

Poetics of Praise

— Notes on Shakespeare's *Sonnets*

Masako Ohno (大野雅子)

The ultimate compliment Shakespeare's Poet offered to the Fair Youth is "Fair, kind, and true" and "you alone are you." This seems to be the Shakespearean resolution of rhetoric's inevitable rhetoricity. But his ever-changing poetics requires a caution: those phrases are only its partial disclosure.

What I hope will emerge from the following discussion is what kind of individual touch Shakespeare's *Sonnets* has added to the by-then-worn-out sonnet form. *The Sonnets*, if scarcely undoes the convention, has clearly lent a new imaginative complexity to the relationship between the praising language and the praised object, and the addresser and the addressee.

1. Heightened Subjectivity

Though no evidence will ever reconstruct *The Sonnets* as a narrative, our examination needs at least one presupposition: we have two oppositional characteristics of the Fair Youth; on the one hand the idealized youth, and on the other hand the youth who has some sensual faults. And correspondingly we have two oppositional attitudes of the Poet towards his beloved: on the one hand the whole-hearted adoration, and on the other hand irony. Narratively considered, whatever the right order is, no one could deny that there are three distinct groups each of which differentiates itself from another in the point of tone: firstly that of pure compliment, secondly that of ironical tone, and lastly that of renewed friendship. And there is certainly a difference in the emotional depth between the pure compliment and the renewed love. We cannot fail to recognize in the last group a clear tone of finality. I dare say the over-all pattern is

unmistakable. The Poet's love that is quite different from the mere panegyric tone in the earlier sonnets has grown out of the long journey of the sequence.

The Sonnets' roughly patterned narrative thus posited, we find there an increasing emphasis on inwardness. The Sonnet 104 says,

To me, fair friend, you never can be old,
For as you were when first your eye I eyed,
Such seems your beauty still.

(ll.1-3)¹

In one way this sonnet can be regarded as one of the dramatizations of the theme of mutability developed often in *The Sonnets*. But for all the resemblances between the Sonnet 104 and the other sonnets on mutability (especially in imagery), the Sonnet 104 differentiates itself markedly from them: the Sonnet 104 does not devote itself to the mere complaint of mutability, nor does it boast the triumph over Time. It declares the beloved's aloofness from mutability in its subjective context. It puts the firm line of distinction between the Poet's personal perception and the reality. David K. Weiser highlights the tone of uncertainty pervading this sonnet. According to him, "to me" and "can" in the line 1 and "seems" in the line 3 reflect "the speaker's awkward mood" and "his fallibility as a seer"². The Poet does not judge the Fair Youth from the perspective of the society any longer. He has discovered his own self as the entity that perceives and judges the outer world. Immortality has become an act of faith, made possible neither by the beloved's marriage nor by the poetry. There is no need to convince the beloved or the others; the world is totally the Poet's subjective experience.

This is a unique way of overcoming mutability. The theme of mutability was the untrodden one before the Elizabethan sonneteers first set about it. Daniel and Spenser preceded Shakespeare as the manipulator of this theme. Spenser could be reconciled to mutability within the Christian framework. And what distinguishes Shakespeare from Daniel is that Shakespeare's *Sonnets* does not end in the recognition of the universal mutability, but that it overcomes Time; in *The Sonnets* mutability becomes the touchstone of love.

Though what emerges is the recapitulation of the theme and imagery of the earlier sonnets of pure compliment, *The Sonnets* has undergone a radical transition. The exposition of the rose image employed throughout *The Sonnets* seems to be revealing. In the opening sonnet, the Fair Youth is said to be "beauty's rose," and encouraged to marry on the ground that he is "the world's fresh ornament" and "only herald to the gaudy spring." When we look at the Sonnet 109, the rose image acquires a peculiar resonance.

For nothing this wide universe I call,
Save thou, my rose: in it thou art my all.
(ll. 13-14)

A different kind of logic is employed to set the rose metaphor at work in the Sonnet 1 and the Sonnet 109: in the latter the Poet's judgement is not based on the objective evaluation. The objective world is completely subservient to the Poet's subjective world. The Friend is "my rose", not the world's rose.

How this transition has been made possible can only be conjectured. But we could safely say that the Poet's revulsion towards the world pays a main role. We can find the impulse towards departure from the hateful world in the presumably earlier sonnets, whose good example is the Sonnet 66.

