

379
N81
No. 676

RHETORICAL FIGURES AND THEIR USES IN

I HENRY IV

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
University of North Texas in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

Master of Arts

By

Brenda W. Martin, B.S.

Denton, Texas

December, 1991

Martin, Brenda W., Rhetorical Figures and Their Uses in I Henry IV. Master of Arts (English), December 1991, 149 pp., bibliography, 54 titles.

This study is concerned with the artistic use of classical rhetorical figures in Shakespeare's I Henry IV.

After the Introduction, Chapter II examines the history of rhetoric, focusing on the use of the rhetorical figures in Ancient Greece, Ancient Rome, and Medieval Europe.

Chapter III investigates rhetorical principles and uses of the rhetorical figures during the English Renaissance and examines the probable influence of rhetoric and the figures on William Shakespeare.

Chapter IV discusses themes, characterization, structure, and language in I Henry IV and presents the contribution of the rhetorical figures to the drama's action and characterization.

Chapter V considers the contribution of the figures to the major themes of I Henry IV and concludes that the figures, when used with other artistic elements, enhance meaning.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE HISTORY OF RHETORIC: FROM THE GRECIAN PERIOD TO THE MIDDLE AGES	5
Ancient Greece	
Ancient Rome	
Medieval Europe	
III. RENAISSANCE RHETORIC: ITS USES AND PROBABLE INFLUENCE ON SHAKESPEARE	23
European Renaissance	
English Renaissance	
IV. THE ARTISTRY OF <u>I HENRY IV</u> : DRAMATIC ELEMENTS AND RHETORICAL CONTRIBUTIONS	53
Artistry of the Drama	
Rhetorical Figures and Action	
Rhetorical Figures and Characterization	
V. THEMES AND RHETORICAL CONTRIBUTIONS	134

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

In striving to convey their ideas, writers throughout time have utilized the literary devices available to them. William Shakespeare, the greatest writer of all time, was certainly no different from other writers in this respect. During the English Renaissance, when Shakespeare created his great masterpieces, writers were experimenting with the flexibility and variability of the English language. As Shakespeare experimented, he adapted rhetorical techniques known to the Renaissance and developed to his greatest potential as a writer.

Since the sixteenth century, scholars have marvelled at Shakespeare's perception of mankind and his mastery of the English language. As a dramatist, Shakespeare reached heights unequalled by his contemporaries, but only after his dramatic genius combined with a mature style. Most literary historians agree that Shakespeare's writing skills evolved throughout four periods of development. In a discussion of "Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama," Eugene Wright notes that it was during the second period of development when a marked difference occurred in Shakespeare's style. Between 1595

and 1600, Shakespeare moved away from experimentation and imitation to create works using his own artistic ability and understanding of human nature. Toward the end of this period, through the exploration of political theories in the history plays, Shakespeare's poetic genius and perceptive powers emerged as he began to control language to suit his dramatic purposes. In the plays of the third period, from 1600-1608, Shakespeare's poetic and dramatic talents reached their heights (2274-2280).

Many scholarly works have been written on the development of Shakespeare's language. Most of these studies point to Shakespeare's progression from using language for its own sake, or ornamentation, to creating a style in which every element contributes to the whole. Madeline Doran's study emphasizes this movement away from "verbal ingenuity and exuberance for their own sake and towards concentrated expression under control for dramatic ends" (235). She suggests that the most obvious evidence of Shakespeare's growth in language reveals itself in the history plays of the second tetralogy. In another study of Shakespeare's language, Carolyn Spurgeon analyzes Shakespeare's use of imagery. Tracing the images throughout the plays, Spurgeon maintains that the images yield insight into the personality of the writer; but more important, she suggests that Shakespeare's recurrent imagery functions to raise and sustain emotion, to provide atmosphere, and to

emphasize theme. Spurgeon further notes that images in the earlier plays appear contrived, whereas in the later plays they are "born of emotions of the theme, and are . . . subtle, complex, varied, but intensely vivid and revealing" (213). These two studies are representative of other language studies which emphasize the complexity of Shakespeare's style and its increasing contribution to his works.

Additional language studies focus on the rhetorical elements of Shakespeare's style. Although numerous analyses of Shakespeare's rhetorical techniques exist, only a small number of these have examined his use of specific rhetorical figures, which date back to Greek oratory. A study by T. W. Baldwin, William Shakespere's Small Latine & Less Greeke, suggests that Shakespeare used every rhetorical tool available to writers during the Renaissance. Sister Miriam Joseph, in Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language, presents the general theory of composition current in Shakespeare's England, including logic, rhetoric, and the rhetorical figures. Joseph attempts to show that the entire scope of this theory is illustrated in Shakespeare's works. Brian Vickers, in Classical Rhetoric in English Poetry, concludes that "Shakespeare's poetic language was nourished on rhetoric" (163). His study highlights Shakespeare's use of the figures throughout his works. Relatively few

studies (such as Vickers' The Artistry of Shakespeare's Prose), however, have examined in detail the contribution of the figures to other artistic elements within a particular work. This study is concerned with Shakespeare's use of the rhetorical figures in I Henry IV, a play written at that stage of the poet's development when Shakespeare's rhetoric becomes disciplined and combines with other artistic elements to produce a drama rich in meaning.

CHAPTER II

THE HISTORY OF RHETORIC: FROM THE GRECIAN PERIOD

TO THE MIDDLE AGES

As defined by Edward P. J. Corbett in Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student, in its most general sense rhetoric means the effective "use or manipulation of words" (20). In examining the etymology of the word, Corbett maintains that rhetoric is "solidly rooted in the notion of 'words' or 'speech'" (20). In his discussion he points out that the Greek word rhetor refers to "a teacher of oratory" and the Greek rhetorike techne to "the art of the rhetor or orator" (21). Corbett also notes that in its beginning in fifth-century Greece, rhetoric was associated primarily with the art of oratory and persuasive discourse (20-21).

In Rhetoric 1 (333 BC) Aristotle recognizes the persuasive power of rhetoric when he claims that the ability to use the rules and principles of the art will "lead to the desired goal of the speaker" (Grimaldi 5). Although rhetoric as we know it today developed to encompass much more than mere persuasion, great rhetoricians who followed Aristotle, such as Cicero of Rome (84-45 BC), also recognized and stressed the persuasive power of rhetoric.

Cicero, for example, in De Inventione expands the art by outlining the five divisions of rhetoric: invention, disposition, elocution, memory, and pronunciation. In discussing elocution Cicero emphasizes the value of the rhetorical figures (Hubbell 1.3-11, 5.357). Later, between the years AD 35 and approximately AD 99, Quintilian of Spain, basing his study of rhetoric mainly on Cicero's work, defines the rhetorical figure as "the term employed when we give our language a conformation other than the obvious and ordinary" (Butler 351). According to Sister Miriam Joseph in Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language, the works of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian were the primary influences on rhetoric of the Middle Ages, a rhetoric firmly based in the rhetorical principles of ancient Greece and Rome (20). This present historical examination of rhetoric will provide an overview of the development of rhetoric as a whole, with an emphasis on the development of the rhetorical figures.

According to Brian Vickers in Classical Rhetoric in English Poetry, a study of Greek literature clearly reveals that rhetoric was practiced in Hellenic society. In the Iliad (800-700 BC) the speeches of Homer's characters alone provide evidence to demonstrate the use of rhetoric (16). Corbett notes that no formal rhetoric or set of rules existed, however, until the 5th century BC when Corax of

Sicily (476 BC) formulated the "art of rhetoric." During this century in Greece, rhetoric was thought of as "the art of persuasive speech" and was used primarily by the orator. Corax developed the art to help ordinary men use the orator's skills to plead cases in court (536). Vickers points out that, instead of a written art of rhetoric, Corax and his student Tysias left only their theories of rhetoric to perpetuate the form, theories which emphasized the practical utility of rhetoric when defending oneself in court (18).

In 427 BC Gorgias of Leontini, an ambassador from Sicily to the Athens senate, exerted a major influence on rhetoric by outlining the rhetorical figures he employed in his oratory. According to Vickers, Gorgias made a lasting impression on the Athenian senate and became influential as a rhetorician throughout Greece. Gorgias proposed applying the figures of his oratory to prose. Prior to fifth-century BC, the figures had been used only in poetry. These figures were hereafter referred to as the "Gorgianic figures" (19). According to Corbett, of the figures cited, Gorgias stressed primarily the use of antithesis (defined as the juxtaposition of contrasting ideas) and parallelism (defined

A list of the figures begins on page 40, Chapter 3, of this text.

as the similarity of structure in words, phrases, or clauses) (537). Vickers points out that in using such rhetorical figures as antithesis and parallelism Gorgias gained a persuasive power over the emotions of men (83).

With the persuasive power of the rhetorical figures established, some of the followers of Gorgias began to use rhetoric for the purpose of deception. According to Corbett, instructors who used the art of rhetoric dishonorably, and taught their students to do the same, became known as Sophists and were responsible for the negative connotation which was associated with rhetorical study for years to come. Yet other Greeks expanded and refined Gorgias's rhetoric. In 392 BC, for instance, Isocrates set up a school of oratory which encouraged teachers of the art to maintain high standards of character. Corbett notes that Isocrates added the periodic sentence as another effective persuasive tool (537). In contrast to the teaching of Isocrates, Plato, in the Gorgias (387-385 BC), discourages the study of rhetoric, charging that rhetoricians are more interested in lies than in truth (Dodds 205). In the Phaedrus (written sometime between 406 and 378 BC), however, Plato allows for a true art of rhetoric, proposing that the speaker must first possess an accurate knowledge of his subject and then use the art to "improve the morals and institutions of a people" (Thompson

90, 123). Plato's student Aristotle sought to refute any arguments for disapproving of rhetoric. In Rhetoric I (333 BC) Aristotle argues that rhetoric is indeed useful, even "tied to the superiority of truth and justice" (Grimaldi 26). He further maintains that rhetoric is a "reasoned activity, and indeed something more proper to man [than to lower animal] since it uses that which is more properly a characteristic property of man" (Grimaldi 30). In his treatise on rhetoric, Aristotle classifies two kinds of persuasive arguments: non-artistic and artistic. Falling into the non-artistic category are types of proofs dealing with laws, witnesses, facts, figures, or testimonies to support the argument. The artistic category of argument includes the art of rhetoric. Aristotle divides this category into three types of appeals: rational, emotional, and ethical (35-40). Although in these appeals Aristotle is primarily concerned with lucid, vivid, and appropriate language, in the third book of Rhetoric he lends his approval to several of the figures of speech. Aristotle describes and favors the use of antithesis and those figures that contain "equality of members," such as isocolon, homoioteleuton, anaphora, epistrophe, polysyndeton, and asyndeton, figures which emphasize balance in periodic structure and affect prose rhythm (Hobbs 361). He counsels the avoidance of figures that lead to ambiguity and obscurity (355). In giving attention to the rhetorical

figures, Aristotle warns against excessive ornateness:

Vertues of a word are two; the first that it be
perspicuous; the second, that it be decent; that
is, neither above or below the thing signified; or
neither too humble, nor too fine.

(352)

Joseph's study concludes that Aristotle, and Isocrates before him, contributed balance to the principles of rhetoric established by Gorgias. Whereas Gorgias encouraged ornamentation in his rhetoric, Isocrates and Aristotle suggested using rhetorical skills with "more art" in order to convey an idea with more clarity (31).

Once firmly implanted in Greek society by Aristotle, the importance of rhetoric remained, and the art of rhetoric continued to be developed. According to Corbett, around the year 300 BC another Greek work influenced rhetoric. On Style, whose author is unknown, focused on a discussion of the kinds of style, particularly diction and the arrangement of words (541). Vickers adds that from about the third century onward, Greek rhetoric showed an increased interest in style, which included the emotional and psychological effects of the rhetorical figures (22).

From the time that the Greek rhetoricians began moving into Rome in the second century BC, the Romans expressed a strong interest in Greek literature and Greek orations. In

fact, according to Vickers, Greek teachers were called on to teach their rhetorical skills so that the Romans could master these skills. In higher education, rhetorical study was the important discipline. As a result of this educational process, Roman literature began to reveal the influence of rhetoric, especially the figures, initially in Ovid's poetry and eventually in Seneca's dramas and Latin prose (24-26). In addition to employing rhetoric in their literature, the Romans applied rhetorical principles in their prose orations. During the first century BC, Cicero, an orator and rhetoric teacher, modified and further developed Aristotle's theories of rhetoric. In De Inventione, written between 84 BC and 45 BC, Cicero concurs with Aristotle's theories of logic involving invention and judgment; however, he places greater emphasis on rhetoric, style, and the figures than on logic (Hubbell 1.2.2-3.7). Cicero's style includes three levels: lofty, intermediate, and plain. His theories of rhetoric also include rules for memory and delivery. From these principles of Cicero's work, the five divisions of rhetoric emerge. Cicero defines these as follows: inventio--"the discovery of valid or seemingly valid arguments to render one's cause plausible"; dispositio or arrangement--"the distribution of arguments thus discovered in the proper order"; elocutio or style, including the figures--"the fitting of the proper language to the invented matter"; memoria--"the firm mental grasp of

matter and words"; and pronuntiatio or delivery--"the control of voice and body in a manner suitable to the dignity of the subject matter and the style" (1.7.9.21). According to Vickers, Cicero utilized the "Gorgianic figures" in his orations and later enumerated them in the De oratore (26). Cicero's works and orations exerted a dominant influence on his age.

As Corbett indicates, another influential Latin text on rhetoric, the earliest extant, was entitled Rhetorica Ad Herennium (written between 86 BC and 82 BC). Until the fifteenth century the author of this text was thought to be Cicero; since the fifteenth century, however, several other names have been attributed to the work. Regardless of who wrote the work, Corbett maintains that its influence on the art of rhetoric remains unchallenged. The Rhetorica Ad Herennium was the first Latin work to treat prose style and the rhetorical figures outlined in the Greek period by Gorgias (541). Joseph adds that the work also "became the principal link in transmitting them [the figures] to its own and later ages" (20). James J. Murphy, in Rhetoric in the Middle Ages, explains that the author of the text divided the figures into two groups: figures of speech and figures of thought. The author then listed forty-five figures of speech, thirty-five of which were the schemes later outlined by Quintilian (20).

M. Fabius Quintilianus (AD 35-96), a Spaniard who moved to Rome and became an outstanding pleader in the courts, contributed to the art of rhetoric by reiterating the principles of Cicero and the Rhetorica Ad Herennium. In Institutio Oratoria, written around AD 88, Quintilian discusses the necessity of rhetorical study in education and expounds on the five divisions of rhetoric (Butler 1:205, 383). In an expanded section on style, Quintilian discusses the figures in a more detailed manner than did Cicero (3:349-591). Quintilian further relates the figures to the logos, pathos, and ethos of argument and views them as yielding credibility to argument, excitement to the emotions, and approval to the deliverers of speeches (359). His rhetorical work defines the term figura as "a rational change in meaning or language from the ordinary and simple form, that is to say, a change analogous to that involved by sitting, lying down on something or looking back" (353). In his discussion, Quintilian divides the figures into two groups: schemes and tropes. He specifies that schemes involve a deviation in the normal arrangement of words, whereas tropes involve a deviation in the meaning of words. He further classifies the schemes according to those relating to single words (involving a change in the configuration of words) and those relating to the construction of several words (involving the arrangement of two or more words, phrases, or clauses) (443-507).

Quintilian's emphasis on the emotional function of the figures, his expanded classification of the figures, and his clarification of general rhetorical concepts establish him as another major influence on the development of rhetoric in the Roman period.

In addition to Quintilian's emphasis on the figures in Institutio Oratoria, Murphy notes that two other Roman works influenced the development of the figures. Between 23 BC and 13 BC the Roman poet Horace wrote the Ars Poetica and encouraged imitation in composition. Later, in 350 AD, Aelius Donatus wrote the Barbarismus, in which he treated the scemata, emphasizing the schemes as positive elements of language (Rhetoric 32). According to Vickers, a study of the later Roman Empire during the fourth and fifth centuries reveals that rhetoric continued to exert a powerful influence, penetrating into all elements of the culture. The influence of Cicero, the Rhetorica ad Herennium, and Quintilian also continued; and their theories, so similar to those of the Greeks, became firmly established as part of classical rhetoric (28).

According to Murphy, the classical rhetoric of Rome directly influenced the Middle Ages. During the third and fourth centuries, prior to the emergence of Christianity in Rome, Cicero's theories continued to be the basis of most rhetorical work (Rhetoric 43). In the fifth century, with

Christianity on the rise, the Church considered Ciceronian rhetoric amoral because of the Sophists' debasement of the art; some rhetorical development did occur, however, once Saint Augustine (AD 353-430) established the place of the art within the Church (Three xiii). Because of the Church's power during the Middle Ages, the secular and political uses of rhetoric declined, and the emphasis shifted to its uses in the Church and education (xxiii). Throughout the Middle Ages, in both religious and secular works, elocution or style received much attention.

As Murphy notes, in the beginning of the fifth century, prior to the pervasive influence of Christianity in the Roman Empire, an addition to Cicero's principles appeared in the De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii of Martianus Capella (AD 410-427). In this work, Capella introduced the seven liberal arts: grammar, dialectic, rhetoric, geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, and music. From this arrangement followed the trivium (the first three subjects dealing with words) and the quadrivium (the last four subjects dealing with mathematics); the trivium and the quadrivium together formed the complete curriculum during the Middle Ages. Although Capella's Book Five on rhetoric relied on Cicero's examples, the work was unique in that it combined, for the first time, the study of grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric (Rhetoric 45-46).

