Shakespeare's Rhetorical Training and His Early Plays

Thomas Kullmann
University of Osnabrueck

The importance of the art of rhetoric for Renaissance letters in general and William Shakespeare in particular has long been recognized. T. W. Baldwin's *William Shakspere's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke* (1944) provides a survey of the wide range of literary texts and treatises available to Shakespeare, and Sr. Miriam Joseph's *Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language* (1947) closely examines the manifold use made by Shakespeare of traditional techniques of invention and argumentation, pathos and ethos. Since then, however, there have been few specific studies on Shakespeare's rhetorical training and practice. While interest in Shakespeare's schooling has risen, few direct links between his Stratford lessons and the text of his plays have been established.

I argue that the impact of the rhetorical training Shakespeare received at the Stratford grammar school can best be seen in his early works, before he moved on to transcend the modes of speechmaking taught by the ancient Latin textbooks, "outrunning precept even while conforming to it," as Sister Miriam Joseph puts it.[1] Among these textbooks, the pseudo-Ciceronian *Rhetorica ad Herennium* certainly takes pride of place. As Baldwin has conclusively shown, Shakespeare "like most other 'learned grammarians' of his day … had mastered *Ad Herennium* as his basic textbook for rhetoric in grammar school."[2] Extant sixteenth-century grammar school statutes often specify *Ad Herennium* as a

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 25, 69-82

ISSN: 1539-5758

text to be studied,[3] and verbal parallels demonstrate Shakespeare's familiarity with this treatise.[4]

While Baldwin focuses on the structure of criminal investigation and pleading as outlined in the second book of *Ad Herennium*, providing the examples of the last scene of *Romeo and Juliet* and the Shylock trial in *A Merchant of Venice*,[5] I propose to examine speeches made in Shakespeare's early plays: that of Katherina at the end of *The Taming of the Shrew* (5.2.136-179)[6] and those of Richmond and Richard when addressing their soldiers in *Richard III* (5.3.237-270 and 314-351).[7] My contention is that Shakespeare in these speeches closely follows the rules proffered by *Ad Herennium* both in the area of *dispositio* or structuring, and in the area of *elocutio*, or sentence formation, including the use of imagery and other rhetorical figures.

In *The Taming of the Shrew*, Petruchio charges Katherine to tell the other two ladies "what duty they do owe their lords and husbands" (5.2.131). Within the tripartite scheme of epideictic, deliberative and judicial speeches, the present one belongs to the epideictic, or demonstrative category, often used to praise individuals or to show some general truth. In this case the praise is given to husbands in general, followed by a demonstration of the duties of wives.

Let's first examine the *dispositio*, or structure, of Katherine's speech. Before she embarks upon the main body of her argument with the pronunciation, "Thy husband is thy lord, thy life, thy keeper" (5.2.146), she addresses the other two ladies personally in a disparaging way (136-145). This part of her speech corresponds to what *Rhetorica ad Herennium* calls "exordium" and "principium," a Latin rendition of Greek *prooimion* (I, iv, 6).[8] From the various options of *principium*, she chooses to discuss her adversaries, to bring to light "hatred, unpopularity and contempt" (I, v, 8). Katherine addresses the widow, who has married Hortensio, but of course her speech is mainly designed to impress the gentlemen present.

The next part of the speech is the *narratio*, or statement of facts (I, viii, 11-12), which should have three qualities: "brevity, clarity and plausibility." Katherine's statement could not be clearer:

> Thy husband is thy lord, thy life, thy keeper,
> Thy head, thy sovereign; one that cares for thee,
> And for thy maintenance (5.2.146-148)

The subject-matter of epideictic speeches can be qualities of character (*laus animi* [III, vi, 10]). The qualities of the good husband enumerated by Katherine correspond to two of the cardinal virtues mentioned in *Ad Herennium*—justness and courage:

> [thy husband] commits his body
> To painful labor, both by sea and land;
> To watch the night in storms, the day in cold,
> While thou li'st warm at home, secure and safe. (5.2.148-151)

The argument is embellished by divisions: sea and land, day and night, cold versus warm. The lines about husbands' bodily exertions serve as *confirmatio* (III, ix, 16), or proof of the initial statement, as do these next lines: "And craves no other tribute at thy hands / But love, fair looks, and true obedience— / Too little payment for so great a debt" (5.2.152-154).

