

Empson Seven Types Of Ambiguity

Empson Seven Types Of Ambiguity

Downloaded from app.ardentx.com by Saul & Benton

THE ENDURING LEGACY OF WILLIAM EMPSON'S SEVEN TYPES OF AMBIGUITY IN LITERARY CRITICISM

In the landscape of twentieth-century literary criticism, few works have sparked as much debate, admiration, and influence as William Empson's *Seven Types of Ambiguity*. First published in 1930 when Empson was a remarkably young student at Cambridge, this book remains a cornerstone of close reading and poetic analysis. For students of literature, writers, and anyone curious about how language can hold multiple meanings at once, understanding Empson's framework offers a gateway to deeper appreciation of poetry and prose. This article explores the essence of Empson's seven types, their context, and their lasting impact on how we approach literary texts.

Who Was William Empson?

William Empson (1906–1984) was a British literary critic and poet, known for his sharp intelligence and his ability to untangle the most complex linguistic knots. As a student of I. A. Richards at Cambridge, Empson developed his theory of ambiguity partly as an extension of Richards’ work on practical criticism. The story goes that Empson’s tutor asked him to analyse a Shakespearean sonnet, and the resulting paper eventually grew into the full-length book *Seven Types of Ambiguity*. This work established Empson as a leading figure of the New Criticism movement, which championed close textual analysis over biographical or historical context.

Empson’s approach was revolutionary because he treated ambiguity not as a flaw or confusion in poetry, but as a deliberate, powerful tool. He believed that the richest poems thrive on multiple, simultaneous interpretations. His seven-part taxonomy gave critics a vocabulary to describe how a single word or phrase can carry a spectrum of meanings, enriching the reader’s experience.

Defining Ambiguity in Empson’s Terms

Before diving into the seven types, it's essential to understand what Empson meant by “ambiguity.” In everyday language, ambiguity often implies vagueness or lack of clarity. For Empson, however, literary ambiguity is a source of depth. He defined it broadly: “any verbal nuance, however slight, which gives room for alternative reactions to the same piece of language.” In other words, ambiguity occurs when a word, phrase, or structure can be understood in two or more distinct ways, and these meanings work together to create a richer effect.

Empson’s categories progress from simple to complex, from cases where two meanings are relatively straightforward to those where multiple interpretations collide in a dizzying but meaningful fashion.

The Seven Types of Ambiguity Explained

TYPE 1: THE DETAIL OF LANGUAGE THAT WORKS IN SEVERAL WAYS

Type 1 is the most elementary form of ambiguity. It occurs when a word or phrase has two or more distinct meanings, and the context allows all of them to be relevant simultaneously. Empson gives the example of Shakespeare’s line “The nimble gunner with linstock now the devilish cannon touches.” The word “devilish” can describe the cannon’s origin (made by devils) or its destructive nature. Both interpretations are plausible, and they reinforce each other.

This type is common in metaphor, where a comparison carries both literal and figurative significance. A poet might describe a sunset as “a dying fire,” evoking both the visual similarity and the sense of ending. The beauty lies in the coexistence of these meanings.

TYPE 2: TWO OR MORE ALTERNATIVE MEANINGS ARE FULLY RESOLVED

In Type 2, the ambiguity stems from a word or phrase that has two meanings that are logically distinct but both intended by the author. Unlike Type 1, where the meanings work in harmony, Type 2 often involves a situation where the reader must choose between interpretations, but the text does not force a single choice. Empson cites John Donne’s poem “A Valediction: Forbidding Mourning,” where the line “Our two souls therefore, which are one” can be read as either a statement of unity or a comparison of two separate entities that become one. The poem sustains both readings, creating a layered effect.

TYPE 3: TWO IDEAS THAT ARE GIVEN SIMULTANEOUSLY

Type 3 involves a single word or phrase that conveys two ideas that are connected but not simply alternative. Empson uses the example of a pun, where the word’s double meaning arises from homophony or homonymy. However, he extends this to more subtle cases where the grammatical structure itself creates a double meaning. For instance, in Shakespeare’s “O that this too too solid flesh would melt,” the word “solid” can mean

“firm” or “dense,” but also “melancholy” (from the old meaning of “solid” as “woeful”). The two ideas—physical and emotional—are presented at once.

TYPE 4: ALTERNATIVE MEANINGS THAT TOGETHER EXPRESS A COMPLICATED STATE OF MIND

Type 4 is more sophisticated. Here, the alternative meanings do not just coexist; they combine to reflect a complex psychological state. The speaker reveals conflicting feelings—love and hate, hope and despair—through a single image. Empson analyses the line from Shakespeare’s Sonnet 73: “That time of year thou mayst in me behold.” The “time of year” could be autumn, which indicates decline, or it could be the season of harvest, which implies ripeness. The ambiguity mirrors the speaker’s mixed emotions about aging: regret and acceptance. This type requires the reader to hold contradictory feelings in mind simultaneously.