Murphy points out that later in the fifth century, between AD 396 and 426, Saint Augustine, a former rhetoric teacher, wrote De doctrina Christiana, one of the most significant books of the early Middle Ages (47). After being converted to Christianity around the year AD 400, Augustine still adhered to the rhetorical principles of Cicero, even though the church at this time was questioning rhetoric's role in Christianity (Three xiii). Book Four of Saint Augustine's De doctrina Christiana settles the question of whether rhetoric should be used in the Church by proposing that rhetorical skills be used to guide Christians in living a holy life. Saint Augustine rejects the Sophists' use of rhetoric to urge falsehoods and returns to the rhetoric of the Roman masters. He stresses that the aim of rhetoric is to instruct and to further the art of preaching (545). Saint Augustine suggests that rhetorical skills might be used as a way of understanding the Scriptures and as a way of expressing this understanding to others (Robertson 117-169). He maintains that, although rhetoric is "of great value in urging either evil or good" and is "in itself indifferent," it should be "obtained for the uses of the good in the service of truth" (Robertson 4.2.3.118-119). Throughout his discussion of style, Augustine illustrates his rhetorical principles with examples from the Scriptures, suggesting the adoption of a

new type of eloquence, one "fitting for men most worthy of the highest authority and clearly inspired by God" (4.6.9.123). According to Murphy, Saint Augustine encouraged the Church to begin a formal training in rhetoric, either through schooling or the study of great models (Three xiii). Murphy comments that by illuminating effective communication in the Scriptures, Saint Augustine initiated an intellectual and scholarly respect for the Bible, a respect which continued throughout the Middle Ages and into the Renaissance. Murphy also suggests that Augustine's contribution to the development of rhetoric in the Middle Ages was twofold: it reinforced the rhetorical principles of Greece and Rome, urging that these principles be taught; and it presented the Church with a useful tool for executing God's work (Rhetoric 61).

Following Augustine's tradition, the Englishman Bede wrote the first rhetorical work in English. In De schenatibus (AD 700 or 701) Bede agrees with Augustine that the Scriptures provide an excellent example of effective communication, and he strengthens his position by defining the figures and tropes, following each with an illustration from the Scriptures (Thompson 241). Murphy suggests that Bede's treatment of the figures and tropes was similar to that found in Roman works and may have set the stage for separate treatment of figures and tropes in later medieval handbooks (Rhetoric 80).

Murphy believes that the next significant rhetorical work of the Middle Ages was the De institutione clericorum of Rabanus Maurus in the ninth century. This work outlined the responsibilities of the priest in relation to "the Mass, public and private prayers, and the sacraments" (82). In the third book, Maurus discussed the priest as a divinely appointed preacher. Instead of basing his work on one source or system of rhetoric, Maurus chose from several sources, such as Cicero and Augustine. Murphy comments: "The importance of this selective method can hardly be overemphasized, for the assimilation of classical rhetoric into Christian methodology is here almost complete" (82).

The works of the Middle Ages discussed thus far, with the exception of Capella's De Nuptiis, reflect the rhetorical development that emerged from writings within the Church. In addition to these religious works, the educational system also fostered the development of rhetoric in the Middle Ages. The typical medieval curriculum for the four-year undergraduate study was referred to as the trivium and was comprised of grammar, logic, and rhetoric (544). As Murphy explains, grammar to the medieval mind was an all-encompassing term which involved principles of correct speaking and writing, as well as analysis and interpretation of literature (Rhetoric 136). The rhetorical genres taught in the medieval period included the Greek tropes and figures

as part of the grammatical art and the arts of letter-writing and of preaching as parts of the rhetorical art. All of these rhetorical genres emphasized style (138). In the trivium, Corbett notes that the logical arts continued to be stressed, but not in connection with rhetoric (544). According to Murphy, the standard grammar text of the twelfth century, the Doctrinale (1199), written in Paris by Alexander of Villedieu, covered "syntax, etymology, quantity, accent, and tropes and figures" (Rhetoric 146). The text provided all the major grammatical rules and furnished examples to clarify these rules. Alexander, like Bede, used illustrations from the Scriptures, but also included classical examples. The entire work emphasized "a grammar meeting the practical requirements of the living language of the day" (148). Vickers notes that in the discussion of tropes and figures, the author gave "four lists of the most familiar Greek figures" (31). Murphy points out that a second significant grammar text, the Graecismus, written by Evrard of Bethune in 1212, also treated the figures by devoting three chapters to them. According to Murphy, "The matter-of-fact way in which Evrard handles this subject [the figures] shows again that medieval grammarians routinely regarded figures and tropes as an integral part of their study" (Rhetoric 151). Vickers notes that a study of the literature of this period also reveals the prominence of the figures in medieval works. For

example, in the English Anglo Saxon poems, Beowulf (written between AD 700-750) and "The Seafarer" (written before AD 950), the figures of anaphora, epanalepsis, and others appear. Vickers adds that other works of the period provide sufficient evidence of the use of figures (29). According to Murphy, the standard grammar texts, the literature of the period, and other works written later in the period, such as Matthew of Vendome's Ars versificatoria (written shortly before 1175) and Geoffrey of Vinsauf's Documentum (1208-1216), reveal that the Middle Ages, while stressing style, still relied on the Ciceronian tradition, even though part of the study of rhetorical principles had shifted from the art of rhetoric to the art of grammar for educational purposes (Rhetoric 163-173).

In addition to the rhetoric of grammar, the later Middle Ages taught the rhetorical art of letter-writing. Murphy notes that this art developed out of a need to communicate in writing and a desire to create a model for written communication. Although writers attempted to link rhetorical principles with the art of letter-writing, the art was "a truly medieval invention" and marked "a sharp break with ancient rhetorical practice" (199, 194). Such writers as Alberic of Monte Cassino in Dictaminum radii (1087) and Canon Hugh of Bologna in Rationes dictandi prosaic (1119-1124) helped to establish the five-part format

and the rhythmical style of letter-writing (266). Many of the works on letter-writing also included sections on the figures (205). This newly developed art functioned to "keep rhetorical interest alive during a time when Cicero's politically-oriented rhetoric was simply not acceptable" (267).

Not only did the Middle Ages develop the new rhetorical art of letter-writing, but also a rhetorical art of preaching. According to Murphy, after Saint Augustine's attempt to fuse rhetoric with Christianity, no other such effort appeared until the early thirteenth century when Alaine de Lille produced De arte praedicatoria (around 1199). In this work the author defined preaching and sought to establish it as a rhetorical art. Alaine did not, however, address dispositio (arrangement), nor did he discuss elocutio (style) (303-309). Murphy also notes that within the first three decades of the thirteenth century, three other writers contributed to the development of the art of preaching. Alexander of Ashby wrote a treatise, On the Mode of Preaching (1200), which included an organization of parts, a discussion of division, and methods of proof. Thomas Chabham of Salisbury followed with his Summa de arte praedicandi (probably written before 1210), which discussed classical terminology, problems dealing with persuasion and dissuasion, and specifics concerning memory. The work also addressed the five divisions of Roman rhetoric and the Greek

figures. The author included these rhetorical principles in the new art of preaching (317-320). The third writer of significance in the development of this art was Robert of Basevorn, who wrote the Form of Preaching (1322). Murphy states that this work assimilated all the theories which had been developed in the rhetoric of preaching and thus helped to preserve the newly created genre (344).

In summary, the Middle Ages carried on the classical tradition of rhetoric with the emphasis on style, as evidenced by the inclusion of Cicero's principles and the Greek figures in the major works of the period. In addition, the age created the two new rhetorical genres of letter-writing and preaching in which ancient rhetorical principles were applied.

A study of rhetorical history reveals a continuing progression of development in the art of rhetoric. Through Aristotle's Rhetoric, Cicero's rhetorical principles, and the medieval arts of grammar and rhetoric run common strands, such as the figures. The commonalities and their endurance throughout three major historical periods yield strength to the rhetorical art as a major discipline and influence in all three periods. It is no wonder that this central discipline continued to exert its influence in the Renaissance which followed.

CHAPTER III

RENAISSANCE RHETORIC: ITS USES AND PROBABLE INFLUENCE ON SHAKESPEARE

As the historical examination of the development of rhetoric from ancient Greece to Medieval Europe has shown, by the end of the Middle Ages the study of rhetoric concentrated primarily on a study of style. According to D. L. Clark, in the Italian Renaissance of the fifteenth century scholars were returning to the classical rhetorical principles of Aristotle; however, the English Renaissance (beginning around 1500), slower in developing, continued to emphasize style throughout the century (69). Some new developments, not restricting rhetoric to style, however, occurred in England by the end of the sixteenth century. Brian Vickers notes that the university and grammar school curricula first began the renewal of the ancient rhetorical art in England. The study of rhetoric and logic also "joined hands in the educational scheme" of the English Renaissance, their relationship being stressed as in the Greek period. In addition, a public interest in these arts developed. Furthermore, rhetoric became the "proper art" for the composition of both poetry and prose, thereby

placing a significance on analyzing and composing literature (37, 40). This present discussion of Renaissance rhetoric, only briefly reviewing developments outside England, will focus on the rhetoric of the English Renaissance and its probable influence on the greatest writer of the period, William Shakespeare. The influence on Shakespeare will emphasize the rhetorical figures.

According to Clark, the Renaissance emerged in Italy in the late fourteenth century. Beginning with Petrarch (1304-1374), scholars turned away from medieval thought and church-dominated education and began searching for a more humanistic philosophy. In their search, these scholars turned to the classical cultures of ancient Greece and Rome. This renewed interest in the Greek and Roman classics led to new developments in the arts. By Clark's definition, the Renaissance was "primarily a literary and scholarly movement derived from the literature of classical antiquity" (3). Vickers points out that Petrarch set the stage for the prominence of rhetoric in the Renaissance by referring to rhetoric as "the queen of the arts" and to eloquence as not only the "proper expression of virtus, ('natural excellence'), but as its reward" (38). Clark notes that in the fifteenth century, early in the Italian movement, many Italian schools used as the basis for their rhetorical authority the Roman treatises of the Ad Herennium, the De oratore, Orator, and the works of Quintilian (63). Edward

P. J. Corbett adds that at the turn of the fifteenth century, with the publication of such classical works as Aristotle's Poetics (written in 335 BC), which had previously circulated in incomplete manuscripts, the Italian Renaissance began to spread over the entire European continent. Included in the classical publications of this time were the major works of the Greek rhetoricians. These works played a vital role in the Renaissance (549).

A return to the rhetorical theory of the Greeks and Romans, however, came slowly to England. According to Vickers, although the classical Greek and Roman theories of logic had continued in the medieval English universities, the classical rhetorical system had given way to medieval religious, social, and cultural demands, resulting in the use of only selected rhetorical principles, not the ancient system as a whole. In the early sixteenth century, however, some of the English humanists began to encourage the study of classical literature. This study led to changes in the university curricula, resulting in a more nearly equal emphasis being given to logic, rhetoric, and grammar (45). Rhetoric became more influential as the universities initiated lectures on the art. As early as 1517 at Oxford and Cambridge, scholars presented lectures on Cicero, Quintilian, and Isocrates. These lectures served as the

beginning of the re-establishment in England of the Greek and Roman principles of rhetoric (46).

In the 1500's, outside of the universities, Continental rhetoricians began exerting an influence on the English Renaissance. Corbett notes that one of these, a Dutchman named Erasmus, spent only five years in England (1509-1514), yet established the English grammar school curriculum and set the stage for rhetorical training in the schools. His visit to England corresponded with Dean Colet's founding of St. Paul's School in London. Upon Dean Colet's request, Erasmus provided a number of texts to be used in the school. One text, the De Copia published in 1512, discussed elocutio, or rhetorical style, and illustrated to students how to use the figures and tropes for variation; the text also taught the classical principles of inventio, or how to be well versed on a number of topics. Erasmus further stated his belief that students did not learn to express themselves fully by merely drilling in exercises. He suggested that they must also read works of merit and practice their skills in writing. Along with medieval rhetoricians, Erasmus encouraged letter-writing and emphasized applying the rules of rhetoric to the composition of letters (546-547).

Similarly, Corbett points out that a Spaniard, Juan Luis Vives (1492-1540), influenced the rhetorical curriculum in English grammar schools. During his time in England

(1523-1528), Vives served as Lecturer of Rhetoric at Oxford. In contrast to Erasmus, Vives did not publish any texts while in England. Instead, after leaving England, he published De Disciplinis (1531), a treatise on education, and later other rhetorical treatises. While the works of Vives were not used as textbooks in English schools as often as those of Erasmus, they did furnish material for English rhetoricians writing after Vives (548).

According to Corbett, three other Continental scholars influenced English rhetoric during the sixteenth century. Petrus Mosellanus (1493-1524), a German, produced a text which became the standard for style in English schools. Another German, Philippus Melanchthon (1497-1560), treated style only briefly and concentrated on inventio and dispositio. In his discussion, he placed these two divisions under the art of logic rather than under rhetoric. This classification marked the beginning of the English Renaissance's recognition of logic and rhetoric as interrelated disciplines. The third Continental influence, published in 1540, was the Epitome Troporum ac Schematum, by Joannes Susenbrotus, who blended the works of Mosellanus and Melanchthon, eventually replacing Melanchthon as the standard school authority on figures and tropes. As the result of works such as these, Corbett argues that rhetoric

became the "dominant discipline" in the grammar schools and universities of sixteenth century England (548-549).

As Joseph maintains, schoolmasters and authors of school texts, early leaders in the Renaissance who took pride in their native English language, cultivated the ground for writing in the vernacular (8). Corbett points out that during the sixteenth century, for the first time, rhetoric texts were composed in English rather than in Latin or Greek (549). According to Joseph, the vernacular rhetorics were, of course, derived from Latin sources of the Italian Renaissance which reached back to the works of Cicero, Quintilian, the Ad Herennium, and ultimately to Aristotle. Three schools of English Renaissance rhetorical thought emerged from these vernaculars: (1) the Traditionalists, who presented the entire classical tradition of rhetoric including the five divisions: invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery; (2) the Ramists, who separated the five divisions of rhetoric, relegating invention, arrangement, and memory to the art of logic, leaving only style and delivery to be taught under rhetoric to "beautify composition" and enhance the delivery of a speech; and (3) the Figurists, who centered attention on the figures or schemes and tropes of style, although a close examination of their works reveals analysis of most of the other principles of rhetoric as well (16-18). Corbett adds that all three rhetorical schools of thought basically

agreed in "their fundamental conception of the art of rhetoric"; they disagreed only in "pedagogical approaches" (549).

The vernacular rhetoricians produced many works which contributed to the development of rhetoric during the English Renaissance. Corbett notes that in 1530 Leonard Cox, a schoolmaster at Reading, composed the first English rhetoric, Arte or Crafte of Rhetoryke, which belonged to the traditionalist school (550). Joseph adds that this text was primarily a translation of Melanchthon's Institutiones Rhetoricae and concentrated on invention (16). Corbett points out that later in 1553 another traditionalist text, Thomas Wilson's The Arte of Rhetorique, appeared. Although Wilson's text was Ciceronian in that it treated all five divisions of rhetoric, it also acquired some of the theories of Erasmus and other vernacular rhetoricians such as Cox. This work gained a wide appeal because it contained "a great mass of sound classical doctrine . . . together with his [Wilson's] own observations, expositions, and illustrations, in an appealing English prose style" (551).

Some other vernacular works of this period representative of the Ramist school of thought also contributed to the development of rhetoric during the English Renaissance. According to Corbett, while the French scholar Peter Ramus (1515-1576) never wrote a rhetoric text,

he did motivate others who shared his views to do so (552). Joseph reveals that Ramus's associate, Talaeus, wrote Rhetorica around the year 1544. Ramus' works on logic and Talaeus's Rhetorica, while separating the functions of rhetoric and logic, asserted that the two arts must supplement each other. Their philosophies, in turn, influenced the vernacular rhetorics of England in Dudley Fenner's The Artes of Logike and Rhetorike (1584) and in Abraham Fraunce's The Lawiers Logike and The Arcadian Rhetorike, both written in 1588 (14-17). Joseph notes that all of these works gave to logic the "essential processes of composition, namely the investigation of the desired subject by means of the topics of invention, and the organization of the material thus derived into appropriate logical forms by means of a suitable method" (17). Joseph adds that along with contributing to a good delivery, the Ramists viewed rhetoric's function as that of making composition beautiful and "emotionally effective by means of a comparatively few figures of speech" (17).

Vernacular works by the Figurists, the third school of rhetorical thought, also enhanced the rhetorical development of the English Renaissance. According to Vickers, in 1550 Richard Sherry's A Treatise of Schemes and Tropes became the first English textbook on schemes and tropes and included about 120 figures (49). In 1577 Henry Peacham wrote The Garden of Eloquence, which lists 184 figures and groups them

according to their emotional or psychological appeals. Peacham's work was followed by George Puttenham's The Arte of English Poesie (1589), which elaborates 107 figures. Although written as a defense of English poetry, the work (in chapters ten through twenty) makes a major contribution to Renaissance rhetoric with its classification of figures into those that appeal to the ear, those that appeal to the mind, and those that appeal to both the ear and the mind. Puttenham's work urges a writer to use the figures in a natural relationship with his subject and to be "commended for his natural eloquence" rather than for affectation (257). Joseph notes that the traditionalists, Ramists, and Figurists treated the figures as part of their rhetorical theories and also agreed with Puttenham as to the purpose of figurative language (33). In The Arte of English Poesie Puttenham states this purpose clearly:

. . . figure it selfe is a certaine lively or good grace set upon wordes, speaches and sentences to some purpose and not in vaine, giving them ornament . . . putting into our speaches more pithe and substance, subtiltie, quicknese, efficacie or moderation. . . .

