The Contradiction of Opposites in Shakespeare's Sonnets.

M.Phil.
University of Birmingham
July 2015

Contents

Abstract.

The aim of research is an examination of the contradiction of opposites in Shakespeare's sonnets. The method used was to examine the contradiction within the lines of poetry as well as a paradoxical meaning between the lines and then between the couplet and quatrains within a sonnet. Finally the meaning between individual sonnets was contrasted. The basic assumption of the research is that a dream and a poem are a similar form of thinking. Both dream and poem weave the contradiction between external and internal reality into a new composite whole, which transforms objective reality into a subjective experience. This transformation is carried out by metaphor or condensation and displacement or metonymy. This makes the latent reading of the sonnet like the dream seditious whereas by contrast the manifest level reveals what is normatively desired and this gives the sonnet its ambiguous or indeterminate meaning. The findings of the research were that although the sonnets never state what love is they create a view of love which is paradoxical; on the one hand love is idealized and on the other denigrated. It is this conflict, which resonates with readers because in love people hold contradictory views of themselves and others.

CHAPTER 1

The Contradiction of Opposites in Shakespeare's Sonnets.

"What quality went to form a Man of Achievement especially in Literature & which Shakespeare possessed so enormously – I mean *Negative Capability*, that is when man is capable of being in uncertainties, Mysteries, doubts without any irritable reaching after fact and reason." Keats, J. *Letters to John Keats.* 21-27 Dec 1817.[i]

A painting called the *The Ambassadors* by Hans Holbein the younger (1533) hangs in the National Gallery in London. If a person looks at the low foreground of the painting there is a shape that from one perspective looks like an elongated disc but from another perspective of this same painting this same disk appears to be a skull or a memento mori. This visual equivocation describes the cognitive experience of paradox. Paradox unsettles the mind as it calls into question intellectual stability. It articulates this is a skull; this is a disk. This according to Quinne[ii] is Grelling's paradox, "It is and it is not". "Para" implies beyond received opinion and through opposites the equivalence of contraries is established. Ironically the more mad it is the more wise it becomes. If the reader resists the urge to harmonize the equivocation and ambiguity this doubleness can be seen to reflect the world-view as it is rather than as common conventional opinion would like to have it as a continuous smooth text that reaches a coherent and unambiguous firm conclusion. The Poet of Shakespeare sonnets both in his plays and in his sonnets reflects an equivocal world view both as it is and how we would like it to be or feel it 'ought' to be. For Instance, Henry V answers Catherine equivocally, "But in loving me, you should love the friend of France, for I love France so well that I will not part with a village of it.." (Act 5. Sc.2. 170-176.)[iii].

In this fashion the Poet of *Shakespeare's sonnets* calls into question common or received opinion by presenting both the manifest received opinion and the opposing contradictory opinion. The Poet achieves this through the use of contradictory rhetorical strategies and poetic lines, which contradict one another. This ambiguity introduces a latent subversive undertone in his sonnets. In so doing he expands and challenges or even dismantles the social belief systems that constitute the world-view of his plays and poems making them appear seditious if not dangerous. Paradox in a poem is designed to render the poem's meaning indeterminate which

makes every sonnet open to a range of interpretation between orthodoxy and sedition. This is apparent in Sonnet 20 where the **oxymoron or the contradictory meaning of "Master-Mistress" (20.2.) highlight the effect of the contradictory gender theme in the poem.** This is apparent where "Master-Mistress" (20.2) represents the contradictory gender connotations of the poem, whilst the chiasmus, "When most I wink then do mine eyes best see," (43.1) emphasize the logic of the illogicality of being able to experience a truth or see clearly whilst dreaming. On the other hand the Poet of Shakespeare's sonnets also alludes to the irrational but common belief that the mind is split from the body, "My life, being made of four, with two alone / Sinks down to death, oppressed with melancholy" (45.7-8) and the paradox produced through the reversal of word order in the chiasmus "But, ah, thought kills me that I am not thought." (44.9). Contradiction in Shakespeare's sonnets also occur between the lines of the poetry in the same poem, "Let me confess that we two must be twain / Although our undivided loves are one;" (36.1-2). There can also be a contradiction between the themes of different sonnets or from one sonnet to the next; as in Sonnet 115, "Those lines that I before have writ do lie, / Even those that said I could not love you dearer," (115.1). This contrasts with "Let me not to the marriage of true minds / Admit impediments, love is not love / Which alters when it alteration finds," (116. 1-3).

Central to this opposition is the difference between the manifest level of the poetry, which portrays what is idealized or the normatively expected received opinion as opposed to the latent level, which conceals the clandestine desire. This ambiguity disrupts and reverses the generally held conformist view making of Shakespeare's poetry wayward and unsettling. This is apparent in Sonnet 135 where the pun on *W*ill stands both for a sexual organ and the name of the Poet, "Think all but one, and me in that one *W*ill." (135.14). M. H. Abrams writing in *20th Century Literary Criticism*

A Reader (1953. 1-28) [iv] quotes Philip Sidney who defended poetry's ability to assert truth through a kind of lying by invoking paradox, "Now, for the Poet, he nothing affirms and therefore neuer lyth. For as I take it, to lye is to affirm that to be true which is false. The trueth poetry is the most feigning."[v]

Selected sonnets of the Shakespearean Sonnets in this thesis are glossed through the prism of Freudian Psychoanalysis. This first chapter briefly lays down all the theoretical concepts and themes, which underpin and which will be applied in the discussion of the sonnets. A cornerstone of this thesis is that the poem or sonnet resemble Freud's psychoanalytic concept of the dream[vi]. In the first instance this is because both sonnet and dream are self-contradictory. The manifest level of the poem like the manifest dream support the idealized conventional wisdom of 'ought to be like' and 'should be like' or 'it is' whilst the latent interpreted reading reveal the enclosed wish or desire of the dream or poem which is directly opposed to its manifest reading and articulates, 'it is not'. This distortion is carried out in order to evade the moral censure of the Superego. The misleading misrepresentation is carried out by the unconscious processes of *condensation* (*S.E*. 5. 661.), *displacement* (*S.E*. 4. 305)[vii] *indirect representation* (*S.E*.14. 228)[viii] and *secondary elaboration* (*S.E.* 5. 666). Thereafter the workings and characteristics of the unconscious mind are examined and this leads on to a consideration of the principal difference between metaphor and symbolism. Sonnet 43 is considered in order to demonstrate unconscious processes at work in the Poet's metaphorical representation of a dream and the way in which paradox or contradiction in the mind or 'it is' and ' it is not' is revealed in both poem and dream. The chapter next goes on to consider the relationship between literary analysis and psychoanalysis through Jakobson's concept of *The Metaphoric and Metonymic poles* (1997.79) [ix]. Here Jakobson discusses the linguistic relationship of metaphor and metonymy to the

structure of the primary process and demonstrates how unconscious processes of the mind are used in all forms of self-expression from the ordinary to the creative. Empson in *Seven Types of Ambiguity* (1930.234)[x] puts forward the proposition that ambiguity or doubleness of meaning is not just a rhetorical strategy but is the outcome of the split or dissociation in the mind of the Poet between self and other, conscious and unconscious and social conventional wisdom as opposed to personal desire. The final paragraph concludes by reviewing the analogical relationship between textual ambiguity and visual equivocation and the difference between the Freudian version of the signifier and signified or unconscious *thing* presentation and conscious word presentation.

In the *Interpretation of Dreams* (1900) and again in his lectures on the "Unconscious"(1915. *p.f.l.* 11.167-216)[xi] Freud described what he believed to be the origins of the unconscious and the rules, which govern its operation and its impulsivity towards expression in consciousness. The unconscious is only accessible via its manifest representation in consciousness. This includes dreams or slips of the tongue and subjective states of mind like love, hate and mourning, Art or in symptoms. Freud understood the contents of the unconscious were organized differently from conscious thoughts and he termed the rules governing the unconscious as the primary process. Free-flowing energy in the system unconscious seek an identification between different perceptions whereas the rules governing consciousness or the secondary process require an equivalence between ideas. In the system conscious energy is *bound* and pleasure is delayed by contrast to the system unconscious where energy is described as mobile and free-flowing. This loose plasticity renders immediate satisfaction of pleasure an imperative.

Unconscious thoughts go through a transformation or distortion before they are accessible to consciousness. Primary process concerns the rules of the process that govern that transformation. These rules disguise unacceptable or traumatic unconscious ideas, which can only be understood through a process of interpretation. Freud understood four fundamental rules that guide the *dream-work* or this process of transformation. The first is *displacement*. This allows an apparently insignificant idea or object to be invested with great intensity, which originally belonged elsewhere. This displacement takes place because consciousness responds to intense feelings – such as aggression, hate, or sexual longing towards an authority or loved object as unacceptable. These thoughts undergo repression. Jakobson refers to this mechanism of displacement as metonymy. Displacement binds together incongruent phantasies by establishing a connection between words whose relationship both in terms of form and content are not obvious. Condensation on the other hand can be seen in terms of what Jakobson views as metaphor or symbolism. In the unconscious, thoughts that are contradictory make no attempt to do away with each other but persist side by side. They often combine to form condensations just as if there were no contradiction between them or arrive at compromises that our conscious thoughts would never permit. Condensation is therefore another way in which unacceptable thoughts pushing through into consciousness are disguised. It also accounts for the fact that the manifest content of a dream or a poem is generally smaller than its latent or interpreted content. Another aspect of the *dream-work* is what Freud addressed as *considerations of representability*. Here dreams represent words in figurative form as images. Freud thought that this was the most interesting part of the dream-work, for instance an eminent person or an authority figure is represented as visually sitting in a high chair. In this way words in dreams become representation of *things*. All dreams are subject to secondary revision, which is an attempt by the dreamer to organize, revise and establish connections in the dream to make its account intelligible. Freud's distinction between the manifest and the latent

content is important. The work that transforms latent thoughts into the manifest dream content is called *dream-work*. This includes condensation, displacement, secondary-revision and consideration of representability.

The work that operates in the opposite direction that seeks to move from the manifest content to the latent thoughts is the work of interpretation. The manifest content is what the dreamer remembers. The latent content is what gives the dream its meaning which is reached through interpretation. The process of interpretation allows access to the wish concealed in the dream, which takes the shape of an hallucinatory wish fulfillment. The dream itself does not think or create but presents an action inside the dream. The content of the dream is constituted from thoughts from the previous day, which are condensed and displaced onto an infantile wish in the unconscious. In this model desire itself becomes the main source of functioning for the unconscious. In his work Freud searched for normal thought, which had been repressed and transformed by the work of the primary process.

Freud compared the work of the interpretation to a rebus or picture puzzle made up of a mixture of pictographic phonetic and ideographic elements each of which required translation. In Linguistics the rebus principle means using existing symbols such as pictograms purely for their sounds and regardless of their meaning to represent new words. Many ancient writing systems used the rebus principle to represent abstract words, which otherwise would be hard to be represented by pictograms. An example that illustrates the Rebus principle is the representation of the sentence "I can see you" by using the pictographs of ‘eye—can—sea—ewe.’ Freud found that by replacing each syllable with an element or a word a sense of the whole can be arrived at. In every dream there is a core or navel, which is

inaccessible and this renders the interpretation of the dream and the poem indeterminate. Like metonymy, unconscious or contiguous association is expressed through the method of free association. Here a person is encouraged to say the first thing that comes into the mind. Through inference and deduction the network of condensed disguised associations is expanded or revealed. The Unconscious is also characterized by the absence of negation: 'no' does not exist. So a statement, which appears in its negative form, might actually imply its opposite. Therefore any statement articulates both 'it is' and 'it is not'. Chronological time is absent from the unconscious so timelessness characterizes the unconscious, which makes different times coexist in one dream or poem. The Unconscious is not accessible to consciousness, which makes the unconscious only accessible through its derivatives like the absence of negation, timelessness visual-images or *thing-presentations* or signifiers, symbolism, metaphor and metonymy.

The main difference between a symbol and metaphor is that a symbol conceals because it is divorced from its natural context whilst a metaphor reveals because its context is overt. Symbols imply that an unacceptable thought or feeling is concealed whereas metaphor communicates because it shows in word-images or metaphor that something is like something else. The Poet articulates this likeness as, expiring love is like old-age which is compared to the Autumn leaves, ".. or none, or few do hang / Upon those boughs which shake against the cold," (73.2-3). Conversely, a symbol comprises all those rules of the dream-work that disguise unacceptable or traumatic unconscious ideas as above. As soon as one piece of behavior is seen to have at least two meanings one of which is standing for the other both concealing and expressing it, the relationship is described as symbolic. This is viewed in the symbolic relationship between passion and enervation or being used-up in the line, "Consum'd with that which it is nourish'd by." (73.12). The poetic line symbolically

represents love as fire or passion which on the one hand sustains “nourishes” but conversely burns itself out, “consum’d”. In the dream there is a mise-en-scene or an attempt at realization akin to hallucination of what cannot be allowed to happen in reality. Freud felt that dreams provided convincing evidence of psychic life more so than conscious activity, which is unreliable because of the process of rationalization. Sonnet 43 is analyzed to illustrate the combination of metaphor, metonymy and symbolism in the representation and interpretation of a dream.

The manifest representation of Sonnet 43[xii] is a mise-en- scene or thoughts in action of what cannot be allowed to happen in reality. The manifest level of the poem therefore is an attempt at realization akin to hallucination of the Poet’s wish to see the absent loved-object. Sonnet 43 can equally be thought about as a metaphorical description of the contradictory processes found in a dream and as a symbol it both disguises and expresses unacceptable ideas about the loved-object. Ironically the loved-object in the dream rather than being presented visually as a shadow or ghost of the Loved-object is revealed as the authentic and tangible object. This is because dreams are a

> “particular form of thinking in which we appear not to think but to experience, that is to say, we attach complete belief to the hallucinations.” (1900. *S.E.* 4. 50).

Moreover in Sonnet 43 the Loved-object is not represented as perfect but conversely presented figuratively as a flawed object in its “imperfect shade” (43.11).

Conventionally people think of being aware and conscious as properties of the daylight hours whereas mindless oblivion and unawareness belong to the night's sleep. In Sonnet 43, the Poet turns this orthodoxy on its head and shows how the dream reveals a truth which daylight hours obscures. The Poet effects this within the line through rhetorical strategies such as oxymoron, chiasmus, epizeuxis and antistasis and by contrasting poetic-images between lines, and between stanza and the couplet. This is made apparent in the reversal of meaning in the second phrase to the first phrase in the same line in the chiasmus, "When most I wink, then do mine eyes best see," (43.1). This inversion immediately reverses the connotation of the poem from "sightless" (43.12) to its antonym perceptive. The verb "wink" (43.1) designates close as in sleep or "wink" the eye to wrong doing, but "wink" here also signifies the opposite implying that the closed eye in the dream is paradoxically open to wrong-doing. This reversal to the opposite questions conventional thought but opens the eye or the mind to a truth. Booth (1997.2003)[xiii] quotes Tilley's proverbial phrase W501, "Although I wink, I am not blind." The question asked of this sonnet is what is this vision that the Poet is inadvertently blinding himself to in daylight hours that he becomes aware of at night or "mine eyes best see" in the dream of Sonnet 43. In *The Metapsychology of Dreams* Freud writes, "A dream is a *projection*: an externalization of an internal process." (1915. *p.f.l.* 11. 231). This implies what is internal thought or ideas are externalized. This clarifies the line, "For all the day they view things unrespected," (43.2) making it contradict its own premise for it is exactly those "things" (43.2) that go unnoticed or repressed "unrespected" during the day that are experienced in "clearer light" (43.7) in the dream.

The Poet's use of a chiasmus in line 4 relates the two opposing clauses to one another by reversing the order of the words. Hence, "And darkly bright," in the first

clause although opposite is connected to the second clause “bright in dark directed.” This reversal overturns the meaning of the first phrase “And darkly bright,” to its opposite in the second phrase, “are bright in dark directed.” (43.4). This turnaround of the word order is emphasized by the oxymoron in the same line “darkly bright”. This makes the reading of the line, although I look on thee during the day your image is only “darkly bright” or has a sinister “darkly” opaque quality. Moreover even though it is visible it goes “unrespected” or un-noticed but at night the reverse occurs and the image becomes “Bright” (43.4.) or clear. Alternatively this line is a literal translation of the Renaissance view that eyes emit light. What is most apparent in the first four lines of this poem are the contradictions and the opposites which exist side by side as if the Poet in this sonnet had entered into the workings of the primary process in the unconscious where words exist with their antithesis still intact, (Freud, S. *S.E*. X1. 153-163)[xiv]

The Poet makes use of the rhetorical figure epizeuxis or the repetition of a word in sharp succession. This repetition emphasizes the paradox where the dream world rather than being incomprehensible, elucidates, “shadow shadows doth make bright” (43.5). This overturns the meaning of shadows into that of embodiment. In this sonnet, all conventional-thought is inverted and the “shadow” (43.5 and 6) itself denotes the embodied clarity of the image, whilst the embodied image becomes obscure and opaque and like a “shadow” during the day. Moreover this highlights the sense of the illogicality of the actual representation of a shadow being able to cast its own shadow which in turn is capable of transforming into an embodied image that “ doth make bright”. In this way, a truth is revealed at night, which is obscured during the day. The “shadow’ or negative side of the loved-object, is revealed at night but during the day it is opaque or in “shadow”. This transformation of illusion into what feels like reality is comprehensible because in the dream world, “reality-

testing is abandoned" and the dream-world accounts as, "undisputed reality" (Freud. 1915. *p.f.l.* 11.242)[xv]. It is the irony that this upside-down world of the dream creates true insight into the self and others through the alliterative oxymoron "thy shade shines so" (43.8) or your image, which during the day was impervious, or in "shadow" becomes transparent at night, "shines so". Furthermore the use of "shadow" normally refers to the dark or sinister part of the person's character, which becomes highlighted in the silent "sh" of the night.

Duncan-Jones (1997.196)[xvi] draws the readers attention to the words in parenthesis in the line, "How would (I say) mine eyes be blessed made," (43.9). This is apt as dreams are idiosyncratic and for the Poet they are experienced as healing "blessed" because without dreams there is no space to process those images and ideas which go "unrespected" during the day but at night reveal the "darkly" or more sinister side of the Loved-object, "thy fair imperfect shade" which during the day is repressed because it would cause anxiety and is therefore censored. Freud in his lecture *Repression* (1915. *p.f.l.*11.147)[xvii] writes, "*the essence of repression lies simply in turning something away, and keeping it at a distance from conscious*." The juxtaposition of opposites of "fair" (43.11) and "imperfect shade" heightens the sense of imperfect where light or fair-minded in "fair" is set against dark or sinister. This reverses the literal sense of "imperfect" to a figurative representation and turns the normative sense of rational thought being the property of daylight hours on its head. It makes of the dream-world truth and day-light hours false. The reversal to the opposite in the chiasmus in the couplet draws together all the senses of this sonnet and turns night into what we normally conceive of as days, "All days are nights" (43.13). The phrase that follows on "to see till I see thee" (43.13) makes of the ordinary experience of external perception into something that is cloudy or uncertain, whilst night transform the same thoughts and ideas into "bright" insight, "And night bright days, when dreams do show thee me." (43.14).

Reading both the manifest and latent sides of Sonnet 43 creates a sense of an upside-down world where night illuminates what the day obscures. If only the manifest reading of the sonnet had been interpreted, the Sonnet would have been glossed as a smooth coherent narrative of the Poet's longing to see the absent-Loved-object, which is rewarded by having a beautiful dream about the loved object. The dream would have been glossed as merely filling in the gap of the absence of the Loved-object. The interpretation of both the manifest and latent content of the dream reveals a truth about the Poet's contradictory feelings about the Loved-object, which are actualized in the mise-en-scene of the dream-world.

According to David Lodge (1977.79-81)[xviii], Roman Jakobson (1956) shows that Metonymy and metaphor may be the characterizing structures of two poetic types, that is, poetry of association by contiguity of movement within a single world of discourse and the poetry of association by contrast, which joins a plurality of worlds. Selection involves the perception of similarity of the same sets and it implies the possibility of substitution within the same set or category. This occurs when nouns such as ships, crafts, vessels or boats or verbs such as crossed ploughed, sailed or moved are substituted one for the other. Metonymy is closely associated with synecdoche or substitution of part for whole in the former and substitution of whole for part in the latter. Examples of the former are the use of the 'White house' to imply the whole American Government whereas 'the library[rather than one person in the library] is very helpful' represents the whole library for a part or one helpful person in it.

Metaphor and metonymy are opposed because they are generated by different principles. For instance metaphor is placed on the selection axis whereas metonymy combines words through contiguous association into a linguistic structure so that perceptions or events that occur together are associated together. The development of discourse may take place along two different semantic lines: one topic may lead to another either through their similarity or their contiguity. The metaphorical way would be appropriate for the selection axis whereas the metonymic way would be apt for contiguity. In normal verbal behavior both are used but careful observation reveals that under the influence of a cultural pattern, personality and verbal style preference is given to one of the two processes over the other (1977.79). For instance drama is basically metaphoric as is portrayed in Shakespeare's play *King Lear* (1605-1606) where there is no linear progression in the play but the characters manage similarities and contrasts between the weather and human life and between appearance and realities. Film on the other hand is metonymic and the technique of close-up is synecdoche as it substitutes a facial expression for the whole person. Laplanche and Pontalis in their article on *displacement* (1988.123)[xix] note that the linguist Roman Jakobson felt justified in correlating,

> "the unconscious mechanisms described by Freud and the rhetorical procedures of metaphor and metonymy which he holds to be the fundamental poles of language; he thus brings together displacement with metonymy in which association is based on contiguity, while he sees symbolism as corresponding to the metaphoric dimension which is governed by the law of association by similarity. Jacques Lacan (1957) has taken up these suggestions and developed them assimilating displacement to metonymy and condensation to metaphor; for Lacan human desire is structured fundamentally by the laws of the unconscious and its nature is metonymic *par excellence*."

According to Empson (2004.192-193)[xx] when two meanings of a word are opposite it reveals a fundamental division in the writer's mind. In this instance it could be a

compromise that is the outcome of a split between the conscious and unconscious as in Sonnet 43 or a vertical split where one part of the mind takes account of conventional thinking, whilst the other is turned toward desire. Both types of dissociation are represented in the first seventeen Shakespearean Sonnets.

The theoretical assumptions outlined in this chapter underpin the whole thesis. Art is a symbol of life but it is not life as it is lived. Through an unconscious symbol like Freud's dream-theory there is a desire to communicate something but an aversion to doing so overtly because the *Super-ego* or moral conscience of the individual responds to it as inappropriate unacceptable or amoral. To evade the Censor, the communication therefore becomes distorted disguised broken up and scattered in all ways that are familiar to the Interpretation of dreams. The symbol therefore conceals because it is divorced from its context. It could be said of Shakespeare's play *Macbeth* (1606 and 1616) that it symbolically represents sterility and barrenness whilst on the other hand the metaphor in the excerpt from *Macbeth* like, "thick" (49), "pall" (50) "peep" "blanket" (52)

> "Come thick night,
> And pall thee in the dunnest smoke of hell,
> That my keen knife see not the wound it makes,
> Nor heaven peep, through the blanket of the dark
> To cry 'Hold, hold!" (Act 1. Sc.4. 49-53)[xxi]

are used to compare clandestine desire to a funeral casket and night to a opaque covering that like a blanket covers and conceals hidden desire which prevents heaven or morality secretly looking in "peep" and preventing the malevolence in Macbeth's desire from becoming actualized, 'Hold, hold." Metaphor therefore reveals because the contexts and comparisons are plain to see.

The Poet of Shakespeare's sonnets through metaphor, metonymy, representation and secondary revision elaborates both sides of the communication the manifest or normative view of it 'should be' and that which is concealed or which would offend the moral conscience of the individual if the denial 'it is not' were made conscious. The Poet's equivocal poetry in this way assumes a three-dimensional rather than a two-dimensional form. If only the manifest account or idealized 'should be' was presented the poetry would represent a flat harmonious smooth text, which would represent an idealized romanticized view of the world. The Poet in Sonnet 8 presents this flawless harmony as,

> "Mark how one string sweet husband to another,
> strikes each in each by mutual ordering;
> Resembling sire, and child, and happy mother,
> Who all in one, one pleasing note do sing" (8. 9-12)

Yet even this pleasing combination of sounds is punctured by the separate and singled-out discordant note of the Loved-object's obdurate refusal to preserve his beauty for posterity, "Sings this to thee thou single wilt prove none" (8.14). The poem therefore decodes as 'this is harmony' and 'this is not harmony or 'this is dissonance'.

As a three-dimensional symbol the Poet's poetry presents a paradox, of 'it is' and 'it is not' which is similar to the cognitive dissonance set up in determining 'this is an elongated disc' and 'this is a skull' found in Hans Holbein the younger's painting of *The Ambassadors*. The visual equivocation described above analogically simulates the intellectual experience of paradox which is found in the figurative representations of the Poet's poetry and mirrors the everyday experience of conflict, ambivalence or of being in two minds simultaneously.

Freud saw the translation and interpretation of the unconscious visual *thing* presentations into *word* presentations as making what is unconscious, conscious.

This is demonstrated in the creation of metaphor. Here, the nameless known in the unconscious is translated into some thing that is comparable to the named known in consciousness. In the *Assessment of the Unconscious* (1915.11.207) Freud writes,

> "We now seem to know all at once what the difference is between a conscious and an unconscious presentation. The conscious presentation comprises the presentation of the thing plus the presentation of the word belonging to it, while the unconscious presentation is the presentation of thing alone. (1915.11.207).

Metaphor and metonymy are products of the word and therefore of culture and of consciousness and what was a disguised symbolic or *thing* presentation or what Bollas termed the *unthought known* (1987. 277) in the unconscious when translated into metaphor and metonymy, becomes conscious as the work of the named known.

Footnotes to chap 1.

I. Abrams, M. H. Orientation of Critical Theories in *2oth Century Literary Criticism. A Reader.* Ed. David Lodge. 1991. London: Longman. 1972. p.11.

II. Bollas, Christopher. *The Shadow of the Object. Psychoanalysis of the Unthought Known.* London: Free Association of Books. 1987.

III. Empson, W. The Seventh Type of Ambiguity in *Seven Types of Ambiguity.* Plimlico: Plimlico. 2004. p.192-193.

IV. Freud, S. Displacement in *The Interpretation of Dreams* (First Part). Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud. Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. Trans. James Strachey. 1st Edition. 1900. Vol. 4. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1900a. p.305.

V. – Displacement in the *Interpretation of Dreams.* (First Part) Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud. Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. Trans. James Strachey. 1st Edition. 1900. Vol. 4. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1900a. p.305.

VI. – Dissection of the Personality in *New Introductory Lectures.* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud. Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. Trans. James Strachey. 1st Edition.1964. Vol XX11. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1933[1932]. p.80.

VII. – Mourning and Melancholia in *On Metapsychology : The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London. Penguin Freud Library. 1915. p.258.

VIII. – Repression in *On Metapsychology*: *The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London. Penguin Freud Library. 1915. p. 147.

IX. – The Antithetical Meaning of Primary Words. In *Five Lectures on Psychoanalysis.* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud. Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. Trans. James Strachey. 1st Edition. 1957. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1910. P. 153-163.

X. - The Metapsychology of Dreams: *The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London. Penguin Freud Library. 1915. p. 223-245.

XI. – *The Interpretation of Dreams* (Second Part) Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud. Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. Trans. James Strachey. 1st Edition. 1953. Vol. V. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1900.

XII. – The Unconscious in *The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. James Strachey. Angela Richards. 1991. Vol. 11. London. Penguin Freud Library. 1915.

XIII. Jakobson, R. The Metaphoric and Metonymic Poles in *Modes of Modern Writing.* Ed. David Lodge. 1991. London: Edward Arnold. 1977. p.79-81.

XIV. Keats, J. *Letters to John Keats.* Ed. Robert Gittings. 1970. Oxford University Press. 1816 -1817.

XV. Lacan, J. The Insistence of the letter in the Unconscious in *Modern Criticism and Theory. Second Edition.* 2nd Edition. 2000. Harlow: Longman. 1988. p. 78.

XVI. La Planche, J. and Pontalis, J-D. Displacement in *The Language of Psychoanalysis.* Karnac. 1988. p. 123.

XVII. Quinne, W. *The Ways of Paradox.* Revised and Enlarged Edition. 1976. Mass: Harvard University Press. 1966. p. 1-10.

XVIII. Shakespeare, W. Sonnet 43. in *The Oxford Shakespeare.* Ed. John Jowett, William Montgomery and Stanley Wells Gary Taylor. 2nd. Edition. 2005. The Clarendon Press.. 1606 & 1616. p.784.

XIX. Shakespeare, W. Macbeth in *The Oxford Shakespeare.* Ed. John Jowett, William Montgomery and Stanley Wells Gary Taylor. 2nd. Edition. 2005. The Clarendon Press.. 1606 & 1616. p. 974.

XX. – *Shakespeare's Sonnets.* Ed. Stephen Booth. 2000. London: Yale University Press. 1997.

XXI. – *Shakespeare's Sonnets.* Ed. K. Duncan-Jones. 2007. London: The Arden Press. 1997.

XXII. – *The Life of Henry Fifth* in *The Oxford Shakespeare.* Ed. John Jowett, William Montgomery and Stanley Wells Gary Taylor. 2nd. Edition. 2005. The Clarendon Press.. 1606 & 1616. p.784.

XXIII. Winnicott, D. W. Ego Distortion in Terms of the True and False Self in *Maturational Processes and the Facilitating Environment.* 1990. London: Karnac. 1960. p.148.

XXIV. – The Location of Cultural Experience in *Playing and Reality.* 1974. London: Free Association Books. 1971. p. 112-113.

