

An International
Journal
of
Linguistic-Literary
Studies

POETICA



ISBN 978-4-8419-0671-4
C3098 ¥4500E
定価 (本体4500円＋税)

YUSHODO

82

ABE Masahiko <i>University of Tokyo</i>	MATSUDA Takami <i>Keio University</i>	Ziva BEN-PORAT <i>Tel-Aviv University</i>	E.G. STANLEY <i>Pembroke College, Oxford, Emeritus</i>
ALVEY Miyamoto Nahoko <i>University of Tokyo</i>	OGURA Michiko <i>Keio University</i>	Piero BOITANI <i>University of Rome</i>	TERASAWA Yoshio <i>University of Tokyo, Emeritus</i>
ELLIS Toshiko <i>University of Tokyo</i>	TAKAMIYA Toshiyuki <i>Keio University, Emeritus</i>	Stephen GREENBLATT <i>Harvard University</i>	Winthrop WETHERBEE <i>Cornell University, Emeritus</i>
KOBAYASHI Yoshiko <i>University of Tokyo</i>		SABAYAMA Takashi <i>Kwansei Gakuin University</i>	IKEGAMI Yoshihiko <i>Showa Women's University</i>

POETICA

An International Journal
of
Linguistic-Literary Studies

82

Special Issue

Romantic Connections

Edited by

Alex Watson
Nahoko Miyamoto Alvey

2014

Yushodo Co., Ltd.
Tokyo

ASSISTANT EDITORS

IWAMASA Shinji
Shirayuri College

TANABE Akira

The aim and role of our journal **POETICA** are threefold:

First, **POETICA** attempts to build up a comprehensive theory of texts and carry out minute analyses of them, thereby making literary interpretation and criticism as intellectual, objective and scientific as possible.

Second, with its interest in theory and methodology, **POETICA** endeavours not only to explore the potentialities of the literary language through the analyses of texts and through an imaginative approach to them, but also to analyse and describe the language in literary texts at all its levels: sound, word, syntax, style and meaning. Thus emphasis is attached to the language of literature and its empirical research as a basis for thinking about principles and theories of literature from a linguistic side.

Third, **POETICA** gives serious attention not only to the historical and social or psychosocial aspects of language as revealed in literary texts against the background of the historical contexts in which such texts were produced, but also to the originators of such texts, poets and writers whose philosophy must naturally be revealed through language and literature.

POETICA appears in spring and autumn in two issues per year, each consisting of approximately 120 pages.

Correspondence related to publication and orders from customers should be directed to:

The Editorial Board of POETICA

Yushodo Co., Ltd.

27 Sakamachi, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160-0002, Japan

Tel:81-3-3357-1449 Fax:81-3-4335-9419

e-mail:pressintl@yushodo.co.jp

You may find the following site helpful when placing orders and making inquiries.

<http://www.yushodo.co.jp/english/public2/poetica/index.html>

© Copyright 2014 in Japan
Toshiyuki Takamiya

No part of this issue may be translated or reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publishers.

ISSN 0287-1629
ISBN 978-4-8419-0671-4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction
ALEX WATSON

ARTICLES

PART 1: CONNECTIONS IN ROMANTICISM

MARY FAIRCLOUGH

Electrical Science and Della Cruscan Poetics in the 1790s 1

RICHARD ADELMAN

Keats and the Sociability of Idle Contemplation 21

MATTHEW SANGSTER

British Institutions, Literary Production and National Glory in
the Romantic Period 39

PART 2: CONNECTIONS IN ROMANTIC TRANSLATION

NAHOKO MIYAMOTO ALVEY

The Artistry of Connection: Shelleyan *Ottava Rima* in “Hymn to Mercury”
and “The Witch of Atlas” 59

YORIMICHI KASAHARA

P. B. Shelley, *terza rima*, and Italy: Con-fusion of Voices, Persons, and
Poetic Forms 79

TOMOKO NAKAGAWA

Naming the Unnameable: Monstrosity and Personification in the First
Japanese Translation of *Frankenstein* and its Illustrations 95

MATTHEW MEWHINNEY

British Romanticism in Classical Chinese: The Pastoral in
Natsume Sōseki’s *Kanshi* 115

List of Contributors 133

Introduction

This issue of *Poetica* presents some of the highlights from “Romantic Connections”: a three-day supernumerary conference of the North American Society for the Study of Romanticism (*NASSR*) that took place at the University of Tokyo in June 2014. The purpose of this event was not only to develop scholarly links between Japan and the rest of the world, but also to provide a forum in which to discuss the connections between European Romanticism and foreign peoples, cultures, and literatures: both in terms of how the Romantics responded to faraway places; and the less-frequently-posed question of how Romanticism itself has come to be understood and appropriated in non-Western contexts.

One of the major virtues of this theme is that it enables us to explore the issue of Romantic-period intercultural encounter in a manner that acknowledges that not all meetings between different cultures can be encompassed within the binary paradigm of dominant Western Self and dominated Eastern Other utilized by Edward Said in his foundational *Orientalism* (1978). Rather, intercultural encounter necessarily takes place in a multi-polar world of shifting power relationships between polyvalent cultures, and the assorted images cultures construct of one another typically display a complex blend of veracity and embellishment, openness and antipathy, insight and incomprehension. At the same time, considering “connection” also foregrounds the links between these new forms of global power and new technologies, such as electricity and the telegram, and new models of social interaction, including the crowd and Adam Smith’s formulation of sympathy. A further, vital advantage of the topic is that it helps us to develop a less Eurocentric view of Romanticism, and to acknowledge its important afterlife in South-East Asia in particular.

