Proceedings of the British Academy, LXXIV, 1988, 135–169

WARTON LECTURE ON ENGLISH POETRY

ENGLISH POETRY AND EMPHATICAL LANGUAGE

By J. H. PRYNNE
Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge

Read 10 November 1988

THE expression which brings my large subject into an initial focus, 'emphatical language', is by William Hazlitt, from the first of his lectures given at the Surrey Institution, near Blackfriars Bridge, on Tuesday, 13th January 1818. In his introductory discourse, 'On Poetry in General', Hazlitt set out to propose a 'general notion' of poetry:

> that it is the natural impression of any object or event, by its vividness exciting an involuntary movement of imagination and passion, and producing, by sympathy, a certain modulation of the voice, or sounds, expressing it.[1]

This measured opening leads to more vehement and exclamatory concentration upon 'vividness' and its features, upon the language of the poetic imagination as 'the highest eloquence of passion'; an assertion which may summarize this aspect, as also Hazlitt's own manner of reasoning, is that 'poetry is the most emphatical language that can be found for those creations of the mind "which ecstasy is very cunning in".'[2] It is hard to guess precisely what his less than sympathetic audience of Dissenters and Quakers and respectable middle-class citizens made of this, but the tones of emphasis are continually recurrent:

[1] William Hazlitt, *Lectures on the English Poets* (1818); *Complete Works*, ed. P. P. Howe (21 vols, London, 1930–4), Vol. 5, p. 1. The definition was violently attacked by William Gifford in his review of the published *Lectures* in *The Quarterly Review*, **19** (1819), 424–34 (see especially p. 426), and the attack was violently countered by Hazlitt in his *A Letter to William Gifford, Esq.* (1819); *Works*, Vol. 9, pp. 13–59 (see especially pp. 44–5).

[2] *Works*, Vol. 5, p. 3; Hazlitt quotes *Hamlet*, III.iv.140.

What a fine return of the passion upon itself is that in Othello—with what a mingled agony of regret and despair he clings to the last traces of departed happiness—when he exclaims,

> —Oh now, for ever
> Farewel the tranquil mind. Farewel content;
> Farewel the plumed troops and the big war,
> That make ambition virtue! Oh farewel![3]

We have reason to know how important were the theme and mood of *Othello* to Hazlitt; the *Liber Amoris* of 1823, reporting the miserable and destructive love-affair that began in August 1820, displayed Hazlitt self-cast and self-accused as a frustrate Othello, and as David Bromwich has observed there are echoes of 'Othello's occupation's gone' to be heard throughout.[4] But characteristic of all these performances is this idea of emphatical expression; and in the lecture many of Hazlitt's quotations and usages of his own include instances of the exclamatory *Oh!* The feature is indeed notable in the impassioned utterance of much Romantic poetry, and in various strands of the dictional and rhetorical tradition making up the repertory of English poetry across its historical development. Upon this rather prominent but under-noticed exclamatory particle I wish to concentrate, as both marking and performing moments of culminative emphasis in poetic speech:

> What a stormy course
> Then follow'd. Oh! it is a pang that calls
> For utterance, to think how small a change
> Of circumstances might to thee have spared
> A world of pain, ripen'd ten thousand hopes
> For ever wither'd.[5]

The emphatic use of *Oh!* in this passage from Book VI of Wordsworth's 1805 *Prelude* raises the pitch of utterance even as it

[3] Ibid., p. 5; Hazlitt quotes *Othello*, III.iii.353–6. On the audience, see Herschel Baker, *William Hazlitt* (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1962), pp. 252–4.

[4] David Bromwich, *Hazlitt; The Mind of a Critic* (New York and Oxford, 1983), pp. 436–7. For what may be the intricate contrivance of Hazlitt's posture, see Marilyn Butler, 'Satire and the Images of Self in the Romantic Period: The Long Tradition of Hazlitt's *Liber Amoris*', *Yearbook of English Studies*, **14** (1984), 207–25; for a less sceptical reading, compare Thomas McFarland, *Romantic Cruxes; The English Essayists and the Spirit of the Age* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 86–7.

[5] William Wordsworth, *The Prelude; or, Growth of a Poet's Mind*, ed. Ernest de Selincourt, 2nd edn rev. Helen Darbishire (Oxford, 1959), VI (1805–6), ll. 291–6. On the 'living voice' of such language see also VI (1805–6), ll. 123–34.

summons it, so as to support and justify the hyperbolic accounting which ensues; the vicarious pain on behalf of an intimate friend is named as the nameless pang, uttered as the call to speak out in sympathy with the stricken Coleridge. At the same time this is recognizably not narrative, outlining an event in the social world of men and their historical actions; it seems chiefly to conjure a possible world internal to the feeling self, where the real and the unreal combine to generate a vehement personal passion by the devices of emphatic culmination.[6]

This internal, personalized character of the moment of emphatic passion in lyric discourse was made central by Hazlitt: the language of the imagination 'is not the less true to nature, because it is false in point of fact; but so much the more true and natural, if it conveys the impression which the object under the influence of passion makes on the mind.'[7] The tendency of this claim has been regarded as historically part of a general shift towards a commitment to the expressive power of poetic language at the expense of its mimetic or representational capacities; as a definitive characteristic of English Romantic literature this shift has been described and charted by M. H. Abrams in his study *The Mirror and the Lamp*, which has subsequently been installed as the canonical account;[8] and there are parallels to be found in lectures being developed at about the same time as Hazlitt's, those on the Philosophy of Fine Art being given at Berlin from 1818 onwards by Hegel.

The arguments reported in the *Aesthetics* under the head of lyric poetry are more systematic and more critical than Hazlitt's. Yet they in part share this stress on the subjective nature of the lyric, as distinguished from the narrative forms of epic:

> We saw that the efflorescence of epic proper required a national state of affairs which was on the whole undeveloped, not yet matured into a prosaic type of reality, whereas the times most favourable to lyric are

[6] For Wordsworth's use of exclamation to represent moments of rhetorical and personal suspense, see Karl R. Johnson, Jr, *The Written Spirit; Thematic and Rhetorical Structure in Wordsworth's 'The Prelude'* (Salzburg, 1978), pp. 81–2.

[7] Hazlitt, op. cit., p. 4.

[8] M. H. Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition* (New York, 1953). Hazlitt's definition of poetry was censured by Abrams (pp. 54–5, 154), taking no account of Hazlitt's audience, and has been defended by Bromwich (op. cit., pp. 251–4). For an overview of *The Mirror and the Lamp* as modern doctrine, see Thomas McFarland, 'A Coleridgean Criticism of the Work of M. H. Abrams', in Lawrence Lipking (ed.), *High Romantic Argument; Essays for M. H. Abrams* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1981), 106–27.

those which have achieved a more or less completed organization of human relationships, because only in those times has the individual person become self-reflective [in sich selbst reflektiert] in contrast to the external world, and, reflected out of it, achieved in his inner life an independent entirety of feeling and thinking. For in lyric both form and content are provided precisely not by the whole external world or by individual action but by the poet himself in his own personal character.[9]

This is a more largely historical context than Hazlitt provides; and Hegel balances the element of self-reflectiveness with the conviction that the power of human language, as the medium 'most capable of seizing the interests and movements of the spirit in their inner vivacity [in ihrer inneren Lebendigkeit]', ought properly to portray and represent the world of the spirit as much as that either of external things or of the individual sensibility.[10]

Nonetheless there is a general parallel in this instance between the thought of Hazlitt and of Hegel, and indeed Hegel quotes from Hazlitt in the course of one of his lectures on sculpture.[11] I bring forward this parallel, before returning to my theme of emphatical language, because it can be seen to locate what in our age may appear a serious weakness where once had been recognized a principal glory: the stance of Romantic subjectivity and its expressive performance. The charge would be that emphasis disrupts connectedness and representational reference, and indeed arbitrarily elevates the composing subject by attaching the power of preferential significance to the act of such disruption. It is a kind of italic interference with the context of meaning.

The objection is put with particular point and insistence by the young György Lukács in his *Theory of the Novel*, drafted in 1914

[9] G. W. F. Hegel, *Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Art*, trans. T. M. Knox (2 vols, Oxford, 1975), Vol. 2, p. 1123.

[10] *Aesthetics*, Vol. 2, p. 972. This dialectical balancing can also be regarded as a central ambivalence, especially concerning the place of lyric poetry as intermediate in Hegel's historical sequence from epic to drama; see René Wellek, *A History of Modern Criticism: 1750–1950* (4 vols, London, 1955–66), Vol. 2, pp. 320–9, Isobel Armstrong, *Language as Living Form in Nineteenth-Century Poetry* (Brighton, 1982), Chap. 1, and Jerome J. McGann, *The Romantic Ideology; A Critical Investigation* (Chicago and London, 1983), Chap. 4. The eventual preference by Abrams himself for spiritual transvaluation over a self-reflective lyrical interiority is demonstrated by the explicit Hegelian acknowledgements of his *Natural Supernaturalism; Tradition and Revolution in Romantic Literature* (New York, 1971).

[11] *Aesthetics*, Vol. 2, pp. 766, 1237.

and first published two years later. This work is very much a product of wartime circumstance and the root of its method is Hegelian, by the author's explicit admission. But the case against lyric poetry, as opposed to epic and dramatic forms of realized historical representation, is asserted with unmistakable vehemence:

> Lyric poetry can ignore the phenomenalisation of the first nature and can create a protean mythology of substantial subjectivity out of the constitutive strength of its ignorance. In lyric poetry, only the great moment exists, the moment at which the meaningful unity of nature and soul or their meaningful divorce, the necessary and affirmed loneliness of the soul becomes eternal. At the lyrical moment the purest interiority of the soul, set apart from duration without choice, lifted above the obscurely-determined multiplicity of things, solidifies into substance; whilst alien, unknowable nature is driven from within, to agglomerate into a symbol that is illuminated throughout. Yet this relationship between soul and nature can be produced only at lyrical moments. Otherwise, nature is transformed—because of its lack of meaning—into a kind of picturesque lumber-room of sensuous symbols for literature; it seems to be fixed in its bewitched mobility and can only be reduced to a meaningfully animated calm by the magic word of lyricism. Such moments are constitutive and form-determining [konstitutiv und formbestimmend] only for lyric poetry; only in lyric poetry do these direct, sudden flashes of the substance become like lost original manuscripts suddenly made legible; only in lyric poetry is the subject, the vehicle of such experiences, transformed into the sole carrier of meaning, the only true reality.[12]

Hazlitt's position would seem very vulnerable to this grander version of the charge, one given added point during his lifetime by the sense that the vast destructive forces of contemporary European and imperial history had repeatedly been dominating, by events on the battlefield, the frailer charms of the scholar's study and the impassioned lecture on poetry.[13] And poets who

[12] Georg Lukács, *The Theory of the Novel*, trans. Anna Bostock (London, 1971), p. 63. For the Hegelianism of the method, see pp. 15–20; for the scheme of the work as in origin introductory to a monograph on Dostoevsky, see György Márkus (trans. Michael Clark), 'Life and the Soul: the Young Lukács and the Problem of Culture', in Agnes Heller (ed.), *Lukács Revalued* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 25–6. Another aspect of this work's connection with earlier German thought is indicated by René Wellek, who has referred to it as 'a curious variation of Schiller's contrast between naive and sentimental poetry'; see his *Four Critics: Croce, Valéry, Lukács, and Ingarden* (Seattle and London, 1980), p. 38.

