Iconicity in Language and Literature (ILL)

A multidisciplinary book series which aims to provide evidence for the pervasive presence of iconicity as a cognitive process in all forms of verbal communication. Iconicity, i.e. form miming meaning and/or form miming form, is an inherently interdisciplinary phenomenon, involving linguistic and textual aspects and linking them to visual and acoustic features. The focus of the series is on the discovery of iconicity in all circumstances in which language is created, ranging from language acquisition, the development of Pidgins and Creoles, processes of language change, to translation and the more literary uses of language.

For an overview of all books published in this series, please see
www.benjamins.com/catalog/ill

Editors

Olga Fischer
University of Amsterdam

Christina Ljungberg
University of Zurich

Volume 15
Dimensions of Iconicity
Edited by Angelika Zirker, Matthias Bauer, Olga Fischer and Christina Ljungberg

Dimensions of Iconicity

Edited by

Angelika Zirker
Eberhard Karls University Tübingen

Matthias Bauer
Eberhard Karls University Tübingen

Olga Fischer
University of Amsterdam

Christina Ljungberg
University of Zurich

John Benjamins Publishing Company
Amsterdam / Philadelphia

To the memory of John White

Table of contents

Preface

The studies of this volume form a selection of some of the papers given at the Tenth International and Interdisciplinary Symposium on Iconicity in Language and Literature. The symposium was organized by Eberhard Karls University Tübingen and took place between March 26 and 28, 2015. Gathering more than sixty scholars from all over the world, it followed the tradition of earlier symposia, namely looking for meaningful similarities between form and meaning and thereby comprising semantic, pragmatic and cognitive dimensions of iconicity. However, it also moved into new directions by establishing a link with the Tübingen research projects on ambiguity (https://www.ambiguitaet.uni-tuebingen.de) and on interpretability (as part of the collaborative research center "The Construction of Meaning", see www.sfb833.uni-tuebingen.de). We would like to thank all those involved in organizing the event, in particular Eva-Maria Rettner and Beate Starke as well as our team of doctoral students and student assistants: Lisa Ebert, Mirjam Haas, Lena Moltenbrey, Nicole Poppe, Susanne Riecker, Ruben Danner, Max Faul, Florian Kubsch, Timo Stösser, and the members of Research Training Group 1808 Ambiguity: Production and Perception. Lisa Ebert and Miriam Lahrsow have helped to prepare this volume for publication, and we are very grateful to them. Our thanks also go to the external reviewers, who assisted us in selecting papers to be published.

While the Tübingen conference also testified to an impressive emergent interest in iconicity among young scholars, such as linguists, cognitivists, intermedial, art and literary scholars, which shows the relevance of this area of research, it was also as always a pleasure to recognize several frequent participants who have consistently contributed to the project's success and continuity over the years. But some were sorely missed, in particular John J. White. John, who was one of our most knowledgeable and appreciated contributors, and who was one of the most loyal attendants of the symposia from its very beginning in 1997, passed away prematurely on 31 January 2015. The iconicity symposia, he once said himself, had provided him with a 'home'. John's sharp wit and mischievous charm together with his rhetorical brilliance gave each conference its particular appeal. An eminent scholar of literary modernism and iconicist from the very start, John formed part of the project's core team in which his tremendous learning and depth of

Performative iconicity

Chiasmus and parallelism in William Shakespeare's *The Rape of Lucrece*

Angelika Zirker
Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen

From the beginning of Shakespeare's dramatic long poem *The Rape of Lucrece*, Tarquin and Lucrece are presented as antagonists: lust-breathed Tarquin (3) vs. chaste Lucrece (7). This opposition also connects them with one another, and the key to their relationship lies in a statement that is uttered late in the poem, when Lucrece is looking at the Troy painting and says: "These contraries such unity do hold" (1558). The characterisation of both Tarquin and Lucrece on the level of content is mirrored on the level of language. For example, when Tarquin in the second line of the epyllion is described to be "borne by the trustless wings of false desire", the apparent parallelism (adjective followed by a noun) in fact contains an antagonistic structure. Throughout the poem, the inner debate that characterises him before the rape of Lucrece is presented in terms of self-division on the level of content; linguistically, this is rendered by means of chiasmus. In the following, I will show that the relations of synonymy and parallelism as well as of chiasmus and oxymoron can be found throughout the poem, and that they are part of the larger setup of the text in that they imitate the content *iconically*, i.e. form and meaning correspond to each other. They also become *performative* as the language enacts the content. Parallelism and chiasmus are part of the semiotic setup and of the dramatic structure of the poem, and they go beyond mere poetic form and content (in the sense of action) as they are also part of the complex technique of character representation.