The first section of this issue, entitled “Connections in Romanticism,” features articles that utilize the concept of “connection” as a means of uncovering overlooked but significant exchanges in Romantic-period culture. In “Electrical Science and Della Cruscan Poetics in the 1790s,” Mary Fairclough traces a hidden relationship between electrical science and political thinking in the revolutionary decade. Fairclough demonstrates how figures as different as the anti-revolutionary polemicist Edmund Burke and the Della Cruscan poets Robert Merry and Mary Robinson each utilized electricity as a political metaphor. While Burke saw electricity’s hazardousness and unpredictability as a mirror of the unprecedented dangers of revolutionary ideology, Merry linked electricity’s intensity and fluidity to radical fellow feeling. Questions of political and

personal communication are also raised by Richard Adelman in “Keats and the Sociability of Idle Contemplation.” Adelman uncovers a subtle but significant link between the poets William Cowper, Percy Bysshe Shelley and John Keats, arguing that each explored disinterested contemplation as a direct challenge to political economy’s description of human life, particularly its view of the human being as primarily a worker. Adelman thereby proposes a rereading of Keats’ famous concept of “negative capability” that exposes its latent radical politics. More pecuniary forms of connection are explored in Matthew Sangster’s “British Institutions, Literary Production and National Glory in the Romantic Period,” which examines two attempts to create an institution for literature to rival the Royal Academy: the Royal Literary Fund and the Royal Society of Literature. Although these institutions assisted such famous names as Samuel Taylor Coleridge and François-René de Chateaubriand, their inability to assume a leading national role represents a failure of British literary Romanticism to link itself to an institutional home.

The second part, “Connections in Romantic Translation,” considers both how Romantic poets sought to connect with foreign cultures via the act of translation, and how later writers and artists have reconstructed Romanticism through translation. In “The Artistry of Connection: Shelleyan *Ottava Rima* in ‘Hymn to Mercury’ and ‘The Witch of Atlas,’” Nahoko Miyamoto Alvey identifies Percy Bysshe Shelley’s employment of the Italian verse form of *ottava rima* as an example of cultural hybridization. According to Alvey, this form allows Shelley to forge a cosmopolitan, intercultural “Anglo-Italian” identity. Shelley resists the temptations of literary colonialism, instead recognizing and representing what is uniquely other in his foreign sources. The presence of the distinctively foreign in Shelley’s writing is also detected by Yorimichi Kasahara in “P. B. Shelley, *terza rima*, and Italy: Con-fusion of Persons, Cases and Poetic Forms,” Kasahara shows how Shelley’s *The Masque of Anarchy* (1819), “Ode to the West Wind” (1819) and *The Triumph of Life* (1822) reveal a movement away from the closure permitted by the final couplet of the traditional English sonnet, towards a process more common in Italian *terza rima*, in which speaker is dissolved into addressee. Otherness of a different order is investigated in Tomoko Nakagawa’s “Naming the Unnameable: Monstrosity and Personification in the First Japanese Translation of *Frankenstein* and its Illustrations,” Nakagawa investigates the different names deployed for the being in *Frankenstein* (1818), with specific reference to the first Japanese translation of the novel (1889–90) and its illustrations by the painter and printmaker Kiyochika Kobayashi. Through their choice of appellation, Anglophone critics and readers, as well as foreign

translators and illustrations, are implicated in an act of translation, betraying (often unwittingly) the degree of humanity to which they attribute this character. Lastly, in “British Romanticism in Classical Chinese: The Pastoral in Natsume Sōseki’s *Kanshi*,” Matthew Mewhinney shows how the celebrated Meiji-era novelist, poet and scholar Sōseki fused Romanticism with ancient Chinese and Japanese culture in his composition of traditional Japanese poetic forms called *kanshi*. In the syntheses and collisions between these different cultural influences, Sōseki stages an ambivalent engagement with Japanese modernity.

Placing these articles alongside one another reveals a few—perhaps surprising—connections: both Fairclough and Sangster, for instance, highlight the importance of the drinking-song; and Shelley, in particular, emerges as a central linking figure, who engaged in many different dialogues within distinctive discourses. But what emerges most strongly is a more open image of Romanticism: as a phenomenon forged and constantly renewed by interpersonal, intertextual and international exchange. It is through their connections with other minds, innovations and cultures that the writers and artists considered in this collection discover their individuality. Their success in reconciling these apparent oppositions provides one of many examples of how our current age of digital communication and globalization continues to be enriched by its connections with Romanticism.

Alex Watson

YORIMICHI KASAHARA

P. B. Shelley, *terza rima*, and Italy:
Con-fusion of Voices, Persons, and Poetic Forms

The present paper consists of two parts: the former part that deals with narrative characteristics of "The Triumph of Life" and "The Mask of Anarchy" seen as triumphal pageants, will be followed by the second part in which the same narrative characteristics manifested in "Ode to the West Wind" will be considered in metrical and vocative terms. In so doing, I hope to show that the above mentioned poems, "Ode to the West Wind" in particular, are marked with an inclination away from coupletized closure of the English sonnet, towards *terza-rimian* process in which the first-person narrator is fused with the second-person addressee. (Hence, in this paper, the style of the original oral presentation is reserved so that the readers may feel, as they read on, as if they were being orally addressed by the first-person paper reader / author.)

* * *

Figure 1 shows what Shelley wrote on pages 52-verso and 53-recto of the folio sheets now kept at the Bodleian Library, Oxford, and photographically reproduced by Donald Reiman in 1986. It is the final part of "The Triumph of Life," considered to have been written during the months of May and June in 1822, and left unfinished when Hunt's arrival at Livorno took Shelley away from the MS on 1 July 1822, a week before his untimely death (Reiman, *A Critical Study* 250).