(133)

Joseph's study concludes that even in areas other than the figures the three groups of Renaissance rhetoricians

basically shared more similarities than differences and that to some degree all recognized the "dominant features of Aristotle's rhetoric" (18).

By the end of the sixteenth century, even though the educational system of the English Renaissance continued to emphasize style, it had reinstated most of the classical doctrines of ancient Greek and Roman rhetoric in the theories and texts of Renaissance rhetoric. Joseph points out that Renaissance rhetoricians also recognized, as had the Greeks, that the arts of grammar, logic, and rhetoric should work together to "guide and govern all discourse" (8).

The variety and vitality of the English Renaissance, according to Joseph, fostered a public interest in the major works of the period. These works enjoyed an enormous popularity outside of the English educational system, especially among the lords and ladies of the court and, in general, among the intellectuals of the middle and upper classes (14). Vickers notes that the education of royalty included a strong emphasis on the rhetorical arts (52). Joseph points out that Renaissance works emphasizing classical theories naturally appealed to lovers of the Greek and Roman classics. The practical application of the figures to letter-writing continued to appeal, as well as did the concept that knowledge of the figures helped in understanding the Scriptures (15). As noted by Vickers, the

Elizabethans' familiarity with the rhetorical figures may be "demonstrated by their many references to them, usually by the appropriate name" (53). Joseph adds that the Tudor rhetoricians capitalized on the lively interest in rhetoric and enhanced the merits of the art by illustrating its application to reality. Because of the public interest in rhetoric, Renaissance rhetorical works circulated among the intellectual circles for the use of all who were "studious of Eloquence" (14).

The re-establishment of Greek and Roman rhetorical principles in the educational system, the inclusion of rhetorical theories in vernacular texts, and a public enthusiasm for rhetoric fostered the application of rhetorical theories in Renaissance literature. According to Clark, most of the precepts which governed literature were found within the framework of logic and rhetoric. A presentation of the stylistic figures appeared in many discussions of literature (91). Puttenham, in The Arte of English Poesie, for example, illustrates use of the figures and suggests that poetry should never be without the adornment of the figures:

This ornament we speake of is given to it [poetry] by figures and figurative speeches, which be the flowers as it were and colours that a Poet setteth upon his language by arte, as the embroderer doth

his stone and perle, or passements of gold upon the
 stufte of a Princely garment.

(115)

According to Joseph, evidence that writers heeded the advice of works encouraging the use of figures is exemplified in the large number of illustrations of the figures taken from works of many of the major Renaissance writers: Christopher Marlowe, Edmund Spenser, Philip Sidney, Francis Bacon, George Herbert, Ben Jonson, and William Shakespeare. The use of figures, however, was only one rhetorical technique employed by Renaissance writers. The goal of many of these writers was to imitate "the most renowned worke-masters that antiquity affourdeth" (5). Joseph adds that in their efforts to create English works equal to the Greek and Roman classics, the major English writers, who had been trained in the curriculum of the English grammar school and left with a lasting impression of its rhetorical doctrine, utilized most of the rhetorical techniques taught in the Renaissance (5-8).

As one of the major writers educated in the system of the English grammar school, William Shakespeare would have acquired a solid foundation in the rhetorical arts. As Joseph notes, although no documented proof exists that Shakespeare attended grammar school, scholarly consensus agrees that he most likely was educated at Stratford Grammar School, where he, like any other young English boy, would

have undergone the rigorous training in the arts of language, which was the "fundamental aim of grammar schools" in Renaissance England (8).

Vickers points out that Erasmus's De Ratione Studi (1512), put into practice by Colet at St. Paul's, had established a system which was imitated throughout England. The goal of this system was to achieve "spoken and written fluency in Latin" (47). According to Joseph, this goal was to be achieved through a systematic method of studying the classics, which "prescribed unremitting exercise in grammar, rhetoric, and logic." Students were "first to learn the precepts, then employ them as a tool of analysis in reading, and finally to use them as a guide in composition" (8). Vickers adds that students attended school from nine to six daily for thirty-six weeks a year. Half of every day was spent in repetition of study. Students were required to repeat the precept that was learned, memorize it, recite it, be tested on it, repeat it again, and then to use it over and over until it could not be forgotten. At the end of each week on Fridays and Saturdays, the whole week's work would be reviewed. Students also memorized and recited large portions of the classics, such as Ovid's Metamorphoses (8 A.D.). Prior to the age of ten, schoolboys in England learned the major divisions of rhetoric, and the

names, definitions, and uses of a large number of the figures (51).

Joseph further notes that after the age of ten, students would graduate to "precepts of logic-rhetoric which were to guide the study of literature and composition" (9). They were first required to gain a foundation in Cicero's topics of logic before they were expected to understand Susenbrotus's figures. Students, having learned the definitions of the figures, were required to identify them in classical works and then to apply them in both prose and verse compositions. Studying poetry involved analyzing the metrics, topics and forms of logic, and rhetorical figures. Students were then expected to imitate these in verse of their own. Students were also trained in the precepts of writing prose. The basis for this study was Cicero's orations with attention given to "grammatical constructions, logical arguments, and rhetorical figures." As in the study of poetry, students were then required to apply the precepts in their own prose (9-10). In addition, according to Vickers, schoolmasters provided the student with an exorbitant number of classical examples and encouraged him to record these examples in a notebook. A knowledge of the figures, especially, was considered necessary to the understanding and composition of literature. In fact, after a young English lad such as Shakespeare had finished his grammar school education, he "knew as much about the

rhetorical figures as his Hellenistic or Roman counter-part" (51). In addition to a knowledge of the figures, Shakespeare would have been well trained in all of the precepts of Renaissance grammar, logic, and rhetoric.

Along with the rhetorical influence of the English grammar school on Shakespeare, the rhetorical styles of his contemporaries most likely encouraged his use of rhetoric. To the writers of this period, the significance of rhetoric may be summed up in the words of Samuel Daniel in Musophilus (1599):

Powre above powres, O heavenly Eloquence,

 Shall we not offer to thy excellence, The richest
 treasure that our wit affords?

(Himelick 86)

Writers of verse and prose alike employed rhetorical styles. Some used rhetoric to add life and clarity to their works, while others achieved ineffective results. John Lyly, for instance, created an artificial style in his prose work entitled Euphues--The Anatomy of Wyt (1578). In this work, Lyly uses tedious repetition, alliteration, and parallelism (Bond 233). Eugene Wright, in his book entitled Thomas Deloney, points out that Deloney, a relatively minor writer, often imitated the rhetorical style of the Renaissance--even though it was unnatural for him and did not enhance his

style (84). Vickers notes that other writers of prose, however, such as Ben Jonson and Francis Bacon, used rhetoric to enhance the meaning of their works. Jonson, for example, used rhetoric in his characterization to distinguish knaves and fools (154). Poets similarly strove for eloquence in their works. According to Vickers, rhetorical principles were evident in the works of all the major poets of the day. Vickers calls Philip Sidney's Astrophil and Stella (1580-1584) "perhaps the most rhetorically complex series of poems in English" (155). In The Faerie Queen (1590-1609) of Edmund Spenser, rhetoric is a "marvellously flexible device," which contributes to many elements of the allegory (157). A rhetorical style prevails in the works of George Herbert, Samuel Daniel, and Michael Drayton (130-131). In particular, the Renaissance poets used the figures to evoke emotion and to enhance meaning in their works (121).

In addition, Renaissance writers, including Shakespeare, may have felt pressure to respond to an educated public that had come to expect employment of the arts in literary works. As previously stated, rhetorical texts circulated and enjoyed great popularity among the middle and upper classes, as well as among royalty. Joseph points out that Puttenham even claimed to have written The Arte of English Poesie for courtiers and ladies of the court to help them in composing and appreciating "polite verse" (14). The rhetorical figures of thought, well known to the

educated Elizabethan by name, evoked much excitement in the Renaissance because the age delighted so in logical exercise (40). Joseph suggests that Shakespeare in his works, along with other Renaissance writers, was perhaps influenced to contend with Elizabethan England's "zestful interest" in logic and rhetoric (15).

The rhetorical training in Shakespeare's grammar school education, the prodigious use of rhetorical precepts in the works of Shakespeare's contemporaries, and the educated public's fascination with the arts suggest three possible influences on Shakespeare's rhetoric. An analysis of his works provides ample evidence that Shakespeare did indeed practice the art of rhetoric. T. W. Baldwin's study of William Shakspeare's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke (1944) asserts that Shakespeare was "trained in the heroic age of grammar school rhetoric in England" and that he showed "knowledge of the complete system, in its most heroic proportions" (2: 378).

Of the rhetorical techniques that appear in Shakespeare's works, the figures are prominent. According to Joseph, the number of figures existing in Renaissance texts totaled approximately two hundred. Rhetoricians divided these figures into tropes and schemes. A trope, such as a metaphor, involved turning a word or sentence from its proper meaning to another meaning in order to increase

its force. The schemes were divided into grammatical and rhetorical schemes. Grammatical schemes were then divided into orthographical and syntactical groups. Rhetorical schemes were further divided into figures of words and figures of thought (33-34). According to Abraham Fraunce in Chapter 26 of The Arcadian Rhetorike (1588), the figures of words conferred on language "a kinde of delicacie" which was "fit to delight," and figures of thought "a force and majestie" which were "apt to perswade" [E4v, E5r]. The following list of the rhetorical figures, though not complete, has been taken from Joseph's compilation in Shakespeare's Use of the Arts. The list, with examples from Shakespeare's works (cited from the Pelican edition of William Shakespeare: The Complete Works), conclusively demonstrates the influence of Renaissance rhetoric, in the form of the figures, on Shakespeare's writing.

GRAMMATICAL SCHEMES

ORTHOGRAPHICAL SCHEMES OF WORDS--"modification of words wrought by adding or subtracting a syllable or letter at the beginning, middle, or end, and less frequently, by exchanging sounds" (50).

Acopoe--"the omission of the last syllable of a word" (53):

Before you visit him, to make inquire
Of his behavior.

(Ham. 2.1.4)

Aphaeresis--"subtracting a syllable from the beginning of a

word" (52):

Point against point, rebellious arm 'gainst arm.

. . .

(Mac. 1.2.56)

Proparalepsis--"the addition of a syllable at the end of a

word" (51):

And bid her hasten all the house to bed. . . .

(R & J 3.3.156)

Prosthesis--"the addition of a syllable at the beginning of

a word" (51):

Enrings the barky fingers of the elm. . . .

(MND 4.1.43)

Synaloepha--"at the juncture of two vowels, omitting one"

(52):

Believ't not lightly--though I go alone. . . .

(Cor. 4.1.29)

Syncope--"the removal of a letter or syllable from the

middle of a word" (52):

Let's make us med'cines of our great revenge.

. . .

(Mac. 4.3.214)

SYNTACTICAL SCHEMES OF CONSTRUCTION--refashionings of language for variety and force, lending poise and balance to language (54).

Anastrophe--"unusual word order" (54):

. . . I'll resolve you

. . . of every

These happen'd accidents. . . .

(Tem. 5.1.248-250)

Anthimeria--the substitution of one part of speech for another (62):

But that the good mind of Camillo tardied
My swift command. . . .

(WT 3.2.160-161)

Antithesis--the juxtaposition of contrasting ideas (32):

What he hath lost noble Macbeth hath won.

(Mac. 1.2.67)

Asyndeton--the omission of conjunctions between clauses (59):

. . . be 't to fly, To swim, to dive, into the
fire, to ride. . . .

(Tem. 1.2.190-191)

Brachylogia--"the omission of conjunctions between words"

(59):

Beguiled, divorced, wronged, spited, slain!

.

Despised, distressed, hated, martyred, kill'd!

(R & J 4.5.55,59)

Diazeugma--"the use of one subject with many verbs" (58):

. . . He bites his lip and starts,
Stops on a sudden, looks upon the ground,

Then lays his finger on his temple. . . .

(Henry 8 3.2.113-115)

Eclipsis or ellipsis--"the omission of a word easily understood" (58):

And he to England shall [go] along with you.

(Ham. 3.3.4)

Epergesis or apposition--a word or phrase which explains the noun or pronoun preceding it (57):

. . . the thunder,

That deep and dreadful organ pipe, pronounced.

. . .

(Tem. 3.3.97-98)

Hendiadys--"the use of two nouns for a noun with its modifier" (61):

The heaviness and the guilt within my bosom
Takes off my manhood.

(Cym. 5.2.1-2)

Hirmus or periodic sentence--a sentence in which "the sense is suspended until the end" (60):

. . . Tell my friends,

Tell Athens, in the sequence of degree

From high to low throughout, that whoso please

To stop affliction, let him take his haste,

Come hither ere my tree hath felt the axe--

And hang himself! I pray you do my greeting.

(Tim. 5.1.205-210)

Homoioteleuton--parallel structures ending in words with like endings (60): churlishly, willingly, and angrily in TGV 1.2.60-63 (see isocolon below).

Hypallage--the application of words perverted and made absurd, a type of parody (55):

The eye of man hath not heard, the ear of man hath not seen, man's hand is not able to taste, his tongue to conceive, nor his heart to report what my dream was.

(MND 4.1.208-211)

Hypozeusis--each clause having its own verb (58):

Madam, the guests are come, supper served up, you called, my young lady asked for, the nurse cursed in the pantry, and everything in extremity.

(R & J 1.3.100-102)

Hysteron proteron--"puts first that which occurs later"

(55):

Th' Antoniad, the Egyptian admiral,
With all their sixty, fly and turn the rudder.

. . .

(A & C 3.10.2-3)

Isocolon--Phrases or clauses having equal length and usually corresponding structures (59):

How churlishly I chid Lucetta hence,
When willingly I would have had her here!

How angerly I taught my brow to frown,
When inward joy enforced my heart to smile!

(TGV 1.2.60-63)

Metabasis--"a figure of transition, telling what has been said and what is to follow" (60):

Why, what an ass am I! This is most brave,
 That I, the son of a dear father murdered,
 Prompted to my revenge by heaven and hell,
 Must like a whore unpack my heart with words
 And fall a-cursing like a very drab, . . .

 . . . I'll have these players
 Play something like the murder of my father
 Before mine uncle. I'll observe his looks.
 I'll tent him to the quick. If 'a do blench,
 I know my course.

(Ham. 2.2.568-572,580-584)

Parenthesis--the insertion of material into the normal flow of a sentence (57):

If you'll bestow a small--of what you have
little--Patience awhile, you'st hear the belly's
 answer.

(Cor. 1.1.120-121)

Polysyndeton--the deliberate addition of conjunctions between clauses (59):

'Tis as I should entreat you wear your gloves,
Or feed on nourishing dishes, or keep you warm,
Or sue to you to do a peculiar profit
 To your own person.

(Oth. 3.3.78-81)

Syllepsis--"a verb, expressed but once, lacks congruence
 with at least one subject with which it is understood" (58):

She has deceiv'd her father, and may thee.

(Oth. 1.3.293)

Tmesis--words inserted between a compound word (55):

If on the first, how heinous e'er it be. . . .

(R2 5.3.34)

Zeugma--"one verb serving a number of clauses" (58):

Our blood to us, this to our blood is born.

(AW 1.3.124)

RHETORICAL SCHEMES

FIGURES OF REPETITION--rhetorical figures of words and
 thought (79).

Anadiplosis--"repetition of the last word of one clause or
 sentence at the beginning of the next" (82):

. . . Husband win, win brother. . . .

(A & C 3.4.18)

Anaphora--beginning a series of clauses with the same word
 or phrase (79):

An if it do, take it for thy labor; an if it make

twenty, take them all. . . .

(1 Henry 4 4.2.7-8)

Antimetabole or Chiasmus--two or more words repeated in inverse order (81):

Plainly as heaven sees earth and earth sees
heaven. . . .

(WT 1.2.314)

Climax--a continued anadiplosis carried through three or more clauses (83):

And let the kettle to the trumpet speak,
The trumpet to the cannoneer without,
The cannons to the heavens, the heaven to earth.
. . . .

(Ham. 5.2.264-266)

Diacope--the repetition of a word with one or more words in between (87):

Light, I say! light!

(Oth. 1.1.143)

Diaphora--"the repetition of a common name so as to perform two logical functions: to designate an individual and to signify the qualities connoted by the name" (84):

My lord is not my lord. . . .

(Oth. 3.4.124)

Epanalepsis--repetition at the end of a clause or sentence

of words used at the beginning of the clause or sentence
(80):

Remember March; the ides of March remember.

(JC 4.3.18)

Epistrophe--ending clauses with the same word (79):

And I can teach thee, coz, to shame the devil--
By telling truth. Tell truth and shame the devil.

(1 Henry 4 3.1.58-59)

Epizeuxis--"the repetition of words with none between" (87):

O horror, horror, horror!

