of probabilistic theory and falsification tests',³² and David Shaw has outlined one way in which statistical theory may contribute to bibliographical research.³³ A full discussion of the possibilities of using statistical tests in order to evaluate compositor studies is beyond the scope of the present article, but I want to show, very briefly,

indicate setting by formes rather than seriatim. Evidence from type shortage is extremely slight, but the use of 'VV' on I4 but not on I4^v (both pages were set by A) is suggestive.

³¹ New Cambridge *Sonnets*, p. xxxvi.

³² 'Science, Method, and the Textual Critic', *SB*, xxv (1972), 14.

³³ 'A Sampling Theory for Bibliographical Research', *The Library*, V, 27 (1972), 310-19.

many pages as A the total number of colons set by each compositor is roughly the same. It can hardly be fortuitous, then, that 16 of 17 colons preceded by a space in the *Sonnets* belong to B's pages. This difference between A and B in the *Sonnets* is also reflected in *Troilus and Cressida*: I have not made a complete count, but it is obvious that the proportion of colons preceded by a space in *Troilus and Cressida* is far higher in B's share than in A's.

My ascriptions would seem, therefore, to be substantially correct, though a few pages may well have been wrongly assigned, and it is not impossible that a third compositor also had some small share in setting the text. On F4, H1^v, I2, and I2^v the proportion of spaced to non-spaced commas seems rather high for Compositor B, though he has two or three such pages in *Troilus and Cressida*. Perhaps F4, which I described as a doubtful page, should be re-assigned to A; on the other three pages the evidence of spelling and 'bibliographical anomalies' seems to point to B, though the evidence from colons/commas ending quatrains is equivocal. B may simply have been a little inconsistent. Certainly I am unable to find any third compositorial pattern which would clearly distinguish a hypothetical Compositor C from Compositors A and B. As I have noted, and the point should be stressed, in *Troilus and Cressida* both A and B were extremely variable in their spacing of commas, so that it would be quite impossible to discriminate their shares on this basis alone—it is only in the overall proportions that a significant difference appears.³⁸

That the bulk of the *Sonnets* Quarto was set by two compositors, who punctuated the text in very different ways, has, I think, been demonstrated.

Auckland

TABLE I

THE following table is divided into four sections: the first gives spellings favoured by Compositor A, the second gives spellings favoured by Compositor B, the third gives bibliographical anomalies characteristic of B's pages, and the fourth gives information about the proportion of colons to commas ending quatrains. It will be noted that entries in the third section (B's bibliographical anomalies) are closely associated with entries in the second (B's spellings) and with blanks in the first (A's spellings). In the fourth section commas imply B (especially if there is more than one or if there are no colons), whereas a marked predominance of colons suggests A: this evidence from punctuation is in close agreement with the evidence from the first three sections on almost every page until sheets H and I where there is conflict on some pages.

In consulting the table one must remember that not all the spellings are equally good discriminators between the two compositors. The spelling *eie* is doubtful evidence of A: I have included it in the table because whereas A seems indifferent over *eye* (17 times, including *A lover's complaint* pages assigned to him) and *eie* (13 times), B strongly prefers *eye* (65 times) to *eie* (10 times); so although the total

³⁸ Howard-Hill found that the Folio compositors were similarly inconsistent in their spacing habits, but the greater size of the Folio pages tends to make proportions per page a more reliable guide in the Folio than in a Quarto.

number of *eie* spellings in B's pages is almost as great as the total number of *eie* spellings in A's pages, it appears that when confronted with the word *eye/eie* in the copy for the *Sonnets* A was more than 5 times as likely as B to set *eie*. The table shows more B spellings than A spellings because B tolerates several spellings (*hower*, *ould*, *gould*, *noe*, *loe*, *-les*, and *-nes*) which A avoids. To have included in the table all instances of *no* or *eye* or the normal *-lesse* and *-nesse* endings, for example, would have been to obscure the compositorial pattern. However, I should perhaps add here that *houre* occurs on B4, C3^v, C4^v, D4^v (2), E1, E1^v, E2, H1, I3, and K2^v (2), *gold* on B4^v, C3^v, and K2, and *old* on B1, B4^v, C2^v, C3, C4^v, E1, E4^v (2), F3^v, G2^v, G3, G3^v (4), I1^v, K2^v, and K3^v. I have not attempted a full-scale analysis of recurrent damaged types in the Quarto, but a damaged O links D1, D4, and I4, strengthening the evidence that they are Compositor A's, and a distinctive drop W links D1^v, G3, and I1, strengthening the evidence that they are Compositor B's: G3 would be a very doubtful page without this evidence. In his twenty Sonnet pages Compositor A uses 30 colons not at the ends of quatrains, whereas in his forty-five Sonnet pages Compositor B uses only 28 colons in these other positions. Compositor B only once uses more than 2 of these extra colons on a page—3 on I2^v, a page upon which the spelling evidence points clearly to B. The appearance of 4 extra colons on G1, G2, and I3, and of 3 extra colons on F3^v and I4^v thus supports the ascription of these pages to Compositor A: I4^v, in particular, needs this extra scrap of evidence.

Entries in the table and figures in the body of the article include plurals and cognate forms or words of which the word under consideration forms a part, such as *inrich*, *toung-tide*, *eielids*, *goulden*, *powrefull*, etc.

	B							
	I	I ^v	2	2 ^v	3	3 ^v	4	4 ^v
<i>shalbe, wilbe</i>	I			I				
<i>ritch</i>								
<i>Oh</i>								
<i>dost</i>		2						
<i>flowre, powre</i>								
<i>tongue</i>								I
<i>eie</i>						I	I	
<i>shall be, will be</i>		I						
<i>rich</i>							I	
<i>O</i>					I	I		I
<i>doost, etc.</i>		3						
<i>flower, power, hower</i>	I	I					I	
<i>toung, etc.</i>								
<i>ould, gould</i>		2	I					
<i>noe, loe</i>			2					
<i>-les, -nes</i>	I	I						
Headings 44+ mm. right	2	I			I		2	I
Sigs. 47+ mm. right					I			

B (cont.)