Tir'd with all these for restful death I cry:....
.....
Tir'd with all these, from these would I be gone,
Save that, to die, I leave my love alone.
(l. 1 and ll. 13-14)

The main subject of the Sonnet 66 is the Poet's deficiencies, for which the mere thought of the beloved compensates. Love as compensation makes the essential characteristic of Shakespeare's *Sonnets* for J.B. Leishman, who poses the rhetorical question as following: "Where, in previous European poetry, from the Greeks until Shakespeare's own day, can we find any form whatever of this topic of 'compensation,' let alone anything approaching Shakespeare's treatment of it?"³ The Sonnet 31 is a fuller treatment of love as compensation almost to the extent of blasphemy:

They bosom is endeared with all hearts
Which I by lacking have supposed dead;
And there reigns love and all love's loving parts,
And all those friends which I thought buried.
.....
Their images I loved I view in thee,
And thou, all they, hast all the all of me.
(ll. 1-4 and ll. 13-14)

It would be never wide of the mark to say that the Sonnet 31 reveals in its religious language a kind of conversion to monotheism. Its words sound like those of idolatory.

But there arises a question: is there any relation between love as compensation and the Poet's heightened subjectivity? To resume the main course of our inquiry, we now turn again to the Sonnet 109. Its couplet says

For nothing this wide universe I call,
Save thou, my rose; in it thou art my all.

The Friend is an equivalent to the world itself for the Poet. The similar idea is expressed in the sentence "You are my all-the-world" of the Sonnet 112. The Poet defines himself through the image of the other; the Fair Youth encompasses all reality, and he is the new-found self-measure. Each of the sonnets discussed above may conclude that the triumphant love in Shakespeare's *Sonnets* is the love of compensation. Leishman includes all these sonnets under the head of compensation or the religious love. But I think something far deeper and far different than this is

involved in the love which equates the Friend to "all-the-world."

I have had an occasion to say that, irrespective of the arrangement of the 1609 Quarto, *The Sonnets* has a kind of roughly progressive unity. The Poet seems to have experienced a figurative journey that went through the process of disillusionment with the world, with the Friend, and with himself, the journey that none of the Elizabethan sonnets have ever experienced before. For all the resemblances between the Sonnets 66 or 31 and the Sonnets 109 or 112, they bear an important difference. The Poet is addressing the beloved as "my rose" in spite of his acute recognition that the beloved is a less than ideal being, that he is no more worthy of his compliment. The sonnets I have placed in the third category actually culminate a long line of development. The Poet has overcome the conflict between the ideal and the real. In short, the Poet has decided to continue to love in spite of everything.

Thus the final formulation after the hard trial of love diverges itself from the idea of love as compensation, or the inverted Platonism ("you pattern of all those" in the Sonnet 98). Therefore though the Poet confesses that he owes his being totally to the Friend, this is the only one aspect of the truth; the other aspect is that only the Poet can resolve the antinomy of being inherent in the Friend. This statement prompts further explanation. It is often said that Shakespeare has broken with the tradition of the courtly love sonnet, in which description, I suppose, many implications are contained. Among the others the main Shakespearean variation lies in the fact that his beloved is given up to earthliness. But the "earthliness" does not set the problem in any clear light, for the Elizabethan sonnets more or less betray their earthly tinge. I include two meanings in "earthliness": firstly vulnerability to the natural change, and secondly possibility of yielding to an error. Now that the should-be-paragon has been given up to the human frailty, some kind of resolution on the part of the Poet must be done. We can never have a real reason to reject the Sonnet 87 as the final. "Farewell, thou art too dear for my possessing" may well attract the readers to think it as some kind of final

resolution. J.W.Lever claims the Sonnet 55 is the "unmistakable conclusion," with the Latin tradition as his authority, where both Ovid and Horace ended their poems with the proud claim of triumph over Time ⁴. The proposed finals are numerous. Whether considered as narrative or examined from the viewpoint of imagery, there is a definite difference in the quality of love between the earlier and the later sonnets, as I have said before.

The Poet has overcome the conflict and contradiction unavoidably inherent in the human being. In other words, friendship has absorbed evil within itself. The Poet's love transcends its immediate object, and no one can say certainly which is more important for him, the beloved or his loving itself. The world has been totally transformed into the poetry. Seen in this way, "my rose" of the Sonnet 109, as distinct from the "beauty's rose" of the Sonnet 1, gains a peculiar resonance.