[13] Not that such themes had been altogether ignored: on sentimental militarism and its Romantic critique, compare the sarcastic martial invoca-

resorted to near-inarticulate particles of speech, ones which claimed to utter throes and pangs of feeling too deep for explicit recognition and outflow in social action, must seem particularly exposed:

> She lived unknown, and few could know
> When Lucy ceased to be;
> But she is in her grave, and, oh,
> The difference to me![14]

Of such particles, *oh* is the most widespread and important in the history of English poetic diction, and it has given difficulty to grammarians and lexicographers alike.[15] Both in emotional reference and in grammatical function it seems locked unconstruably into the interiority of the uttering subject. In the *Institutio Oratoria* Quintilian observed (I.iv.19–20) that to a comprehensive list of parts of speech interjections must be added, but he offered no further account. Donatus gave a brief description which had by then become quite representative: 'Interiectio est pars orationis interiecta aliis partibus orationis ad exprimendos animi adfectus',[16] and this same tradition is still followed for example by

tions of the opening to Canto VIII of Byron's *Don Juan*: 'Oh blood and thunder! and oh blood and wounds!' (*Poetical Works*, ed. Jerome J. McGann, Vol. 5 [Oxford, 1986], p. 365). Compare also Joseph Fawcet, *The Art of War. A Poem* (London, 1795) and 'Civilised War. A Poem', in *Poems* (London, 1798) with Leigh Hunt's radical satire of 1835, *Captain Sword and Captain Pen. A Poem* (facsimile edn with intro. by Rhodes Dunlap, Iowa City, 1984). On *The Art of War* see Arthur Beatty, 'Joseph Fawcett: The Art of War; Its Relation to the Early Development of William Wordsworth', *University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature*, **2** (1918), 224–69 (reprinting in full the text of 1795).

[14] William Wordsworth, *The Poetical Works*, Vol. 2, ed. E. de Selincourt, 2nd edn rev. H. Darbishire (Oxford, 1952), p. 30. On the enigmatic vehemence of 'difference' here, as a marked climax to 'the tone of heightened reserve which characterizes all of the Lucy poems', compare Frances Ferguson, *Wordsworth: Language as Counter-Spirit* (New Haven and London, 1977), Chap. 5; and contrast the flatter pitch of *The Prelude* (1805–6), XII, ll. 202–19.

[15] The English grammarians largely treated the interjection as an anomalous category expressing 'passion of the mind'; see Ian Michael, *English Grammatical Categories and the Tradition to 1800* (Cambridge, 1970), pp. 76–81, 461–5. Modern grammar is more alert to the boundaries between the logic of sentence structure and the force of speech acts, but otherwise the conventional analysis of interjections continues: see, e.g., Randolph Quirk *et al.*, *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, (London, 1985), pp. 74, 88, 853 ('purely emotive words which do not enter into syntactic relations'), and the carefully apologetic tone of Bruce Mitchell, *Old English Syntax* (2 vols, corrected reprint, Oxford, 1987), Vol. 1, p. 526.

[16] Donatus, *Ars grammatica*, II.17; *Grammatici Latini*, ed. H. Keil (8 vols, Leipzig, 1857–70), Vol. 4, p. 391.

Archibald Lane in his *Key to the Art of Letters: or, English a Learned Language*, published in 1700: 'Those voices call'd Interjections are not properly words, because they do not signify by the *custom* of any Language, but are Natural Expressions or Signs of the Passions of the mind, and are the same in all Languages, as, *ah*, *o*, *oh*, *ha*, *ha*, *he*, &c.'[17]

There are, however, considerations of generic context. In some cases of its literary use, the traditions of rhetorical analysis would claim that the interjection characteristically introduced figures of outward-facing apostrophe, including formal vocative address to deities or personifications, often in later practice consciously borrowed from classical models. Essentially the figure is analysed as a turning, in the form of an appeal or invocation, away from the principal direction of address and towards a new audience. Such seems plainly the case, for example, with the October eclogue of Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender*; the invocation of a former classical glory as the model for a new English national poetry is quite explicit, as Piers enlarges his culminating plea:

> O pierlesse Poesye, where is then thy place?
> If not in Princes pallace thou doe sitt:
> (And yet is Princes pallace the most fitt)
> Ne brest of baser birth doth thee embrace.
> Then make thee winges of thine aspyring wit,
> And, whence thou camst, flye backe to heauen apace.[18]

E.K. in his gloss to the poem records the conscious classical debt: 'This AEglogue is made in imitation of Theocritus his xvi. Idilion. . . . The style hereof as also that in Theocritus, is more

[17] A. Lane, *A Key to the Art of Letters: Or, English a Learned Language, Full of Art, Elegancy and Variety* (London, 1700), p. 60. Lane explains the nomenclature thus: 'An Interjection is so called, because it is thrown in between words in speaking; by the Force or Violence of some Passion, as of *Joy* or *Grief, Pain* or *Pleasure, Admiration* or *Indignation*, &c' (p. 60). For Lane's interest in universal grammar see G. A. Padley, *Grammatical Theory in Western Europe, 1500–1700: Trends in Vernacular Grammar* (2 vols, Cambridge, 1985–8), Vol. 2, pp. 181–90, 378–81.

[18] Edmund Spenser, *The Works*, ed. Edwin Greenlaw *et al.* (11 vols, Baltimore and London, 1932–57): *The Minor Poems*, ed. Charles Grosvenor Osgood *et al.* (Vols [7] and [8], Baltimore and London, 1943–7), Vol. [7], p. 98. For the generic novelty of this sequence see, e.g., Paul Alpers, 'Pastoral and the Domain of Lyric in Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender*', *Representations*, **12** (1985), 83–100. Not surprisingly, in view of his overall argument, the two final lines of Spenser's stanza are quoted by William Webbe in his *A Discourse of English Poetrie* of 1586; see G. Gregory Smith (ed.), *Elizabethan Critical Essays* (2 vols, Oxford, 1904), Vol. 1, p. 232.

loftye then the rest, and applyed to the heighte of Poeticall witte.' This repertory of apostrophe was important for translation from classical epic, and for the history of the elegy and the pindaric ode.[19]

But other aspects of interjectional writing, although comparable in the shaping of mood and occasion, have been assigned to the more inward-facing or solitary figure of exclamation, in which sorrow or wondering admiration are expressed in utterance pitched up in elevated contemplation but not addressed directly either towards surrogate recipients inside the poem or towards an acknowledged reader outside it. George Puttenham, in his *Arte of English Poesie* of 1589, defined it thus:

> The figure of exclamation, I call him [*the outcrie*] because it vtters our minde by all such words as do shew any extreme passion, whether it be by way of exclamation or crying out, admiration or wondering, imprecation or cursing, obtestation or taking God and the world to witnes.[20]

In each type of interjectional use, that of apostrophe and of exclamation, the tone of deliberate elevation and formality may be quite similar, often invoking Longinus as authority and model; and in fact these two kinds of figural usage frequently meet in complex hybrid forms.[21] The patristic and theatrical

[19] Compare Pope's defence of how in the *Odyssey* Homer consistently 'performs by speeches' the development of the narrative ('Postscript by Mr. Pope to *The Odyssey of Homer*'; Norman Ault and Rosemary Cowler [eds], *The Prose Works of Alexander Pope* [2 vols, Oxford, 1936–86], Vol. 2, p. 57); and see, e.g., G. W. Pigman III, *Grief and English Renaissance Elegy* (Cambridge, 1985), Chap. 3; Scott Elledge, 'Cowley's Ode "Of Wit" and Longinus on the Sublime: A Study of One Definition of the Word "Wit"', *MLQ*, **9** (1948), 185–98; Anne Williams, *Prophetic Strain; The Greater Lyric in the Eighteenth Century* (Chicago and London, 1984), pp. 65–9; Margaret Anne Doody, *The Daring Muse; Augustan Poetry Reconsidered* (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 249–58. Abrams somewhat characteristically recruits Longinus into his study of pedigrees for Romantic subjectivity; see *The Mirror and the Lamp*, pp. 72–8.

[20] George Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie*, ed. Gladys Doidge Willcock and Alice Walker (Cambridge, 1936), p. 212. The scheme of this figure runs back to Cicero and Quintilian; see Lee A. Sonnino, *A Handbook to Sixteenth-Century Rhetoric* (London, 1968), pp. 87–8. For the forms of vocative and exclamatory usage in classical Latin poetry see Manu Leumann *et al.*, *Lateinische Grammatik*, Vol. 2: J. B. Hofmann, neubearbeitet von Anton Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (München, 1965), p. 26; also David O. Ross, Jr, *Style and Tradition in Catullus* (Cambridge, Mass., 1969), pp. 49–53.

[21] An instructive example is George Herbert's poem from *The Temple* of 1633, 'Sighs and Grones', in which pairs of short petitionary exclamations function as a kind of rhymed burden to the main poem. Annotation and

forms of soliloquy would be cases in point,[22] but the Romantic lyric characteristically shifts back and forth, and its conventions of an enclosed station for the uttering voice mean that even the modes of apparently outright apostrophe often develop forms of invoking or calling-on which function as kinds of meditative exclamation.[23] In the case of the stanza from the *Shepheardes Calendar* given above, we may note that, even though the figure looked to be a clear case of apostrophe, E.K. in his final 'Embleme' to 'October' commented thus:

> Hereby is meant, as also in the whole course of this AEglogue, that Poetry is a diuine instinct and vnnatural rage passing the reache of comen reason. Whom Piers answereth Epiphonematicos as admiring the excellencye of the skyll whereof in Cuddie hee hadde alreadye hadde a taste.[24]

And the figure of Epiphonema, or Acclamatio, is indeed a special form of exclamation attached to the close of an utterance. Regarding rhetorical analysis, therefore, we may conclude that the modes both of apostrophe and of exclamation contribute to interjectional usage, in ways that are often intricately mixed.[25]

discussion have not indicated the connection of this with Romans, 8:26: 'We know not what wee should pray for as wee ought: but the spirit it selfe maketh intercession for vs with groanings, which cannot bee vttered.' Herbert is too burdened by sin to accomplish articulate apostrophe, so that his cries are exclamatory and not brought to formed utterance: yet, through the spirit, their plea is heard. The text from Romans was important in the contemporary controversy about spontaneous prayer; see Jeremy Taylor, *An Apology for Authorized and Set Forms of Litvrgie: Against the Pretence of the Spirit* (London, 1649), pp. 7–8, 23–4, etc.; Horton Davies, *Worship and Theology in England, From Andrewes to Baxter and Fox, 1603–1690* (Princeton, 1975), pp. 194–6.

[22] See, e.g., Robert J. O'Connell, S.J., *Art and the Christian Intelligence in St. Augustine* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 24–5; S. J. Hitch, 'Alfred's Reading of Augustine's *Soliloquies*', in D. M. Reeks (ed.), *Sentences; Essays Presented to Alan Ward* ... (Southampton, 1988), 21–9; Wolfgang Clemen, *Shakespeare's Soliloquies* (Cambridge, 1964).

[23] On such an effect in Wordsworth see Alastair Fowler, *Kinds of Literature; An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes* (Oxford, 1982), p. 103. This figural hybridism is historically early: see Ernest Gallo, *The 'Poetria Nova' and its Sources in Early Rhetorical Doctrine* (The Hague and Paris, 1971), III.A.4 (ll. 264–460) and pp. 172–4. Jonathan Culler's essay on 'Apostrophe' fails ultimately to persuade because it ignores the existence of these intermediate, hybrid formations; see his *The Pursuit of Signs; Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction* (London, 1981), 135–54.

[24] Edn cit., Vol. [7], p. 103; compare also p. 58.