	I	I ^v	2	2 ^v	3	3 ^v	4	4 ^v
C.w. ignores heading Sonnets ending with comma or no stop			I				I	I
Colons/commas ending quatrains	4/0	I/0	3/3	5/1	4/3	2/2	I/2	3/3

C

	I	I ^v	2	2 ^v	3	3 ^v	4	4 ^v
shalbe, wilbe								
ritch							I	
Oh						I		I
dost								2
flowre, powre								
tongue								
eie		I	I			I		
shall be, will be								
rich	I				I			
O	2	3						
doost, etc.				I				
flower, power, hower	2							
toung, etc.		I						
ould, Gould	2	I						
noe, loe	I			2				
-les, -nes				2				
Headings 44+ mm. right								
Sigs. 47+ mm. right					I			
C.w. ignores heading								
Sonnets ending with comma or no stop				2			I	
Colons/commas ending quatrains	I/3	I/I	3/0	0/I	I/2	4/0	2/I	4/I

D

	I	I ^v	2	2 ^v	3	3 ^v	4	4 ^v
shalbe, wilbe	I							
ritch								
Oh	2						I	
dost	I							

D (cont.)

	I	I ^v	2	2 ^v	3	3 ^v	4	4 ^v
flowre, powre							I	
tongue								
eie								2
shall be, will be								
rich							I	
O							I	
doost, etc.		I	I	I				
flower, power, hower							I	I
toung, etc.								
ould, Gould							2	
noe, loe								
-les, -nes								
Headings 44+ mm. right								
Sigs. 47+ mm. right			I		I			
C.w. ignores heading			I					
Sonnets ending with comma or no stop			I					
Colons/commas ending quatrains	2/I	I/2	0/I	0/I	I/3	0/3	5/0	I/0

E

	I	I ^v	2	2 ^v	3	3 ^v	4	4 ^v
shalbe, wilbe								
ritch								
Oh	3							
dost		I						
flowre, powre								
tongue								
eie		3			I			
shall be, will be			I					
rich			I					
O		I		3	I	2	I	I
doost, etc.					I		I	
flower, power, hower			I	I	3			
toung, etc.				I	2			
ould, Gould					2			
noe, loe						I		
-les, -nes								

E (cont.)

	I	I ^v	2	2 ^v	3	3 ^v	4	4 ^v
Headings 44+ mm. right		I	2			I		2
Sigs. 47+ mm. right					I			
C.w. ignores heading					I			
Sonnets ending with comma or no stop			I					2
Colons/commas ending quatrains	o/o	o/o	o/I	o/2	2/2	I/I	I/I	I/2

F

	I	I ^v	2	2 ^v	3	3 ^v	4	4 ^v
<i>shalbe, wilbe</i>					I			
<i>ritch</i>					I			I
<i>Oh</i>							I	2
<i>dost</i>						I		I
<i>flowre, powre</i>								3
<i>tongue</i>						I		I
<i>eie</i>					I			I
<i>shall be, will be</i>		2	I					
<i>rich</i>	I		I	I			I	
<i>O</i>		I						
<i>doost, etc.</i>	2	I						I
<i>flower, power, hower</i>								
<i>toung, etc.</i>		2		I				
<i>ould, Gould</i>				I				
<i>noe, loe</i>								
<i>-les, -nes</i>								
Headings 44+ mm. right							I	
Sigs. 47+ mm. right	I		I					
C.w. ignores heading		I						
Sonnets ending with comma or no stop		I						
Colons/commas ending quatrains	o/I	o/2	I/2	o/I	2/o	2/o	o/o	4/o

G

	I	I ^v	2	2 ^v	3	3 ^v	4	4 ^v
<i>shalbe, wilbe</i>	I	I						
<i>ritch</i>	I		I					
<i>Oh</i>		I	I					I

G (cont.)

	I	I ^v	2	2 ^v	3	3 ^v	4	4 ^v
<i>dost</i>			I					
<i>flowre, powre</i>		I						I
<i>tongue</i>			2					
<i>eie</i>								2
<i>shall be, will be</i>								
<i>rich</i>								
<i>O</i>								
<i>doost, etc.</i>						I	I	
<i>flower, power, hower</i>	I	I						
<i>toung, etc.</i>					I		I	
<i>ould, Gould</i>								
<i>noe, loe</i>								
<i>-les, -nes</i>								
Headings 44+ mm. right								
Sigs. 47+ mm. right								
C.w. ignores heading				I				
Sonnets ending with comma or no stop						I		
Colons/commas ending quatrains	2/o	I/o	2/o	o/I	I/I	2/3	o/2	4/o

H

	I	I ^v	2	2 ^v	3	3 ^v	4	4 ^v
<i>shalbe, wilbe</i>								
<i>ritch</i>								
<i>Oh</i>								
<i>dost</i>								
<i>flowre, powre</i>								
<i>tongue</i>								
<i>eie</i>		I					I	
<i>shall be, will be</i>								
<i>rich</i>					I			
<i>O</i>	I	I	I					
<i>doost, etc.</i>					2			I
<i>flower, power, hower</i>					I			
<i>toung, etc.</i>				3	3		I	
<i>ould, Gould</i>						I		
<i>noe, loe</i>				I	I			
<i>-les, -nes</i>			I					
				2		I		

H (cont.)

	I	I ^v	2	2 ^v	3	3 ^v	4	4 ^v
Headings 44+ mm. right		2		I	I	2	2	I
Sigs. 47+ mm. right	I							
C.w. ignores heading						I		
Sonnets ending with comma or no stop	I							
Colons/commas ending quatrains	3/I	0/0	1/0	4/I	0/I	0/5	1/0	2/0

I

	I	I ^v	2	2 ^v	3	3 ^v	4	4 ^v
shalbe, wilbe								
rich								
Oh							2	
dost					2			
flowre, powre					I		2	
tongue		I						
eie								I
shall be, will be								
rich	I							
O		2		I		4		
doost, etc.	I			2				
flower, power, hower		2						
toung, etc.		I	2					
ould, Gould								
noe, loe				I				
-les, -nes								
Headings 44+ mm. right								
Sigs. 47+ mm. right	I		I					
C.w. ignores heading			I					
Sonnets ending with comma or no stop								
Colons/commas ending quatrains	1/0	2/2	3/0	1/1	1/1	1/2	0/1	3/0

I add notes on pages not included in the table; K1 contains the last sonnet only, number 154; the remaining pages contain *A lover's complaint*:

K1	B	Sonnet heading 44 mm. right; sig. 52 mm. right; 0 colons, 2 commas ending quatrains.
K1 ^v	?	eye (2); 3 colons.