(Mac. 2.3.60)

Ploce--the repetition of a word or phrase with a little
intermission (85):

O, let me not be mad, not mad, sweet heaven!

(Lear 1.5.40)

Polyptoton--"the repetition of words derived from the same
root" (83):

As ending anthem of my endless dolor.

(TGV 3.1.240)

Symploce--the combination of anaphora and epistrophe (79):

How will my mother for a father's death

Take on with me, and ne'er be satisfied.

How will my wife for slaughter of my son

Shed seas of tears, and ne'er be satisfied.

(3 Henry 6 2.5.103-106)

VICES OF LANGUAGE--"the ignorant violation of grammatical rules" (64).

Amphibology--"ambiguity of grammatical construction, often occasioned by mispronunciation" (66):

If we offend, it is with our good will.

That you should think, we come not to offend,
But with good will. To show our simple skill,
That is the true beginning of our end.

.
Our true intent is. All for your delight,
We are not here.

(MND 5.1.108-111, 114-115)

Barbarismus--"mispronunciation of words" (65):

I pray you bear vitness dat me have stay six or
seven, two, tree hours for him, and he is no come.

(MWW 2.3.31-32)

Bomphiologia--"bombastic speech" (70):

. . . At my nativity
The front of heaven was full of fiery shapes
Of burning cressets, and at my birth
The frame and huge foundation of the earth
Shaked like a coward.

(1 Henry 4 3.1.13-17)

Cacemphaton--"the vice of foul speech" (68):

The preycl princess pierced and pricked a pretty

pleasing pricket. . . .

(LLL 4.2.54)

Cacosyntheton--"the ill-placing of words" (68)

My name is Pistol called.

(Henry 5 4.1.62)

Cacozelia--"the coining of fine words out of Latin" (72):

Now will I look to his remuneration.

Remuneration? O that's the Latin word for three farthings.

(LLL 3.1.128-129)

Heterogenium--"answering something utterly irrelevant to what is asked" (66):

When I desired him to come home to dinner,

He asked me for a thousand marks in gold.

(CE 2.1.60-61)

Homiologia--"tedious and inane repetition" (69):

I will not excuse you, you shall not be excused,
excuses shall not be admitted, there is no excuse
shall serve, you shall not be excused.

(2 Henry 4 5.1.4-6)

Malapropism--an ignorant misapplication of words (75):

Why, sir, for my part, I say the gentleman had
drunk himself out of his five sentences.

(MWW 1.1.154-155)

Pareclon--"the addition of a superfluous word" (69):

Till that the weary very means do ebb?

(AYLI 2.7.73)

Periergia--"overlabor to seem fine and eloquent" (70):

Anointed, I implore so much expense of thy royal
sweet breath as will utter a brace of words.

(LLL 5.2.520-521)

Perissologia--"the addition of a superfluous clause which
adds nothing to the meaning" (69):

I do despise a liar as I do despise one that is
false, or as I despise one that is not true.

(MWW 1.1.58-60)

Pleonasmus--"the needless telling of what is already
understood" (69):

. . . [His] biting is immortal: those that do die
of it do seldom or never recover.

(A & C 5.2.246-247)

Solecismus--"the ignorant misuse of cases, genders, tenses"
(64):

And didst thou not, . . . desire me to be no more
so familiarity with such poor people. . . .

(2 Henry 4 2.1.93-95)

Tapinosis--"the use of a base word to diminish the dignity
of a person or thing" (67):

Away, thou rag, thou quantity, thou remnant. . . .

(TS 4.3.111)

Tautology--"vain repetition of the same idea" (68):

What manner o' thing is your crocodile?

It is shaped, sir, like itself, and it is broad as
it has breadth; it is just so high as it is, and
moves with its own organs.

(A & C 2.7.40-43)

The preceding list of rhetorical figures, with illustrations from Shakespeare's works, reveals the poet's use of only one rhetorical theory widely accepted during the Renaissance. Joseph's study further concludes that Shakespeare drew not only from the figures, but from most of the rhetorical theories of the period (12-13). In his employment of the rhetorical arts, Shakespeare was functioning as a true product of the English Renaissance, an age whose educational system, literary community, and educated public all encouraged a rhetorical style in the writers of the day.

CHAPTER IV

THE ARTISTRY OF 1 HENRY IV: DRAMATIC ELEMENTS AND RHETORICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

While writing in the rhetorical style characteristic of Renaissance England, Shakespeare drew from every resource available to him in creating a style all his own. From his early use of classical rhetorical figures, which at times appear artificial, he progressed to a more mature use of the rhetorical structures, taking advantage of the flexibility and freedom of expression encouraged by the Renaissance. At the time of writing the histories, Shakespeare was beginning to exhibit the mature style characteristic of his later works. In addition to adorning his own works, Shakespeare's rhetoric began to make significant contributions to the artistic elements of the dramas. In 1 Henry IV, Shakespeare combined all of the elements to create a thematically rich play. The language of the play illustrates a maturing control in Shakespeare's style and at the same time contributes to other artistic elements. In particular, the rhetorical figures employed by Shakespeare enhance the plot, characterization, and meaning of the play. Before presenting the figures as they contribute to the play, however, it will be helpful to discuss the dramatic

elements of the play and to present the prevailing opinions of the critics on these elements. A discussion of these elements will enable the reader to understand better the contribution of the rhetorical figures to the drama.

In interpretations of I Henry IV, on one point the critics agree--the play is a study of kingship; but on the question of what type of kingship, dissenting opinions exist. One viewpoint perceives the drama as the education of the ideal Christian king, while another asserts that 1 Henry IV is a study of kingship in the hands of a Machiavel. Within either of these interpretations exist the consequences of rebellion, the immorality of political and common corruption, and an examination of honor. As a study of the rhetorical figures will later show, each of these themes contributes to the richness of the play.

To understand 1 Henry IV as the education of the ideal Christian king, one must be aware of the idealism of the Middle Ages. According to Lily B. Campbell, Christian principles governed the Renaissance concept of the ideal English king, as the Tudor Doctrine demonstrates:

The king was responsible to God, both as a man, one of God's creatures, and as His vice-gerent, the representative of His divine justice. But he was responsible only to God. He was not to be judged by his subjects, and his subjects were not to decide the matter of their obedience upon the

basis of the king's merits. A bad king was punishment meted out to the people for their sins, but the king was responsible to God for his sins. Rebellion was the rod of chastisement to the bad king, but the rebels were no less guilty because they were used by God.

(Campbell 214-215)

According to Irving Ribner, the Tudor Doctrine held that the king must be obeyed at all costs. Even if he were a tyrant, the king was still considered God's agent on earth, and no one had the authority to depose him except God. If the king committed sins, God would execute punishment (157). The ideal Tudor king must therefore be sinless or he would not remain king. Ribner notes that the Tudor Doctrine also included patriotic principles, a result of the Humanist influence. To the Elizabethan, a king must be strong enough to maintain civil order. Rebellion was not acceptable under any circumstances. The Tudor Doctrine allowed the king liberty in protecting the country from foreign invasions and maintained that no sin or misrule was involved in actions that protected England (17, 169).

An understanding of the Tudor Doctrine provides a background for considering I Henry IV as the education and making of an ideal Christian king, Henry V. Some critics maintain that Prince Hal learns how to be an ideal king by watching the mistakes of the less-than-ideal kings before

him. Una Ellis-Fermor notes the weak and failing rule of Richard II as it contrasts with the strong, responsible, yet domineering, rule of Henry IV. Richard II, although a weak leader, ruled by Divine Right; Henry IV, on the other hand, is a usurper who can not claim Divine Right, yet he exerts control and maintains order (41-43). Hal, as heir to the throne, is aware of a king's responsibilities and, as a man of common sense, most likely recognizes that neither the rule of Richard nor that of his father has provided an acceptable model for an ideal king. William B. Hunter, Jr. interprets I Henry IV as Prince Hal's struggle toward moral perfection and considers Aristotle's ethics as the basis for understanding Hal. He suggests that Hal represents the mean between the extremes of "excess and deficiency" of virtue (176), an interpretation based on Aristotle's theory that virtue or goodness is a mean between two extremes, both lacking virtue (Burnet 95). In Hunter's view, accepting Hal as the mean leads to an acceptance of Falstaff as representing a deficiency of virtue and Hotspur as representing an excess of virtue (175-176). According to Aristotle, the mean is the "ideal pattern of action" (Burnett 95). Hunter suggests that if Hal represents the mean, he must then reject the extremes and move toward "moral perfection" (176). Hunter points to examples throughout the play of qualities in Hal which may reflect Christian virtues. He cites, for example, Hal's moderate liberality, temper, and

temperance, as depicted in the tavern scenes. In addition to these virtues, Hal is not insolent, fearful of danger, nor lax in conferring benefits on others, as exhibited in his conduct at the Battle of Shrewsbury. He further helps those in need and is congenial with all classes of people, as seen in the tavern scenes (176-178). Hunter views Hal as the young heir to the English throne, who struggles in his youth between what is right and what is wrong, but who ultimately chooses the right in order to become the ideal Henry V (179).

The religious dramas of the Medieval Period provide another basis for the critics to interpret 1 Henry IV as the education and making of an ideal Christian king. J. Dover Wilson explains that the medieval morality play was an allegory "which exhibited the process of salvation in the individual soul on its road between birth and death, beset with the snares of the World or the wiles of the Evil One" (185). In these allegorical dramas, the Devil and his Vice tempt man as he moves toward salvation, but the "powers of darkness are withstood, and finally overcome, by the agents of light" (185). Wilson maintains that 1 Henry IV follows the pattern of the morality play, with Falstaff representing the Vice who attempts to lure the young prince away from the virtues that will lead him to salvation. Wilson notes that Hal also associates Falstaff with the Riot character of the interlude plays (who is a misleader of youth), the Devil of

the miracle play, and the Vice of the morality play. Hal refers to Falstaff as "that villainous abominable misleader of Youth, that old white-bearded Satan, that reverend Vice, that grey Iniquity, that father Ruffian . . . the tutor and feeder of my riots" (187). In addition, Wilson compares Hal to the prodigal son in the Bible, who leaves home, falls into riotous living, and later returns home repentant. In Wilson's interpretation, Hal's repentance is to be taken seriously and admired, his ultimate rejection of Falstaff the Vice as necessary in terms of Hal's reformation (189). Wilson views Hal's repentance as being of "the Renaissance type, which transforms a wayward prince into an excellent soldier and governor," and claims that Hal was never guilty of sins "against God," but "against the interests of the crown. . . . Instead of educating himself for the burden of kingship, he had been frittering away his time, and making himself cheap, with low companions" (192). According to Wilson's interpretation, 1 Henry IV reveals the prince in his wayward ways, but traces the development of his character as he begins to assert the moral, social, and political responsibilities that will make him an ideal king (190). The morality play and the Tudor Doctrine provide a background by which the critics may view the play as the education of a Christian king.

In contrast to an interpretation of 1 Henry IV as the education and making of an ideal Christian king, Cleanth

Brooks and Robert B. Heilman note that other critics view the play as the "study of a king who has a 'Machiavellian policy' from beginning to end" (170). Christian Gauss, in his introduction to The Prince, explains that this Machiavellian policy, introduced to the world by Niccolo Machiavelli of Florence, Italy, was an attempt to provide advice to princes who would strengthen their political and military organizations (12). In The Prince Machiavelli declares that a ruler who professes to be good in everything will necessarily experience failure among men who are not good. He, therefore, proposes that a ruler should learn how not to be good so that he can use or not use goodness according to the necessity of the case (92-93). According to Machiavelli, in operating from a politically expedient base, a prince may "aim at conquering and maintaining the state, and the means will always be judged honourable and praised by everyone" (94). John F. Danby notes that some of Machiavelli's concepts actually made their way into Tudor Doctrine, for example, in Elizabeth's homilies, which support Tudor possession as of primary concern (88). Brooks and Heilman comment that many critics of 1 Henry IV view Hal as simply executing a Machiavellian policy" (170).

With this interpretation, critics point to Machiavellian traits in Henry IV and assert that Hal exhibits some of the same qualities as his father. D. A. Traversi points out that in striving to be a good king,

Henry IV wants to bring about national unity and to calm the political unrest which he created in his exploits to gain the throne. As a good king, he wants to unite the people, and he also wants the people to forget that he usurped the throne; keeping them busy with a crusade should accomplish both goals (139). Traversi suggests that Henry's "only true moral criterion is political success" and that he has deceived the people for his own advantage (140). According to Traversi, the king's deceiving his subjects is his greatest immorality. Traversi concludes that, although Hal is moral, he could have easily learned from his father "to separate the promptings of humanity from the necessities of political behaviour" and to "subject all personal considerations to public achievement" (140).

Danby, also seeing Hal as a Machiavel, argues that in his first soliloquy the prince attempts to make virtue the "object of machiavellian [sic] strategy" by vowing to reform in order to gain the favor of the people (90). Traversi suggests that Hal uses his reformation as "an instrument to gain political success" (141). Traversi points out that not only in the opening act, but throughout the entire play, Hal demonstrates his ability to "devote himself to attaining the practical, political end without being diverted from his task" (141).

According to a Machiavellian interpretation of this drama, Hal also exhibits Machiavellian characteristics in

dealing with his associates. As Traversi states, Hal "judges all men by their value in relation to a coldly conceived political scheme . . ." (142). Traversi further comments that in Hal's relations with his tavern friends, he presents the humble picture of one who has lowered himself to the level of those in the tavern; but when alone, Hal confesses that this is a false humility (142). His friendship with the taverners lasts only as long as it is expedient for the prince. Traversi also points out that Hal's observations of those that he calls friends reflect a coldness out of character in friendship. Hal constantly uses vulgar and gross imagery in reference to his tavern friends, especially in reference to the "fleshy" Falstaff (143). According to Ellis-Fermor, Hal's "love for his people carries with it a "tinge of expediency, a hint of the glib platform speaker" (47). In an article discussing the scene with Hal and the drawer Francis, Eugene Wright reiterates Hal's coldness to his tavern friends. Wright states that in Act 2, scene 4, lines 28-63, Hal is not physically cruel to Francis; Hal, however, proves himself to be a strong force on a weak servant, a force who uses the taverners and "misuses his power for his own purposes" (68). According to Traversi's view of the play, in addition to developing unsatisfactory relationships, Hal puts aside his potentially good qualities to achieve political success (141). Wright suggests that Hal ultimately becomes a good

king because he can put aside his good qualities and change his position according to what is expedient (69).

Brooks and Heilman point out that in examining the play few critics accept either interpretation of 1 Henry IV without some qualifications. They argue that "a good king must reject Falstaff (the bad), but that in the process by which a man becomes a good king, something else--something spontaneous, something in itself good and attractive--must be sacrificed . . ." (170). These critics further maintain that Shakespeare balances the two worlds perfectly without judging them and presents a real world of "contradictions, and of mixtures of good and evil" (171). As a study of the rhetorical figures will later emphasize, within the two interpretations of the play, the making of an ideal Christian king and the execution of policy by a Machiavellian king, the reader clearly sees the mixture of good and evil.

The contrast of good and evil saliently emerges in the play's major theme of honor. Through the characters of Hotspur, Falstaff, and Hal, Shakespeare depicts varying degrees of honor. Hotspur, as noted by Traversi, has some genuine qualities which are admirable. For example, he sees through the vanity of Glendower and observes some of the falseness in others around him, such as the "poppinjay" who brings the king's demands for the prisoners. Yet he allows his passions to rule and acts on a false honor as much as he

faults others for not displaying a sense of honor (147). Giles R. Mitchell and Eugene Wright comment that Hotspur unconsciously deceives himself into believing that he is more honorable than others, for instance, Bolingbroke and Glendower (121-123). According to Harold C. Goddard, Hotspur demonstrates "blunt honesty," but his honesty is based on the old chivalric code which contains a degenerate honor, a self-glory. Goddard further states that within Hotspur there is the belief that man was born to fight, not just for righteous causes, but for the sake of fighting. Goddard also notes that Hotspur displays some elements of true honor when he states that life is short and should not be spent in baseness or when he is willing to fight against the King's larger forces; Hotspur, however, exhibits this true honor only when he is in a passion or is "intoxicated" with war and honor (167). Hotspur's honor deals with the extreme passion of chivalry's false honor and the glory associated with that honor.

In contrast to Hotspur's seemingly passionate commitment to honor, Falstaff illustrates a total lack of any kind of honor. Although Falstaff's vices are obvious, Traversi comments that because of his human qualities Falstaff wants to live and not die as he expresses in his speech on honor (149). Goddard points out that Falstaff, though not altogether honest, is not really a counterfeit or hypocrite. He states that Falstaff does not want to risk

his life for "honor" because in doing so he would be supporting two "equally damnable seekers after power and glory" (186), the king and the rebels seeking to dethrone him. According to Goddard, in his speech on honor, Falstaff is not being a counterfeit--he truly believes that "life was given for something greater than glory or than the gain that can be gotten out of it" (188). Brooks and Heilman, however, point out that Falstaff's lack of honor involves a lack of responsibility to any authority and too much reliance on common sense (161). They believe that Falstaff, taken as a whole, is still a coward who has no honor (168).