[25] The *New English Dictionary* somewhat unconvincingly tried to maintain that, outside the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, a spelling difference

But in all this there is agreement that it is expression of the passions of the mind which gives power and emphasis to utterance, as Hazlitt claimed, and those writers who were interested in describing spoken discourse as much as in grammatical classification saw emphasis as essential to articulacy and power of expression.[26] In his *Rhetorical Grammar of the English Language* of 1781 the Irish actor and elocutionist, Thomas Sheridan, commended Cicero for recommending 'that a public speaker *remit*, from time to time, somewhat of the vehemence of his action, and not utter every passage with *all the force he can*; to set off, the more strongly, the more *emphatical parts*'.[27] Earlier, in his Lecture 'Of Emphasis' from the *Course of Lectures on Elocution* of 1762, Sheridan demonstrates how by accent, varied speech-tones and what we should call contrastive stress, 'the affections and passions are excited, the fancy agitated, and the attention of the hearer engaged by the delight which accompanies the very act of attending'.[28] More or less contemporaneously, Joshua Steele had

existed between *O* as the form characteristic of vocative address and *Oh* as exclamation; see *NED*, s.v. 'O' and 'Oh'. For an attempt to discriminate the earliest European post-classical applications of *o* as distinct from *oh* see Walther v. Wartburg, *Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch; Eine Darstellung des Galloromanischen Sprachschatzes*, Vol. 7 (Basel, 1955), pp. 260–1. One may, however, note such evidence as MacD. P. Jackson, 'Punctuation and the Compositors of Shakespeare's *Sonnets*, 1609', *The Library*, 5th Ser., **30** (1975), 1–24, where idiosyncratic compositorial variation between *O* and *Oh* in this famous Quarto seems well established.

[26] The older sense of 'emphasis', as a rhetorical figure in which a deeper meaning is revealed than is actually expressed in the words (Quintilian VIII.iii.83), is either mostly ignored or is assimilated to the later sense of vigour of expression, or stress of voice laid upon a word or phrase to mark its stronger significance. For a modern analysis and review of emphasis in relation to discourse structure see Paul Werth, *Focus, Coherence and Emphasis* (London, 1984).

[27] Thomas Sheridan, *A Rhetorical Grammar of the English Language* (2nd rev. edn, Dublin, 1781), p. 175; the Cicero reference is to *De oratore*, III.xxvi.101. On Sheridan's career and reputation see W. Benzie, *The Dublin Orator; Thomas Sheridan's Influence on Eighteenth-Century Rhetoric and 'Belles Lettres'* (Leeds Texts and Monographs, N.S. [4]; Leeds, 1972).

[28] Thomas Sheridan, *A Course of Lectures on Elocution* (London, 1762), p. 68. Sheridan also shared the view, earlier instanced in the quotation from Lane, above, that uttered expressions of passion are universal: 'Thus, the tones expressive of sorrow, lamentation, mirth, joy, hatred, anger, love, pity, &c. are the same in all nations, and consequently can excite emotions in us analogous to those passions, when accompanying words which we do not understand' (ibid., p. 101). Despite such fanciful universalism, English *O*, *Oh* is probably best regarded as a Latin loanword introduced via French; it is not

also attempted to define and record patterns of emphasis in speech and poetry, in his *Essay Towards Establishing the Melody and Measure of Speech* of 1775. Steele contested the classically derived habits of analysing speech-melodies only by reference to accent and quantity, ignoring force and emphasis as well as pause. 'The tones of passion', he argues, 'are distinguished by a greater extent of the voice both into the *acute* [rising tone] and the *grave* [falling tone], and by making the *antithesis*, or diversity between the two, more remarkable.'[29]

Yet to these essentially dramaturgical defences of expressive speech the young Lukács might well have objected that nostalgia for an entirely efficacious vocalizing of social feeling always constructs an imaginary space void of obstacles within which to play out its lyrical idealization: method becomes a binding law. 'The nature of laws and the nature of moods,' says Lukács in *The Theory of the Novel*, 'stem from the same *locus* in the soul: they presuppose the impossibility of an attained and meaningful substance, the impossibility of finding a constitutive object adequate to the constitutive subject.'[30] Hazlitt would not have described his half-tragic, half-farcical run-in with Sarah Walker in quite these terms: but the narrator of the *Liber Amoris* shows with comical vehemence that he has learned their lesson: 'Oh! how I felt at that moment! Restored to love, hope, and joy, by a breath which I had caught by the merest accident, and which I might have pined in absence and mute despair for want of hearing!'[31] Wordsworth's intercessionary pang for Coleridge's blighted hopes, cited earlier, claimed the nobility of altruism; this passage of Hazlitt's half-claims the deeper misery of consciously ignominious self-pity, of narcissistic abjection.

part of the Germanic system of interjections (see, e.g., Mitchell, *Old English Syntax*, Vol. 1, p. 528). The evidence for the extent of its indogermanic distribution is reviewed in Ernst Schwentner, *Die Primären Interjektionen in den Indogermanischen Sprachen, mit Besonderer Berücksichtigung des Griechischen, Lateinischen und Germanischen* (Heidelberg, 1924), pp. 9–12.

[29] Joshua Steele, *An Essay Towards Establishing the Melody and Measure of Speech* (London, 1775), p. 191. Such features of emphatic contrast are also argued to be shaped rhythmically in measured speech: 'The *instinctive* sense of *pulsation* gives the mind an *idea* of *emphasis* and *emphatic divisions*' (p. 117). On Steele's early form of intonation analysis see Paul K. Alkon, 'Joshua Steele and the Melody of Speech', *Language and Speech*, **2** (1959), 154–74, and David Crystal, *Prosodic Systems and Intonation in English* (Cambridge, 1969), pp. 22–5.

[30] Lukács, *The Theory of the Novel*, p. 65.

[31] William Hazlitt, *Liber Amoris: Or, The New Pygmalion*, ed. Gerald Lahey (New York and London, 1980), pp. 217–18.

A further difficulty with the use of expressive interjections to prompt the moment of recognized passion, where the recognition itself may carry possibilities of powerfully ironic acknowledgement of the occasion, is that the mood-content may be quite uncertain and labile. For the lexicographer, as for the grammarian, this has been a problem of discriminatory definitions. Part of the pedigree of vocative and exclamatory discourse came not only from classical example but from the sacred poetry of scripture and the liturgy, giving force to the concept of a spiritual pathos which signalled the sublime possibility of a human discourse admitted to the ear of God. For the Hebrews there was the note of exultation, in the eager hope that the enemies of Israel would be trampled down; for sinful man in post-classical Europe the fear of unworthiness and the threat of despair produce a note of anguish almost always at least latent in the accent of petitionary prayer.[32]

The puzzle about the mood-content of the interjection *O* in secular usage is represented by an entirely unadventurous entry in Nathan Bailey's supplementary volume to his *Universal Etymological Dictionary*, of 1737; the word was used, he says 'as an interjection of abhorrence, admiration, calling, derision, desiring, indignation, &c', and even this list omits despairing, imploring and surprise (which may itself be angry or delighted); the *&c* seems well justified, if somewhat defeatist.[33] There is perhaps a latent phenomenology of projective, intentional affect, such as unites the underlying stance and utterance-forms of praying, exulting and cursing, which would interconnect these moods; but in any case it is hard to resist the impression, implicit in this account and in others like it, of a sub-articulate outcry formed prior to a discriminated emotional profile.[34]

[32] For an overview see George A. Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times* (London, 1980), Chap. 7: 'Judeo-Christian Rhetoric'.

[33] N. Bailey, *The Universal Etymological Dictionary: Containing An Additional Collection of Words (not in the first Volume)* ([Vol. 2], 3rd enlarged edn, London, 1737); the bibliography of this often-reprinted work is complex, since the 3rd edn of Vol. 2 was issued in 1737, the 3rd edn of Vol. 1 in 1726, and each form is complete in itself. A similar listing of 'passions of the mind', but with 'griefe' in the first position and including also (in the second edition) 'exclamation', appears under 'O' in John Florio's Italian–English dictionary: *A Worlde of Wordes, Or Most copious, and exact Dictionarie in Italian and English* ... (London, 1598), p. 242; *Queene Anna's New World of Words, Or Dictionarie of the Italian and English tongues* ... (2nd enlarged edn, London, 1611), p. 336.

[34] On interjectional aspects of praying and cursing see, e.g., Walter Burkert

A sophisticated if succinct attempt at distinguishing forms of usage in the frame of sacred discourse is set out in Thomas Wilson's *Christian Dictionarie, Opening the signification of the chiefe wordes dispersed generally through Holie Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, tending to increase Christian knowledge*, first issued in 1612, and here the roots of noble exclamation in biblical rhetoric are altogether apparent. The word is noticed as explicitly a represented utterance: first, 'the voice of one lamenting'; second, 'the voice of one praying, and calling vpon another'; third, 'the voice of one wondering, & exclaiming with admiration, as at some strange thing'; fourth, 'the voice of one chiding or speaking to another, in way of reprehension'; and fifth, 'the voice of one exhorting and encoraging to dutie'.[35] Wilson's citations for the prime sense, the voice of lament, are Luke 13:34: 'O Hierusalem, Hierusalem, which killest the Prophets, and stonest them that are sent vnto thee; how often would I haue gathered thy children together . . .'; and 2 Sam. 18:33: 'And the king was much moued, and went vp to the chamber ouer the gate, and wept: and as he went, thus he said, O my sonne Absalom, my sonne, my sonne Absalom: would God I had died for thee, O Absalom, my sonne, my sonne.'[36]

(trans. John Raffan), *Greek Religion, Archaic and Classical* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 73–5.

[35] Thomas Wilson, *A Christian Dictionarie, Opening the signification of the chiefe wordes dispersed generally through Holie Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, tending to increase Christian knowledge* (London, 1612), p. 339. In the fourth edition and the first after Wilson's death in 1622 there was 'a large Edition [*sic*], both of words and phrases, by M^r^. Iohn Bagwell', and to the entry for *O* Bagwell added a witty note emphasizing the inward and outward directions of the word's usage:

> One word and syllable lesse than a word, a letter lesse than a common syllable, a short expression of a long and longing affection. An inter[i]ection fit to cast into the middest of our inward thoughts, and outward affaires.

(*A Christian Dictionary . . . the fourth Edition* [London, n.d.], sig. Kk2^v^; publication datable to *c.*1635).

[36] This last text was the subject of numerous seventeenth-century musical settings, offering as it did such conspicuous opportunities for powerful and expressive vocal treatment; the published settings are Michael East, *The Fovrth Set Of Bookes, Wherein Are Anthemes for Versus and Chorus, Madrigals, and Songs of other kindes* (1618), No. 20, and Thomas Tomkins, *Songs Of 3. 4. 5. and 6. parts* (1622), No. 19. On the setting by Tomkins, see Denis Stevens, *Thomas Tomkins, 1572–1656* (London, 1957), pp. 111–13; on the setting by Thomas Weelkes, and others surviving only in MSS, see David Brown, *Thomas Weelkes; A Biographical and Critical Study* (London, 1969), pp. 141–9. Weelkes in

We approach now, and pass over, the thresholds of a great traditional power in the combination of seemingly sub-articulate utterance with circumstances of anguish and desolation, drawing on the admitted powers of sacred speech but within occasions now painfully deprived of their controlling authority:

> *Glost.* O let me kisse that hand.
> *Lear.* Here wipe it first, it smels of mortalitie.
> *Glost.* O ruind peece of Nature, this great world should so weare out to naught, do you know me?[37]

There are deeply buried puns here, beyond the comprehensions of either speaker yet ensconced within their predicament of speaking about utter perdition: the round O of loyal plea turned into horror and outcry at ruined nature, broken and unpeaceful, is the self-same figure as the great world itself and the cypher it has come to, the naught. There is echo of a preceding blank outcry, by Edgar, driven to exclaim in horror: 'world, world, O world!' (IV.i.9); we may compare the Fool, earlier, at I.iv.200–1 to Lear: 'now thou art an O without a figure, I am better then thou art now, I am a foole, thou art nothing.'[38] Or take Coleridge's hardly less desolate outcry, close to the conclusion of 'The Rime of the Ancient Mariner', when the narrating voice

particular takes full advantage of the text's internal quotation as he isolates the moments of outcry with telling silences, bringing in his separate voices to build up the concerted full lament.

