The Image of Shakespeare's text (if one would only look at it) subverts Shakespeare's Text.

That is: the image of the original evidence of Shakespeare's text subverts the edited versions we all study.

The matter is likely to remain so, for the new editions of Shakespeare summoned into being, generation after generation, are publishing ventures launched in a marketplace, where to survive and prosper they must appeal to consumers, whose conservative expectations and needs have been shaped by the very tradition of unconservative editing, which spans more than two and a half centuries. This market now wags the dog.

Editing began in the 18th century, an age of thorough rationalization and reform of language--spoken, written, and thought; an age of enforcement of decorums and proprieties upon language. Accordingly, we who are the children of both the Renaissance and the 18th century (not to mention a host of other parents in various marriages and other liaisons, here and abroad--some recorded), find the terrain of our ancestry sundered by a Great Fault. On this side, our Shakespeare is accommodated. On the other lies a stranger uttering chaotic language, not tidy enough for the parlour. Our parents are no longer on speaking terms, and who among us can grasp how they fell out?

One of the achievements of 18th-century language reform was the suppression of linguistic uncertainty. This is evident in the largely successful attempt to achieve coherent tone in standard literary English, in the preoccupation with national literary culture, in the legitimization of the lexicon by the dictionary, in the spread of education and suppression of dialect, and in the consequent diminishing of lexical ambiguity.

This Enlightenment program did not arise in a vacuum. It had long roots into the 17th century, even into the 16th. But even if the 18th century had not forced literature into a strait-jacket, and thereby inevitably caused a diminution in our aptitude to grasp Shakespeare's richness--now to be viewed as wildness, resistance to reasonable rule, and unbearable penchant for punning--spoken and written English had been undergoing "on its own", as it were, the inevitable evolutionary processes of a living language and so had become partially unintelligible to the England of a century after Shakespeare's death.
IMAGINATION

The implicit curriculum of modern editions of Shakespeare, where all the text is reset in familiar spellings, is rationally pointed, and elegant in appearance, is introduced by Professor So-and-So (who ought to know what Shakespeare means) is that He is one of Us. That's its body language, even before we read a word. But to look at the icon, a photograph, even--and in our age especially a photograph--of the 1609 quarto of SHAKESPEARE'S SONNETS, is to perceive a strange mediation of the long-ago poet and the here-and-now us. As if in a dream, suddenly a stranger had asked, "Will you dance," he already dancing, waiting for me to join in. If only I could hear the music. (And where did I leave my clothes?) Modernizing and, therefore, anachronizing editions deliver Shakespeare already translated. But before the old icon it is we who must wander down the dark and dusty centuries, translating. And who are we then?

Editors of SHAKE-SPEARES SONNETS re-present the text after they have read it cover to cover. This can be an appropriate way to proceed; but it can also get out of control, or be too much controlled, rather, as when one's final understanding is bulldozed retroactively through the poem. When one approaches the first sonnet through the notes of the editor, John Dover Wilson, for example--and I pick an editor who, having gone to Shakespeare's bosom, is beyond any harm I can do him (or he to me)--we see this kind of process at work.

The young man's duty to Nature and Society at large: gardeners cultivate to produce the finest flowers and fruits, cattle-breeders to develop the finest stocks; if you, loveliest of men, neglect to do likewise, you will rob the world of its due by wasting your own rich substance.

If the editor reads in that much into this poem, how intelligently can he understand the words before him, let alone the strange countenance of the quarto icon that confronts him,

From fairest creatures we desire increase,
That thereby beauty and荣 might never die,
But as the riper should by time decrease,
His tender heire might bear his memory:
But thou contracted to thine owne bright eyes,
Feed't thy lights flame with selfe substantial fuel.
Making a famine where abundance lies,
Thy selfe a torch, to thy sweet selfe too cruel.
Thou that art now the worlds freshe ornament,
And only herald to the gaudy spring,
Within thine owne bud brestly snuffe thy content,
And tender chorde mak'st wait in rigour:
Pity the world, or else this gluton bee,
To ease the worlds due, by the grave and these.

for to read the sonnet itself is not to know the sex of the speaker or the addressee.
(or to find more than a very small percentage of Wilson's vocabulary). The first word of the third line, a pronoun, which might seem to decide the issue of the sex of the addressee, was indistinguishably masculine or neuter in Shakespeare's time. (Paradoxically, Wilson, who defines the addressee as male, glosses this pronoun in a subsequent note as neuter only).

Look at the tenth line.

Within thine owne bud buriest thy content.