2. Non-mimetic Poetry

A step further would show that the Poet's language is no more mimetic. "You never can be old" effects a different representational logic from that of "Thou that art now the world's fresh ornament, /And only herald to the gaudy spring." Poetic language dreams to attain the access to the reality. As a form of encomium, the sonnet is more preoccupied with such a complete correspondance between the metaphor and the referent. I think it is not going too far to say that the panegyric poetry, to anticipate the course of our argument momentarily, is the Renaissance Neoplatonic dream of mystical identification between the signifier and the signified, or between the addresser and the addressee.

The wider question at issue is that the Poet's subjectivity deceives the basically mimetic notion of metaphor. Murry Krieger is right in pointing out that metaphor requires "a total identity of the two elements collapsed into the figure instead of settling for mere similarity, which permits difference as well similarity to remain as the characteristics of the two elements, still grasped as two, with some remainder-large or small-incommensurate and so unabsorbed" ⁵. In short,

metaphor is a movement to break down the barrier between the image and the thing represented.

This tendency, this dream towards the total union of the word and the thing is a necessary concomitant to the epideictic poetry. The poet comes to grips with the hard task to portray the beloved who is the paragon of beauty and virtue, and to praise her. He is naturally doomed to complain of his lack of power for her full description. Moreover another kind of spur works in the move towards meta-poetry in the poetry of praise. It is a historical one, for as the sonnet form develops historically, it must necessarily repeat itself and so is compelled to turn upon itself. The artificiality and self-consciousness of sonnets is a historical necessity. Such is the case in Sidney's famous sonnet opening *Astrophil and Stella*. Shakespeare's *Sonnets* also has many specimens of such a movement. The Sonnet 15 is the first example of the theme of immortalization through his poetry:

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

(ll. 13-14)

And as early as the next sonnet the Poet becomes preoccupied with the fear that his poetry as a means of eternalization would be too futile in comparison with procreation:

But wherefore do not you a mightier way
Make war upon this bloody tyrant Time,
And fortify yourself in your decay
With means more blessed than my barren rhyme?

(ll. 1-4)

Even the vigorous Sonnet 18, in the close observation, betrays the Poet's fear of the metaphoric deficiency:

Shall I compare thee to a summer's day?
Thou art more lovely and more temperate.

(ll. 1-2)

The Poet is well aware that his metaphor cannot attain the magical identity with the beloved; the Fair Youth

is beyond any comparison.

The Poet's fear reaches the climactic moment when he confronts the Rival Poet's gorgeous language.

My tongue-tied Muse in manners holds her still,
While comments of your praise, richly compiled,
Reserve thy character with golden quill
And precious phrase by all the Muses filed.
I think good thoughts whilst others write good
words,
And, like unlettered clerk, still cry 'Amen'
To every hymn that able spirit affords
In polished form of well-refined pen.
Hearing you praised, I say, 'Tis so, 'tis true,'
And to the most of praise add something more;
But that is in my thought, whose love to you
(Though words come hindmost) holds his rank
before.

Then others for the breath of words respect,
Me for my dumb thoughts, speaking in effect.

(The Sonnet 85)

He declares that all the possible means to oppose the Rival Poet is the language of silence. He is too acutely aware of the mistake of his own metaphorical endeavour to try it again.

Set in the context of these sonnets that express the Poet's preoccupation with the metaphoric identity which has begun almost as early as the beginning, it appears too strange that the Poet affirms "'Fair, kind, and true' is all my argument" in the Sonnet 105. Is it ever possible to say with J.W.Lever that this is the triumphal declaration of love? ⁶ It would be naive to deduce the Poet's idealistic intention from his statement developed in the Sonnet 105. There are so much more statements that express the contrary view that we cannot take this as the Poet's final declaration; his poetics has kaleidoscopic patterns.

In some likelihood the Sonnet 105 may belong to the earlier group. Truly this sonnet, at first sight, offers the most straightforward praise, but it seems to have lost Shakespearean metaphoric density we are familiar with; it is completely stripped of metaphor. This requires a peculiar attention.

The Sonnet 105 deserves a full quotation and the close observation.

Let not my love be called idolatory,
 Nor my beloved as an idol show,
 Since all alike my songs and praises be
 To one, of one, still such, and ever so.
 Kind is my love today, tomorrow kind,
 Still constant in a wondrous excellence;
 Therefore my verse, to constancy confined,
 One thing expressing, leaves out difference.
 'Fair, kind, and true' is all my argument,
 'Fair, kind, and true', varying to other words;
 And in this change is my invention spent,
 Three themes in one, which wondrous scope
 affords.
 Fair, kind, and true have often lived alone,
 Which three till now never kept seat in one.