1. Introduction: Performative iconicity

The term "performative iconicity" is not an established one, but it seems to me that it is an apt expression to describe what we find in Shakespeare's *The Rape of Lucrece*, an epyllion first published in 1594, during a period when the theatres in

London were closed due to the plague.[1] The poem tells the story of Tarquin, who listens to his friend Collatine talk about his wife Lucrece's beauty and chastity: inflamed by this report, Tarquin goes to Collatium and rapes her. The first half of the poem focuses on Tarquin and his lust, as well as his inner fight, and the second part on Lucrece and her reaction to the rape, culminating in her suicide at the end of the poem. The structure of the epyllion, i.e. its two parts with the peripety in the middle, reflects the relationship of the two characters: from the beginning of Shakespeare's dramatic long poem, Tarquin and Lucrece are presented as antagonists – lust-breathed Tarquin (Shakespeare 2007a: 3)[2] vs. chaste Lucrece (7). This opposition, however, also connects them with one another. The key to their relationship lies in a statement that is uttered late in the poem, when Lucrece is looking at the Troy painting and says: "These contraries such unity do hold" (1558). Lucrece and Tarquin are antagonists and linked to one another at the same time.

This relationship is indicated not only on the level of content but also on the level of linguistic form which, iconically, mimes meaning. In particular, parallelism and chiasmus are used in a way so as to show that similarity and contrast are by no means incompatible but are dynamically related to each other.[3] This can be seen when Tarquin, before the rape, enters the chamber of Lucrece; her face at this moment is

(1)   Showing life's triumph in the map of death,
      And death's dim look in life's mortality.   (400–403)

The chiasmus "life's triumph in the map of death, / And death's dim look in life's mortality" in (1) apparently contrasts life and death. According to the Arden editors, the oxymoron and chiasmus "enact the reconciliation of life and death and sex and chastity" (Shakespeare 2007a: 272n400). But it is hard to see a "reconciliation" here, especially since the apparent chiasmus does not exactly express a double balance:

(2)   life's triumph in the map of death
      And **death's** dim look in **life's** mortality.

(3)   **life's** triumph in the map of **death**
      And **death's** dim look in life's **mortality**.

First, "life's triumph" and "the map of death", i.e. life and death are contrasted with each other;[4] but then, "death's dim look" is not antagonistic to "life" (as in (2)) but reinforced by "mortality" (as in (3)). "Life's" is just the possessive; the object is "mortality", i.e. death. The chiasmus does not enact a reconciliation of life and death; rather, the expectation of such a chiastic balance is created only to be tipped towards the side of death, which contains a clear foreshadowing of Lucrece's tragedy. We hence see the dynamics in these lines as the apparent contrast turns out to be a parallel structure; what initially seems to be opposed to each other is in fact related through similarity. At the end of the epyllion, the characters of Tarquin and Lucrece and their seemingly contrastive relationship undergo a similar development: chiasmus and parallelism are used iconically in order to express a turn from opposition to exchange (see below, Section 3).

In Shakespeare's *The Rape of Lucrece*, chiastic and parallel structures are used not only to mime the meaning conveyed but actually to "carry [it] into effect" (see *OED* 2014, "perform, *v.*" I.1.a.) by making the reader realize relationships that are not explicitly communicated semantically.[5] Energeia is created on the basis of contrastive characters, and the dynamics of the text rely on patterns of exchange and parallelism. As in a performance we see a text enacted;[6] the text itself may comprise patterns of linguistic structures that enhance as well as modify the meaning of the lines. Iconicity, in this sense, contributes to the dramatic and performative dimension of Shakespeare's poem.[7]

---

1.   For reflections on the performativity of literary texts see, e.g., Eckstein (2010: 30–42), Fischer-Lichte (2008), Krämer (2002), and Maassen (2001). None of them, however, addresses iconicity and its potential performative quality.

2.   All references given are to line numbers in the poem, unless indicated otherwise.

3.   Norrman notes four "constituent principle[s]" of chiasmus: dualism, antithesis, inversion, and reciprocity (1986: 3–16). They all come into play in Shakespeare's use of the figure throughout his epyllion and also affect the overall structure, which is determined by the change of focus from Tarquin to Lucrece after the peripety at its middle (cf. Norrman 1986 on the structural uses of chiasmus, esp. 33).

4.   The "map" of death is an expression that, for one, calls forth the body of the beloved in Donne's *Elegies*; moreover, map refers to "the embodiment, the very picture or image" (Shakespeare 2007a: 272n402; see *OED* 2014: "map, *n.*" 5.b. Sleep as a shadow of death is topical, e.g. in Donne but also in Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*.

5.   Cf. Nänny: "Hence, iconicity, like beauty, is in the eye of the beholder: the perception of imitative form depends on the reader's capacity to see connections, to perceive similarities between the meaning of a sign or text and the formal means used for its expression" (Nänny 1999: 374). See also Elleström 2015 and Nöth 2001.

6.   One of the reviewers of this paper has pointed out that the "performative qualities of the passages adduced are clearly stronger in the monologue/soliloquy than in the narrative parts". I would like to thank him/her for this suggestion.