~~And~~ ~~some~~ grew weary of the ghastly dance
 And sank fell, as I have fallen by the
 way side
 Alas I kiss you [?]
 Those soonest, from whose limbs the
 from whose forms most shadows
 past
 strength
 And least of beauty & beauty did abide.—
 Then, said
 And what is Life I cried . . . the cripple cast
 His
 An eye upon the distant—car of beams
 car which now had rolled
 Onward, as if that look must be the last
 And answered . . . Happy those for whom the fold
 Of
 (Reiman, *Holograph Draft* 269–71)

Reiman's transcript roughly goes as follows:

some
 And most grew weary of the ghastly dance
 And sank fell as I have fallen by the
 way side
 Alas I kiss you [?]
 Those soonest, from whose limbs the
 from whose forms most shadows
 past
 strength
 And least of beauty & beauty did abide.—
 Then, said
 And what is Life I cried . . . the cripple cast
 His
 An eye upon the distant—car of beams
 car which now had rolled
 Onward, as if that look must be the last
 And answered . . . Happy those for whom the fold
 Of
 (Reiman, *Holograph Draft* 269–71)

Mary Shelley, based on this MS, edited her *Posthumous Poems* and published it in 1824, upon which, says Reiman, all editions before 1960 ultimately depended (Reiman, *A Critical Study* 119). The following is Mary Shelley's version:

And some grew weary of the ghastly dance,

 "And fell, as I have fallen, by the way side:—
 Those soonest, from whose forms most shadows past,
 And least of strength and beauty did abide.

 "Then, what is life? I cried."— (95)

The major or substantial difference, as far as "The Triumph of Life" is concerned, is that she did not include the final five lines into the canon, that part in which the cripple (crossed out in Reiman's transcript) casting his eye upon the car and answers, "Happy those, etc., etc." The minor or accidental difference, on which

Fig. 1. Bodleian MS. Shelley adds. c. 4, f. 52v, f. 53v.

From *Peter Bell the Third: A Facsimile of the Press-copy Transcript*; and *The Triumph of Life: A Facsimile of Shelley's Holograph Draft* (New York: Garland, 1986) 268.

we must confine our present attention, is that Mary added punctuation marks at various places, and gave inter-stanzaic spaces simply to make the bare text more readable as a *terza-rima* poem. But one could not make a text readable without interpretation of some sort on the part of the editor, especially as “[‘The Triumph of Life’] was left in so unfinished a state, that [Mary Shelley] arranged it in its present form with great difficulty” (*Posthumous Poems* vii). And it is this editorial interpretation that I wish to dwell upon now.

According to this method of punctuation, especially the quotation marks, along with the exclusion of the cripple passage, Mary Shelley seems to think, or she seems to have us think, that it is Rousseau who speaks what she shows us to be the final words of the poem: “Then, what is life.” This interpretation was succeeded in her 1839 edition, 1847 edition, and by William Michael Rossetti in his 1870 edition. Please see below, for easy comparison of the points of difference in each edition (I am following Reiman’s method of abbreviation), with who is “I” that says or cries “Then, what is life?”

*C*₁ (Mary 1839) and *C*₂ (Mary 1847): I = Rousseau
[Lines set without indentions, and with inter-stanzaic spaces]
“...abide. / “Then, what is life? I said.”—

*R*₁ (Rossetti 1870): I = Rousseau
[Lines set with indentions, and with inter-stanzaic spaces]
“...abide. / “Then, what is life?” I cried.”—

Then came the change in interpretation in Rossetti’s second edition of 1878. It reads as follows:

*R*₂ (Rossetti 1885): I = Poet Narrator
[Lines set with indentions, and with no inter-stanzaic spaces for the *terza rima*, but with spaces for verse-paragraphs]
“...abide.”/[Space]/ “Then what is life?” I cried.

What is characteristic, in fact revolutionary, about Rossetti’s second edition is that he did away with the three-line *terza-rima* stanza in editing “The Triumph of Life.” Instead he made use of verse paragraphs. But more important than this obvious fact in our present context is another small but obvious fact: Rossetti put a closing quotation mark after the word “abide.” What this closing quotation mark means is that Rousseau’s long narrative closes with the word “abide.”

Then comes “What is life?” with “I cried” outside the quotation marks. And this eventually means that it is the narrating poet who speaks “Then, what is life.” With this method of punctuation, the outermost framework of narrative has emerged. Sometime between Rossetti’s first edition of 1870 and his second edition of 1878, he must have thought that the three-line stanzaic form with spaces in every three lines was not suitable for “The Triumph of Life,” and that the poem would better end with the poet narrator appearing and speaking the final sceptical question.

Rossetti found support in George Edward Woodberry in his edition of 1892. His punctuation goes as follows:

W (Woodberry 1892): I = Poet Narrator
[Lines set with no indentions, and with inter-stanzaic spaces]
“...abide.” / “Then, what is life? I cried.”—

Although Woodberry’s punctuation marks are slightly different from those in Rossetti’s second edition, with the closing quotation marks at the end of “abide,” what comes after is to be interpreted as spoken by someone different from the person who has spoken those words that come before “abide.”

There remain, however, those who wish to let Rousseau have the final say: Harry Buxton Forman’s 1877 edition gives the same punctuation as Mary Shelley’s edition. This punctuation was followed by Thomas Hutchinson in his 1904 edition, to be succeeded by G. M. Matthews in 1970.

F (Forman 1877): I = Rousseau
[Lines set with no indentions, and with inter-stanzaic spaces]
“...abide. / “Then, what is life? I cried.”—

Hutchinson (1904) + Matthews (1970): I = Rousseau
“...abide. / “Then, what is life? I cried.”—

C. D. Locock, in his 1911 edition, includes into the canon what was written on the verso side of page 53 of the original manuscript:

L (Locock 1911): I = Poet Narrator / the cripple = Rousseau
[Lines set with no indentions, and with inter-stanzaic spaces]
“...abide.” / “Then, what is Life?” I cried.— The cripple cast // And answered, “Happy those for whom the gold / Of”

With the appearance, or perhaps the introduction of the cripple, presumably Rousseau, the speaker of "Then, what is Life?" cannot be anyone else but the poet narrator.

The point of this long list of various editorial interpretations shown above lies not so much in clarifying the authorial intention as in showing the diversity of editorial intention, or editorial confusion perhaps, confusion on the part of past editors as to the identity of the narrative voices. Why did so ideal and representative readers of the past such as Mary Shelley, Rossetti, Locoock, Woodberry, Hutchinson, etc., etc. get confused in the identity of the subject of the speaking voice?

