Kate Aughterson (University of Brighton)

'Too hot, too hot'[i]: The Rhetorical Poetics of Soliloquies in Shakespeare's Late Plays

When Leontes asks Camillo 'Is whispering nothing?' (*The Winter's Tale* 1.2.281) he rhetorically and meta-theatrically poses the conundrum of the self-addressed speech and its rhetorical function within the late plays. Paradoxically, whispering is both everything and nothing in his court: Leontes's privately perceived world ('They're here with me already, whisp'ring, rounding', 1.2.214) juxtaposed with public courtly discourse. Even soliloquies delivered *solus* retain the performative effect of whispering. The delivery of a soliloquy gives a character a certain status on stage and in the plot: rather than being subject to the plot, the self-addressed speech sits slightly outside, albeit in commentary on, the plot, and may on occasion change the direction of the action. The soliloquies of the late plays pose an additional critical paradox. Considered as a chronological grouping, these plays contain the largest number of self-addressed speeches of any other similar grouping, including the tragedies[ii]: but these plays generally eschew character development in favour of fantastical plot and poetry, moving from mimesis to poesis[iii]. The conventional critical and performative view of the soliloquy is that they provide insight into character and the inner life[iv]: however, the higher frequency of soliloquies in the late plays does not produce drama that is more mimetic. While early modern rhetorical handbooks do not explicitly mention the soliloquy: the rhetorical function of the 'auricular figure' is a useful critical tool for thinking about performed drama and the soliloquy. We hear soliloquies (whether whispered or not) in a different way to other speeches: they are a distinct and structured rhetorical

intervention. While the term 'soliloquy' was not used by early modern dramatists, actors or typesetters: two early modern stage directions do recognise the particular nature of the performed event: '*solus*' and '*aside*' [v] (although these do not always appear textually). James Hirsh's definition of the soliloquy as: 'a passage spoken by a single actor and not intended by that actor to heard by any other character'[vi] includes even short asides: however for the purpose of this chapter, I have not included the minimal aside[vii]. I would add to this definition that while soliloquies are not audience-addressed, they do through metre, voice and scenic positioning 'stand aside' from the main action.

George Puttenham's *The Arte of English Poesie* (1589) describes auricular figures as:

> those which work alteration in th'eare by sound, accent, time and slipper volubility in utterance… And not only the whole body of a tale in a poeme or historie may be made I such sort pleasant and agreeable to the eare, but also very clause by itself, and every single word carried in a clause (Book 3, p.172)

I shall argue that the soliloquy is a type of structural 'auricular figure': Puttenham describes figures which 'work…. by disorder' (Book III, chapter 12) denominated as a group as 'the trespasser'[viii]. These are auricular figures which disrupt or exceed the semantic, metrical or grammatical order, usually for intellectual or dramatic emphasis. Puttenham's personification of two modes as 'the insertour', and 'the interruptor' matches the performance and insertion of soliloquies in the late plays. Shakespeare's experimentation with language and form in the late plays extends to experimentation with the mode of the soliloquy as a rhetorical mode of interruption, and such interruptions and disruptions (which mark both the language and narrative form of these plays[ix]) are quintessentially performed by experimentation with the soliloquy. Although there is not space in this chapter to consider the full extent of that experimentation in a performative space, it is crucial to

remember that these plays were written for the re-opening of the indoor theatre at Blackfriars for adult companies, particularly celebrated for its special effects, which included the enhanced intimacy of a smaller auditorium, and thence, arguably, a better ability to hear the whisperings[x].

Recent critical interest in the phenomena of 'lateness' has foregrounded the late-plays' disjointedness, theatricality and political and linguistic complexities[xi]. All six usually considered in this grouping (*Pericles, The Winter's Tale, Cymbeline, The Tempest, Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*) were written between 1609-1613 and share certain 'family resemblances'[xii]: of romantic and improbable plots; of families re-united through supra-natural agents; of linguistic and performative complexity; a self-conscious breaking of classical dramatic conventions; an emphasis on plot over character; and the intersections between political and private lives. Most critical focus on soliloquies has been on those from Shakespeare's middle period, in particular the tragedies of 1600-1605[xiii]. Neither critical discussions of Shakespeare's late plays nor critical discussions of soliloquies examine these late soliloquies as distinctive units. Nordland counts an average of 1717 'inside' words per play written between 1590-4; 1273 between 1595-9; 1704 between 1600-4; 1509 between 1605-9; and 2565 in the late period[xiv]: a figure which flattens differences between plays, but illustrates a shift towards more soliloquies in the last plays. Those plays which include the highest number of 'insides' as part of the action are *Cymbeline* and *The Winter's Tale*, both written within a year or so of each other, and Shakespeare's first sole-authored plays for the newly available space of the Blackfriars Theatre. We can test how the soliloquy as an auricular rhetorical mode is part of the late plays' experimentalism by looking at patterning, placement, voice, and performative and dramatic contexts. McDonald[xv] argues that the late

plays' stylistic characteristics (such as ellipsis, syntactic disruption, parenthesis, repetition, hypermetricality, cumulative metaphors and self-conscious virtuosity) act as rhetorical memes in the play's broader meaning. These stylistic memes grammatically echo and help generate the jagged and peculiar romance narrative structure. Could the late play's rhetoric of individual soliloquies or scenic units which use juxtaposed soliloquies help define the late soliloquy and the identity of lateness (a question not asked by McDonald)?