7.   The term "dramatic" is here used in the sense of "pertaining to, or connected with the, or a, drama; dealing with or employing the forms of the drama" (*OED* 2014: "dramatic, *adj.*" A.1.) and as the "animated action or striking presentation, as in a play, theatrical" (*OED* 2014: "dramatic, *adj.*" A.2.). On the dramatic and performative qualities of early modern poetry, see my article "'Oh make thy selfe with holy mourning blacke': Aspects of Drama and Performance in John Donne's *Holy Sonnet* 'Oh my black Soule'" (Zirker 2016). On "Diagrammatic figurations as

2. Parallelism, chiasmus, and multiple perspective

Throughout the poem, the characters' relationship as well as their own perception is textually foregrounded by means of iconic diagrammatic relations (cf. Ljungberg 2010:47) such as parallelism and chiasmus, and, as in (2) and (3), apparent contrast and actual synonymy. The iconic interplay between these linguistic forms enables us to take both Tarquin's and Lucrece's perspective, and the dynamics underlying their relationship as well as the turn of perspective from Tarquin to Lucrece in the middle of the epyllion lends the text a performative quality: the text enacts what is being described on the level of language and character.

2.1 Tarquin's "trustless wings of false desire": The opening of the poem

The opening of the epyllion is an instance of such an interplay and multiple perspective:

> (4) From the besieged Ardea in all post,
>   Borne by the trustless wings of false desire,
>   Lust-breathed Tarquin leaves the Roman host   (1–3)

Ardea is the capital of the Rutuli (see Shakespeare 2007a:234n7) which was burned by Aeneas and from whose "ashes the heron (*ardea*) emerged" (234n7).[8] But besides this historical and mythological context, the word "Ardea" evokes Latin *ardeo* and *ardens*, both of which refer to burning and glowing desire: Cooper's *Thesaurus* has the example "Ardere in virgine. Ouid. To be ravished with loue of" (Cooper 1969 [1565]). The beginning thus prepares the reader for the second and third lines by opening the semantic field of lust with this allusive wordplay.[9]

textual performance" see Ljungberg 2010. – Strecker refers to chiasmus as being "dramatic" but he does not clearly define what he means by using this epithet: "The point I am trying to establish is that is that the internal organization of tropes is dramatic, and that in order to understand […] chiasmus we need to have a closer look at the relationships pertaining between [its] different parts" (Strecker 2014:77). His notion of chiasmus is somehow based on "dynamics" but how is not really explained (cf. 77); in the context of Shakespeare's "Fair is foul and foul is fair", he links this dynamics to "the drama of life" which "always involves retrospective and prospective feeling and thinking" (81); the notion, overall, remains vague.

8.   In the Bible, the heron is "named only in lists of unclean 'abominations' (Lev. 11.19, Deut. 14.18)" (Ferber 2007:97).

9.   See Cheney: "The name of the first city, Ardea, with its suggestion of burning, ardor, gives point to the image of bearing 'lightless fire' to Collatium; that Tarquin is 'lust-breathed' suggests […] that he is inspired by lust" (Cheney 1982:115). The only occurrence of "ardent" in

The imagery of lust is continued in the following description of Tarquin as being "borne by the trustless wings of false desire".[10] His desire is false because it is directed at the wife of another man.[11] While the Arden editors claim that "trustless" is used in a new sense of the word and expresses that "Tarquin is sceptical of Lucrece's chastity" (Shakespeare 2007a:237n2; see *OED* 2014: "trustless, *adj.*" 2.: "[h]aving no trust or confidence; unbelieving, distrustful" (2.), first documented for 1598), the fact that his desire is "false" points to a different reading. Were he sceptical of Lucrece's chastity, he would not regard her body as such a desirable prize to be won, and he would not imagine how he will "girdle with embracing flames the waist / Of […] Lucrece the chaste" (6–7). This means that the reader here learns that it is Tarquin's desire which is false, not to be trusted, treacherous and cruel, an idea taken up again later: "To quench the coal which in his liver glows. / O rash *false* heat" (47–48; emphasis mine). The wings are "trustless" on which Tarquin and his desire are borne. Accordingly, while it does not make sense to speak of wings that are distrustful (as the Arden editors obviously do), it makes sense to speak of desire's wings that cannot be trusted. Thus, the reader will perceive the dishonesty of Tarquin's desire, whereas Tarquin himself will come to realize that his desire is not supported by sufficient means to be truly fulfilled. The second meaning, "Having no […] confidence" may be implied after all, but only with regard to Tarquin himself. The adjective thus refers to his being "trustless" in the sense of him having no self-trust, a concept which is taken up again later in the poem: "For where is truth, if there be no self-trust?" (158).[12] Tarquin lacks trust in

Shakespeare is in *Timon of Athens*: "Servant. Excellent! your lordship's a goodly villain. The devil knew not what he did when he made man politic; he cross'd himself by't; and I cannot think but, in the end, the villainies of man will set him clear. How fairly this lord strives to appear foul! takes virtuous copies to be wicked; like those that under hot *ardent* zeal would set whole realms on fire; of such a nature is his politic love" (Shakespeare 2008:3.3.28–35; my emphasis). The lines are spoken by one of Timon's servants after meeting Sempronius, who refuses to help Timon. Sempronius – like Tarquin – aims at appearing fair but is actually foul. His outward show is one of affection, but he will not show mercy and would risk anything because of his "ardent zeal". The adjective is here mentioned in a context that introduces the opposition of exterior and interior states of a character.