This confusion may perhaps be explained in part by the fact that Rousseau's narrative is so long, that by the time the reader comes to Rousseau's encounter with the Shape all Light and his description of "a new vision," Rousseau has virtually become the first-person narrator, with the outermost narrative framework pushed out of the consciousness of the reader.

What adds to this is the fact that the recurrence of similar events or narratives makes the identity of the speaker further confused, confused at least in the reader's mind. Rousseau, who appears in the dream vision of the poet narrator, recounts the story which is similar to that of the poet narrator. "Whence camest thou and whither goest thou? How did thy course begin, and why?" (296-97)¹ asks the poet narrator to Rousseau, who later in turn asks the Shape all light almost the same question, "Shew whence I came, and where I am, and why" (398). The repetition of similar questions by the person who once was asked of that question has a power of involving readers' consciousness trapped in a curiously convoluted spiral.² In fact, persistent convoluted consciousness concerning the past and future and their problematic relation with the present is the dominant tone of the entire poem. Having considered thus, we are left to wonder if this is a mere confusion, or something related more to the root and nature of Shelley's poetic composition.

This suspicion is made even stronger when we consider that another poem, in which a long narrative at the latter half of the poem poses a question as to the identity of the speaking voice, also depicts an imaginary triumphal pageant.³ The poem in question is "The Mask of Anarchy," but before discussing details of the poem, we might take a look at what Shelley has to say on the sculptural or architectural representation of the triumphal procession in his prose piece "Arch of Titus," which Nora Crook claims in fact "is an address—an epistle—a dramatic oration, even—to Jews by a Jew who is not necessarily in Rome" (47-48).⁴

After detailed descriptions of the reliefs, either real or imaginary as Crook

claims (47), commemorating Emperor Titus's triumphal procession that took place in Rome in AD 71 after he devastated the entire city of Jerusalem in the preceding year, Shelley, or a Jewish orator, looks far beyond the Foro Romano, and says:

Beyond this obscure monument of our destruction is seen the monument of the power of our destroyer's family, now a mountain of ruins. The Flavian Amphitheatre is become a habitation of owls & dragons. The power, of whose possession it was once the type, & of whose departure it is now the emblem, is become a dream & a memory. Rome is no more than Jerusalem. (Crook 59)

Thus concludes Shelley with an epigrammatic sentence. If Rome the destroyer, is the same as Jerusalem the destroyed, in the triumphal pageant, the identity of the subject of the speaking voice may very well be confused. Rousseau in "The Triumph of Life" is no more than the poet narrator. Besides, Rousseau says to the poet narrator before he begins his story, "And what thou wouldst be taught I then may learn / From thee" (307-08). The role of the guide is reversed from the very beginning.

"The Mask of Anarchy" was written in September 1819 at the occasion of Peterloo Massacre that took place in Manchester in the preceding month (White 2:105). The former half of this poem is a description of the visionary, allegorical triumphal pageant that the poet narrator saw as he was stimulated by the "voice [that came] from over the Sea [as he] lay asleep in Italy" (1-2). The latter half of this poem is an extended address to the "Men of England" (147). The identity of the addresser, however, is not clear. The poem does not say who is speaking: it merely says, "These words...arose...as if her [Earth's] heart had cried aloud" (138-45, emphasis added).

This long extended address to the men of England ends not with a direct appeal to action but with words of prophecy to be "[h]eard [by them] again - again - again—// Rise like lions after slumber / In unvanquishable number—// Ye are many - they are few." These final five lines (368-72) are the repetition of the first words (151-55) of this long address, in fact the first imperative after the vocative address to "Men of England." And if these words are to be heard again and again and again, then this long address itself will be self-reflexively cyclic. This confusion of narrative voices, unlike the case of "The Triumph of Life," must definitely be the authorial intention. Here is an example of an extended address turned into a convoluted voice of prophecy at the end of a poem.

With the appearance, or perhaps the introduction of the cripple, presumably Rousseau, the speaker of "Then, what is Life?" cannot be anyone else but the poet narrator.

The point of this long list of various editorial interpretations shown above lies not so much in clarifying the authorial intention as in showing the diversity of editorial intention, or editorial confusion perhaps, confusion on the part of past editors as to the identity of the narrative voices. Why did so ideal and representative readers of the past such as Mary Shelley, Rossetti, Locock, Woodberry, Hutchinson, etc., etc. get confused in the identity of the subject of the speaking voice?

This confusion may perhaps be explained in part by the fact that Rousseau's narrative is so long, that by the time the reader comes to Rousseau's encounter with the Shape all Light and his description of "a new vision," Rousseau has virtually become the first-person narrator, with the outermost narrative framework pushed out of the consciousness of the reader.

What adds to this is the fact that the recurrence of similar events or narratives makes the identity of the speaker further confused, confused at least in the reader's mind. Rousseau, who appears in the dream vision of the poet narrator, recounts the story which is similar to that of the poet narrator. "Whence camest thou and whither goest thou? How did thy course begin, and why?" (296-97)¹ asks the poet narrator to Rousseau, who later in turn asks the Shape all light almost the same question, "Shew whence I came, and where I am, and why" (398). The repetition of similar questions by the person who once was asked of that question has a power of involving readers' consciousness trapped in a curiously convoluted spiral.² In fact, persistent convoluted consciousness concerning the past and future and their problematic relation with the present is the dominant tone of the entire poem. Having considered thus, we are left to wonder if this is a mere confusion, or something related more to the root and nature of Shelley's poetic composition.