K2	B	Sig. 48 mm. right; O, doost -nes, but gold, eies; 0 colons.
K2 ^v	B	O, -ower (2), eyes (2), but houre (2), old; 3 colons.
K3	A?	tongue (2); 1 colon.
K3 ^v	B?	-ower (2), but old, eies; 2 colons.
K4	B	Sig. 50 mm. right; O; 2 colons.
K4 ^v	?	eyes; 2 colons.
L1	A	ritch, Oh (3), but -les; 2 colons.
L1 ^v	A	els, Oh, -owre (2), eie (2), but O, eye; 5 colons.
L2	A and B?	Oh (2), eies (2); followed by loe and sig. 48 mm. right; 6 colons.
L2 ^v	B	O (5), eye; 2 colons.

TABLE II

The following table shows for each page of the *Sonnets* Quarto the number of spaced (left-hand column) and non-spaced commas:

Compositor B's pages			Compositor B's pages		
B1 ^v	0	1	H1	1	8
B2	0	2	H1 ^v	3	4
B3	1	14	H2	2	14
B3 ^v	1	10	H2 ^v	1	9
B4	0	3	H3	2	14
B4 ^v	1	3	H3 ^v	2	12
C1	0	4	H4	0	9
C1 ^v	0	4	H4 ^v	0	7
C2 ^v	0	9	I1	3	12
C3	1	4	I1 ^v	0	6
D1 ^v	0	14	I2	4	7
D2	0	13	I2 ^v	2	3
D2 ^v	1	11	I3 ^v	2	11
D3	0	7	K1	0	3
D3 ^v	0	8	K2	0	5
E1 ^v	1	10	K2 ^v	2	7
E2	2	9	K4	0	3
E2 ^v	1	4	L2 ^v	0	3
E3	0	8	TOTAL	41	399
E3 ^v	0	5			
E4	0	10			
E4 ^v	1	7			
F1	1	9			
F1 ^v	1	7			
F2	0	9			
F2 ^v	0	14			
F4	4	10			
G2 ^v	0	21			
G3	0	13			
G3 ^v	1	9			
G4	0	10			

Compositor A's pages

B1	0	6
B2 ^v	3	6
C2	2	7
C3 ^v	2	7
C4	3	3
C4 ^v	2	14
D1	0	12
D4	6	9
D4 ^v	3	15

Punctuation of Shakespeare's Sonnets, 1609

Compositor A's pages			Compositor A's pages		
E1	2	6	L1	1	5
F3	0	11	L1 ^v	7	8
F3 ^v	5	9	TOTAL	43	182
F4 ^v	2	10	Unassigned A lover's		
G1	0	11	complaint pages		
G1 ^v	1	11	K1 ^v	2	2
G2	1	11	K3	2	8
G4 ^v	0	15	K3 ^v	2	7
I3	0	2	K4 ^v	2	4
I4	2	2	L2	2	7
I4 ^v	1	5			

Note additional to 29, page 12

After submitting this article I encountered C. G. Petter's New Mermaid edition (1973) of *Eastward ho!*, a play first printed by George Eld in 1605. According to Petter, three skeletons were used: I for both formes of sheets A, C, and F, and for I(o); II for both formes of B, D, and G, and for I(i); and III for both formes of E and H. Petter, drawing not only on Miss Walker's analysis of *Troilus and Cressida* but also on the work of Yamada and Evans on Chapman's *All fools*, which Eld printed in 1605, argues that Eld A and Eld B shared the composition of *Eastward ho!*, but he finds the compositorial pattern 'enigmatic' and cannot relate it to the skeleton pattern.

The 1622 Edition of Sir John Davies's *Orchestra*

By J. R. BRINK

TWO versions of Sir John Davies's *Orchestra* were published during his lifetime, one in 1596 and the other in 1622. The 1622 edition contains a new dedication and a revised ending which supposedly renders the poem incomplete, but otherwise does not differ significantly from the earlier work.¹ Modern editors of Davies have taken it for granted that the 1622 version is indeed incomplete and have explained the new dedication addressed 'To the Prince' and the fragmented conclusion as an attempt on Davies's part to conceal his lingering dislike of Richard Martin, the 'dearest friend' to whom he had dedicated the 1596 edition of *Orchestra*. There are, however, other plausible reasons for Davies's having removed the dedication to Martin, and what biographical evidence there is suggests that his reconciliation with Martin was probably genuine. Furthermore, the issue of why Davies removed the earlier dedication to Martin and a possible allusion to him in the conclusion seems to be irrelevant to the question of why the final stanzas are left in such a disorganized, 'unfinished' state. The standard view is that Davies deliberately left the poem incomplete to conceal his motives for changing the dedication.² A more likely explanation for the 'unfinished' state of the conclusion is that the printer erred in interpreting Davies's notes and that the 1622 edition does not reflect the poet's intentions. There is, in fact, textual evidence that the printer confused the order of the new stanzas which were to be added and that he also inserted them in the wrong place. Once the relevant stanzas are reordered, the new conclusion results in a coherent, finished poem, and the 1622 conclusion is in certain respects aesthetically superior to the 1596 version.

The current editorial hypothesis, that Davies revised the conclusion deliberately leaving it incomplete in 1622, depends upon our assuming that his revisions were influenced by a lifelong grudge against Richard Martin. On 9 February 1598, twenty-four years before the 1622 edition appeared, Davies assaulted Richard Martin in the Middle Temple dining hall.³ As a result of this flagrant violation of legal decorum, he was expelled from the Temple for more than three years. According to Chamberlain's letters, the two men were reconciled by 8 July 1601.⁴ The only basis for assuming that Davies's public apology was not genuine seems to be Grosart's account of the parliamentary debates of 1601. According to Grosart's biography, Davies

¹ For a collation of LF, an early manuscript version of the poem, 1596, and 1622, see Robert Krueger, 'Sir John Davies: *Orchestra* Complete, *Epigrams*, Unpublished Poems', *RES*, n.s., xiii (1962), 2-29. The 1622 edition contained *Nosce teipsum* and *Astraea* as well as *Orchestra*.

² For the best summary of this view, see Krueger, p. 26.

³ *Middle Temple records*, ed. Charles Henry Hopwood, 1904, i, 381.

⁴ Chamberlain, *Letters*, ed. Norman E. McClure, Philadelphia, 1939, i, 126.