10.   For a full interpretation of the opening of the poem see Zirker 2015.

11.   The adjective "false" carries further negative connotations such as wrong, lying, trustless, and cheating (cf. *OED* 2014: "false, *adj., adv* and *n.*" II.).

12.   Another case in point is the relationship between Troilus and Cressida. When he sees her with Diomed in the Greek camp, Troilus says: "This is and is not Cressid" (Shakespeare 1998:3.2.145), which refers back to her earlier statement: "I have a kind of self resides with you, / But an unkind self, that itself will leave / To be another's fool" (3.2.146–148).

himself – and while the right desire is full of trust,[13] his false desire is "trustless", which is stressed by the adjective "false" that alludes to the vicious character of Tarquin and his desire. This lack in Tarquin also foreshadows that he will later act out of weakness and not strength. In a single line Shakespeare thus manages by the apparent tautology of "trustless" and "false" to combine the two perspectives of Tarquin and Lucrece: how the perpetrator sees his victim, and how he is perceived by the reader, who shares Lucrece's (later) assessment of him.

The third line of the poem gives a hint with regard to the way in which the complex inner states of the protagonists are made visible through language: Tarquin is "lust-breathed", i.e. he is breathing lust and his soul is lust, which means that he has been corrupted from the beginning and was not inspired by God's but by some devil's breath. The characterisation of Tarquin is based on both word meaning and linguistic form: he is "borne by the trustless wings of false desire", but the apparent parallelism (adjective followed by a noun) in fact contains an antagonistic structure as it introduces several contradicting views. The relations of synonymy and parallelism in (4) imitate the semantics of these lines iconically; moreover, the internal rhyme of "trust" and "lust" iconically establishes a link between the words involved. The beginning of the poem hence shows how the language mimes and enacts meaning and thus becomes performative. This performative quality is, for one, achieved through the presentation of Tarquin's inner state which is made visible to us as on a stage. The adjectives "trustless" and "false" that appear at first to be tautological enact the multiple perspectives linked to the protagonists. The apparent parallelism in fact represents a relation of contrast; the iconicity, accordingly, consists in parallelism (as in this case) and chiasmus (as in Example (5)) miming the relationship between the characters. This relationship of Tarquin and Lucrece culminates in an actual performance at the end of the poem: when Lucrece kills herself, her suicide becomes a performance for her husband showing him what has happened to her, and her antagonistic relationship with Tarquin becomes dynamic in that it evolves into one of unity when her hand becomes "his" that kills her.

---

13. One might argue that there is nothing like a "right desire", esp. in the context of (at least some of) Shakespeare's *Sonnets*, e.g., "Desire is death" (Shakespeare 2003: 347.8). And yet Shakespeare himself treats the notion of desire ambivalently, see Sonnet 51: "Therefore desire, of perfect'st love being made" (10). – The notion of holy desire can also be found, for example, in religious texts; in his translation of Thomas à Kempis's *Imitatio Christi*, Rogers writes: "Grant that I maie so burn in love, that through the heate of desire I maie exceede my selfe: that I maie sing the ballad of love, folowe thee my lover aloft, and set forth thy praises with such a zeale, that even my hart maie faint againe: that I maie love thee more than myselfe" (Rogers 1592: 3.7; 124). See also examples from mystical poetry, e.g. "Lufe es thought wyth grete desire, of a fayre loving" (Woolf 1968: 370).

2.2   "doth Tarquin lie revolving / The sundry dangers of his will's obtaining": Chiasmus and *apo koinou*

In his essay on "Iconicity and Rhetoric" in Shakespeare, Wolfgang Müller writes about the iconic use of syntax: "Rhetorical features […] are structuring and ordering devices, which point to the structure and activity of the mind and to cognitive and epistemological processes" (Müller 2000: 307). In his view, chiasmus has "tremendous iconic potential" (320); I would like to add that *The Rape of Lucrece* is expressive of this potential as chiasmus is *functional* in Shakespeare's poem: chiasmus, which is often based on items that are brought into a contrasting and antagonistic relation,[14] is part of its semiotic structure.[15]

One of the earliest instances of syntactic chiasmus in *The Rape of Lucrece* can be found in a description of Tarquin. After his arrival at Collatium, he is described as lying in bed and unable to sleep because of his inner battle between lust and fear – and the question whether or not to rape Lucrece:

(5)   Now leaden slumber with life's strength doth fight,
       And every one to rest himself betakes,
       Save thieves and cares and troubled minds that wakes.
       As one of which doth Tarquin lie revolving
       The sundry dangers of his will's obtaining;
       Yet ever to obtain his will resolving,
       Though weak-built hopes persuade him to abstaining.   (124–130)

The syntactical structure mirrors his inner state: on the one hand, he considers the dangers that result from "his will's obtaining", on the other hand, he wants to "obtain his will"[16]. The underlying contrastive relation is supported by "Yet":

---

14. On the relatedness of chiasmus, contrast and also parallelism see, e.g., Davis 2003 and 2005: 338; Engel 2009; Horvei 1981: 35–105, Ch. 4 and 1984, esp. 188, 193; Paul 1992. Chiasmus may be syntactic and semantic (cf. Horvei 1981: 35). One of the most recent studies on chiasmus by Paul and Wiseman (2014) makes the very strange claim that "it was only in the late nineteenth century that some scholars began to think it [chiasmus] could be anything more than a local decorative literary effect. Even today, anyone who has heard of chiasmus is likely to think of it as no more than a piece of rhetorical playfulness" (1).