Table 1: The soliloquies of the late plays

Play	Date	Number of TOTAL soliloquies (including asides of longer than 3 lines)	Number EXCLUDING audience address such as chorus/ song
Pericles	1608/9	13	6
Cymbeline	1610	19	19
The Winter's Tale	1610	15	14
Tempest	1611	8	7
Henry VIII	1613	8	6
Two Noble Kinsmen	1613	12	10

One way to assess the soliloquies' stylistic distinctiveness is by considering how they differ from the speeches around them in measurable ways, and metre is one such easily observable measure. The late plays are distinctively hypermetrical (the usage of more than ten beats to the iambic line)[xvi]. Metrical assessment of Shakespeare's plays has conventionally been undertaken to help date and order the canon[xvii]an enterprise fraught with a number of critical and methodological dangers. Wells and Taylor have used Wentersdorf's index to construct a revised metrical index of hypermetricality in the plays, which includes all non- iambic pentameter lines (including feminine endings, alexandrines, and over-flows)[xviii]. This metrical index ranges between 7 and 17 per hundred lines in plays up to *As You like It*; from 20 (in *Hamlet*) to 29 (in *Macbeth*); and to 35-38 in the late plays. An index of over 30% hypermetricality is found *in Antony and Cleopatra, Coriolanus, The*

Winter's Tale, Cymbeline, The Tempest, Henry VIII and Two Noble Kinsmen, an index of 24 per hundred lines for *Pericles*[xix]. Such data blur the individual impact of points in the plays where hypermetricality is most intense. McDonald identifies hypermetricality as a key rhetorical meme which distinguishes the roughness of late style: do soliloquies stand out even more from their surrounding verse? In the following tables, I have noted the proportion of each soliloquy with a hypermetrical line.

Table 2: Soliloquies in *Pericles*
Revised metrical index (Wells and Taylor): 24

Scene/Lines	Speaker	Ends scene/ opens scene?	% hyper-metrical	Prose/ verse	First line
1.1-42	Gower*	Opens	19	verse	'To sing a song that old was sung'
1.164-85	Pericles	No	9	verse	'how courtesy would seem to cover sin'
2.1-34	Pericles	Opens	24	verse	'Let none disturb us. Why should this change our thoughts?
3.1-9	Thaliart	Opens	n/a	prose	'So this is Tyre and this the court. Here must I kill King Pericles'
5.1-40	Gower	Opens	5	verse	'Here have you seen a mighty king'
5.41-51	Pericles	Yes	36	verse	'Yet cease your ire, you angry stars of heaven'
9.13-20	Simonides	No	22	Prose	'So they are well dispatched. Now to my daughter's letter'
10.1-60	Gower	Opens	6	verse	'Now sleep y-slacked hath the rout'
11.1-14	Pericles	Opens	42	verse	'The gods of this great vast rebuke these surges'
15.1-52	Gower	Opens	7	verse	'Imagine Pericles arrived at Tyre'
18.1-45	Gower	Opens	11	verse	'Thus time we waste, and long leagues make we short'
20.1-24	Gower	Opens and ends	37	verse	'Marina thus the brothel scapes and chances'
22.1-20	Gower	Opens	5	verse	'Now our sands are almost run'
22.107-125	Gower	ends	27	verse	'In Antiochus and his daughter you have heard'

*Gower of course speaks mainly in tetrameters not pentameters, except for the pentameters of the first four lines of scene 15, scenes 18 and 20, and the final epilogue which are all iambic pentameters.

Most of *Pericles's* soliloquies are delivered by Gower as a commentator who chorally addresses the audience. If recent computer assisted analysis of the text is correct in attributing scene 10 onwards to Shakespeare, he contributed only a single non-choral soliloquy. Pericles's speech which opens scene 11 is the most intensely hypermetrical soliloquy in the play.

Table 3: Soliloquies in *Henry VIII*					
Revised metrical index (Wells and Taylor): 34					
Scene/Lines	**Speaker**	**Ends scene/ opens scene?**	**% hyper-metrical**	**Prose/ verse**	**First line**
1.0.1-32	Prologue	Opens/ends	25	Verse	'I come no more to make you laugh. Things now'
2.4.232-8	Henry	Ends	40	Verse	'I may perceive/These cardinals trifle with me'
3.2.95-104	Wolsey	No	40	Verse	'The late Queen's gentleman? A knight's daughter'
3.2.108-11	Henry	No	80	Verse	'What piles of wealth hath he accumulated'
3.2. 204-228	Wolsey	No	68	verse	'What should this mean?/What sudden anger's this?'
3.2.351-73	Wolsey	No	73	Verse	'So farewell - to the little good you bear me'
5.2.9-18	Cranmer	No	60	Verse	''Tis Butts,/The King's physician.'
5.5.1-14	Epilogue	Opens and ends	21	Verse	''Tis ten to one this play can never please'

Critical and computer-metrical analysis credits Shakespeare with 1.1 and 1.2; 2.3 and 2.4; the first two hundred lines of 3.2, and 5.1[xx]. The intersecting soliloquies of 3.2 cannot therefore be clearly attributed to either Shakespeare or Fletcher. Nevertheless, all the soliloquies are well above the average metrical index for play. However, the uncertain scenic and speech allocation makes the play an unsuitable source for generalising about Shakespeare's late soliloquies.