Prince Hal, on the other hand, is courageous but is not driven by ambition. His honor is based on a realistic rather than an idealistic attitude. Edward Dowden comments that Prince Hal sees "in the world a substantial reality" (213). According to W. Gordon Zeeveld, Hal's honor "is not plucked from the pale-faced moon. It is beyond all else an awareness that a definition of honor might more properly be modest and earth-born" (252). Reckless and lackadaisical in the beginning of the play, Hal rises to the occasion of war and fights when he must. Zeeveld also points out that by the end of the play Hal's honor exceeds that of Hotspur because Hal's humanity defines honor as it should be (253). Other critics, however, suggest that Hal's honor is not truly virtuous. Wright notes that although Hal represents the mean between the extremes of Hotspur and Falstaff in

regard to honor, his honor lacks true virtue because Hal operates from a political base, acting according to what is expedient (69). Goddard, too, states that the Prince is a "double man" because he accepts Falstaff's idea of honor, yet he does not hesitate to act as an honorable prince when he meets Hotspur and says: "I'll crop [Hotspur's honors], to make a garland for my head" (190). Whether Hal possesses the pure virtue of honor is questionable; what he does provide is a more moderate example of honor than do the extremes represented by Hotspur and Falstaff.

Through the presentations of Hotspur, Falstaff, and Hal, Shakespeare presents varying degrees of honor, each containing some honorable, some dishonorable qualities. The play, however, may be considered on a much broader base than just on the ideal of honor. Several critics argue that Henry IV depicts a world where immorality outweighs morality and evil disguises itself as good.

According to Goddard, "Shakespeare seems bent on getting together every known duplicity, counterfeit, and deceit in this play . . ." (166). Traversi points out that Shakespeare portrays a country ruled by a king who is false and morally deficient. King Henry's planned crusade to the Holy Land, according to Traversi, is an attempt to turn attention away from the way he obtained the throne, which was by murdering Richard II (138). Traversi notes that Henry reveals another moral deficiency when he later

confesses to Hal that he "stole all courtesy from heaven" and dressed himself in humility in order to gain the approval of the people (140). The rebels, Traversi adds, demonstrate the same flaw as that of the King. They are prompted to rebel because of the same desire for power which prompted them to help Henry dethrone Richard II and thus rise to power (144). They are as immoral as the king. Traversi points out that, in addition to rebelling, the rebels display other flaws. Worscester, for instance, illustrates a lack of morality when he lies to Hotspur about Henry's offer of peace. Glendower, because of his self-regard, cannot be honest with the other rebels either. Both sides in the Battle at Shrewsbury invoke honor to justify their causes, "but the reality is that crime born of self-interest on either side has born fruit in unnecessary bloodshed" (Traversi 146), and both sides are guilty of immoral actions.

Not only is the world of nobility corrupt, but also the world of commoners abounds with corruption. Among the taverners, Falstaff most clearly exemplifies immorality. According to Goddard, Falstaff has no regard for the rights of others and overindulges in sack (181). Brooks and Heilman add that he is a "moral anarchist," acts much as a coward on the battlefield, and fails to accept responsibility, for example, when he carries sack rather than a pistol into battle (163, 165). Brooks and Heilman

conclude that, in light of the meaning of the play, Shakespeare emphasizes the immoral qualities of Falstaff (165). Danby points out that the taverners exhibit "riotous irresponsibility," but claims they are no worse than the nobles who display "frigid opportunism" and "quarrelsome 'honour'"; the common element shared by court and tavern, he suggests, is that both are diseased (84). The critics therefore agree, as the study of rhetorical figures will later emphasize, that the themes of corruption and immorality are prominent in the play.

On the portrayal and function of characters, the critics concur for the most part. The only major disagreement exists on the character of Prince Hal, between those critics who view him as the ideal Christian king and those who see him as a Machiavel. The critics who adhere to the interpretation of I Henry IV as the education of an ideal Christian king concentrate on Hal's more attractive qualities. Wilson, for example, describes Prince Hal as a "madcap prince" who grows into an ideal king (190). Dowden suggests that the "change which effected itself in the Prince . . . was no miraculous conversion, but merely the transition from boyhood to adult years." He emphasizes that Hal had kept himself from what was "really base" (211). Wilson further states that Shakespeare depicts Hal's conversion from a prodigal prince to a man who faces more and more of his responsibilities as heir to the throne

(190). Ribner points out that Shakespeare follows the morality pattern in I Henry IV and comments that, by the end of the play, Hal has completed the first stage of regeneration and has partially redeemed himself (174, 176).

In contrast to viewing Hal as the ideal Christian king, critics who interpret the play as showing the execution of policy in the hands of a Machiavel emphasize the prince's flaws. Ellis-Fermor notes that Hal does indeed "transform himself into a public figure," but suggests that the completeness with which this has been done is alarming (45). G. B. Shaw describes the prince as "an able young Philistine, inheriting high position and authority, which he holds on to and goes through with by keeping a tight grip on his conventional and legal advantages . . ." (429). Traversi points out that Hal is a politician whose "intelligence is placed consistently at the service of his political interests" (141).

Although the critics who view Hal as the ideal king emphasize his positive attributes, and those who see him as the Machiavel stress his negative traits, neither group interprets him as totally virtuous or entirely wicked. Most critics agree that the prince possesses both desirable and undesirable qualities. Danby, for example, describes Prince Hal as "courageous, patriotic, acquainted with every sort of man, the winner--in open competition--of all the social prizes; excellent in the tap room, on the battlefield, in

the councils of state" (90). He notes that Hal takes to heart the responsibilities of the state and suggests that the prince "equips himself to be good" in order to govern well. According to Danby, Hal becomes a "machiavel [sic] of goodness" (91). Although many critics would never concede that Hal displays Machiavellian traits, few would disagree with the other characteristics Danby has noted in the prince. As the study of the rhetorical figures will later show, Hal does indeed exhibit strong leadership qualities which will enable him to govern well.

In the depiction of Falstaff, Shakespeare paints a colorful portrait, one viewed by the critics as exhibiting primarily vices, but possessing human qualities and therefore some virtue. A. C. Bradley describes Falstaff as the "bliss of freedom gained in humour" and contends that Falstaff's enemy is anything that interferes with his freedom (256). Bradley proposes that among the things which restrict Falstaff's freedom are truth, honor, law, patriotism, duty, war, religion, and death (257). Falstaff's enemy, then, is anything which is "respectable and moral" (256). According to Bradley, however, "we praise him, we laud him, for he offends none but the virtuous, and denies that life is real or life is earnest, and delivers us from the oppression of such nightmares, and lifts us into the atmosphere of perfect freedom" (257). Nathan Drake points out Falstaff's "intellectual vigour," inexhaustible

wit, and undeviating good humour (524). Falstaff's humorous wit, according to Bradley, is responsible for his lies, which Falstaff does not expect to be believed, but tells for the sake of humor (258); and his humor, according to Brooks and Heilman, "does have point and does make rich commentary on the world about him, does have a philosophical quality" (163). In addition to Falstaff's freedom, humor and wit, another notable feature of his character is his self-interest. Franz Alexander maintains that Falstaff is the "personification of the wholly self-centered pleasure-seeking principle" (269). Dr. Samuel Johnson in his essay "The Inimitable Falstaff" summarizes the character of Falstaff as most critics view him:

Thou compound sense of vice . . . a thief and a glutton, a coward, and a boaster, always ready to cheat the weak, and prey upon the poor; . . . Yet the man thus corrupt, thus despicable, makes himself necessary to the prince that despises him, by the most pleasing of all qualities, perpetual gaiety . . . his wit is not of the splendid or ambitious kind, but consists in easy escapes and sallies of levity . . . He is stained with no enormous or sanguinary crimes . . . his licentiousness is not so offensive but that it may be borne for his mirth.

On the character of Hotspur, the critics agree that he represents the ideal code of conduct and honor carried to the extreme, but note that he allows passion instead of reason to dominate. As a study of the rhetorical figures will later note, Hotspur's honor is not flawless. According to Drake, Hotspur's admirable qualities exist in the military realm, but even there he exhibits a "fiery and uncontrollable courage," an "impetuous heroism" (523). Allardyce Nicoll adds that he possesses an "idealistic obsession which carries him into the impractical region of the absurd" (130). Hunter notes that Hotspur almost breaks up the conspiracy because of his "hotheaded insistence" to do things his own way (175). Drake points out that outside of the military realm, Hotspur exhibits few social skills. Drake describes him in society as "boisterous, self-willed, and unaccommodating" (623). Hunter also cites examples of Hotspur's inept social skills. For instance, he points to Hotspur's insulting Glendower and causing his own father to call him a "wasp-stung and impatient fool" (175). Brooks and Heilman, however, concede that Hotspur does have an attractive side. They describe in Hotspur a "kind of abandon, a kind of light-hearted gaiety--in his whole-souled commitment to the pursuit of honor, in his teasing of his wife, and in his laughing at the pompous mystery-mongering of Glendower" (161). Hunter concludes that, although we admire Hotspur's commitment to honor, we must remember that

in the end his honor destroys him (175). Hunter suggests that Shakespeare, in emphasizing Hotspur's excesses and the way in which they lead him astray, does not intend for the reader to view this character as an ideal hero (174-175). Hunter's view coincides with the accepted critical opinion of Hotspur.

Although the critics view King Henry as "a vile politician," they also acknowledge that he seeks the general good for his kingdom. Traversi points out that Henry's motives are mixed with "selfish calculation" and a genuine desire for "general good" (138). According to Traversi, in the beginning of the play, Henry hopes that his crusade to the Holy Land will "distract attention away from the way in which he himself came to the throne" (138). The dethroning and murder of Richard II are crimes that haunt Henry. Traversi suggests that Henry possesses Machiavellian traits and that he passes them on to his son (140). H. B. Charlton notes that Henry operates on the rule of expediency and "absolute pragmatism," which eliminates the possibility of moral consciousness in the king. Charlton further states that Henry controls all feelings in order to expedite policy as an ideal servant should (14).

In addition to pointing out Henry's corrupt nature, the critics also note his noble qualities. Nicoll notes that Henry is "an effective ruler" even though he has come to the throne through strife (128). Dowden adds that all of

Henry's "faculties are well organized" and that he cherishes the honor of England, not passionately as Hotspur does, but with "strong considerate care" (206). Ellis-Fermor points out other admirable qualities in Henry: his "shrewdness, tenacity, and self-command." Overall, Ellis-Fermor describes Henry as an "able and hard-working statesman" who has good intentions (42-43). Frederick Boas, however, concludes that even with some virtues and talents, Henry lacks integrity (261). As a study of the rhetorical figures will later highlight, this lack of integrity overshadows Henry's noble qualities and contributes to Henry's being the successful civil servant that the critics describe.

Not only do the critics agree on the consistent qualities of the major characters, with the exception of Prince Hal, but they also see the minor characters similarly. The two most significant groups of minor characters consist of the rebels and the taverners. The major characters within the rebel camp are Worcester, Northumberland, Mortimer, Glendower, Douglas, and Vernon. The critics agree that these rebels lack desirable qualities, but Brooks and Heilman go so far as to classify them as Machiavellian (162). Traversi comments that Glendower is a "mixture of superstition, vanity, and incompetence whose self-regard prompts him to look everywhere for insults and makes it impossible for him to collaborate honestly with his fellow-conspirators" (146).

Traversi also describes Worcester as a man who disregards reason and operates on "selfish passion," for example, when he conceals the king's offer of peace (146). Traversi further notes that Douglas is a "brainless butcher," just as Prince Hal describes him. According to L. C. Knights, the rebels are no better than their usurper king (153). Similarly, the tavern characters overall demonstrate undesirable qualities. This group is composed of Poins, Gadshill, Peto, and Bardolph. Danby suggests that the world of the taverners, as well as that of the rebels, reflects a diseased world, a world pervaded by fraud (84-85). Drake describes Falstaff's associates as "dissolute companions," depraved in their principles (523). Danby concludes that the individuals in the tavern world, as in the political world, lack "moral integrity" (85).

In regard to the structure of the play, critics divide into primarily two groups: those who interpret I Henry IV as a unified whole and those who maintain that the play is only a unified whole when connected to 2 Henry IV. According to E. M. W. Tillyard, I Henry IV is incomplete in itself because at its conclusion many loose ends exist, among them the incomplete reign of Henry IV and the not-yet-quelled rebels (221-222). M. A. Shaaber, however, representing the view of the play as a unified whole, points out that everything has been done in the play to reveal that the prince is indeed a true prince, and that if Shakespeare's

major theme is honor, then once the prince chooses honor, nothing else needs to be said (226-227). To consider the play as structurally unified is the most popular view among the critics. Within this view of structural unity, the critics discuss a series of contrasts, which the study of rhetorical figures will later emphasize. Brooks and Heilman comment on the most important contrasts, those of Hal vs. Hotspur and Hal vs. Falstaff (159). These two critics suggest that "it is almost as if Shakespeare were following, consciously or unconsciously, the theme of Aristotle's Nichomachean ethics [sic]: virtue as the mean between two extremes of conduct" (160), Hal representing the mean, Hotspur and Falstaff representing the extremes, and honor representing the code of conduct. Tillyard suggests that in the structure of the play Hal must choose between "Sloth or Vanity" and "Chivalry"; the prince chooses chivalry but becomes the mean between the extremes of "honour exaggerated and dishonour" (223). Another obvious contrast exists between the serious world of the court, which forms the main plot, and the comic world of the taverners, the sub-plot. Brooks and Heilman point out that this contrast is "between the pomp and state of the councils at court, which are called to debate the state of the realm, and those other councils at the Boar's Head, which take measures for the better lifting of travelers' purses" (159). Knights comments that both of these groups "prey on the

commonwealth" (155). In addition to the tavern and court groups, included in the main plot is another important group, the rebels. According to William Empson, these three groups would be structurally unmanageable if Hal did not, in some way, connect to all three--he no doubt belongs to court and tavern, but he also connects to the rebel group in his meeting with Hotspur on the battlefield (43-44). Falstaff also moves among all three groups, and Traversi notes that he serves as a "connecting-link" to criticize the "whole political action, both on the loyalist and the rebel sides" (149). Brooks and Heilman maintain that the unity of the play depends on the battlefield scenes in which all three groups come together. These critics also note that the battle scenes do not cancel out the tavern scenes; they merely qualify them as belonging to a world of timelessness and irresponsibility (165-166). Brooks and Heilman further suggest that in the battle scenes Falstaff is subordinated to the larger meaning of the play (165), which Shakespeare emphasizes in these final battle scenes. L. C. Knights points out that part of Shakespeare's meaning is satire directed toward statecraft and warfare. He suggests that the sub-plot contributes to this satire because of the corruption in the low-lives as seen in the Gadshill conspiracy and counterplot (154). Empson adds that Falstaff's wandering over the battlefield and cheering on the groups of fighters takes the "dignity out of the rebels"

and shows that war is just "another lust" (46). In these final scenes, also, Shakespeare draws the reader's attention to the theme of honor. The prince eliminates Hotspur, the exaggerated honor, and scorns Falstaff for his lack of honor, thereby revealing a truly virtuous honor. In the final scenes, Shakespeare's structure brings all of the elements of the play together.

The critics concur also on the contribution that Shakespeare's language makes in I Henry IV. As Madeleine Doran states, "It is a commonplace that the development of Shakespeare's style is away from verbal ingenuity and exuberance for their own sake and towards concentrated expression under control for dramatic ends" (235). According to Doran, by the time Shakespeare writes I Henry IV he has ended his "experimental years" and is moving toward controlled expression (235). His control of language is perhaps most noticeable in the structure of the play. Milton Crane notes that "[n]owhere in Shakespeare are the boundaries of two worlds so clearly delimited by the use of prose and verse as in the Henry IV plays (247). Crane adds that in I Henry IV Shakespeare writes the historical scenes in verse and Falstaff and company in prose, with only exceptions of conventional usage, such as the letter Hotspur reads and the comic dialogue (247). This differentiation of language between the two worlds of the play is appropriate and realistic because the historical scenes deal with

nobility, and verse is the language of nobility; the Falstaff scenes take place among the taverners who do not speak in verse, but in prose. In the verse passages, as B. Ifor Evans comments, the "matter no longer dominates the style" as in earlier plays, and the stronger concentration in the verse produces a "compact effect," lending a "sense of pressure" to the passage (62-63). Evans also notes that the prose, although it seems more experimental than the verse, offers "a contrast in effect between the verse and prose passages" and at times appears to function as foreshadowing (64). Brian Vickers suggests that "Shakespeare's language is an increasingly subtle medium for reflecting the differences and interactions between characters, situations and moods" (3). According to Crane, Falstaff as a clown speaks in prose; furthermore, representing the world that Hal must leave behind and also representing realism, Falstaff must speak in opposition to nobility (248). Crane further notes that Prince Hal "takes his cue from his company, speaking prose in the tavern scenes and verse in the court with equal facility" (251). Commenting on the character of Hotspur, Doran says that even though Hotspur hates poetry, he "speaks some of the most vivid and the most beautiful poetry in the play." Doran attributes this adeptness in poetry to Shakespeare's ability to "express the mind of a character who could not himself compose a poem at all" and maintains that this ability

reveals a high degree of artistry in Shakespeare's language (246). According to the above critics, Shakespeare's language is a major contribution to the play.