This suspicion is made even stronger when we consider that another poem, in which a long narrative at the latter half of the poem poses a question as to the identity of the speaking voice, also depicts an imaginary triumphal pageant.³ The poem in question is "The Mask of Anarchy," but before discussing details of the poem, we might take a look at what Shelley has to say on the sculptural or architectural representation of the triumphal procession in his prose piece "Arch of Titus," which Nora Crook claims in fact "is an address—an epistle—a dramatic oration, even—to Jews by a Jew who is not necessarily in Rome" (47-48).⁴

After detailed descriptions of the reliefs, either real or imaginary as Crook

claims (47), commemorating Emperor Titus's triumphal procession that took place in Rome in AD 71 after he devastated the entire city of Jerusalem in the preceding year, Shelley, or a Jewish orator, looks far beyond the Foro Romano, and says:

Beyond this obscure monument of our destruction is seen the monument of the power of our destroyer's family, now a mountain of ruins. The Flavian Amphitheatre is become a habitation of owls & dragons. The power, of whose possession it was once the type, & of whose departure it is now the emblem, is become a dream & a memory. Rome is no more than Jerusalem. (Crook 59)

Thus concludes Shelley with an epigrammatic sentence. If Rome the destroyer, is the same as Jerusalem the destroyed, in the triumphal pageant, the identity of the subject of the speaking voice may very well be confused. Rousseau in "The Triumph of Life" is no more than the poet narrator. Besides, Rousseau says to the poet narrator before he begins his story, "And what thou wouldst be taught I then may learn / From thee" (307-08). The role of the guide is reversed from the very beginning.

"The Mask of Anarchy" was written in September 1819 at the occasion of Peterloo Massacre that took place in Manchester in the preceding month (White 2:105). The former half of this poem is a description of the visionary, allegorical triumphal pageant that the poet narrator saw as he was stimulated by the "voice [that came] from over the Sea [as he] lay asleep in Italy" (1-2). The latter half of this poem is an extended address to the "Men of England" (147). The identity of the addresser, however, is not clear. The poem does not say who is speaking: it merely says, "These words...arose...as if her [Earth's] heart had cried aloud" (138-45, emphasis added).

This long extended address to the men of England ends not with a direct appeal to action but with words of prophecy to be "[h]eard [by them] again – again – again—// Rise like lions after slumber / In unvanquishable number—// Ye are many – they are few." These final five lines (368-72) are the repetition of the first words (151-55) of this long address, in fact the first imperative after the vocative address to "Men of England." And if these words are to be heard again and again and again, then this long address itself will be self-reflexively cyclic. This confusion of narrative voices, unlike the case of "The Triumph of Life," must definitely be the authorial intention. Here is an example of an extended address turned into a convoluted voice of prophecy at the end of a poem.

* * *

Yet another poem in which the confusion of narrative voices occurs at the end of a poem is "Ode to the West Wind," composed in October 1819 (White 2: 586). The entire poem is an address of the lyric speaker to the west wind, and is made up of five fourteen-line sections (I call them "sonnet sections" in my paper), with each sonnet section consisting of four *terza-rima* stanzas with the addition of a couplet. This couplet is in consonant with the middle line of the preceding *terza-rima* stanza. Thus one sonnet section rhymes as: aba bcb cdc ded ee.

The curious thing about this metrical scheme is that the penultimate lines of the sonnet sections form phonetically a couplet, yet hardly form couplets in meaning, in the narrow sense of the word where concluding summaries are given with sense and metre coinciding at the end.⁵ First three sonnet sections end as addresses to the west wind, ending in the imperative of the verb "hear." These vocative-imperative endings in the form of an address give us an impression that they are far from being closed, firstly because of the unparalleled syntax of the last two lines in which the imperative of a verb "O hear!" is added almost like an appendage, and secondly because of the narrative momentum in which the poet calls out to a being outside of the poem.

Then comes the turning point after the third sonnet section. In the fourth sonnet section, the poet becomes keenly aware of the distance between the west wind, an "[u]ncontrollable" being, and himself, "fall[ing] upon the thorns of life[, and] bleed[ing]." The penultimate lines are descriptive of the poet himself, yet the rhyming words are quite opposite in meaning: "bowed" and "proud," making the couplet not only open, but rather crippled. Yet this pairing of opposing words in the final couplet of the sonnet section itself is indicative of the distance between the west wind and the poet. Thus, these four couplets, far from being closed in meaning, are somewhat de-coupletized in the traditional use of the metre.

The vocative-imperative couplet of the first three sonnet sections naturally presupposes the distinction of the first-person entity from the second-person entity. It is the first-person addresser speaking to the second-person addressee. Again in the fourth sonnet section, the focus is on the difference between the two entities. And comes the fifth sonnet section:

Make me thy lyre, even as the forest is:
What if my leaves are falling like its own!
The tumult of thy mighty harmonies

Will take from both a deep, autumnal tone,
Sweet though in sadness. Be thou, Spirit fierce,
My spirit! Be thou me, impetuous one!

Drive my dead thoughts over the universe
Like withered leaves to quicken a new birth!
And, by the incantation of this verse,

Scatter, as from an unextinguished hearth
Ashes and sparks, my words among mankind!
Be through my lips to unawakened Earth

The trumpet of a prophecy! O Wind,
If Winter comes, can Spring be far behind? (57-70)

Here, the distinction between the first-person addresser and the second-person addressee is cancelled, or is on the point of being cancelled, when the poet speaks to the spirit of the west wind, "Be thou me." It is the most direct statement of the first-person addresser to the second-person addressee to be the first-person entity. After this imperative sentence, any address to the second-person entity is confused or overlaid with the attributes of the first-person addresser. The west wind is to "[d]rive *my* dead thoughts," "[s]catter...my words," "[b]e through *my* lips...[t]he trumpet of prophecy" (emphasis added).

And then comes one of the most quoted passages in the English Romantic poetry: "O, Wind, / If Winter comes, can Spring be far behind?" Since there is no longer, at this moment, a distinction between the first-person addresser and the second-person addressee, this apostrophic vocative to the wind inevitably becomes self-reflexively convolute. And this leads on to the final question, which becomes a self-reflexive rhetorical question. It is only by cancelling the distinction between the first-person and second-person entities and thereby making the address convolutedly self-reflexive that Shelley succeeds in closing the couplet and thereby ending the poem, in metre at least.