The next two lines can be described as *exornatio*, or embellishment (III, ix, 16), even though they already introduce the image used for the following part: "Such duty as the subject owes the prince, / Even such a woman oweth to her husband" (5.2.155-156).

The proof or *confirmatio* is followed by a *refutatio*, a refutation of the contrary argument:

> And when she is froward, peevish, sullen, sour,
> And not obedient to his honest will,
> What is she but a foul contending rebel,
> And graceless traitor to her loving lord? (5.2.157-160)

This is followed by the *conclusio*, or résumé:

> I am asham'd that women are so simple
> To offer war where they should kneel for peace,
> Or seek for rule, supremacy and sway,
> When they are bound to serve, love, and obey. (5.2.161-164)

Katherine then adds further arguments or *confirmationes*, one from natural disposition: "Why are our bodies soft, and weak, and smooth" (5.2.165), and one from her own personal experience: "My mind has been as big as one of yours" (5.2.170). This is followed by a personal *conclusio*: "In token of which duty, if he please, / My hand is ready, may it do him ease" (5.2.177-178).

Incidentally, we may notice that *Ad Herennium* also contains several paragraphs on the issue of delivery of speeches, which would certainly have been of great interest to Shakespeare as actor

and director (III, vi-viii, 11-15; and III, xi-xv, 19-27).[9] As we do not have recordings of Shakespearean performances, we will never know to what extent the rules and suggestions of the Latin treatise were followed. What we can examine, however, is the issue of *elocutio*, or style, to which the author devoted the fourth and last book of his treatise. The author first defines three different styles, the grand, the middle, and the simple. Of these three, Katherine's speech fits the middle style, as it is certainly more elevated than ordinary prose (IV, viii, 11 and ix, 13), but does not consist of a display of the most ornate words available (viii, 11). *Ad Herennium* also outlines basic rules of variation and euphony, which are certainly kept in Katherine's speech (xii, 18).

Ad Herennium further defines *exclamatio* (or apostrophe) and *interrogatio* (or rhetorical question) (xv, 22), both of which are found in her speech. In 5.2.169, Katherine addresses Bianca and the widow directly: "Come, come, you froward and unable worms!", and twice, in 5.2.159-160 and 5.2.165-168, she couches her argument in the form of a rhetorical question: "What is she but a foul contending rebel, / And graceless traitor to her loving lord?"; "Why are our bodies soft, and weak, and smooth" (5.2.165). The enumeration of qualities in a husband, "thy lord, thy life, thy keeper, / thy head, thy sovereign" (146-147), or of bad qualities in a woman, "froward, peevish, sullen, sour" (5.2.157), are examples of what *Ad Herennium* calls *articulus*, or comma (xix, 26), "when single word are set apart by pauses in staccato speech."

The greatest debt which Shakespeare owes *Ad Herennium*, however, is the technique of cola, or corresponding parts of a sentence: "Such duty as the subject owes the prince, / Even such a woman oweth to her husband" (5.2.155-156). These sentences sometimes take the form of isocolon, i.e., corresponding parts of the same length and structure, as in "the night in storms, the day in cold" (5.2.150). This isocolon, taken together, forms a new colon which is completed by the next line: "Whilst thou li'st warm at home, secure and safe" (5.2.151). Quite often, the figure of colon goes along with antithesis: "Too little payment for so great a debt" (5.2.154); "graceless traitor to her loving lord" (5.2.160); "to offer war where they should kneel for peace" (5.2.162); "Or seek for rule, supremacy and sway / When they are bound to serve, love, and obey" (5.2.163-164), and "That seeming to be most which we

indeed least are" (5.2.175).

The figure *Ad Herennium* calls *dissolutum*, or asyndeton (30. 41) is found twice towards the end of the speech, and the two instances form antithetical cola:

> My mind has been as big as one of yours,
> My heart as great, my reason haply more …
> But now I see our lances are but straws,
> Our strength as weak, our weakness past compare.
> (5.2.170-171, 173-174)

Both parts of this antithesis also feature the figure of *gradatio*, or climax (xxv, 34)—the three members of each of the two arguments follow one another in ascending order.