ペイター自身の文体が、自己抑制どころか、過剰な浪費を感じさせ、その饒舌さにおいて、ほとんど失語症を思わせるほどの拡散的で焦点の定まらない耽溺性を示すのは興味深い。第一章の「江夏の21球」や絲山秋子の作品の分析を通して指摘したように、文章におけるスローモーションには言語化の拒絶という側面がある。ペイターの瞬間至上主義は、一見「小さいものから大きいものを生み出す」近代的な効率主義と重なるように思えるが、究極のところ生産性を拒絶し、その無駄で、過剰で、意味に収斂しない多弁を通して、論理や生産性よりも感情や美をこそ上に置くような価値観へのスライドを実現しているのである。だからこそ抒情詩なのだ。感極まることで言葉をなくす *apostrophe* という古典詩以来のレトリックがあるが（ラナム 一八六）、瞬間の微分化としてのペイター流のスローモーションにおいては、必ずしも生産的ではないこうした「感情の過剰」が、近代的な時間「カネ」という価値観への抵抗を具現するのである。

エリオットが「形而上派詩人」の中で指摘したように、そもそも感情は論理とは対立するべきものではなかった。それが、まるで感情が論理や生産性に対立するかのようにつまえられるようになったのだとするなら、まさにそこに近代の兆候があるということになる。ペイターが行ったのも、効率主義に対してアンチテーゼを発明するということではなかった。むしろ効率と生産の思想が感情や美と対立しうるかのように語った、つまり、両者の間に対立軸を呼びこんだこと自体が重要なのである。その基盤となったのが、連綿と流れる歴史的な時間に、スローモーション的

な微分によって無限化される瞬間を対峙させるという美の方法だったのである。

廻れば、ワーズワスを代表としたロマン派の詩人にも、明らかにこうした瞬間の美学への傾斜は見られる。第六章でとりあげた、「オード」における「私は感ずる すべて感ずるのだ」(I feel it all) という感覚が象徴的に表すように、時の一点を深々と掘り下げ、知覚体験をスローモーションとともに時間的に微分化するという方法は、背後にある「小さいものから大きいものを得る」という原理において、近代的な生産主義の価値意識と不即不離の関係をとることになるのである。逆に時代を下つても、第七章で見たように、ペイターを遠く先祖として仰ぐことになった二十世紀の文芸批評の方法において、時間的な微分化に根ざした「小さいものから大きなものを」という原理は強力な影響を及ぼしてきた。文学における「ゆっくり」は、こうして小さい／大きい、少ない／たくさんといった対立を、速さ／ゆっくりの対立に変換することで、近代最大の関心事としての「富」の問題と深く結びついてきたのである。

あなたは時間になる

シェイクスピアのソネット一番

時間が計量可能なものとして意識されるようになったのは、時計が普及しはじめたシェイクス

ピアの時代である。その結果、「小さいものから大きいものを」という生産の理念は、時間にも適用されるようになった。美しい青年に向け、「時はどんどん流れていくのだ、だから今のうちに、子孫を作ってあなたの美を再生産せよ」と語るシェイクスピアの『ソネット集』にも、たしかに時間・カネという近代的な効率主義の萌芽は見られる。そもそもソネットという様式自体が、「小さいもの」の典型例なのである。こうした点を踏まえ、このセクションではソネットが「ゆつくり」を紹介して近代特有の「富」の意識と密接につながることにについて、シェイクスピアやダンの作品の読解を通して確認してみたい。

言うまでもなく、ソネットは西洋の文学形式の中でもっとも短いもののひとつである。とくに英語圏では、はじめてソネット形式が移入された十六世紀以降、短さや小ささの持つ「冴え」こそがこの形式の売り物となる傾向があった。abbaabba cdecdec d という風に同じ韻を多用するペトラルカ式とは違い、英語式のソネットでは abab cdcd efef gg と、押韻しにくい英語特有の事情に合わせて韻にヴァリエーションを持たせる傾向があったが、その付随的特徴とも言えるのが、最後のカプレットであった。コウリーの指摘するようにシェイクスピアの『ソネット集』でも、しばしばエピソード的な寸言が構造上の要となり、鋭さや冴えの印象を与えている（七五など）。ただ、その一方、『ソネット集』では青年の美を褒め称えるに際しても財産の隠喩が頻出し、ブルジョア資本主義者かと思まごうほどに利潤や富が称揚されている。背後にあるのは聖書やギ

リシャ・ローマの古典世界にも通底するような、物質的な豊かさの理念に基づいた「たくさん」の価値意識である（カズン 一二九三〇）。こうした豊かさへの憧憬が華麗な展開性に富んだ構成にも反映され、「抒情詩らしい俊敏さとナラティブ的拡大の拮抗」（ストランド&ポランド）の上に成り立つような、矛盾をはらんだ両義的なソネットの枠組みが形成されることになる。ソネットは「小さく少なく閉じ、それでいてなお深くあれ、大きくたくさんであれ」と無理難題の課されたゲームとなったのである。詩人たちはこの無理難題をクリアするために、あの手この手で読者をそののかし、畏にはめ、幻惑する。だからソネットをしっかりと読むためには、こちらまらずはうっかりだまされてみる必要があるだろう。

まず『ソネット集』の冒頭を飾る一番にどんな仕掛けがこらされているかを読んでみよう。

From fairest creatures we desire increase,
That thereby beauty's rose might never die,
But as the ripper should by time decease,
His tender heir might bear his memory;
But thou, contracted to thine own bright eyes,
Feed'st thy light's flame with self-substantial fuel,

Making a famine where abundance lies,

Thyself thy foe, to thy sweet self too cruel.

Thou that art now the world's fresh ornament

And only herald to the gaudy spring

Within thine own bud buriest thy content,

And, tender churl, mak'st waste in niggarding.

Pity the world, or else this glutton be,

To eat the world's due, by the grave and thee.