[37] *M. William Shak-speare: His True Chronicle Historie of the life and death of King Lear and his three Daughters* (London, 1608), sig. I4^{r} (IV.vi.134–7). For a description of Shakespeare's exclamatory sentence-types, see Vivian Salmon, 'Sentence Structures in Colloquial Shakespearian English' (1965), in Vivian Salmon and Edwina Burness (comps), *A Reader in the Language of Shakespearean Drama* (Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, **35**; Amsterdam and Philadelphia, 1987), 265–300; for their acute prominence in *King Lear*, see Joseph H. Summers, '"Look there, look there!" The Ending of *King Lear*', in John Carey (ed.), *English Renaissance Studies Presented to Dame Helen Gardner in Honour of her Seventieth Birthday* (Oxford, 1980), pp. 74–93; for mocking imitation compare, e.g., Henry Fielding, *The Tragedy of Tragedies; or, The Life and Death of Tom Thumb the Great* (1731), III.x.14–17.

[38] Ibid., sig. D1^{r} (I.iv.211–12); visually the two type-forms, for letter O and for zero, are not easily distinguishable. The foole with his two o's is better provided than a King, who has none; compare also John Donne, 'Obsequies to the Lord Harrington, brother to the Countesse of Bedford', ll. 105–6, for a related conceit of O as a circle. There is some evidence also of closer sound-forms for *O* and *naught* than modern pronunciation would suggest: John Willis in *The Art of Stenographie* (1602) recorded that *ah* and *oh* were spoken as if written *agh* and *ogh*; see E. J. Dobson, *English Pronunciation, 1500–1700* (2nd edn, 2 vols, Oxford, 1968), Vol. 1, pp. 386, 427.

with its 'strange power of speech' refers to his soul in the third person, unable to claim it as his own because of the yet incomplete penance of his remaining life:

> O Wedding-Guest! this soul hath been
> Alone on a wide wide sea:
> So lonely 'twas, that God himself
> Scarce seeméd there to be.[39]

This is impassioned apostrophe in form, yet the hearer within the narrative is unwilling and distracted, the speaker driven to solicit attention as a pretext for confronting himself with retrospective insight. The now secular plea rehearses, by belated remorse, the lost moment for prayerful contrition, and for this loss the recalled sense of an absconded deity serves both as excuse and punishment.[40] The marking of such culminating emphasis of anagnorisis and insufficient passion, by the use of the exclamatory particle which has its roots in imploration and the secularized optative, may even so seem to give weight to the counter-

[39] S. T. Coleridge, *The Complete Poetical Works*, ed. Ernest Hartley Coleridge (2 vols, Oxford, 1912), Vol. 1, p. 208. For the special kind of salvation story embedded in this narrative, see Jerome J. McGann, *The Beauty of Inflections; Literary Investigations in Historical Method and Theory* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 156–7; and compare also Thomas De Quincey's exclamatory comments on the mariner's 'penitential sorrow' (*The Collected Writings*, ed. David Masson [new & enlarged edn, 14 vols, Edinburgh, 1889–90], Vol. 13, p. 195). Lukács argued against solitude as symptomatic of fundamental human consciousness, and also against the evisceration of narrative by allegory, in *The Meaning of Contemporary Realism* (1957), trans. John and Necke Mander (London, 1963), Lecture 1: 'The Ideology of Modernism'.

[40] This note of displaced and belated address, of recognition the more passionate for being overtaken by the events which frame it, has been heard in the earliest English versions of classical epic; compare Surrey's *Aeneid* of *c.* 1538–44, rendering the outcry of Aeneas at the return in dream of the mutilated Hector (II.279–82):

> Whome franckly thus, me thought, I spake vnto,
> With bitter teres and dolefull deadly voice,
> O Troyan light, O only hope of thine:
> What lettes so long thee staid?

(Florence H. Ridley [ed.], *The 'Aeneid' of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey* [University of California Publications, English Studies: **26**; Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1963], pp. 67–8 [II, ll. 356–9]. This context is with vivid alteration implicitly recalled in *Paradise Lost*, I, ll. 84–7, where for the reader the moment is ironically belated within both the sacred action of the poem's narrative and also the secular history of precedent epic composition. Lukács described Virgil's heroes as leading 'a cool and measured shadow-existence, nourished by the blood of a splendid ardour that has sacrificed itself in order to conjure up what has vanished forever' (*The Theory of the Novel*, p. 49).

arguments which we have already noticed: that the claimed nobility and anguish of such moments, the trailing remnants of a discredited sacral destiny, are locked out of man's social and historical nature and are thereby figments of unregenerate self-isolation: denied productive commitment to the activity of a world, these types of remorse draw towards sanctification but are actually the outcome of collusive, private sentimentalism.[41]

If we trace the history within the English vernacular tradition of such utterance forms back to earlier beginnings we shall find seeming endorsement for at least the descriptive content of this counter-argument. Let us consider what sounds like an intact devotional lyric upon the passion of Christ, set into the text of the Butchers' play on 'The Death of Christ' in the fifteenth-century cycle of Corpus Christi plays from York, and given to the character of the blind knight Longinus at the moment that the side of Jesus is pierced by the spear:

Longeus latus O maker vnmade, full of myght,
O Jesu so jentill and jente
Þat sodenly has sente me my sight,
Lorde, louyng to þe be it lente.
On rode arte þou ragged and rente,
Mankynde for to mende of his mys.
Full spitously spilte is and spente
Thi bloode, lorde, to bringe vs to blis
Full free.
A, mercy my socoure,
Mercy, my treasoure,
Mercy, my sauioure,
Þi mercy be markid in me.[42]

This is presented as a reverent calling upon the Maker of all things who in the person of his son has miraculously at the moment of his passion made one previously unable to behold it now regain that power. But the paradox of making and unmak-

[41] Compare Coleridge on 'the startling *hysteric* of weakness over-exerting itself, which bursts on the unprepared reader in sundry odes and apostrophes to abstract terms'; *Biographia Literaria; or, Biographical Sketches of My Literary Life and Opinions*, ed. James Engell and W. Jackson Bate (2 vols, London and Princeton, 1983), Vol. 2, p. 85. For Byron's opposition to 'a discourse ruled by symbols, which drive into silence and ecstatic revelation' see Jerome J. McGann, *Don Juan in Context* (London, 1976), p. 111.

[42] Richard Beadle (ed.), *The York Plays* (London, 1982), p. 330; on the visual treatment of this scene and its moment of 'wonder and belief' see W. L. Hildburgh, 'English Alabaster Carvings as Records of the Medieval Religious Drama' [1939], *Archaeologia*, **93** (1949), pp. 85–6.

ing discloses a bitter, dignified amazement, one that prompts a sudden, deep contradiction of feeling which is itself a form of knowing, as it was for Gloucester whose sight had been so cruelly unmade that he could see only feelingly.[43] Here, the person of Jesus who had never been made in the way of mortal men, whose divine nature is eternal and unconfined, suffers a pinioned unmaking of his human selfhood at the hands of those he had come to redeem.[44] The interjection is not so much petitionary or optative as rather the mark of a rapt contemplation, within a scene of great violence and activity.[45] The assignment of this play to the Butchers, for performance amongst their open shambles, seems both painfully apt and aptly painful.

This moment of profound feeling, then, looks with renewed vision deeply inward, as well as outward towards the scene of the Passion; involvement in the enclosing narrative is temporarily excluded by the powerful convergence of forces which that narrative has brought to this climax. The lyrical moment seems essentially interpolated, outside the main action. And yet, of course, like revelation itself, it alters both how action is perceived and also what it means: the knight's speech quotes by anticipation what is to be also the observer's own response as he or she

[43] For Hegel's view of Gloucester's blindness, see *Aesthetics*, Vol. 2, p. 1229; for comment, see Terence Cave, *Recognitions; A Study in Poetics* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 159–60. Admiration of the storm scenes in *King Lear* by advocates of Longinian sublimity proceeded upon different grounds: see William Smith (trans.), *Dionysius Longinus on the Sublime* (London, 1739), pp. 117–18.

[44] The expression 'maker unmade' was evidently formulaic, and is used in a comparably exclamatory context, though without the crucial irony of the York usage, in Richard Misyn's 1434 translation of the *De emendacione vitae* of Richard Rolle; see Ralph Harvey (ed.), *The Fire of Love, and The Mending of Life or The Rule of Living ... of Richard Rolle ... [translated] by Richard Misyn* (EETS, OS Vol. 106, London, 1896), Cap. XI (p. 122, l. 30). Misyn's 'unmade' renders *incircumscriptus* (Cambridge Gonville and Caius College MSS 216/231, fol. 15^{r}, 353/580, fol. 140^{r}).

[45] Sometimes the violence is not so much narrative and dramatic as rhetorical within the moment of intense emotional self-confrontation: as in Chaucer's translation in Book I of *Troilus and Criseyde* from Petrarch's 'S'amor non è, che dunque è quel ch'io sento?'. Here Troilus invokes by impassioned outcry the violent contradictions which compel acknowledgement and provide its terms: 'O quike deth, O swete harm so queynte' (rendering 'O viva morte, o dilectoso male'). The mortifying strangeness of heightened consciousness here is part of the courtly lover's perilous obligation; see Geoffrey Chaucer, *Troilus & Criseyde*, ed. B. A. Windeatt (London and New York, 1984), p. 112 and Patricia Thomson, *Sir Thomas Wyatt and His Background* (London, 1964), pp. 152–60, and compare George Gascoigne's 'Love, hope, and death, do stirre in me such strife' (Poem 3 in *A Discourse of the Adventures passed by Master F.J.*), ll. 13–14.

sees with new eyes.[46] The tone of devotional lamentation has indeed already been set by the sorrowing of Mary which is part of the earlier interchange of voices in this play, and this has evident connections, as its editors have noted, with the form of the Latin hymn known as the *planctus Mariae*.[47] The origins of the lyrical *planctus* and its collateral relations with the dirge and the lament of exile have been reviewed by Peter Dronke; more recently, its musical and dramatic resources have been explored by John Stevens, and its later development into the High Style *plang* of troubadour practice has been indicated by Christopher Page.[48] But a rather different tradition is outlined in the entry by A. L. Lloyd under 'Lament' for the *New Grove*.[49] Here a more anthropological and folkloric approach to the forms of ceremonial and song in funerary rites results in a distinction between the framing *discourse* of such occasions and 'the almost involuntary cry of grief' which is named as the *planctus*.[50] The moment of

[46] On the presupposing of an enclosing story which frames the moment of lyrical expression, see (in a slightly different context) Rosemary Woolf, *The English Religious Lyric in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1968), pp. 44–5.

[47] Richard Beadle and Pamela M. King (eds), *York Mystery Plays; A Selection in Modern Spelling* (Oxford, 1984), p. 222. On the *planctus Mariae* see Douglas Gray, *Themes and Images in the Medieval English Religious Lyric* (London, 1972), p. 137, and Rosemary Woolf, op. cit., Chap. 7; on its use in medieval drama, see Rosemary Woolf, *The English Mystery Plays* (London, 1972), pp. 263–6; on the relations of the *planctus* to the *lai* and the crucifixion laments in Latin and English see E. J. Dobson and F.Ll. Harrison (eds), *Medieval English Songs* (London and Boston, 1979), pp. 83–93, 118–19, 154.