15. Nänny notes how chiasmus can be used to "various mimetic or iconic ends" (Nänny 1987: 35), e.g. "as an iconic reinforcement of reversal or inversion" (81) and "an emblem to indicate balance, symmetry or equality" (90).

16. The complexity of these lines goes beyond the performance of "pleasant ornamental tricks" that Paul generally ascribes to the early works of Shakespeare (Paul 1992: 33). They rather express, as Horvei puts it, also in general terms, "in condensed form" one of the "main ideas" of the work (Horvei 1984: 37). On chiasmus as a compositional principle in Shakespeare see also Ramirez 2011.

will's obtaining – Yet – obtain his will.[17] The chiasmus that mimes Tarquin's inner conflict is immediately preceded by another iconic construction, namely the *apo koinou* sentence switching between his bodily "revolving" in bed and his mental "revolving / The sundry dangers". The syntax iconically represents and enacts Tarquin's difficulty at making a decision but also his being made up inwardly of contrasting forces, i.e. his will/lust and his fear.

The ambiguity is continued in "dangers of his will's obtaining" which also contains an *apo koinou*. At first, one reads "dangers of his will['s]"; i.e. the will itself is dangerous. Then one reads "dangers of his will's obtaining", which leads to a re-interpretation of "dangers" in the sense of 'risk': Tarquin ponders that there may be some risk involved in doing what he desires. In this case, he does not consider his will as dangerous to Lucrece (and perhaps others) but regards the action as risky (to himself): either his will is dangerous or the pursuit of the action is risky; the double perspective is thus enacted in the *apo koinou* and expressed in a chiasmus.

2.3   "O modest wantons, wanton modesty": Chiasmus and the reconciliation of contrast

While in the case of Tarquin, chiasmus is used locally (i.e. on the microstructural level) to portray his inner state, for Lucrece, it emphasizes her ability to bring contrasting forces to a reconciliation (at any rate before the rape). After Tarquin has entered her room, she is described in detail:

(6)   Her hair, like golden threads, played with her breath,
      O modest wantons, wanton modesty!
      Showing life's triumph in the map of death,
      And death's dim look in life's mortality.   (400–403)

There are at least two instances of chiasmus to be found in these lines, and both times they connect elements with one another that are related by an oxymoron. The first, "modest wantons, wanton modesty", refers to Lucrece's hair which becomes metonymical of Lucrece herself:[18] it is both "immodestly restrained" (Shakespeare

---

17. See, e.g., Fowler, who distinguishes between various types of chiasmus (i.e. its syntactical structure), for example, between the type a b C b a and a b c d d c b a, i.e. one with a centre, the other a "recessed symmetr[y] without a central accent" (Fowler 1970: 93–94).

18. See the comment by the Arden editors: "The paradoxical and playful nature of the description is suggested by the way her hair plays in response to her breath, rather than the more conventional images of her breath playing with her hair" (Shakespeare 2007a: 372n400).

2007a: 372n400) and modest, i.e. contraries "hold unity".[19] The second, "life's triumph in the map of death, / And death's dim look in life's mortality", as we have seen above, only apparently contrasts life and death; in fact, however, the apparent chiasmus does not exactly express a double balance.

3.   The iconic performance of contrast in unity

The examples so far ((4–6)) referring to the main characters have shown that chiasmus and parallelism are not only rhetorical figures, i.e. marked sentence structures, but actually determine and are expressive of the relationship of characters as well as the overall structure of the text with the rape as peripety at its centre. Parallelism and chiasmus are also functional with regard to the inherent drama of the poem, which is illustrated by the off-balance chiasmus of Lucrece (see (6)). The two characters are intricately linked to one another on the basis of chiasmus. The chiastic relations expressed are, however, not always the same, and they may have different functions – as Examples (5) and (6) have shown. The point is not "simply symmetry" (Fowler 1970: 102), but that chiasmus is used to communicate all kinds of relationships, from symmetry to contrast.

Chiasmus on the level of syntax thus points towards chiastic structures on the level of character. This is true for individual characters, e.g. in the context of their self-division (see Example (5) of Tarquin) or their ability to "hold contraries in unity" (as in the case of Lucrece in (6)), as well as for the interaction between them.[20] Lucrece and Tarquin are set in a chiastic relation to one another: he, being "lust-breathed", wants to rape her because she represents what he is not, namely chastity; his (public) siege of Ardea is transposed onto his (private) siege of Lucrece; and the "private" action of the rape is again transformed by Lucrece into a public one through her suicide.