While the Poet protests against any suspicion of idolatry, his logic can never succeed in dissociating his love from idolatry. The much disputed "Since" of the third line (whether it is interpreted as "for," or as "on the ground that") reveals the Poet's strategic fallibility, for it fails to be any help for the preceding two lines. And the line 5 onward focus on an idolatrous praise; the entire sonnet strengthens the claim of idolatry against which it protests. In fact it would not be far-fetched to say that this sonnet is the pronouncement of the highest kind of idealization of all the sonnets; it sets forth the idea of the Christian trinity, making the three values concur all in the Fair Youth.

Yet we should not let the Poet's apparent logic distract ourselves from the implication the poem conveys. A moment earlier I have said that the complete lack of poetical ornament should be called for attention. Though the important requirement in our discussion of Shakespeare's *Sonnets* is the fact that there is no textual authority to support the present text we have is the final and decisive one, it is at least conceivable that the present sonnet belongs to the later group. Something decisively different from the earlier pure panegyric exists in it: the Poet is praising what he does not regard praiseworthy. There is much in this

distinction. If it is not the triumphal declaration of love over a series of trials, it is at least a kind of episodic dynamics; it has come after the recognition that the Friend is not altogether 'Fair, kind, and true.' It is true that when we recall many sonnets where the Poet complains about the Friend's misconduct, thrice repeated phrase 'Fair, kind, and true' sounds rather disturbing to our ears. We have heard the Poet says,

Thou mayst be false, and yet I know it not.
 (The Sonnet 92, l. 14)

Or,

That you were once unkind befriends me now, . . .
 (The Sonnet 120, l. 1)

Whether considered to be a construct of strict narrative or not, various elements merge together to countermove against the Poet's apparent sincere meaning. His argument, deceiving its purport, cannot attain any access to the Fair Friend. Rather, "the young man is 'fair,' 'kind,' and 'true' precisely *because* "'fair,' 'kind,' and 'true' is all my argument'"⁷. The Poet is continuously presenting the 'fair, kind, and true' young man that he cannot represent because there is no such reality to do so. This kind of semantic autonomy is what Richard Waswo calls the "constitutive language." Waswo, discriminating the attitude of Shakespeare towards language from that of Dante, says that for Shakespeare "the meaning of the poem is not its object of "reference," but the very act of praise committed in reciting it"⁸. 'Fair, kind, and true' does not correspond to any preexistent thing; it is creating something that would not exist without it. Summarily stated, the Poet's poetics has come short of the principle of "ut pictura poesis"; he never rejects praising, but gave up getting at the beloved by way of metaphor.

The similar illusion of the height of idealization can be observed in the Sonnet 84:

Who is it that says most which can say more
 Than this rich praise-that you alone are you,
 In whose confine immurèd is the store

Which should example where your equal grew?
 Lean penury within that pen doth dwell
 That to his subject lends not some small glory,
 But he that writes of you, if he can tell
 That you are you, so dignifies his story;
 Let him but copy what in you is writ,
 Not making worse what nature made so clear,
 And such a counterpart shall fame his wit,
 Making his style admirèd everywhere.

You to your beauteous blessings add a curse,
 Being fond on praise, which makes your
 praises worse.

This is another kind of variation on the Poet's seeming resolution about how to depict the Friend best. It should be now reminded that the principle of "amplificatio" was much honoured in the Renaissance rhetoric. The laudatory poetry, among the others, must need magnify the praised so much that the "amplificatio" was an essential constituent of it. It should be acknowledged, however, that to amplify is not to digress or to dilate. As Rosemond Tuve has put it, "amplification may frequently be used in the interest of brevity". It does not turn endlessly around something significant without ever getting at it, but it points to the "vividness of image" and "significancy."

In terms of the Poet's effort to find out the language just adequate to illustrate and ornament the Fair Youth, the Sonnet 84 seems to be one of the sonnets that express the Poet's climactic moments. The Renaissance poetics, in one sense, could be seen to have been a series of war against the rhetoric's inevitable rhetoricity. The war was on the two fronts: on the one hand there was the laudatory poetry's duty to ornament and amplify, and there was the other duty to illustrate truly and vividly the praised. In one way, the Sonnet 84 may be regarded as the Poet's final resolution of all these dilemmas. But this kind of interpretation only begs another question: why does it tag the couplet so ambiguous and ironical?