Table 4: Soliloquies in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*					
Revised metrical index (Wells and Taylor): n/a					
Scene/Lines	**Speaker**	**Ends scene/ opens scene?**	**% hyper-metrical**	**Prose / verse**	**First line**
1.0.1-32	Prologue	Opens/ends	10	Verse	'New plays and maidenheads are near akin'
2.2.228-47	Palamon	No	60	Verse	'and me too/even when you please, of life'
2.3.1-24	Arcite	Opens	47	Verse	'Banished the kingdom? 'Tis a benefit'
2.3.85-93	Arcite	Ends	33	Verse	'This is an offered opportunity'
2.4.1-33	Jailor's daughter	Opens and ends	54	Verse	'Why should I love this gentleman? 'Tis odds'
2.6.1-39	Jailor's daughter	Opens and ends	56	Verse	'Let all the dukes and all the devils roar'
3.1.1-30	Arcite	Opens	20	Verse	'The Duke has lost Hippolyta; each took'
3.2.1-38	Jailor's daughter	Opens and ends	26	Verse	'He has mistook the brake I meant is gone'
3.4.1-18	Jailor's daughter	Opens and ends	72	Verse	'I am very cold and all the stars are out too'
3.6.1-16	Palamon	Opens	56	verse	'About this hour my cousin gave his faith'
4.2.1-54	Emilia	Opens	68	Verse	'Yet I may bind those wounds up that would open'
Epilogue 1-18	Epilogue	Opens and closes	38	Verse	'I would now ask ye how ye like the play?'

The allocation of scenes between Fletcher and Shakespeare (based on stylistic analysis and contemporary digital methods[xxi]) gives Shakespeare the first Act (where there are no soliloquies), 2.1 and 2.2 (one soliloquy in the midst of action), probably the first two scenes of Act 3 (two soliloquies), and the final scenes (no soliloquies). The play places soliloquies predominantly at the beginning or endings of scenes, unlike the practice in *The Winter's Tale, Cymbeline* and *The Tempest*. Shakespeare's verse here is typically far less hypermetrical than Fletcher's (who typically writes 11-beat pentameters[xxii]).

Thus while Shakespeare's use of soliloquies increased in *The Winter's Tale* and *Cymbeline*, this is not true of his practice in collaborative late plays. This chapter will therefore concentrate on the three sole-authored (middle late) plays, arriving at conclusions which we might then use to think about his practice in the very late (collaborative) plays.

Table 5: Soliloquies in *The Winter's Tale*
Revised metrical index (Wells and Taylor): 32

Scene/Lines	Speaker	Ends scene/ opens scene?	Prose/ verse	% lines Hyper-metrical	First line
1.2.108-19	Leontes	No	Verse	80	'Too hot, too hot,/ To mingle friendship far..'
1.2.179-204	Leontes	No	Verse	52	'I am angling now/though you perceive me not'
1.2.347-60	Camillo	No	Verse	23	'O miserable lady! But for me...'
2.3.1-9	Leontes	Opens	verse	44	'Nor night nor day no rest. It is but weakness'
2.3.1.18-26	Leontes	No	verse	87	'Fie fie no thought of him/ The very thought of my revenges'
3.3.14-57	Old shepherd	No	Prose	n/a	'I would there was no age between ten and twenty'
4.1.1-32	Time	Opens and ends	Verse	28	'I that please some try all; both joy and terror'
4.3.1-30	Autolycus	Opens	song /prose	n/a	'When Daffodills begin to peer/... My traffic is sheets...'
4.3.31-49	Clown	No	Prose	n/a	'Let me see...'
4.3.116-24	Autolycus	ends	Prose	n/a	'Prosper you sweet sir.../ 'song
4.4.504-9	Camillo	No	Verse	40	'He's irremovable/Resolv'd for flight'
4.4.592-614	Autolycus	No	Prose	n/a	'Ha, Ha! What a fool honesty is'
4.4.658-63	Camillo	No	Verse	0	'What I do next shall be to tell the king'
4.4.665-81	Autolycus	no	Prose	n/a	'I understand the business, I hear it'
4.4.824-35	Autolycus	ends	Prose	n/a	'If I had a mind to be honest'
5.2.111-20	Autolycus	No	prose	n/a	'Now had I not the dash of my former life'

From this table of soliloquies in *The Winter's Tale* we can see that Leontes dominates self-address in the first three acts, and Autolycus the last two. The soliloquy as a particular poetic and rhetorical speaking mode carries a symbolic resonance: we are privileged listeners to a dramatic moment. The shift from king to clown as privileged speaker echoes and underlines the plot shifts, although arguably by keeping the soliloquy speakers as male, the power of speaking and being listened to still rests in men. Most of these soliloquies occur in the midst of action, not as stand-alone moments at the beginning or end of scenes. Leontes' verse is particularly intensely hypermetrical, although all verse soliloquies in the play, with the exception of one by Camillo and that by Time, have higher than average hypermetricality.