CHAPTER 2

The Fear of Mortality in four of Shakespeare's Sonnets.

Richard
"Give me that glass, and therein will I read.
No deeper wrinkles yet? Hath sorrow struck
So many blows upon this face of mine
And made no deeper wounds? O flatt'ring glass,
Thou dost beguile me!" (Richard 11. Act 5. Sc1. 266-269)

This chapter ascribes meaning to the contradiction of opposites in some of Shakespeare's first seventeen sonnets through the Freudian theoretical perspective of *Narcissism* and the Life and Death Instinct. In Sonnets 1, 2, 4 and 10 the Poet of Shakespeare's sonnets appear to express two contradictory views. One view impels the object to preserve his beauty for posterity whilst on the other hand the object rebels against this injunction and takes the view that his sexuality is part of him and it his choice of how to use it. In these sonnets the Poet presents an emotionally conflicted view of life as it is lived as opposed to a moral idealized view of life and how it should be lived.

In Sonnets 1 and 10 the Poet of Shakespeare's sonnets presents two emotionally conflicted attitudes towards the Fair Youth. The attitude is epitomized in the oxymoron "tender churl" (1.12). On the one hand the Fair Youth is idealized as "tender" or sensitive and on the other hand denigrated as an ill-mannered boor or "churl." Notwithstanding the core meaning of the poem lies in the irony of the lines, "Thyself thy foe, to thy sweet self too cruel:" (1.8) and in the lines, "Grant if thou wilt, thou art beloved of many, / But that thou none lov'st is most evident:" (10. 3-4) and finally in, "Pity the world, or else this glutton be, / To eat the world's due, by the grave and thee." (1.13-14). Sonnet 1, 2, 4 and 10 are interpreted according to Freud's theory *On* Narcissism: *An Introduction* (1914. *p.f.l.* 11. 59-99)[xxii] and the Freudian theory of *The Life and Death Instincts* in his lecture, *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* (1920. *p.f.l.* 11. 269-339).[xxiii] The pathos of Narcissism is that in the excess of self-love, the subject rather than preserving the self destroys it. Ironically on the other hand the wish for immortality through altruism or the concern for the well-being of others in the line, "From fairest creatures we desire increase" (1.1) is equally self-defeating because it too is a self-seeking deathless, "never die" (1.2) "desire"(1.1) and not grounded in reality.

In this chapter the theoretical concept of *Narcissism* (1914. *p.f.l.* 11. 59-99)[xxiv] is broken down into those aspects, which relate specifically to aspects of Sonnet 1, 2, 4 and Sonnet 10 and more generally to the first seventeen sonnets. The movement from narcissism to object-relationship is described as a move between *ego-libido* or self-interest to *object-libido* (1914. *p.f.l.* 11.78) or belief in acting for the good of others. The more love there is for the self the less love there is for the other. The Narcissists chooses a love object on the model of his own self or *ideal-ego* whereas the humanitarian choses an object on the model of the other or *ego-ideal* (1914. *p.f.l.*11. 90). The poetry draws a contradiction between the life-giving properties of procreation, which 'wishfully' lead to immortality as opposed to the vanity, self-preservation and futility of self-love, which leads to mortality. This contradiction between mortality and immortality is understood through the Freudian concept of the *Life and Death instinct* (1920. *p.f.l.* 11. 306-315).[xxv] The mind-set of the Narcissist is founded in phantasy and as such is analogous to that of the dreamer and processed by the primary processes of the dream-work of condensation and displacement, which Jakobson[xxvi] views as in accord with the linguistic process of metaphor and metonymy. The Poet's use of metaphor and metonymy rather than the abstract concepts of narcissism or humanitarianism in Sonnets 2 and 4 break down the concept of self-interest into its derivatives like agriculture, old-age and the economy which makes it possible for the reader-auditor to relate to and identify with rather than if the Poet had made use of didactic abstract concepts like egoism which would have been disregarded as the received axiomatic view and possibly ignored or repressed. The Poet's conflicted view of the love-object is examined according to Empson's[xxvii] understanding of ambiguity which Empson views as the outcome of a "fundamental division in the writer's mind" (2004.192). This is consistent with the fundamental Freudian concept of opposites or the divided self, which appears split

when the mind is conflicted between the emotions of love and hate, idealization and denigration and life and death. The discussion concludes with the Poet's move from the embodiment of beauty in concrete objects to one of symbolic immortality in the figurative beauty of the Poet's poetry about the Love-object.

Paul Nacke 1899 introduced the term *Narcissism* to denote the attitude of a person who loves his own body in the same way that the body of an external sexual object is loved. The Narcissist obstructs the influence of external reality and by so doing thwarts the opinions of others in the external world which results in the megalomania of narcissism found in sleep, melancholia, mourning and all forms of *desire* where the influence of the unconscious predominates over the preconscious-conscious and reality testing. In the thrall of his own self as ideal the Narcissist rejects the voice of the *Ego Ideal*, which develops into the *Super-Ego* or moral conscience (1914.*p.f.l.*11. 89). Freud writes,

> "For what prompted the subject to form an ego ideal, on whose behalf his conscience acts as watchman, arose from the critical influence of his parents (conveyed to him by the medium of the voice), to whom were added, as time went on those who trained him and taught him." (1914.*p.f.l.* 11. 90).

Like all products of the Unconscious, the immature *ideal-ego* (1914) is imaginary and renders the same superficial reading of the self as given by a mirror as in Richard 11 above. The Poet describes this egoism as, "But thou contracted to thine own bright eyes," (1.5). The hedonism of the *ideal ego* is based on fantasy; this renders it self-destructive and dangerous to the self and to society. The Poet articulates this pleasure-seeking state of mind as, " Thyself thy foe to thy sweet self too cruel:" (1.8).

Freud, in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* (1920) describes the irony inherent in the pleasure principle. If the pleasure principle or hedonism in the Unconscious played a dominant role in life the majority of our mental processes would be accompanied by pleasure. The reality is they are not. The un-pleasure of the reality principle is patent when the efflorescence of youth comes to an end and when the idealized experiences of the narcissism of childhood are brought to a painful and distressing conclusion and the Ego experiences humiliation when he can no longer expect that "..he shall once more really be the centre and core of creation – 'His Majesty the baby' " (1914.*p.f.l*.11.85). Central to Freud's notion of *Narcissism* is his concept of *object-choice* (1914). Whereas the *anaclitic* person (1914.84) allows himself dependency on others the narcissistic person chooses an object on the model of his own self; that is, what he himself is; what he himself was; would like to be and someone who was once part of himself (1914). The Poet articulates this egoism as, "contracted to thine own bright eyes," (1.5) and, "Thou art thy mother's glass and she in thee / Calls back the lovely April of her prime," (3.9-10). This choice which articulates the self as the *ideal ego* of narcissism rather than like the *Ego-Ideal* who aspires to procreate for the benefit of others. This renders the Narcissist's orientation to the external world, paranoiac. From Melanie's Klein's (1946. 9-10)[xxviii] perspective this is because, "With an unassimilated idealized object there goes a feeling that the ego has no life of its own." The Poet expresses this as, "But that thou none lov'st is most evident:" (10.4) and again, "No love toward others in that bosom sits, / That on himself such murd'rous sham.e commits." (9.13-14).

Central to the see-saw movement of ego-libido and object-libido is the Ego's attitude to procreation which from the narcissistic perspective is expressed as Sexual intercourse is his prerogative and his choice of how to use it; as opposed to an attitude where the subject views himself as temporary holder of a birthright which is

passed on to succeeding generations. The Poet in Sonnet 4 expresses a similar view of the Loved-object's attitude to procreation, "Unthrifty loveliness why dost thou spend, / Upon thy self thy beauty's legacy?" (4.1-2). On the other hand, Sonnet 1 opens with the wish that, "From fairest creatures we desire increase," and continues with a plea for immortality, "never die." "The essence of life" writes Freud is directed to the coalescence of two different cell-bodies. That alone is what guarantees the immortality of the living substance in the higher organisms"(1920.*p.f.l.* 11.329).

> If two different animalculae, at the moment before show signs of senescence are able to conjugate (soon after which they once more separate) they are saved from growing old and become rejuvenated. Conjugation is the forerunner of the sexual production of higher creatures and is limited to the mixture of substances of two individuals" (1920.*p.f. l.* 11. 320).

Conversely *narcissism* is seen to be part of the death –instinct (1920.316) whilst life and immortality are considered part of *Eros* or fusion with others or sexuality between two different objects (1920. *p.f.l.* 11. 311-313). A similar contradiction is enunciated by the Poet, "Thy unus'd beauty must be tomb'd with thee, / Which used lives th'executor to be." (4.13-14). Freud quotes Weismann (1882) who introduced the division of living substance into mortal and immortal parts or what Freud would have termed ego-instincts and sexual instincts. The mortal part is the body in the narrow sense. This soma alone is subject to natural death whilst the germ-cells are concerned with sex and inheritance. This is the immortal portion, which is concerned with the survival of the species and reproduction.

> " The individual does actually carry on a twofold existence: one to serve his own purposes and the other as a link in a chain, which he serves against his will, or at least involuntary. The individual regards sexuality as one of his ends; whereas from another point of view he is an appendage to his germ-plasm, at whose disposal he puts his energies in return for a bonus of pleasure" (1914. *p.f.l.* 11. 70-71).

In Beyond the Pleasure principle (1920. *p.f.l*. 11. 316) Freud notes that it is only on this condition of uniting with another cell that the sexual function can prolong the life of a cell and lend it the appearance of immortality. Whereas Freud assigns narcissism to the death instinct because it unties connections between people or in the Poet's words, "For having traffic with thy self alone," (4.9) Freud assigns sexuality to *Eros* or the life instinct which was viewed by Freud as principally a force of cohesion which it effects through establishing ever greater unities which preserve life by binding and combining more and more different living substance into ever-greater unities. Again in the Poet's words, "Which used lives th'executor to be." (4.14).

The state of mind of the Narcissist is akin to that of the dreamer. Freud writes in *Metapsychology of Dreams* (1915. *p.f.l.* 11.230) that, 'narcissism may be described as the libidinal complement of egoism" and in the *Interpretation of Dreams*, "The beloved ego appears in all dreams. The dreamer's ego is invariably present in person or through identification" (*S.E*. IV. 223). The manifest dream according to Freud "Is a (disguised) fulfillment of a (repressed) wish." (*S.E.* IV 160.)[xxix] . This distortion is necessary for if the manifest dream became conscious the dreamer would awake in fright for "Dreams are the fulfillment of wishes" (*S. E*. XX11. 18)[xxx] and these unconscious wishes are not compatible with reality. The dream makes use of condensation and displacement to formulate the manifest dream so that it evades the censor. Likewise the Poet makes use of metaphor and metonymy in order to reconceive egoism in a form more acceptable to consciousness. In the creation of the manifest dream unusable abstract rational thought is,

> "transformed into images mainly of a visual sort; that is to say, word presentations are taken back to the thing presentations which correspond to them .. it is always ready to exchange one word for another till it finds the

> expression which is most handy for plastic representation" (1915.*p.f.l.*11.235-236)[xxxi].

And again in *Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious*[xxxii] displacement as part of the dream-work makes possible,

> "The selection of ideas which are sufficiently remote from the objectionable one for the censorship to allow them to pass, but which are nevertheless derivatives of that idea and have taken over its psychical cathexis by means of a complete transference. For this reason displacement are never absent in a dream.." (*S.E*. V111.171)[xxxiii].

In this way the psychoanalytic signifier or the manifest wish in the dream or poem is disguised to allow the sleeper in the dream to go on sleeping and the Narcissist to remain blind or ignorant and unaware of his own self-absorption and conceit. Roman Jakobson associates the rhetorical strategies of metaphor and metonymy with the unconscious processes of condensation and displacement. In the poetry of Shakespeare's first seventeen sonnets the egoism and narcissism of the Fair Youth is metaphorically and metonymically displaced from the overt threatening idea of egoism, selfishness, self-centeredness and self-absorption to ideas that are acceptable to consciousness or in the Poet's words narcissism can be thought of as, "Feed'st thy light's flame with self-substantial fuel, / Making a famine where abundance lies," (1.6-7). In this way the threatening idea of narcissism by losing its original form loses its power to attract attention to itself and is allowed to cross over the barrier into consciousness.

In this fashion the narcissism of youth is broken down into aspects or derivatives of narcissistic attitude as revealed in the poetry of Shakespeare's sonnets and

displaced on to themes of the “grave” (1. 14), eating (1.14), tomb (3.7; 4.13; 17.3), distilling (5.9; 6.2), seasons (12, 2, 18, 5), thrift and unthrift (9, 2,4,13), audit (6, 2), self-will and self-killed (1, 6), egoism which leads the world impoverished (1, 19, 15,16, 18, 17), printing and verse (11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19), time (12, 15, 16, 19, 5, 18), house and descent (3, 10) and the rising and setting of the sun in Sonnet 7. The metaphors in Sonnet 1-17 employ a diversity of vehicles, which are displaced onto: flowers like the *“Rose”* (1.2), which become distilled and therefore retain their perfume. This occurs in Sonnet (5.13-14) and Sonnet (6.1-4) while vegetal conceits occur in in Sonnet (3.9-10), (5.5-10), (6.1-2), (12.2-12) and (15. 5-8). The young man’s self-destructive prodigal and egotistical behavior is associated with the personification of Time’s mutilation in Sonnet (1.2-4) and Sonnet 19 “Devouring time” (19.1). The contrast of opposites is pertinent in the young man himself who is described both as “beauty’s *Rose”* (1.2) “the world’s fresh ornament” (1.9) as well as “niggarding” (1.12) and again in the oxymoron of “tender churl”. (1.12).

William Empson in his discussion of the seventh type of ambiguity comments on the Freudian concept of condensation and Freud’s fundamental concept of opposites in his theory of dreams,

> “Now a Freudian opposite at least marks dissatisfaction; the notion of what you want involves the idea that you have not got it, and this again involves the ‘opposite defined by your context,’ which is what you cannot avoid” (2004.193).

Empson connects his notion to the *condensation* found in dreams or metaphor in poetry because these two processes combine two different ideas or images into a novel composite unity. Likewise the processes in the creation of the dream are similar to that of metaphor. The two different psychical states of mind like reality and the unconscious combine to form an innovative compromise as a replacement

satisfaction in the shape of the manifest dream or poem. What Empson appears to be implying is that there are two types of splits or disjunctions in the mind. Both are the outcome of a defensive conflict between the *pleasure principle* or *phantasy* and the *reality principle* of the Ego instincts. Freud introduced the horizontal split in his *Theory of Dreams* (1900a) and in psychic health communication between the *Ucs.* and *Pcs.* occurs and this osmosis-like diffusion between the two systems occurs through derivatives of the unconscious, which are able to evade the censor. These derivatives are here illustrated by metaphor and metonymy of Shakespeare's sonnets 1-17 as above.

On the other hand Freud also conceptualized the defensive process of splitting of the ego as a vertical split in the mind and this notion was introduced by Freud in his article *Splitting of the Ego in the Process of Defence*" (*S.E*. XX111. 275-278)[xxxiv]. The vertical split describes the coexistence at the heart of the ego of two psychical attitudes towards reality. The first attitude takes reality into account whilst the second disavows it and replaces it by a product of desire. The two attitudes persist side by side without influencing one another. As this contradiction between two different realities touches on four of the first seventeen sonnets of Shakespeare's sonnets, it could be said, that the Fair Youth views sexuality as one of his own needs *and* "He is the mortal vehicle of a (possibly) immortal substance" (1920 &1914). The separation of the sexual instincts in the form of immortality from the opposing ego-instincts in the form of mortality would simply reflect this twofold function of the individual" (1914. *p.f.l.* 11. 71 and 1920. Vol. *p.f.l.* 11. 318). This split in the Ego presents two opposites not as contradictions of one another where one view is cancelled out but the two views co-exist together without influencing the other. The Poet of Shakespeare's sonnets expresses a similar sentiment in the form of a chiasmus, "To give away your self, keeps your self still," (16.13).

The horizontal split by contrast occurs in dreams and all forms of phantasy and desire. Here a compromise is formed between the reality-orientated *Pcs.* and the phantasy orientated *Ucs.* The outcome of this compromise is that the pre-conscious wish is formed, which "gives expression to the unconscious impulse in the material of the preconscious day's residues" (1915. *p.f.l.* 11.234). For Freud, "Dreams are a form of thinking" (*S.E .* V111. 145)[xxxv] and again in the *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis* (*S.E.* XXV. 136),

> "A dream is a compromise formation between the wish to sleep and on the other hand it allows a repressed instinctual impulse to obtain the satisfaction that is possible in these circumstances, in the form of the hallucinated fulfillment of a wish."

Freud regards *Considerations of Representability*[xxxvi] as the third important factor of the dream work. *Considerations of Representability* relieves the psychological pressure of constricted thinking by pouring the content of a thought into another mould; that is pictures. The unconscious wish occurs in the manifest dream or by extension any verbal product from phantasies to literary work that exists in the form of metaphor and metonymy and where the intention is that the unconscious signifier will be interpreted. If it is poetry it is not subjected to the scrutiny of reality testing. In *Two Principles of Mental Functioning* (1911. *p.f.l.* 11. 41-42) Freud writes that *Art* can,

> "bring about reconciliation between the two principles" [of pleasure and reality] "in a peculiar way. An artist is originally a man who turns away from reality because he cannot come to terms with the renunciation of instinctual satisfaction which it at first demands, and who allows his erotic and ambitious wishes full play in the life of phantasy. He finds the way back to reality, however, from this world of phantasy by making use of special gifts to mould his phantasies into truths of a new kind, which are valued by men as precious reflections of reality."

Likewise the Poet of Shakespeare's sonnets symbolically *substitutes* (*S.E.*, XX.145)[xxxvii] his wish for the concrete immortality of beauty in the Fair Youth in embodied form through progeny to a more realistic desire for the immortality of beauty to be found in symbolic form in the Poet's poetry about the beauty of the Fair Youth, "Thou shouldst print more, not let that copy die" (11.14) and "As he takes from you, I engraft you new." (15.14) and "You should live twice in it, and in my rhyme" (17.14).

The discussion above concentrates on narcissism in those aspects, which relate specifically to Sonnets, 1, 2, 4 and 10 and more generally to sonnets 1-17. In Sonnet 1 the Poet foregrounds the conflict between immortality, which results from a moral idealized view of life as opposed to mortality, which is a portrait of life and the way it is lived. Ironically both life-styles lead to death. This is because the aspiration for corporeal immortality is found to be unrealistic and therefore unattainable. Similarly the narcissism of the Fair Youth's desire to preserve the self at the expense of the other or progeny in the poetry is found to lead to death.

Quatrain 1 of Sonnet 1 lays out the conflicted main theme of this poem, which is the contradiction between desire and reality; immortality and mortality. Sonnet 1 opens with the sense of all-inclusive created things encapsulated in the word, "creatures" (1.1) which includes, man, animal vegetable, all of which are perceived as "fairest" (1.1). The idealization of the all-embracing sense of all living creatures is immediately contracted to include only those that are "fairest" or most beautiful or fair-minded which introduces an aberrant note of eugenics into the sense of immortality. The conflict between immortality and mortality is introduced by the two senses of "by". One sense of 'by' is used in "thereby" (1.2) while the second "by" occurs in "should by time decease," (1.3). This doubling of "by" according to Booth

(1977.135) creates an ambiguity in the sense of "beauty's *Rose*" which can be glossed either as mortality in the transience of "the bloom of youth" or as, "one flower which blooms and dies" or alternatively as immortality in a "rose bush which goes on generating flowers indefinitely". The first two lines therefore echo the swing from ego-libido to object-libido; between narcissism to a relationship to objects. The question becomes is the rose "the fragile vehicle of beauty (Colin Burrow (2002.383)[xxxviii] or is it part of a line of descendants as in "rose bush" or a Tudor emblem of the Tudor dynasty (Duncan-Jones. 1977.112). The conjunction "But" (1.3) introduces a paradox into the poem through the sense of "never die' (1.2) to except in the circumstances of the riper dying, "But as the riper should by time decease," (1.3). This line contradicts line 2, where the "*Rose*" (1.2) is impelled to "never die." Line four of Sonnet 1 actualizes the idealized-illusory sense of "never die," into it practical and tangible outcome in "His tender heir might bear his memory:" (1.4). The Poet's use of "tender" draws the two sense of "tender" together in the supple stem of the plant, as well as "tender" in the sensitive heir of descent. The pun or homophone on "bear" (1.4) reveals the condensation between fruit and heir, which translates into bear a child or the bearing of fruit.

Whereas the first quatrain lays down the theme of immortality and the preservation of only "fairest creatures" (1.1) of the species,

> "In considering narcissism from the libidinal aspect one can see that the overvaluation of the self plays a central role, based mainly on the idealization of the self. Self-idealization is maintained by omnipotent introjective and projective identification with good objects and their qualities. In this way the narcissist feels that everything that is valuable relating to external objects and the outside world is part of him or is omnipotently controlled by him, (Rosenfeld, 1971.173).[xxxix]

By contrast in the second quatrain the tone of voice adopted by the Poet changes sharply from idealized self-satisfaction if not complacency to one of denigration censure and shaming. This quatrain illustrates the destructive aspects of narcissism, which describe an internal state of the Ego's destructiveness towards and within the self and indifference to posterity,

> "we find that the destructive aspects of self-idealization again play a central role, but now it is the idealization of the omnipotent destructive parts of the self. They are directed both against any positive libidinal object-relationship and any libidinal part of the self which experiences need for an object and the desire to depend on it (Rosenfeld, 1971.173).[xl]

This insensibility towards others is represented as egoism, "contracted to thine own bright eyes" (1.5) as well as the Fair Youth's independence of others, "Feed'st thy light's flame" (1.6), and "self-substantial fuel" (1.6). According to Booth the sense of "self-substantial fuel" suggests a simile with a candle, which burns itself out. This is apt as the energy of narcissism is self-depleting rather than energizing as it saps the vitality of the ego, in the same way that a candle burns itself out. According to Freud (1914. *p.f.l.* 11.94),

> "Loving in it itself in so far as it involves longing and deprivation, lowers self-regard; whereas being loved, having one's love returned, and possessing the loved object, raises it once more." (1914.94-95).

The Poet presents a paradox in the image of "self-substantial fuel", which leads to "famine" (1.7) rather than "abundance" (1.7). The expectation of the reader is that normally abundance will lead to profusion; but in line 5 abundance leads to famine in the line, "Making a famine where abundance lies" (1.7). This reversal to the opposite serves to mimic the swing from object-libido to ego- libido and intensifies the irony of abundance, which diminishes into "famine". This translates as the Fair-Youth in his

abundance of sperm rather than creating a copious line of descent leaves no descendants “making a famine” as he squanders all the sperm in masturbation. Burrow appears to empathize with the pathos of narcissism in line 7, “My very abundance of contact with what I love makes me poor”. The irony of narcissism is that self-love saps the self of vitality because no potency, vigour or *object-libido* is absorbed from the world of others. This act of self-destruction is epitomized in, “Thyself thy foe, to thy sweet self too cruel:” (1.8) because in the Youth’s self-sufficiency he does not leave an heir and his beauty rather than being immortalized dies.

This egoism is exemplified in the isolating and shaming sense of “But thou” (1.5). In two short monosyllabic words the loving sense of “tender heir” is transformed into the outsider and excluded as other. Ironically the Fair-Youth appears equally to exclude himself by relying only on himself, in “self-substantial fuel” . The Poet’s use of a pun in “contracted” (1.5) makes “contracted” ambiguous. “Contract” (1.5) implies both a marriage contract to another different person in the anaclitic object relationship whereas “contracted to thine own bright eyes” diminishes the self to one who is “contracted” to the looking glass where the other is not an external other but is the loved object of the self as in the quote of Richard 11 above (Richard 11. Act 5. Sc1. 266-269).

Quatrain 3 suggests the generality and universality of the first quatrain as well as the harshness of the invective towards the Fair Youth in the second quatrain. The sense of “now” (1.9) implies a sense of the transience of the beauty of the Youth, which was first introduced in the metaphor, “beauty’s *Rose*.” The use of the noun “ornament” (1.9) qualifies the adjective “fresh” (1.9). This creates a contradiction in the sense of

beauty. On the one hand “fresh” suggests novel, unfamiliar and unaffected by time whilst on the other the beauty of the Fair-youth is presented as a mere external decoration almost a façade like decoration, ”ornament” which like the “*Rose”* will shortly after blooming or reaching its prime, wither and die. Paradoxically this line implies that beauty achieves its perfection as it decays which underwrites the meaning of, “But as the riper should by time decease,”(1.3).

The Poet’s use of puns and oxymoron pervade quatrain 3 which replicate the Poet’s ambivalent attitude to the fair youth. Burrow views the sense of “only” as chief forerunner, which precedes the arrival of spring whereas Duncan-Jones writes that “gaudy” (1.10) does not necessarily carry the connotation of vulgarity or excess, but the sense of extreme or outstanding. In this chapter “gaudy” is viewed in its ambiguity of both vulgarity in relation to the garishness “gaudy” egotistic Fair Youth and conversely outstanding or singular in its relation to “fairest creatures.” This doubling echoes the Poet’s own divided ambivalent attitude towards the Youth portrayed in the oxymoron “tender churl.” The use of the noun “bud” is consistent with the sense of “tender heir” which according to Booth connotes an un-opened flower or sexually un-opened. Burrow comments on the pun in the ambiguity of the word “content” (1.11). When the stress falls on the second syllable of “content” content signifies emotional disposition, ”content” which evokes the sense of “self-substantial” (1.6) whereas when the stress falls on the first syllable of “content” it implies the substance out of which the Fair Youth is made or the pleasure in his own libido “lights flame” (1.6) which he hoards for himself like a glutton hoards food. The sense of “bud” (1.11) together with the pejorative sense of “tender churl” emphasizes the sense of the Fair youth squandering his manhood on himself like a sexually un-opened or un-germinated flower, which dies before becoming “riper”. Booth interprets the oxymoron “tender churl” to mean tender miser or tender boor.

The oxymoron implies the Poet's divided opinion of the Fair-Youth, which is both protective in "tender" and uncouth in "churl." The sense of "tender-churl" contradicts "tender heir" which according to Duncan-Jones implies a paradox that the Fair Youth squanders his beauty even as he tries to preserve it for himself. The transformation of "tender heir" to "tender churl" calls attention to the antithetical themes of this poem of "famine" "abundance" "waste" and "niggarding" which are typified by the line, "Thyself thy foe, to thy sweet self too cruel." The Narcissistic youth in his gluttony rather than preserving himself saps his own vitality by amassing it for himself, "niggarding." Burrow integrates the meaning of "tender" into the whole poem glossing it as, "the sensitivity of the Fair Youth makes his lack of an heir, an ignoble meanness."

The couplet is marked both by disillusion and perplexity. There is a sense of disenchantment and disappointment in the penultimate line as if the hopes and desires of the first line of the poem have turned out to be false "From fairest creatures we desire increase". The "desire" rather than enlarging the world with the beauty of the Fair Youth's progeny is "contracted" by the Youth's "glutton" (1.13). The Youth through greed and miserliness has jeopardized the beauty owing to the world, "to eat the world's due" (1.14). The ambiguity of line 14 "To eat the world's due by the grave and thee." creates a paradox, as the manifest injunction of the poem is, "to give away yourself," (16.13) as it is used in Sonnet 16, "To give away yourself, keeps your self still," (16.13). In Sonnet 1 giving your self away by preserving the line of descent is proved an unfulfilled wish. On the other hand the grave and the Fair Youth are symbolically equated in the same way as self-preservation of *Narcissism* is seen by Freud (1920) to be part of the *death instinct* as it leads life back to the inorganic state. Conversely the grave nourishes life in the sense of the proverb 'dust to dust'. Duncan-Jones clarifies that the young man

consumes the beauty that is owed to the world “world’s due” (1.14) and he is finally devoured by the grave because dying is commonly referred to as paying one’s debt to nature. Ironically, the Fair youth in his self-sufficiency transforms into the grave itself with no debt outstanding as he has taken nothing from the world and therefore has nothing to return to the world. The last line of the poem leaves the reader with an eerie feel. This is because narcissism is a fantasy and as fantasy leaves no material trace of the self in the world.

Sonnet 1, 2 and 4 extend the wishful-theme that through an heir the Fair Youth will preserve his beauty in perpetuity. This enlarges the Freudian discussion of the life and death instinct as conjugation between two different cells enhances and rejuvenates the life of the two different cells and leads to immortality, whereas narcissism leads to mortality. The Poet articulates a similar view, “This were to be new made when thou art old, / And see thy blood warm when thou feel’st it cold.” (2.14) and again in the paradox of the couplet of Sonnet 4, “Thy unus’d beauty must be tomb’d with thee, / Which used lives th’executor to be.” (4.13-14). In *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* (1920. *p.f.l.*11.316), Freud explains this experience of rejuvenation and immortality,

> “Whereas the sexual instinct though it is true that they reproduce primitive states of the organism what they are clearly aiming at by every possible means is the coalescence of two germ cells which are differentiated in a particular way. If this union is not effected the germ cells dies along with all the other elements of the multicellular organism. It is only on this condition that the sexual function can prolong the life of a cell and lend it the appearance of immortality” (1920.*p.f.l.* 11.316).

Both Sonnet 2 and 4 demonstrate the way in which the objectionable idea of narcissism and egoism is disguised and distorted into derivatives of the unconscious

and in this way the abstract concept of narcissism is figuratively transformed. In the *Interpretation of Dreams* (*S.E*., Vol.5, 349) Freud writes,

> "A thing that is pictorial is from the point of view of a dream, a thing that is *capable of being represented*. "This pouring of a thought into another mould may at the same time serve the purpose of the activity of condensation and may create connections, which might not otherwise have been present, with some other thought" (*S.E.* V. 349).