美しく造られたものには 是非とも増え栄えて欲しい
そうすることで 美という薔薇が朽ちることなく

年老いたものが時の経過のうちに没しても

その若い跡継ぎが面影をたたえてくれるように

しかし あなたは自分の輝かしい目にかかりきりで

その火に燃料をくべるため 自分自身を浪費するばかり

豊作のはずが 飢饉となり

まさに自分が自分の敵 甘美な自分に酷い仕打ちをする

今 この世を若々しく飾るあなた

気持ちの良い春の 並ぶ者のない先駆けであるあなたは

自分の蕾に持てるものを埋め

けちんぼよろしく 吝嗇に走って大切なものを無駄にする

この世に情けをかけよ さもなくば貪欲さそのものだ

この世の取り分を自分で そして やがては墓で食い尽くすも同然だ

一般論ではじまるソネットである。美しい人こそ、その美を後世に残すべく子孫を繁栄させるべきなのだ、という。男性の語り手が美しいパトロンの青年に、「あなた、子供をつくりなさい」と論ずというこの何とも怪しげな設定は、『ソネット集』冒頭の十以上のソネットで一貫して用いられるものである。しかし、ただ単に「子をつくれ、生め、増やせ」と言い募るだけではない。たとえばこの冒頭部では、まず一般論が四行ほどつづいてからはじめて五行目で、But thou, contracted to thine own bright eyes... という呼びかけがくる。五行目になってやっと「あなた」が表に出てくるのである。なぜか。

ために穴蔵のような入り口をもった地下の喫茶店を想像して欲しい。薄暗い階段を下りてい

ってドアをあけると、天井から裸電球がさがっていて、ところが思いがけず、その向こうに明るい空間が広がっている。はっとする。しかし、それは鏡に映った、外の明かりを背景に立ち竦んだ自分自身なのである。五行目の呼びかけはこれと似ている。それまで一般論を媒介に築かれてきた語り手と読者の間の默契が、ここへ来て小さく転覆される。テキストは語り手と読者一般とを結んでいたはずだったのに、ここへ来て、それが語り手と「あなた」という特定の人物との間をこそつないでいたことが判明するのである。その「あなた」に一瞬、自分自身を重ねてしまう読者もいるかもしれない、いずれにせよここで起きるのは、はじめに前提とされていたテキストの空間が思いがけずまったく別のスケールに転換されてしまうような、眩暈の感覚である。読者の焦点が、つかの間、ぼける。

今、鏡の比喩を用いたのは、この幻惑感が広いものを狭く見せる一方で、狭いものを広くみせもするような、一筋縄ではいかない操作に基づいているからである。呼びかけは頓呼法 (apostro-
phe) として英詩の中でもよく用いられるもので、感情の極みを表現することが多い。五行目是一般論を助走にした語り手が、ついに個人的な思いをぶちまける抒情的跳躍の地点であり、声の最大化の瞬間である。しかし他方、語り手はここで「あなた」に向けて語り始めもする。つまり、今までのようにパブリックな声高きで不特定多数に対して語りかけることをやめ、「あなた」という親密な間柄の相手に、距離の短い、非常にパーソナルな語りをはじめるのである。声の感情

が高まりその到達範囲が広がる一方、語り手と「あなた」の対峙する関係の場はぐっと狭くなっている。

こうしてソネットの空間は五行目になって拡大したとも、縮小したとも言えるのである。おそらくそこにあるのは、狭い環境でなお、大きな場を想定したかのように行われる語りなのである。独特の密集感、狭い空間で逆に膨張しようとするような充溢感がそこにはある。

このような仕掛けにこだわったのは、その後続く「あなた」の描き方が、この密集感と関わっているからである。同じような構文が二回続くので比べてもらいたい。ひとつは今の五行目からの部分。

But thou, contracted to thine own bright eyes,
Feed'st thy light's flame with self-substantial fuel

もうひとつは九行目から。

Thou that art now the world's fresh ornament
And only herald to the gaudy spring

いずれも「あなた」Thouという主語の提示のあと、contracted to thine own bright eyesとか、that art now...といった挿入部分のある、つまり〈Thou+挿入部分+verb〉という構造になっている。

第三章で話題にしたワーズワスの「眠りが私の心を封じた」とは違い、このソネットにおける述語の遅延はかなりお約束に則ったもので、不安の少ない、行く先のある程度見えたものと言える。『ソネット集』全般でこうした挿入表現は多用されているので、あらためてその効果について考えてみると、まず、こうして「あなた」のあとにためをつくることで、「あなた」の重要さが際立つということはあるだろう。とくに「あなた」の名詞としての存在感が屹立する。と同時に、言えるはずのことをさらつとは言えずに間を持たせしてしまうような、どこかに感情の引っかかりというか、情の深さのようなものが隠れている重たさも伝わってくる。

さらに考えられるのは、これは英語の同格的表現や関係詞節につきものの特徴だが、微妙に「くだから」「くなのに」という理由説明や逆接のニュアンスが加わるということである。原詩に付した訳では、五行目は「あなたは自分の輝かしい目にかかりきりで」としたが、ここには、「……かかりきりだから」という含みもあるだろう。九行目も、「この世を若々しく飾るあなた」

と訳したが、そこにはニュアンスとして「あなたはこの世を若々しく飾るにもかかわらず」という意味が入ってくる。つまりいずれにも、「だから」とか「かかわらず」といった論理的な方向付けの仕草を読みとることができるのである。こうした仕草には、相手を自分の議論に引き込んで説得しようとする意図が見える。くだくだしく、言い訳的で、執拗で、それを突き詰めると、そもそも何をさせたいかよりも、させたいの部分だけが突出したような語り手像が浮かんでくる。させたい、とは支配欲だ。「あなた」と呼びかけられる青年をいかに言葉の中に封じ込めるかは、『ソネット集』最大のテーマのひとつでもあるのだが、こうして「あなた」という揺るぎない独立体を、「くだから」や「くなのに」のレトリックを通して論理の流れの中に溶解させることで、「あなた」が徐々に流麗な言葉の連続に呑みこまれていく気味がある。「あなた」は動かぬ静物として揺るがしがたく屹立するのではなく、論理の流れの中で時間化されている。言ってみれば、「あなた」は修飾され、説明され、議論されることでのみ生かされるような、刻々と変化する続ける動的な対象となっていくのである。

英語の構文の上では語り手は、thou...という風にその後に一瞬のためをつくり息をつくることで、「あなた」を語りきれないでみせるのだとも言えるだろう。「あなた」はいわば語りの圏外にあふれ、言葉による静的な定着を逃れる。そして、そのことによって名詞としての「あなた」は捕捉不能となったとしても、「させたい」の気迫そのものは一層充滿する。