Finally, we can take a look at the imagery used by Katherine and compare it with the suggestions of *Ad Herennium*. The "exordium" contains a series of *translationes* or metaphors (xxxiv, 45): "*unknit* that threat'ning unkind brow"; "*dart* not scornful glances from those eyes," and "to *wound* thy lord, thy king, thy governor" (5.2.136-138), followed by two *imagines*, or similes (xlix, 62), taken from nature: "as frosts do bite the meads" (5.2.139) and "as whirlwinds shake fair buds" (5.2.140).

The most characteristic form of imagery which Shakespeare may have drawn from rhetorical training, however, is *permutatio*, or allegory (xxxiv, 46), which according to *Ad Herennium*, "operates through a comparison when a number of metaphors originating in a similarity in the mode of expression are set together" (xxxiv, 46). Such an allegory concludes the *exordium*: "A woman moved is like a fountain troubled, / Muddy, ill-seeming, thick, bereft of beauty …" (5.2.141-145). All the unattractive qualities of an outspoken woman can be visualized. The second instance is in 5.2.154: "Too little payment for so great a debt." 5.2.172-173 provide the next example: "To bandy word for word and frown for frown; / But now I see our lances are but straws." The image of playful fighting is kept up through three connected metaphors. Finally, the conclusion takes the shape of an allegory, as body parts stand for wifely attitudes: "Then vail your stomachs, for it is no boot, / And place your hands below your husband's foot" (5.2.176-177). Katherine ends on a particularly striking note in that she acts out her metaphor by literally placing a hand in front of Petruchio's foot.

Rhetoric shapes how Shakespeare organizes the arguments in favor of wifely submission. The techniques outlined in *Ad Herennium* are integrated into iambic, even rhymed verse, and that the verse structure may help to create parallelisms, as in isocolon. It also provides an opportunity to Katherine to get the better of her sister and the other women, and for the boy actor playing her to shine in front of company. The perfection of this speech, of course, ironically undercuts the discourse of female inferiority it embodies.[10]

Like his later plays, *The Taming of the Shrew* ends with a certain sense of ambiguity. We may also note that the techniques of imagery allow Shakespeare to introduce some of his pet motifs, notably the concept of natural order, by deriving his notions from the idea that the bodies of men are naturally strong, while those of women are soft. Disturbances of the natural hierarchy between husbands and wives are illustrated by disturbances in nature, and both will finally be rectified.

My next examples are the two orations found in *Richard III*, by the Earl of Richmond (5.3.238-271) and by King Richard (5.3.315-342). Orations by army leaders were not usually discussed in classical rhetoric, but they can certainly be subsumed under the deliberative genus, as they intend to persuade the soldiers to fight bravely. The speeches are marked similarly, as "*His oration to his Soldiers*" (5.3.237) or "*His oration to his Army*" (5.3.313), in scene directions. Moreover, the two speeches share the same structure and thus lend themselves to a comparison.

Richmond starts off with an *exordium* stating his humility, the love of his hearers and the importance of the occasion, i.e., briefly encompassing three of the four methods of a *principium*, a direct opening (*Ad Herennium*, I, iv, 8), references to the speaker, the hearers and the cause. The fourth method, a reference to the adversary, is omitted: "More than I have said, loving countrymen, / The leisure and enforcement of the time / Forbids to dwell upon" (5.3.237-239). The "statement of facts" consists of an assertion of the divine justice of their cause: "God, and our good cause, fight upon our side; / The prayers of holy saints and wronged souls, / Like high-rear'd bulwarks, stand before our faces" (5.3.240-242).

In the system of arguments in deliberative speeches, the *utilitas* or advantage proposed is *honesta* rather than *tuta*; it is honor rather

than security. The issue is *honesta* because it is *rectum*, right, rather than just *laudabile*, praiseworthy (*Ad Herennium,* III, ii, 3). The statement is followed by a series of arguments, beginning with a distinction: "Richard except, those whom we fight against / Had rather have us win than him they follow" (5.3.243-244).