Therefore, through the condensed word pictures of metaphor and displacement or metonymy, the abstract concept of narcissism is transformed into visual pictures of the derivatives of narcissism, which make it possible to evade the *Censor*. If the Poet had used pejorative abstract concepts like narcissistic, egotistic, selfish, self-orientated self-love, masturbation the reader rather than experiencing and identifying with the sentiments expressed in the poem would have found the poetry judgmental if not boring and turned away from it as the reader would have been adverse to experiencing it or identifying with it. The Poet transforms the objectionable censure into commonly held financial, agricultural metaphors and bodily sensations with which the reader can readily identify.

In Sonnets 2 and 4 the abstract concepts of narcissism and altruism are concealed within metaphors, which deal with beauty either as the investment of money for profit or miserly self-defeating financial conservatism where beauty is represented as being misused rather than invested for the benefit of descendants. In Sonnet 2 The fair Youth's desire to preserve his beauty for himself is infused with a sense of cold death rather than well-being, "blood warm" (2.14) in the same way that the consequence of "glutton" (1.13) in the Fair Youth is transformed into "famine" (1.7). In Sonnet 2 praise again turns to blame and shame. The poem creates a cold death-like feel in the imagery of "Winters" (2.1) in the violence and impotence against death in

“besiege” (2.1). The beauty of the Fair-youth is converted into an oppressive sense of death. This is conveyed in images of “cold” (2.4) old age with “deep-sunken eyes,” (2.7) while “deep trenches” describe ground-in worry lines. The linking of “old” (2.13) with “cold” and “tottered weed” (2.14) is contrasted to more life perpetuating representations, “blood warm”, visual descriptions of insignia in “ proud livery” (2.3) of commerce “sum my count” (2.11), which create a metaphorical contrast to the destruction of the beauty of the Fair Youth as he is humbled like a bent “totter’d weed” with no heir to present a balanced audit of the way he used his beauty during his life. Through quantifiable images of accountancy “sum my count” (2.11) the heir or the child is symbolically equated with financial investment, “Shall sum my count,” that can be added up to show a balance or subtracted as evidence of either the thrift or extravagance of the Fair Youth towards his descendants. From this perspective Booth (1977.139) notes that the heir or child will in effect act both as evidence and as lawyer condemning the father for the consumption of beauty expended during his life on himself and for not leaving it to heirs.

Sonnet 4 is comprised of oxymoron like “Unthrifty loveliness” (4.1), “beauteous niggard” (4.5), “Profitless usurer” (4.7) and antithetical themes like, “..spend, / Upon thy self” (4,1-2) as opposed to, “Nature’s bequest gives nothing but doth lend,” (4.3) and “…why dost thou use, / So great a sum of sums yet canst not live?” (4.7-8) and in “…traffic with thy self alone,” (4.10). An alternative life-style to “Thy unus’d beauty must be tom’d with thee, is offered to the Fair-youth in the final line of the poem, “Which used lives th’exector to be.” (4. 13-14). The Poet’s use of “of thy self” (4.10) presents “the self” not as an external other but as the mirror-self or loved-object of the self or an internal part of the Ego in the same way as does Richard 11 above.

Sonnet 4 suggests the paradox as well as co-existence inherent in libidinal and destructive parts of Narcissism, “Thou of thy self thy sweet self dost deceive” (4.10) which reiterates, “Thyself thy foe, to thy sweet self too cruel:” (1.8). On the one hand the Fair Youth is presented as incorporating everything that is of value in the external world as part of him. This is apparent in “Nature’s bequest” (4.3) and, “The bounteous largess given thee to give?” (4.6); whilst on the other hand illogically even with this the Narcissist, “canst not live?” (4.8). This waste is the result of his idealization of the omnipotent destructive parts of the self which are directed both against any positive libidinal object-relationship and any libidinal part of the self which experiences need for an object and the desire to depend on it. The Poet articulates this self-exclusion as, “For having traffic with thy self alone” (4.9) which echoes the line in, “Feed’st thy light’s flame with self-substantial fuel,” and “Thy unus’d beauty must be tomb’d with thee” (4.13). The Poet presents this sense of libidinal and destructive narcissism as an oxymoron “beauteous niggard.” On the one hand libidinal narcissism is portrayed in pictures of “Nature’s bequest” in images of “bounteous largess” “frank” and “free” (4.4) while on the other hand destructive narcissism diminishes the self and presents an opposing verbal picture of “niggard” and “can’st not live?” In the oxymoron, “Profitless usurer” (4.7) the Fair-youth is painted as a money-lender who makes no profit from his beauty and as such the “unus’d beauty must be tomb’d with thee,” (4.13). Yet again this sonnet repeats the conflict between mortality and immortality or the life and death instinct, only in this sonnet mortality and immortality are reduced to financial metaphors, either materially advantaging or depriving descendants.

As afore discussed the abstract concept of narcissism when poured into a different mould as word pictures is experienced and identified with; rather than if it is held in an abstract form of didactic knowledge. The metaphor “traffic” indicates movement

and in Freudian terms signifies “exchange of bodily fluid in the conjugation between two different cells” (Freud 1920). The verb “traffic” also implies commerce between different peoples, which binds people together in ever-greater unities or what Freud (1920) defines as the sexual or *life instinct*. This instinct for life in the words of the Poet is expressed as “Nature’s bequest” or what is bequeathed or entrusted to the next generation. In Freud’s words, “It is only on this condition that the sexual function can prolong the life of a cell and lend it the appearance of immortality” (1920.316).

> “if this union is not effected the germ-cell dies along with all the other elements of the multicellular organism” and *the death instinct* draws life back to the inanimate state (1920. *p.f.l.* 11. 316).

In the words of the Poet this waste of possibility results in, “Thy unus’d beauty must be tomb’d with thee.” The phrase in line 13 of Sonnet 4, “…must be tomb’d with thee” describes the static, unchanging, un-modifiable nature of narcissism as opposed to the movement of ever-greater unities or “traffic” of the life instinct or Eros and “Which used lives th’exector to be” (4.14). This sonnet together with Sonnets 1 and 2 in the view held here illustrate the fundamental opposition presented by Freud in his dualistic theory of the instincts of self-preservation as opposed to the preservation of the species.

The dualistic tendency in Freudian thought manifests not only in self-preservation when it is opposed to preservation of the species but in the notion of pairs of opposites. Hate is commonly thought of as the opposite of love but this is not always the case according to Freud in *Instincts and Their Vicissitudes* (1915. *p.f.l.* 11. 105-139). Sadism and hate are not derived from the sexual instincts of love but from the instinct of self-preservation to maintain itself. In this lecture (1915. *p.f.l.*11.137)

Freud writes masochism was seen to be sadism turned around on the subject's self. Hate was seen to be a separate instinct and was seen to be older than love,

> "Hate derives from the narcissistic ego's primordial repudiation of the external world with its outpouring of stimuli… it always remains in an intimate relation with the self-preservative instinct; so that the sexual and ego-instincts can readily develop an antithesis which repeats that of love and hate" (1915.*p.f.l.* 11.137).

Freud writing again in his lecture *The Two classes of Instincts* in the *The Ego and the Id* writes about the transformation of love into hate,

> "..It is clear that here the changes are purely internal and an alteration in the behavior of the external object plays no part in them" (1923. *p.f.l.* 11. 384).

In 1920 Freud included within the *Death Instinct* narcissism masochism, sadism, hate and ambivalence whereas aggression was viewed as a separate instinct. Sonnet 10 calls attention to Empson's theory of ambiguity, which is the outcome of the divided mind and in the Poet's poetry is actualized in the Poet's ambivalent attitude to the Fair Youth. The Poet in Sonnet 10 takes the sense of procreation back to its roots in love, but conversely this sonnet is not about the celebration of love and life but by contrast forms the Poet's reproach to the Fair-Youth for his lack of love towards any, "For shame deny that thou bear'st love to any" (10.1). This sonnet does not repeat the Fair-Youth's self-love rather the Poet in this sonnet upbraids the Youth for not loving at all, "But that thou none lov'st is most evident" (10.4). In relation to a destructive form of narcissism, Freud raises the question, "what makes it necessary at all for our mental life to pass beyond the limits of narcissism and to attach the libido to objects?" (1914.11.78). Freud explains when the cathexis of the Ego exceeds a certain amount,

> "A strong egoism is a protection against falling ill, but in the last resort we must begin to love in order not to fall ill, and we are bound to fall ill if, in consequence of frustration, we are unable to love" (1914.11.78).

The tone of Sonnet 10 changes from the universal "we" (1.1) to the specific "me" (10.13). Here the Poet indicates that he has a personal relationship to the Fair Youth in "Make thee an other self for love of me," (10.13). The tone of sonnet also changes from berating the Fair-Youth for his self-love to rebuking him for his hate towards others in a destructive form of narcissism or "murd'rous hate" (10.5) which turns around on the subject's self, "gainst thy self" (10.6).

Sonnet 10 appears to follow the sentiments expressed in the couplet of Sonnet 9, "No love toward others in that bosom sits / That on himself such murd'rous shame commits. (9.13-14). Sonnet 10 opens with a contradiction. On the one hand the Fair-Youth is represented as despising others, "But that thou none lov'st is most evident:" (10.4) but conversely he is beloved of many." The first line therefore starts with a rebuke that out of a sense of shame or humility the Fair Youth should own or take responsibility for his lack of love towards others rather than deny that "thou bear'st love to any" (10.1). There is a sense in this poem of the Poet pleading with the Youth not to be so reckless "unprovident" (10.2), or according to Crystal and Crystal (2002.421[xli]) to think twice "stick'st" (10.6). As afore discussed narcissism is unrelated to reality and therefore part of the pleasure principle which like the impulses of the dream strive for immediate gratification of pleasure. Notwithstanding in this poem the negation "not" (10.6) according to Freud [xlii](1925. 438) reverses the stated negative meaning of the proposition to the affirmative,

> "To negate something in judgement is, at bottom, to say: 'This is something I should prefer to repress.' A negative judgement is the intellectual substitute for

> repression, its 'no' is the hall-mark of repression, a certificate of origin – like, let us say, 'Made in Germany'" (1925.11.438).

The lines, "For thou art so possess'd with murd'rous hate, / That 'gainst thy self thou stick'st not to conspire" (10.5-6) therefore reads, you are so "possess'd" (10.5) or demonically controlled by hate that against yourself you plot your own destruction. This is the irony of narcissism, rather than turning towards the self in self-love and self-protection hate turns against the self and destroys the Fair-Youth. The synecdoche "beauteous roof" (10.7) according to Booth (1977.148-149) metaphorically stands for the head, whole body, lineage, or house. The assonance of "ruinate" in relation to "roof" (10.7) links the sense of spoiling of something good and beautiful, like the line of descent to "roof" and ruins or spoils it. Line 8 of Sonnet 10 disrupts the sense of harm and damage thus far expressed in the first two quatrains of this sonnet and transforms the sense of "unprovident' "murd'rous" , "ruinate" to the opposite in a benign wish for "repair" (10.8). The Poet again in this sonnet presents the Fair-Youth with an alternative, "Shall hate be fairer lodg'd than gentle love?" (10.10). The Poet's use of the metaphor "lodg'd" links back to the Poet's use of the demonic sense of "posssess'd" (10.5) as if an evil malevolent spirit were ingrained or imprisoned in the body, head or line of descent "possess'd" by, the Fair-Youth. According to Crystal and Crystal (2002.344) "presence" signifies 'appearance, bearing, demeanour, which returns the concept of narcissism to that of the mirror-self where the superficial self-reflection of Richard's 11's mirror-self deceives him. In Richard's words, "O flatt'ring glass, / Thou dost beguile me!" Line 12 of Sonnet 10 appears to differentiate external presence or appearance from internal feeling, "or to thy self at least kind-hearted prove" (10.12). According to Duncan-Jones the external appearance of the Fair-Youth appears to be amiable in intention by contrast to the internal feeling of the Fair-Youth, which is unnatural and insensitive and suggests "fresh ornament" and the mirror-self of narcissism. The line

“Make thee an other self for love of me,” can be taken literally as produce an heir or figuratively in transform your moral character. The last line of the Sonnet reveals the Poet’s uncertainty of the enduring nature of beauty through an heir in material procreation, “that beauty still may live in thine or thee,” (10.14).

At the heart of the first Shakespearean sonnets is a symbolic fear of mortality or the transience of beauty. In Sonnet 1 this fear is metaphorically and metonymically articulated as “That thereby beauty’s *Rose* might never die,” (1.2), in Sonnet 2, “Where all the treasure of thy lusty days;” (2.6), in Sonnet 3, “ “Or who is he so fond will be the tomb, / Of his self-love to stop posterity?” (3.7-8). The fear of the brevity of the life is voiced in Sonnet 4 as, “Nature’s bequest gives nothing but doth lend, / And being frank she lends to those are free:” (4.3-4), and finally in Sonnet 10 the Poet concerns himself with hate as it destroys love when experienced in relationship. On the one hand the Fair Youth is loved by others “Grant if thou wilt, thou art beloved of many,” (10.3), whilst on the other hand, “But that thou none lov’st is most evident.” This fear of loss or mortality is experienced by the Poet as anxiety which takes the form of recrimination against the Fair-Youth for his self-serving self-sufficiency, “self-substantial fuel” (1.6), his gluttony, “Pity the world, or else this glutton be,” (1. 13), and his negligence, “Then being ask’d, where all thy beauty lies / To say within thine own deep-sunken eyes” (2.7). Furthermore the Poet reproaches the Fair Youth for his refusal to marry “Disdains the tillage of thy husbandry?” (3.6) and for using his own beauty or sperm for his own sexual purposes, “Then beauteous niggard why dost thou abuse” (4.5). Finally the Fair-Youth’s hate towards himself is projected as hate towards others, “But that thou none lov’st is most evident:” (10.4). As afore discussed given that death is part of life, the wish for immortality appears fanciful. However, through the experience of the Poet’s poetry the wish for immortality becomes credible; whereas if the sentiments expressed had been in the form of

abstract knowledge the Poet's poetry would have seemed moralistic and intolerable. Although Narcissism manifests as self-love or hate towards others; it is a defence against loss of relationship to others,

> "When the ego assumes the features of the object, it is forcing itself, so to speak, upon the id as love-object and trying to make good the id's loss by saying; "Look, you can love me too – I am so like the object." (1923. *p.f.l.*11. 369).

Freud, writing again in the *Ego and the Id* (1923. *p.f.l.* 11. 369)[xliii] explains this indifference to the sexual object as desexualisation of libido,

> "The transformation of object-libido into narcissistic libido which thus takes place obviously implies an abandonment of sexual aims, a desexualisation – a kind of sublimation, therefore. Indeed, the question arises, and deserves careful consideration, whether this is not the universal road to sublimation". (1923.*p.f.l.* 11. 369).

In relation to his concept of *sublimation,* Freud goes on to postulate in " '*Civilized Sexual Morality and Modern Nervous Illness*' " (1908. *S.E*. 1X. 189), that in relation to human activities which have no apparent connection with sexuality but which are assumed to be motivated by the same force or energy of the sexual instinct are those which are described by Freud as *sublimated*. These are artistic creation and intellectual inquiry. In this case, the instinct is described as *sublimated* in so far as it is diverted towards a new, non-sexual aim and in so far as its objects are socially valued ones. In this way the Poet of Shakespeare's sonnets symbolically *sublimates* (1908. *S.E*. 1X, 189) his wish for the concrete immortality of beauty through the Fair-Youth's progeny to a more realistic desire for the symbolic immortality of beauty to be found in the Poet's poetry about beauty,

"When in eternal lines to time thou grow'st,
So long as men can breathe or eyes can see,
So long lives this, and this gives life to thee," (18.12-14).

Footnotes to Chap 2

I. Booth, Stephen. *Shakespeare's Sonnets.* Ed. Stephen Booth. 2000. London: Yale University Press. 1977.

II. Crystal, D. and Crystal B. *Shakespeare's Words.* London: Penguin. 2002. p. 421

III. Duncan-Jones. Katherine. *Shakespeare's Sonnets.* Ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones. 2007. London: The Arden Shakespeare. 1997.

IV. Empson, William. Chapter V11 in *Seven Types of Ambiguity.* 3rd Ed. 2004. London. Plimlico. 1930. p.193.

V. Freud, S. Lecture V1. Communication between the Two Systems in *On The Unconscious in Metapsychology: the Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1915. p 1944-198.

VI. – Fragment of an Analysis of a case of Hysteria in *A Case of Hysteria* in *Three Essays on Sexuality and other Works.* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alan Tyson and Alix Strachey. 1st Ed. 1953. Vol. V11. London. The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1901 – 1905. 3-112.

VII. – A Metapsychology of Dreams in *Metapsychology. The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: The Penguin Freud Library. 1915. p. 216—223.

VIII. - Appendix C. Words and Things in *The Unconscious in Metapsychology. The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: The Penguin Freud Library. 1915.

IX. – Beyond the Pleasure Principle in *Metapsychology The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: The Penguin Freud Library. 1915. p. 269-339.

X. – Civilized Sexual Morality in *Jensen's Gradiva and Other Works in* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alan Tyson and Alix Strachey. 1st Ed. 1959. Vol. 1X. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1908. p.189.

XI. – Considerations of Representability in *The Interpretation of Dreams.* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alan Tyson and Alix Strachey. 1st Ed. 1953. Vol. V. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1900-1901. p.344.

XII. – Femininity in *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis.* Ed. James Strachey assisted by Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 2. London. Penguin Freud Library. (1933[193]). P.143.

XIII. – *Inhibitions Symptoms and Anxiety.* Ed. Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alan Tyson and Alix Strachey. 1st Ed. 1959. Vol. XX. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1926 [1925]) p. 145.

XIV. – Instincts and their Vicissitudes in *Metapsychology The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: The Penguin Freud Library. 1915. p. 137.

XV. *Jokes and their Relation to the Unconscious.* Ed. James Strachey and Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 6. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1905.

XVI. Lecture V! Jokes, Dreams and the Unconscious in *Jokes and their Relation to the Unconscious.* Ed. James Strachey and Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 6. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1905. p. 171.

XVII. – Leonardo Da Vinci and a Memory of his Childhood in *Five Lectures on Psychoanalysis.* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alan Tyson and Alix Strachey. 1st Ed, 1960. Vol. V111. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1905. 171.

XVIII. –Leonardo Da Vinci and a Memory of his Childhood in *Five Lectures on Psychoanalysis.* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alan Tyson and Alix Strachey. 1st Ed. 1957. London: The Hogarth Press. 1910. 63-139.

XIX. - Negation in *On Metapsychology The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: The Penguin Freud Library. 1915. p.438.

XX. - On Narcissism an Introduction in *On Metapsychology The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: The Penguin Freud Library. 1915. p.59-99.

XXI. - Revision of the Theory of Dreams in *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis .* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alan Tyson and Alix Strachey.1st. Ed. 1964. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1932-1936. p.20.

XXII. – Splitting of the Ego in the Process of Defence in *An Outline of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alan Tyson and Alix Strachey. 1st Ed. 1964. Vol. XX111. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. (1940[1938]) P. 275 -279.

XXIII. – The Psychogenesis of a Case of Homosexuality in a Woman in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle, Group Psychology and Other Works.* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alan Tyson and Alix Strachey. 1st Ed. 1957. Vol. XV111. London: The Hogarth Press and Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1920. p. 145.

XXIV. – The Ego and the Super-Ego in the *Ego and the Id in On Metapsychology The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: The Penguin Freud Library. 1915. p. 369.

XXV. – The Primary and Secondary Processes in *The Interpretation of Dreams* . James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alan Tyson and Alix Strachey.1st Ed. 1953. Vol. V. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1900-1901. p. 597.

XXVI. – The Theory of the Instincts in *Part 1.* [*The Mind and its Workings*] in *An Outline of Psychoanalysis.* 1st Ed. 1964. Vol.XX111. London: Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1940[1938]). p. 148-152.

XXVII. – The Unconscious in *On Metapsychology and Other Works.* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. 1st Ed. 1957. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1914-1916.

XXVIII. – *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis.* Vol. 15-16. 1916-1917. p.128 - 129.

XXIX. – Two Principles of Mental Functioning in *On Metapsychology. The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1911. p. 40-41.

XXX. – *The Interpretation of Dreams.* Vol. 4. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alan Tyson and Alix Strachey.1st Ed. 1953. Vol. 1V. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1900. p.160.

XXXI. Hinshelwood, R. D. *A Dictionary of Kleinian Thought.* Ed. R. D. Hinshelwood. 1991. London: Free Association Books. 1989. p. 358.

XXXII. Jakobson, R. The Metaphoric and Metonymic Poles in *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader.* Ed. David Lodge and Nigel Wood. 2nd Ed. 2000. Harlow. 1988. p. 56-61.

XXXIII. Klein, M. Notes on Some Schizoid Mechanisms in *Envy and Gratitude.* 1988. London: Virago Press. 1946. p. 9-10.

XXXIV. Shakespeare, W. The Tragedy of King Richard the Second in *Shakespeare. The Complete Works.* Ed. William Montgomery, John Jowett, William

Montgomery and Stanley Wells. 2nd Ed. 2005. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Oxford Shakespeare. 2002. p.361.

XXXV. – *Shakespeare. The Complete Works and Poems in The Oxford Shakespeare.* Ed. Colin Burrow. 2008. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2002. p. 382.

Chapter 3

The Wisdom of Wit in Shakespeare's Sonnets.

Iago. "Good name in man and woman, dear my lord,
Is the immediate jewel of their souls:
Who steals my purse steals trash; 'tis something –
Nothing,
'Twas mine, 'tis his, and has been slave to thousands.
But he that filtches from me my good name
Robs me of that which not enriches him
And makes me poor indeed.

Shakespeare,W. *Oth.* Act 3.Sc.3. 160-165.

Iago in Act 3 in Shakespeare's Play *Othello*[xliv], symbolically equates honour with a person's name. Yet if the above quotation is taken literally it is a person's name that can be stolen from him. This raises a conundrum as a name is integral to a person's personality and as such cannot be stolen; yet no person is born with a name, a name is given to him; yet it becomes as fundamental to his personality as is his thumb-print. The excerpt from Othello raises the question of the legitimacy of the signifier's link with its signified that is, the link between the integrity of the physical aspect of the word as a sign or signifier and its concrete signified in the person to whom it refers and belongs. In Sonnet 135 and 136 the Poet of Shakespeare's sonnets presents his name in the form of a joke or a witty play on words and in so doing he subverts the meaning of his name and the conventional meaning of love. This subterfuge displays his wisdom in guarding the honour of his literary reputation. According to both de Saussure[xlv] and Freud[xlvi] [xlvii] there is no intrinsic existential link between the acoustic image or signifier and its signified or the interpreted word. Furthemore, it is because of the looseness of the connection between signifier and signified that meaning becomes destabilized and the same signifier as a *thing*, sign or symptom used in a different context can signify some meaning completely different. This subversion of meaning introduces ambiguity and contradiction into the reading of the Poet of Shakespeare's sonnets.

This chapter examines Sonnet 135, 136, 121 at three levels of meaning. The first is that of de Saussure[xlviii] who raises the question of the relationship between the arbitrary nature of the signifier or acoustic image or sound to the word or signified. For Saussure the signifier is the physical aspect of the word as a sign as distinct from its meaning. Freud[xlix] from a psychoanalytic perspective offers a different perspective of the same problem. Here, the conscious presentation" [interpreted word] "comprises the presentation of the *thing* or subjective visual presentation or

signifier plus the presentation of the *word* or meaning belonging to it; while the unconscious presentation is of the *thing* alone (1915.*p.f.l.*11.207). According to Freud this *vorstellung* or the subjective idea or memory of a *thing Vorstellung* is what emanates from the object or the external world and is only made conscious through its link with an interpreted *word*. Some authors such as La Planche and Pontalis (1973.205)[l] have felt justified in comparing Freud's concept of *Vorstellung* or representation with the linguistic notion of the *signifier*, which was coined by de Saussure above. The Poet in Sonnet 135 and 136 exploits this arbitrary connection between signifier and signified or *thing* and *word* in the form of a witty play on words which at the manifest level seemingly imply the name of the Poet, while at the latent level decode as sexual lust. The second level of investigation relates to the analysis of the sonnets. Freud's analysis of Jokes[li] is applied to Sonnet 135 and 136 and focuses on the 'contradiction' in language as it mirrors the contradiction within the mind between the manifest and latent interpretation of Sonnet 135 and Sonnet 136. Conversely Sonnet 121 is created out of a 'compromise' between the objectivity of the preconscious and the subjectivity of the unconscious. This compromise generates a third signified which is a composite of reality and the unconscious and which colours reality with a subjective hue. The third level of analysis relates to the contradiction between "am I" (135.3) and "I am" (121.9). This is glossed according to Winnicott's theory of "I am" in *Ego Distortion in Terms of True and False Self* (1960.140-153)[lii]. According to Lionel Bailly (209. 118-122)[liii] who interprets Jacques Lacan (1901 -1981) there is a fine line in play between pleasure and pleasure, which if crossed transforms pleasure into pain. This chapter views the Poet's wisdom in setting his overt literary self and his covert erotic voice in the form of a joke and in so doing the Poet attempts to circumvent what might have been moral reproaches by the Super-ego to his literary self. In his article on *Humour* (1927. *S.E.* 21. 165-166)[liv],

> "A joke is thus the contribution made to the comic by the unconscious. In just the same way, *humour would be the contribution made to the comic through the agency of the super-ego.*"

Freud explains this as the Super-ego in its representation as social authority figures condescendingly allowing the ego to obtain a small yield of pleasure by consoling it rather than criticizing it for the tendentious nature of the joke.

Ferdinand de Saussure (1998) divided language into two parts the signifier or acoustic image and its signified or concept. According to Saussure there is no existential link between the signifier and its signified. For Saussure, the link between the two was seen by him to be arbitrary and merely a social convention accepted by all users of a given language. Language according to Saussure has a social aspect, which enables members of the same society to use their common language faculty by collective agreement. According to de Saussure language also has an individual aspect and this feature of language shows the way the individual uses language to express personal thought. Freud on the other hand was primarily interested in the interpretation of the *signifier* or unconscious ideational representative, *Vorstellung* or *thing*. The idea or *Vorstellung* is the idea that represents the instinct or the relationship between soma or body and psyche or mind. The "idea" in Freud's theory is always the "un-thought known" (Bollas.1987.277) in unconscious and represents the subjective element or what one represents to oneself about the object. Freud in his article *Word and things* (Appendix C. 1915. *p.f.l.*11.216-223) [lv] and in his monograph on *Aphasia* (1891b)[lvi] identifies four components of the word presentation. The sound-image, the visual letter-image, the motor speech-image and the writing-image. A word is thus a complex presentation consisting of the images enumerated above. In the same way that Roman Jakobson (1998. 56-61) [lvii] identified disturbances of speech in aphasia as occurring in either the selection axis or

metaphoric pole or combination axis or metonymic pole so does Freud classify first level aphasia or verbal aphasia as the breakdown of the separate elements of the word presentation or the reading, writing and motor image components. Second order aphasia or asymbolic aphasia occurs when the association between the *word* presentation and the *thing* presentation is disturbed. The Poet of Shakespeare's sonnets takes advantage of the dissociation between the *word* and *thing*-presentation particularly in Sonnet 135 and 136 where the proper name of the Poet as aforesaid is applied to various *thing* representations and contexts with the intention of producing a witty rhetorical effect rather than the some deep meaning or signified.

Stephen Booth (1977.466-469)[lviii] writes that "Sonnets 135 and 136 are festivals of verbal ingenuity in which much of the fun derives from the grotesque lengths the speaker goes to for a maximum number and concentration of puns on *W*ill or *w*ill. At the manifest level of the poem or *signifier*, "*w*ill or *W*ill*"* signify "one's will" or "what one wishes to have or do". The words "wish" and "will" (135.1) in "thy *Wi*ll" (135.1) imply "willfulness" or "wanting one's own way". Alternatively "*Wi*ll" (135.1) becomes a proper name or the abbreviation of the Poet's name. On the other hand it may imply the name of the Poet's friend. The phrase, "thou hast thy will" (135.1) becomes a proverb recorded by Tilley's and referred to by Booth as, "wedded to one's will" (Tilley W392). Notwithstanding according to Booth the meaning of "*wi*ll"or "*W*ill " in Sonnet 135 and Sonnet 136 mean "sexual desire" or a word for both "male and female sexual organs." This transforms the *signified* or latent reading of these sonnets into a very bawdy reading.

In this chapter what is commonly referred to as the *W*ill poems or Sonnet 135 and Sonnet 136 are not seen as superficial or meaningless but in line with Winnicott's theory of *Communicating and Not Communicating Leading to a Study of Certain Opposites* (1963.187)[lix] these sonnets are seen to represent the Poet's sincere attempt to remain as "isolated" or remote as he was in the sonnets addressed to the young man where according to Fineman (1986.6-7) in ostensibly writing about the object the Poet is in fact writing about himself. By contrast in Sonnet 135 and 136 the poet does not remain concealed in the person of the Loved-object but nonetheless remains "insulated" and protected within his literary persona. Winnicott's central statement in this paper is "that every individual is an isolate and therefore the right not to communicate must be respected" (1963.186). In relation to the above quote by Winnicott the Poet of the young man sonnets (1-126) allows himself to become subsumed within the young man's invective and praise but by contrast the Poet of Sonnets 135 and 136 seemingly exposes himself by apparently at the manifest reading of the poem speaking his name overtly, "Will". He does so in the form of a joke so that this naming of himself is not taken as verifiable evidence of his personality but rather a witty way with words which covertly signifies sexual desire. Using this motive and rhetorical device the Poet as craftsman and writer, rather than as participant in the represented relationship remains isolated from the glare of social and moral condemnation that might arise from the lewd nature of the double-entendre in the play on the word "*w*ill" or "*W*ill*"*. Consequently at the manifest level of the poem the Poet appears not to insulate himself and seems to reveal himself in his name "Will" while at the latent level he cloaks what Winnicott refers to as his "true self" (1960.148) by presenting the covert meaning of his name in the form of lustful joke or play on the word Will or "*W*ill" (135.1). The appearance of "*W*ill" as his name rather than the reality of the bawdy undertone at the concealed latent level is not taken seriously but nevertheless allows the Poet to remain

insulated. Winnicott (1960. 144-148) in his article *Ego distortion in terms of the True and False Self"* writes,

> "Only the True Self can be creative and only the True Self can feel real, the existence of a False Self results in feeling unreal or a sense of futility" (1960 148).