An examination of the artistic elements of I Henry IV provides insight into the relationships among the play's themes, characters, structure, and language. A more careful analysis of the elements of language, in particular, the rhetorical figures, reveals that Shakespeare's use of the figures in this play is prodigious. Whether Shakespeare consciously designed the figures into the play to contribute to the dramatic elements, one cannot say. One may conclude, however, that in I Henry IV, as Shakespeare's style matures, the rhetorical figures enhance the play by highlighting the action of the plot, by revealing the natures of the major and minor characters, and by emphasizing meaning.

In commenting on the action, Shakespeare's characters use a variety of rhetorical figures. In the play's opening scene, Shakespeare's anaphora, ploce, and isocolon highlight expository information disclosing the country's previous rebellions and wars:

No more the thirsty entrance of this soil
Shall daub her lips with her own children's blood:
No more shall trenching war channel her fields,
 [anaphora]
 . . . Those opposed eyes

Shall now in mutual well-beseeming ranks
 March all one way and be no more [plocce] opposed
 Against acquaintance, kindred, and allies
 [isocolon].

The edge of war, like an ill-sheathed knife,
No more [plocce] shall cut his master.

(1.1.5-7, 9, 14-18)

The repetition of "no more" suggests the king's hope that such a condition will not occur again and introduces the center of the play's action--rebellion and war.

Later, in Act 1, scene 3, Shakespeare's epistrophe exposes Hotspur's anger with the king for accusing Mortimer of revolting:

King: Whose tongue shall ask me for one penny cost
 To ransom home revolted Mortimer.

Hotspur: Revolted Mortimer?

(91-93)

The revelation of Hotspur's anger introduces the conflict between Hotspur and the king, which sets the rest of the play's action in motion. In the same scene,

Harbage, Alfred, ed. William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, 1969. All further references to the play are from this work. (I have denoted the figures by underlining.)

Shakespeare's isocolon, antithesis, and ploce help explain antecedent action necessary to establish a motive for the rebel cause and function as a persuasive technique to stir up the rebels against the king:

Shall it for shame be spoken [ploce] in these
days,

Or fill up chronicles in time to come,

That men of your nobility and power

Did gage them both in an unjust behalf

(As both of you, God pardon it! have done)

To put down Richard, that sweet lovely rose,

And plant this thorn, this canker, Bolingbroke?

[antithesis]

And shall it in more shame be further spoken

[ploce]

That you are fooled, discarded, and shook off

[isocolon]

By him for whom these shames [ploce] ye underwent?

(170-179)

Before the end of this scene, Shakespeare employs antithesis and isocolon. This time the figures, introducing the rebels' plots against the king, intensify and add suspense to Shakespeare's story. Worcester reveals,

I speak not this in estimation,

As what I think might be, but what I know

[antithesis]

Is ruminated, plotted, and set down [isocolon].

(269-271)

Not until Act 3 do the rhetorical figures contribute more to the action, for up until this point Shakespeare has concentrated primarily on exposition and development of character. At the end of scene 2, however, Shakespeare's anaphora and antithesis point to the quickness of the king's actions in preparing to face the rebels and alerts the audience to Henry's strategies:

On Wednesday next, Harry, you shall set forward;

On Thursday we ourselves will march [anaphora].

Our meeting

Is Bridgenorth; and, Harry, you shall march

Through Gloucestershire; by which account

Our business valued, some twelve days hence

Our general forces at Bridgenorth shall meet.

Our hands are full of business [anaphora]. Let's

away:

Advantage feeds him fat while men delay

[antithesis].

(172-180)

Then in Act 3, scene 3, in using antithesis, Shakespeare creates tension in Hal's speech; this tension focuses attention on the ensuing battle between the rebels and the king: "The land is burning; Percy stands on high; / And either we or they must lower lie" (194-195).

In Act IV Shakespeare's figures focus on future action. In scene 1, for example, Shakespeare's isocolon points to the confrontation between Hotspur and the Prince of Wales: Hotspur vows, "Harry to Harry shall, hot horse to horse, / Meet, and ne'er part till one drop down a corse" (122-123).

In scene 3, the antithesis spoken by Vernon and Douglas draws attention to the time element which will bring the battle closer. Vernon comments, "Let it be seen tomorrow in the battle / Which of us fears." Douglas replies, "Yea, or tonight" (11-13).

Later in scene 4, the figure of isocolon increases tension in the plot by emphasizing the weakness of the rebel troops in the absence of the promised support:

What with the sickness of Northumberland,
Whose power was in the first proportion.
And what with Owen Glendower's absence thence,
.....
I fear the power of Percy is too weak. . . .

(14-16, 19)

Further suspense is created when Shakespeare uses polysyndeton to describe the king's stronger troops:

The Prince of Wales, Lord John of Lancaster,
The noble Westmoreland and warlike Blunt,
And many more corrivals and dear men
Of estimation and command in arms.

(4.29-32)

In the final act, also, Shakespeare's rhetorical figures add to the tension of the action. In scene 2, isocolon and plocé are used to point out the rebels' grievances against the king and the readiness of both camps to meet on the battlefield:

Wor: I told him gently of our grievances,
Of his oath-breaking [isocolon], which he mended
 thus,

By now forswearing that he is forsworn,
 He calls us rebels, traitors, and will scourge
 With haughty arms this hateful name in us.

Doug: Arms, gentlemen! to arms! [plocé] . . .

(36-41)

Finally, the action of the plot reaches its structural climax in scene 4 when Hotspur and Prince Hal come face to face:

Two stars keep not their motion in one sphere,
 Nor can one England brook a double reign
 Of Harry Percy and the Prince of Wales.

(64-66)

Shakespeare's antithesis here increases the tension of the central conflict between Hal and Hotspur.

In addition to emphasizing significant parts of the action, Shakespeare's rhetorical figures also aid in the development of character. By tracing the figures throughout the play, without considering other methods of character

development, one can determine the dominant traits of both major and minor characters. In the very first line of Act 1, scene 1, Shakespeare uses isocolon in Henry's words: "So shaken as we are, so wan with care" (1), which help to establish the emotional state of the king. The anaphora in lines 5-7, which recalls previous war and rebellion, may also emphasize the king's determination that similar action will not reoccur and separate him from the throne:

No more the thirsty entrance of this soil
Shall daub her lips with her own children's blood:
No more shall trenching war channel her fields.

. . .

(5-7)

A little farther into scene 1, we learn more about King Henry. In the following passage, Shakespeare's isocolon points out that the king's unhappiness with his son has led to his own envy of Norththumberland. The anadiplosis helps to emphasize the king's admiration for a son (Northumberland's) who is honorable. The antithesis, in pointing to the contrast between Hotspur and Hal, at the same time, makes clear Henry's opinion of his son--Hal is riotous and dishonorable in his father's eyes:

Yea, thou mak'st me sad, and mak'st me sin

[isocolon]

In envy that my Lord Northumberland

Should be the father to so blest a son--

A son who is the theme of honor's tongue

[anadiplosis]

Amongst a grove the very straightest plant;
 Who is sweet fortune's minion and her pride;
Whilst I, by looking on the praise of him,
See riot and dishonor stain the brow
Of my young Harry [antithesis].

(77-86)

Further in this passage, a specific type of antithesis called chiasmus highlights even more the king's dissatisfaction with his son:

. . . O that it could be proved
 That some night-tripping fairy had exchanged
 In cradle clothes our children where they lay,
And called mine Percy, his Plantagenet!
Then would I have his Harry, and he mine.

(86-90)

In scene 3, Shakespeare's antithesis and epanalepsis emphasize two other important traits of the king--his expediency and his pride respectively:

I will henceforth rather be myself,
Mighty and to be feared, than my condition,
Which hath been smooth as oil, soft as young down,
 [antithesis]

And therefore lost that title of respect

Which the proud soul ne'er pays but to the proud
[epanalepsis].

(5-9)

In the anaphora of the following lines, we learn that Henry is a man of policy, and that he would never pardon treason:

. . . Shall our coffers, then,
Be emptied to redeem a traitor home?

Shall we buy treason? . . .

.

No. . . .

(3.85-87, 89)

Later in this scene, when Hotspur stands up for Mortimer, the isocolon draws attention to the king's growing anger:

Send me your prisoners with the speediest of
means,

Or you shall hear in such a kind from me
As will displease you. My Lord Northumberland,

We license your departure with your son--

Send us your prisoners, or you will hear of it

[isocolon].

(120-124)

In the antithesis and isocolon of the following lines, through Hotspur's contrast of Henry and Mortimer, we learn of the king's corrupt reputation:

But I will lift the downtrod Mortimer

As high in the air [antithesis] as this unthankful

king,

As this ingrate and cankered Bolingbroke

[isocolon].

(3.135-137)

At the end of this scene, the king's analytical mind and capability for vengeance emerge through Shakespeare's use of antithesis and plocé respectively in Worcester's speech:

The king will always think [plocé] him in our debt
[antithesis],

And think we think [plocé] ourselves unsatisfied,

Till he hath found a time to pay [antithesis] us
home.

(283-285)

When the final scene of Act 1 ends, the rhetorical figures have contributed to the portrayal of the king as a ruler inwardly shaken with fear of rebellion and war, but outwardly demanding obedience from his subjects who perceive him as corrupt and vengeful. The figures also reveal a king who is prideful of his own kingly qualities and a father who is disappointed in a son who fails to exhibit any of these kingly qualities.

No important development of the king's character occurs in Act 2, but in Act 3 the rhetorical figures again focus attention on significant traits of King Henry. In scene 2, Shakespeare's isocolon again stresses Henry's disappointment in Hal's behavior:

Could such inordinate and low desires,
Such poor, such bare, such lewd, such mean
attempts,
Such barren pleasures, rude society,
 As thou art matched withal and grafted to,
 Accompany the greatness of thy blood
 And hold their level with thy princely heart?

(12-17)

As this scene continues, Henry indicates that he would never have lowered himself to the level of common men as Hal has done, for there would have been no advantage in doing so. The isocolon in the following lines helps the reader recognize Henry's pride and self-interest:

Had I so lavish of my presence been,
So common-hackneyed in the eyes of men,
So stale and cheap to vulgar company,
 Opinion, that did help me to the crown,
Had still kept loyal possession
 And left me in reputeless banishment,
 A fellow of no mark nor likelihood.

(39-45)

At the end of this passage, however, Henry does exhibit some humanity. Because of his fatherly affection, Henry, in the following antithesis, declares that he is somewhat blinded to Hal's common behavior:

. . . Not an eye

But is aweary of thy common sight,
Save mine, which hath desired to see thee more;
 Which now doth that I would not have it do--
 Make blind itself with foolish tenderness.

(87-91)

Later in scene 2, isocolon highlights the king's recognition and fear of Hotspur's military prowess:

Thrice hath this Hotspur, Mars in swathing
 clothes,
This infant warrior, in his enterprises
Discomfited great Douglas; ta'en him once,
Enlarged him, and made a friend of him,
 To fill the mouth of deep defiance up
 And shake the peace and safety of our throne.

(112-117)

In the isocolon of the following words to Hal in scene 2, additional notes on Henry's character emerge--paranoia about losing the throne and mistrust even of his own son:

Thou art like enough, through vassal fear,
Base inclination, and the start of spleen,
To fight against me under Percy's pay,
To dog his heels and curtsy at his frowns,
To show how much thou art degenerate.

(124-128)

Near the end of this scene, chiasmus emphasizes Henry's extreme relief and confidence that Hal will not rebel

against him. Hal promises, "And I will die a hundred thousand deaths / Ere break the smallest parcel of this vow," and the king responds, "A hundred thousand rebels die in this!" (158-160).

In this act, the rhetorical figures help to reiterate Henry's disapproval of his son. In addition, the figures help to establish Henry as a man who mistrusts those close to him and one who feels insecure in his position.

In the pre-battle scenes of Act 4, the rhetorical figures contribute even more to the corrupt character of the king. In Act 4, scene 3, the isocolon and polyptoton in Hotspur's speech, for instance, draw attention to Henry's hypocritical, expedient nature:

The king is kind, and well we know the king
Knows at what time to promise, when to pay
 [isocolon].

.
 Cries out upon abuses, seems to weep
 Over his country's wrongs; and by this face,
 This seeming [polyptoton] brow of justice, did he
 win

The hearts of all that he did angle for. . . .

(52-53, 81-84)

Two other appearances of isocolon in Hotspur's dialogue delineate the king's unscrupulous actions:

In short time after, he deposed the king;

Soon after that deprived him of his life;
 And in the neck of that tasked the whole state;
 To make that worse, suff'ered his kinsman March
 (Who is, if every owner were well placed,
 Indeed his king) to be engaged in Wales,
 There without ransom to lie forfeited;
Disgraced me in my happy victories,
Sought to entrap me by intelligence;
Rated mine uncle from the council board;
 In rage dismissed my father from the court;
Broke oath on oath, committed wrong on wrong.

. . .

(3.90-93, 97-101)

In Act 5, the figures reiterate the king's corrupt nature. In scene 1, the polyptoton, isocolon, and antithesis in Worcester's speech stress the king's dishonesty, manipulation, and usury:

. . . You swore to us,
 And you did swear [polyptoton] that oath at
 Doncaster,
 That you did nothing purpose 'gainst the state,

 You took occasion to be quickly wooed
 To gripe the general sway into your hand;
Forgot your oath to us at Doncaster [isocolon];
 And, being fed by us, you used us [antithesis and

polyptoton] so

As that ungentle gull, the cuckoo's bird,
Useth the sparrow [polyptoton]. . . .

.
 By unkind usage, dangerous countenance,
And violation of all faith and troth [isocolon]
 Sworn to us in your younger enterprise.

(41-43, 56-61, 69-71)

Later in scene 1, the isocolon, polysyndeton, and antithesis in the king's response to Worcester's speech depict Henry as a deceptive Machiavellian politician who knows how to win the support of the people:

We love our people well; even those we love
 [isocolon]
 That are misled upon your cousin's part;
And, will they take the offer of our grace,
 Both he, and they, and you [polysyndeton], yea,
 every man
 Shall be my friend again, and I'll be his
 [antithesis].

(104-108)

In scene 4, ploce again emphasizes a key characteristic of the king. In dialogue between Douglas and the king, Shakespeare juxtaposes the word counterfeit with phrases containing the word king, subtly suggesting, once more, Henry's deceptive nature. Douglas questions the king,

". . . What art thou / That counterfeit'st the person of a king?" Henry responds: "The king himself, who, Douglas grieves at heart." Douglas answers: "I fear thou art another counterfeit; / And yet, in faith, thou bearest thee like a king" (26-28, 34-35). In the closing scenes of the drama, Shakespeare emphasizes Henry's faults more than his virtues.

Henry's characteristics as stressed in the rhetorical figures coincide with his dominant traits as noted by the critics of the play; and, when used in conjunction with other elements of Shakespeare's style, the figures help bring into focus the image of this "vile politician."

Similarly, an analysis of the rhetorical figures brings to light important traits in the character of Hotspur. Early in Act 1, scene 1, the figures draw attention to Hotspur's most significant quality. The same example of anadiplosis which points out the king's envy of Northumberland also introduces Hotspur's honor:

In envy that my Lord Northumberland

Should be the father to so blest a son--

A son who is the theme of honor's tongue. . . .

(80-81)

In the anaphora and isocolon of the following lines, we find physical evidence that Hotspur gives his all to the old chivalric concept of honor:

But I remember, when the fight was done,

When I was dry with rage and extreme toil

[anaphora],

Breathless and faint [isocolon], leaning upon my

sword,

Came there a certain lord. . . .

(3.30-33)

In the same scene, while explaining his reasons for not returning prisoners to the king, Hotspur reveals further evidence of his allegiance to honor. Shakespeare's isocolon in Hotspur's description of the "poppinjay" leads the audience to understand that Hotspur has no respect for one who can only talk of war. In fact, Hotspur is so incensed with the emissary from the king that he acts rashly and later cannot even remember how he responded:

Out of my grief and my impatience

Answered neglectingly, I know not what--

He should, or he should not; for he made me mad

To see him shine so brisk, and smell so sweet,

And talk so like a waiting gentlewoman

Of guns, and drums and wounds. . . .

(51-56)

Other characters also attest to Hotspur's honor by their willingness to support him, for example, Sir Walter Blunt. The isocolon and antithesis in Blunt's supportive words reveal his respect for Harry Percy and his confidence that Hotspur will retract words spoken in the heat of a moment:

Whate'er Lord Harry Percy then had said
 To such a person, and in such a place,
 At such a time [isocolon], with all the rest
 retold,
 May reasonably die, and never rise [antithesis]
 To do him wrong, or any way impeach
 What then he said, so he unsay it now
 [antithesis].

(3.71-76)

In the same scene, epistrophe stresses Hotspur's passionate nature and reiterates his commitment to honor. When the king states that he will not "ransom home revolted Mortimer," Hotspur will not hold his tongue and allow Mortimer's character to be slandered. Instead, he boldly exhibits his anger and counters the king: "Revolted Mortimer?" (92-93). Shakespeare's antithesis in the same scene provides perhaps the clearest insight into Hotspur's character thus far. Although he may jeopardize his life, Hotspur must have a clear conscience. Within this antithesis is another insight: the ruling factor in Hotspur's life is passion, not reason. He will not send the prisoners to the king for the following reason: ". . . for I will ease my heart, / Albeit I make a hazard of my head" (127-128). Again in this scene, the figure of isocolon stresses Hotspur's obsession with honor as he declares the heights and depths to which honor can take one:

By heaven, methinks it were an easy leap
 To pluck bright honor from the pale-faced moon,
 Or dive into the bottom of the deep,
 Where fathom line could never touch the ground,
 And pluck up drowned honor by the locks. . . .