十四行の中でいかに論理の流れをつくるかは詩人の腕の見せ所である。ここではそれが、「あなた」をめぐる「させたい」の衝動によってつくられている。「だってあなたはこうじゃないか」、「さだから」、「くなのに」としつつく食い下がり、もつと自分の言うことを聞いてくれ、と訴え続ける語り。その執拗さの向こうに「あなた」が浮かぶ。

このソネットでは、「あなた」と四行目で呼びかけがなされた瞬間から、「たくさん」と「少ない」の葛藤が表面化するのである。Thouに呼びかける声の、その声高さと密やかさとの混交した密集感はその後にも引き継がれ、語り手は「あなた」をめぐる挿入節の中で、ひとりであるはずの「あなた」を語り切るかわりに、同格や関係節を通しあれこれと理屈づけをおこなう。その過程で「あなた」は、いつまでも時間的に終わらない対象として、まさに冒頭部の一般論で語られたような複数の主体として増殖し、拡大し、しかもそれゆえにこのソネットの中に封じこめられることにもなる。

「あなた」が「あなた」でしかないのに、それ以上の時間的存在となりうるのは、「あなた」(Thou)という言葉の周辺で起きる「ゆつくり」のためである。このソネットの「ゆつくり」は、そもそも時間的ではない「あなた」という名詞的な存在を、説得という身振りを通して時間化することで行われる。まるで、「あなた」は説得されることでしか存在しえないかのような錯覚がそこには生ずる。

ソネット一番は「たくさん」の理念にあふれた作品である。ヴェンドラーは「けちんぼ」となる語り手の仕草そのものに、究極的には豊富さを称揚するような「見せびらかし」があることや、全編通して内省あり、非難あり、割りこみあり、予言あり、とさまざまな語りのモードが使われること、また、『ソネット集』全体に散りばめられたさまざまな重要イメージがこのひとつのソネットの中にぎっしりと詰まっていることなどを指摘したうえで、この作品が「へたくさん」の美に賭けた」作品だとしている(四六五)。「あなた」をめぐる「ゆつくり」もまた、そのひとつの表れと言えるのかもしれない。

関係詞と接続詞で仕掛ける

シェイクスピア・ソネット七十三番とダン「死よ 驕るな」

十四行という短いスペースの中にいかに長い時間を流れさせるか。これがソネットにおける「富」の創出において重要な課題となる。しかし、ペイターの美の方法を特徴づけたようなロマン派的な「過剰なる瞬間」が現れる前の時代には、ペイター流のスローモーションは選択肢にはなかった。時を徹底的に微分化することで、一瞬の中に無限の時の礫を見出すという感受性はまだ芽生えていなかったのである。

その替わりとなったのは何か。たとえば今「あなた」への呼びかけに關して取り上げたような、アポストロフィに伴う視点の転換や声の転調などは頻繁に使われる方法のひとつだった。十四行というソネットの枠を、どう区切り裁断していくかで、十四行というスペースは四十四・四十二ともなれば、八十六ともなれば、二十二・二十二……ともなる。そうした区切りからくる断絶や飛躍の感覚をうまく利用すれば、時間を作り出すことができた。また、ソネットが元々持っていたとされる議論的な性格を最大限に利用して、対象を論理的に語られ説明されねばならない存在として執拗に、長々と、くねくねと解きほぐし、そこに時間を暗喩する、という方法についても上記で確認した通りである。

一見無時間的とも思える論理の流れを「長い時間」としてスローモーション的に表現するという方策はまさにソネットならではのものだろう。ソネットは限定的で、厳密で、しかもなお、明確な結末の要請される様式なのである。そうした要請に応えるためには、連鎖と因果関係の絡み合いの中で巧妙に語りを練り上げる技術が必要となるわけだが、それが十四行という限定的なスペースの扱いをきわめて洗練させたものにしていった。

この洗練法について、こんどは関係詞と接続詞の使い方に焦点をあて、もうふたつほどの作品例をあげて考えてみたい。

シェイクスピアのソネット七十三番は、何とももの悲しいトーン、哀愁感あふれる作品であ

る。詩人三十代の作と言われるが、老いを自覚し、枯れていく自己を思い切り悲しんでいる。「僕はもう朽ちていなくなるのだ。もつと僕を愛せ」というメッセージ。それが嫌な感じではない。『ソネット集』にときおりある、「あなた、あなた、もつとこつちを向いて、僕を見て、見て」というしつこい感じもない。とくに出だしの四行がいい。

That time of year thou mayst in me behold
When yellow leaves, or none, or few, do hang
Upon those boughs which shake against the cold,
Bare ruined choirs where late the sweet birds sang.

私の中にあなたはこんな季節を見るかもしれない
葉が黄色く枯れ すっかり落ち あるいはわずかに残っているような
枝の冷たい風におびえて揺れる季節を
先頃甘い歌声の鳥たちが聖歌隊として陣取ったこの場所も 今やむき出しの廃墟となつてしまつた

二行目で *yellow leaves* から *none*、そして *few* となるあたりなど、詩人が、そしてその言葉が、実にうまく枯れていく、静謐の中で、命の余韻がすーっと消えていく様が音となって聞こえてくるようだ。だから「先頃甘い歌声の鳥たちが聖歌隊として陣取った場所」(*where late the sweet birds sang*) というノスタルジックな一節の「甘い」(*sweet*) という語など、何でもない言葉なのに実に切なく響く。

と、思わずうっとりしていると、あることに気づく。やけに関係詞が多いのだ。出だしの四行に *That/When, those/which, where* と三回も出てくる。残りの部分に目をやると、やはり多い(下線参照)。

In me thou seest the twilight of such day
As after sunset fadeth in the west,
Which by and by black night doth take away,
Death's second self, that seals up all in rest.
In me thou seest the glowing of such fire
That on the ashes of his youth doth lie,
As the deathbed whereon it must expire,

Consumed with that which it was nourished by.
This thou perceiv'st, which makes thy love more strong,
To love that well which thou must leave ere long.