The editor's gloss on "content" suggests the two words, which we distill from that graphic shape by shifting stress: *content and content*. The written medium in Shakespeare's time evidently used one graphic shape to cover two very different meanings, just as we still do. No problem here.

Earlier in this line, the quarto's "owne" is rendered by the editor as "own". Immediately we come up against what must seem to most as a merely innocent re-setting of the type and slight modernizing, as if a squiggly "owne" were no different from an "own" in a modern fount. But to look deeply at the quarto's "owne" in all its ungainliness and with that silent vowel at the end of it is to have impressed upon one the oddity and unfamiliarity of the graphic shape: I wonder how a Renaissance reader would have leapt from that shape to whatever sense he would make of it. Its physical bearing will certainly make it always alien to the world of graphic conventions in which I was raised, a world other than that of Shakespeare's time: but not as, to those of us who speak English, Chinese is an other language, rather as a world that has made itself other specifically by denying, or suppressing, or replacing the graphic medium of Shakespeare's time, even as a child becomes who she will be by pushing off against her parents. History is written by the victorious, and one must always be aware that the elegant modern medium has survived a battle in which it can scarcely be expected to report its own glorious achievements dispassionately.

Consider these two verses from Marvell's "Garden":

Two Paradises twere in one,
To live in Paradise alone.

Phonologists can tell us that there was a perfect rhyme in these lines in Marvell's time and in Shakespeare's, and a rhyme all the more rich because it was of cognates. The original pronunciation of "one" (it didn't sound like "won") is conserved still in such cognates as "only" and "atone". For the latter word, most of us learn the etymology, if ever, only as adults. In Shakespeare's England, it would have been transparent to anyone who could speak and hear. The former word, "only", occurs in the preceding line of the poem, and is therefore played upon by the present "owne"—to modern and Renaissance auditors alike, though with different understandings of that play in each era. Such phonetic effects are not insignificant in poetry, especially in that genre known as a "little sound".
So, the words we separate graphically as "own" and "one" were phonetically indistinguishable in Shakespeare's time. The Oxford English Dictionary confirms the corollary you might have anticipated, that neither did the graphic forms prejudice the meaning in Shakespeare's time. Therefore, the following readings should not have troubled a 16th-century reader:

Own, two, thre, ...
As I one this house, Im the bosse.

When we in the 20th century hear our word "one" spoken, the context must help us differentiate it from the word we write as "won." When Shakespeare heard his "owne" spoken, there was no confusion of it with the idea of winning; rather the idea of ownership was confused with that of singularity, and context would have to assist the auditor to differentiate them.

What may seem, therefore, the least innocuous of an editor's housekeeping chores, to make the poem of easy access for modern readers by sprucing up the typeface, by familiarizing it, by taking off the final, silent, superfluous "e" is scarcely innocent. Once the icon goes, the visible symbol of Shakespeare as alien is lost. My reaction would be substantially different if Wilson had an apologetic note saying that his edition modernized the quarto's "owne" as "own", but that "one" was just as plausible, and that he, deeply conservative, had chosen to follow the path of every other modernizer. But he has no note for this editorial change, and one suspects that he and all the other editors who do not provide such a note, are unaware of the issues--and have patronized their readers by legitimizing with notes only the mysteries they cared to countenance or that they knew about. Of course, if a modern editor did opt for the reading "one", would he not feel obliged to alter the preceding word, from "thine" to "thy" ("Within thy one bud...")? And then the cat would be out of the bag. Another note would be called for. Readers who knew the poem from another edition would see the embarrassing nature of the editor's game. Such a seemingly gross alteration of the poem would call attention to the fact that neither translation is responsible, as neither is competent alone to convey the complexity of the original. And what is Shakespeare's poetry, if not intricacy and complexity--and simplicity?

What I have been saying addresses a completely different issue than whether written English in Shakespeare's time was competent to convey the complexity of the contemporary spoken language, or vice versa. Spoken and written media could not be completely and unambiguously mapped onto each other then or now. The crucial thing to realize, the issue that the editing tradition buries in the sand along with the ostrich's head, is that the capacities and styles of mapping of the two epochs, divided by the Great Fault, are not compatible. In both eras (and in all eras) the struggle for the text is part of the text. Anachronizing editions vitiate that poetic struggle.
As for the phrase "beauties Rose" in the second line, Wilson follows the tradition of every other edition I have seen that is printed after the style of marking possessive case with an apostrophe sprang up: "beauty's rose". His rendering "beauty's" requires the word to be singular. To my sensibility, this rendering of the quarto's "beauties" forces on me an allegorical response--as if "Beauty's", a form I have actually seen in some editions, and which is accompanied with the decapitalization of the quarto's "Rose". (The long s is itself part of the strangeness of the icon and deserves a paper in in its own right--but another time.) If editors ever modernized to the other option "beauties"", they would evoke for me concrete individuals. To modernize, then, is to close down the ambiguities. That's what our modern graphic language--our reformed language--is about. And for editors to use it is to deny and frustrate the very medium of Renaissance English literature.