[48] Peter Dronke, *Poetic Individuality in the Middle Ages; New Departures in Poetry, 1000–1150* (2nd edn, London, 1986), pp. 27–9; John Stevens, *Words and Music in the Middle Ages; Song, Narrative, Dance and Drama, 1050–1350* (Cambridge, 1986), Chap. 4; Christopher Page, *Voices and Instruments of the Middle Ages; Instrumental Practice and Songs in France, 1100–1300* (London and Melbourne, 1987), pp. 42–6; see also Paul Zumthor, *Le Masque et la Lumière; La Poétique des Grands Rhétoriqueurs* (Paris, 1978), pp. 191–2. For an earlier tradition of musical settings for exclamatory texts, the O-Antiphons (so-called because they all begin with the interjection *O*), see Willi Apel, *Gregorian Chant* (Bloomington, Ind., 1958), p. 400; Susan Rankin, 'The Liturgical Background of the Old English Advent Lyrics: a Reappraisal', in Michael Lapidge and Helmut Gneuss (eds), *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England; Studies Presented to Peter Clemoes on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Cambridge, 1985), 317–40.

[49] A. L. Lloyd, 'Lament'; *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, ed. Stanley Sadie (20 vols, London, 1980), Vol. 10, 407–10.

[50] Art. cit., p. 407. Again the mood-content of such cries may not be fully determinate; see for instance Peter Dronke, *The Medieval Lyric* (2nd edn, London, 1978), p. 190, and compare the discussion of Hebrew *Selah*, as a musical term possibly indicating 'either a crescendo by the accompanying

outcry which produces exclamatory syllabic vocalizations is disordering and paroxysmic, but is absorbed back into the *discourse* 'by turning the planctus into a refrain' or by developing antiphonal patterns of alternating voices: 'indeed the very origin of antiphon and of refrain may lie in the lament.'[51]

Once again, here, we find a double perspective, isolating the fragments of language which are extra-grammatical and also drawing their force of expression and recognition back into the frame of articulateness and acknowledgement. Thus, for instance, Marlowe in the 1604 text of *The tragicall History of Doctor Faustus* has Faustus exclaim:

> O no end is limited to damned soules,
> Why wert thou not a creature wanting soule?
> Or, why is this immortall that thou hast?[52]

The prospect of a punitive eternity yawns before its terrified victim, with the old sense of 'limited' as 'fixed or appointed' and only a distant echo of the limit marking the end; yet the distance of that echo must have been the more painful, because the end was in fact no end, a soul reduced to suffering nullity but lasting for ever. Here, the exclamatory particle is outside the discourse limits controlling its line, being entirely hypermetrical.[53] This

music or a cultic cry raised by the cultic community', in Ivan Engnell (trans. John T. Willis and Helmer Ringgren), *Critical Essays on the Old Testament* (London, 1970), pp. 87–8. On cultic cry in relation to biblical lament see also Sigmund Mowinckel (trans. D. R. Ap-Thomas), *The Psalms in Israel's Worship* (2 vols, Oxford, 1962), Vol. 1, pp. 8–9 and *passim*.

[51] Art. cit., p. 408; compare also Margaret Alexiou, *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition* (Cambridge, 1974), pp. 13, 41, 136. For an hypothesis concerning text to tune association based on the primitive nucleus of children's vocative chants, see Mark Yoffe Liberman, *The Intonational System of English* (Bloomington, Ind., 1978), pp. 19–59.

[52] Christopher Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus, 1604–1616: Parallel Texts*, ed. W. W. Greg (Oxford, 1950), Sc. xiv (1604), ll. 1488–90 (p. 290); compare also Alexiou, op. cit., p. 146.

[53] The power of climactic expressive utterance to transgress its formal occasion, just as emphasis may override regularity of intonation, not infrequently finds confirmation in hypermetrical forms: again, not so much imitating the modal affect involved as rather marking the moment of heightened recognition. See for instance the discussion by Stevens of a strikingly melismatic setting of extra-metrical interjections in the text of the *Ordo Rachelis* from the Fleury Playbook (*Words and Music*, p. 361, with full Latin and English text and vocal score); it is suggestive that the affect expressed in 'O dolor, O patrum' is disclosed as a highly complex transitional feeling by what immediately follows: '... mutataque gaudia matrum ad lugubres luctus'.

feature is tidied up in the text of 1616; W. W. Greg comments, with what I take to be deep insight, that the earlier *O* 'may have been an actor's addition—but I do not think it was.'[54]

This aspect of exclamatory utterance shows a parallel development in musical usage, and most specifically in song. George Gascoigne advised, in his 'Certayne Notes of Instruction concerning the Making of Verse or Ryme in English' of 1575: 'in your verses remembre to place euery worde in his natural *Emphasis* or sound, that is to say, in such wise, and with such length or shortnesse, eleuation or depression of sillables, as it is commonly pronounced or vsed';[55] and Thomas Campion, in the preface 'To the Reader' of the first *Booke of Ayres* of 1601, offers similar advice: 'we ought to maintaine as well in Notes, as in action, a manly carriage, gracing no word, but that which is eminent, and emphaticall.'[56] Utterance, in poetry as in song, thus carries accent by virtue of the argument between prosody and emphasis.[57] There are examples of passionate exclamation in Campion's repertory of monophonic ayres, as for instance 'Oft have I sigh'd' in the *Third and Fourth Booke* of *c.*1617, where the woman's voice is heard in repeated, passionate complaint: 'Oh yet I languish still through his delay';[58] and as Thomas Morley

[54] Op. cit., p. 399; see also D. W. Harding, *Words into Rhythm* (Cambridge, 1976), pp. 105–7.

[55] George Gascoigne, 'Certayne Notes of Instruction Concerning the Making of Verse or Ryme in English, Written at the Request of Master *Edouardo Donati*', from *The Posies of George Gascoigne, Esquire, corrected, perfected, and augmented by the Author* (London, 1575), reprinted in *Elizabethan Critical Essays* (ed. Smith), Vol. 1, p. 49. Over the word *Emphasis* in his copy of the *Posies* Gabriel Harvey wrote 'Prosodie' (in his special sense of the pronunciation of a word or syllable in verse); Smith, op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 359.

[56] Thomas Campion, *The Works*, ed. Walter R. Davis (London, 1969), p. 15; compare also Coburn Freer, *The Poetics of Jacobean Drama* (Baltimore and London, 1981), pp. 41–50. The notion of *emphasis* here, in Gascoigne and Campion, bears a somewhat complex relation to metrical accent and the accommodation of speech-intonation to stress-patterns in English verse; see Derek Attridge, *Well-Weighed Syllables; Elizabethan Verse in Classical Metres* (Cambridge, 1974), pp. 91–2, 219–27, and David Crystal, *The English Tone of Voice; Essays in Intonation, Prosody and Paralanguage* (London, 1975), Chap. 7.

[57] For technical discussion of accent in relation to stress, and on both in relation to emphasis, see Crystal, *Prosodic Systems*, pp. 113–20, 156–9, 290.

[58] Thomas Campian (*sic*), *Third Booke of Ayres*, ed. Edmund H. Fellowes, rev. Thurston Dart (The English Lute-Songs, 2nd ser., **10**; London, [1969]), pp. 2–3; Davis (op. cit., p. 134) prints the words only. On the musical setting see David Lindley, *Thomas Campion* (Leiden, 1986), pp. 85–8. Disappointed passion is given a wittier turn in Donne's 'Breake of Day', a more sardonic dawn-song in which the woman's complaint is adroitly modulated to a shrug:

had recommended in his *Plain and Easy Introduction to Practical Music* of 1597, 'You must then when you would express any word signifying hardness, cruelty, bitterness, and other such like make the harmony like unto it, that is somewhat harsh and hard, but yet so that it offend not.'[59] Exclamatory emphasis isolates the distinctive moment of its utterance, and yet its performance is kept within the margins of an intelligible context of expressive forms and rhythms.

Furthermore, the domestic sung lament, which modulated into the musical elegies of the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the 'death songs' of the playhouses and the 'songs of mourning', also continued in the popular and folklore repertory, and impassioned exclamation often there also marked a culmination of feeling and of narrative.[60] We may consider such a familiar lament as this:

> Early one morning, just as the sun was rising,
> I heard a maid sing in the valley below;
> 'Oh, don't deceive me, Oh, never leave me!
> How could you use a poor maiden so?'[61]

The tune and words are regularly described as 'traditional', although the diction of the subsequent stanzas seems distinctly eighteenth-century in manner. But this artless song is interesting as a case of one song quoting another: the *chanson d'aventure* outset

> Must business thee from hence remove?
> Oh, that's the worst disease of love,
> The poore, the foule, the false, love can
> Admit, but not the busied man.

(*The Elegies and The Songs and Sonnets*, ed. Helen Gardner [Oxford, 1965], p. 37).

[59] Thomas Morley, *A Plain and Easy Introduction to Practical Music*, ed. R. Alec Harman (London, 2nd rev. edn, 1963), p. 290. This formula was nicely mocked by Swift in his 'A Cantata', in which as it comes to its prolonged and highly pathetick close the words dwindle into repetitious inanity; see Jonathan Swift, *The Poems*, ed. Harold Williams (2nd rev. edn, 3 vols, Oxford, 1958), Vol. 3, pp. 955–61 (includes musical score, by the Revd John Echlin).

[60] For a listing of late sixteenth and early seventeenth-century musical elegies, see Vincent Duckles, 'The English Musical Elegy of the Late Renaissance', in Jan LaRue (ed.), *Aspects of Medieval and Renaissance Music; A Birthday Offering to Gustave Reese* (London, 1967), pp. 150–3.

[61] Cecil J. Sharp (ed.), *A Book of British Song, for Home and School* (London, 1902), No. 55 (pp. 118–19); this first stanza, of four, is underlaid to the score. The song is listed in the section headed 'Old English Songs and Ballads' (p. xiv) and is described as 'Tune and words traditional' (p. 118); there is no comment recorded in his 'Notes on Songs'.

opens on to another chant, overheard in its singing by an abandoned maid thinking herself unheard or not caring whether she was or not. The original of Wordsworth's 'Solitary Reaper' of 1805 was also overheard, but in that case she sang in Erse (a marginal and excluded discourse, for sure) and so only the 'melancholy strain' of the melody gave the clue to 'natural sorrow'.[62] Here in the folksong melody the notes rise to a pitch of imitative exclamation, just as if within the more artful formulae of a coded musical rhetoric; the cry of abandonment is complex, because her petition not to be deceived must tacitly presume that she already has been, just as also is presumed not only that he has left her but done so never to return. In protesting the misery of this fate she shows that she understands and even accepts it; the silent auditor likewise accepts that this moment of wretchedness is confirmed by the solitude and silence which surround it and which the maid's song cannot alter. If her exclamation is an apostrophe it is presented as addressed not to the unknown hearer who is present unbeknown, but to the deceiver who is deliberately absent and who is all too well known to her and yet not at all to the only person who hears. Yet neither the first auditor of her song, nor we the auditors of the outer, framing narrative, know who either of them is or was; the main narrative's past tense back-shifts, into an unascertainable remove, the immediacy of the heard lament, preserving its piercing moment as something also beyond present knowledge.[63] What is presented as apostrophe functions implicitly as undirected exclamation. The moment of recognition is in the third line, and is confirmed by the highly melismatic melody of line four: she sings 'How could you use', but she knows that he cannot hear her and that what she means is 'How could he have used'.