あなたは私の中に黄昏を見る
太陽の沈んだ後 西に消えるような
次第に忍び寄る黒い夜に拉し去られる黄昏を
死の今ひとつの姿としての眠りがやってきて すべてを安らぎのうちに
封印する黄昏を

あなたは私の中に火の輝きを見る
若さの燃え尽きた灰に残された火
さながら最期の燃焼のために死の床に横たわるかのよう
かつて養ってくれたものによって使い尽くされていく
あなたはこうしたものを感じずにつけ より愛情を強くし
まもなくあなたが別れねばならぬものをさらに愛するようになるのだ

十四行作品の中で、実に十一個の関係詞がある。これはどうしたことだろう。七十三番特有の憂愁と関係詞の多さとは何かつながりがあるのだろうか。いったいどういうからくりなのか。これが一つ目の問題提起である。

もうひとつの例はダンの宗教ソネット「死よ 驕るな」(Death, be not proud)である。このソネットは、七十三番とは対照的に実に激しい語り口である。出だしから、死に対し「うぬぼれるな、図に乗るな、お前になんか負けるものか」と言い募る。

Death be not proud, though some have called thee
Mighty and dreadful, for, thou art not so,
For, those, whom thou think'st, thou dost overthrow,
Die not, poor death, nor yet canst thou kill me;

死よ 驕るな 中はお前を
屈強で恐ろしいものと呼ぶ者もいるが お前はそんなものではない
お前がうち倒したと思う者も
死ぬことはないのだ 哀れな死よ お前は私を殺すこともできない

ふつうソネットならターニングポイントのひとつもありひねりが加えられるのだが、このソネットは最後までひたすらエスカレートするばかりで、一本調子なのである。

From rest and sleep, which but thy pictures be,
Much pleasure, then from thee, much more must flow,
And soonest our best men with thee do go,
Rest of their bones, and soul's delivery.
Thou art slave to fate, chance, kings, and desperate men,
And dost with poison, war, and sickness dwell,
And poppy, or charms can make us sleep as well,
And better than thy stroke; why swell'st thou then?
One short sleep past, we wake eternally,
And death shall be no more, Death thou shalt die.

休息も睡眠も お前のいまひとつの姿
それが大いに心地よいなら お前からはいもっと多くの快楽のあるはず

すぐれた人も喜んでお前につき従う

骨は休息し 魂は解放されるのだ

お前は運命や 偶然や 諸国の王 なりふり構わぬ人間たちに従うほかないのだ

そして毒や戦争 病とともにある

薬草や呪文も我々を眠らせてくれるし

お前の一撃よりも技量は上だ ならばお前が威張る理由などあるか？

短いひと眠りののち 我々には永遠の目覚めが待っている

その後にはもう死はないのだ そのとき 死よ お前は死ぬのだ

どうだ、参ったか、お前は××だ、○○だ、△△だ、だから威張るな！ という。畳みかけて、修辭疑問でとどめを刺す。ぐうの音も言わせない。

もともとエリザベス朝の流行期に書かれたソネットは褒めるためのものだった。君はきれいだ、すばらしい、夏の太陽のようだ、と褒めちぎるだけで終わって良いのがソネットという形式だった。だが、エリザベス女王の時代が終わると、作品中で美辭麗句を述べることがそのまま女王への忠誠に直結するという幸福な状況には終止符が打たれた。ダンのソネットは「褒める」というソネットの制度をひっくり返し、いかに貶すかで勝負している。もちろん、それはいかにもダン

らしいレトリックで、「お前なんか、お前なんか」と語り手に叫ばせるだけで、決して反論してこない死の、その恐ろしい無言が最後には引き立てられる、という仕掛けにもなっているのだが、それにしてもこの激しい呪いの語りには、結論が見えているにも関わらず、ついこちらが耳を傾けてしまうような説得の力もある。

よく見てみると、激しく感情にまかせてしゃべっているような語り手が、forとか、thenとか、yetといった論理的な連関を明らかにする語を多用していることに気づく。節を導くときにはたいていこうした語を用いて、前後関係をはっきりさせている。九行目から十二行目などでは、特に行頭で、Andが頻出している。こんなに感情的なのに、なお、論理的であろうとしているのである。なぜだろう。これが二つ目の問題提起である。

ダンのソネットについてのひとつの答えは、ルイス・マーツの古典的著作『瞑想の詩』(The Poetry of Meditation)を参照することによって得られるだろう。カトリックの一族に生まれたダンは、反宗教改革派の瞑想法に関心を持っていた。イエズス会士であったイグナチウス・ロヨラの説いた瞑想法には、(1)場所の設定、(2)省察、(3)祈念という三つの段階があり、知的な省察を踏み台にした上での、感情を伴った信仰の獲得というプロセスが想定されていた。信仰は盲目的な没入を通してのみ成就されるのではなく、丁寧に知的ステップを踏んで初めて到達されるというのである(マーツ 二五五六)。そうした瞑想法が如実に作品のつくり反映されている

ソネットもダンにはある。このソネットは、必ずしもそこまで瞑想の構造を模倣しているわけではないが、それでも語り手は感情にまかせてばかり語るのではなく、がっちり論理的な手続きを経て、だから我々も説得されるのだ、と考えることはできるだろう。だから「休息も睡眠も お前のいまひとつの姿」それが大いに心地よいなら お前からはもっと多くの快楽のあるはず」「(五十七行目) とか、末尾の「死よ お前は死ぬのだ」といった論理の遊びが効果を発揮しする。

しかし、果たしてそれだけだろうか。

今のふたつの作品をよりよく理解するには、あらためてソネットにおける時間の経過という点に注意する必要があると筆者は思う。ここで「ゆっくり」がからんでくる。すでに触れてきたようにソネットで腕の見せ所となるのは、並列や、対照や、転換といった構成の妙を、いかに十四行というコンパクトな形の中に収めるかという、その手際の良さである。こんなに短い形の中で、いかに多くのことを語ってみせるか、やってみせるか。それが冒頭で問題にした、十四行という限られたスペースにいかにかくさんの時間を流れさせるかということと関係してくる。「今を樂しめ」(carpe diem)という言葉はひくまでもなく、時間と生命の問題はルネサンス人にとって最大のオブセクションだった。流れていく時間の冷酷さ、死の恐怖、生きている現在への執着——こうしたものをたつぷりと感ずるのである。だからこそ、あつという間に終わる十四行の中にゆ

っくり流れるたぐさんの時間を封じ込めることができたなら、それは決してあつという間には終わらない生を具現するものとなるのかもしれない、という着想が切実さを持ち得た。⁴ シェイクスピアのソネット十八番は、「人が息をつき その目がものを見る限りこの詩も生き続け あなたに命を与えるのだ」(So long as men can breathe or eyes can see, / So long lives this, and this gives life to thee)というキュッとした締めのカプレットで終わるが、ここに表された詩の永遠を誇る語り手の自負は、同時に、ソネットの中に永遠を生け捕りにする、という考えを伴っている。