The first two soliloquies are delivered by Leontes within seventy lines of each other. His first erupts onto the stage apparently from nowhere, whilst he observes Hermione persuading Polixenes to stay:

> Too hot, too hot.
> To mingle friendship far is mingling bloods.
> I have *tremor cordis* on me; my heart dances,
> But not for joy, not joy. This entertainment
> May a free face put on, derive a liberty
> From heartiness, from bounty, fertile bosom,
> And well become the agent – 't may, I grant - .
> But to be paddling palms and pinching fingers,
> As now they are, and making practiced smiles
> As in a looking glass; and then to sigh, as 'twere
> The mort o'th'deer – oh that is entertainment
> My bosom likes not, nor my brows. – Mamillius
> Art thou my boy? (1.2.108-119)

The intensity of delivery and language is audible and displays the typical characteristics of the late style[xxiii]: hypermetricality (4/10/12/11/12/ 11/11/11/10/12/11/11); enjambment

(five of twelve lines); the dominance of spondees ('too hot, too hot'; 'free face'); a high instance of alliteration; verbal and parallel grammatical repetitions; and minimal metaphoric extensions. This 'late style' may be typical of the language throughout the play and across all characters, but it seems to reside most intensely in the soliloquies. Grammar, semantics, and aural experience interrupt the smoothness of social courtly intercourse. Both performatively and linguistically then, this speech epitomises Puttenham's 'insertour' (*The Arte of English Poesie*, p.140).

These two first soliloquies have classically been performed as stages in emotional escalation: for example, in the Royal Shakespeare's Company 1999 production, Antony Sher's physical tics commence only with this second soliloquy. Is there internal stylistic and metrical evidence which directs the actor's performance?

Gone already!
Inch-thick, knee-deep, o'er head and ears a fork'd one.
-Go Play boy play.- Thy mother plays, and I
Play too, but so disgraced a part, whose issue
Will hiss me to my grave. Contempt and clamour
Will be my knell. – Go play, boy, play. - There have been,
Or I am much deceived, cuckolds 'ere now,
And many a man there is, even at this present,
Now, while I speak this, holds his wife by th'arm,
That little thinks she has been sluiced in's absence,
And his pond fished by his next neighbour, by
Sir Smile his neighbour. Nay, there's comfort in't
Whiles other men have gates and those gates opened,
As mine, against their will. Should all despair
That have revolted wives, the tenth of mankind
Would hang themselves. Physic for't there's none.
It is a bawdy planet that will strike
Where 'tis predominant; and 'tis powerful, think it,
From east, west, north, and south: be it concluded,
No barricade for a belly. Know't
I will let in and out the enemy
With bag and baggage. Many thousand on's
Have the disease and feel't not. How now boy? (1.2. 184-206)

Both these soliloquies have a potential or near-by eavesdropper (here it is Mamilius), who renders the event of a soliloquy more dangerous and covert: making dramatically explicit that a soliloquy is an interruption to the main stage business. Hypermetricality dominates in at least eleven of twenty-one lines and rhythmic spondees ('inch thick knee deep') equally disrupt the smoothness of an iambic line. The speech is highly alliterative: 's's alongside 't's and 'c's, 'p's and 'b's generate lines which an actor needs to spit and hiss out. The repetition of those alliterative letters generates an undercurrent to the speech, the letters whispering a choral profane unconscious ('c - t', 's – t', 'p – s', 'b – s – t', 'c – k'). Alliterative repetition is echoed by verbal or clausal repetition which delays the completion of sentences; sentences themselves are inverted; and enjambement occurs in eleven of the twenty two lines. Cumulatively these stylistic and grammatical features act as implicit stage directions to the actor, combining a feeling of rushing onwards (the alliteration and enjambement) with a hiccupping stuttering (through the repetition and hypermetricality). In Sher's case, he used the speech rhythms to generate stuttering all-body tics. This asyndetonic style (described by McDonald as a rhetorical and narrative mode in the late plays[xxiv]) is particularly intense in these two soliloquies.

Camillo's soliloquy in the same scene displays a hypermetrical index of only 23, and there are fewer asyndetonic rhetorical tropes, although they include alliteration, contraction (in the omission of connectives and grammatical contractions) and expansion (through enjambement and parenthesis).

What about Leontes' other soliloquies? He has two soliloquies in 2.3, broken only by a very short interchange with a servant. Do these speeches replicate the auricular irregularities and intensities of the first ones? The opening speech ('Nor night nor day no rest' 2.3.1-9) has four hypermetrical lines, again higher than the play's average; whilst the second part of the speech ('Fie fie no thought of him', ll.18-26) has only one standard pentameter, alongside five hypermetrical and two hypometrical lines. Alliterative plosives compete with sibilants again ('p – s' in particular); verbs are omitted in some clauses, intensifying the choppy metre and obscuring precise semantic meanings (perhaps this is one reason why Sher omitted this speech in the RSC production).

What is clear from this brief discussion is that the main protagonist's verse soliloquies display a much more extreme asyndetonic style than the dialogic verse: whilst in the past critics have attributed such a style to Leontes' disturbed self, McDonald and other have shown that these stylistic features can also be found in speeches by Florizel, Polixenes, and Paulina[xxv]. However, it is clear that Leontes's soliloquies are particularly asyndetonic: I suggest that this rhetorical insertion is to engender and make explicit the soliloquy as an insertive disruption on the main action. Metrical disturbance acts as a set of implicit stage directions to the actor: to speak this type of verse requires a certain kind of performance which literally sets the actor apart from the main action and other actors. The audience then both see and hear such disturbance through the metre as narrative and psychological discontinuity.