This chapter attempts to unlock the wisdom of this strategy in the paradox presented by Winnicott in his article *Communicating and Not Communicating Leading to a Study of Certain Opposites* (1963.187). On the one hand *Wi*ll presents himself as a name but on the other an erotic joke which according to Booth represents "one universal appetitive *wi*ll or *Wi*ll uniting all lovers and the sexual organs of both sexes into himself." In this fashion *Wi*ll or *wi*ll conceals his true identity in the question he poses in the first line of Sonnet 136, "If thy soul check thee that I come so near." (136.1). In *Ego Distortion of the True and False Self* (1960. 144-148) Winnicott credits poets as people who feel intensely with a concern for truth. Winnicott writes,

> "Poet, philosophers and seers have always concerned themselves with the idea of a true self, and the betrayal of the self has been a typical example of the unacceptable….Shakespeare perhaps to avoid being smug, gathered together a bundle of truths and handed them out to us by the mouth of a crashing bore called Polonius. In this way we can take the advice:
>
> 'This above all: to thine own self be true,
> And it must follow, as the night the day,
> Thou canst not then be false to any man'" (*Ham*. Act. 1.Sc.111. 78-81).[lx]

To communicate or not to communicate presents in the artists of all kinds a dilemma (1963) which belongs to the co-existence of two trends; one is the urgent need to communicate; while the other by contrast is the still more urgent need "not be found" or to remain isolated and private. (Winnicott:1963). Given this self- contradiction in the artist the Poet in Sonnet 135 and 136 appears to solve the dilemma by presenting his name in the form of a play on words which allows his auditor to enjoy

the latent obscene trend of the above sonnets against the weight of the social pressure of censorship and the criticism of the Superego which would normally lead the artist to repress this trend in himself.

According to Freud (1905.*p.f.l.* 6. 40-44)[lxi] a joke is a playful judgment characterized by the condition that we do not ask anything of the object except the aesthetic attitude that we bring to the enjoyment of merely contemplating it. A Joke represents a rebellion against authority, a liberation from pressure" (1905. *p.f.l.* 6. 149) and therefore jokes bring forward something that is concealed or hidden. The comic is concerned with bringing into view the ugly and any form of pretense, insincerity, or hypocrisy. Accordingly this is uncovered and brought forward in the light of the comic way of looking at things (1905. *p.f.l.* 6. 44). Tendentious jokes make use of a play on words and in this way caricature and parody come about. Jokes are the arbitrary connecting or linking usually by means of verbal association of two ideas, which in some way contrast with each other. Freud identifies the characteristics of jokes as brevity, which is the outcome of the process of condensation. The process of condensation exploits the multiple use of the same word creating a double meaning or play on words. From the doubleness of meaning formed by condensation a replacement satisfaction is shaped in the in the form of a substitute satisfaction or joke. Different meanings are created often from the juxtaposition of literal or metaphorical meanings or the juxtaposition of proper names with physical things or through allusion (1905.*p.f.l.* 6. 69). The purpose of the play according to Hamlet and also of the dramatist who creates the play is "to hold as 'twere, the mirror up to nature' to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time his form and pressure" (*Ham*. Act 111 Sc. 11. 22-24). Play on words in the adult has its origins in childhood and the enjoyment in jokes as adults is that a joke is put back for a moment to the state of childhood so that once more we

gain possession of the childish source of pleasure. Children play with the sound of a homophone in different contexts. When we laugh at children's playfulness with words we are uncovering the unconscious material of jokes in the adult that has been dammed up by rational criticism in the course of intellectual development.

Freud (1905. *p.f.l.* 6.161) also comments that that the purpose in jokes is to question the nature of "truth" and jokes do this by destabilizing deeply held values and standards of morality. A variation of the Poet's playing with his name as an unfixed signifier is the Poet's playing with him name as an identity, 'Will-I-am'. This designation of him as 'Will-I-am' challenges prevailing normative assumptions about what is socially acceptable. This cratylism questions the norms that assign stability and rigid meanings to what 'truth' signifies more especially in a world where moral standards are constantly in flux. By so doing the nature of truth is destabilized. The Poet confronts the permanence and validity of moral standards in his name 'Will-I-am'. The way in which the Poet does this is in, "No, I am that I am, and they that level / At my abuses, reckon up their own," (121.9-10). In a different manifestation of this challenge the interrogative "am I" evokes the corporeality in the name of the Poet as "*W*ill "am I" (135.3). This is apparent in the first two lines of Sonnet 135 where the notion that women are sexually reticent is undermined because in the first line the reader is confronted with a determined woman who is sexually voracious, "thou hast thy *W*ill," (135.1). According to the poem the auditor is no longer dealing with fantasy or desire, but with the reality of sexual appetite. Line 3 suggests that it is not only the woman to whom the poem is addressed who is sexually insatiable but also the Poet, "More than enough am I that vex thee still,". In Sonnet 121, "No, I am that I am, and they that level" also appears to question the solidity and constancy of moral standards but here it is through the Jesuitical principle of respect for the freedom of conscience and the adoption of case by case judgment to personal moral decision,

"While in their will count bad what I think good?" (121.8). Both the sense of "I am" in Sonnet 121 and "am I" in Sonnet 135 appear to confront conventional standards of what is morally acceptable.

The latent level of both sonnets appears also to focus on and articulate the Kleinian concept of *projective identification* (1946.1-25).[lxii] Here, the subject projects on to the object or other the anti-social parts of the self that they unconsciously disown, "Which in their wills count bad what I think good?"(121.8). Alternatively, "I may be straight though they themselves be bevel / By their rank thoughts, my deed must not be shown (121. 11-12). The Poet's use of "bevel" pours the abstract Kleinian concept of *projective–identification* into a different mould as a word-picture or metaphor which is more readily grasped and identified with by the reader than the psychoanalytic concept. The Poet equates the intransitive verb "bevel" or slanting or crooked edge of the mirror with a person who is in him or herself like the bent "bevel" crooked glass at the edge of the mirror and the use of "bevel" when it refers to a person is metaphorically thought of as not "straight" or honest because the mental reflection given by the other is "bevel" in that it is not true but biased. The use of the image of a mirror equates the mirror reflection with reflective thought and gives rise to the impression of a person who reflects or reveals their own estimate of the Poet with shades of their own internal values and attitudes attached, "bevel." This metonymic substitution of part of the subject into the whole object yields a projected or a distorted image of the Poet in the same way as the "bevel" of a mirror does.

The Winnicottian perspective of "I am", in Sonnet 121 "No, I am that I am, and they that level" (121.11) and the "am I" (135.3) appears to be equally pertinent to a reading of Sonnet 135 and Sonnet 136 as it draws the Poet's various uses of his

name into one whole or integrated "*W*ill." This appears in, "Think all but one, and me in that one *W*ill." (135.14) and "Make but my name thy love, and love that still, / And then thou lov'st me for my name is *W*ill" (136. 13-14). First according to Winnicott (1962) comes "I", which includes everything else which is "not me". This can be seen in the difference between the subjectivity of the Poet in the young man series where the Poet is a participant part of the idealization or denigration of the young man as identified by Fineman (1986. 291) and the subjectivity of the "I" in "am I' and "I come so near" (136.1) in the Will sonnets and the "No, I am that I am" in Sonnet 121. According to Winnicott first comes "I am, I exist", I gather experiences and enrich myself and have an introjective and projective interaction with the "Not-Me", the actual world of shared reality,

"For why should others' false adulterate eye,
Give salutation to my sportive blood?
Or on my frailties why are frailer spies;
Which in their will count bad what I think good?" (Sonnet 121.5-8).

Winnicott continues "Add to this, "I am seen or understood to exist by someone and further add to this: I get back (as a face seen in a mirror) the evidence I need that I have been recognized as being" (1962.56-64). This interpretation of Winnicott returns to the Poet's line in Sonnet 121, "I may be straight though they themselves be bevel / By their rank thoughts, my deeds must not be shown." (121.11-12). Is the face in the mirror "straight" in that it reflects back the Poet's individuality honestly or is it bevel which mirrors the Poet's personality with a distortion or bias as in, "I may be straight though they themselves be bevel" (121.11). The summation of all the parts of within "I am" (135.3) are gathered together in the line "Think all but one, and me in that one *W*ill", or I get back (as a face seen in a mirror) the evidence I need that I have been recognized as being"

Sonnet 135 and Sonnet 136 according to Duncan-Jones (1997.384)[lxiii] develop the idea of women's sexual voracity through a play on the two meanings of "*W*ill" and "*W*ill" (136.2). The first two lines in Sonnet 135, "Who ever hath her wish, thou hast thy *W*ill, / And *W*ill to boot, and *W*ill in over-plus (135. 1-2) differentiate women into two different types. Those women who only have sexual fantasies, her "wish" from those that demand genuine sexual activity where "thou" denotes the present past, "thou hast thy *W*ill". "W" in "Will" is written in the quarto in the Stephen Booth's edition both in italics and in capitals, "Who euer hath her wifh, thou haft thy *w*ill*, /* And *W*ill too boote, and *W*ill in ouer-plus, and again in "Swear to thy blind foule that I was thy *w*ill*,"* (136.2). This implies that when "W" is written in italics and in capitals it denotes the Poet's proper name, "*W*ill". Conversely according to Booth when *"W*" refers to a common noun the "*W"* of "W" is put into small letters "*w*ill". When "*w*" is written in small letters it becomes an unfixable multifunctional signifier. As a common noun *w*ill denotes either the penis of the Poet, "thy *w*ill" or the vagina of the woman to whom the poem is addressed. By line 2 the reader's attention is drawn to the literal excess of the number of times the word *W*ill or the word *w*ill appears on the page which creates what Fineman (1986) terms, "a hearable materiality" (1986.290). This generates an embodied concrete meaning to the words, "to boot, and *w*ill in over-plus" (135.1-2). The excess of the use of the word "*W*ill" or "*w*ill" creates the impression of a very demanding suitor or persistent lover when *"W"* is capitalized or a very sexually active male or female when *"w"* is in small letters. Alternatively it becomes a fleshy and licentious metaphor for an engorged penis or enlarged vagina as a consequence of excess use or promiscuity, "Wilt thou, whose *w*ill is large and spacious, / Not once vouchsafe to hide my *w*ill in thine?" (135.5-6).

As afore written the signifier is capricious and meaning metamorphoses according to the context in which the signifier is found for instance the reader's attention is drawn to the word "am I" which is written in the interrogative form in the line "More than enough am I that vex thee still" (135.3). On the surface the change in word order does not appear significant, "More than enough am I" to the way "I am" is used in Sonnet (121.9-10), "No, I am that I am" yet its latent reading is significant and alters the tone of the meaning critically. This is apparent in Sonnet 135 because the meaning of "*w*ill" is covert as it allows for the expression of thoughts that society usually suppresses or forbids. For instance, the many "*wi*ll" or, "Wilt thou, whose *w*ill is large and spacious" creates the impression of a large amount of sexual activity within one "*Will*" or person. Or alternatively as quoted by Booth "*w*ill" can be read as a common noun in which case it denotes an enlarged female sexual organ or engorged penis.

From a Psychoanalytic perspective the psychological process involved is different in a dream from that of a joke. In a joke there is an interaction but not a *compromise* between social mores and unconscious thoughts, which leaves the *contradiction* in place between repressed forbidden thoughts and feelings and the pre-conscious morality of the Super-ego or moral conscience. Both social mores and unconscious thoughts and ideas are overt and manifest simultaneously. Jokes foreground forbidden thoughts and feelings that are normally repressed but by being shown simultaneously with permissible thought and by being set in the interrogative form "am I" (135.3) these words form a *contradiction* between hypocrisy or the hypocrisy and superficiality of manifest social respectability and covert latent licentiousness.

Burrow[lxiv] (2002.650) notes the bawdy sense of *w*ill in line 6 of Sonnet 135 as, "hide my penis in your vagina" or he takes the sense of *w*ill as signifying "unite your wishes

with mine". Line 8, "And in my *w*ill no fair acceptance shine;" introduces a double-entendre on the "William who is mine" or "the penis that is mine". The negative "no" (135.8) brings to the fore the notion that this poem is a love-suit rather than a brag or conquest of sexual prowess signified by, "thou hast thy *W*ill" (135.1). On the contrary in line 8 "*w*ill no acceptance shine:" appears to emphasize the point that the Poet implores the lady to make visible her acceptance or favourable reception of the Poet *W*ill or his *w*ill or penis, " in thine" (135.6) or her vagina. Line 9 of Sonnet 135 connects sexuality symbolically to its rightful place in nature, "The sea all water, yet receives rain still / And in abundance addeth to his store," (135. 9-10). This line echoes Orsino's comment in Twelfth Night "O spirit of love, how quick and fresh art thou / That, notwithstanding thy capacity / Receiveth as the sea, naught enters thee," (1.1.9-11).[lxv] Line 12 of Sonnet 35 appears to carry on the sense of acceptance in the metaphor of the sea, which compares the lady's enlarged sexual organ to the sea, which like the enlarged vagina goes on receiving and accommodating rain or men. The sonnet then goes on to implore the lady to accept one "*w*ill" more or one more "*W*ill", "So thou being rich in *W*ill add to thy *W*ill, / One will of mine to make thy large *W*ill more" (135.12-12). These two lines could be glossed as a mere play on the name *W*ill which raises the hypothetical question if there are two people named *W*ill because both "*W*ill" in the line are written in capitals to whom the lady imparts sexual favours or alternatively the phrase, "to make thy large *w*ill more" (135.12) or where "thy large" refers to the metaphor of the lady's accommodating vagina which in its receptivity symbolically represents the sea.

The diacope in the couplet or the repetition of a phrase which is interrupted by a few words, formed by the two no's in line 13, "Let 'no' unkind no fair beseechers kill, / Think all but one, and me in that one *W*ill." (135. 13-14) formed by the inverted commas around the first 'no' appear to imply a spoken denial 'no' in 'no' [unkind]

remark where [unkind] is interpolated. By contrast the second negative "no" appears to emphasize "no fair" rather than "no beseechers" which suggests the acceptance of many suitors rather than one suitor in the poem. The capacity of her *w*ill to accommodate "more" returns sexual appetite to its symbolic form in the sea and serves to reiterate a very passionate rather than a frigid woman in the line, "Who ever hath her wish, thou hast thy *W*ill."

The couplet of Sonnet 135 is beautiful and this harmony is created and shaped by the reversal of each line "Let no unkind, no fair beseechers kill, / Think all but one, and me in that one *W*ill." The comma after "unkind" is mirrored by the inversion of the second clause in the same line, "no beseechers kill". The same structure is repeated in line 14, "Think all but one, and me in that one *W*ill." In this way, line 13 is musically related to line 14 and together and separately they form a criss-cross structure or a chiasmus. This rhetorical device serves to relate the two lines which become associated in the mind like a lyrical chant which emphasizes the name of the poet *W*ill, as the only one.

Although Sonnet 136 appears on the manifest level designed to emotionally touch the addressee as well as the auditor to their very "soul" (136.1), it nonetheless echoes the light bawdy tropes of Sonnet 135. The noun "soul" appears to be a word that all use but all interpret differently. Duncan-Jones (1997.136) glosses it as the female sexual organ whereas Booth (1977.469-473) annotates it as the seat of intuition or one's sense of things. Knowledge seems to strike Hamlet like an epiphany, "O my prophetic soul! My Uncle!" *Ham*. (1.V.41)[lxvi]. In Crystal and Crystal (2002.409)[lxvii] soul is the driving force or the animating principle in man and they quote, "Will you with free and unconstrained soul" *Much Ado* (1.1.24) or alternatively

in *Oth.*(1.ii.3), soul becomes integrity, “My parts, my title, and my perfect soul / Shall manifest me rightly.” Finally again according to Crystal and Crystal in Sonnet 136 “soul” is glossed as real nature or essence of the lady to whom the Poet addresses his poem. “Check thee” in this sonnet implies restrain or stop me from coming so near [to your soul] as it does in *Two Gentleman of Verona* (Act. 4.3.19), “No grief ever came so near thy heart.” In this chapter, “If thy soul check thee that I come so near,” (136.1) appears to imply if I make such bold sexual advance where in [suing for your love] is interpolated. Line 2 of Sonnet 136 appears to destabilize the meaning of “soul” as it was used in line 1, “Swear to thy blind soul that I was thy *W*ill”. Again it is variously interpreted from its literal use as the soul shut up in the body to the use of “blind” as it is used in Sonnet 137, “Thou blind fool love”. (137.1). Here it appears to contradict the emotional veracity of the way “soul” was used in line 1 and seems pejorative as if the lady referred to lacks insight or is referred to by the Poet in her corporeal capacity rather than her spiritual self. The oxymoron “blind soul” appears to cancel out the meaning of insight in “soul” in the way it was used in *Ham* quoted above, which makes of the sense of the signified as insight illogical. Normally soul is accorded a spiritual transcendent significance whereas here it plunges into the opposite and becomes the essence of the female addressee’s body.

The latter sense of body rather than spirit or intuition appears to carry over into line three implying that “thy soul” (136.1&3) knows that “*W*ill” (136.2) is admitted there. Here according to Booth (1977.469-473) “soul” (36.3) refers to a woman’s soul as well as her genitals. According to Burrow (2002.652)[lxviii] some editors put commas before and after “sweet” making of it, “Thus far for love, my love-suit, sweet, fulfill.” (136.4). According to Burrow this creates an interrogative. However when read as an adjective, sweet agrees with “love-suit” (136.4). Line 5 introduces the pun on “*W*ill.” “*W*ill, *w*ill fulfill the treasure of thy love,” (136.5). According to Duncan-Jones

*W*ill and *w*ill are read both as sexual desire and as a proper name "*W*ill and in this way *W*ill and *will* become associated in the mind because –ill in *W*-ill and –ill in *w*-ill is a repetitive sound. In the same way that "treasure" (136.5) is used in Sonnet 20 so is it used in Sonnet 136 as a metaphor for the female or male genital organ rather than precious jewels as it is used in Sonnet 52, "Can bring him to his sweet up-locked treasure" (52.2). The treasure of Sonnet 136 evokes the concrete sense of the word treasure in the same way as it does in Sonnet 20, "Mine be thy love and thy love's use their treasure." (20.14). The use of "treasure" again brings this Sonnet away from the sense of "soul" as the addressee's spiritul nature or essence of the lady into the corporeal sense of the word as it is used in, "treasure of thy love" (136.5). The woman to whom the poem is addressed is wanted or made use of as a *thing* or material object for her sexual purposes in the physical sense of the word rather than in the sense of being treasured or a person who is cherished and loved. Here, the deeper question that seems to be asked in this poem, is love merely sexual appetite which has nothing whatever to do with the lofty sentiments of "soul". The adverb "near" in, "If thy soul check thee that I come so near" seems to touch on a raw social nerve which is the hypocrisy and double standards in love that are unconsciously socially lived out like the play on words heard in the double-entendre of this poem. As afore discussed jokes raise the ugly the hypocritical to the surface. Willen and Reed quoted by Booth (1977) give two related glosses to the meaning of "soul" as speak the hidden the truth and come close to the heart of the matter (cf. Lyly, *Gallathea* 3.1.1).

According to Booth line 6 of Sonnet 136 the pun on " Ay" implies either the subject of verb "fill" as it is in "I", "I fill it" or the confirmation of the verb in "Yes fill it". (136.6). Burrow comments that the argument here is that your sexual organs are like a large exchequer or treasure chest in which "things" (136.7) is glossed as penis in the same

way that “thing” is glossed in Sonnet 20, “By adding one thing to my purpose nothing.” (20.14). In Sonnet (135.12-14) the line, “Think all but one, and me in that one *w*ill” “one” converts in Sonnet (136.10) to, “I one must be”. Line (136.8-12) appears on the one hand to request the lady to physically “hold” him (136.11) or regard him as of no worth or value, “For nothing hold me”(136.11). This wish is contradicted in the second phrase of the same line, “so it please thee hold” (136.11). Booth comments on, “this hectic display of bawdy puns” where “nothing implies view me as of no consequence or worthless or a non-thing so long as you hold, “That nothing me, a something sweet to thee.” Here the play on the words “in the number” (136.9) and “nothing” escalates in tension until it reaches its climax in and becomes, “something sweet to thee.” or as an object that you consider “sweet” as opposed to valueless to you. Alternatively it could be read as an object of value to you my sweet or an object, which in your evaluation is sweet rather than a nothing to you.

The Poet plays on the sense of “nothing” which in essence means something in many of his plays as recorded by Crystal and Crystal (2002.298). Crystal and Crystal list them in *Tim* (V1.86) “Nothing brings them all things,” *Ham*. (1.V.7) “Thou dost talk nothing to me.” In King Lear Cordelia’s sense of “nothing” becomes the anguish of the whole play, “Can you make no use of nothing, nuncle” / Why no, boy, nothing can be made out of nothing” (Act 1. 4. 129-130). There is a contradiction between the way “nothing” is interpreted in Sonnet 20 and the way it is used in Sonnet 136. In Sonnet (20.12) the assertion is that nature’s addition or “thing” is useless for the Poet’s male purposes, “By adding one thing to my purpose nothing” whereas by contrast in Sonnet 136 “nothing” becomes, “something sweet to thee.” According to Booth, here the “thing” (20.12) that would be of no purpose becomes the “thing” that would be to his purpose “something.”

Through the course of this sonnet the attitude of the Poet changes to the addressee. This is typical of the emotional see-saw in the Kleinian concept of the *paranoid-depressive* vacillation where fear for the integrity of the self alternates with fear for the wholeness of the object. Initially the lady is referred to as a "blind soul" (136.2) and seen only in her sexual rather than her spiritual or personal value to the Poet, "*W*ill *w*ill fulfill the treasure of thy love, / Ay fill it full with *w*ills, and my *w*ill one," (136.5-6). This bravado or self-importance on the part of the Poet is then pricked into humility and is followed by, "one being reckon'd none". (136.8) or regard me of no consequence which in turn mutates into, "I one must be" (136.10). This emotional vacillation continues until the Poet begins to view himself rather than the lady as "nothing" (1946. 124).[lxix] This is different from the way the Poet thought of himself in Sonnet (135.14). Here *Will* saw himself as the only one, "Think all but one, and me in that one *W*ill." According to Burrow, by contrast in Sonnet 136, "one" (136.8) and "*W*ill" count for nothing, "Then in the number let me pass untold," (136.9) implies count me as nothing which suggests "therefore let me or my penis into [your vagina] surreptitiously without telling anyone or counting me as part of the tally.

Jokes are the arbitrary connecting or linking usually by means of verbal association of two ideas, which in some way contrast with one another for instance "*W*ill" and "*will*". Here lies the paradox of jokes. Jokes appear to mean something, yet they are meaningless. We attach sense to a remark that we know logically cannot have any meaning. We discover truth in jokes, which lie contrary to our experience. This is made apparent, "In things of great receipt with ease we prove, / Among a number one is reckon'd none." (136.7-8). At the manifest level of the poem Line 7 appears to mean what it says, in things of great importance or consequence which leaves the auditor waiting to hear what the truth is in this important insight only to be met by a

bathos that the importance on the face of it is meaningless, “one is reckon’d none” (136.8). At the latent level of these two lines lies the sexual meaning, “in things”(136.7). This “in things” refers to the female sexual organ whereas one thing or male sexual organ counts for nothing or is counted as a nonentity by comparison to the female organ. Previously the female was regarded or her sexual organ was referred to as “thy blind soul” (136.2) or mere body without soul. Now by contrast the female sexual organ is regarded of “great receipt” or possibly of great sexual voracity as she was viewed in Sonnet 135. According to Duncan-Jones this line returns to the metaphor of the sea in Sonnet (135.9) and connotes this line at the physical level as it refers to sexual organs of large capacity that are able receive or take in a great deal. The interpretation offered by Duncan-Jones is contradicted by the gloss given by Booth.

For Booth the line, “Among a number one is reckoned none.” is similar to the line in Sonnet 8 “Sings this to thee thou single wilt prove none.” (8.14). This “none” implies unmarried and thus without an heir. In other words the line of descent will become extinct on your death or being single (one as the numeral 1) you will turn out to be nothing (zero or the numeral 0). This proverb of women stigmatized as “none” or meaning nothing socially appears to arise from Aristotle’s Metaphysics 1080 as quoted by Booth, “And as she spake those words came somewhat neare him.. One is no number (36) mayds are nothing then..”(38). The idea that woman is an imperfect creation only made perfect by marriage to a man remained a social convention from the time of Aristotle to post World War 1. Thereafter the sense of woman being socially inferior to men began to change slowly in fits and starts in the Western World. The verb “reckon’d” (136.8) suggests both apprehended and calculated. According to Booth there appears to be an allusion to the ancient mathematical principle that one is no number or Tilley records “one as opposed to a

multitude" as proverbial (Tilley.054). Booth singles out the graphic allusion of "nothing" to zero, as "0" in its circular shape appears to be similar in shape or a symbol for female vagina. Nothing, also applies to the Poet's sense of his own insignificance, "let me pass untold" by comparison to the amount of the Addressee's lovers, which are so numerous that they cannot be counted, "let me pass untold."

Lines 9-10 introduce the contradiction between nothing and something. The motif of nothing is carried in the line "let me pass untold" whereas in line 10 this sense of nothing is reversed and becomes, "Though in thy store's account I one must be," (136.10). The phonetic sound of "account" (136.10) echoes the acoustic form cunt and is similar to the way it is understood in Sonnet 20 by Booth, "A woman's gentle heart but not acquainted" (20.3). Here the similarity in sound is 'cunt' or slang for a woman's vagina. The noun "store" (136.10) devalues people making of them into possessions and evokes the motif of "nothing." As a possession, in "thy store's account" emphasizes the corporeal nature of both men and women making of them, "nothing" (136.12) in the physical sense of the word rather than as "something" in the spiritual sense of both men and women. This echoes the contradiction between the material and the spiritual raised in the oxymoron, "blind-soul." Notwithstanding the sense of personal worthlessness is lyrically inverted to something of value by the chiasmus in line 11, "For nothing hold me so it please thee hold, / That nothing me, a something sweet to thee." (136.11-12).

The couplet of Sonnet 136 (13-14) is again formed by a chiasmus in the same way as it was in Sonnet 135 (13-14), "Make but my name thy love, and love that still," (136.13). The reversal of the structure of the line is repeated in line 14 of Sonnet 136, "And then thou lov'st me for my name is Will". Although it creates the same musical

effect as it did in Sonnet 135 in this sonnet it appears to tie up all the different senses of *W*ill or *w*ill as they have been used in both sonnets. In this way all the different senses of *W*ill and *w*ill become subsumed within the name of the Poet *W*ill. An opposing interpretation is offered by Burrow. Burrow views the use of the conjunction, "but" in, "Make but my name thy love, and love that still," (136.13) as make only my name thy love. On the other hand Booth does not emphasize the conjunction "but" in the same way as does Burrow but places his stress on the conjunctive adverb "for" (136.14) which serves to summaries or encapsulate all the different senses of *W*ill or *w*ill. According to Booth, this includes, since you love *w*ill, it follows that you must love me or find me loveable because of my *will* or my name is *W*ill – I – am. I am composed of *w*ill, I am personified by the name *W*ill.

According to Lionel Bailly (2009.118-122) [lxx] the Lacanian term "jouissance" is enjoyment of a sensation for its own sake but ironically this pleasure is linked to the death drive. Here there exists a border a place between pleasure and pain. If the boundary between pleasure and pain is crossed it leads to a sense that pleasure will transform into pain. This death drive is experienced as fear of castration or the humiliating experience of being deprived of power or the sexual experience of impotency. Freud elaborates this sense of symbolic castration in his paper *On Narcissism: An Introduction*,

> "But the revolt against the 'censoring agency' arises out of the subject's desire to liberate himself from all those influences beginning with the parental one,.. His conscience then confronts him in a regressive form as a hostile influence from without." (1914. *p.f.l.* 11. 90-91)

At the manifest level of Sonnet 135 and Sonnet 136 is a sense of the Poet merely playing with the sound of his own name. At the covert unconscious latent level is the

Poet playing with his name as a metaphor or symbol of his sexual organ or sexual self where *W*ill becomes personified as his sexual identity. At the concealed level of the sonnet the Poet seditiously attempts to seduce the addressee to whom the poem is written and excite her sexually. The lady on hearing the words of the poem addressed to her is expected to become aware of the speaker's excitement and as result to be become sexually excited in turn. The latent aim is to expose. In an attempt to seduce her, the Poet uses various sexually charged puns on *w*ill or *W*ill in an endeavour to seduce her and to entice her to imagine the parts of the body of the Poet or the procedure in question and show her that he too is imagining her parts (Freud, S. 1905. *p.f.l.* 6. 141). This view expressed by Freud is comparable to the latent play on the word *W*ill and *w*ill in the two sonnets above. The question becomes how does what is conceivably only in its symbolic aesthetic sense amusement between Poet and addressee transform into psychic pain.