Richard's followers are distinguished from Richard himself, who now comes in for abuse, emphasized by anaphora and repetition of words: "One rais'd in blood, and one in blood established / One that made means to come by what he hath" (5.3.247-248). The next part of the argumentation lists various motivations for fighting Richard, which will all result in some benefit, comprising, as *Ad Herennium* advises (III, iv, 8), both honor and safety. The argument that "if you fight against God's enemy, / God will in justice ward you as his soldiers" (5.3.253-254) belongs to the category of honor; the next one: "If you do sweat to put a tyrant down, / You sleep in peace, the tyrant being slain" (5.3.255-256) to that of safety. To honor and safety Richmond adds material benefits: "If you do fight against your country's foes, / Your country's fat shall pay your pains the hire" (5.3.257-258), and sexual ones: "If you do fight in safeguard of your wives, / Your wives shall welcome home the conquerors" (5.3.259-260). The final benefit is a long-term one: "If you do free your children from the sword, / Your children's children quits it in your age" (5.3.261-262). The conclusion, initiated by "then," again refers to God, as well as to Richmond himself, who will reward his followers.

With regard to elocution, we may first note *ratiocinatio*, or Reasoning by Question and Answer (IV, xvi, 23): "For what is he they follow? Truly, gentlemen, / A bloody tyrant and a homicide" (5.3.245-246). The next figure is *traductio*, or transplacement, i.e., the reintroduction of the same word (IV, xiv, 20): "One rais'd in blood, and one in blood established; / One that made means to come by what he hath, / And slaughtered those that were the means to help him" (5.3.248-249), with the repetition of the word *means* drawing attention to the paradox. The list of benefits, which constitutes a *distributio* (xxxv, 47), is characterized by anaphora (IV, xii, 19) and isocolon (IV, xx, 27). The two line-structure: "If you do sweat to put the tyrant down, / You sleep in peace, the tyrant being slain" (5.3.255-256) is repeated four times. In each of

the pairs of lines we also notice the *traductio*, or transplacement of a noun, as with "tyrant" in the example quoted.

With regard to *exornationes verborum*, or Figures of Diction (IV, xxix-xxxi, 41-42), we note allegory, referring to Richard as: "A base foul stone, made precious by the foil / Of England's chair, where he is falsely set" (5.3.250- 251). This image indicates that Richard does not belong to the throne of England. In blaming Richard, Richmond at the same time upholds "the essence of kingship, which is the root of its dignity and intrinsic honor, namely, that it is a principle of order, a delegation of divine authority made sacred by anointing."[11] The protection of God and holy saints is invoked by means of a simile (IV, xlix, 62): "Like high-rear'd bulwarks, stand before our faces" (5.3.242). We may also discover instances of synecdoche (IV, xxxiii, 44): "sweat" (5.3.255); "your country's fat" (5.3.258); "from the sword" (5.3.261); metonymy (IV, xxxii, 43): "one raised in blood" (5.3.247), "this cold corpse" (5.3.266), and personification (IV, liii, 66): "pay your pains the hire" (5.3.258) and "your willing swords" (5.3.264).

Richard's *exordium*, consisting of just one line, is similar to Richmond's, but appears more colloquial and dismissive: "What shall I say more than I have inferr'd?" (5.3.314). Indeed, this line can be considered an example of the figure of *dubitatio*, or Indecision (I, vi, 10), recommended for a Subtle, rather than Direct approach, or *exordium*, which needs to be used "if the cause has a discreditable character" (I, vi, 9). Unlike Richmond's speech, Richard's statement of facts amounts to an abuse, first of the enemy soldiers (5.3.315-322), then of Richmond himself (5.3.323-326), introduced, like Richard in Richmond's speech, by *ratiocinatio*: "And who does lead them but a paltry fellow?" (5.3.323). Richard's speech also operates by means of anaphora and isocolon: "You sleeping safe, they bring to you unrest; / You having lands and blessed with beauteous wives, / The would restrain the one, distain the other" (5.3.320-322).