Tarquin himself points to their interconnectedness, which is reported by Lucrece when she is quoting him to her husband: "[He said:] this act will be / My fame, and thy perpetual infamy" (1637–1638). "Fame" and "infamy" are here juxtaposed in an antagonistic relation on the basis of paronymy and connected through parallelism: Tarquin's threat to kill Lucrece and put her in bed with one of her servants shows his reasoning; he would be famous, while her fate would be infamy. The connection that would result from this deed is based on parallelism and contrast, and, again, the two reinforce each other. Lucrece's suicide eventually

---

19. Cf. Shakespeare's "married chastity" in *The Phoenix and Turtle* (Shakespeare 2007b: 31).

20. See Davis: "[Chiasmus] can operate on multiple structural levels simultaneously" (2005: 351).

reverses the relation of fame and infamy that Tarquin announces here: she will become famous (for her chastity), he infamous (for the rape). This is a chiasmus on the macro-structural level of the text that is, however, based on local chiasmus.

That the fear of infamy, the feeling of "shame" as well as the notions of "honour" and "fame" are relevant to Lucrece is made obvious when she is making her "will":

(7) "My honour I'll bequeath unto the knife
     That wounds my body so dishonoured.
     'Tis honour to deprive dishonoured life;
     The one will live, the other being dead.
     So of shame's ashes shall my fame be bred,
     For in my death I murder shameful scorn;
     My shame so dead, mine honour is new born."   (1184–1190)

Lucrece dwells on her "honour" and her being "dishonoured"; these words frame the first two lines of the stanza and are repeated in a parallel construction in line three. But honour also frames the whole stanza, cancelling shame through death and thus also emphasizing Lucrece's motive for her suicide. The contrastive relation of honour and dishonour are set in connection with fame and shame; the concluding three lines of the stanza (1188–1190) are composed around these notions:

(8) So of **shame's ashes** shall my **fame** be **bred**,
     For in my **death** I murder **shameful** scorn;
     My **shame** so **dead**, mine **honour** is new **born**."   (1188–1190)

Shame is linked to death (the "ashes"), and from this is born ("bred") Lucrece's fame. There is a choreography of these four words and notions, in which chiasmus and parallelism (also through rhyme) are carefully intertwined; the chiasmus is inserted into a parallel construction. The resulting image here is not one of exchange but of fame and honour being born, phoenix-like, from the ashes of Lucrece's shame; this image is enacted and mimed in the words of these lines.

Lucrece goes on to talk about her testament, her "legacy" (1192), and this is the epitome of the anagnorisis with regard to her connection with Tarquin: "How Tarquin must be used, read it in me" (1195). When she is looking at the Troy painting, she learns how to read[21] and, in a similar fashion, she will become a story to be read and to give instructions as to how to "use" Tarquin:

---

21. This is reminiscent of her first encounter with Tarquin, when her own face was to be deciphered as a text (see Shakespeare 2007a: 31–72).

(9) "This brief abridgement of my will I make:
     My soul and body to the skies and ground;
     My resolution, husband do thou take;
     Mine honour be the knife's that makes my wound;
     My shame be his that did my fame confound;
     And all my fame that lives disbursed be
     To those that live and think no shame of me."   (1198–1204)

The "abridgement" is, however, not so "brief"; in fact, she repeats some of the aspects mentioned in the previous stanzas, and she refers to these again by using both parallelism and chiasmus. She states that she will give her "soul and body to the skies and ground" and in a parallel structure bequeaths resolution, honour etc. to various instances. The stanza ends on chiasmus, and in the final three lines, "shame" and "fame" are again the predominant arguments: It is her shame that she gives to Tarquin, whereas she remains with "no shame". Her fame that was "confounded" by Tarquin will be "paid out" (cf. Shakespeare 2007a: 333n1203) to those that do not blame her for what happened. The word "disbursed" and the subsequent argument also underline the notion of giving and taking, which is based on a chiasmus that can be found both on the lexical and syntactic as well as on the semantic level. The construction here, i.e. form, is iconically related to the matter at hand, i.e. the semantic content, and Lucrece herself becomes the instrument of her fame. Moreover, the interplay of "shame" and "fame" can be regarded as a preparation of Lucrece's suicide, which brings the performative iconicity to its culmination.

The knife supposed to kill her will assist her in her suicide; when she first thinks of stabbing herself, Lucrece says:

(10) "Poor hand, why quiver'st thou at this decree?
      Honour thyself to rid me of this shame.
      For if I die, my honour lives in thee;
      But if I live, thou liv'st in my defame."   (1030–1033)

Her hand is personified and becomes connected to her honour. She emphasizes the metonymical interdependence of her hand and herself: her hand will honour itself (and her whole body) by helping her kill herself and, thus, her shame. When she is dead, her honour will live on, "me" will be rid of shame and not cease to exist; yet should she go on living, her honour will be dead, and her life will be one of shame. The personified hand stands for the deed itself, which will continue to live, either in honour or in infamy.