The couplet introduces a surprise. What is often discussed is whether the comma after "Being fond on praise" should exist or not. Whether Shakespeare wrote the comma or not, it cannot be denied that the line 14 carries the double meaning: the praise that the

Rival Poets gives to the Friend only derogates him, and as the result of his fondness of being praised his fame will be lessened.

Besides in the couplet, there can be observed many kinds of ominous insinuations. The very phrase "you alone are you," looking back to the earlier sonnet, betrays its ambiguity behind the seeming declaration of God-like integrity. J.W.Lever has found the echo from the Sonnet 13:

O that you were yourself; but love, you are
 No longer yours than you yourself here live.

(ll. 1-2)

In this sonnet the fact that he is himself bears an implication of self-sufficiency, which is every now and then reproached even if obliquely. "The supreme praise, 'that you alone are you,' does not answer the warning of XIII" ¹⁰. The word "immurèd" also cannot be void of any irony¹¹; "confine," "immurèd" always purport to express warning or ironical attitude towards the Friend.

It would be clear now that as well as "Fair, kind, and true," "you alone are you" is not the pronouncement of the highest kind of admiration. It cannot be at the height of all the attempts to describe the paragon. The Poet's seeming confidence can be easily translated into his fear that the Fair Youth may not be the Fair Youth as he has supposed. The tautology is the only means to describe him now that it has been clarified that he is less than ideal; the recognition of divergence from the convention has led him to tautology. "you alone are you," along with "Fair, kind, and true," would serve as a specimen of "constitutive" language in opposition to "cosmetic" language in Waswo's division, for it constitutes the illusion of the beloved's integral being, rather than represents the reality.

3. Poetics of Praise

We have traced the way that Shakespeare modified the inherited Petrarchan language of praise by allowing the distance between the word and the referent. It would be useful now for our argument to

cite Joel Fineman's definition of the panegyric poetry.

In what follows I summarize the tradition of epideictic theory by saying that praise, poetical or rhetorical, is what happens when mimesis and metaphor meet. This is an oversimple formula; it is a useful one, however, because it speaks to the fact that praise is conventionally understood to be a referential discourse that amplifies its referent by means of ornamental trope. . . .¹²

In the panegyric poetry literary signs join together and purport to represent the object by amplifying themselves; extra words paradoxically serve as a mediator of the total coincidence between the sign and the referent. Fineman somewhere else, putting the above in another way, says that the poet is both the mirror and the lamp for the ideal mistress. This would amount to saying that the poet's language is both cosmetic and constitutive: it constitutes the reality as well as represents it.

This movement towards the semiotic correspondence necessarily accompanies the movement towards the magical correspondence between the addresser and the addressee, in other words between the subject and the object; the language of praise has within itself an impulse towards the coincidence with "you" with whom "I" dreams to be equal; the dialectic is the three-term correspondence. This strategy of panegyric is abundantly demonstrated in the Elizabethan sonnets. To cite one example from Shakespeare,

My glass shall not persuade me I am old
So long as youth and thou are of one date;
But when in thee Time's furrows I behold,
Then look I death my days should expiate. . . .

(The Sonnet 22, ll. 1-4)

Your beauty is my beauty; the praise of "you" is the praise of "me." Therefore the praising subject is the praised object.

At issue is the underlying Erotic dream to live twice and more fully in the presence of the other; the speaking voice traces a trajectory of the soul in search

of God. Its strategy is that of the ascent from the terrestrial to the celestial in loving a beauty which is the manifestation of the divine beauty. And it might be carried a stage further by saying that it is a formulation of the Renaissance Neoplatonism.

Frances Yates in "The Emblematic Conceit in Giordano Bruno's *De Gli Eroici Furori* and in the Elizabethan Sonnet Sequence" develops an argument that in the sonnets of Sidney, Daniel and Drayton "the conceit is an emblem," which contains in itself the pattern of the spiritual aspiration. What she emphasizes is that Petrarchism is an unmistakable manifestation of Neoplatonism. It would be revealing to cite her words in discussing Giordano Bruno's sonnet sequence:

. . . however much it might appear to be addressed to an 'ordinary love,' it would in fact be a record of spiritual experience, a translation of the image of the Cantic into Petrarchan conceits used as hieroglyphs.¹³

The sonnets, since its origination and during the European vogue initiated by Petrarch and Dante, have been a dramatization of the traditional dualistic vocabulary; the dualism of the sacred and the profane has constituted its theoretical framework. It would be quite correct to say with Frances Yates that beneath the seeming reference to the earthly beloved the dialectic of the sonnet is developed on the sacred plane. The universe is always perceived to be constructed so as to hide the spiritual meanings behind its physical meanings.