Ad Herennium establishes the dichotomy of honor and security as advantageous courses of action. While Richmond emphasizes honor, Richard confines himself to security, and while Richmond promises rewards, Richard raises fears. "Sleeping safe" and the love of wives were also motifs in Richmond's speech but Richard warns against losing these benefits rather than arguing in favor of

winning them. A figure he uses in 5.3.322 is *paronomasia*, or a play on similar sounds (IV, xxi, 28)—restrain, distain. The abuse he pours upon the enemy soldiers as "rags of France" does not keep him from voicing his fears in interrogation, or rhetorical questions: "Shall these enjoy our lands? Lie with our wives? / Ravish our daughters?" (5.3.336-337).

The *exornationes*, or figures of diction of Richard's speech, are characterized by vulgarity: we may notice personification, metaphor and allegory in the line: "Whom their o'ercloyed country vomits forth" (5.3.318). There is the metonymy of the "overweening rags," and there are further metaphors: "Let's whip" (5.3.327) and "poor rats" (5.3.331). The latter image appears unfortunate, as it is difficult to imagine the rats hanging themselves. At the end, Richard refers to amazing "the welkin" rather than appealing to God (5.3.341). Even in his final evocation of England's patron saint, where Richard does call on religion, he omits the direct reference to God that Richmond offers, instead replacing God by an invocation of hellish animals: "Our ancient word of courage, fair Saint George, / Inspire us with the spleen of fiery dragons!" (5.3.350). The structural similarities of the two speeches invite us to pay particular attention to the differences in their rhetorical strategies. Even though the number of rhetorical figures is about the same in the two speeches, it is obvious that Richmond's dignified speech can be considered an example of the middle style, while Richard's belongs to the simple style or *oratio extenuata* (IV, viii, 11 and ix, 14).

Through these varying rhetorical strategies, Richmond is characterized as calm, confident, God-fearing and legitimate, while Richard is nasty, lacking in empathy, vulgar, fearful, and abandoned by God. The Latin manual of rhetoric offered Shakespeare an elaborate and flexible frame to organize the language of character delineation. Shakespeare's rhetorical training thus emerges as the foundation on which Shakespeare developed his use of language to shape individual character and the complexities of social interaction.

In later plays, Shakespeare continues using rhetorical techniques but transcends the scope provided by the Latin manual with regard both to their form and their purpose. Baldwin quotes John of Gaunt's speech of consolation to his banished son as an

example of the rhetorical structure of argumentation.[12] While convincing, Baldwin misses out on a detail which distinguishes Gaunt's speech from classical rhetoric. Gaunt does not attempt to persuade Bolingbroke to be happy with his banishment, but he gives advice to him on how to persuade himself:

> Teach thy necessity to reason thus: (1.3.277)
> Think not the King did banish thee (1.3.279)
> Go, say I sent thee forth to purchase honor (1.3.282)
> Look what thy soul holds dear, imagine it /
> To lie the way thou goest. (1.3.386-387)

The techniques of rhetoric are psychologized and become a tool of self-persuasion. Shakespeare alludes to the mistrust to which rhetoric often gives rise. Arguments may not be fair, and may not be true; and you can easily twist the outcome. This means that someone who—like Stoic philosophers—is in command of his affections can use pretend arguments to mentally come to terms with a situation. Duke Senior in *As You Like it* is proceeding in a similar way when he makes his point that "the churlish chiding of the winter's wind" (2.1.7) is preferable to the life "of painted pomp" (2.1.3) at court. As Amiens remarks, the Duke has the enviable capacity "to translate the stubbornness of fortune / Into so quiet and so sweet a style" (2.1.19-20). The Duke does not need to persuade his friends but uses the notorious fact-changing potential of rhetoric to come to terms with a situation.[13]

A psychological turn also takes place in the king's soliloquy the night before the battle of Agincourt in *Henry V*. After talking to his soldiers in disguise, Henry soliloquizes about the privileges and responsibilities of kingship, and his frustration about "ceremony" as the only, and indeed doubtful, advantage kings have over commoners (4.1.230-284). His speech works with *apostrophe, interrogatio* (rhetorical question) and *ratiocinatio* (Question and Answer), while it dispenses with rules of *dispositio*. The king is not persuading anybody, but engages in introspection and self-examination. Rhetoric is used to address issues specific to this play and to Henry's character.