The Poet as discussed above appears to be saying in Sonnet 121 that people project onto others what they in themselves repudiate or disavow, "No, I am that I am and they that level / At my abuses, reckon up their own," (121.9-10). In relation to this perceived and predicted projection in Sonnet 135 and Sonnet 136 the Poet appears to use his wisdom in placing his erotic voice at the manifest level of the poem in the form of a joke where it is aesthetically and contemplated as pure enjoyment rather than being seen for what it is as the expression of a thought provoking idea about the nature of love. Covertly on the other hand the question being asked in these sonnets is there a discrepancy between the idealized normative view of love and love as it is experienced and lived. Alternatively is there as contradiction between the way love 'should be" and the way it is experienced by the Poet 'it is not'. This dissonance is apparent in sonnet 147 where love becomes a "fever longing still," (147.1). In Sonnet 148 the Poet questions his own capacity to love, "O how can love's eye be

true, / That is so vex'd with watching and with tears?" (148.9). By contrast in Sonnet 50 the Poet begins to see the love-object as a seductress who lures him away from his own known self, "Who taught thee how to make me love thee more, / The more I hear and see just cause of hate," (50.9). In Sonnet 151, the Poet appears to come to the conclusion that love is merely sexual appetite,

For thou betraying me, I do betray
My nobler part to my gross body's treason,
My soul doth tell my body that he may,
Triumph in love, flesh stays no farther reason,
But rising at thy name doth point out thee
As his triumphant prize, proud of his pride,
He is contented thy poor drudge to be
To stand in thy affairs, fall by thy side.
No want of conscience hold it that I call,
Her love, for whose dear love I rise and fall." Sonnet 151. 5-18.

In Sonnet 135 and Sonnet 136 what lies covert is the Poet's attitude to women. "So thou being rich in *w*ill add to thy *w*ill add to thy *w*ill / One will of mine, to make thy large *w*ill more." (135.11-12). The manifest reading of the sonnet implies that women are sexually voracious. Notwithstanding at the latent level the Poet associates women's wombs with the unconscious meaning of the sea, "The sea all water, yet receives rain still," (135.9) where it becomes a metaphor of life with all its regenerative powers and where the waves crashing against the shore and receding again become an unconscious symbol for sexual union and the life it produces. In Sonnet 136 the female addressee is disparagingly represented as a "blind soul" (136.2), a body without a soul without insight without personality whose suitors in her mind count as non-entities "For nothing hold me" (136.11). Alternatively her suitors or the number of the times she has intercourse are so numerous they to her become un-countable, "In things of great receipt with ease we prove / Among a number one is

reckoned none" (136.7-8) yet only a few lines later the Poet says of himself "That nothing me,' (136.12). In his wisdom the Poet returns the pejorative latent projection of sexual insatiability back onto his own self and in so doing re-presents the allusion to the sea of the woman as a bountiful life force in the same way as the Poet saw in nature, "And being frank she lends to those are free," (4.4.)

Civilization and higher education have a large influence in the development of repression and it is supposed that under such conditions the psychical organization undergoes an alteration as a result of which what was formerly felt as agreeable now seems unacceptable. This sense of the unacceptable is formed by a fear of castration in its symbolic sense of humiliation or made to feel powerless or sexually impotent and the wish is rejected with all possible psychical force. The task of dream formation is to overcome the inhibition from the censorship, which dominates daytime life and it is precisely this task, which is solved by jokes. Jokes like dreams make use of the same unconscious processes. The superficial difference between dreams and jokes is that the joker is fully aware. He is not isolated from the external world and as such does not enjoy the same narcissism or egotism as does the dreamer nor do the processes involved in constructing a dream regress to perception and therefore a joke never becomes an hallucinatory experience as does the dream. By contrast to dreams the capacity to make jokes develops at the stage of play that is during the stage of childhood. Here pleasure is taken in the sound of words for their own sake more especially when words are placed in their incorrect contexts. The anti-stasis or repetition of a word in contrary senses like the use of *W*ill as a proper name and *w*ill as a verb or *w*ill as a common noun destabilizes formal syntax and in adults this childish pleasure is put back momentarily to the infantile type of thought activity.

Both dreams and jokes make use of unconscious thought processes, but whereas the dream makes use of the day's residues or thoughts that are left active in the preconscious which are used to construct a dream in the sleeper; "jokes in the first person are formed by a preconscious thought being given over for a moment to unconscious revision and the outcome of this is at once grasped by conscious perception" (Freud, 1905. *p.f.l.* 6. 223). Although jokes are similar to the making of a judgement or an objection the judgement in a joke is covert. According to Freud,

> "A joke has quite outstandingly the characteristic of being a notion that has occurred to us involuntarily" (1905.224).

It is a sudden release of intellectual tension and then all of a sudden a joke is there. Jokes can be compared to analogy or allusion where allusion and analogy occur without being able to follow the preparatory thought. Condensation in the dreamer compresses the qualities and images of different people together in order to create a symbolic theme, trope or dream scenario. Conversely jokes plays on the multiple uses of the same word, similarity of sound and in this way a yield of pleasure is produced. Displacement or metonymy is the same in both dreams and jokes. Displacement selects ideas, which are remote from the objectionable idea for instance in the sonnets above the objectionable idea is the male and female sexual organs. Jokes relocate the objectionable idea onto innocuous ideas wishes or desires, "If thy soul check thee that I come so near" (136.1) and "Who ever hath her wish, thou hast thy *W*ill," (135.1). In this way the offensive idea "*w*ill" as it represents the sexual organs of both sexes becomes quite capable of evading the censor by seemingly fitting the name of the Poet, "*W*ill" yet at the same time remaining derivatives of the unpalatable idea *w*ill or sexual organ in the unconscious. Alternatively the idea of the female genital organ becomes represented by an

allusion to the sea, which consciously like the sea “receives rain still”((135.9), but unconsciously represents sexual intercourse. However, under the pressure of the censor the primary process of dream work exploit any form of connection which can be formed by contiguity, similarity or similarity in sound. In *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* (*S.E.* 6. 58)[lxxi] Freud writes,

> “A similarity of any sort between two elements of the unconscious material – a similarity between the things themselves or between their verbal presentation – is taken as an opportunity for creating a third, which is a composite or compromise idea.”

The difference between dreams and jokes according to Freud (1905. *p.f.l.* 6. 230),

> “is that jokes usually respect the limits imposed on their employment in conscious thinking. Furthermore jokes unlike dreams do not create compromises between the day’s residue or reality and unconscious thought processes. Nor do they attempt to evade the censor. They do however insist on maintaining play with words or with nonsense unaltered. Nothing distinguishes jokes more clearly from all other psychical structures than the double-sidedness and duplicity in speech”,

like “*W*ill” and “*wll.*”

This chapter has raised the question of the link between the signifier and signified and foregrounded the argument that there is no existential connection between the acoustic image or signifier and its signified or the interpreted word. It is the looseness of this connection between the signifier and signified that allows the Poet of Shakespeare’s sonnets in his wisdom to exploit the flexibility between the signifier and its meaning and in this way the Poet evades the invective to his literary persona. The Poet does this by manifestly playing with his name and latently playing with his name in the form of an erotic rhetorical joke. Jokes like dreams are part of unconscious reasoning or personalized psychic truth. This was foregrounded by the Winnicottian paradigm of the *True and False Self* above. This psychic truth in the

latent meaning of Sonnet 135 and Sonnet 136 destabilizes the conventional nature of the idealization of love and the denigratory attitude to women that prevailed at that time. The Poet by playing with his name in the form of a witty play on words or pun displays his wisdom in evading the moral condemnation of the Super-ego which would have morally censured the sonnets if their sexual themes had been overtly exhibited.

Footnotes Chap. 3.

I. Bailly, Lionel. *Lacan.* Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2009. 118-122

II. Barthes, R. Death of an Author in *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader.* 2nd Ed. 2000. Harlow: Longman. 1988.

III. Booth, Stephen. *Shakespeare's Sonnets.* 2000. Yale: Yale University Press. 1977.

IV. Crystal, D. and Crystal, B. *Shakespeare's Sonnets. A Glossary & Language Companion.* London: Penguin Books. 2002. 4009.

V. De Saussure, Ferdinand. The Object of Study in *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader.* Ed. David Lodge and Nigel Wood. Harlow: Longman. 1988. p. 2-10.

VI. Duncan-Jones, K. *Shakespeare's Sonnets.* Ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones 2007. London: The Arden Shakespeare. 1997.

VII. Edmundson, P. and Wells, S. The Critical Reception of Shakespeare's Sonnets in *Shakespeare's Sonnets.* Oxford. Oxford University Press. 2004. p.133.

VIII. Fineman, Joel. *Shakespeare's Perjured Eye.* California: University of California Press. 1986.

IX. Freud, S. "Antithetical Meanings of Primal Words in *Five Lectures on Psychoanalysis. Leonardo da Vinci and Other Works.* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud assisted by Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. Trans. James Strachey. 1st Ed.1957. Vol X1. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1910 153-163.

X. – Appendix C. Words and Things in *On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. Angela Richard. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol 11. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1915. 216-22.

XI. – *Jokes and their Relation to the Unconscious*. Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 6. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1905.

XII. – Lecture V11 Assessment of the Unconscious in *The Unconscious in On Metapsychology. The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. Angela Richards. Trans James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1915. p.207.

XIII. – *On Aphasia*. New York: International University Press. 1891.

XIV. – *The Interpretation of Dreams.* 1991. Vol. 4. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1900a.

XV. – Humour in the *Future of an Illusion in Civilization and Its Discontents and Other Works.* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with James Strachey, Anna Freud, Alan Tyson, Alix Strachey. 2001. Vol. XX1. London: Vintage. The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Pschoanalysis. 1927. p.165 -166.

XVI. – *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life.* Ed. James Strachey. Trans. Alan Tyson. 1st Ed. 1960. Vol V1. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis.. 1901. p 58.

XVII. Jakobson, R. The Metaphoric and Metonymic Poles in *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader.* 2nd Ed. David Lodge and Nigel Wood. 2nd Ed. 2000. Harlow: Longmans. 1988. p 56-61.

XVIII. - The Metaphoric and Metonymic Poles in *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader.* 2nd Ed. David Lodge and Nigel Wood. 2nd Ed. 2000. Harlow: Longmans. 1988. p 31-56

XIX. Klein, M. Notes on Some Schizoid Mechanisms in *Envy and Gratitude and Other Works.* 1988. London: Virago Press. 1946. 1-25.

XX. La Planche, J. and Pontalis, J-D. Ideational Representative in *the language of Psychoanalysis.* 1988. London: Karnac. 1973. p 205.

XXI. Shakespeare, W. *The Oxford Shakespeare. The Complete Works and Poems.* Ed. John Jowett, William Montgomery, Gary Taylor and Stanley Wells. 2nd Ed. 2008. The Clarendon Press. 1600- 16001.

XXII. – The Tragedy of Hamlet in *The Oxford Shakespeare. The Complete Works and Poems.* Ed. John Jowett, William Montgomery, Gary Taylor and Stanley Wells. 2nd Ed. 2008. The Clarendon Press. 1600 – 16001. p. 41.

XXIII. – The Tragedy of Hamlet in *The Oxford Shakespeare. The Complete Works and Poems.* Ed. John Jowett, William Montgomery, Gary Taylor and Stanley Wells. 2nd Ed. 2008. The Clarendon Press. 1600 – 16001. p. 681 -719.

XXIV. – The Tragedy of Othello, The Moor of Venice in the *The Oxford Shakespeare. The Complete Works and Poems.* Ed. John Jowett, William Montgomery, Gary Taylor and Stanley Wells. 2nd Ed. 2008. The Clarendon Press. 1600 – 16001. p. 873-909.

XXV. – *The Oxford Shakespeare. The Complete Works and Poems.* Ed. John Jowett, William Montgomery, Gary Taylor and Stanley Wells. 2nd Ed. 2008. The Clarendon Press. 1600 – 16001. p. 681-719.

XXVI. – *The Oxford Shakespeare. The Complete Sonnets and Poems.* Ed. Colin Burrow. 208. Oxford.

XXVII. Winnicott, D.W. The Location of Cultural Experience in *Playing and Reality.* 2nd Ed. 1974. London Penguin Books. 1971. p. 112-122.

XXVIII. Winnicott, D. W. Communicating and Not Communicating Leading to a Study of Certain Opposites in *Maturational Processes and the Facilitating Environment.* 2nd Ed. 1990. London: Karnac. 1963. p.179-193.

XXIX. – Ego Distortion in Terms of the True and False Self in *Maturational Processes and the Facilitating Environment.* 2nd Ed. 1990. London: Karnac. 1963. P. 140-153.

Chapter 4

Transience and Loss

“When I consider everything that grows
Holds in perfection but a little moment.”

(Sonnet 15. 1-2)

Joseph Pequinqney[lxxii] nominates love as the subject of Shakespeare's sonnets. It could also be said that the theme of Shakespeare's sonnets is beauty. Although I agree that many of the themes of Shakespeare's sonnets are about both beauty and love in this chapter I question the notion that the sonnets address love and beauty in an unambiguous certain or clear way. Rather this chapter views the description of love and beauty presented by the Poet of Shakespeare's sonnets as equivocal and contradictory. This is evident in Sonnet 17 and 18 where the beauty of the love object cannot in itself be described because it is found to be above comparison. In Sonnet 17, "Who will believe my verse in time to come" (17.1) and "Shall I compare thee to a Summer's day? / Thou art more lovely and more temperate:" (18.1-2). Here the Poet attempts to describe the beauty of the Loved-object but fails because the Loved-object is found to be matchless. Notwithstanding, the sonnets do appear to tell a story of the proneness to decay of all that is beautiful and perfect and the Poet's despondency and impotence in not being able to capture all the loveliness in both art and nature before it is destroyed by those instruments of ruin and annihilation like time, insincerity, nature, human rage and human and natural destruction.

This chapter examines sonnets, 64, 91, 146, 30, 31 and 60. Sonnet 64 and 91 are studied in terms of Freud's theory *On Transience.*[lxxiii] In Sonnet 146, the Poet describes the contradiction between the false and artificial beauty of the body's materialism as opposed to the soul's truth and morality and this is explored in terms of Winnicott's theory of the *True and False self.*[lxxiv] In Sonnet 30 and 31 the Poet describes the forlorn state of grieving for the lost object and this is understood through Freud's theory of *Mourning and Melancholia,*[lxxv] and *Analysis Terminable Interminable*[lxxvi] where Freud understands that if the reason for the loss is not comprehended the loss is repeated. In Sonnet 64, the Poet describes a pessimistic

determined view of the world where nature is transient love is futile and human endeavour pointless. Sonnet 91 appears to accentuate the difference between the value of material possession or artifice as opposed to emotional love. Unlike material possession love is experienced as ephemeral as it cannot be possessed because it is a feeling, which can only be preserved when held mutually. This reliance on another renders love vulnerable to deception betrayal and transience. In Sonnet 146, the Poet implies that beauty is distorted and misrepresented and portrayed as a false external signifier rather than internal veracity or truth. In this sonnet the soul or internal truth is represented as perishing under the weight of the body's materialistic avarice. Sonnet 30 and 31 bring to the fore the difference between the Freudian concept of mourning and that of melancholia. Whereas mourning is the reaction to loss where the world is experienced as becoming poorer, melancholia is a loss to the ego where the ego itself becomes impoverished. The chapter concludes by appraising Sonnet 60. In the couplet of this sonnet the Poet appears to accept loss and the transience of beauty with a sense of optimistic expectation that the beauty of his verse will survive the destruction by man and nature. This suggests an awareness that his unique use of metaphor and metonymy will serve to empower his poetry with a personal truth and it is this that will immortalize his sonnets.

Freud elaborates the notion of transience in an essay of the same name (1916.*p.f.l.* 14. 291-294).[lxxvii] Freud in the company of two artists on a walk in the summer is dismayed when one of the artists cannot enjoy the surrounding beauty because of the fleeting nature of beauty in itself. Freud by contrast repudiates this sentiment writing that evanescence of beauty rather than terminating enjoyment heightens it, "As regards, the beauty of Nature, each time it is destroyed by winter it comes again next year so that in relation to the length of our lives it can in fact be regarded as

eternal" . This sentiment is contrary to that expressed by the Poet in sonnets 64, 91, 146, 30, 31 and 60 and in Sonnet 12. In these sonnets the Poet writes of the transience of concrete beauty, "And nothing 'gainst Time's scythe can make defence" (12.13). Freud maintains a different view of concrete immortality,

> "A time may indeed come when pictures and statues which we admire today will crumble to dust or a race of men may follow us who no longer understand the works of our poets and thinkers, or a geological epoch may even arrive when all animate life upon the earth ceases; but since the value of this beauty and perfection is determined only by its significance for our own emotional lives, it has no need to survive us and is therefore independent of absolute duration" (1916.*p.f.l.* 14. 288).

By contrast the Poet of Shakespeare's sonnets expresses the fragility of beauty, "How with this rage shall beauty hold a plea, / Whose action is no stronger than a flower?" (64.3-4) and again in Sonnet 55, "When wasteful war shall *Statues* overturn, / And broils root out the work of masonry" (55.5-6). The First World War broke out a year after this walk was taken. Freud writes (1916.*p.f.l.* 14 .289) that

> "It destroyed not only the beauty of the country-sides through which it passed and the works of art which it met with on its path but it also shattered our pride in the achievements of our civilization, our admiration for many philosophers and artists and our hopes of a final triumph over the differences between nations and races."

Ironically rather than feeling destroyed Freud found that,

> "our affection for those nearest us and our pride in what is common to us have suddenly grown stronger" (1916.*p.f.l.* 14. 289-290).

Freud concludes that this is because what was precious has proved not to be lasting and therefore mourning, "however painful it may be comes to a spontaneous end." Freud deduced that mourning ends because the, "libido or capacity to love is once

again freed-up and able to replace the lost object by fresh ones equally loved or still more precious." Freud draws the essay to a close "We shall build up again all that war has destroyed, and perhaps on firmer ground and more lastingly than before."

By contrast to the optimism in the cycle of devastation and renewal expressed by Freud above each quatrain in sonnet 64 begins with an anaphora "When I have seen." The repetition of the phrase "When I have seen" colours the poem with a sense of pessimism, which is derived from the Poet's past experience of acquisition and loss or creating and destroying. This see-saw or swing from possession to deprivation serves to make the Poet anticipate loss, "But weep to have, that which it fears to lose" (64.14). Reversals pervade this sonnet, which emphasize the powerlessness of human endeavour against the dominance of nature. This is evident in the Poet's description of building up of "Lofty towers" (64.3) which through the use of oxymoron reverse to the opposite creating a sense of the impotence of human enterprise in "down razed" (64.3), "outworn" (64.2) "buried age" (64.2). The chiasmus derived from the reversal of the word order in the second phrase to the first appears to emphasize the cycle of fortune to loss and loss to fortune by mirroring it in the structure of the line of verse on the page, "Increasing store with loss, and loss with store". This serves to encapsulate the inverted sense of ownership, which over-turns possession into deficit. This have and have-not world is created by metaphors of competition between the land described as "shore"(64.6) and "firm soil"(64.7) which is undermined and sunk by the personification of the sea as ambitious "..hungry Ocean" (64.6) which the Poet describes as "gain advantage" (64.6) and the "wa'try main"(64.7). These oxymoron serve to accentuate the sense of human defenselessness against the powerful omnipotent destroyer of Nature and Time. The paradox where loss is increased rather than diminished by store is carried into the third quatrain in "interchange of state" (64.9). Here the "state itself" (64.9) is

"confounded, to decay," (6410). Crystal and Crystal[lxxviii] cite a line from *KJ* 1V.ii.29 where "confounded" is glossed as "mar, corrupt and spoil." The lines from King John, emphasize, the sense of perfect beauty being destroyed by human envy rather than loss caused by natural, "decay" (64.9). "When workmen strive to do better than well / They do confound their skill in covetousness" *KJ* (1V.ii.29).

The sense of spoil in the noun "Ruin" (64.11) suggests destruction of something that was previously whole and perfect before it was destroyed and wrecked through human negligence or envy in "ruinate." "Ruinate" makes use of the same vowel sounds as "Ruin" and this introduces a similar note of human neglect, which allows beauty to decay through lack of frugal management as in Sonnet 10, "Seeking that beauteous roof to ruinate"(10.7). An alternative interpretation of "ruinate" is glossed as ruminate in the quarto reading and works more effectively as the verb ruminate appears to cohere with line 12-14 of Sonnet 64, "Ruin hath taught me thus to ruminate" as it appears to give credence to love's impotence against the powerful destructive force in both man and nature which pervades this poem in the metaphor of "brass eternal" (64.4). Brass is connected to slave as both are beaten; yet brass is a durable metal and this sense of resilience is contrasted to the vulnerability of a slave who is beaten into submission by an enraged master "mortal rage" (64.4). Ironically it is the slave like the brass that survives destruction "eternal slave" (64.4) which possibly lends credulity to man's destructive brutality to others which survives and endures beyond the destruction of civilizations in "buried age" (64.2), or high buildings "down razed (64.3)". The sense of man's rivalry and need to dominate is personified in nature in metaphors like, "hungry Ocean gain / Advantage on" (64.5-6) and "interchange of state" (64.9) which underscore the competition between the sea and land and the rivalry between man and man. The sense of "interchange of state," creates a sense of insecurity of nameless identity where even states are

interchangeable and able to substitute one for the other as if each state had no fixed identity or individuality in time or place.

In the face of this wanton neglect, devastation and decay the couplet, expresses the Poet's feeling of impotence and helplessness in not being able to maintain love or beauty, "This thought is as a death which cannot choose / But weep to have, that which it fears to lose." The poem leaves the reader with a sense of fear of the transience of beauty and love and of possession, "weep to have" (64.14) because 'having' by default entails loss. In this sonnet the Poet describes a world that is determined. Lack of choice to do other than repeat loss appears to underscore the transience of beauty and the futility of love and human endeavour.

Sonnet 91 opens with what sounds like a nursery rhyme or chant. The anaphora or the repetition of a word or phrase at the beginning of successive lines is comparable to 3Henry (V1.2.5.26-38)[lxxix] repetitive phrase of "How many" and "So many" as he counts out the hours and minutes. Likewise, mock bravado in opens Sonnet 91. The pronoun, "Some" (91.1) begins each line of the first quatrain. "Some glory" (91.1) and "Some in their wealth" (91.2) and "Some in their garments" (91.3) and finally "Some in their "Hawks and Hounds" (91.4). The metaphors chosen by the Poet are concrete and can be visualized as the artifices or signifiers of what appears to "Some" (91.1-4) to be wealth. The poet's reference to "Humour" (91.5) recalls the way it was used by the Poet in Sonnets 44 and 45 where the Poet refers to the imbalance of his four humours of blood phlegm, melancholy and choler in, "My life being made of four, with two alone, / Sinks down to death, oppress'd with melancholy." (45.7-8). According to Colin **Burrow** writing in the Oxford Shakespeare (2002.562)[lxxx] the sense of "humour" (91.4) is broader in Sonnet 91, implying that each type of person

has their own peculiar pursuit according to that person's disposition as determined by the relative balance of that person's four humours. In line 7 of Sonnet 91 the Poet differentiates himself from others by referring to these signifiers of wealth expressed in the first quatrain as, "But these particulars are not my measure" (91.7). Booth writing in (1977. 297-298)[lxxxi] argues whether "better" in line (91.8) should rather be read as it is in the Quarto edition of Shakespeare's sonnets as "bitter." The sense of "bitter" rather than "better" serves to elaborate the meaning of "my measure" in line 7 creating a link with the speaker's ageing and impending death as expressed in sonnets 63, 71, 73 and 81, "No longer mourn for me when I am dead, / From this vile world with vildest worms to dwell:" (71.1-2).

Line 1-4 and line 9-11 of Sonnet 91 embody the outward signifiers of prosperity in the signifiers of prosperity in "high birth" "wealth" "garments cost" but line 10 belittles and diminishes these signifiers of affluence into the childish toys that are found in the nursery. The repetition of the consonant of "Hawks" "horses" "hounds" (91.4) creates a sense of playthings by joining the repetitive hard consonant "h" to a simplistic end rhyme formed by "me" (91.9) and "be" (91.11). This rhetorical strategy makes the contrast between "wealth" and "high birth" appear puerile when contrasted to the "wealth" (91.2) or significance of "Thy love" (91.9). The movement from the pretense and the affectation of external tokens of love to internal sincerity in "Thy love" in line 9 advances the question chosen in this chapter of the evanescence of love. The irony in this sonnet is that the human emotion of love can be taken away, "All this away," (91.14) leaving the Poet as worthless, "wretched make" (91.14) and humble deprived of "all men's pride" more so than if the Poet had lost the external concrete signifiers of wealth as designated in the first quatrain as "birth", "skill", "wealth", "body's force", "garments", "hawks" "hounds" and "horse" which according to the Poet are not "my measure" (91.11).

The irony between external materialism and social flattery in comparison to the significance of internal wealth, and sincerity is clarified in Sonnet 91. This deliberate deception is again highlighted in Sonnet 125, “Have I not seen dwellers on form and favour / Lose all.“ (125.5-6). In Sonnet 91 the Poet appears to accentuate the difference between a material possession or artifice which in this sonnet is more durable than emotional love which in Sonnet 91 is depicted as brief, “..That thou mayst take, / All this away,” (91.13-14). Unlike material possession love cannot be possessed because it is a feeling, which can only be conserved when held mutually. This reliance on another “But mutual render, “only me for thee.” (125.12), renders the Lover vulnerable and love open to deception and betrayal which makes love easily lost “..a true soul / When most impeach’d, stands least in they control” (125.12) and again in, “Or mine eyes seeing this, say this is not, / To put fair truth upon so foul a face,”(137.11-12). Love and hate are two sides of the same coin and this same sense of the fallibility and shortcomings of love re-appears in Sonnet 90 and Sonnet 92 and serves to underscore the fleeting and transient nature of having love and losing it that the Poet fears, “All this away.” Sonnet 90 opens with the line, “Then hate me when thou wilt, if ever, now,” whereas Sonnet 92 highlights the transience of love, when it is dependent on an erratic or fickle lover, “I see, a better state to me belongs” / Than that, which on thy humour doth depend.” (92.7-8).

Whereas some sonnets proffer earthly qualities of beauty and love, Sonnet 146 appears to preference the endurance of moral richness over earthly avariciousness. According to Booth (1977. 501-517)[lxxxii] the poem’s theme cannot be set into terms of the alternatives of either as opposed to or but should be interpreted in terms of “both” “and” “is also.” This sonnet is not understood in terms of religion but in terms of the

transience of false external signifiers of beauty as opposed to the durability of those qualities of internal authenticity as designated in the beauty of the Loved-object, “And him as for a map doth Nature store, / To show false Art what beauty was of yore.” (68.13-14). The soul according to Crystal and Crystal (2002.409) is the “driving force, or animating principle and can be viewed in the same light as it is in Sonnet 136, “If thy soul check thee that I come so near” (136.1) as “conscience”, “heart”, “inner being”. According to Booth (1977. 501-517) the soul is depicted as the centre of the body in the same way that it is portrayed in King John (3.3.20-21), “Within this wall of flesh / There is a soul counts thee her creditor” and here once again in Hamlet, “I will find / Where truth is hid, though it were hid indeed / Within the centre” (*Ham* 11.ii.156-158).

In Sonnet 146 the conflict between the transience and loss of beauty is transferred from the external world to the conflict within the arena of the body and the soul. In the first quatrain of Sonnet 146 the body’s false signifiers of external beauty “my sinful earth” (146.1) rather than the soul’s internal sincerity “within be fed” (146.13) is favoured. The body in Sonnet 146 is portrayed as, “these rebel powers” (146.2) which lure the soul away from its proper “charge” (146.8) of authenticity which here is viewed as the enduring quality of veracity as it is portrayed in “Let me not to the marriage of true minds” (Sonnet 116.1). According to Booth these “rebel powers” (146.2) pose a paradox, which symbolically represent the whole poem. The “rebel powers” are the body, which besiege the soul allowing it to “pine” (146.3) and “suffer dearth”(146.3). Booth forms a literal view of the body and views it as forming the outward shell of the soul, which serves as the soul’s protector “thy outward walls ” (146.4) and “mansion” (146.6).

The abject or “Poor soul” (146.1) on the other hand is represented as “pines within” (146.3) and suffering “dearth.” The word “dearth” carries two opposing meanings. One is read as “scarcity” in the same way as it is depicted in Sonnet (14. 4), “Of plagues, of dearths, or season’s quality” whilst the other sense of “dearth” implies the opposite “costliness, high value” as it in *Hamlet* (V.ii.117) [Hamlet to Osrick, of Leartes], “His infusion of such dearth and rareness” (Crystal and Crystal 2002.116). The contrast between the body’s opulence and the soul’s languish is questioned by the Poet, “Why so large cost having so short a lease / Dost thou upon thy fading mansion spend?” (146.5-6). This sense of cost is understood in terms of previous sonnets. The “large cost” can be viewed in terms of the material external signifiers of abundance and prosperity with which the body arrays itself, “… some in their body’s force” / Some in the garments though new-fangled ill” (91.2-3). Alternatively “large cost” (146.5) can refer to the “large cost” to the soul of the body at the expense of the soul which is allowed to hunger and “pine within” contrariwise to the portrayal of the body’s, “Painting thy outwards walls so costly gay” (146.4). What the Poet appears again to be implying in this sonnet is that beauty is again misrepresented and portrayed as an external signifier rather than internal veracity, “But as the Marigold at the sun’s eye, / And in themselves their pride lies buried,” (25.6).