To help us understand his phrase, "beauty's rose", Wilson quotes from the OED to indicate that the rose is "A peerless or matchless person; a paragon; esp. a woman of great beauty, excellence, or virtue." This commentary serves to feminize the rose, but where is this sense of gender countenanced in his interpretation I quoted above? And how does it square with his interpretation of "His" as neuter.

*

It is now time to distinguish between the Renaissance ear and the Renaissance eye (on the one hand) and the modern ear and the modern eye (on the other.) Let us assume that a Renaissance wife reads the first sonnet aloud to her husband, and that a modern wife reads the edited version aloud to hers. Let's bring it down to familiar practice.

1. --the Renaissance wife reads "beauties Rose" and understands the first word as singular or plural or both; and so does her husband.

   --when the modern wife encounters the phrase "beauty's rose", she must understand the first word only as singular, but her husband understands singular or plural or both.

2. --encountering the phrase "thine owne bud", the Renaissance wife understands in the middle word both what we write as "own" and what we write as "one"; the same is true of her husband.

   --when the modern wife reads the edited phrase "thine own bud", she understands in "own" only ownership, as does her husband.

3. --In the case of "thy content", both Renaissance and modern wives must choose a stress option, (content or content) even if they are aware of both options, and their husbands will perform understand only the option their mates have chosen. The neglected option
remains potential but unactivated. And if those wives had been reading silently, they might have absorbed both meanings—not having to choose.

Here are three cruxes exhibiting three structures of ambiguity: Only the third one functions in kind now as it did then, to reader and to auditor. The first one equates the experience of both Renaissance and modern auditors in contrast to the experiences of both Renaissance and modern readers. The second crux equates the experience of reader and auditor, but only within their own periods. All in all, each period therefore, has its own distinct structure of ambiguities deriving from the textual icons peculiar to each age.

No poem is an island entire of itself. It floats in a changing linguistic medium. And so our attempt to understand a poem of so removed an age as Shakespeare’s must be simultaneously to understand its relationship to that medium. It is here that the editorial tradition fails us.

* *

The question of sexual ambiguity continues to linger in most of the first two dozen sonnets, to take an arbitrary bite. You might try an unprejudiced reading of them, asking yourself what evidence there really is for the sex of the speaker and the sex of the addressee, and when you have found it, if you can find it, whether you think the context allows it to remain unequivocal. Forget the critical and editorial baggage you’re accustomed to carry with you, such as the euphemism.

"The opening poems constitute the marriage sonnets...."
or the imported story line, at best a retrospective story line,

"Shakespeare urges the young man...", for all this is no substitute for the intolerable wrestle with words and meanings. As you read this way, line after line, the question of the sexual identity of the addressee especially seems raised and about to be answered—the "he" of Sonnet 19 is as definitive (though late) as one can get; but for the most part the poems shy away from specific identification; they equivocate sex. Sonnet 19 may mark the place of triumphant self-congratulation on the reader’s part: male at last. But characteristically, SONNETS follows it with a sonnet that re-opens the hole question. All the earnestness of the foregoing sonnets yields to a joyous romp, a send-up of the entire issue. Here is a good place to see how editorial translation disambiguates the complex linguistic play.
The role of contextual factors in shaping and controlling the content of thought and action is a core aspect of cognitive psychology. Contextual factors can influence attention, memory, and decision-making processes. For example, in a study by L. A. Martin and colleagues, participants were asked to perform a task under different contextual conditions, such as in a quiet or noisy environment. The results showed that contextual factors significantly affected performance, with participants performing better in a quiet environment.

In a different study, researchers investigated the effect of contextual factors on creativity. They found that participants were more creative when they were in a context that encouraged exploration and innovation, as opposed to a context that emphasized conformity and adherence to rules. These findings highlight the importance of considering contextual factors in understanding and predicting behavior.

Overall, the importance of contextual factors in shaping thought and action cannot be overstated. Understanding these factors can help us better predict and influence behavior in various contexts.
If ever your earnings are only temporary

Explain

You're a living story. When your story ends,
I hope you've found a life that's not as brief,
And as the years pass, in your memory,
You'll remember the people who were here.