It may seem laboured to make so much of a piece that can hardly even claim the jealously guarded status of an authentic folksong.[64] But its essential features are brought to emphatic

[62] William Wordsworth, *The Poetical Works*, Vol. 3, ed. E. de Selincourt and Helen Darbishire (Oxford, 1946), pp. 444–5, quoting Thomas Wilkinson's *Tour in Scotland*; the bounds of constraining circumstance are still further loosened and enlarged in, e.g., Wallace Stevens, 'The Idea of Order at Key West' (*The Collected Poems* [London, 2nd imp., 1959], pp. 128–30).

[63] Even the gender of the outer song's narrating voice is unacknowledged, although the tacit pressure of genre requires a dominant masculine adventurer making his excursion into the submissive landscape of nature; see Dronke, *The Medieval Lyric*, p. 200; also Zumthor, *Le Masque et la Lumière*, pp. 148–50.

[64] Introducing his 1902 anthology Sharp commented: 'Therefore, in collecting these songs, I have confined myself to those which are traditional, and,

culmination in the force of the planctus-like exclamations, as is similarly the case with, for instance, 'Barbara Allen' or 'A Brisk Young Lover' in the ballad repertory.[65] Narrative in each case presumes no source of sacral order to which appeal could be directed. Rather, it positions the framing circumstance for the cry which exceeds its limit only to show that the limits bind strictly and may not, without penalty, be exceeded: what Hazlitt termed 'a fine return of the passion upon itself.' This strain of popular lament can be traced in various genres more or less continuously, while the more elevated modes of musical and literary composition drew on its underlying power to produce those culminations of acute pathos which Hazlitt so enthusiastically admired and which the young Lukács treated with such hostile resentment.[66] From the Marxian viewpoint, 'the valley below' can only represent a suppressed and subordinated nature, replaced by the apparatus of an estranged consciousness which substitutes for it 'a charnel-house of long-dead interiorities.'[67]

And while the devices of the Rhapsodic Ode and the sublime epick poem were being expounded by the English literary and aesthetic theorists of the eighteenth century, there is plentiful evidence that the hyperbolic and unsupported tendency of high-pitched exclamation was, for reasons not completely alien to

being chiefly of folk origin, are of assured humanity' (op. cit., p. vi); but there is no sign of 'Early One Morning' in Maud Karpeles (ed.), *Cecil Sharp's Collection of English Folk Songs* (2 vols, Oxford, 1974), and it seems that after he had identified the living continuity of authentic traditional song in the repertoire of active folk singers Sharp rejected 'composed' popular songs of impure pedigree such as this one.

[65] C. J. Sharp and Charles L. Marson (eds), *Folk Songs from Somerset* (London and Taunton, 1904), No. 22; James Reeves (ed.), *The Idiom of the People; English Traditional Verse ... from the Manuscripts of Cecil J. Sharp* (London, 1958), No. 20. Reeves summarizes the complex transmission of 'A Brisk Young Lover' and comments: 'It seems probable that behind this song is a lost ballad of some length and that in the various versions the original narrative elements have been to a greater or lesser degree suppressed in favour of the personal, lyrical aspects' (p. 43).

[66] On vernacular popular lament in English, see Sir Edmund Chambers, *The English Folk-Play* (Oxford, 1933), pp. 38–41; A. L. Lloyd, *Folk Song in England* (London, 1967), p. 29; for a non-European perspective see S. T. Coleridge, 'Lecture on the Slave-Trade' in Lewis Patton and Peter Mann (eds), *Lectures 1795 On Politics and Religion* (London and Princeton, 1971), p. 242.

[67] Lukács, *Theory of the Novel*, p. 64; compare 'Banks of Sweet Primroses', verse 5, in Ginette Dunn, *The Fellowship of Song; Popular Singing Traditions in East Suffolk* (London, 1980), p. 74.

those presented by Lukács, being reprobated by the critics of enthusiasm in all its forms. As early as 1614 Thomas Ravenscroft the popular musician and song-writer had listed '*Enthusiasme* or *rauishing of the Spirit*' as one of 'the Philosophers three *Principall Causes of Musick*' (together also with *Dolour* and *Ioy*).[68] And John Dennis in his *Advancement and Reformation of Modern Poetry* published in 1701 argued, much to Wordsworth's later admiration, for the primacy of 'Poetical Enthusiasm' and its expression: 'There must be passion then, that must be distinct from ordinary Passion, and that must be Enthusiasm. . . . But here the Reader is desir'd to observe, that by Poetry, we mean Poetry in general, and the Body of Poetry; for as for the Form or Soul of particular Poems, that is allow'd by all to be a Fable. But Passion is the chief Thing in the Body of Poetry; as Spirit is in the Human Body.'[69] On the other side of this argument, however, the entry in Johnson's 1755 *Dictionary* for *O* is curt and singularly lacking in enthusiasm; and in his *Life* of Pope he commented that 'exclamation seldom succeeds in our language, and I think it may be observed that the particle O! used at the beginning of a sentence always offends.'[70]

[68] Thomas Ravenscroft, *A Briefe Discovrse of the true (but neglected) vse of Charact'ring the Degrees by their Perfection, Imperfection, and Diminution in Measurable Musicke, against the Common Practise and Custome of these Times* (London, 1614), sig. A3^{v}.

[69] John Dennis, *The Critical Works*, ed. Edward Niles Hooker (2 vols, Baltimore, 1939), Vol. 1, p. 216; in the expression of these ideas the stylistic features most admired by Dennis are, unsurprisingly, 'Elevation, Severity and Vehemence' (p. 217). For Wordsworth's 'craze' about Dennis, see *The Prose Works of William Wordsworth*, ed. W. J. B. Owen and Jane Worthington Smyser (3 vols, Oxford, 1974), Vol. 1, pp. 170–1; Vol. 3, pp. 46–7, 104–5.

[70] Samuel Johnson, *Lives of the English Poets*, ed. George Birkbeck Hill (3 vols, Oxford, 1905), Vol. 3, p. 266. As an instance of concurring parody, compare the exordium to Part I of *The Dignity, Use and Abuse of Glass-Bottles. Set forth in A Sermon Preach'd to an Illustrious Assembly* (London, 1715):

> And Oh! That Men in general were but as faithful Preservers of this Heavenly Infusion, as you O Bottles! How few are there of you that fly, and how few of them that hold!

(Alexander Pope, *Prose Works*, ed. Ault and Cowler, Vol. 1, p. 212). William Cowper in 'A Dissertation on the Modern Ode' of 1763 ridiculed the excesses of pathetical writing practised, in the name of 'a fine enthusiasm', by the Ode-mongers of his day: 'Never trouble yourself to express the warm emotions of the feeling heart, but get together a large quantity of Oh's and Ah's!' (William Cowper, *The Letters and Prose Writings*, ed. James King and Charles Ryskamp [5 vols, Oxford, 1979–86], Vol. 5, p. 36); to illustrate these degraded formulae Cowper also composed his own delicately fatuous *exemplum* ('Shall I begin with *Ah*, or *Oh*?').

Yet the example of Milton has carried power, and has cast a shadow. In *East Coker* T. S. Eliot wrote:

> O dark dark dark. They all go into the dark,
> The vacant interstellar spaces, the vacant into the vacant,
> The captains, merchant bankers, eminent men of letters,
> The generous patrons of art, the statesmen and the rulers,
> Distinguished civil servants, chairmen of many committees,
> Industrial lords and petty contractors, all go into the dark.[71]

Eliot expects the attentive reader to recognize a variety of sarcastic tones here, jumbled in pompous triviality and ordered in mock-solemn procession such as recalls the last book of Pope's *Dunciad*.[72] And yet behind this phantasmagoria, as behind Pope's, looms the form of Milton's Samson, trapped not in the temporary shades of night as was Lycidas before he returned as 'genius of the shore' but in the confines of unrelieved blindness and captivity:

> O dark, dark, dark, amid the blaze of noon,
> Irrecoverably dark, total eclipse
> Without all hope of day!
> O first-created beam, and thou great word,
> Let there be light, and light was over all;
> Why am I thus bereaved thy prime decree?[73]

Samson's passionate outburst is represented as spoken within the hearing of the Chorus, but they recognize that he is alone with his grief and unapproachable:

[71] T. S. Eliot, *Four Quartets* (London, 1944), pp. 18–19 (*East Coker*, ll. 101–6). In the well-known 1947 recording (His Master's Voice, C.3598–3603) of Eliot reading *Four Quartets* the opening exclamatory phrase of line 101 is spoken pitched-up and with passion.

[72] Pope in his turn quoted an impassioned apostrophe from Milton in his translation of Homer: compare his *Iliad*, X, ll. 405–6 with *Paradise Lost*, IV, ll. 866–7; and see Alexander Pope, *The Poems*, ed. Maynard Mack *et al.* (11 vols, London and New Haven, 1961–9), Vol. 7, p. cxxxiii.

[73] John Milton, *Samson Agonistes*, ed. John Carey, in *The Poems*, ed. John Carey and Alastair Fowler (London, 1968), p. 349 (ll. 80–5); compare also John Milton, *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio Secunda* (London, 1654), pp. 50–1. There are allusions intermediate between Milton and Eliot: see, e.g., Keats, 'Hyperion: A Fragment', III, ll. 86–94, and 'Why did I laugh tonight? No voice will tell', ll. 6–8; on the conflations in Eliot's usage, see Lyndall Gordon, *Eliot's New Life* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 106–7. Peter Dronke discusses the image of Samson's 'double darkness' in Peter Abelard's fourth Lament, the *Planctus Israel super Samson*, in his *Poetic Individuality*, pp. 119–45 (with complete text in Latin and English).

softly a while,
Let us not break in upon him;
O change beyond report, thought, or belief![74]

They are not equal to the occasion of his wretchedness, but in their more derivative and echoed exclamations they intimate their own sympathy and sorrow. Their mediation and framing presence make the figure of Samson at once more intimately close to us, as readers, and also more distant.[75] Yet there is more than a hint of indulged compunction in Samson's cry of despair: he laments blindness but is also blinded by lamentation.[76] The dramatic use of such voices is cogent by countervailing variety and by the internal distance that this creates, and is given part of its peculiar force by the continuing ambiguity which hovers about the relations between apostrophe as a form of address, and exclamation as a form of expression.[77] Eliot's appropriation of Milton may be felt to borrow from one of the voices of poetry so as to lend to another, to shift this outcry into a kind of meditative lament where the darkness is not an individual, historic predicament but, as it was for Pope, more an universal tendency towards nullity and its fearful abruptness.[78]

[74] Ed. cit., p. 350 (ll. 115–17). On the relations of speech to chant in these exchanges see F. T. Prince, *The Italian Element in Milton's Verse* (corrected 2nd imp., Oxford, 1962), pp. 155–8, and Louise Schleiner, *The Living Lyre in English Verse; from Elizabeth through the Restoration* (Columbia, Missouri, 1984), Chap. 5.

[75] Compare Hazlitt's *Edinburgh Review* notice of the *Biographia Literaria*: 'As the dialogues in Othello and Lear furnish the most striking instances of plain, point-blank speaking, or of the real language of nature and passion, so the Choruses in Samson Agonistes abound in the fullest and finest adaptations of classic and poetic phrases to express distant and elevated notions, born of fancy, religion and learning' (*Works*, Vol. 16, p. 136).

[76] His bitter remorse is not yet repentance, as was pointed out by A. S. P. Woodhouse; see *The Heavenly Muse; A Preface to Milton*, ed. Hugh MacCallum (Toronto, 1972), p. 298. For the pedigree of this comment, compare Bishop Joseph Hall's warning note about Samson: 'No devotion is so fervent, as that which arises from extremity: *O Lord God, I pray thee thinke upon me*' (in *Contemplations upon the Principall Passages of the Holy Storie* [1642], Lib. X; *The Works* [London, to be sold by Andr. Crooke, 1647], p. 978).