The sense of outward cost, “outward walls so costly gay” and inward “dearth” is made to appear absurd in the light of the body’s short tenure on life, “Why so large cost, having so short a lease”. The term “lease” (146.5) is understood to be the span of life where life is not owned but merely on loan to the soul or rented out making both the soul and the body’s tenure on earth transient, “Shall worms inheritors of this excess / Eat up thy charge?” (146.7-8). The paradox of large cost as opposed to short tenure suggests the Poet’s use of a similar paradox in line two of Sonnet 64, “The rich proud cost of outworn buried age” (64.2). This irrationality underwrites the

sense of futility of bodily or earthly expense, on the body's "fading mansion spend?" The misguided and foolish waste is again highlighted in line (146.8) only in this line the blame and guilt is reversed and now falls to the soul who this time is rebuked for neglecting its rightful "charge" or responsibility, which here is viewed as virtue and morality and which supersedes the bodies greed of earthly signifiers of wealth. This laxity on the part of the soul permits the body to embellish itself at the expense of the soul's rightful "charge" or responsibility, which is "within be fed"(146.13). According to Colin Burrows (2002.672) the implied loss reverses the predatory relationship, with which the poem started: now the body is placed subordinate to the soul. This reversal of roles underscores the inter-dependence of the soul and body.

The rhetorical question, "Is this thy body's end?" opens the question of whether "thy.. end?" (146.9) is addressed to the soul "thy end" or the body. The partial phrase "thy end" (146. 9) introduces the inter-dependence of body and soul because the soul is within the body and the soul by default is implicated in the wasted time and worthless material, "hours of dross" that is consumed by the body. The alternative offered to the soul is "Buy terms divine" which according to Burrows finds an echo of the biblical, "lay up treasure for yourself in heaven, where neither the moth nor canker corrupteth and where thieves neither dig nor steal." The use of the verb "Buy" implies purchase and this poses a conundrum as to the values embodied in this poem as "Buy" (146.12) serves to equate earthly acquisitions with the procurement of **spiritual or non-physical part of the person which holds** belief as if they were both the same. Neither is earned through hard work and both can be purchased. The choice offered to the soul by the Poet, "Within be fed, without be rich no more:" (146.12) appears to be either that the soul continues to live off "thy servant's" (146.10) or thy body's "loss" which will only "aggravate" (146.11) and add to its weight and magnify or increase its load, "thy store" (146.11) or "burden" (Crystal and Crystal 2002.12). Or, alternatively

the soul by contrast to the body's materialistic avarice can choose to, "Within be fed," on abstract ethical and moral values.

The couplet is one of profound depression "So shalt thou feed on death, that feeds on men." This line can be viewed as returning to the meaning imbued in line 14 of Sonnet 1 where the Narcissist's "glutton" (1.13) "To eat the world's due, by the grave and thee" (1.14) ironically serves to destroy the beauty of love-object rather immortalizing it through progeny. The tacit understanding of line 14 of Sonnet 146, "So shalt thou feed on death, that feeds on men," is glossed as a life where the sole meaning is derived from external signifiers of wealth, "Then soul live thou upon thy servant's loss," (146.11). This type of life according to the Poet is experienced as already dead, or a life without meaning where " death that feeds on men," (146.14). This life mutates from a life of significance where the soul is mindful of its "charge" into a life without inner importance or value, "Shall worms inheritors of this excess / Eat up thy charge ?" (146.7-8). Death feeds on such a life as such a life life is already dead or without vitality or a "soul" whilst living. This view is corroborated in the sense of "death once dead" (146.14). This sense of a double-death or an inner and an outer, physical or external death suggests the first quatrain where the body is privileged over the soul "pine" . This materialism over spiritualism creates a sense of spiritual deadness or what Winnicott refers to as "not feeling real" (Winnicott, D.W. 1963. 179-193)[lxxxiii].

The body is described as the "rebel" and as "sinful earth," that entices the soul away from its proper function "thy charge?" Here virtue is viewed as the soul's charge in, "Within be fed." The body's, "Painting thy walls so costly gay" is death to the soul and this feeling of outside "gay" and inner poverty is re-visited in Sonnet (66. 3), "And

needy Nothing trimmed in jollity,". The oxymoron "needy nothing" implies the irony that although destitute poverty requires no succor or "nothing" (66.3). The causticness of the oxymoron "needy nothing"(66.3) is further intensified when set into the line "trimmed in jollity." This ironically portrays inner poverty as a "beggar born" (66.2) camouflaged by external ornamentation. This same sense of external gay and internal dearth is repeated in Sonnet 146 where it is glossed as similar to that of the deception of the inner starving soul within the outer luxuriously adorned body. This sham creates a sense of inner-deadness to the experience of being alive, "And death once dead," appears here to signify that of not being animated or being emotionally and spiritually dead while physically living. Once the body is actually dead, "there's no more dying then." (146.14) as the body and the soul are portrayed in Sonnet 146 as inter-dependent; the soul needs the body in order to exist within; whilst the body needs the soul "thy charge" (146.8) to master it, "Shall worms inheritors of this excess / Eat up thy charge ? / Is this thy body's end?"

According to Winnicott (1963.184)[lxxxiv] "communication belonging to the false self does not feel real because it is detached or split-off from the true self or split off from the "soul" (146.1) and therefore there is no communication with "subjective objects" that is those subjective feelings thoughts and ideas which belong to the *True Self*. Not feeling real, "is not a true communication because it does not involve the core of the self, that which could be called the *"true self*" (1963.184). Winnicott writing in *Playing and Reality* (1971. 76-100)[lxxxv] notes, "it is creative apperception more than anything else that makes the individual feel that life is worth living." For Winnicott creative apperception implies an infant who develops from the centre of gravity and is therefore lodged in the kernel of his own sense of self. This implies that the infant's perception of reality is inflected by subjectivity; it is subjectively significant. This

according to Winnicott lends meaning to life and makes living worthwhile (1971. 65)[lxxxvi].

In Sonnet 30 the Poet apparently mourns the loss of ideals, “lack of many a thing I sought” (30.3) and the loss of “precious friends” (30.6). The question becomes are Sonnets 30 and 31 a description of mourning or melancholia or depression because in the poem the lost-loved objects of Sonnet 30 appear not to be permanently lost because the old lost love is merely transferred to a new object in Sonnet 31, “Their images I lov’d, I view in thee,” (31.13). Freud in his lecture *Mourning and Melancholia* (1917. *p.f.l.* 11.245-269)[lxxxvii] writes that mourning for a lost object is a natural condition. Mourning can be for the loss of a loved person, one’s country, one’s liberty, or an ideal. Freud differentiates the work of mourning from melancholia in

> “that mourning is the reaction to the loss of a loved object, which comes to a spontaneous end because the libido or capacity to love is once again freed-up and fresh objects equally loved or still more precious can replace the lost object.”

By contrast, melancholia is a loss to the ego of a more ideal kind. In melancholia this takes the form of a narcissistic injury as a result of being jilted or a loss of an ideal. What has been lost in mourning is known and therefore conscious, but in melancholia what has been lost is unconscious or unknown. However the same work of mourning or grieving over the lost object is common to them both,

> “Then can I grieve at grievances foregone,
> And heavily from woe to woe tell o’er
> The sad account of fore-bemoaned moan” (Sonnet 30.9-11)

By contrast to mourning the work of grieving absorbs the melancholic entirely as it lowers his self-regard, which makes him feel that his ego or sense of self has been

impoverished. In melancholia, the ego itself has become empty and suffers impoverishment. Conversely in mourning it is the world that has become poorer.

Booth (1977.181.183), Duncan-Jones(1997.170) [lxxxviii] and Burrow (2002.440) all gloss "sessions" in line one of Sonnet 30 as referring to the periodic sittings of judges in a law court. The reference to judges in law courts is pertinent to this poem because it suggests the Poet is ruminating on his current experience of loss in the light of his past experience of loss. Freud (1923) viewed the super-ego's role in relation to the ego as that of a judge or a censor. In this way conscience, self-observation and the formation of ideals become part of the function of the Super-ego. In the second line of Sonnet 30 the Poet makes use of the verb "summon up." This is germane as the essence of memory is that it is not currently available but can only be summoned up or evoked by a loss in current life that arouses the memory of the lost object of the same or similar ilk of the past. The two losses although different feel the same and are experienced in the same way, "I summon up remembrance of things past,"(30.2). Freud (1895.7) [lxxxix] writes "Hysterics suffer mainly from reminiscences" and this sense of unconscious recollection is made tangible in the verb "Summon up" as it explains the preoccupation of the hysteric with the signifiers of the unconscious or what Freud termed "*Vorstellung"* or the "Ideational Representative"[xc].

The ideational representative differs from a linguistic representation in that a linguistic representation is conscious whereas an ideational representative like a signifier or the manifest dream or work of art is an unconscious symbol and requires understanding to be consciously known. ***Vorstellung*** or ideational representative involves all those memories feelings and ideas that originally emanated from the

object within the external world, which the mourner unconsciously represents to himself within the internal world. It is these unconscious *thing presentations*, which are past but are projected in current life on to the object in the present, which makes the past and present object feel the same and be experienced in the same manner. The paradox of “old woes new wail” epitomizes the sense of the equation of the past in the present as for the mourner, they are both felt as the same loss, “old woes new wail my dear time’s waste:” (30.4).

In line 6, the loss is experienced as “lack” (30.3) of “precious friends”. Here, the sense of “lack” is experienced as a narcissistic blow or hole in the Poet’s own sense of well-being caused by the loss of expectation or loss of ideals, “the lack of many a thing I sought.” However in line 6 of Sonnet 30 the loss becomes the loss of “precious friends.” This loss of “precious friends” rather than causing a hole in the ego as it does in melancholia “the lack of many a thing I sought,” this loss is caused by missing people or “precious friends.” The loss of precious friends becomes a hole in the world where the loved-object is missing whereas the loss of ideals causes a hole in the self. In this sonnet then, the Poet in the first 8 lines of the sonnet describes a repetitive loss of two types. One is of melancholia where the “lack” is of the loss of expectation and the loss is within him; the other reveals the work of mourning for a lost love object, which is repeatedly mourned in “death’s dateless night.” The sense of time does not exist in the unconscious as timelessness characterize the unconscious which makes different times merge and coexist in one dream or poem, “dateless.”

The adjective “dear” refers to the cost of the wasted time rather than “dear” or cherished “time” (30.4). The parenthesis around “unus’d to flow” (30.5) in preference

to being an after-thought or a digression serves to accentuate that the Poet does not consciously allow himself to squander time in lost expectation because of the “dear” (30.4) or expense of the cost of time. The visual metaphor, “drown” (30.5) creates a picture of a gush of tears from an eye that is “(unus’d to flow)” drowning in the heavy flow of its own tears. The sense of “drown an eye” followed by “unus’d to flow” which is set in parenthesis, “(unus’d to flow)” seems to suggest interpolating the reason for “flow” which because of the parenthesis makes the reason understood by the reader as one of self-conscious embarrassment, (unus’d to flow). This self-consciousness on the part of the Poet reinforces the melancholic’s sense of self-criticism or self-recrimination that the Poet appears to express that he only has himself to blame for the loss, “And moan th’expense of many a vanished sight.” (30.8). It is his own self-pity, which causes his eye to drown in its own tears. The choice of the verb “hid” serves to qualify the sense that the friends cannot be found, they are “hid” or obscured from sight in daylight but “hid’ in “death’s dateless night.” The sense of “dateless” reinforces the sense of repetition, in “dateless” or no fixed time, which is strengthened by the effect of the alliteration in “death’s dateless night”. The alliteration of the consonant “d” in “dateless” and “death” serves to emphasize the repetitive nature of the emotional rather than the actual experience of “death” which if it were an actual “death” it would occur only once and not be repeated. This sense of recurrence is repeated in the end rhyme “night”, which although opposite rhymes with “sight” (30.8). This serves to enhance the rhetorical technique of alliteration and assonance draws these two rhymed opposites together making of them the same repetitive “vanished sight” (30.8). The sight that within the night vanishes in day-light “mourn the loss” is repeated in the dark of the following night which underscores the sense that the loss is not an actual loss of a friend but loss through repetitive betrayal, rejection or desertion of not one friend or ideal but many. Line 6 portrays the body as preoccupied by loss.

As aforesaid it is this recurrence of loss to the ego, which transforms the work of mourning into a melancholia as described by Freud (1917) above. The juxtaposition of night and death in Sonnet 30 evokes Sonnet 73 “Death’s second self that seals up all in rest.” (73.8). Both sonnets suggest the night-dream when the awareness of the day and reality-testing is eliminated. Mourning is differentiated from melancholia because in mourning daylight and “reality testing” reveal that the loved-object no longer exists, “objects shall have been lost which once brought real satisfaction.” (1925. *p.f.l.* 11. 440). Freud writing in *Mourning and Melancholia* writes that,

> the work of mourning differs from that of melancholia because it shows that the loved-object no longer exists. “Reality demands that all libido should be withdrawn from the love object.”

In the first 8 lines the Poet describes his loss. In line 9 the mood of the sonnet changes with the conjunctive adverb, “Then” (30.9). “Then” introduces the reader to the Poet’s practical experience of the loss. The Poet explains the repetitive memory of lost expectation in, “many things I sought” (146.3) and the “precious friends” (30.6) that return as if in a dream at night. “Then can I grieve at grievances foregone,” (30.9.). ”Foregone” according to Crystal and Crystal (2002.183) 146.9) signifies carried out in the past and “..tell, o’re / “The sad account of fore-bemoaned moan”(146. 10-11). “Fore-bemoaned” again according to Crystal and Crystal (2002.183) is interpreted as previously lamented. The Poet’s sense of, “new pay as if not paid before” (30.12) re-iterates the repetitive theme of this sonnet in “remembrance of things past” which are repeated in the present “And weep afresh love’s long since cancell’d woe.” Freud (1917) comments that in melancholia

> "Reality demands that all libido should be withdrawn from the love-object. This demand of reality results in opposition from the Ego and this opposition takes the form of a renewed clinging to the object." The Ego prolongs the process of mourning by constantly thinking about the loss. "Each single one of the memories and expectation in which the libido is bound to the object is brought up and hyper-cathected" (Freud 1917).

Freud's words above can be applied to an interpretation of the Poet's pre-occupation with loss, which is expressed as, "Which I new pay as if not paid before" (30.12) "And weep afresh love's long since cancelled woe," (30.8).

The couplet of Sonnet 29 creates the same reversion to the opposite to the first three quatrains of the sonnet as it does in Sonnet 30. This reversal to the opposite acts as form of negation, which can be glossed as cancelling the envy out of sonnet 29 or withdrawing the mourning of Sonnet 30. The envy expressed in Sonnet 29 is evident in line 4, "Wishing me like to one more rich in hope, / Featur'd like him, like him with friends possess'd," (29.5-6). This envy is negated in the couplet of Sonnet 29, "For thy sweet love rememb'red such wealth brings, / That then I scorn to change my state with Kings."(29.13-14). In Sonnet 30 the same rhetorical maneuver prevails, "But if the while I think on thee (dear friend) / All losses are restor'd, and sorrows end." (30.13-14). The negation of the envy in Sonnet 29 and the negation of mourning of Sonnet 30 emphasizes that the envy or mourning of the previous night is annulled and it is for this reason that it has not been understood or mourned and let go of that the sense of loss or envy persists and returns the following night. A different interpretation emphasizes the ambiguity of the last line of Sonnet 30. The words "dear friend" (30.13) are set in parenthesis. The question raised is does this parenthesis mark a departure from the topic of mourning, or is it an after-thought or a satirical aside which points to a latent resentment on the part of the Poet towards the lost friend for forsaking him.

On the one hand there is the wish is to mourn the loss of the loved-object and on the other hand the wish is the opposite; that the loved-object was still present in the life of the Poet. This sense of loss is further complicated by the resentment the Poet feels towards the lost loved-object in line 12, “Which I new pay as if not paid before.” This suggests the Poet’s negative feelings of resentment or hostility towards the loved-object because the object has abandoned him. The above instances of mixed emotions makes of the mourning in Sonnet 30, a melancholia where the experience of loss rather than the actual loss is repeated and the Poet unconsciously becomes pre-occupied by loss and in so doing prevents himself from moving on from the past loss, “Then can I drown an eye (unus’d to flow).”

Freud in *Analysis Terminable Interminable* writes, “**Objects that are lost** cannot be replaced”[xci]. In the light of this assertion by Freud, Sonnet 31 could be thought of as a defence against loss as what appears to have been lost in Sonnet 30 is not lost but merely replaced by transferring the same love towards the lost object onto a new different object, which replaces the old lost objects of Sonnet 30,

> “Thy bosom is endeared with all hearts,
> Which I by lacking have supposed dead,
> And there reigns Love and all Love’s loving parts,
> And all those friends which I thought buried. (31. 1-4).

In quatrain 2 of Sonnet 31 the Poet appears to express a sense of resentment at the time spent in the “holy and obsequious tear” of a mourner who pays-out “interest” or spends time in a proper regard in the ritual for the dead. The time spent seems to imply that the dead demand a penance, “interest of the dead” (31.7). This sense of

advantage gained by the dead over the living is expressed in the sense of servile duty that is undertaken by the mourner, “holy and obsequious tear” (31.4). Alternatively “interest” or a valid claim on the Poet (Crystal and Crystal 2002.243) can signify that even though the Poet has turned his attention away from the buried loves of Sonnet 30 he has only managed to transfer the same old love onto a new object, “But things remov’d that hidden in thee lie” (31.8) and further in, “Thou art the grave where buried love doth live”. In this way the old-claim of the old Loved-object remains operative in the new object. The loved-objects rather than being hidden in “death’s dateless night” as they were in Sonnet 30 now are “hidden” (31.8) in “thee” or in the “bosom” of a new loved-object.

There is a shift in the mood of the poem from one of resentment expressed in quatrain two to that of triumph over the dead, “Hung with the trophies” (31.9) in quatrain three. Now, the new-loved object becomes the “grave where buried love doth live” (31.9). The paradox of “buried love” doth “live” points to the irrationality of mourning the loss of the living. This illogicality is inherent in melancholia where the dead are not lost but resurrected in a new emotionally alive object. This same sentiment is expressed in Sonnet 68 line 8, “To live a second life on second head,” (68.8). Line 10 of Sonnet 31 is ambiguous. The question becomes do the tokens of victory or “trophies” (31.10) belong to the “lover’s gone,” (31.10) or to the Poet? All “their parts” (31.11) appear to be metonymically displaced and condensed and transferred onto the new Love-object, “thee did give,” (31.9-10). The metonymic substitution of parts for the whole emphasizes the paranoid narcissistic loss to the Poet’s own ego “parts of me” (31.11) rather than the depressive anxiety of fear or concern for the loss of the whole loved-object. Freud’s paper *On Transference* [xcii] is applied to the understanding of this metonymic displacement of part of the object for the whole object in Sonnet 31. What has been transferred is not the memory of the

whole past Loved-object, rather it is “but all their parts of me.” These parts referred to by the Poet and made sense of through Freud’s theory *On Transference* (*S.E.* V11.116) are “new editions or facsimiles of the impulses and phantasies which are aroused and made conscious” in the new relationship… but they have this peculiarity, which is characteristic of their species, that they replace some earlier person by the person” of the new loved-object.”

In this way, “all hearts, / Which I by lacking have supposed dead….But things remov’d that hidden in thee lie.” (31.1-2 and 31.8), becomes credible. Parts of the new loved-object in the day’s residues of current life establish a connection with parts of the old lost love object of past life in the preconscious. Parts of the old love metonymically transfer their cathexis or emotional intensity onto the new object, making the two different objects feel the same and be experienced in the same way and in this way the lost object is emotionally replaced.

There is a new shift in the couplet of the poem from the fear of the loss to the Poet’s own Ego outlined in the first three quatrains of Sonnet 31 to the concern that the object will be lost in the couplet of Sonnet 31. The condensation of “Their Images” implies, “For Precious friends hid in death’s dateless night,” which are re-found or re-duplicated “in thee” (31.13) and are viewed by the Poet as neither new nor old, “And thou (all they)” (31.14). The quarto’s setting of “(all they)” in parenthesis highlights that condensation should not be looked on as a summary or aggregate of parts of the old love object which are subsumed within the new loved-object “I view in thee,” but each part of the old loved object represents an identified element or part of the lost object in the unconscious associative chain. Each element or “(all they)” where “all” is an identified part of the lost love object or lost objects in relation to the Poet, “Who

all their parts of me to thee did give." Each part has its own meaning and cannot be submerged or subsumed within a different person. The old love object retains "parts" its identity in the new object as "interest of the dead,"(31.2).

Sonnet 31 by contrast to Sonnet 30 introduces a note of what Klein called depressive anxiety (1935. 262-290). [xciii] This traces a change in the predominant anxiety from dread of persecution or fear of loss to the ego to fear that hate or resentment by the Ego towards the lost object or in this instance the Poet in Sonnet 31 to past Loved-object "As interest of the dead, which now appear, / But things remov'd that hidden in thee lie" has done actual harm to the loved object and that the object has been lost and the object has gone. The emotion shifts in each quatrain of sonnet 31. The first quatrain evokes a sense of melancholy "And all those friends which I thought buried", whilst the second quatrain stirs with a note of resentment towards the lost loved-objects "Interest of the dead" and "stol'n from mine eye." The third quatrain proclaims a note of triumph in, "trophies of my lover's gone" or triumph over the dead whereas the Poet turns his attention back to the past love objects in "(all they)" in the couplet (31.14).

Sonnet 31 brings about an actualization of the past in the present. In *Analysis Terminable and Interminable* Freud writes that the,

> "Compulsion to repeat" is a process arising in the unconscious. The subject deliberately places himself in a distressing situation, thereby repeating an old experience but he does not recall this prototype on the contrary he has the strong impression that the situation is fully determined by the circumstances of the moment".

Freud continues, that,

> "A thing which has not been understood inevitably re-appears like an un-laid ghost. It cannot rest until the mystery has been solved and the spell is broken." (1937. S.E. XX111. 79-80).

Sonnet 30 and 31 appear to re-enact this *compulsion to repeat* "And weep afresh love's long since cancell'd woe, / And moan th'expense of many a vanish'd sight." The repetitive lost relationship is transferred onto a new object because the reason for the loss has not been understood.

In Sonnet 60 the Poet of Shakespeare's sonnets makes use of the unconscious primary processes of condensation and displacement or metaphor and metonymy to create a sense of perpetual loss by mimicking through the structure of his verse the rhythms of the coming-in and going-out of the sea-tides. The tides are metonymically linked to the mechanical ticking of time and this ticking away of time is likened to the processes of human life and death, which like the sea and the mechanisms of clock tick "all forwards do contend." (60.4) yet, ironically ebb life away. The analogical reasoning which links the similarities between the different objects of the sea and time to life and death like metaphor enlarges the reader's comprehension of both this sonnet and of their own lives.

Line one of Sonnet 60 begins with a simile. "Like as" (60.1). The trochee in line1 formed by the adverb "towards" momentarily holds the steady rhythm of iambic pentameter of the first line "make towards the pebbled shore," (60.1). This temporary freezing of the movement of the verse imitates the visual metaphor of the freezing of the wave at its height before it breaks and rolls "towards" (60.1) the shore. The metaphor of birth and death is taken up in line 2 of Sonnet 60, "So do our minutes hasten to their end." The phrase "hasten to their end" captures not only the rhythm of the wave as it reduces in size from its height but it accurately represents time as

the seconds tick away into “minutes” (60.2). A similar sense of the high and low in life’s journey is echoed in Sonnet 7. Here it is the sun which is likened to a man at the height of his power “from highmost pitch” (7.9) who like the sun descends “to his low tract” (7.12) and is “outgoing” (7.13) in his ”noon”(7.13). In Sonnet 60, the progression of human life is seen to be like the wave which with the increasing speed “hasten to their end” (60.2) or death. By contrast to Booth (1977.239) who writes that “waves do not exchange places with one another”, here, a deeper meaning is sought which is more in line with Winnicott in *The Location of Cultural Experience* (1971.112)[xciv]. Winnicott writes

> “When I first became a Freudian I *knew* what it meant. The sea and the shore represented endless intercourse between man and woman, and the child emerged from this union to have a brief moment” [“towards”](60.1) “before becoming in turn adult or parent and then old-age and death.”

This life-cycle and woman’s receptive place in it is referred to in chapter 3 in relation to the sea which like a woman’s womb receives, “The sea all water, yet receives rain still” (135.9).

Ironically the sonnet is numbered “60” almost as if it were a representation of the 60 minutes within the hour or the 60 seconds within a minute. Each wave “in sequent toil” (60.4) like each minute can never be re-lived, re-captured or re-taken, “And time that gave, doth now his gift confound.” (60.8). The use of “sequent” according to Crystal and Crystal (2002.392) creates a sense of following or attendant on the other which is apt if the meaning of human action like the wave is determined by the action or wave that proceeded it.

Birth or “nativity” with its sense of opportunity is metaphorically compared to the great expanse of the sea “once in the main of main of light,” (60.5). This sense of **this supremacy.** is comparable to the way it is figured in Sonnet (80.8), “But since your worth (wide as the Ocean is).” The representation of the infant pictured crawling or going at slow pace “all forwards” as it “Crawls to maturity” (60.6) is apposite because the picture fuses or condenses the infant’s movement with time which is experienced as going slowly in youth “Crawls” before the infant’s journey is thwarted by “eclipses” (60.7). In Sonnet (107.5) “eclipse” is figuratively used to represent both the woman’s menstrual cycle through the month and the Moon’s passage through the month, which in this sonnet represents peace, “The mortall Moone hath her eclipfe indur’de” (107.8). By contrast “eclipses” as it is used in Sonnet 60 are “crooked” which according to Crystal and Crystal (2002.108) signifies a malignant, perverse astronomical influence which thwarts man’s accomplishment “being crowned” (60.6) and frustrates man’s attempt at achievement “gainst his glory fight” (60.7).

Quatrain three personifies “Time” (60.9) as it does in Sonnet 19 “Devouring time” (19.1) as the destroyer, which in Sonnet 60 metaphorically stabs at the healthy glow in the “flourish” (60.9) of youth’s brow. “Transfix” (60.9) adds a note of shock to the violence and destruction of youth. “Time” is transformed from a benign presence as depicted in the first quatrain, “In Sequent toil all forwards do contend” to metaphorically wounding youth immobilizing it in the verb “Transfix” or piercing it as it “delves’ (60.10) or digs the wrinkles which like corresponding worry lines “parallels” (60.10) form in beauty’s brow. “Time” is once again personified as gluttonous “Feeds on the rarities of nature’s truth.” (60.11). Here “rarities” according to Crystal and Crystal (2002.362) signifies exceptional qualities. In line 11 “Time” is metaphorically represented almost as if it were nourishing itself on youth rather than enabling youth

as it does in line 4 to go " all forwards" towards "maturity" in "being crowned." By line twelve, "Time" (60.9) has metamorphosed into a "scythe" (60.9), which brutally cuts down life in "mow." (60.12).

The couplet by contrast to the metaphors of despair, helplessness, transience and loss figured in the first three quatrains of Sonnet 60, offers the very human quality of "hope" (60.13). Here, "hope" is coupled with the Poet's verse. This sense of "hope" is given special importance in the conjunctive adverb "And Yet" in spite of everything, "my verse shall stand" (60.13). The pronoun "thy" is left indefinite for the auditor to project his or her own sense of praise into. The sense of "And Yet" almost appears to give a sense of the Poet's acceptance rather than negation of both transience and Loss. The Poet appears to be saying in this sonnet that in spite of the brevity, fragility, deceit, destruction and violence to love and beauty, "my verse shall stand / Praising thy worth, despite his cruel hand. " (60.13-14).

Freud understood that consciousness or awareness was inextricably bound up with language. Making the unconscious conscious was in his *Meta-psychological papers* presented as the difference between *thing presentation* and *word presentation* (Freud, 1923). *Thing presentations* or the un-named known or un-comprehended characterize the unconscious system whereas *word presentations* characterize the system conscious. In other words, where signifier is no longer unconscious but is indistinguishable from its signified and is made conscious through the interpreted *word.* Through the sonnets above the Poet of Shakespeare's sonnets has allowed the reader into his own organization of personal associations and recollections of transience and loss causing them to resonate and interact with the reader's own. The metaphors used in the sonnets above, which relate to transience and loss are

not about the immediate future or about-to-have. They are about the past present, having had and losing what has been had, “But weep to have, that which it fears to lose.”(64.14). **The Poet’s ingenuity** in re-presenting what has been lost or *thing presentations* through the consciousness of the language of his poetry is a way of averting future loss. The loss through metaphor and metonymy has been made conscious and therefore has been understood. The *word* is conscious and in being conscious there is no longer a need to compulsively repeat what remains unconscious as the *thing* because it has been understood through the metaphor or word. “Where id was there shall ego be.” (Freud. *S.E.*XX11.80).

Footnotes Chap 4.

I. Bailly, Lionel. *Lacan.* Oxford: Oneworld Publications. 2009.

II. Barthes, R. Death of an Author in *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader.* 2nd Ed. 2000. Harlow. Longman. 1988. p 145-146.

III. Booth, Stephen. *Shakespeare's Sonnets.* Edited with Analytic Commentary by Stephen Booth. 2000. Yale. Yale University Press. 1977.

IV. Burrow, Colin. *William Shakespeare. The Complete Sonnets and Poems.* Oxford University Press. 2002.

V. Crystal, D. and Crystal, B. *Shakespeare's Words. A Glossary and Language Companion.* London: Penguin Books. 2002. p. 4009.

VI. Crystal, D. and Crystal, B. *Shakespeare's Words. A Glossary and Language Companion.* London: Penguin Books. 2002. p. 93.

VII. de Saussure, Ferdinand. The Object of Study in *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader.* Ed. David Lodge and Nigel Wood. Harlow: Longman. 1988. p. 1-10.