Autolycus's soliloquies provide a very different model of the soliloquy as asydetonic. Autolycus's function is similar to the Morality Plays' Vice: but he does not directly

apostrophise the audience (for example his fear of being overheard by the clown confirms he is speaking as fully integrated in the 'world-in-the-play'[xxvi]). The fusion of Autolycus's opening soliloquy with song is a bold interruptive experiment: it enables the audience to hear his words as music and vice-versa. Soliloquy as music or contrapuntal chorus thus creates a pause in the action: the soliloquy explicitly functions comically as Puttenham's figure of 'the interrupter'. Autolycus the thief and con-man also successively interrupts the action and preparations of the festival and then the departure for Sicily. Language, mode and character fuse. The semantics of Autolycus's prose have a gnomic quality of short sententiae, spattered with alliterative liquid sounds and sibilants. Autolycus has four additional soliloquies, in each case as a commentator figure (4.4.592-614; 4.4.665-78; 4.4.824-35; and 5.2. 111-20). These interruptions of action and plot through the soliloquy draw attention to the soliloquy's rhetorical mode as itself the narrative delivery of 'unconsidered trifles' (4.3.25): of excess, which is quintessential to the late plays' narrative and philosophical design.

Table 6: Soliloquies in *Cymbeline*
Revised metrical index (Wells and Taylor): 34

Scene/Lines	Speaker	Ends scene/ opens scene?	Prose/ verse	% hyper-metrical lines	First line
1.5.32-44	Cornelius	No	verse	27	'I do not like her. She doth think she has…'
1.5.75-82	Queen	No	verse	66	'a sly and constant knave/Not to be shaked'
1.6.1-9	Innogen	Opens	verse	75	'A father cruel and a stepdame false'
2.1.49-62	Second Lord	Ends	verse	35	'That such a crafty devil as is his mother'
2.2.11-51	Iachimo	No	verse	60	'The crickets sing, and man's o'er-laboured sense'
2.3.63-74	Cloten	No	verse	16	'I know her women are about her; what…'
2.4. 153-87	Posthumus	Ends	verse	44	'Is there no way for men to be, but women'….
3.2.1-22	Pisanio	opens	verse	40	'How? Of adultery? Wherefore write you not'
3.5.56-65	Queen	No	Verse	60	'Pisanio thou that standst so for Postumus!'
3.5.70-9	Cloten	No	Verse	60	'I love and hate her for she's fair and royal'
3.6.1-27	Innogen	Opens	verse	62	'I see a man's life is a tedious one'
4.1.1-23	Cloten	Opens	prose	n/a	'I am near to th'place, where they should meet'
4.2.170-84	Belarius	No	Verse	40	'O thou goddess/thou divine nature'
4.2.292-33	Innogen	No	Verse	43	'yes sir, to Milford Haven, which is the way?'
5.1.1-33	Posthumus	Opens/ends	Verse	45	'Yea, bloody cloth, I'll keep thee, for I once wished'
5.2.1-10	Iachimo	Opens	Verse	70	'The heaviness and guilt within my bosom'
5.3.64-84	Posthumus	No	Verse	38	'Still going? This is a lord, O noble misery'
5.3.97-122	Posthumus	No	verse	48	'Most welcome bondage, for thou art a way'

5.3.217-30	Posthumus	No	Verse	38	'Sleep, thou hast been a grandsire and begot'

Cymbeline has the highest number of soliloquies, and the highest number of words contained in 'insides' of any Shakespearean play[xxvii]: and their distribution amongst speakers is more diverse than *The Winter's Tale*. None are direct addresses to the audience and under half open or close a scene, so soliloquies occur most typically amidst action and plot. Hypermetricality dominates the soliloquies' verse: although less important characters have lower proportions, a metrical signal forcing the main characters as soliloquists to slow down in acting this part. This enables the speaker to 'stand aside' from their usual speech patterns. Now, however, I shall turn to look at how voice and gender are inflected and informed by the rhetoric of the soliloquy.

Female characters who deliver soliloquies are rare in these late plays, despite current critical consensus that the plays' sensibilities are framed within a feminine aesthetic[xxviii]: Innogen, the Queen and the Jailor's daughter (the latter's role mainly written by Fletcher) are the female *solus* speakers. Innogen has three soliloquies: two commence scenes, and one leads to a new stage in the action. In this scenic placing, her soliloquies are atypical of the majority in the play. This structural positioning, through the status a soliloquy proffers, figures Innogen as a major active protagonist, explicitly opposed to the three other soliloquists who open a scene, all men who desire her sexually (Posthumus, Cloten and Iachimo). Puttenham's auricular rhetorical figure of 'the interruptor' matches both action and content of her speeches. Because soliloquies stand out in audience memory (their delivery changed by the metrical disturbances) these successive individual soliloquists thread the play as a sub-textual musical dialogue: acting in contrapuntal symphonic

intellectual and metaphoric dialogue across the play's acts. Innogen's first soliloquy, for example, calls forward to Iachimo's a mere two scenes later, just as, when we listen to him, we recall hers. If we look at the two soliloquies as a performative dialogue (particularly since they bookend the debate in this scene between Innogen and Iachimo), we can gain a sense of how Shakespeare uses the soliloquy as a marker of privileged speaking which by standing aside from the main action, acts as a rhetorical aural mnemonic for both actors and audience.