TYPE 5: A FORTUNATE CONFUSION WHERE THE AUTHOR DISCOVERS HIS MEANING IN THE ACT OF WRITING

Type 5 is one of the most interesting from a creative perspective. Empson suggests that sometimes ambiguity occurs because the writer themselves is working through an idea, and the resulting text contains multiple meanings that the author may not have consciously intended. The ambiguity is not a flaw but a testament to the generative process of writing. Empson’s example comes from the poetry of George Herbert, where a line can shift in meaning as the reader progresses, revealing a layered religious insight that seems to emerge organically. For modern readers, this type underscores that meaning is not always premeditated; it can be discovered.

TYPE 6: WHAT IS SAID IS CONTRADICTORY, AND THE READER MUST INCONSISTENT INTERPRETATIONS

Type 6 introduces outright contradiction. The text says one thing but implies the opposite, forcing the reader to reconcile two incompatible statements. Empson points to passages where a poet says “I love you” but the context makes it clear that love is painful or impossible. The reader must hold both the stated emotion and the implied irony. This type is common in dramatic monologues or in poems that explore self-deception. For example, in Andrew Marvell’s “To His Coy Mistress,” the speaker argues for immediate gratification, but the exaggerated images of time and death undercut his urgency. The ambiguity lies between earnest persuasion and ironic mockery.

TYPE 7: FULL CONTRADICTION THAT REVEALS A FUNDAMENTAL DIVISION IN THE WRITER’S MIND

The final type is the most profound and rare. Here, the ambiguity reflects a deep-seated conflict within the author’s worldview. The text contains meanings that are so opposed that they cannot coexist logically, yet the poem forces them together. This type often indicates a crisis of belief or psychology. Empson uses the example of the ending of Shakespeare's *The Phemix and the Turtle*, where the poem celebrates a union of two beings that is simultaneously a union and a paradox. The reader is left with a sense of mystery that cannot be resolved. Type 7 shows that some complexities of human experience resist simple explanation.

The Impact of Empson’s Framework on Literary Studies

Seven Types of Ambiguity changed the way critics and readers approach poetry. Before Empson, analysis often focused on authorial intention, historical context, or moral lessons. Empson shifted the spotlight to the text itself, showing that a close reading of language could reveal multiple layers of meaning. His method became a hallmark of New Criticism, influencing critics like Cleanth Brooks, Robert Penn Warren, and John Crowe Ransom.

Moreover, Empson’s work encouraged readers to embrace complexity rather than reduce poems to single interpretations. For students, his seven types provide a practical toolkit for analyzing how words work. For writers, they offer strategies for enriching language by allowing ambiguity to create depth. Even today, when post-structuralist theories have challenged the stability of meaning, Empson’s taxonomy remains a useful starting point for understanding how multiple meanings function in literature.

Criticisms and Limitations

No influential theory escapes critique, and Empson’s seven types have been questioned on several fronts. Some commentators argue that his categories are not always distinct—certain passages could fit into multiple types. Others claim that Empson’s method overinterprets texts, finding meanings that the author never intended. The New Critical emphasis on close reading has also been criticized for ignoring the social, political, and historical forces that shape literature. Nonetheless, these criticisms do not diminish the usefulness of Empson’s insights. They simply remind us that any framework is a tool, not a dogma.

Applying Empson’s Ambiguity in Modern Writing and Reading

For contemporary writers and readers, the concept of ambiguity remains vital. In poetry, ambiguity allows for condensed expression—a few words can evoke an entire spectrum of emotion. In prose, ambiguity can create nuance in character motivation or thematic resonance. For example, a character’s ambiguous statement in a novel can hint at hidden motives, leaving the room for interpretation. Empson’s work teaches us to slow down and savour the multiplicity of meaning.

In the digital age, where information is often reduced to headlines and sound bites, Empson’s call for careful reading is more relevant than ever. Understanding ambiguity fosters critical thinking and empathy, as it requires us to consider alternative viewpoints. Whether you are a student writing

a critical essay, a poet crafting a line, or a curious reader exploring a Shakespearean sonnet, Empson’s seven types offer a guide to the rich complexities of language.

Conclusion

William Empson’s *Seven Types of Ambiguity* is more than a historical artifact of literary criticism. It is a living framework that continues to illuminate how language creates meaning through multiplicity. By classifying ambiguity into seven distinct types, Empson gave us a vocabulary to appreciate the depth that arises when words carry more than one significance. From simple puns to profound contradictions, his categories reveal the artistry behind beautiful writing. As we navigate a world saturated with information, Empson’s insights remind us that the most rewarding texts are those that ask us to hold multiple truths at once—and that ambiguity, far from being a weakness, is one of literature’s greatest strengths.