But the hand she addresses is also linked to Tarquin, who will later guide the knife and stab her: "[…]' tis he / That guides this hand to give this wound to me" (1721–1722). He lends her his hand to stab herself, and she bequeaths him the

"stained blood [...] / Which by him tainted shall for him be spent" (1181–1182), which means that he guides the hand to free her from the taint he gave her.[22] The exchange between Lucrece and her hand is now extended to Tarquin. The link between them was established at the beginning of the poem through the basic antagonism that underlies the action and is brought to a conclusion when "he" kills her.

4. Conclusion

The antagonism of the two main characters, Tarquin being "lust-breathed", Lucrece "chaste", is at the basis of the drama that enfolds in Shakespeare's epyllion. But they are not only contrasted with each other: the antagonism links them to each other; in this poem, contraries do indeed hold unity.

The connection between Tarquin and Lucrece is eventually realized in the "exchange" that takes place after the rape, with Tarquin's soul being destroyed as well as Lucrece's body. Their relation is therefore a chiastic one: while Tarquin's body is untainted, he destroys his soul – Lucrece's soul remains intact, but her body becomes a "spotted princess" (Shakespeare 2007a: 721). Body and soul, their conditions, are reversed; before the rape, Lucrece's inner goodness was expressed on her outside – and so was Tarquin's "inward ill" (91; see Zirker 2015: 34–35). The parallel constellation becomes a chiastic one after the rape, and hence the antagonism of the characters is cancelled. The original "order" can only be reinstalled through another exchange, namely when Tarquin's "hand" kills Lucrece:[23] When she kills herself, she accordingly says "'Tis he", namely Tarquin, who kills her.[24]

Chiasmus and parallelism are strong formal and semantic elements throughout the poem; they can be found locally but they also constitute an overarching global structure. Chiasmus determines the structure of Shakespeare's epyllion; together with parallelism it serves to iconically represent reversals and exchanges of inner and outer self, of body and soul, of Tarquin and Lucrece. Chiasmus thus contributes to the allegory which becomes enacted on the stage of the poem in the acting characters. They are different, defined by defect and perfection, they are polar antagonists, but in their opposition they form a unity. As iconic diagrams, chiasmus and parallelism thus become performative in that they are dynamic – in the movement from antagonism to unity – but also by means of positioning the characters within the text. When Lucrece kills herself, her suicide can be read as the concluding performance of her relationship with Tarquin: her hand becomes his, their contrast is exchanged for unity, and both chiasmus and parallelism enact this iconically. Linguistic structures in Shakespeare's epyllion mime and thus perform the relationship of Tarquin and Lucrece that is not explicitly communicated otherwise. Form, i.e. contrast, parallelism and chiasmus, adds meaning to the poem, and this in itself can be regarded as a performative gesture, as it "carries something into effect".

---

22. In a paradoxical way, this will be the redemption of Tarquin, which is expressed by means of the ambiguous "for him", i.e. either because of him or for his sake.

23. One might also think of this ending in terms of the reinstitution of symmetry; cf. Norrman on symmetry in literary texts which may, among other structures, be achieved through chiasmus: "In language, chiasmus is one of the most important manifestations of symmetry on the sentence level" (Norrman 1999: 39). In *The Rape of Lucrece*, chiasmus on the sentence level may express and create both asymmetry and symmetry on the level of character constellation: the "exchange of roles" (Norrman 1999: 39) effected by chiasmus is thus performed when Lucrece kills herself. As Norrman concludes (his example for illustrating this phenomenon is Shakespeare's "fair is foul and foul is fair"): "We now realize that there is a special and significant triangular relationship between (1) opposites, (2) 'existential' chiasmus, and (3) symmetry" (70).

24. See also "his guilty hand" (358) when he opens the door to her chamber.

References

Cheney, D. 1982. Tarquin, Juliet, and other *Romei*. *Spenser Studies* 3: 111–124.

Cooper, T. 1969[1565]. *Thesaurus Linguae Romanae et Britannicae*. Menston: The Scholar Press.

Davis, W. L. 2003. Better a witty fool than a foolish wit: The art of Shakespeare's chiasmus. *Text and Performance Quarterly* 23(4): 311–330. doi:10.1080/1046293042000190595

Davis, W. L. 2005. Structural secrets: Shakespeare's complex chiasmus. *Style* 39(3): 237–258.

Eckstein, L. 2010. *Reading Song Lyrics*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Elleström, L. 2015. Visual, auditory, and cognitive iconicity in written literature: The example of Emily Dickinson's 'Because I could not stop for Death.' In *Iconicity: East Meets West* [Iconicity in Language and Literature 5], M. K. Hiraga, W. J. Herlofsky, K. Shinohara & K. Akita (eds), 207–218. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/ill.14

Engel, W. E. 2009. *Chiastic Designs in English Literature from Sidney to Shakespeare*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Ferber, M. 2007. *A Dictionary of Literary Symbols*. Cambridge: CUP. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511481475

Fischer-Lichte, E. 2008. *The Transformative Power of Performance: A New Aesthetics*. London: Routledge.