VIII. Duncan-Jones, K. *Shakespeare's Sonnets.* Ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones. 2007. London: The Arden Shakespeare. 1997.

IX. Edmundson, P. and Wells, S. The Critical Reception of the Sonnets in *Shakespeare's Sonnets.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2004. p.133.

X. Empson, D. W. Chapter V11 in *Seven Types of Ambiguity.* 2004. London: Plimlico. 1930. p. 130.

XI. Fineman, J. *Shakespeare's Perjured Eye.* California: California University Press. 1986.

XII. Freud, S. Analysis Terminable and Interminable in *Moses and Monotheism. An Outline to Psychoanalysis and Other Works.* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alan Tyson, Alix Strachey. Trans. James Strachey. 2001. Vol XX111. London: The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1937 -1939. p. 209 -255.

XIII. – Antithetical Meaning of Primal Words in *Five Lectures on Psychoanalysis, Leonardo da Vinci and Other Works.* Ed. James Strachey in collaboration with Anna Freud assisted by Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. Trans. James Strachey. 1st Ed. 1957. Vol. X1. London: The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psychoanalysis.. 1910. p. 153-163.

XIV. – Appendix C. Word and Things in On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis. Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1915. p. 216-222.

XV. – *Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious.* Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 6. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1905.

XVI. – Lectures V111 Assessment of the Unconscious in *The Unconscious in On Metapsychology. The Theory of Psychoanalysis. The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1915. p. 207.

XVII. – Lecture XXV11 On Transference in *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis. Parts 1 and 2.* Ed James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud. Assisted by Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. 1st ed. 1963. Vol. XV. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis.. 1915 – 1917. p. 80.

XVIII. – Lecture XXX1 Dissection of the Personality in *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis and Other Works.* Trans. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud. Assisted by Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. 1964. Vol XX11. London: The Hogarth Press in Collaboration with the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1933. p. 80.

XIX. – Mourning and Melancholia in *On Metapsychology. The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: Penguin Freud Library. (1915[1917]). p. 245 -269.

XX. *On Aphasia.* New York. International University Press. 1891.

XXI. On Transience in *Art and Literature.* Ed. Albert Dickson. Trans. James Strachey. 1990. Vol. 14. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1916 [1917]). p.283 -291.

XXII. – *The Interpretation of Dreams.* 1991. Vol 4. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1900a.

XXIII. – Two Principles of Mental Functioning in *On Metapsychology. The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1911. p. 41-42.

XXIV. – Conscious and Unconscious in On *Metapsychology. The Theory Of Psychoanalysis.*Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1923. p. 396.

XXV. Freud, S. Breuer, J. *Studies in Hysteria. 1991. Vol 3.* London: Penguin Freud Library. 1893 – 1895. p. 7.

XXVI. Freud, S. Humour in *The Future of an Illusion in Civilization and its Discontents and Other Works.* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alan Tyson, Alix Strachey. 2001. Vol. XX1. London: Vintage. The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1927. p. 165-166.

XXVII. – *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life.* Ed. James Strachey. Trans. Alan Tyson. 1st Ed. 1960. Vol V1. London: The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1901. p. 58.

XXVIII. Jakobson, R. The Metaphoric and Metonymic Poles in *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader. Second Edition.* Ed. David Lodge and Nigel Wood. 2nd. Ed. 2000. Harlow: Longmans. 1988. p. 56-61.

XXIX. Klein, M. A Contribution to Manic Depressive States in *Love, Guilt and Reparation.* 1988. London: Vintage. 1935. p. 1-25.

XXX. Klein, M. Notes on Some Schizoid Mechanisms in *Envy and Gratitude. 2nd. Edition.* 1975. London: Virago Press. 1946.

XXXI. La Planche, J. and Pontalis, J-D. Ideational Representative in *The Language of Psychoanalysis.* London: Karnac. 1988. p. 244 -205.

XXXII. Pequigney, Joseph. *A Study of Shakespeare's Sonnets.* London: The University of Chicago Press. 1985.

XXXIII. Shakespeare, W. *The Oxford Shakespeare. The Complete Sonnets and Poems.* Ed. John Jowett, William Montgomery, Gary Taylor, Stanley Wells. 2nd Edition. 2008. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2002.

XXXIV. – The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark. Ed. Gary Taylor, John Jowett, William Montgomery, Stanley Wells. 2nd Edition. 2005. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1600- 1601. p. 681-719.

XXXV. – The Tragedy of Othello. The Moor of Venice. Ed. John Jowett, William Montgomery, Gary Taylor, Stanley Wells. 2nd. Edition. 2005. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1986.

XXXVI. – The Oxford Shakespeare. *The Complete Sonnets and Poems.* Ed. Colin Burrow. 2008. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2002.

XXXVII. – The Tragedy of Richard Duke of York and the Good King Henry Sixth in *The Oxford Shakespeare. The Complete Works.* Ed.William Montgomery, John Jowett, Gary Taylor, Stanley Wells. 2005. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1591. p. 104.

XXXVIII. Winnicott, D. W. Creativity and its Origins in *Playing and Reality.* 1974. London: Penguin Books. 1971. p. 65.

XXXIX. Winnicott, D. W. The Location of Cultural Experience in *Playing and Reality.* 2nd Edition.1974. London: Penguin Books, 1971.

XL. – Communicating and Not Communicating Leading to a Study of Certain Opposites in *Maturational Processes and the Facilitating Environment.* 2nd Edition. 1990. London: Karnac. 1963. p. 179-193.

XLI. – Ego Distortion in Terms of the True and False Self in *Maturational Processes and the Facilitating Environment.* 1990. London: Karnac Books. 1960. p. 140-153.

Chapter 5

"…love is not love"
Sonnet 116. 2.

This thesis has presented the view that the Poet of Shakespeare's sonnets both in his plays and in his sonnets offers a view of life as it is lived as opposed to an idealized view of life as it 'should be' or we would like it to be lived. The Shakespearean sonnets present a view of life that is equivocal, inconsistent, and self-contradictory and this is because ambivalence indecision and self-doubt corresponds to the way life is experienced in the real world.

Socially, small closed communities where meaning is shared no longer constitute the contemporary world; rather the contemporary world includes a polarity of cultures, social groups, and even people within one closed social community all of whom hold divergent viewpoints and meanings even of the same thing. The irreconcilable differences even within one social and historical context serves to challenge the concept that meaning is created either by the syntactic, historical or social context in which a word falls. Likewise Dollimore and Sinfield 1985 and Drakakis 1995[xcv] challenged the view that held that a historical context like the Elizabethan era was constituted by a shared well-ordered cosmos where there was an unquestioning belief and obedience to ordained law. Furthermore it is not just a matter of irony in conversation where a person can say one thing but mean quite another; irony and contradiction can effect an entire personality. Empson noted this divided personality in *Seven Types of Ambiguity* (2004.293)[xcvi] He identified opposites as a sign of conflict in the mind of the Poet but he qualifies this by writing,

> "Of course, conflict need not be expressed overtly as contradiction, but it is likely that those theories of aesthetics which regard poetry as the resolution of conflict will find their illustrations chiefly in the limited field covered by the seventh type."

Winnicott in *Communicating and Not Communicating Leading to a Study of Certain Opposites* (1963. 184)[xcvii] comments that a split or conflict in the mind is *part of health,*

> "I am postulating that in the healthy (mature, that is, in respect of the development of object-relating) person there is a need for something that corresponds to the state of the split person in whom one part of the split communicates silently with subjective objects." (1963.184).

The Poet of Shakespeare's sonnets articulates a similar opinion, "I think good thoughts, whilst others write good words," (85.4) and, "Me for my dumb thoughts, speaking in effect." (85.14). In our contemporary era of simulation, mass-communication and disenchantment it is accepted that the process of ironic re-reading reveals that a text may mean something other than what it explicitly says. In the view held here, all Shakespeare's sonnets, "Even those that said I could not love you dearer," (115.2) articulate irony.

In this thesis the view is held that irony, contradiction of opposites, paradox, oxymoron, antimetabole and chiasmus are all figures of speech, which voice one thing while meaning another. This attitude of skepticism and mistrust adopted by the Poet in his sonnets effects not only himself but the Loved-object of whom he writes, for instance, "Thou blind fool love, what dost thou to mine eyes, (137.1). "They know what beauty is, see where it lies, / Yet what the best is, take the worst to be." (137. 3-4) and, "Therefore I lie with her, and she with me, / And in our faults by lies we flattered be." (138. 13-14) and again, "For sweetest things turn sourest by their deeds, / Lilies that fester, smell far worse than weeds." (94.13-14) and finally "But what's so blessed fair that fears no blot, / Thou mayst be false, and yet I know it not" (92. 13-14). Abrams in *Orientation of Critical theories* quotes Samuel Johnson who

wrote that the Shakespearean Poet in his sonnets and plays reflects a world-view that is, " the mirror of life and of inanimate nature as well;" (1953.15). However, the tone adopted by Johnson would in the contemporary world-view be viewed as didactic and more an instance of what 'should be' rather than 'what is'. Johnson goes on to write, "The end of writing is to instruct: the end of poetry is to instruct by pleasing…. If a poem fails to please whatever its character otherwise, it is, as a work of art, nothing;". Johnson adopts a moralistic tone and goes on to insist, "it must please without violating the standards of truth and virtue" (1953.15).[xcviii]

Irony, paradox, ambiguity challenge the notion of received wisdom and in this thesis some of the Poet's sonnets have been selected to amplify this viewpoint. In the first instance this final chapter examines the method by which this research has been carried out in relation to its foundation, which is the literary analysis of the Shakespearean sonnets relative to the Freudian analysis of the dream. This chapter then reconsiders some of the themes that arise from selected sonnets in this thesis, which portray paradox. It then goes on to discuss the way in which the Poet of Shakespeare's sonnets through the use of rhetorical strategies of hyperbole, chiasmus and oxymoron ironically treats the over-exaggerated idealized or denigrated theme of love within a sonnet and between sonnets. This final chapter concludes by reviewing the Freudian notion of negation and disavowal in sonnets like, "Let me not to the marriage of true minds" (116.1.) and ends with a short passage from one of the Poet's plays which supports a consistent simple straightforward view of love which contradicts the theme of ambivalence laid down in this thesis yet contrarily resonates with the reader because it feels emotionally convincing and is not open to ambiguity.

The introduction of this thesis particularized paradox, and elaborated the way in which a poem's meaning is indeterminate and open to a range of interpretation

between the orthodox received opinion and sedition in much the same way as does the dream. This is because in the dream and in the Poet's sonnets there is not only a slippage in Psychoanalytic terms rather than Saussurian terms between the signifier or the manifest reading of the poem and its signified or the latent interpreted meaning but also because a Shakespearean sonnet and a play at one and the same time articulates a paradox, 'this is' and 'this is not'. Reading only the manifest level would yield a false interpretation as illuminated in Sonnet 43, which was examined in the Introduction of this thesis. This ambiguity, which articulates 'it is' and 'it is not' includes, *Twelfth Night* which calls gender into question. This is apparent when Sebastion comments to Olivio on her marriage," You are betrothed both to a maid and man." (5.1.266)[xcix] and again in Troilus and Cressida, "Without revolt! This is and is not Cressid."(5.2.149)[c] or in Sonnet 20 the loved-object 'is' and 'is not' female or 'is' and 'is not' male.

In addition to this doubleness the Poet makes use of rhetorical strategies such as oxymoron and chiasmus within a line but also contrasts the meaning between lines in a single sonnet and opposes the meaning between the first three quatrains and the couplet. This is evident in the first line of Sonnet 36, "Let me confess that we two must be twain" (36.1) and the couplet of the same sonnet, "But do not so, I love thee in such sort, / As thou being mine, mine is thy good report." (36.13-14). Moreover, the poet holds several differing views on one theme and this became evident in many poems. The divergent views held by the Poet arise not only because of the difference between the normative view of love and the Poet's actualized experience of love but also because emotions are capricious and colour the way the Poet perceives the world. This unpredictability creates conflict in the Poet's poetry, "Mine eye and heart are at a mortal war, / How to divide the conquest of thy sight," (46.1-2).

Freud was intensely suspicious of the claims that morality or the normatively determined view make on us and this informed his view that the Ego itself was conflicted. The Ego according to Freud is like a sycophant who is besieged by contradictory claims and who tries to please the Id, the Super-ego and external reality simultaneously, "helpless in both directions, the ego defends itself vainly, alike against the instigations of the murderous id and against the reproaches of the punishing conscience" (1923. *p.f.l.* 11. 395). Freud concluded that the Ego and the id are more like the horse and rider, "Thus in its relation to the id it is like a man on horseback, who has to hold in check the superior strength of the horse;".. "often a rider, if he is not to be parted from his horse, is obliged to guide it where it wants to go; so in the same way the ego is in the habit of transforming the id's will into action as if it were its own" (1923. *p.f.l.* 11. 364)[ci]. Freud writes in *Civilization and its Discontents (S.E.* XX1.64-149)[cii] when it comes to the demands of morality and civilization, the Superego is portrayed as a faculty of surveillance and punishment keeping people on the straight and narrow. If anything the Superego is on this characterization, an enforcer of pretense and simulation. It has the contradictory structure of 'no' to the ids 'yes' or 'it is not' to the ids 'it is.' The guilty unhappy discontented individual thereby manages a civilized life a life of social pretense or what Winnicott termed the differentiation between the *True* and *False* self in the healthy individual. In Sonnet 50, the Poet similarly expresses the pull of the id when the instinct is forced to do something that goes against its grain, "The beast that bears me, tired with my woe, / Plods dully on, to bear that weight in me, (50.5-6) but contradictorily the opposite is also true, "In winged speed no motion shall I know, / Then can no Horse with my desire keep pace," (51.8-9).

A key-stone of this thesis is that the poem like all art **resembles** Freud's psychoanalytic concept of the dream[ciii] This occurs because many of the sonnets are seditious and like the dream the manifest content is disguised to allow the latent subversive meaning to evade the morality of the Super-ego or moral conscience. To effect this distortion of meaning both sonnet and dream employ unconscious processes of *condensation* [civ] and *displacement* (S.E. V. 4, 305) and *indirect representation* (1917. *S.E.*14.228)[cv] but whereas dreams and visual art create a symbol of life a poem goes through the process of *secondary elaboration* which, "reconstitutes the elements of the dream so that the manifest content has some semblance or façade of logic and coherence" which is created by word pictures or metaphor (*S.E*. V. 666). Furthermore from the discussion of the relationship between the sonnets and dream it seems that both sonnets and the dream share an ambiguity of meaning, which make both the poems and the interpretation of a dream indeterminate.

The method of analysis in this thesis has been to go initially from observation. To begin with this involved the repetitive reading and listening to an auditory taped recording of each sonnet. Following on from this the whole cycle of sonnets were continually read and listened to. Thereafter sonnet themes seemed to fall naturally into a pre-conscious template generated by Psychoanalysis. Next sonnets were categorized in themes according to a psychoanalytic classification. Each sonnet within a sonnet grouping was then glossed according to the literary interpretations offered by Booth (1977)[cvi] Burrow (2002)[cvii] Duncan-Jones[cviii]. The literary analysis was then related to the psychoanalytic method of analyzing a dream. In the analysis of a dream the whole dream is broken down into parts and each part is then interpreted according to the psychoanalytic method detailed in chapter 1. The same method was applied to the analysis of the poetry but contrarily to the analysis of the

dream a literary perspective was applied to the analysis of the poetry rather than a psychoanalytic perspective. No attempt was made to impose literary theory or psychoanalytic theory onto individual sonnets for in Freudian terms this would have been viewed as *Wild Psycho-Analysis* (1910. 351-356).[cix] Rather literary and psychoanalytic theory was only applied to part of the poem or the whole poem if it was seen to dovetail with the deductions and inference made from the analysis of the observed material of each individual poem.

In the Introduction to this thesis the psychoanalytic interpretation of the unconscious was discussed and through the writing of this thesis literary analysis was seen to be comparable to psychoanalytic analysis. Freud regarded dream analysis, which he laid down in his *Interpretation of Dreams* (1900. *S.E.* IV. 169-200) and in his lectures on the *Unconscious* (1915) as parallel to literary analysis as both make use of word-play or puns, metaphor and metonymy, verbal allusion, timelessness, negation, antithetical meanings of words, dissecting the narrative content of the dream or poem, symbolism and allegorical or mythical meaning. Freud viewed the creativity of the dream-work to the creation of metaphor. Metaphor like the dream implies the comparison and synthesizing of two unlike *things*, which actually have something in common or the juxtaposition of contradictory ideas, which together become meaningful. Conversely metonymy in the dream makes use of part of an object to represent the whole or the whole object to represent a part. The core of the interpretation of a dream is the method of applying the dreamer's *free association* to parts of the dream in the understanding of the whole dream. The essence of this *free association* is metonymy as *free association* combines ideas that are free-flowing and contiguous. "Creativity" writes Freud, "is no longer the exclusive preserve of the divinely inspired or the few great poets, for, from a psychoanalytic point of view

everyone is poetic because everyone dreams in metaphor and generates symbolic meaning in the process of living"(1900a.).

Mortality is foregrounded in Chapter 2 This defence against the temporariness and ephemerality of life manifests in a conflict between the virtuous behaviour of altruism as opposed to the id's self interest. According to the Poet both the aspiration to "never die" (1.2) and the aspiration to preserve the self at the expense of the other "To eat the world's due," (1.14) are found by the Poet to be unachievable. By contrast the desire for the immortalization of beauty is found to be attainable in the symbolic beauty about the love-object in the Poet's poetry, "So long as men can breathe or eyes can see, / So long lives this, and this gives life to thee," (18.13-14) and "Thou shouldst print more, not let that copy die." (11.14).

Chapter 3 concentrated on the arbitrary link between both the Saussurian and Psychoanalytic signifier and signified and highlights Sonnet 135 and 136 to elaborate this point. Within these two sonnets the Poet presents his name in the form of a joke or a witty play on words and in so doing he subverts the meaning of his name and the conventional meaning of love through the use of a joke or pun that exploit the different possible signifiers of his name *"W*ill" (135.1). This humour tends to disguise the erotic connotations he gives to his name. In this fashion he protects the honour of his literary reputation within the puritanical context of the Super-ego within the socio-cultural period of that time. Different psychic processes are used in the making of a joke to those of the creation of a dream. In a dream there is a compromise between reality and phantasy which colours objectivity with a subjective hue. Conversely in Freud's theory of *Jokes and their Relation to the Unconscious* (1905. *p.f.l.* 6)[cx] the contradiction between the preconscious and unconscious is retained

and both conscious and unconscious signifiers appear simultaneously in the manifest joke. The theory behind the rhetorical concept of oxymoron or the juxtaposition of two words which are opposites but which together create a truth is highlighted in Freud's theory of the *Antithetical Meaning of Primal Words* (S.E. X1.1910.157)[cxi] In this lecture Freud makes the case that the German word for 'strong' intrinsically contains within it its opposite meaning 'weak' as does the word 'light' contain the meaning of 'dark' within it. The same is true of compound words such as 'far-near' and 'outside-inside'. Freud accords this to the primitive processes involved in the unconscious for in this system there is no negation so that what is negative can equally be thought of as positive. It is this equivocation that illuminates a truth embedded in oxymoron as it resonates with the ambivalence found within the reader.

In chapter 4, loss is discussed. Loss implies symbolization for without the capacity to accept loss there can be no language as words or symbols stand in place of the lost or absent object. Furthermore, without the acceptance of the loss of the loved object there can be no reality testing because the reproduction of a perception as a presentation or representation arises from the capacity to bring before the mind once more something that has once been perceived by reproducing it as representation without the external object having still to be there. The precondition then for setting up of reality testing is that, "objects shall have been lost which once brought real satisfaction." (1925.*p.f.l.* 11.440). Many of the sonnets are about love, but rather than describe this love the Poet details his impotency and despondency in not being able to capture all the loveliness in both art and nature before it is destroyed by those instruments of ruin and annihilation like time, insincerity, nature, human rage and human and natural destruction. Whereas mourning is the reaction to loss where the world is experienced as becoming poorer, melancholia or depression is a narcissistic loss to the Ego itself, which becomes impoverished. As a defence against loss the

old love is transferred on to a new object and this is interpreted through Freud's theory of *Mourning and Melancholia* (1917. *p.f.l.*11.245-269) and in *Analysis Terminable and Interminable* (1937. *S.E*. XX111.209-205).[cxii] In these lectures, Freud understands, if the reason for the loss is not comprehended the loss is repeated.

Some of the descriptions of love and beauty presented by the Poet are equivocal and contradictory. For instance in Sonnet 87 the Poet writes about love as an illusion, "Thus have I had thee as a dream doth flatter, / In sleep a King, but waking no such matter." (87.13-14). In Sonnet 87, the Poet questions his own hyperbole, "Who will believe my verse in time to come" (17.1). In Sonnet 115, the Poet questions his own judgment, "Those lines that I before have writ do lie, / Even those that said I could not love you dearer," (115.1-2). Furthermore, the comparison between a sonnet like Sonnet 21 and Sonnets 127, 130 and 132 amplifies the notion of irony if not mock encomia. On the one hand Sonnet 127, 130, and 132 appear to mock the mindless mechanical application of the Petrarchan-like over-blown metaphorical descriptions of love referred to in Sonnet 21,

"Stirr'd by a painted beauty to his verse,
Who heaven it self for ornament doth use,
And every fair with his fair doth rehearse,
Making a couplement of proud compare
With Sun and Moon, with earth and sea's rich gems:" (21.2-6).

In light and in line with the oblique reference to the hyperbole and pretentious comparisons in Petrarchan sonnets, Sonnet 127, 130, and 132 appear to be a mock encomia, where praise is lavished on "black" (127.1) which was at that time conventionally regarded as implying ugly, 'But is profan'd, if not lives in disgrace." (127.8) and again, "In the old age black was not counted fair, / Or if it were it bore not beauty's name:" (127.1-2). The reader is left in wonder in a space of indecision of

where [moral] truth or even the Poet's own truth lies. Here, the trope does not lie in the substitution of the opposing word, but in the expression of an opposite sentiment or idea so that on the surface it appears that praise is intended. This becomes apparent through the insertion of "My" (130.12) and, "And yet by heaven I think my love as rare / As any she belied with false compare." (130.13-14). Notwithstanding at the latent interpreted meaning this praise implies derision through the use of metaphors such as "dun" (130.3) and the choice of the pronoun "some" in "some perfumes" (130,7) which suggests that all perfumes are not sweet smelling, "some" (130.7) perfumes like the one on the Poet's mistress's breath "reeks" (130.8) indicating foul smelling. Sonnets 127, 130 and 132 may also be understood as a satire or mock encomia on the follies of women wearing make-up to beautify themselves in order to deceive the world, "Fairing the foul with Art's false borrow'd face" (127.6).

In Sonnet 116 the Poet presents love as a contradiction of its own premise "… love is not love" (116.2). According to Booth (1977.389) [cxiii] Sonnet 116 is the most universally admired of the Shakespearean Sonnets, " the more one thinks about this grand, noble absolute convincing gesture, the less there seems to be of it" . Booth continues that it is a "high sounding energetic nonsense that addresses its topic but does not indicate what is being said about it". The reader comes away from it wondering in what sense love has been made credible or concrete or something that is actually experienced with which the reader can identify. The first line, "Let me not to the marriage of true minds" takes its morality from Ephesians 5: 14-16. "Be very careful, then, how you live —not as unwise but as wise, [16] making the most of every opportunity, because the days are evil". Unlike metaphor which makes a comparison between two unlike things, irony invokes an absent or hidden sense and it this absence that results from the explicit sense of negation that opens the poem, ".. love is not love"(116.2). The straightforward statement if taken literally implies a paradox that contradicts its own assertion but gives no clue as to what genuine love is and as

such the puffed up words appear empty, vague and meaningless. “Similarly” writes Booth “the hyperbole of the couplet is so extreme that it merely vouches for the speakers intensity of feeling – it gives no evidence to support the validity of his statement because on a literal level it is ridiculous as we cannot doubt what has been written” (1977.389). The comparison in itself is illogical because there is no commonality between the different act of writing and the experience of love.

From a Freudian (1925.p.f.l. 11. 438) perspective the negation “..love is not love” is a way of taking notice of what has been repressed. What has been repressed is the opposite of love’s steadfast commitment as it is espoused in the sonnet; indeed according to the Poet’s own poetry, love is irresolute, uncertain, false, “In loving thee thou know’st I am forsworn, / But thou art twice forsworn to me love swearing,” (152. 1-2). In these sonnets and possibly in life love as it is experienced cannot be named, “Or if it were it bore not beauty’s name:” (127.2). If it cannot be consciously named it cannot be thought about (1915. p.f.l.11. 201-210). Likewise, to negate something in judgement is according to Freud (1925.p.f.l .438), “at bottom to say this is something which I should prefer to repress.” The repression of an idea involves the splitting of idea and its concomitant emotion. The elided idea is repressed and the emotion is suppressed. The lifting of repression implies reconnecting the idea and emotion corresponding to it. The idea that is repressed and omitted in the grandiloquence of Sonnet 116 is the actual lived-experience of love. This elision gives to Sonnet 116 an ironic meaning and an ungrounded insincere emptiness for in all its excess of high-sounding phrases which advocate love there is no counterbalancing contradictory statement which espouses what the experience of love actually feels like. On the one hand it states “love is not love” (116.2) but on the other it does not declare what love is. This is similar to the interpretation of only the manifest dream or signifier. If the interpretation of the manifest dream was taken to represent the

whole dream, the interpretation would be viewed as flawed or unbalanced. This is especially salient when this negation of love is contradicted by the monosyllabic simplicity and emotional real-lived experience of the Poet's own words in Much ado about Nothing which create a sense of credibility and truth,

Benedick "..And now tell me, how doth your cousin?
Beatrice Very Ill
Benedick And how do you
Beatrice Very ill too.
PBenedick Serve God, love me, and mend.

William Shakespeare.
Much Ado About Nothing. (Act. 4. Sc.2. 315-324)[cxiv].

In this way the Poet grounds and nominates love as concern for the other and through the use of the verb "mend" links love to healing, recovery and being made whole. The Poet relates the sense in the verb "mend" to God whatever the reader conceives God to be.

This thesis has examined the contradictions in the poetry of *Shakespeare's sonnets* and related the literary analysis of the sonnets to Freud's study of the creation, contradictions and interpretation of the dream. The sonnets feel emotionally convincing to us because they respond to the reader's own ambivalent, contradictory and divided nature.

41.480 words with citations included.

Footnotes to Chap 5.

I. Abrams, M. H. Orientation of Critical Theories in *20th Century Literary Criticism. A Reader.* Ed. David Lodge. 2nd Edition. 1991. London. Longman. 1953.

II. Colebrook, Claire. Irony in *The New Critical Idiom.* London: Routledge. 2008.

III. Edmundson, P. and Wells, S. *Shakespeare Sonnets.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2004.

IV. Empson, W. The Seventh Type of Ambiguity in *Seven Types of Ambiguity.* 3rd Edition. London: Plimlico. 1930. p. 193.

V. Freud, S. Analysis Terminable and Interminable in *Moses and Monotheism. A Outline of Psychoanalysis and other works.* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud assisted by Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson and Alix Strachey. 1st Edition. 1964. Vol. XX111. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1937. p. 64-149.

VI. – *Jokes and their Relation to Unconscious.* Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vo 6. London. Penguin Freud Library. 1905.

VII. –On Transience in *Art and Literature.* Ed. Angela Richards and Albert Dickson. Vol 14. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1916[1917]). p. 283 -291.

VIII. – The Antithetical Meanings of Primal Words in *Five Lectures on Psychoanalysis, Leonardo da Vinci and Other Works.* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alix Strachey, Alan Tyson. 1st Edition. 1957. Vol. X1. London: The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1910. p. 153-154.

IX. – The Ego and The Id in *On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol.11. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1923. p. 364.

X. – The Interpretation of Dreams Second Part. Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alix Strachey, Alan Tyson. 1st Edition.1953. London: The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1900.

XI. – The Interpretation of Dreams First Part. Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alix Strachey, Alan Tyson. 3rd Edition.1991. London: The Penguin Freud Library. 1900a.

XII. – The Metapsychology of Dreams in *The History of the Psychoanalytic Movement. Papers on Metapsychology and Other Works.* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. 1st Edition 1957. Vol. XIV.

XIII. – Wild Psychoanalysis in *The Freud Reader*. Ed. Peter Gay. 1995. London: Vintage. 1910. p.351-356.

XIV. Lodge, David. The Metaphoric and the Metonymic Poles in *Modern Writing.* Ed. David Lodge. 1991. London: Edward Arnold. Division of Hodder and Stoughton. 1977. p. 81-82.

XV. *Shakespeare Sonnets*. Ed. Stephen Booth. 2nd Edition. Yale: Yale University Press. 1977.

XVI. – Much Ado about Nothing in *The Complete Works.* Ed.. William Montgomery, John Jowett, Gary Taylor, Stanley Wells. 2nd Edition.2005. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1601. p. 315 -324.

XVII. - *The Complete Works.* Ed.. William Montgomery, John Jowett, Gary Taylor, Stanley Wells. 2nd Edition.2005. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1601. p. 569-595.

XVIII. – *The Complete Works.* Ed.. William Montgomery, John Jowett, Gary Taylor, Stanley Wells. 2nd Edition.2005. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1601. p. 569-595.

XIX. - *The Complete Works.* Ed.. William Montgomery, John Jowett, Gary Taylor, Stanley Wells. 2nd Edition.2005. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1601. p.741.

XX. – *Shakespeare Sonnets.* Ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones. The Arden Shakespeare. London: 2007.

XXI. – The History of King Lear in *Shakespeare The Complete Works.* Ed.. William Montgomery, John Jowett, Gary Taylor, Stanley Wells. 2nd Edition.2005. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1601. p. 925.