(201-205)

Even though Hotspur professes to hate flowery language, his emotions at times produce ornament without substance in his speech. Worcester's antithesis comments on Hotspur's figures: "He apprehends a world of figures here, / But not the form of what he should attend" (209-219). Hotspur's actions are guided by the old code of chivalry, part of which held that one on the side of right should antagonize a wrongful king. Shakespeare's epistrophe in scene 3 indicates that Hotspur upholds this part of the chivalric code and suggests Hotspur's vindictive nature:

He said he would not ransom Mortimer,
Forbade my tongue to speak of Mortimer,
 But I will find him when he lies asleep,
And in his ear I'll hollo 'Mortimer,'
Nay I'll have a starling shall be taught to speak
Nothing but 'Mortimer,' and give it him
 To keep his anger in motion.

(219-225)

Later in this scene isocolon alerts the audience to Hotspur's antipathy for Henry and Henry's vileness:

Why, look you, I am whipped and scourged with rods,
Nettled and stung with pismires when I hear
 Of this vile politician Bolingbroke.

(238-240)

In Act 1, with the aid of the figures, Shakespeare clearly develops the most important traits of Hotspur. The audience perceives him as bold, rash, and, above all, excessively concerned about honors--traits fostered by his passionate nature.

In Act 2, the rhetorical figures continue to emphasize and expand on the qualities of Hotspur introduced in Act 1. The isocolon used in the letter that Hotspur reads at the beginning of scene 3 emphasizes the danger in the rebels' plot:

The purpose you undertake is dangerous, the friends you have named uncertain, the time itself unsorted, and your whole plot too light [isocolon]
 for the counterpoise of so great an opposition.

(10-13)

The place in Hotspur's response to this letter focuses on his bravery and confidence:

By the Lord, our plot is a good plot as ever was laid; our friends true and constant; a good plot, good friends, and full of expectation; an

excellent plot, very good friends [plocce].

(15-18)

His sense of duty is also apparent as the plocce in the following lines of the same scene points out:

I must not have you henceforth question me

Whither I go, nor reason whereabouts.

Whither I must, I must, and to conclude,

This evening must I leave you, gentle Kate.

(99-101)

Although Hotspur's character is dominated by his ideas of honor, in this scene Shakespeare depicts him as a plausible character by noting his human qualities. We see, for instance, Hotspur's sense of humor in the following response to his wife's question. She asks, "What is it carries you away?" He answers, "Why, my horse, my love, my horse!" (72-73). In this scene, we better perceive his relationship with his wife as Shakespeare's antithesis and isocolon note that, although Hotspur must leave Kate, he cares enough for her that he will not remain separated from her: Hotspur promises, "Whither I go, thither shall you go too; / To-day will I set forth, to-morrow you" (110-111). The rhetorical figures in Act 2 help to expand the character of Hotspur.

In Act 3, Shakespeare elaborates on Hotspur's passionate nature. In scene 1, with his mind completely on the task at hand--the rebellion against Henry--Hotspur is abrupt, brusque, and irritated with Glendower.

Shakespeare's anaphora illustrates Hotspur's feelings for Glendower; when Glendower brags, "I say the earth did shake when I was born," Hotspur bluntly retorts, "And I say the earth was not of my mind . . ." (21-22). In other dialogue with Glendower in this scene, the antithesis in Hotspur's speech stresses his antipathy for Glendower's deceit and by contrast suggests Hotspur's honesty: "And I can teach thee, coz, to shame the devil-- / By telling truth. Tell truth and shame the devil" (58-59). Also in scene 1, the isocolon in the following lines illustrates Hotspur's dislike for and impatience with Glendower's trivial nature:

. . . Sometimes he angers me
 With telling me of the moldwarp and the ant,
Of the dreamer Merlin and his prophecies,
 And of a dragon and a finless fish,
A clip-winged griffin and a moulted raven,
A couching lion and a ramping cat,
 And such a deal of skimble-skamble stuff
 As puts me from my faith.

(146-153)

Later in scene 1, the antithesis in Worcester's speech highlights the virtues and the vices which result from Hotspur's passionate nature:

Though sometimes it shows greatness, courage,
blood --
 And that's the dearest grace it renders you--

Yet oftentimes it doth present harsh rage,
Defect of manners, want of government,
Pride, haughtiness, opinion, and disdain. . . .

(179-183)

Again in scene 1, antithesis emphasizes Hotspur's zeal when Glendower contrasts Mortimer and Hotspur as they prepare to confront the king: "Come, come, Lord Mortimer. You are as slow / As hot Lord Percy is on fire to go" (260-261).

In scene 2, the isocolon in the king's speech, pointing to the results of a fervent military devotion, highlights Hotspur's accomplishments:

He doth fill fields with harness in the realm,
Turns heads against the lion's armed jaws,

Leads ancient lords and reverend bishops on
To bloody battles and to bruising arms.

(101-105)

Hotspur's passionate pursuit of honor has earned him a highly regarded reputation, this time noted by isocolon near the end of scene 2 in the prince's speech:

And that shall be the day, whene'er it lights,
 That this same child of honor and renown,
This gallant Hotspur, this all-praised knight,
 And your unthought-of Harry chance to meet.

(138-141)

In Act 3, the audience becomes aware of Hotspur's impatience even to the point of harshness with his military peers. Also by the end of this act, the audience, seeing Hotspur's unfaltering zeal, views Hotspur as the symbol of chivalric honor.

The rhetorical figures further assist in developing Hotspur's character in the final two acts of the play, depicting him as consistent in honor. The audience's admiration for Hotspur, however, fades when Hotspur calculates his strategy in order to gain more glory for himself. Shakespeare's isocolon draws attention to Hotspur's lust for glory as he considers Northumberland's absence:

I rather of his absence make this use:
 It lends a lustre and more great opinion,
A larger dare to our great enterprise,
 Than if the earl were here. . . .

(4.1.76-79)

In the following example of anaphora at the end of this scene, Hotspur demonstrates his ultimate commitment to honor through his willingness to die: ". . . Doomsday is near. Die all, die merrily" (135).

Hotspur's perception is not clouded--he sees his military position clearly, as the following antithesis in his words in scene 3 points out: "His [King Henry's] is certain, ours is doubtful" (4). Hotspur is also perceptive

about people, specifically the king. Hotspur accepts and has faith in his military position because he is on the side of right. The following isocolon delineates the king's wrongs against Hotspur and justifies Hotspur's actions against Henry:

Disgraced me in my happy victories,
Sought to entrap me by intelligence;
Rated mine uncle from the council board;
 In rage dismissed my father from the court;
Broke oath on oath, committed wrong on wrong;
 And in conclusion drove us to seek out
This head of safety. . . .

(4.3.97-103)

In Act 5, Shakespeare continues to emphasize Hotspur's dominant quality of honor. In scene 1, the isocolon in the prince's speech describes Hotspur's chivalry:

I do not think a braver gentleman,
More active-valiant or more valiant-young,
More daring or more bold, is now alive. . . .

(89-91)

In scene 2, Worcester's isocolon suggests that his nephew's wrongdoings may be forgiven because of his passionate youth: "My nephew's trespass may well be forgot; / It hath the excuse of youth and heat of blood . . ." (16-17). Later in scene 2, antithesis, anadiplosis, and plocé provide more proof that Hotspur believes his actions

against the king are virtuous and that he will face death honorably:

O gentlemen, the time of life is short!

To spend that shortness basely were too long

[anithesis]

.

An if we live, we live to tread on kings

[anadiplosis];

If die, brave death, when princes die [ploce] with us!

(81-82, 85-86)

In scene 4, Shakespeare's antithesis in Hotspur's final speech points out the strength of Hotspur's pride even as he faces death:

I better brook the loss of brittle life

Than those proud titles thou hast won of me.

They wound my thoughts worse than thy sword my flesh.

(77-79)

The antithesis in Hotspur's final words, completed by Hal, reveals the irony of Hotspur's honorable rise and fall:

Hotspur: . . . No, Percy, thou art dust,

And food for

Prince: For worms, brave Percy.

(4.84-86)

Again in this passage, Shakespeare uses antithesis in the prince's speech to pay a final tribute to Hotspur's chivalrous spirit and honorable reputation; the irony, however, lies in the result of Hotspur's honor--his death:

When that this body did contain a spirit,
A kingdom for it was too small a bound;
 But now two paces of the vilest earth
Is room enough. This earth that bears thee dead
Bears not alive so stout a gentleman.

(87-92)

Throughout the play, Shakespeare portrays a consistent picture of Hotspur. Although not a one-dimensional character, Hotspur, above all else, exhibits a passion for honor. The rhetorical figures focus on this one trait more than any other, thus suggesting that Hotspur possesses an extreme of honor which is undesirable and unproductive. A study of Hotspur through an examination of the rhetorical figures simply confirms the critical consensus of opinion on this character.

Likewise, a study of the rhetorical figures in conjunction with Falstaff reveals a character corresponding to the critical view. In Act 1, scene 2, Shakespeare's combination of homoioteleuton, polysyndeton, and isocolon in Hal's speech introduces Falstaff's immorality and irresponsibility:

Thou art so fat-witted with drinking of old sack,

and unbuttoning thee after supper, and sleeping upon benches after noon [homoioteleuton and polysyndeton], that thou has forgotten to demand that truly which thou wouldst truly know. What a devil has thou to do with the time of the day? Unless hours were cups of sack, and minutes capons, and clocks the tongues of bawds, and dials the signs of leaping houses, and the blessed sun himself a fair hot wench in flame-colored taffeta, I see no reason why thou shouldst be so superfluous to demand the time of the day [isocolon and polysyndeton].

(2-11)

In the same scene, antithesis and polyptoton point out Falstaff's desire to retain Hal's support once Hal is king and also Falstaff's ability to disguise his criminality:

Marry, then, sweet wag, when thou art king,
let not us that are squires of the night's body be called thieves of the day's beauty [antithesis].

. . . and let men say we be men of good
government, being governed [polyptoton] as the sea is, by our noble and chaste mistress the moon, under whose countenance we steal.

(21-27)

This passage also illustrates Falstaff's ability to use

words to his own advantage, an ability which will be emphasized again and again throughout the play.

Later in this scene, the anaphora introduces Falstaff's practice of blaming others for his faults: "Before I knew thee, Hal, I knew nothing . . ." (87). The prince's sarcastic anthithesis in the following lines emphasizes Falstaff's corrupt nature: "I see a good amendment of life in thee--from praying to purse-taking" (2.96-97). The epistrophe in Falstaff's response to the above statement illustrates his talent for making wrong appear to be right: "Why, Hal, 'tis my vocation, Hal. 'Tis no sin for a man to labor in his vocation" (2.98-99). Near the end of this scene, the antithesis in Poin's speech highlights Falstaff's habit of lying:

The virtue of this jest will be the
incomprehensible lies that this same fat rogue
will tell us when we meet at supper. . . .

(174-176)

At the conclusion of Act 1, the figures have contributed to the development of Falstaff's character by emphasizing his vices, including drinking, lying, stealing, and irresponsibility. His only virtue at this point is his loyalty to Prince Hal.

In Act 2, the rhetorical figures continue to highlight Falstaff's undesirable traits. In scene 4, lines 108-147, the ploce using the word coward and Falstaff's insistence

that he is no coward cause the audience to suspect that Falstaff is, at least in some situations, cowardly indeed. In this same passage, Shakespeare's tapinosis alerts the audience to Falstaff's sense of humor:

[If] manhood, good manhood be not forgot upon the face of the earth, then am I a shotten herring.

(120-121)

Later in this scene, isocolon points to the exaggerated quality of Falstaff's lies:

I am eight times thrust through the doublet,
four through the hose; my buckler cut through and
through; my sword hacked like a handsaw. . . .

(157-159)

Falstaff exaggerates his lies for perhaps two reasons: he is having fun with them or, in looking out for himself, he is attempting to elevate himself; or perhaps he exaggerates for both of these reasons. The anaphora and tapinosis in the following lines again point out Falstaff's exaggeration:

All? I know not what you call all, but if I
fought not with fifty of them [anaphora], I am a
bunch of radish [tapinosis]. If there were not
two or three and fifty upon poor old Jack
[anaphora], then am I no two-legged creature
[tapinosis].

(4.175-178)

The isocolon in the prince's speech further stresses

Falstaff's shameful behavior and his physical grossness: He refers to Falstaff as "this sanguine coward, this bed-presser, this horseback-breaker, this huge hill of flesh--" (4.229-231). Again in this scene, Shakespeare's isocolon and antithesis stress Falstaff's habit of deceiving others and lying his way out of trouble: The prince asks:

What trick, what device, what starting hole
[isocolon] canst thou now find out to hide thee
from this open [antithesis] and apparent shame?

(249-251)

In this same scene, when Falstaff plays the part of the king and Hal plays himself, the anaphora in Falstaff's announcement to the prince emphasizes the crudeness and commonness of Falstaff: "This chair shall be my state, this dagger my sceptre, and this cushion my crown" (360-361). In the antithesis and chiasmus of the following lines, Falstaff as the king ironically speaks of his own virtues. The irony in the antithesis is that neither Falstaff nor his fruit is virtuous. These lines clearly point out his attempt to deceive others in regard to the truth about himself:

If that man should be lewdly given,
he deceiveth me; for Harry, I see virtue in his
looks [antithesis]. If then the tree may be known
by the fruit, as the fruit by the tree [chiasmus],
then, peremptorily I speak it, there is virtue in

that Falstaff.

(405-409)

Later in this scene, as the prince plays King Henry, the combination of isocolon and tapinosis focuses on the physical flaws of Falstaff:

[That] trunk of humors, that bolting hutch of beastliness, that swoll'n parcel of dropsies, that huge bombard of sack, that stuffed cloakbag of guts, that roasted Manningtree ox with the pudding in his belly. . . .

(427-431)

As this passage continues, Shakespeare's isocolon, highlighting Falstaff's character flaws and juxtaposed to Falstaff's physical flaws, suggests that Falstaff is flawed both inside and out:

. . . [That] reverend vice, that grey iniquity, that father ruffian, that vanity in years? Wherein is he good, but to taste sack and drink it? wherein neat and cleanly, but to carve a capon and eat it? wherein cunning, but in craft? wherein crafty, but in villainy? wherein villainous, but in all things? wherein worthy, but in nothing?

(431-436)

Also in this scene, anaphora and isocolon note two other character traits of Falstaff: he constantly rationalizes his

faults and defends himself against criticism. In addition, toward the end of the following passage, with the repetition of the word banish, there is a hint that Falstaff may feel insecure in his friendship with Hal, in spite of the confident liberties he takes while in Hal's presence. He may even fear that he will ultimately be removed from Hal's company:

If sack and sugar be a fault, God help the wicked!
If to be old and merry be a sin, then many
 an old host that I know is damned. If to be fat
be to be hated [anaphora], then Pharoah's lean
 kine are to be loved. No, my good lord: banish
Peto, banish Bardolph, banish Poins [anaphora];
 but for sweet Jack Falstaff, kind Jack Falstaff,
true Jack Falstaff, valiant Jack Falstaff, and
 therefore more valiant being, as he is, old Jack
Falstaff [isocolon], banish not him thy Harry's
company, banish not him thy Harry's company.
Banish plump Jack, and banish all the world!
 [anaphora]

(447-456)

Act 2, scene 4, ends with Falstaff once again attempting to elevate himself in the eyes of others. The following antithesis, spoken by Falstaff, ironically suggests that Falstaff is the counterfeit and not the gold: "Never call a true piece of gold a counterfeit" (467-468).

The rhetorical figures in Act 2 emphasize Falstaff's vices. His deception, thievery, and lewd behavior are all fostered by his dominant trait, self-interest. The figures do point out Falstaff's sense of humor, wit, and intelligence; unfortunately, he uses these potentially good qualities to further intensify his vices.

In Act 3, Shakespeare's rhetorical figures continue to highlight Falstaff's deceptive nature. In scene 3, for example, the anaphora emphasizes Falstaff's attempt to play on the sympathy of others:

Bardolph, am I not fall'n away vilely since
this last action? Do I not bate? Do I not
dwindle? Why, my skin hangs about me like an old
lady's loose gown!

(1-3)

In the following example of isocolon, Bardolph suggests that Falstaff has gone beyond reasonable limits in the consumption of food and drink, but the audience may conclude that Falstaff has also extended his actions beyond the limits of the law:

Why, you are so fat, Sir John, that you must
needs be out of all compass--out of all reasonable
compass, Sir John.

(3.19-21)

In the place found in Falstaff's response to Bardolph, the audience sees Falstaff's ability to turn his faults on

others: "Do thou amend thy face, and I'll amend my life" (22-23). In this scene, also, polysyndeton stresses Falstaff's habit of increasing his debts to the hostess, thereby revealing his irresponsibility:

You owe money here besides, Sir John, for your diet and by-drinkings, and money lent you four-and-twenty pound.

(69-71)

Later in scene 3, although Falstaff is being humorous, the irony underlying the antithesis and plocé may suggest again that Falstaff believes his position with Hal is insecure:

Why, Hal thou knowest, as thou art but man,
I dare; but as thou art prince [antithesis], I
fear thee as I fear [plocé] the roaring of the
lion's whelp.