This is Innogen's spirited reminder to the audience of both her fairy-tale function and her subjective voice:

> A father cruel, and a step-dame false;
> A foolish suitor to a wedded lady,
> That hath her husband banish'd;—O, that husband!
> My supreme crown of grief! and those repeated
> Vexations of it! Had I been thief-stol'n,
> As my two brothers, happy! but most miserable
> Is the desire that's glorious: blest be those,
> How mean soe'er, that have their honest wills,
> Which seasons comfort. Who may this be? Fie! (1.6.1-9)

This short speech displays the typical characteristics of late style in high proportions: six of the eight are hypermetrical lines; it is highly contracted (lacking a verb in the first sentence, two modal clauses in the second, and both verbal and participial connectives in the third); and alliteration and consonance create a highly wrought condensed poetic summary of both her external situation and an emotional response to it. The fairy-tale princess is given a voice on the fairy-tale subject. By locating the soliloquy at the beginning of the scene, Shakespeare gives this point of view power across this scene and through her next appearance when Iachimo inserts himself into her bedroom.

Iachimo's first soliloquy has a high hypermetrical count (six out of ten); a high proportion of alliteration; and contracted sentences. The sibilant hypermetrical speech linguistically reinforces the vice figure as a literal trespasser (here into the bedroom). The soliloquy as a rhetoric of interruption and trespass is literally played out: the high number of self-apostrophes and a high frequency of demonstrative pronouns (two 'thus'es, 'these', 'such and such' and 'such', 'there' 'here's', two 'this'es) suggest a spatial control of the stage and situation which contrasts with Innogen's silent and prone body. Nevertheless, the echo of Innogen's previous soliloquy in which she characterises herself as an active agent in a fairy-tale continues here in the reference to her reading Ovid's *Metamorphosis* (2.2.44-6). Although Iachimo salaciously implies rape will silence Innogen, as it does Philomel, Innogen's previous evocation of mythical archetpyes implicitly invokes a different tradition: the Ovidian heroic woman who 'speaks back' against dominant masculine constructions of femininity[xxix]. By bookmarking the two soliloquies as opposite points of view on the female voice and debates about the potential autonomy of the female body, Shakespeare offers a radical performative dialogue through the rhetorical space offered by the soliloquy. Both Innogen's and Iachimo's soliloquies interrupt and direct the action: in self-consciously calling attention to their own linguistic virtuosity they call the audience's attention to listen more carefully, flagging up connections between such interrupter speeches. Such virtuosity draws attention to the way action slows down when sentences get longer: it takes the performer longer to speak a more complexly constructed verse. Soliloquies are both linguistic and performative memic units which thread *Cymbeline* as a radical political intervention on the question of female voice, leadership, and physical autonomy. Where *The Winter's Tale* (despite the poetic emphasis on female creativity) fails to give a woman speaker sole control of the stage, *Cymbeline* offers an explicitly political version of female and feminised rhetoric.

Table 7: Soliloquies in *The Tempest* **Revised metrical index (Wells and Taylor): 34**					
Scene/Lines	**Speaker**	**Ends scene/ opens scene?**	**% Hyper-metrical**	**Prose/ verse**	**First line**
1.2.450-57	Ferdinand	No	44	Verse	'Where should this music be? I'th'air or th'earth?'
2.2. 1-17	Caliban	Opens	41	Verse	'All the infections that the sun sucks up'
2.2.18-40	Trinculo	No	n/a	Prose	'Here's neither bush nor scrub to bear off...'
2.2.42-55	Stephano	No	n/a	Prose/ song	'I shall no more to sea, to sea'
3.1.1-10	Ferdinand	opens	60	Verse	'There be some sports are painful, and their labour'
3.3.97-104	Prospero	No	54	Verse	'... so with good life/ And observation strange...'
5.1.33-85	Prospero	no	36	Verse	'Ye elves of hills, brooks, standing lakes, and groves'
5.1.362-80	Prospero	ends	n/a	Verse	'Now my charms are all o'erthrown'

Soliloquies are surprisingly sparse in *The Tempest* compared to *The Winter's Tale* and *Cymbeline*: more than half occur within a scene; they are delivered by a divergent set of characters; Ferdinand and Caliban, are given a measure of scenic control with self-address at the opening of a scene; and Prospero has surprisingly few soliloquies. The verse soliloquies have a higher hypermetrical proportion than the play's average: performed delivery of soliloquies marginally slows down and interrupts the action.

The scene in which Caliban, Trinculo and Stephano first encounter one another stands out because it consists, unusually of three successive soliloquies which are juxtaposed, not as in *Henry VIII* (3.2) or *The Winter's Tale* (2.3) for a kind of political poetic realism, but instead for comic effect. Soliloquies spoken as either eavesdroppers or as eavesdropped is a staple of early modern comic drama (perhaps most perfectly realised in the box tree in *Twelfth Night*[xxx]). Formally the extended juxtaposition of soliloquies produces a dramatic space and experience which is decidedly non-mimetic, calling on the audience to view each of the three characters as both subject and object. Unlike other eavesdropping scenes, no one character or set of characters is a privileged eavesdropper: the delicious comedy of the

whole scene lies in enabling us to see each character's point of view successively, simultaneously and humorously. This egalitarianism of soliloquy speaking and point of view echoes the play's other non-aristocratic scenic viewpoints, such as the opening scene. On a mythopoetic level, juxtaposed soliloquies also rhetorically pattern out how human dialogue is a succession of solipsistic monologues. In this scene Shakespeare's juxtaposed soliloquies discover a scenic unit for representing and performing a kind of subjecthood as defined in opposition to others (whether comically, as in this scene or satirically as in the political asides of *Henry VIII*). This does not imply that soliloquies find the language of the 'inner life' of a character: but rather that as a rhetorical mode within a scene, the soliloquy enables a subject to speak alongside but in contradistinction to others.