Scenes 4.2 and 4.3 then contain speeches by army leaders which can be compared to those of *Richard III*. The Constable of France, like King Richard, tries to motivate his soldiers by belittling and disparaging enemy soldiers (4.2.15-37), while

King Henry (4.3.20-67), talking to the Earl of Westmoreland, emphasizes the honor to be won and develops the theme of the "happy few" (4.3.60) privileged to achieve glory. His *distributio,* or reference to the alternatives of winning or losing the battle, testifies to his sense of responsibility: "If we are marked to die, we are enow / To do our country loss" (4.3.20-21). Starting from "classical" techniques of rhetoric, Shakespeare develops his own language of characterization and self-revelation.

Brutus's and Antony's speeches in *Julius Caesar,* however, are less about self-revelation than manipulation of public opinion. Brutus who claims to defend himself and his fellow-conspirators ends his speech using a figure of moral coercion: "Who is here so vile that will not love his country?" (3.2.32-33). When Antony is given leave to speak his praise of Caesar, he delivers an epideictic speech. The force of his speech derives from a subtle change of genre. By degrees, Antony changes from the epideictic to the deliberative mode and ends by persuading his audience to take up arms against the conspirators. As a manipulative tool rhetoric works best when its rules are subtly impaired.

Shakespeare, of course, was not the only Elizabethan playwright to make extensive use of his rhetorical training, and we may ask if earlier works influenced Shakespeare's use of rhetoric. As a rhetorician, Christopher Marlowe probably stands out. In *Tamburlaine the Great, Part I* (c. 1587), the art of making speeches is clearly more conspicuous than military prowess. The Prologue promises that the audience will "hear the Scythian Tamburlaine / Threatening the world with high astounding terms" (Prologue, 4-5); "scourging kingdoms with his conquering sword" (Prologue, 6) evidently comes second.[14] Tamburlaine builds up his power from scratch. A simple shepherd, he takes a travelling princess and her retinue prisoners. When meeting Theridamas, a Persian general, and his thousand horsemen, he manages to persuade him to change sides and submit to his command (1.2.165-208). As Kent Cartwright notes, "the yielding of Theridamas fulfills a humanist fantasy of the power of rhetoric," the fantasy of overthrowing an enemy by speaking rather than fighting.[15]

Like the Shakespearean speeches discussed above, Tamburlaine's address begins with an *exordium*:

> In thee, thou valiant man of Persia,
> I see the folly of thy emperor;
> Art thou but captain of a thousand horse,
> That by characters graven in thy brows,
> And by thy martial face and stout aspect,
> Deserv'st to have the leading of an host? (1.2.165-170)

Flattery of the addressee is subtly connected with the disparagement of an enemy, the Persian emperor. Tamburlaine thus combines two of the four methods of direct opening according to *Ad Herennium* (I, v, 8)—discussing the persons of the adversary and the hearer. This capture of the hearer's *benivolentia* is followed by the *propositio* (II, xviii, 28): "Forsake thy king, and do but join with me" (1.2.171), which will be taken up in the conclusion: "Join with me now in this my mean estate" (1.2.201). The *narratio*, or list of arguments, can be divided into two sections. Tamburlaine first hyperbolically boasts of his own greatness and claims to be favored by the gods, emphasizing his claims by referring to his booty of gold and the Princess (1.2.173-186). The second part is devoted to the benefits which will accrue to Theridamas from joining with him—material spoils (1.2.189-191) as well as power and glory (1.2.193-197). The *utilitas* is confined to what *Ad Herenium* calls *tuta*: power, glory and material wealth, while arguments referring to the *honestas* of the action proposed are missing (cf. *Ad Herennium*, III, 2. 3).[16] Tamburlaine's speech also contains a *refutatio*. By referring to Jove he counters the objection that he is only a simple shepherd (1.2.198-200). Like Katherine in *The Taming of the Shrew*, Tamburlaine ends his speech by a *confirmatio* (1.2.204-208).