Fowler, A. 1970. *Triumphal Forms: Structural Patterns in Elizabethan Poetry*. Cambridge: CUP.

Horvei, H. 1981. *Der Chiasmus: Ein Beitrag zur Figurenlehre mit spezieller Berücksichtigung einiger Werke der deutschen Klassik*. Bergen: Private print.

Horvei, H. 1984. *"The Chevril Glove": A Study in Shakespearean Rhetoric*. Bergen: Private print.

Krämer, S. 2002. Sprache – Stimme – Schrift: Sieben Gedanken über Performativität als Medialität. In *Performanz: Zwischen Sprachphilosophie und Kulturwissenschaften*, U. Wirth (ed.), 323–346. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Ljungberg, C. 2010. The bell jar, the maze and the mural: Diagrammatic figurations as textual performance. In *Signergy* [Iconicity in Language and Literature 9], C. J. Conradie, R. Johl, M. Beukes, O. Fisher & C. Ljungberg (eds), 47–72. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/ill.9.06lju

Maassen, I. 2001. Text und/als/in der Performanz in der frühen Neuzeit: Thesen und Über-
legungen. *Paragrana* 10(1): 285–302.

Müller, W. G. 2000. Iconicity and rhetoric: A note on the iconic force of rhetorical figures in
Shakespeare. In *The Motivated Sign* [Iconicity in Language and Literature 2], O. Fischer &
M. Nänny (eds), 305–322. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/ill.2

Nänny, M. 1987. Chiastic structures in literature: Some forms and functions. In *The Structure of
Texts*, U. Fries (ed.), 75–97. Tübingen: Narr.

Nänny, M. 1999. Alphabetic letters as icons in literary texts. In *Form Miming Meaning* [Iconicity
in Language and Literature 1], M. Nänny & O. Fischer (eds), 173–198. Amsterdam: John
Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/ill.1.16nan

Nöth, W. 2001. Semiotic foundations of iconicity in language and literature. In *The Motivated Sign*
[Iconicity in Language and Literature 2], O. Fischer & M. Nänny (eds), 17–28. Amsterdam:
John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/ill.2.05not

Norrman, R. 1986. *Samuel Butler and the Meaning of Chiasmus*. New York NY: Macmillan.
doi: 10.1007/978-1-349-18067-7

Norrman, R. 1999. Creating the world in our image: A new theory of love of symmetry and icon-
icist desire. In *Form Miming Meaning* [Iconicity in Language and Literature 1], M. Nänny &
O. Fischer (eds), 59–82. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/ill.1.08nor

Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd edn. 2014. ⟨www.oed.com⟩ (11 December 2016).

Paul, A. 1992. The Torture of the Mind: Macbeth, Tragedy and Chiasmus. PhD dissertation,
University of Amsterdam.

Paul, A. & Wiseman, B. 2014. Introduction: Chiasmus in the drama of life. In *Chiasmus and
Culture*, B. Wiseman & A. Paul (eds), 1–16. New York NY: Berghahn.

Ramirez, M. 2011. Descanting on deformity: The irregularities in Shakespeare's large chiasms.
Text and Performance Quarterly 31(1): 37–49. doi: 10.1080/10462937.2010.526240

Rogers, T. 1592. *Soliloquium Animae: The Sole-Talke of the Soule*. London: The Fourth Booke of
the Imitation of Christ.

Shakespeare, W. 1998. *Troilus and Cressida* [The Arden Shakespeare], D. Bevington (ed.). Walton-
on-Thames: Nelson House. doi: 10.5040/9781408160114.00000007

Shakespeare, W. 2003[1997]. *The Sonnets* [The Arden Shakespeare], K. Duncan-Jones (ed).
London: Thomson.

Shakespeare, W. 2007a. The Rape of Lucrece. In *Shakespeare's Poems* [The Arden Shakespeare], K.
Duncan-Jones & H. R. Woudhuysen (eds), 231–383. London: Cengage.

Shakespeare, W. 2007b. The Phoenix and Turtle. In *Shakespeare's Poems* [The Arden Shakespeare],
K. Duncan-Jones & H. R. Woudhuysen (eds), 421–428. London: Cengage.

Shakespeare, W. 2008. *Timon of Athens* [The Arden Shakespeare], A. B. Dawson & G. E. Minton
(eds). London: Cengage. doi: 10.5040/9781408160138.00000009

Strecker, I. 2014. Chiasmus and metaphor. In *Chiasmus and Culture*, A. Paul & B. Wiseman (eds),
69–88. New York NY: Berghahn.

Woolf, R. 1968. *The English Religious Lyric in the Middle Ages*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Zirker, A. 2015. *Stages of the Soul in Early Modern Poetry: William Shakespeare and John Donne*.
Habilitation: University of Tübingen.

Zirker, A. 2016. 'Oh make thy selfe with holy mourning blacke': Aspects of drama and perfor-
mance in John Donne's *Holy Sonnet* 'Oh my black Soule.' *ZAA* 64(3): 247–262.

PART V

New dimensions of iconicity