What can we conclude from this discussion of the patterns of occurrence and delivery of Shakespeare's soliloquies in the late plays? There are a number of observable structural shifts compared to earlier plays. First, there are more instances of self-address in the three sole-authored late plays; secondly, such self-address is predominantly embedded in action; thirdly, self-address is shared across classes and gender; and fourthly self-address is extended to dynamic juxtaposed speeches. But perhaps more interestingly is the fusion of these structural markers with distinctive rhetorical and linguistic ones. Linguistically, soliloquies in the late plays are intensely hypermetrical and both rhetorically and structurally asyndetonic, deliberately interruptive. The soliloquy as rhetorical mode stands aside from action and standard verse, acting both as implicit stage directions and markers of key imagistic moments in the play. This rhetorical function of interruption as mode seems to be self-consciously and meta-theatrically celebrated in the late plays, not simply as a virtuoso tour-de-force of a celebrated dramatist, but for serious philosophical ends. By using

interruption and disruption as rhetorical modes, the plays suggest both poetically and mimetically a world which is disjointed. The predominance of this rhetorical mode of insertion and interruption mitigates against, and balances, the narrative modes towards smooth reconciliation on which the late plays' narratives end. Palfrey argues that in the late plays:

> The romance 'world of words' proffers its own contingent, inherently contrapuntal laws of physics: within or around the hopeful verities of order and *telos*, it is an edgy universe of occluded origin and abrupt ellipses, of warps and falls and assymetries, and endings unresolved, whatever the nostalgic pleadings[xxxi].

The rhetoric of the soliloquy, in language and metrical form, plays out this asymmetry, fusing mode and speaker to generate performative and performed verse which plays out this edgy universe.

---

[i] All quotations from the plays are from the Oxford Shakespeare, individual editions: *Cymbeline*, ed. Roger Warren (Oxford University Press, 1998); *The Tempest*, ed. Stephen Orgel (Oxford University Press, 1998); *The Winter's Tale*, ed. Stephen Orgel ((Oxford University Press, 1996); *Pericles*, ed. Roger Warren (Oxford University Press, 2003)
[ii] Marcus Nordlund, 'Shakespeare's Insides: A Systematic Study of a Dramatic Device', in ed. Brett Hirsch and Hugh Craig, *The Shakespeare International Yearbook* 14 (2014), pp. 37-56 and *The Shakespearean inside: A Study of the Complete Soliloquies and Solo Asides* (Edinburgh University Press, 2016, in press).
[iii] Russ McDonald, *Shakespeare's Late Style* (Cambridge University Press, 2006), p.76.
[iv] James Hirsh, *Shakespeare and the History of the Soliloquy* (Associated University Presses, 2003), pp.1-28.
[v] Alan Dessen and Leslie Thomson, *A Dictionary of Stage Directions in English Drama 1580-1642* (Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp.206-7; pp.15-6.
[vi] *History of Soliloquies,* p.22
[vii] Nordlund ('Shakespeare's Insides') includes all asides in his definition of the 'inside' address.
[viii] McDonald, *Late Style,* p.115.
[ix] As McDonald argues.
[x] Gordon McMullan, 'The First Night of *The Tempest'*, https://www.bl.uk/shakespeare/articles/the-first-night-of-the-tempest.
[xi] Simon Palfrey, *Late Shakespeare: A New World of Words* (Clarendon Press, 1997); McDonald, *Late Style*; Gordon McMullan, *Shakespeare and the Idea of Late Writing: Authorship in the Proximity of Death* (Cambridge University Press, 2006); Raphael Lyne *Shakespeare's Late Work* (Oxford University Press, 2007.
[xii] Barbara Mowat *The Dramaturgy of Shakespeare's Romances* (University of Georgia Press, 1976), pp.36, 39.
[xiii] Even James Hirsh does not ask how genre affects the nature of the soliloquy,
[xiv] Nordland 'Shakespeare's Insides' pp.52-3
[xv] McDonald, *Late Style*, pp.1-42.
[xvi] George T. Wright *Shakespeare's Metrical Art* (University of California Press, 1988), chapters 9 and 11; Macdonald, *Late Style*, p.97;