This is truly the case with Sir Philip Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella*. It might be said to be the translation of the experience of an ordinary love into that of the sacred love. We could express it in the vocabulary of the three-term correspondence discussed above: Sidney's sonnets follow a quest for the total identification between the speaking subject and the spoken object. Put another way, its language has an impetus to call up the magical presence of the beloved. In Murry Krieger's words, "the invocation of the very name "Stella" produces a magic nominalism, as into the name the sacred person is incarnated,

transforming reality, even making it act in ways contrary to itself, as in the paradox of Christian miracle"¹⁴. One sonnet Krieger cites as its example is the Sonnet 35:

... , and now long needy Fame
Doth even grow rich naming my *Stella's* name
(ll. 10- 11)

Another example is the Sonnet 106:

O Absent presence *Stella* is not here;
.....
Stella, I say my *Stella*, should appear.
(l. 1 and l. 4)

Astrophil's voice is the voice of Eros, which seeks to call the other into being through the very act of speech. In terms of the analogical way of thinking of Northrop Frye, it is the attempt to change its natural earthly plane for one-stage higher plane.

Yet, as we have seen earlier, the metaphorical impetus is always bound to fail. Language realizes the momentary illusion only to open up to the difference between the sign and the referent. This is also the case with Sidney as with Shakespeare. As a necessary concomitant to the long-honoured literary form, various kinds of divergence emerge within the convention. At the risk of over-generalization, we could say that the definite distinction between the human and the divine characterizes Dante or Petrarch: for them the value undeniably lies in the higher plane at the cost of the lower plane; the earthly beloved acts only as a stepping stone.

As the age goes on, the dualistic world-view comes to have a different spiritual accent. Sidney's Stella is not so one-dimensionally a manifestation of the celestial beauty. There arises a moral conflict between Stella as the divine object and Stella as the object of sensual love. Shakespeare gets much more individualizing touch: the traditional dualistic vocabulary cannot work as the absolute framework in *The Sonnets*. In Shakespeare the conventional dialectic between the sacred and the profane lapses into incoherence.

It may also be true on various levels: the linguistic and the extralinguistic join together to break with the tradition. Shakespeare's non-mimetic language is inextricably connected with the non-dualistic world-picture. The traditional dualistic framework definitely splits the divine and the human, which in its turn goes to split the word and the thing, the speaker and the beloved, and the flesh and the spirit. The magical effect of obliterating the difference between them can be possible paradoxically only in such a dualism. As is sometimes pointed out, the world was one vast network of analogy for the Elizabethans. In Shakespeare analogy gave way to something else. What is this something else cannot be decided in terms of allegory-symbol theme that is much loved today. But it is certain that Shakespeare differentiates himself almost radically from his English predecessors: while the conventional lyrical voice expresses the dream of unity between the speaking subject and the spoken object, Shakespeare's voice expresses the loss of unity. Now that the beloved is not the manifestation of the celestial beauty, the very hierarchy begins to lapse. Once a destabilizing element has been introduced, at stake is the whole structure.

Though a signifier perpetually moves towards a signified, it can never rest in it. A momentary illusion of the coincidence between the word and the thing, and the subject and the object immediately opens up to difference. The praising language of *The Sonnets* is always exposed to restlessness, where Shakespearean dynamics is generated.

Notes

1. Citations from *The Sonnets* are taken from *The Sonnets and A Lover's Complaint*, ed. John Kerrigan (Penguin Books, 1986).
2. *Mind in Character: Shakespeare's Speaker in the Sonnets* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1987), p. 38.
3. *Themes and Variations in Shakespeare's Sonnets* (London: Hutchinson, 1961), p. 206.
4. *The Elizabethan Love Sonnet* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1956), p. 269.

5. *A Reopening of Closure: Organicism Against Itself* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1989), p. 6.
6. Lever, *op. cit.*, p. 259.
7. Joel Fineman, *Shakespeare's Perjured Eye: The Invention of Poetic Subjectivity in The Sonnets* (California: University of California Press, 1986), p. 141.
8. *Language and Meaning in the Renaissance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), p. 60.
9. *Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery: Renaissance Poetic and Twentieth-Century Critics* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1947), p. 90.
10. Lever, *op. cit.*, p. 232.
11. *Ibid.*
12. Fineman, *op. cit.*, p. 3.
13. *Lull and Bruno* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982), p.191.
14. Krieger, *op. cit.*, p. 16.