While the *dispositio* of Tamburlaine's speech resembles that of the Shakespearean speeches previously discussed, its *elocutio*, following the precepts of *Ad Herennium*, is far less intricate. Metaphors and personifications are conventional, and most of them refer to the speaker's connections with divinities: "I hold the Fates bound fast in iron chains, / And with my hand turn Fortune's wheel about" (1.2.173-174); "Jove himself will stretch his hand from heaven" (1.2.179), and "See how he rains down heaps of gold in showers" (1.2.181). His view of government is slightly allegorical, as he proposes that he and Theridamas act as "consuls of the earth" (1.2.196) with mighty kings as their "senators" (1.2.197). Another rhetorical feature taken from classical rhetoric (though not from *Ad Herennium*) are the references to mythology

("As far as Boreas claps his brazen wings" [1.2.205]). Altogether, however, Marlowe does not use the arsenal of rhetorical features offered by *Ad Herennium* as extensively as does Shakespeare.

Similar examples can be found in the works of George Peele and Robert Greene. We can conclude that while all the dramatists draw on Latin manuals of rhetoric, Shakespeare does so independently and does not follow any previous dramatist's lead. It was his own study of the pseudo-Ciceronian rhetorical treatise which gave him the wherewithal to make his characters speak. However, both Marlowe's and Shakespeare's speeches testify to the uses of rhetorical studies in the Elizabethan grammar school system. Rhetoric taught students to organize an argument, convey it to their interlocutors, and thereby assert difference and individuality while keeping within the limits of civilized interaction. The stage also alerted wider audiences to the fact that the art of speaking could be misused for ethical manipulation.[17]

Notes

1. Sister Miriam Joseph, *Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1947), 4.

2. T. W. Baldwin, *William Shakspere's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke*, 2 vols (Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1944), 2:107. On the central position of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, see also Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine, *From Humanism to the Humanities: Education and the Liberal Arts in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Europe* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986), 18-21, and Leonard Barkan, "What Did Shakespeare Read?" in *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare,* ed. Margreta de Grazia and Stanley Wells (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 34-35.

3. Baldwin, *William Shakspere's Smalle Latine*, 2:70-71.

4. Baldwin, *William Shakspere's Smalle Latine*, 2:72-76. See also Vanessa Lim, "The *Rhetorica ad Herennium*: A Source for *Richard II*," *Notes and Queries* 63.3 (Sept. 2016): 405-6.

5. Baldwin, *William Shakspere's Smalle Latine*, 2:77-84.

6. As Brian Morris has shown, *The Taming of the Shrew* is likely to be one of the first, and perhaps the very first, of Shakespeare's plays. See "Introduction," *The Taming of the Shrew*, *The Arden Shakespeare* (London: Methuen, 1981), 50-65.

7. *The Riverside Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, ed. G. Blakemore Evans (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997).

8. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, with an English translation by Harry Caplan, The Loeb Library (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1954).

9. They may also have been of interest to the Stratford schoolboys and their master, to whom, as Lynn Enterline points out, acting was certainly an integral part of rhetorical training. See *Shakespeare's Schoolroom: Rhetoric, Discipline,*

Emotion (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), 33-61.

10. On the "ironic distance between speaker and speech that many hear in Kate's final speech," see also Enterline, *Shakespeare's Schoolroom*, 118-19. As Enterline notices, Shakespeare from the well-known "disjunction between a given rhetorical performance and what an orator thinks and feels … derived a way to create convincing effects of character beyond even the specific lesson offered in Aphthonius."

11. Joseph, *Shakespeare's Use,* 111.

12. Baldwin, *William Shakspere's Smalle Latine*, 2:87-88.

13. See also Keir Elam, *Shakespeare's Universe of Discourse: Language Games in the Comedies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 61.

14. Christopher Marlowe. *Tamburlaine the Great, in Two Parts*, ed. U. M. Ellis-Fermor (New York: Gordian, 1966).

15. Kent Cartwright, *Theatre and Humanism: English Drama in the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 211.

16. According to Harry Levin, Tamburlaine is characterized by a "*libido dominandi*" and is an "exponent of the new age." See *The Overreacher* (London: Faber and Faber, 1961), 51. While Theridamas evidently admires these character traits, however, Tamburlaine's choice of arguments clearly shows his lack of honor and honesty to all the spectators conversant with the art of rhetoric.

17. I cannot go along with Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine's contention that humanist education was designed to instill a fixed set of elitist values. See *From Humanism to the Humanities: Education and the Liberal Arts in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Europe* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986), 156.