[77] Some pertinent features of Milton's exclamatory style are noticed in Mary Ann Radzinowicz, *Towards 'Samson Agonistes'* (Princeton, 1978), p. 19, and Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, *'Paradise Lost' and the Rhetoric of Literary Forms* (Princeton, 1985), pp. 244–53.

[78] Compare Eliot, 'The Three Voices of Poetry' (1953): 'The first voice is the voice of the poet talking to himself—or to nobody. The second is the voice of the poet addressing an audience, whether large or small. The third is the voice of the poet when he attempts to create a dramatic character speaking in

Nor need the expression be so stark in order to achieve its power; sometimes the frame that holds and reduces the moment itself increases the distance which is part of its cause, as was the case with 'Early One Morning'. Here are the final stanzas of the 'Ode Occasion'd by the Death of Mr. Thomson' published by William Collins in 1749:

> The genial Meads assign'd to bless
> Thy Life, shall mourn thy early Doom,
> Their Hinds, and Shepherd-Girls shall dress
> With simple Hands thy rural Tomb.
>
> Long, long, thy Stone and pointed Clay
> Shall melt the musing BRITON'S Eyes,
> O! VALES, and WILD WOODS, shall He say
> In yonder Grave YOUR DRUID lies![79]

Again, one lament encloses the quotation of another, as the traditionally anonymous passer-by of the future is to make out the message of the inscription and to associate it with the natural setting, to which the earlier poet had given a life in representation both celebrating and exceeding the limits of that in nature.[80] The vales and wild woods have become darker and less under the control of sympathetic nurture now that their poet is gone: there is a chill in the air, of mortality. But the natural forms are called upon as mute witnesses to the prophetic voice who once spoke their futures, bringing them in imagination before the eye of later readers so that, in the presence of the original forms themselves, they can acknowledge the durable truth of prophecy. Of course the claim is a kind of neo-classicalizing fancy; the reader does not quite have to *believe* in the antiquarian fabrica-

verse; when he is saying, not what he would say in his own person, but only what he can say within the limits of one imaginary character addressing another imaginary character' (T. S. Eliot, *On Poetry and Poets* [London, 1957], p. 89).

[79] William Collins, *The Works*, ed. Richard Wendorf and Charles Ryskamp (Oxford, 1979), p. 55 (ll. 37–44).

[80] Thus, again, the narrative of the poem encloses a culminating moment which utters by anticipation the response of those who will, later on, contemplate and give inner voice to its silent epitaph. The implicit relation between passion and The Passion is marked by a text like Lamentations 1.12: 'Is it nothing to you, all ye that passe by? behold and see, if there be any sorow like vnto my sorowe, which is done vnto me'; see also Gray, *Themes and Images*, p. 141, and compare Erwin Panofsky, '*Et in Arcadia Ego*: Poussin and the Elegiac Tradition', revised version in his *Meaning in the Visual Arts; Papers in and on Art History* (Garden City, N.Y., 1955), 295–320.

tions of druid-lore. But fancy at the level of a fancied experience is to be claimed as truth by the power of art: what is earlier described as 'the soothing shade' is to be the relief of natural protection from the heat of the day and also the truth-telling power of the departed spirit's lingering presence. None of this is contained in the 'O!' of the last stanza, nor claimed to be expressed by it; but the recognition of this latent accumulation of insights is given occasion by the moment of acknowledgement which the exclamation indicates and enjoins.[81] Thus the expression is hospitable to almost all the contradictory moods which could be part of the acknowledgement: surprise and joy as well as lament and sorrow; the optative and the petitionary and the apostrophic, as well as the mark of attention and earnest pondering. It is an extraordinarily powerful word, for all the vacancy of the efforts to give it lexical definition and perhaps, in some large measure, precisely because of that vacancy.

The multiple and overlaid dialectic of its pressure upon the self-recognitions of consciousness, in both writer and reader, can often have consequences which expand not concentrically outward from a singular emphatic moment but which reorder the perceived development of a narrative and its interconnecting sequence of moods and tenses. To work up this effect there has characteristically to be a working up towards it, by rhetorical strategy and amplitude, as in this instance from Book XI of the 1805 version of Wordsworth's *Prelude*:

> Oh! soul of Nature, excellent and fair,
> That didst rejoice with me, with whom I too
> Rejoiced, through early youth before the winds
> And powerful waters, and in lights and shades
> That march'd and countermarch'd about the hills
> In glorious apparition, now all eye
> And now all ear; but ever with the heart
> Employ'd, and the majestic intellect;

[81] Compare Alastair Fowler, of Collins, in *A History of English Literature; Forms and Kinds, From the Middle Ages to the Present* (Oxford, 1987): 'Instead of talking about inner feelings, he invokes them as if they were external' (p. 185); or, as Lawrence Lipking has put it, 'Collins deliberately superimposes an ancient scene of mourning upon a modern one' (*The Life of the Poet; Beginning and Ending Poetic Careers* [Chicago and London, 1981], p. 150); the tacit connection already noticed by John Bagwell (note 35, above) between 'long' and *longing* (here adverb and imperative/optative) is part of this double perspective.

O! Soul of Nature! that dost overflow
With passion and with life, what feeble men
Walk on this earth! how feeble have I been
When thou wert in thy strength! Nor this through stroke
Of human suffering, such as justifies
Remissness and inaptitude of mind,
But through presumption.[82]

One of the tones given off, here, is rhapsodic joy and gratitude, at the answering suffusion of spirit experienced by the poet's younger self in his shared sense of elevation in the presence of nature.[83] The language of power and of majesty seems natural enough in such a context, although it would have made Hazlitt uneasy and would have struck Lukács as typical of the surrogate, man-made structures which impose the rigidity of satisfaction upon the plasticity of first nature. But the glorious apparition of lights and shades 'That march'd and countermarch'd about the hills' is the language of a most overt militarism, and the glory is that of an heroic battlefield where a proclaimed magnanimity of liberation by force of conquest suppresses mention or even direct awareness of its counterparts in defeat: crushing terror and abject human suffering.[84] What Wordsworth describes as the

[82] William Wordsworth, *The Prelude*, edn cit., XI (1805–6), ll. 138–52; the final (1850) version of this passage displays a farrago of awkward and anxious tinkerings.

[83] The rhetorical interjection would in such a context mark the moment of a wordless *jubilatio*, as defined for instance in Stevens, *Words and Music*, pp. 304, 402–3 (and see also Hugh Benham, *Latin Church Music in England, c.1460–1575* [London, 1977], p. 60); the effect is implicitly recognized also by Armstrong, *Language as Living Form*, pp. 22–3. Similar rhapsodic outcry may work the words used into a pattern of sound with its own development and momentum, as in Shelley's *Prometheus Unbound* (II.i). Here the echo of Apollo's sorrow at the fate of Hyacinth, laid low like the falling flowers and the cadence of Apollo's name, is extended by forms of choric incantation through the repeats and turns of what functions also as antiphonal, exilic lament: the originating formula is 'Follow! Follow!' (l. 131), leading on through '*O follow, follow!*' (l. 141) and '*Follow, O follow!*' (l. 153), with its own internal echoes of ardency closed in by recurrence and displacement. (There is a somewhat different interpretation by Abrams of the mood here: see *Natural Supernaturalism*, pp. 303–4; but see also Earl R. Wasserman, *Shelley; A Critical Reading* [Baltimore and London, 1971], pp. 309–10, 316–18.)

[84] 'Marches, such as I have made in this war, were never known or thought of before. In the last eight days of the month of October, I marched above one hundred and twenty miles, and passed through two Ghauts with heavy guns, and all the equipments of the troops, and this without injury to the efficiency of the army; and in the few days previous to this battle, when I had

culpable weakness of his earlier self is mutely but forcibly reflected in the culpable show of strength in these powerfully marshalled figures, displaced into a green world hardly yet ravaged by the violence implicit here in this eager prolepsis.[85] All this contributes the sharp under-note of lament and elegiac contrition which qualifies the exclamatory *Oh* of gratitude and joy: it is the presumption not merely of thoughtless happiness but, seemingly, of all natural happiness, because its apparent sufficiency will not and cannot adequately acknowledge the contradictions of secular history which press against it.[86]

The desperation of this mood is given perhaps its most tumultuous and radical expression in William Blake's last prophetic poem, *Jerusalem*, of which the engraved title-page carries the date 1804 but which was not certainly complete before 1820. It is by his own acknowledgement a poem of spiritual 'enthusiasm', in which 'the terrific numbers are reserved for the terrific parts'.[87] It is a narrative of constant exclamation, a poem of lament for the sleeping Albion and the lost Jerusalem, also itself quoting the laments of these personages as they are caught in the toils of the narrative action:

> But when the joy of meeting was exhausted in loving embrace:
> Again they lament. O what shall we do for lovely Jerusalem?

determined to go into Berar, I never moved less than between seventeen and twenty miles, and I marched twenty six miles on the day on which it was fought' (Major General the Hon. A. Wellesley to the Hon. H. Wellesley, from Camp, 24th Jan. 1804; *The Dispatches of Field Marshal the Duke of Wellington during his Various Campaigns*, comp. Lieut. Colonel Gurwood [London, 12 vols, 1834–8], Vol. 2, p. 75); compare *The Prelude*, edn cit., VI (1805–6), ll. 426–45, and *The Prose Works of William Wordsworth*, ed. Alexander B. Grosart (3 vols, London, 1876), Vol. 3, pp. 451–2.

[85] A closely similar conflict of attachments and loyalties of feeling had already been acknowledged by Coleridge, with fierce and explicit self-accusation, in 'Fears in Solitude; Written in April 1798, during the Alarm of an Invasion'; and see Nicholas Roe, *Wordsworth and Coleridge; The Radical Years* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 263–75.

[86] Other moments of ecstatic self-reproach, each in varying degrees less than fully candid and each bearing those burdens of uncertain self-knowledge, are at *The Prelude* (1805–6), III, ll. 178–89; XIII, ll. 120–2. Exclamation in both passages invokes the justifying power of 'heroic argument' and further at the same time reconnoitres for reparation (see also Fowler, *Kinds of Literature*, p. 207; Roe, *The Radical Years*, pp. 74–6).

[87] William Blake, *Writings*, ed. G. E. Bentley, Jr (2 vols, Oxford, 1978), Vol. 1, pp. 419–20 (Plate 3); see also John Hollander, 'Blake and the Metrical Contract', in Frederick W. Hilles and Harold Bloom (eds), *From Sensibility to Romanticism; Essays Presented to Frederick A. Pottle* (New York, 1965), 293–310.

To protect the Emanations of Albions mighty ones from cruelty?[88]

The division which we saw to split the sensibility of Wordsworth's tender outcry in the passage from Book XI of *The Prelude*, between the pathos of individual sensibility and the ethos of concerted human action, is by Blake made fully conscious and deliberate: as he describes the scheme of *Jerusalem* in his *Descriptive Catalogue* of 1809, 'The Strong man represents the human sublime. The Beautiful man represents the human pathetic, which was in the wars of Eden divided into male and female. The Ugly man represents the human reason. They were originally one man, who was fourfold; he was self-divided, and his real humanity slain.'[89] At one of the poem's moments of immense climax the grief-stricken and remorseful Albion exclaims thus:

O Jerusalem Jerusalem I have forsaken thy Courts
Thy Pillars of ivory & gold: thy Curtains of silk & fine
Linen: thy Pavements of precious stones: thy Walls of pearl
And gold, thy Gates of Thanksgiving thy Windows of Praise:
Thy Clouds of Blessing; thy Cherubims of Tender-mercy
Stretching their Wings sublime over the Little-ones of Albion
O Human Imagination O Divine Body I have Crucified
I have turned my back upon thee into the Wastes of Moral Law:
There Babylon is builded in the Waste. founded in Human desolation.[90]

This ecstatic listing of the idealized sacred city contrasts vehe-

[88] William Blake, *Jerusalem; The Emanation of the Giant Albion* (facsim. edn. of the Stirling copy, with Preludium by Joseph Wicksteed; Intro. and 4 Parts, London, [1951]), Part I, Plate 11; compare *Writings*, ed. Bentley, Vol. 1, p. 437 (ll. 16–18), where the full stop after 'lament' has been replaced editorially by a colon and the following utterance enclosed in quotation marks.