Table 1. List of WINDs at the end of lines in P. B. Shelley's poems, compiled by the author from *English Poetry*, 2nd ed., with its P. B. Shelley's works based on Hutchinson's 1904 ed.

(1) Works	(2) Lines	(3) Rhyming words BEFORE wind	(4) WIND related phrases	(5) Rhyming words AFTER wind	(6) Not in rhyme	NB
Daemon	390		gusty wind		1	
Daemon	503		melancholy wind		1	
Alastor	243		every wind		1	
Alastor	259		Spirit of wind		1	
Alastor	309		and the wind		1	
Alastor	397		stream of wind		1	
Alastor	410		wanton wind		1	
Revolt	1667		like a wind	lined	1	
Revolt	2123	1 blind	like a wind	mind	1	
Revolt	3099	1 behind	weary wind			
Revolt	3181		like wind	unbind	1	
Revoit	4607	1 o'ertwined	to the wind			
Rosalind	816	1 declined	an altered wind			
Rosalind	854		muttering wind		1	
Rosalind	1161	1 confined	moving wind			
Rosalind	1280		and the wind	Rosalind	1	
Rosalind	1		Cf.	Rosalind		unkind
Rosalind	1318		Cf.	Rosalind		kind
Julian	275	1 twined	the ooze and wind			
Julian	297	1 behind	envious wind			
Prom. Unb.	327		climb the wind	behind	1	
Prom. Unb.	660		wing the wind		1	
Prom. Unb.	683		within the wind	mind	1	
Prom. Unb.	50		made the wind		1	
Prom. Unb.	147		unwilling wind		1	
Prom. Unb.	195		ebbing wind		1	
Prom. Unb.	53	1 behind	uplifting wind			
Prom. Unb.	37		enamoured wind		1	
Prom. Unb.	98		swift as wind		1	
Prom. Unb.	218		an inward wind		1	
Prom. Unb.	324		by its own wind		1	
Cenci	41		to the wind		1	
Cenci	170		frozen wind		1	
Mask	132		tameless as wind	grind / behind	1	
Peter	613	1 mind	in the wind			
Witch	196	1 confined	and the wind	unbind	1	
Witch	487		platforms of the wind	behind	1	
Wich	521		of that wind	humankind	1	
Oedipus	104		upon the wind		1	
Epips.	108	1 disentwined	faint wind			
Epips.	290	1 mind	by the wind			

(1) Works	(2) Lines	(3) Rhyming words BEFORE wind	(4) WIND related phrases	(5) Rhyming words AFTER wind	(6) Not in rhyme	NB
Adonais	457	1 find	bitter wind			
Exhortation	22	1 mind	beams and wind			
Sensit. Pl.	23		of the wind	behind	1	
Arethusa	25		south wind	behind	1	
Arethusa	54	1 behind	cloudy wind			
Orpheus	36		murnuring wind		1	
Serchio	91	1 behind	morning wind			
Fr. Rain	1		in the wind		1	
Hom. Cast.	13		the wind	behind	1	
Hom. Sun	20	1 twined	uplifting wind			
Fr. Elegy	7		sweetness on the wind		1	
Magico Prodigioso	140		invisible wind		1	
Faust	161	1 behind	outspeeding the wind			
Q. Mab	221		powerless as the wind		1	
Q. Mab	94		the gusty wind		1	
Song	20		sweeping wind		1	
Song	27		to the wind		1	
Revenge	38	1 reclined	of the wind			
Spectral Horseman	3		blast of the wind		1	
Bigotry	1		songs of the wind	hind	1	
Ch. 1st	470		coming wind		1	
Triumph	166	1 find / behind	insulting wind			
O that a chariot	6		billowing wind		1	
Marenghi	149		by the wind	mind	1	
Ode W. Wind	69	1 mankind	O Wind	behind	1	
Hellas	177		and a wind		1	
Hellas	286		ever-veering wind		1	
Heilas	291		northern wind		1	
Hellas	480		Thracian wind		1	
Hellas	496		north wind		1	
Hellas	516		tainted wind		1	
Hellas	628		infant wind		1	
Heilas	720		rushing wind		1	
Ch. 1st	138		before the wind		1	
Ch. 1st	361		favouring wind		1	
On Leaving London	1		unfettered wind	behind	1	
W. Jew	1053	1 mind	as the wind			
W. Jew	1085		upon the wind		1	
W. Jew	1214	1 mind	in the wind			
SUM		22			15 34	71

As shown in Table 1, Shelley uses the word "wind" at the end of lines 71 times in all, when it is used as a noun meaning (according to Ellis's definition) "movement of air," with the instances of the verb "wind" excluded. Of those 71 instances, while 34 are used in unrhymed contexts, 37 are used to rhyme with words ending with an /-aɪnd/ sound. We should note that all the words used in Shelley's poetry to rhyme with "wind" meaning "movement of air" end with an /-aɪnd/ sound, and none are used to rhyme with words ending with an /-ɪnd/ sound.⁶

Here in our ode, the final vocative address to the west wind, as elsewhere in his 36 instances, the word is to be pronounced as /waɪnd/ to rhyme with "man-kind" and "behind," make it phonetically a couplet, and thereby end the poem in metre.

In theme, however, the poem does not end.⁷ Now that the state of spring being not "far behind," it may not be too fanciful to claim that the Shelleyan poetic pronunciation /waɪnd/ will have a power of *winding* us back to the first sonnet section when the west wind's "azure sister of the Spring" is prophesied as "blow[ing] / Her clarion...o'er the dreaming earth," and "plain and hill" are prophesied as being filled with "living hues and odours." In other words, the Shelleyan pronunciation /waɪnd/ helps the autumn wind that is present in the poem to reach out to the spring wind that is not present in the poem yet promised in the revolution of seasons and of social change as well.