XXII. Shakespeare, W. *The Oxford Shakespeare. The Complete Sonnets and Poems.* Ed. Colin Burrow. Oxford. Oxford University Press. 2002.

XXIII. Winnicott, D. W. Ego Distortion of the True and False Self. 1990. London: Karnac. 1960. p. 140 -153.

XXIV. – Communicating and Not Communicating Leading to a Study of Certain Opposites in *Maturational Processes and the Facilitating Environment.* 2nd. Edition. 1990. London: Karnac. 1963. p. 184.

Bibliography

Abrams, M.H. Orientation of Critical Theories in *20th Century Literary Criticism. A Reader*. Ed. David Lodge. 1991. London: Longman. 1972.

Bailly, Lionel. *Lacan*. Oxford: Oneworld Publications. 2009.

Barthes, R. Death of an Author in *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader*. Ed. David Lodge and Nigel Wood. 2nd Edition. 2000. Harlow: Longman. 1988.

Bollas, Christopher. *The Shadow of the Object. Psychoanalysis of the Unthought Known.* London: Free Association Books. 1987.

Colebrook, Claire. Irony in *The New Critical Idiom.* London: Routledge. 2008.

Crystal, David and Crystal, Ben. *Shakespeare's Words. A Glossary and Companion.* London: Penguin Books. 2002.

de Saussure, Ferdinand. The Object of Study in *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader.* Second Edition. 2000. Ed. David Lodge and Nigel Wood. Harlow: Longman. 1988.

Empson, W. The Seventh Type of Ambiguity in *Seven Types of Ambiguity*. Plimlico: Plimlico. 2004.

Fineman, Joel. *Shakespeare's Perjured Eye* . California: University of California Press. 1986.

Freud, S. Lecture V1. Communication Between the Two Systems in *On the Unconscious in On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1915.

Freud, S. A Fragment of an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria in *A Case of Hysteria, Three Essays on Sexuality and Other Works.* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alan Tyson and Alix Strachey. 1st Ed. 1953. Vol. V11. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1901-1905.

—. A Metapsychology of Dreams in *On Metapsychology. The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: The Penguin Freud Library. (1915[1917]).

—. Analysis Terminable and Interminable in *Moses and Monotheism, An Outline of Psycho-Analysis and Other Works*. Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud assisted by Alex Strachey and Alex Tyson. Trans. James Strachey. 2001. Vol. XX111. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1937-1939.

—. Antithetical Meanings of Primal Words in *Five Lectures on Psychoanalysis, Leonard da Vinci and Other Works*. Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud assisted by Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. Trans. James Strachey. 1st Edition. 1957. Vol. X1. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1910.

—. Appendix C. Words and Things in *On Metapsycholgy: The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1915.

—. Beyond the Pleasure Principle in *On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis*. Ed. Angela Richards and James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1920.

—. Civilization and its Discontents in *The Future of an Illusion, Civilization and its Discontents and Other Works.* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alix Srachey and Alan Tyson. Trans. James Strachey. 1st Ed.1961. Vol. XX1. London: The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1927-1931.

—. Civilized Sexual Morality in *Jensen's Gradiva and Other Works.* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud assisted by Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. Trans. James Strachey. Ist Edition. 1959. Vol. 1X. London: The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1908.

—. Considerations of Representability in *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. First Edition. 1953. Vol. V. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institutue of Psychoanalysis. 1900-1901.

—. Displacement in *The Interepretation of Dreams (First Part).* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. Trans. James Strachey. 1st Edition. 1900. Vol. 4. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1900a.

—. Dissection of the Personality in *New Introductory Lectures.* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. Trans. James Strachey. 1st Ed. 1964. Vol. XX11. London: The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1933[1932].

—. Femininity in *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis.* Ed. James Strachey assisted by Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 2. London: Penguin Freud Library. (1933[1932]).

—. *Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety* . Ed. Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson James Strachey In Collaboration with Anna Freud. Trans. James Strachey. First Edition

1959. Vol. XX. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Pschoanalysis. 1926[1925].

—. Instincts and their Vicissisitudes in *On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis*. Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1915.

—. *Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious*. Ed. James Strachey and Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 6. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1905.

—. Lecture V11 Assessment of the Unconsious in The Unconscious in *On Metapsychology. The Theory of Psychoanalysis*. Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London : Penguin Freud Library. 1915.

—. Lecture V1 Jokes, Dreams and the Unconscious in *Jokes and their Relation to the Unconscious.* Ed. assisted by Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud. First Edition 1960. Vol. V111. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1905c.

—. Lecture XXV11 On Transference in *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis. Parts I and 2.* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud. Assisted by Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. First Edition. 1963. Vol. XV. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1915-1917.

—. Lecture XXX1 Dissection of the Personality in *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis and Other Works*. Trans. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud. Assisted by Alix Strachey. First Edition. 1964. Vol. XX11. London: Hogarth Press and The institute of Psychoanalysis. 1933.

—. Leonardo Da Vinci and a Memory of his Childhood in *Five Lectures on Psychoanalysis.* Ed. In Collaboration with Anna Freud asssisted by Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. first Edition. 1957. London: The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1910.

—. Mourning and Melancholia in *On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis*. Ed. Angela Dickson. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: Penguin Freud Library. (1915[1917]).

—. Negation in *On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. James Strachey and Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1991. Vol. 11. London: Penguin Freud Library, 1925.

—. *On Aphasia*. New York: International Universities Press, 1891.

—. On Narcissism: An Introduction in *On Metapsychology. The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. Angela Richards and James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1914.

—. On Transience in *Art and Literature*. Ed. Angela Richards and Albert Dickson. Vol. 14. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1916[1917].

—. Repression in *On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. James Strachey and Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1915.

—. Revision of the Theory of Dreams in *New Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis*. Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud assisted by Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. First Edition. 1964. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1932-1936.

—. Splitting of the Ego in The Process of Defence in *An Outline of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud assisted by Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. First Edition 1964. Vol. XX111. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. (1940[1938]).

—. The Psychogenesis of a Case of Homosexuality in a Woman in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle, Group Psychology and Other Works.* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud Assisted by Alan Tyson and Alix Strachey. Trans. James Strachey. 1st Edition. 1957. Vol. XV111. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1920.

—. The Antithetical Meanings of Primary Words in *Five Lectures on Psychoanalysis*. Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. Trans. James Strachey. 1st Edition. 1957. Vol X1 London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1910.

—. The Ego and the Id in *On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1923.

—. The Ego and the Super-Ego in *The Ego and the Id in Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis*. Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1923.

—. *The Interpretation of Dreams Second Part.* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. Trans. James Strachey. 1st Ed. 1953 . London: The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1900.

—. *The Interpretation of Dreams.* Ed. James Strachey assisted by Alan Tyson. Trans. James Strachey. 3rd Ed. 1991. Vol. 1V. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1900a.

—. The Metapsychology of Dreams in *On the History of the Psychoanalytic Movement. Papers on Metapsychology and Other Works.* Ed. James Strachey in Collabaration with Anna Freud, Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. 1st Ed. 1957. Vol. X1V. London: The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1915[1917]).

—. The Metapsychology of Dreams in *On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. James Strachey and Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: Penguin Freud Library. (1915[1917]).

—. The Primary and Secondary Processes in *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud assisted by Alix Strachey and Alan

Tyson. First Edition 1953. Vol. V. London: The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1900-1901.

—. The Theory of the Instincts in *Part* 1 [The Mind and its Workings] *in An Outline of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud in Collaboration with Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. First Edition. 1964. Vol. XX111. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1940[1938].

—. The Unconscious in *Papers on Metapsychology and other works.* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud in Collaboration with Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. First Edition. 1957. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1914-1916.

—. Two Principles of Mental Functioning in *On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1911.

Freud, S. and Breuer, J. *Studies on Hysteria.* 1991. Vol. 3. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1893 -1895.

Freud, S. Conscious and Unconscious in *On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1923.

—. Humour in *The Future of an Illusion, Civilzation and its Discontents and Other Works.* Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud Assisted by Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. 2001. Vol. XX1. London: Vintage. The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1927.

—. *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis.* Ed. James Strachey and Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 1. Penguin Freud Library. 1916-17.

—. *The Interpretation of Dreams.* Ed. Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud. Trans. James Strachey. 1st Edition. 1953. Vol. V. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1900a.

—. *The Interpretation of Dreams (First Part).* Ed. Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud. Trans. James Strachey. First Edition 1958. Vol. IV. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1900.

—. *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life.* Ed. James Strachey. Trans. Alan Tyson. 1st Ed. 1960. Vol. V1. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. 1901.

—. The Unconscious in *Metapsycholgy: The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: Penguin Freud Library. 1915.

—. Wild Psycho-Analysis in *The Freud Reader.* Ed. Peter Gay. 1995. London: Vintage. 1910.

Hinshelwood, R. D. *A Dictionary of Kleinian Thought.* Ed. R. D. Hinshelwood. 1991. London: Free Association Books. 1989.

Jakobson, R. The Metaphoric and Metonymic Poles in *Modes of Modern Writing*. Ed. David Lodge. 1991. London: Edward Arnold. 1977.

Jakobson, Roman. The Metaphoric and Metonymic Poles in *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader*. Ed. David Lodge and Nigel Wood. 2nd. Ed. 2000. Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd. 1988.

Keats, J. *Letters of John Keats*. Ed. Robert Gittings. 1970. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1816-1817.

Klein, M. A Contribution to the Psychogenisis of Manic Depressive States in *Love, Guilt and Reparation*. 1998. London: Vintage. 1935.

—. Notes on Some Schizoid Mechanisms in *Envy and Gratitude* . 1988. London: Virago Press. 1946.

Lacan, J. The Insistence of the letter in the Unconscious in *Modern Criticism and Theory*: *A Reader*. Ed. David Lodge and Nigel Woods. 2nd Edition. 2000. Harlow: Longman. 1988.

La Planche, J. and Pontalis, J-B. Ideational Representative in *The Language of Psychoanalysis*. 1988. London: Karnac. 1973.

Laplanche, J. and Pontalis, J-B. Displacement in *The Language of Psychoanalysis*. London: Karnac. 1988.

Peqquigney, Joseph. *Such is My Love. A Study of Shakespeare's Sonnets* . London: The University of Chicago Press. 1985.

Quine, W. V. *The Ways of Paradox. Revised and Enlarged Edition.* 1976. Mass: Harvard University Press. 1966.

Shakespeare, W. *Shakespeare's Sonnets*. Ed. Stephen Booth. 2nd ed. 2000. Yale: Yale University Press. 1977.

—. Sonnet 43 in *The Oxford Shakespeare.* The Complete Works. 2nd Ed. John Jowett and William Montgomery Stanley Wells, Gary Taylor. 2nd Edition. 2005. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Oxford. 1603-1604.

—. *The Oxford Shakespeare. The Complete works. Second Edition.* Ed. John Jowett, William Montgomery. General Editors Gary Taylor, and Stanley Wells. 2nd. Ed. 2005. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1986.

—. The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark in *The Oxford Shakespeare The Complete Works*. Ed. John Jowett, William Montgomery. General Editors. Gary Taylor Stanley Wells. 2nd Ed. 2005. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1600-1601.

—. The Tragedy of King Richard the Second in *The Oxford Shakespeare. The Complete Works.* Ed. William Montgomery, John Jowett. General Editors Gary Taylor, and Stanley Wells. Second Edition. 2005. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1595.

—. The Tragedy of Othello, the Moor of Venice in *The Oxford Shakespeare. The Complete Works* Ed. John Jowett, and William Montgomery. General Editors. Gary Taylor,Stanley Wells. 2nd Ed. 2005. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1603-4.

—. Macbeth in *The Oxford Shakespeare. The Complete Works.* Ed. William Montgomery, John Jowett. General Editors. Gary Taylor, Stanley Wells. 2nd Ed.2005. The Clarendon Press. 1606 & 1616.

—. *Shakespeare's Sonnets*. Ed. Stephen Booth. 2000. London: Yale University Press. 1997.

—. *Shakespeare's Sonnets*. Ed. K. Duncan-Jones. 2007. London: The Arden Shakespeare. 1997.

—. The Complete Sonnets and Poems in *The Oxford Shakespeare.* Ed. Colin Burrow. General Editor. Stanley Wells. 2008. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2002.

—. The History of King Lear in *The Oxford Shakespeare. The Complete Works. Second Edition.* Ed. William Montgomery, John Jowett General Editors Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor. 1986. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1605-1606.

—. The Life of Henry the Fifth in *The Oxford Shakespeare, Complete works.* Ed. John Jowett, William Montgomery. General Editors. Gary Taylor. Stanley Wells. 2nd Edition. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1603-4.

—. *The Oxford Shakespeare. The Complete Works*. Ed. William Montgomery, John Jowett. General Editors. Stanley Wells, Gary Taylor. 2nd Edition. 2005. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1986.

—. The Tragedy of Richard Duke of York and the Good King Henry Sixth in *The Oxford Shakespeare. The Complete Works.* Ed. William Montgomery, John Jowett. General Editors. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor. 2005. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1591.

Winnicott, D, W. Creativity and its Origins in *Playing and Reality*. Ed. 1974. London: Penguin Books. 1971.

—. Playing: The Search for Self in *Playing and Reality.* 1974. London: Penguin Books. 1971.

Winnicott, D, W. The Location of Cultural Experience in *Playing and Reality*. 2nd Edition 1974. London: Penguin Books. 1971.

Winnicott, D. W. Communicating and Not Communicating Leading to a Study of Certain Opposites in *Maturational Processes and the Facilitating Environment*. 2nd Edition. 1990. London: Karnac. 1963.

—. Ego Distortion in Terms of the True and False Self in *Maturational Processes and the Facilitating Environment.* 1990. London: Karnac Books. 1960.

Please note.

1 To prevent duplications of one text or one Author in the Bibliography page ranges are given within the text and not within the bibliography as both

Authors and Articles with differing page ranges are referred to on a number of occasions within the text. This is done in order to simplify and condense the whole Bibliography.

2 *S.E.* refers to The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological works of Sigmund Freud.

i. Dates for the *S.E.* are not given in the text as vol no's refer to specific texts.

3 *p.f.l.* refers to the Penguin Freud Library.

a. Dates are given within the text for Penguin Freud Library as there are many articles within the *Penguin Freud Library* that do not correspond to the dates or volumes as given within the *S.E. Editions.*

4 There is a confusion between date of writing and date of publication in both the *S.E.* and *p.f.l.* editions of Freud's writing.

a. Therefore dates in the Bibliography are sometimes given as (1915[1917]) as this corresponds to the double entry.
b. In order to simplify in the <u>text</u> only one date is selected. For example,
c. In the text Metapsychology of Dreams is given as 1915. This is differentiated from Mourning and Melancholia which is given as 1917.
d. In the Bibliography both Metapsychology of Dreams and Mourning and Melancholia are given as (1915[1917]) as this is their recognized dating for both articles.

[i] (Keats)
[ii] (Quine)
[iii] (Shakespeare, The Life of Henry the Fifth in The Oxford Shakespeare, Complete works.)
[iv] (Abrams)
[v] (Abrams)
[vi] (Freud, The Interpretation of Dreams)
[vii] (Freud, 1958)
[viii] (Freud, "The Metapsychology of Dreams" on Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis.)
[ix] (Jakobson) metaphoric
[x] (Empson)
[xi] (Freud, The Unconscious in Metapsycholgy: The theory of Psychoanalysis.)
[xii] (Shakespeare, "Sonnet 43" in the Oxford Shakespeare.)

[xviii](Shakespeare, Shakespeare's Sonnets) Booth
[xiv] (Freud, "The Antithetical Meanings of Primary Words" in Five Lectures on Psychoanalysis.)
[xv] (Freud, "The Metapsychology of Dreams" on Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis.)
[xvi] (Shakespeare) Duncan Jones
[xvii] (Freud, "Repression" in On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis.)
[xviii] (Jakobson)
[xix] (Laplanche)
[xx] (Empson)
[xxi] (Shakespeare, Macbeth in Teh Oxford Shakespeare, The Complete Works.)974
[xxii] (S. Freud, "On Narcissism. An Introduction" in On Metapsychology: the Theory of Psychoanalysis.)
[xxiii] (S. Freud, "Beyond the Pleasure Principle" in On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis.)
[xxiv] (S. Freud, "On Narcissism. An Introduction" in On Metapsychology: the Theory of Psychoanalysis.)
[xxv] (S. Freud, "Beyond the Pleasure Principle" in On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis.)

[xxvi] (Jakobson, "The Metaphoric and Metonymic Poles in Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader.)
[xxvii] (Empson) (Empson)
[xxviii] (Klein)
[xxix] (S. Freud, "A fragment of an Analysis of a case of Hysteria" in A Case of Hysteria, Three Essays on Sexuality and Other Works.)
[xxx] (S. Freud, Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis.)
[xxxi] (S. Freud, "A Metapsychology of Dreams Supplement to the Theory of Dreams" in On Metapsychology. The Theory of Psychoanalysis.)

[xxxii] (S. Freud, "Jokes and their Relation to the Unconscious")

[xxxiii] (S. Freud, "Jokes and their Relation to the Unconscious")
[xxxiv] Freud, S. “Splitting of the Ego in the Process of Defence” in An Outline of Psychoanalysis. Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alix Strachey, Alan Tyson. 1st Edition. 1964. Vol. XX111. London: The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psychoanalysis. (1940[1938]).

[xxxv] Freud, S. “The Psychogenesis of a Case of Homosexuality in a Woman in Beyond the Pleasure Principle, Group Psychology and Other Works. Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. 1st Edition. 1957. Vol XV111. London: The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psychoanalysis., 1920.

[xxxvi] Freud, S. “Consideration of Representability” in The Interpretation of Dreams. Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alix Strachey, Alan Tyson. 1st Edition. 1953. Vol. V. London: The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psychoanalysis., 1900-1901.

[xxxvii] Freud, S. “Inhibitions Symptoms and Anxiety”. Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. 1st Edition. 1959. Vol XX. London: The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psychoanalysis. (1926[1925]).
[xxxviii] Shakespeare, W. “The Complete Shakespeare Sonnets” in The Oxford Shakespeare. Ed. Colin Burrow. General Editor. Stanley Wells. 2008. Oxford: Oxford University Press., 2002.

[xxxix] Hinshelwood, R. D. “A Dictionary of Kleinian Thought.” Ed. R.D. Hinshelwood. 1991. London Free Association Books. 1989.

[xl] Hinshelwood, R. D. “A Dictionary of Kleinian Thought.” Ed. R.D. Hinshelwood. 1991. London Free Association Books. 1989.

[xli] Crystal, D. and Crystal, B. “Shakespeare’s Words”. London: 2002.

[xlii] Freud, S. “Negation” in On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis. Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11.London: Penguin Freud Library.,1925.

[xliii] Freud, S. “The Ego and the Superego” in the The Ego and the Id. in Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis. Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. London: Penguin Freud Library., 1923.

[xliv] Shakespeare, W. “The Tragedy of Othello, The Moor of Venice in The Oxford Shakespeare The Complete Works. Ed. Gary Taylor, John Jowett and William Montgomery and Stanley Wells. 2nd Ed. 2005. Oxford University Press, 1603-4.

[xlv] de Saussure, Ferdinand. “The Object of Study” in Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader. Ed. David Lodge and Nigel Wood. Harlow: Longman,1988.

[xlvi] Freud, S. “Appendix C. Words and Things” in On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis. Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: Penguin Freud Library, 1915.

[xlvii] Freud, S, “On Aphasia”. New York: International University Press, 1891.

[xlviii] de Saussure, Ferdinand. “The Object of Study” in Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader. Ed. David Lodge and Nigel Wood. 2nd Edition. 2000. Harlow: Longmans, 1988.

[xlix] Freud, S. “Lecture V11. Assessment of the Unconscious” in The Unconscious in On Metapsychology. The Theory of Psychoanalysis. Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: Penguin Freud Library, 1915.

[l] (Laplanche)

[li] Freud, S, “Jokes and their Relation to the Unconscious.” Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol 6. London: Penguin Freud Library, 1905.

[lii] Winnicott, D, W. “The Location of Cultural Experience” in Playing and Reality. 2nd Ed. 1974,. London: Penguin Books, 1971.

[liii] Bailly, Lionel. “Lacan”. Oxford: Oneworld Publications., 2009.

[liv] (Freud, Humour in The Future of an Illusion, Civilzation and its Discontents and Other Works.)
[lv] Freud, S. "Appendix C. Word and Things" in On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis. Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol.11. London: Penguin Freud Library, 1915.

[lvi] Freud, S. "On Aphasia" New York: International Universities Press, 1891.

[lvii] Jakobson, R. "The Metaphoric and Metonymic Poles" in Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader. Ed. David Lodge and Nigel Wood. 2nd Ed.2000. Harlow: Longmans, 1988.

[lviii] Booth, Stephen. "Shakespeare's Sonnets". 2000. Yale University Press., 1977.

[lix] Winnicott, D, W. "Communicating and Communicating Leading to a Study of Certain Opposites in Maturational Processes and the Facilitating Environment. 2nd. Ed. 1990. London. Karnac., 1963.

[lx] Shakespeare, W. "The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark" in The Oxford Shakespeare. The Complete Works 2nd Ed. 2005. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1603-4.

[lxi] Freud, S. "Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious". Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol 6. London: Penguin Freud Library., 1905.

[lxii] Klein, M. "Notes on some Schizoid Mechanisms" in Envy and Gratitude. 1988. London: Virago Press., 1946.

[lxiii] Duncan-Jones, K. "Shakespeare's Sonnets." Ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones. 2007. London: The Arden Shakespeare, 1997.

[lxiv] Shakespeare, W. "The Oxford Shakespeare. The Complete Works" Ed. Colin Burrow. 2002. Oxford: Oxford University Press., 2008.

[lxv] Shakespeare, W. "The Oxford Shakespeare. The Complete Sonnets and Poems. Ed. William Montgomery, Stanley Wells, Gary Taylor, John Jowett. 2nd Ed. 2005. Oxford: Oxford University Press., 1986.

[lxvi] Shakespeare, W. "The Tragedy Of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark." In The Oxford Shakespeare. The Complete Works. Ed, Gary Taylor, John Jowett, William Montgomery, Stanley Wells. 2nd Ed. 2005. Oxford: Clarendon Press., 1600-1601.

[lxvii] Crystal, D. and Crystal, B, "Shakespeare's Words A Glossary and Language Companion." London: Penguin Books., 2002.

[lxviii] Shakespeare, W, “The Complete Sonnets and Poems.” Ed. Colin Burrow. 2008. Oxford: Oxford University Press., 2002.

[lxix] Klein, M. “Notes on Some Schizoid Mechanisms” in Envy and Gratitude. 2nd Ed. 1988. Virago Press., 1946.

[lxx] Bailly, Lionel. “Lacan.” Oxford: Oneworld Publications. 2009.

[lxxi] (Freud, The Psychopathology of Everyday Life)

[lxxii] Pequigney, Joseph. “Such is my Love. A Study of Shakespeare’s Sonnets”. London: The University of Chicago Press., 1985.

[lxxiii] Freud, S. “On Transience” in Art and Literature. Ed. Albert Dickson. Trans. James Strachey in collaboration with Anna Freud assisted by Alix Strachey and Alex Tyson. Trans. James Strachey. 2001. Vol XX111. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis.., 1937-1939
James Strachey. 1990. Vol 14. London: Penguin Freud Library, 1916[1915]).

[lxxiv] Winnicott, D. W. “Playing: The Search for Self” in Playing and Reality. 1974. London: Penguin Books.., 1971,

[lxxv] Freud, S. “Appendix C: Words and Things.” In On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis. Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 11. London: Penguin Freud Library., 1915.

[lxxvi] Freud, S, “Analysis Terminable and Interminable” in Moses and Montheism, An Outline of Psychoanalysis and other works. Ed. James Strachey in collaboration with Anna Freud assisted by Alix Strachey and Alex Tyson. Trans. James Strachey. 2001. Vol XX111. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis.., 1937-1939

[lxxvii] Freud, S. “On Transience” in Art and Literature. Ed. Angela Dickson. Trans. James Strachey. 1990. Vol 14. London: Penguin Freud Library, 1916[1915].

[lxxviii] Crystal, David and Crystal, Ben. “Shakespeare’s Words”. A Glossary Companion”. London: Penguin Books., 2002.

[lxxix] (Shakespeare) 3HenryV1.2,5,26-38. P104
[lxxx] Burrow, Colin. “William Shakespeare. The Complete Sonnets and Poems”. Oxford: Oxford University Press., 2002.

[lxxxi] Booth, Stephen. “Shakespeare’s Sonnets” Ed. with Analytic Commentary by Stephen Booth. 2000. Yale: Yale University Press., 1977.

[lxxxiii] Winnicott, D. W. “Communicating and Not Communicating Leading to a Study of Certain Opposites” in Maturational Processes and the Facilitating Environment. 1990. London: Karnac, 1963.

[Xv1] Winnicott, D. W. “Ego Distortion in Terms of the True and False Self” in Maturational Processes and the Facilitating Environment. 1990. London: Karnac Books., 1960.

[lxxxv] Winnicott, D, W. “Creativity and its Origins” in Playing and Reality. 1974. London: Penguin Books, 1971.

[lxxxvi] Winnicott, D. W. “Playing and the Search for Self” in Playing and Reality. 1974. London: Penguin Books, 1971.

[lxxxvii] Freud, S. “Mourning and Melancholia” in On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis. Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol 11. London: Penguin Freud Library., (1915[1917]).

[lxxxviii] Duncan-Jones, K. “Shakespeare’s Sonnets”. Ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones. 2007. London: The Arden Shakespeare, 1997.

[lxxxix] Freud, S. and Breuer, J. Studies in Hysteria. 1991. Vol.3. London: Penguin Freud Library., 1893-1895.

[xc] La Planche, J. and Pontalis, J-B. “Ideational Representative” in The Language of Psychoanalysis. 1988. London: Karnac, 1973.

[xci] Freud, S. “Analysis Terminable and Interminable” in Moses and Montheism, An Outline of Psychoanalysis and Other Works. Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud assisted by Alex Strachey and Alex Tyson. Trans. James Strachey. 2001. Vol. XX111. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis., 1937-1939.

[xcii] (S. Freud, "Lecture XXV11 On Transference" in Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis. Parts I and 2.) 1915. 1963.

[xciii] Klein, M. “A Contribution to the Psychogenisis of Manic Depressive States” in Love, Guilt and Reparation. 1988. London: Vintage., 1935.

[xciv] Winnicott, D.W. “The Location of Cultural Experience” in Playing and Reality London: Penguin Books., 1971.

[xcv] Colebrook, Claire. “Irony” in The New Critical Idiom.London: Routledge, 2008.

[xcvi] (Empson)

[xcvii] (Winnicott, Communicating and Not Communicating Leading to a Study of Certain Opposites in Maturational Processees and the Facilitating Environment.)

[xcviii] Abrams, M.H. “Orientation of Critical Theories” in 20Th Century Literary Criticism. A Reader. Ed. David Lodge. 2nd Ed. 1991. London: Longman., 1953.

[xcix] (Shakespeare, Complete Works.) Twlefth Night.

[ci] Freud, S. “Analysis Terminable and Interminable” in Moses and Monotheism. An Outline of Psychoanalysis and other works. Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. Trans. James Strachey. 1st Ed. 1964. Vol XX111. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis., 1937.

[cii] Freud, S. “Civilization and its Discontents” in The Future of an Illusion, Civilization and its Discontents and Other Works. Ed. Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson, James Strachey in Collobartion with Anna Freud. Trans. James Strachey. 1st Ed. 1961. Vol.XX1. London: The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1927-1931.

[ciii] Freud, S. “The Interpretation of Dreams”. Ed. James Strachey assisted by Alan Tyson. Trans. James Strachey. 3rd Ed. 1991. Vol. 1V. London: Penguin Freud Library, 1900a.

[civ] Freud, S. “The Interpretation of Dreams. Second Part.” Ed. James Strachey assisted by Alan Tyson. Alix Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud. Trans James Strachey. 1St Ed. 1953. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis., 1900.

X111 Freud, S. “The Metapsychology of Dreams” in On the History of Psychoanalytic Movement. Papers on Metapsychology and other Works. Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. 1st Ed. 1957. Vol. X1V. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis., 1915[1917].

[cvi] (W. Shakespeare, "Shakespeare's Sonnets") (W. Shakespeare, "Shakespeare's Sonnets") Booth
[cvii] (W. Shakespeare) Burrow
[cviii] (W. Shakespeare, Shakespeare's Sonnets.) Duncan Jones (Boo776)
[cix] (Freud, Wild Psycho-Analysis in The Freud Reader)
[cx] Freud, S. “Jokes and their Relation to the Unconscious Ed. Angela Richards. Trans. James Strachey. 1991. Vol. 6. London: Penguin Freud Library, 1916[1917].

[cxi] Freud, S. “The Antithetical Meaning of Primal Words” in Five Lectures on Psychoanalysis, Leanardo da Vinci and Other Works. Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. Trans. James Strachey. 1st Ed. 1953. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis., 1910.

[cxii] Freud, S, “Analysis Terminable and Interminable” in Moses and Monotheism. An Outline to Psychoanalysis and Other Works. Ed. James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud, Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. Trans. James Strachey. 1st Ed.1964. Vol. XX111. The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis., 1937.

[cxiii] Shakespeare, W. “Shakespeare’s Sonnets”. Ed. Stephen Booth. 2000. Yale: Yale University Press., 1977.

xv11 Shakespeare, W, “Much ado about Nothing” in The Oxford Shakespeare. The Complete Works. Second Edition. Ed. Gen. Editors Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor. Ed. John Jowett, William Montgomery. 2005. Oxford: Oxford University Press., 1986.