[xvii] E.K.Chambers, *William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems* (1930); Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor, *William Shakespeare a Textual Companion* (Oxford University Press, 1987), pp.106-8; and Karl Wentersedorf 'Shakespearean Chronology and the Metrical tests' in *Shaksepeare-Studien: Festschrift fur Heinrich Mutschmann* (N.G.Elwert, 1951), pp.161-93.
[xviii] Wells and Taylor, p.108.
[xix] It would be fruitful to re-consider the soliloquies of *Coriolanus* and *Antony and Cleopatra* in the light of this chapter's findings
[xx] Robert Law 'The Double Authorship of Henry VIII', *Studies in Philology* 56 (1958), pp.471-88; and Cyrus Hoy 'The Shares of Fletcher and his Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon' *Studies in Bibliography* 15 (1962), pp.71-90
[xxi] See Ed. Gary Taylor, *The New Oxford Shakespeare: Authorship Companion* (Oxford University Press, 2017, in press).
[xxii] Marina Tarlinskaja, *Shakespeare and the Versification of English Drama 1561-1642* (Ashgate 2015), p.150;
[xxiii] McDonald, *Late Style*, p.33
[xxiv] Ibid. p.38
[xxv] ibid, pp.91; 163.
[xxvi] Robert Weimann, *Author's Pen and Actor's Voice: Playing and Writing in Shakespeare's Theatre* (Cambridge University Press, 2008), p.22.
[xxvii] Nordlund, 'Shakespeare's Insides', p,53
[xxviii] See note xi.
[xxix] Laurel Fulkerson, *The Ovidian Heroine as Author: Reading, Writing and Community in the Heroides* (Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp.1-23; Deborah Greenhut, *Feminine Rhetorical Culture: Tudor Adaptations of Ovid's 'Heroides'* (Peter Lang Publishers, 1988); Efrossine Spenzou, *Readers and Writers in Ovid's Heroides: Transgressions of Genre and Gender* (Oxford University Press, 2003); and Jennifer Richards ed. *Rhetoric, Women and Politics in Early Modern England* (Routledge, 2007), pp.1-25.
[xxx] See Hirsh, *Soliloquies*, p.140.
[xxxi] Palfrey, *Late Shakspeare*, p.viii.

Bibliography

Chambers, E.K. *William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems* (The Clarendon Press, 1930)

Dessen, Alan and Thomson, Leslie *A Dictionary of Stage Directions in English Drama 1580-1642* (Cambridge University Press, 1999)

Fulkerson, Laurel, *The Ovidian Heroine as Author: Reading, Writing and Community in the Heroides* (Cambridge University Press, 2005)

Greenhut, Deborah S. *Feminine Rhetorical Culture: Tudor Adaptations of Ovid's 'Heroides'* (Peter Lang Publishers, 1988)

Hirsh, James *Shakespeare and the History of the Soliloquy* (Associated University Presses, 2003)

Hoy, Cyrus 'The Shares of Fletcher and his Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon' *Studies in Bibliography* 15 (1962), pp.71-90

Law, Robert 'The Double Authorship of Henry VIII', *Studies in Philology* 56 (1958), pp.471-88

McDonald, Russ *Shakespeare's Late Style* (Cambridge University Press, 2006)

McMullan, Gordon 'The First Night of *The Tempest*', https://www.bl.uk/shakespeare/articles/the-first-night-of-the-tempest (accessed 17 November 2016)

- - - *Shakespeare and the Idea of Late Writing: Authorship in the Proximity of Death* (Cambridge University Press, 2006)
-

Mowat, Barbara *The Dramaturgy of Shakespeare's Romances* (University of Georgia Press, 1976)

Nordlund, Marcus 'Shakespeare's Insides: A Systematic Study of a Dramatic Device', in ed. Brett Hirsch and Hugh Craig, *The Shakespeare International Yearbook* 14 (2014), pp. 37-56

- - *The Shakespearean inside: A Study of the Complete Soliloquies and Solo Asides* (Edinburgh University Press, 2016, in press).

Palfrey, Simon *Late Shakespeare: A New World of Words* (Clarendon Press, 1997)

Puttenham, George *The Arte of English Poesie* (Richard Field, London, 1589)

Richards, Jennifer ed. *Rhetoric, Women and Politics in Early Modern England* (Routledge, 2007)

Shakespeare, William, Cymbeline, ed. Roger Warren (Oxford University Press, 1998)

- - - *The Tempest*, ed. Stephen Orgel (Oxford University Press, 1998)
- - - *The Winter's Tale*, ed. Stephen Orgel ((Oxford University Press, 1996)

Shakespeare, William and Wilkins, George, *Pericles*, ed. Roger Warren (Oxford University Press, 2003)

Shakespeare, William and Fletcher, John *Henry VIII; or All is True*, ed. J. Hallio (Oxford University Press, 2008)

Shakespeare, William and Fletcher, John *The Two Noble Kinsmen* ed. Eugene Waith (Oxford University Press, 2008)

Spenzou, Efrossine *Readers and Writers in Ovid's Heroides: Transgressions of Genre and Gender* (Oxford University Press, 2003)

Tarlinskaja, Marina *Shakespeare and the Versification of English Drama 1561-1642* (Ashgate, 2015),

Taylor, Gary ed. *The New Oxford Shakespeare: Authorship Companion* (Oxford University Press, 2017, in press).

Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary *William Shakespeare a Textual Companion* (Oxford University Press, 1987)

Weimann, Robert *Author's Pen and Actor's Voice: Playing and Writing in Shakespeare's Theatre* (Cambridge University Press, 2008),

Wentersedorf, Karl 'Shakespearean Chronology and the Metrical tests' in *Shaksepeare-Studien: Festschrift fur Heinrich Mutschmann* (N.G.Elwert, 1951), pp.161-93.

Wright, George T *Shakespeare's Metrical Art* (University of California Press, 1988)