To put it grammatically, the vocative case of a noun is verging upon the imperative of a verb with the same spelling, just like other imperative verbs in the poem: "hear," "hear," and "hear" in the final couplet of the first three sonnet sections, along with other imperative verbs: "lift me...," "make me...," "Be thou me," "Drive...," "Scatter...," and "Be through my lips..." (In fact this poem is characterized with abundance of imperative verbs!)

It is, of course, far from my intention to claim that the word "wind" is a verb, but with the Shelleyan pronunciation /waɪnd/, the vocative case of the noun "wind" acquires a power of verging onto the imperative of a verb. If and when we pronounce this word as /waɪnd/, then all the couplets in "Ode to the West Wind" are de-coupletized, fraught with the kinetic momentum to go on and on in the perpetual cycle of seasons, and the perpetual cycle of social change (whether for good or bad). What emerges out of all this is: (1) the triumph of the *terza rima* over the closed couplet, or the closure of the English sonnet form being challenged by the Italian form of the continuous *terza rima*; and (2) the case of the first-person addresser being united with the second-person addressee at the end of an extended address.

To sum up, what appears to be an editorial confusion of speakers of Shelley's

final words in Italy as a poet, "Then, what is life," may have its origin in "Ode to the West Wind," in which a vocative address is invested with a power of con-fusing (meaning "fusing together" rather than "mixing up") the addresser with the addressee, and invalidating the coupletized closure in favour of the *terza-rimian* process.

Notes

1 All subsequent quotations will be from *Shelley's Poetry and Prose*. 2nd ed.

2 See for example Angela Leighton's comment: Rousseau's long narrative tells as much as the younger poet has already experienced, and the whole poem thus repudiates his search for answers (173–74).

3 For a detailed discussion of the triumphal tradition in Shelley, see John Robert Leo, *Visualized Triumph Patterns in Shelley* (Diss. Northwestern U, 1973). Although Leo admits that a "triumph tradition is difficult to describe in relation to Shelley's understanding of it," he asserts that "[t]he two major triumph poems Shelley writes [are] *The Mask of Anarchy* and *The Triumph of Life*" (43, 3).

4 Neither Crook nor E. B. Murray confirms its composition date, though it had formerly been associated with the spring of 1819, ever since Mary Shelley put it as a footnote to Shelley's letter to Peacock dated 23 March 1819 in her *Essays, Letters from Abroad...* (1840). I should like to express my sincerest gratitude to my friend Nahoko Miyamoto Alvey, who kindly directed my attention to Crook's article.

5 See for instance, "couplet" and "sonnet" in *Princeton Encyclopaedia of Poetry and Poetics*: ...the heroic couplet is "closed"—syntax and thought are fitted neatly into the envelope of rhyme and meter.... The Spenserian and Shakespearean [sonnet] patterns... invite a division of thought into 3 quatrains and a closing or summarizing couplet. Also see what Barbara Herrnstein Smith has to say on closure and formal conventions of the English sonnets: ...the terminal rhyming couplet of the English sonnets allows the poet to end it with striking resolution, finality, punch, pointedness... a rhymed couplet, when it corresponds to a syntactically complete utterance, is, in itself, an effectively closed form (51).

6 The instance in "Rosalind and Helen" (1280) may look tricky. But elsewhere in this poem the word "Rosalind" rhymes with "unkind" (1), and "kind" (1318). "Rosalind" therefore ends with an /-aɪnd/ sound.

7 See what White says on *terza rima* and the concluding couplets: ...when [Shelley] came to write his "Ode to the West Wind" he modified it [*terza rima*] boldly into a stanza form in which concluding couplets, conventionally used to establish a full stop, became a device for increasing suspense and cumulative force (2: 451).

Works Cited

- Ellis, F. S. *A Lexical Concordance to the Poetical Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley*. London: Quaritch, 1892.
- English Poetry*. 2nd ed. CD-ROM. Medford, NJ: Bell, 1992–2001.
- Cameron, Kenneth Neil. *Shelley: The Golden Years*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1974.
- Crook, Nora and Tatsuo Tokoo. "Shelley's Jewish 'Orations'." *Keats-Shelley Journal* 59 (2010): 43–64.
- Leighton, Angela. *Shelley and the Sublime: An Interpretation of the Major Poems*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.
- Leo, John Robert. *Visualized Triumph Patterns in Shelley: A Phenomenological Reading*. Diss. Northwestern U, 1973. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1989.
- Murray, E. B. ed. *Miscellaneous Poetry, Prose, and Translation from Bodleian MS. Shelley adds. c.4, etc.* The Bodleian Shelley Manuscript 21. New York: Garland, 1995.
- Preminger, Alex, ed. *Princeton Encyclopaedia of Poetry and Poetics*. London: Macmillan, 1974.
- Reiman, Donald H. *Shelley's "The Triumph of Life": A Critical Study*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1965.
- , ed. *Peter Bell the Third: A Facsimile of the Press-copy Transcript; and, The Triumph of Life: A Facsimile of Shelley's Holograph Draft*. The Bodleian Shelley Manuscript 5. New York: Garland, 1986.
- Shelley, Percy Bysshe. *The Complete Poetical Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley*. Ed. George Edward Woodberry. 4 vols. Boston: Houghton, 1892.
- . *The Complete Poetical Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley*. Ed. Thomas Hutchinson. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1904.
- . *The Complete Poetical Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley*. Ed. Thomas Hutchinson, corr. by G. M. Matthews. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1970.
- . *Essays, Letters from Abroad, Translations and Fragments of Percy Bysshe Shelley*. Ed. Mrs. Shelley. 2 vols. London: Moxon, 1840.
- . *The Poems of Percy Bysshe Shelley*. Ed. C[harles] D. Locock. 2 vols. London: Methuen, 1911.
- . *The Poetical Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley*. Ed. Mrs. Shelley. 4 vols. London: Moxon, 1839.
- . *The Poetical Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley*. Ed. Mrs. Shelley. 3 vols. London: Moxon, 1847.
- . *The Poetical Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley*. Ed. William Michael Rossetti. 2 vols. London: Moxon, 1870.
- . *The Poetical Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley*. Ed. H[arry] Buxton Forman. 4 vols. London: Reeves, 1876–77.
- . *The Poetical Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley*. Ed. William Michael Rossetti. 3 vols. London: Moxon, 1878.
- . *Posthumous Poems of Percy Bysshe Shelley*. Ed. Mary W. Shelley. London, 1824; rpt. Ed. Jonathan Wordsworth. Oxford: Woodstock, 1991.
- . *Shelley's Poetry and Prose*. 2nd ed. Ed. Niel Fraistat and Donald H. Reiman. New York: Norton, 2002.
- Smith, Barbara Herrnstein. *Poetic Closure: A Study of How Poems End*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1968.
- White, Newman Ivey. *Shelley: A Biography in Two Volumes*. 2 vols. London: Secker, 1947.