For nothing is permanent, and nothing is permanent,
Not even the memories that we cherish.

So take a moment to reflect on your life,
And know that even though it may be fleeting,
Your story will live on in the hearts of others,
And that's what truly makes it worthwhile.

And so, as you gaze into the distance,
And think of the places you've been,
Remember that each day is a gift,
And make the most of it while you can.

For nothing is permanent, and nothing is permanent,
Not even the memories that we cherish.

And so, as you continue your journey,
And face the challenges that come your way,
Remember that you are loved,
And that you are not alone in this world.

For nothing is permanent, and nothing is permanent,
Not even the memories that we cherish.

And so, as you close this chapter of your life,
And begin a new one, full of promise and hope,
May you find joy and happiness,
And may your journey be filled with wonder.

For nothing is permanent, and nothing is permanent,
Not even the memories that we cherish.

And so, as you continue your journey,
And face the challenges that come your way,
Remember that you are loved,
And that you are not alone in this world.

For nothing is permanent, and nothing is permanent,
Not even the memories that we cherish.
Now shows the results of my experiment and preparation for the writing of the article. The next experiment, which involves this model, will be presented at the next meeting of the Association of Scientific Researchers. The complete report of this experiment will be published in a forthcoming issue of the journal.

Over the course of my experiment I observed that the experiment

Instead to conduct the next level of our experiment, which involves the study of cognitive mechanisms in the brain, we decided to focus on the development of a new methodology for investigating cognitive processes. This methodology is based on the observation that cognitive processes are not static but rather are dynamic and change over time. To investigate this, we conducted a series of experiments that involved monitoring the activity of different areas of the brain in response to various stimuli. The results of these experiments were then analyzed to determine how cognitive processes change over time and how they are influenced by different factors.

The results of these experiments were then used to develop a new model of cognitive processes. This model is based on the observation that cognitive processes are influenced by a variety of factors, including the environment, the individual's past experiences, and the individual's current state of mind. The model also takes into account the fact that cognitive processes are not static but rather are dynamic and change over time.

The next step in our research is to test the validity of our new model. To do this, we will conduct a series of experiments in which we will manipulate the various factors that influence cognitive processes and then measure the effect of these manipulations on the individual's cognitive performance. These experiments will be conducted in both laboratory and field settings.

The results of these experiments will then be used to refine our model and to develop new strategies for improving cognitive performance. These strategies will be implemented in a variety of settings, including schools, workplaces, and communities. The ultimate goal of our research is to develop effective strategies for improving cognitive performance and to make a significant contribution to the field of cognitive science.
NOTES

Your name

1. I am not sure what you mean by "impartial information on your performance". Do you mean that you want to know your performance in a fair and unbiased way, or that you want to know how you performed compared to others who performed the same task? If you mean the first, I think that giving you access to the actual measurements of your performance would be appropriate. If you mean the second, I think that giving you access to the actual measurements of the performance of others who performed the same task would be appropriate.

2. I am not sure what you mean by "progression analysis of your development from the task". Do you mean that you want to know how you have progressed in the task over time, or that you want to know how your performance has changed from the beginning of the task to the end? If you mean the first, I think that giving you access to the actual measurements of your progress over time would be appropriate. If you mean the second, I think that giving you access to the actual measurements of your performance at the beginning and end of the task would be appropriate.

3. I am not sure what you mean by "unbiased and fair assessment of yourself and others". Do you mean that you want to know that the assessment is unbiased and fair, or that you want to know how you and others are being assessed? If you mean the first, I think that giving you access to the actual measurements of the assessment would be appropriate. If you mean the second, I think that giving you access to the actual measurements of how you and others are being assessed would be appropriate.

4. I am not sure what you mean by "progression analysis of your development from the task". Do you mean that you want to know how you have progressed in the task over time, or that you want to know how your performance has changed from the beginning of the task to the end? If you mean the first, I think that giving you access to the actual measurements of your progress over time would be appropriate. If you mean the second, I think that giving you access to the actual measurements of your performance at the beginning and end of the task would be appropriate.

5. I am not sure what you mean by "impartial information on your performance". Do you mean that you want to know your performance in a fair and unbiased way, or that you want to know how you performed compared to others who performed the same task? If you mean the first, I think that giving you access to the actual measurements of your performance would be appropriate. If you mean the second, I think that giving you access to the actual measurements of the performance of others who performed the same task would be appropriate.
The information you're asking for is not visible in the provided image. Please ensure the content is correctly displayed or provide additional context so I can assist you effectively.