[89] *Writings*, ed. Bentley, Vol. 2, p. 850 ([Page] 41, [Page] 42); compare Vol. 1, p. 729. It is probable, but not certain, that Blake intends to refer to *Jerusalem* here; see Morton D. Paley, *The Continuing City; William Blake's 'Jerusalem'* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 4, 60. M. H. Abrams suggests a comparison between this aspect of Blake's Albion and Shelley's Prometheus; see *Natural Supernaturalism*, pp. 300–2.

[90] Facsim. edn cit., Part I, Plate 24; compare *Writings*, ed. Bentley, Vol. 1, p. 465 (ll. 17–25), where the full stop after 'Waste' has been replaced editorially by a comma; compare also John Donne, 'Goodfriday, 1613. Riding Westward', ll. 36–42. It may be noted that the text of this passage from *Jerusalem* in William Blake, *The Poems*, ed. W. H. Stevenson and David V. Erdman (London, 1971) is defective, since line 17 seems to have dropped out during printing; the imminent second edition will correct this omission.

mently with Eliot's listing of the personnel inhabiting contemporary London; but the contrast is more apparent than real, for the London of Blake's day seemed no less dark and self-destroying.[91] The visionary invocation must be truly terrific, to employ Blake's word, if it is to attempt to show how the burden of Albion's shame might be lifted. Thomas Tomkins set the final verses of Psalm 122 in his anthem 'O pray for the peace of Jerusalem', as also had Richard Nicholson of Oxford before him, and this same petition is inscribed over the chancel arch in the church of St John Evangelist at Little Gidding.[92] The cry which Blake's Albion utters, to and in the name of the human imagination and the divine body, represents his acknowledgement of the division by which the cities of imagination and of deformed nature have become estranged; it is an apocalyptic lament, but intimate in its delicately emphatic and persistent rhythms, and the elements of an ideal humanity are not vapourized into a hectic enlargement.[93]

What is the action of these exclamatory interjections? Are they markers for the emphatical compunction of a lost sacred language over-pitched in secular vacancy? Are they part of the rhetorical apparatus for elevating the tone towards sublimity, for laying claim to the power of a primal *planctus*? Are they simply language breaking away into some prelinguistic expressivity, a vocalized pang or response to imaginative pain as if directly connected to the involuntary reflexes?[94] What is their relation to the corpus of other usages which we have been able briefly to

[91] See David V. Erdman, *Blake: Prophet Against Empire; A Poet's Interpretation of the History of his Own Times* (3rd rev. edn, Princeton, N.J., 1977), pp. 270–9, 469–75, etc.

[92] Both composers were admitted to the Oxford B.A. degree in music; see Nan Cooke Carpenter, *Music in the Medieval and Renaissance Universities* (Norman, Okla., 1958), p. 161. Bernard Rose, in his edition of Thomas Tomkins, *Musica Deo Sacra: III* (Early English Church Music, Vol. 14; London, 1973), erroneously refers the text of 'O pray for the peace' to Psalm 120 (p. 262). The cry of 'O Jerusalem' was acknowledged by Wallace Stevens, in a specifically American context, as confessing 'an affair of fundamental life'; see *Opus Posthumous*, ed. Samuel French Morse (London, 1959), p. 260.

[93] The *modus operandi* here is described persuasively by Thomas R. Frosch as 'an epic extrapolation'; see *The Awakening of Albion; The Renovation of the Body in the Poetry of William Blake* (Ithaca and London, 1974), p. 97.

[94] 'Utterances which are merely interjections' have been described by Quirk *et al.* (op. cit.) as 'quasi-linguistic noises' (p. 88). The Spanish Renaissance grammarian Sanctius completely excluded each such utterance from the parts of speech, 'on the grounds that it is not a word at all, but only a natural noise' (Michael, op. cit., p. 81).

consider, in reviewing some consequences of Hazlitt's attempt to locate the distinctiveness of poetry in a language of emphasis?

To such questions no definite answers can briefly be proposed. But I believe it important to recognize that, in the hands of writers with powerful creative intelligence, the calling up of such exclamatory powers in the language of passion is a form of acknowledgement and dialectical holding to the locus of a demanding but possible truth, at least as much as simply the expression of some feeling about a moment particularly stressed by the pressures of experience. When Hopkins exclaims, towards the climax of the opening section of 'The Wreck of the Deutschland',

> Oh,
> We lash with the best or worst
> Word last![95]

the best word ('I did say yes/O at lightning and lashed rod') is also the most difficult because it means assent to the power of an inscrutable God whose ultimate goodness we trust not because it is part of knowledge but because we believe it. Thus for Hopkins we are lashed into acute pain by that which secures us, which lashes us not to the mast of a failing ship but to a Lord of the living and the dead.[96] The interjection is not an apostrophe except technically, but is rather a marked point of stress in the process of giving form to recognition, a stress of anguish and jubilation deeply interfused.[97] This kind of interjection can carry

[95] Gerard Manley Hopkins, *The Poems*, ed. W. H. Gardner and N. H. MacKenzie (4th rev. edn, London, New York, Toronto, 1967), p. 54.

[96] These are the two senses listed for 'lash' in Hensleigh Wedgwood (ed.), *A Dictionary of English Etymology* (4 vols, London, 1859–65), a work quite possibly known to Hopkins. In his Introduction Wedgwood assigned prominent significance to interjections in his conjectures about the origins of language (Vol. 1, pp. xii–xviii). The notion was derided by Max Müller as 'the *Pooh-pooh theory*'; see his *Lectures on the Science of Language Delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain* (London, 1861), Lecture 9 (pp. 344–56).

[97] Compare the essay 'On Personality, Grace and Free Will', dating from late 1881: 'It [freedom of pitch] is choice as when in English we say "because I choose", which means no more than (and with precision does mean)/I instress my will to so-and-so. And this freedom and no other, no freedom of field, the divine will has towards its own necessary acts. And no freedom is more perfect; for freedom of field is only an accident. So also *pitch* is ultimately simple positiveness, that by which being differs from and is more than nothing and not-being, and it is with precision expressed by the English *do* (the simple auxiliary), which when we employ or emphasise, as "he said it, he did say it", we do not mean that the fact is any more a fact but that we the more state it' (Gerard Manley Hopkins, *The Sermons and Devotional Writings*, ed. Christopher Devlin [London, New York, Toronto, 1959], pp. 150–1; and see also pp. 47–8).

multiple stress, at high or at low pitch, because convention has kept it separated from grammatical linkages which would cant its force sideways and absorb it into the coded frameworks of sentence-structure.[98] At the same time we may say more generally, and not only in the context of explicitly sacred speech, that the extremely self-conscious and genre-governed shaping of contexts for merging apostrophe and exclamation, public and private modes, makes the use of lyrical *O* a marker for the boundary of one discourse where it is momentarily exceeded by another; used strongly, the word may convoke the currencies of previous usage by quoting recursively the power of poetic speech itself, calling it in evidence to locate a dialectic convergence of outward and inward sense.[99]

Despite the insufficiency and incoherence of most lexicographical treatments, therefore, the word *O* is one of the most difficult and exacting in the language of emphatical speech. More recent poetic usage is highly sceptical about such exclamatory particles, and will employ them only with muted or parodic intention; or, as in the case of Yeats, they are deployed rather frequently, with a florid and risky grandiloquence in which power and remorse engage in their familiar reciprocal escalations.[100] Sometimes a scepticism about these forms itself devises the occasion of an hypermetrical inward-turning of the voice, as in Samuel Beckett: 'Ah to love at your last and see them at theirs, the last minute loved ones, and be happy, why ah, uncalled

[98] See Schwentner, *Die Primären Interjektionen*, pp. 45–6.

[99] To cite the case previously in point: the comments on Milton's versification in his letter to Canon Dixon of 5th October 1878 strongly imply that Hopkins had the precedent of stressed speech-rhythms in *Samson Agonistes* more or less consciously in mind during composition of 'The Wreck of the Deutschland'; see Claude Colleer Abbott (ed.), *The Correspondence of Gerard Manley Hopkins and Richard Watson Dixon* (Oxford, 2nd rev. imp., 1955), pp. 14–15.

[100] Arthur Hugh Clough's sarcastic, self-taunting jingle in *Dipsychus*, VI, ll. 234–5:

> 'Tis Easter Day, and on the Lido
> Lo, Christ the Lord is risen indeed, O!

is echoed in the comparably facetious Byronism of Ezra Pound's 'L'Homme Moyen Sensuel', ll. 23–4:

> The constitution of our land, O Socrates,
> Was made to incubate such mediocrities.

Yeats characteristically admired Byron more for decisive power of will than for parodic adroitness; see W. B. Yeats, *Memoirs*, transcribed and ed. Denis Donoghue (London, 1972), p. 203.

for.'[101] Sometimes, however, the muting is what holds the most delicately low pitch momentarily free of its surrounding limits:

> Fire is the symbol: the celestial possible.
> Speak to your pillow as if it was yourself.
> Be orator but with an accurate tongue
> And without eloquence, O, half-asleep,
> Of the pity that is the memorial of this room.[102]

Thus Wallace Stevens, in his poem addressed in imagination to George Santayana, dying in a Roman Convent which he had chosen as the place from which to depart.[103] Always it may look a rhetorical contrivance, eloquently to claim or disclaim eloquence, and to mark the tone of emphasis with a device protected by the traditions of poetic figure from seeming also the full responsibility of the poet. In allowing its own appeals the practice may seem, even, to trade on vocation. Lukács would have considered such devices tantamount to outright admission of false consciousness. So also indeed should I, in the sense that recognition and understanding under such stress of feeling must fully admit false consciousness if the moment of stress is to locate the possibility of more true and completed forms of culmination.

[101] Samuel Beckett, 'Old Earth' (1974), in *For to End Yet Again* (London, 1976), p. 54; compare David Jones, *The Roman Quarry and Other Sequences*, ed. Harman Grisewood and René Hague (London, 1981), p. 133.

[102] Wallace Stevens, 'To an Old Philosopher in Rome', *Hudson Review*, **5** (**3**) (Autumn, 1952), p. 326; *Collected Poems*, p. 509.

[103] Santayana died on 26th September 1952, aged eighty-eight, in the nursing home of the Little Company of Mary, an English order; see George Santayana to George Sturgis, letters dated October 12 and 17, 1941, *The Letters*, ed. Daniel Cory (London, 1955), pp. 348–50; Wallace Stevens to Barbara Church, letter dated Sept. 29, 1952, *Letters*, ed. Holly Stevens (London, 1967), pp. 761–2. Stevens had written of Santayana that 'we accept what he says as we accept our own civilisation' (*Opus Posthumous*, p. 187); see also Robert Buttel, *Wallace Stevens; The Making of 'Harmonium'* (Princeton, 1967), pp. 17–18, and Frank Kermode, *Wallace Stevens* (reprinted, with a new preface by the author, New York, 1979), pp. 122–4.