さて、七十三番の関係詞について、以上のような点を踏まえて考えてみよう。冒頭部分の関係詞は、「係り」と「結び」に分けられるような使われ方をしている: *That time of year thou mayst in me behold / When yellow leaves, or none, or few, do hang / Upon those boughs...* つまり、線を引いた *That time of year* を受けて、次行で *When* とくるのだが、ここに差し挟まれる約一行分の間合いはこの詩全体のトーンを決めるのにきわめて重要な働きをしている。このソネットでは、こうして一行分くらい間があいてやつと先行詞の内容が明かされるというタイミングが、ごくあたり前なことなのである。待たせる語りが、何ら違和感なく、つまり変にサスペンスなど伴わずに、ごく自然に行われる。ゆっくり行きますよ、待っていてください、とでもいうような語り口なのである。

どうもこのソネットの関係詞は、今にも終わりそうな文を、「さらに」、「まだまだ」とつない

でいく持続の役割を担っているらしい。今の箇所が続きでも、いつ終わってもおかしくない文が関係詞によって枝分かれし、延命されている——*Upon those boughs which shake against the cold, / Bare ruined choirs where late the sweet birds sang.* 冒頭の一行分の「待ち」以来、ソネットには「まあ、待ちなさい。せつかちになりなさんな」とでもいう、ゆったりとした言葉との関わり合いが雰囲気として生み出され、そうした気分が終わりそうで終わらない関係詞の連鎖によって補強されている。これがいかにも老いを自覚した語り手らしい枯れた、しかし、やさしい口調を作り出し、残り少ない時間を、焦らずに、大切に、丁寧に生きようとする姿勢ともつながってくる。ひとつひとつの関係詞が来るたびに、「まだまだ」とあらためて足を踏み出すような、踏ん張りの構えが見えるのである。どの文も一点強調型の強引な主述関係（たとえば *thou shalt die* のような）には収斂せず、いくつもの節に力点を分散させた、脱力感に満ちた連鎖となる。

それだけに五行目から八行目にかけての文で、「死」(Death) という言葉が唐突に出てくるときには、どきつとさせられる——*In me thou seest the twilight of such day / As after sunset fadeth in the west, / Which by and by black night doth take away, / Death's second self, that seals up all in rest.* 「死の今ひとつの姿としての眠り」という訳で示したように、*Death's second self* とは *sleep* のことなのだが、我々はすっかりこのソネットの、*by and by* 的なゆるやかでやさしい時間の流れに馴染んでしまったものだから、「死」という語には肝を冷やす。この一節は音的にも、

意味内容の上でも鋭く短いから、時間を裁断する出来事となるのである。この恐ろしい瞬間は、続く *that seals up all in rest* という節によってふたたびゆったりした時間の流れの中にほどけていくのだが、行頭にくる *Death* の不吉な響きは消し去ることができず、穏やかでゆったりした語りの行く末にある暗いものを暗示し続けることになる。

七十三番のテーマは老いである。関係詞の多用は一方でその「老い」を枯れた語り手の身振りとして表現するのに役立つと同時に、少しでも多くの時間を生きたい、まだまだ終わりとくなく、もつとたくさん生きたい、というゆっくり流れる時への願いをも叶えることになる。むろん究極的には関係詞は、主文との関係や順番を、文構造のヒエラルキーに忠実に従う形で守るのでもあり、そういう意味では、時間の連鎖の果てにある死に敗北する運命にある、それが七十三番の憂愁の根本にある、とも言えるのだが。

ダンソネットでも時の経過は重要である。先に見たように、そこには *For, then, yet, and* といった論理性を示す接続の言葉が頻出するが、とくに *then* や *yet* などは「それならば」、「しかし」などのつながりを表すだけでなく、「そして」、「まだ」といった時間の流れを暗示する言葉でもある。たとえば語り手が「〜なら、お前からはもつと多くの快楽のあるはず」(*then from thee much more must flow*)というとき、*then* は「ならば」を意味すると同時に、「*From rest and sleep* から *from thee* へと視点を移す語りの、「そして」的な時間経過そのものを演出している。ダン

の論理への執着は、単に知の優位を表示するだけでなく、論理的であることの時間性をも表現しているのである。だからこそ、そうした時間の中でしか演じられえない語り手の激しい感情性を、我々はうっかり読んでしまう。

論理もまた、時間から自由であることはできない。「死よ、お前なんか××だ。なぜなら……」と言っているそばから、冷酷に時間は流れ過ぎ去っていく。論理は、それが時間の中で実践されなければならぬ以上、非情な時間の流れの果てにある死に打ち勝つことはできないのである。then, then とステップを踏み、and, and, and と連鎖していく中で語り手は、多大な時間の経過を生き、そうすることですべてを浪費し、死に向かって歩みを進めている。「短いひと眠りののち我々には永遠の目覚めが待っている／その後にはもう死はないのだ　そのとき　死よ　お前は死ぬのだ」(One short sleep past, we wake eternally, / And death shall be no more, Death thou shalt die.) という最後の一節は、生と死の力関係をレトリックの力で転覆するが、どきつとさせるのは、「短いひと眠りののち」の「早さ」でもある。〈死「短い眠り」〉という隠喩が、時間と死から自由に抽象的な論理ゲームをゆつくりたつぷり生きたはずの語り手に、思いがけず利根性の威力を思い知らせるのである。

どちらのソネットにもたくさんの時間が流れている。一方は、よりたくさんの時間を生きようとする語り手の願いを叶えるかのように、ゆつたりとした時間。もう一方は、死神の足音を響か

せるかのような、足早で、残酷な、大量の時間。こうして「早さ」と「ゆつくり」の相克をうまく利用することで、ソネットはその小さな容器の中に、たくさんの、そしてさまざまな時間を蓄えることができる。短く刹那的だからこそ、ゆつくりたつぷり流れる、永遠に終わらないかのような甘い持続への期待をソネットは宿すのである。その夢想をかなえるのか、あるいは逆に寸断された、冷たい時間へと転倒させるのか。短さと小ささが「売り」のソネットにおいて、永遠への夢をどう終わらせるかがこうして芸の勘所となっていく。ソネットの「富」はこうして築かれるのである。