- ibokushū*. Tokyo: Kyūryūdō, 1980. Print.
- Watson, Burton. *Poetry and Prose in Chinese by Japanese Writers of the Later Period*. Vol. 2 of *Japanese Literature in Chinese*. New York: Columbia UP, 1976. Print.
- Williams, Raymond. *The Country and the City*. New York: Oxford UP, 1973. Print.
- Wordsworth, William, and Samuel Taylor Coleridge. *Lyrical Ballads 1798–1800*. Edited by Michael Gamer and Dahlia Porter. Toronto: Broadview P, 2008. Print.

CONTRIBUTORS

RICHARD ADELMAN is a lecturer at the University of Sussex, UK. He is the author of *Idleness, Contemplation and the Aesthetic, 1750–1830*, which was published by Cambridge University Press in hardback in 2011, and in paperback in 2014. This book charts the development of a British idealism in the last decades of the eighteenth century by focusing on nascent political economy, various forms of social philosophy, and on the period's literary culture. Richard is currently completing a companion piece to this monograph, a study of the decay of idealist aesthetics, and of the changing conceptions of idleness, across the course of the nineteenth century.

NAHOKO MIYAMOTO ALVEY is a professor in the Department of Area Studies at the University of Tokyo, Japan. She is the author of *Strange Truths in Undiscovered Lands: Shelley's Poetic Development and Romantic Geography* (University of Toronto Press, 2009), and the editor and translator of *Shelley's Poems: Parallel Translation* (Iwanami, 2013). She is currently working on a project on cross-cultural literary practices and negotiations of British Romantic poets and their influences beyond Europe and America.

MARY FAIRCLOUGH is a lecturer in English and Related Literature and member of the Centre for Eighteenth Century Studies at the University of York. She is the author of *The Romantic Crowd: Sympathy, Controversy and Print Culture* (Cambridge University Press, 2013), and several articles exploring the intersection of literary, political and scientific culture in the eighteenth century and Romantic period. She is currently working on a monograph project on cultures of electricity in the eighteenth century which thinks about the ways in which scientific discourse is incorporated into literary and political works.

YORIMICHI KASAHARA, or better known as Kasahara Yorimichi, is Professor at Meisei University, Tokyo, and currently President of Japan Association of English Romanticism (2012–) after he had served on its Editorial Board (1990–2000, 2006–12). He also held the third presidency of Japan Shelley Studies Center (2007–11) after its second President Tokoo. He is the editor/author of *From John Denham to Romanticism: How Arose the Lyric from Loco-descriptive Poetry* (2004), and the editor/translator of *Byron's Poems: Parallel Translation* (2009), both in Japanese; while his past publications in English include "Meditations on the Acropolis" in *Byron: A Poet for All Seasons* (Messolonghi Byron Society,

2000) and “Byron’s Dying Gladiator in Context” (*The Wordsworth Circle*, 2009). He is recently interested in annotating various Dying-Gladiator poems in the English Romantic period.

MATTHEW MEWHINNEY is a doctoral student in the Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures at the University of California, Berkeley. His research examines modern subjectivity and forms of representation in Japanese literati culture in the eighteenth through early twentieth centuries. He is interested in questions concerning the relationship between prose and poetry, the overlap of visual and literary mediums, and the negotiation between the past and the present. Matthew has rendered many of Natsume Sōseki’s *kanshi* into English, and looks forward to translating more classical works of Japanese intellectuals writing in the modern period.

TOMOKO NAKAGAWA is Professor in the Department of English Language and Literature at the University of the Sacred Heart, Tokyo. She is the author of *Nichijō no Sōbō* [*Aspects of Daily Lives in the British Novel*] (2011) and an editor of *Furankenshutain* [*Frankenstein*] (2006), *Shoku de Yomu Igitisu Shosetsu* [*The British Novel and the Representations of Food*] (2004), and *Interia de Yomu Igitisu Shōsetsu* [*The British Novel and the Representations of Domestic Interiors*] (2003). Her current research interests lie in the interplay between image and text in illustrated novels, cultural exchanges between Japan and Britain in the nineteenth century and eco-critical approaches to the modern British novel.

MATTHEW SANGSTER currently teaches at the University of Birmingham, having previously taught in Oxford and London, worked at the British Library, and conducted research as a Fleeman Fellow at the University of St Andrews. His doctoral studies at Royal Holloway, University of London focused on authorial careers in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries; he submitted his thesis in 2012 and is revising the manuscript for publication as a monograph. The article included in this issue is drawn from the early stages of a new project on the relationships between metropolitan institutions and literary production in the Romantic period.

ALEX WATSON is an Assistant Professor at Japan Women’s University, Tokyo. His monograph, *Romantic Marginality: Nation and Empire on the Borders of the Page* (Pickering and Chatto, 2012) is the first book-length study of Romantic-era annotation. As well as writing articles on J. G. Ballard and travel-writing, he is

currently working on a second monograph that explores how the image of the ruin provided an unstable cultural and epistemological foundation for the British Empire in the Romantic period.