(139-141)

Another example of antithesis in this scene emphasizes Falstaff's laziness. The prince tells Falstaff: "I have procured thee, Jack, a charge of foot." Falstaff replies: "I would it had been of horse" (178-179).

In Act 3, the figures help to reiterate the flaws in Falstaff's character by accenting his irresponsible, lazy qualities and by again focusing on his primary concern of self-interest.

The rhetorical figures in Act 4 highlight Falstaff as a soldier. In scene 2, isocolon and antithesis point out the

contrast between the type of soldiers Falstaff claims he tried to procure and those he actually has in his service:

I press me none but good householders, yeomen's sons; inquire me out contracted bachelors, such as had been asked twice on the banes--such a commodity of warm slaves as had as lieve hear the devil as a drums, such as fear the report of a caliver worse than a struck fowl or a hurt wild duck [isocolon]. I pressed me none but such toasts-and butter, with hearts in their bellies no bigger than pins' heads, and they have bought out their services; and now my whole charge consists of ancients, corporals, lieutenants, gentlemen of companies--slaves as ragged as Lazarus in the painted cloth where the glutton's dogs licked his sores; and such as indeed were never soldiers, but discarded unjust servingmen [antithesis]. . . .

(14-27)

In the same scene, when the prince notes how pitiful Falstaff's men are, Falstaff responds in a thoughtless and insensitive manner concerning the lives lost in war. The isocolon in Falstaff's reply highlights his harsh, unfeeling comment:

Tut! Tut! good enough to toss; food for powder, food for powder. They'll fill a pit as

well as better. Tush, man, mortal men, mortal men.

(62-64)

In Act 4, the figures aid in the development of Falstaff's character by presenting his irresponsibility and levity in war.

In the final act of the play, the rhetorical figures continue to emphasize Falstaff's qualities seen in the previous acts and bring to light his practical nature, which is void of any degree of honor and is contradictory to performing on the battlefield. In scene 1, Falstaff presents his catechism on honor. In this passage, Shakespeare's ploce, primarily using the words no and honor, and antithesis combine to reveal both Falstaff's practical nature and his total lack of honor:

Well, 'tis no matter; honor pricks me on. Yea, but how if honor pricks me off when I come on?
 [antithesis] How then? Can honor set a leg? No.
 Or an arm? No. Or take away the grief of a wound? No. Honor hath no skill in surgery then? No. What is honor? A word. What is that word honor? [ploce] Air--a trim reckoning! Who hath it? He that died a Wednesday. Doth he feel it? No. Doth he hear it? No [anaphora and ploce].
 'Tis insensible then? Yea, to the dead. But will it not live with the living? No [antithesis and

ploce]. Why? Detraction will not suffer it. Therefore I'll none of it. Honor [ploce] is a mere scutcheon--and so ends my catechism.

(129-139)

In scene 4, after Falstaff "rises from the dead," the ploce and antitheses point out his dominant traits: self-interest, practicality, power to rationalize, hypocrisy, and deprecation of honor:

Counterfeit? I lie; I am no counterfeit. To die is to be a counterfeit [ploce], for he is but the counterfeit of a man who hath not the life of a man [antithesis]; but to counterfeit dying when a man thereby liveth [antithesis], is to be no counterfeit, but the true and perfect image of life indeed [antithesis]. The better part of valor is discretion, in the which better part I have saved my life.

(113-119)

In the following lines of the same scene, the prince's words to Falstaff, which contain antithesis, make clear that Falstaff is indeed a counterfeit: "Thou art not what thou seem'st" (135). At the end of scene 4, in Falstaff's final speech of the play, he again demonstrates his self-interest. The ploce in the following lines emphasizes this self-interest once more, this time by pointing out Falstaff's

ulterior motive for following Hal: "I'll follow as they say, for reward. He that rewards me, God reward him" (158-159).

In regard to Falstaff's development, the rhetorical figures simply reiterate the qualities which the critics view in Falstaff. Even with his vices, Falstaff's wit provides laughter and wins for him the approval of the audience.

The figures also enhance the characterization of Prince Hal. Shakespeare presents Hal as an ambivalent character who possesses both Christian-like and Machiavellian traits. The rhetorical figures certainly draw attention to Hal's ambivalence. As we are introduced to Hal in Act 1, scene 2, we see a quick wit and a keen perception in the prince. When Falstaff tries to divert attention from his unlawful activities, the prince plays the game only to show that he is not being fooled. The anaphora in this dialogue between Falstaff and Hal reveals Hal's mental facility. Falstaff declares, ". . . [Is] not my hostess of the tavern a most sweet wench?" The prince replies, "As the honey of Hybla, my old lad of the castle--and is not a buff jerkin a most sweet robe of durance?" Falstaff retorts with, "What a plague have I to do with a buff jerkin?" And the prince quips, "Why, what a pox have I to do with my hostess of the tavern?" (37-40, 42-45). This dialogue also points out the prince's playful nature and sense of humor. Later in this scene, when Poinz discloses the trick he wants to play on

Falstaff by robbing him, the isocolon in Hal's response suggests that the prince is not criminal-minded, but very practical-minded:

Yea, but 'tis like that they will know us by our horses, by our habits, and by every other appointment, to be ourselves.

(163-165)

The final passage in scene 2, Hal's first soliloquy, lends itself to the Machiavellian view of the prince: anaphora, antithesis, isocolon, and polyptoton emphasize Hal's sense of expediency:

So, when this loose behavior I throw off
 And pay the debt I never promised,
By how much better than my word I am,
By so much shall I falsify men's hopes [anaphora];
 And, like bright metal on a sullen ground,
 My reformation, glitt'ring o'er my fault
 [antithesis],
 Shall show more goodly and attract more eyes
 [isocolon]
 Than that which hath no foil to set it off.
 I'll so offend to make offense [polyptoton] a
 skill,
Redeeming time when men think least I will
 [antithesis].

(196-205)

The above passage suggests that Hal has an offensive plan that he will execute at the appropriate time, making himself look all the better in men's eyes.

The rhetorical figures in Act 1 aid in the depiction of an intelligent, quick-witted, and humorous young prince; yet, the figures also emphasize Hal's practical, expedient nature.

In Act 2, scene 2, the antithesis and isocolon in Hal's comment to Poins again reflect Hal's sense of humor:

The thieves have bound the true men. Now could thou and I rob the thieves [antithesis] and go merrily to London, it would be argument for a week, laughter for a month, and a good jest for ever [isocolon].

(85-88)

As the prince speaks later in scene 4, isocolon and brachylogia highlight Hal's perceptive ability, especially in regard to Falstaff. Hal sees right through Falstaff's lies:

These lies are like their father that begets them --gross as a mountain, open, palpable [isocolon]. Why, thou clay-brained guts, thou knotty-pated fool, thou whoreson obscene greasy-tallow-catch-- [isocolon and brachylogia].

(214-217)

Hal's perception allows him consistently to question

Falstaff's lies; and in doing so, Hal deflates Falstaff's ego. Also in scene 4, the prince's isocolon emphasizes that Hal clearly recognizes Falstaff's vices. Hal refers to Falstaff as "[that] villainous abominable misleader of youth, Falstaff, that old white-bearded Satan" (439-440).

Until the last scene of this act, the prince has not been called upon to perform any serious action. He has simply been using his abilities to enjoy himself. The audience, consequently, sees the figures highlighting the prince's intellect and his easy-going nature.

When Hal meets with his father in scene 2 of Act 3, we learn through Henry's account of Hal's behavior that the prince is not as noble, arrogant, or aloof as his father would like for him to be. Because of the "vulgar" company that Hal has been keeping, the king considers him an irresponsible heir to the throne. The following examples of isocolon and antithesis in the king's speech stress the "unprincely" qualities of Prince Hal:

Could such inordinate and low desires,
Such poor, such bare, such lewd, such mean
attempts,
Such barren pleasures [isocolon], rude society,
 As thou art matched withal and grafted to,
Accompany the greatness of thy blood
 And hold their level with thy princely heart
 [antithesis]?

(12-17)

Another antithesis in this discussion between the king and his son, comparing Hotspur to Hal, points out the lack of concern or action Hal has exhibited in the interest of his country: In reference to Hotspur, the king states, "He hath more worthy interest to the state / Than thou, the shadow of succession . . ." (98-99). In the same scene, when the king hints that Hal is base enough to fight with the enemy against his own father, the epistrophe in Hal's reply suggests that Henry's opinion of his son is wrong. The prince urges, "Do not think so. You shall not find it so" (129). In scene 2, Hal begins to show his princely qualities when he announces that he, too, is honorable and will fight for his country. Shakespeare's polyptoton and antithesis in Hal's speech to his father highlight the prince's chivalric honor:

I will redeem all this on Percy's head
 And, in the closing of some glorious day,
 Be bold to tell you that I am your son,
 When I will wear a garment all of blood,
 And stain my favors in a bloody mask [polyptoton],

 . . . For the time will come
 That I shall make this northern youth exchange

His glorious deeds for my indignities

[antithesis].

(132-136, 144-146)

In scene 3, as Hal continues to point out Falstaff's faults, he reveals his own Christian-like principles by disapproving of Falstaff's vices. The following example of antithesis illustrates the contrast between Falstaff's vice and the prince's virtue. In regard to the Gadshill robbery, the prince states, "O my sweet beef, I must still be good angel to thee. The money is paid back again." Falstaff replies, "O, I do not like that paying back!" (169-171). Though still in the company of the taverners at the end of scene 3, Hal no longer exhibits irresponsibility, but is beginning to demonstrate his leadership ability. The figures in Hal's final speech in Act 3 emphasize his quality of leadership, his determination to uphold the honor of his country, and his recognition of the urgency of the military situation:

Go bear this letter to Lord John of Lancaster,
To my brother John; this to my Lord of
Westmoreland.

Go, Peto, to horse, to horse [isocolon]; for thou
 and I

Have thirty miles to ride yet ere dinner time.

Jack, meet me to-morrow in the Temple Hall

At two o'clock in the afternoon.

There shalt thou know thy charge, and there
receive

Money and order for their furniture [anaphora].

The land is burning; Percy stands on high;

And either we or they must lower lie [antithesis].

(186-195)

By the end of Act 3, the rhetorical figures have helped to reveal a transformation in the prince. Whether Hal is doing the right thing for the right reason as the Christian king, or whether he is doing the right thing for the wrong reason as the Machiavellian politician, the important fact is that he has reformed and will now demonstrate his honor, for whatever reason.

The new image of the prince is apparent in scene 1 of Act 4. First, Vernon, using isocolon, describes Hal as a military prince:

All furnished, all in arms;
All plumed like estridges that with the wind
Bated like eagles having lately bathed;
Glittering in golden coats like images,
As full of spirit as the month of May
And gorgeous as the sun at midsummer;
Wanton as youthful goats, wild as young bulls.

(97-103)

Then, in scene 2, Hal himself appears. In this scene his sense of humor remains intact, as the combination of

isocolon and tapinosis in his address to Falstaff stresses: "How now, blown Jack? How now, quilt?" (46)

In the character development of the prince, Act 4 serves to emphasize the reformed, yet not completely changed, Hal. The figures contribute to this emphasis.

In the beginning of Act 5, the military prince appears again, this time more valiant and more noble. In scene 1, Prince Hal nobly praises Hotspur and honorably offers himself in a single fight for his country. The use of isocolon highlights Hal's nobility and honor:

I do not think a braver gentleman,
More active-valiant or more valiant-young,
More daring or more bold, is now alive
 To grace this latter age with noble deeds.

 I am content that he shall take the odds
Of his great name and estimation,
 And will, to save the blood on either side,
Try fortune with him in a single fight.

(89-92, 97-100)

In scene 2, plocé, isocolon, and antithesis in Vernon's report to Hotspur reiterate Hal's virtues by pointing out his modesty and the respect he holds for Hotspur:

. . . I never in my life
 Did hear a challenge urged more modestly,
 Unless a brother should a brother [plocé] dare

To gentle exercise and proof of arms.
 He gave you all the duties of a man;
Trimmed up your praises with a princely tongue;
Spoke your deservings like a chronicle [isocolon];
 Making you ever better than his praise
 By still dispraising praise valued with you
 [antithesis]. . . .

(51-59)

The isocolon in scene 3 stresses that the prince no longer has time for witty repartee with Falstaff, but only time for commitment to honor and seriousness toward the military task. The prince questions Falstaff:

What, stand'st thou idle here? Lend me thy sword.
 Many a nobleman lies stark and stiff
 Under the hoofs of vaunting enemies,
 Whose deaths are yet unrevenged. I prithee
Lend me thou sword.

(39-43)

When Westmoreland offers help to Prince Hal in scene 4, Shakespeare's chiasmus points out Hal's physical strength and endurance. Westmoreland volunteers, "Come, my lord, I'll lead you to your tent." Hal replies, "Lead me, my lord? I do not need your help" (8-9). Later in this scene, when Hal speaks of John's duty to honor, isocolon emphasizes Hal's Christian virtues of love and respect for his fellow

man: "Before, I loved thee as a brother, John; / But now, I do respect thee as my soul" (18-19).

In scene 4, when the prince saves his father from Douglas, the antithesis in his words to Douglas emphasizes that Hal is indeed a man of his word: "It is the Prince of Wales that threatens thee, / Who never promiseth but he means to pay" (41-42). Later in the scene, as Prince Hal confronts Hotspur, antithesis points out that Hal is now showing complete confidence in himself and is no longer willing to share in the glory of honor with Hotspur:

I am the Prince of Wales, and think not, Percy,
To share with me in glory any more.

Two stars keep not their motion in one sphere,
Nor can one England brook a double reign
Of Harry Percy and the Prince of Wales.

(62-66)

As this passage continues, the antithesis highlights the prince's vow that he will supercede Hotspur's honor: "And all the budding honors on thy crest / I'll crop to make a garland for my head" (4.71-72). In this same scene, once Prince Hal has killed Hotspur, the antithesis in his final speech over Percy demonstrates Hal's virtue in praising his enemy even in death: ". . . This earth that bears thee dead / Bears not alive so stout a gentleman" (91-92).

In the final scene of the play, the anastrophe, isocolon and antithesis in the prince's words stress

Hal's humanity and recognition of valor, even in an enemy:

. . . At my tent

The Douglas is [anastrophe], and I beseech your
grace

I may dispose of him.

.

Go to the Douglas and deliver him

Up to his pleasure, ransomless and free
[isocolon].

His valors shown upon our crests today

Have taught us how to cherish such high deeds,

Even in the bosom of our adversaries [antithesis].

(22-24, 27-31)

The rhetorical figures in Act 5 help to depict a prince who represents the epitome of valor and honor and, at the same time, retains his human virtues.

From the beginning of the play until the end, the audience witnesses a dramatic change in the actions of the young prince. Hal progresses from a truant (in regard to his princely duties) to a gallant warrior upholding the honor of his country. At no time in the play does he relinquish his sense of humor or common sense. The rhetorical figures contribute to this development of Prince Hal's character by highlighting the virtues he possesses from start to finish and by emphasizing his reformation as a wayward heir to the throne.

Besides contributing to the development of the major characters, the figures also play a role in the development of the minor characters. An analysis of the figures as they relate to the two major groups of minor characters will reveal the general characteristics of those within each group.

The taverners share many of the same qualities. Falstaff's companions, for example, exhibit greed. In Act 1, scene 2, Poins seeks the support of the taverners in the Gadshill robbery and plays on their lust for money. Shakespeare's isocolon emphasizes what is to be gained by participating in the robbery:

There are pilgrims going to Canterbury with rich offerings, and traders riding to London with fat purses.

(117-119)

In Act 2, scene 1, we realize that the taverners are not only greedy, but have a reputation for lying and thievery. The antithesis in Gadshill's comment and the Chamberlain's response points out the taverners' reputation. Gadshill declares, "Give me thy hand. Thou shalt have a share in our purchase, as I am a true man." The Chamberlain answers, "Nay, rather let me have it, as you are a false thief" (88-91).

In scene 4, the prince reveals another common vice of the taverners. The antithesis in his remark, "Hot livers

and cold purses" (307), suggests that Bardolph spends all the money he has by overindulging in drink.

In Act 3, scene 3, Bardolph again reveals the lawlessness of the taverners when he agrees with Falstaff that the prince should rob the exchequer. The place in the dialogue stresses Bardolph's approval of Falstaff's idea. Falstaff suggests, "Rob me the exchequer the first thing thou doest, and do it with unwashed hands, too." Bardolph urges, "Do, my lord" (175-176).

Although the figures are used sparingly in connection with the taverners, who speak in prose (the figures are more common in verse than in prose), these few examples confirm that where the figures are used they do contribute to the overall impression of corruption and immorality in this group.

Likewise, an examination of the figures in relation to the rebels reveals that this group also is corrupt and lawless, in spite of the honor of some in the group. In Act 1, scene 3, anaphora and isocolon in Hotspur's speech disclose that Worcester and Northumberland share the responsibility of Richard's murder with Henry:

But shall it be that you, that set the crown
Upon the head of this forgetful man,
 And for his sake wear the detested blot
Of murderous subornation [anaphora and isocolon]--
Shall it be

That you a world of curses undergo [anaphora],
 Being agents or base second means,
The cords, the ladder, or the hangman rather?
 [isocolon]

(160-166)

In this scene, the rebels justify their rebellion by suggesting that their own lives are in danger. The ploc in Worcester's speech emphasizes this rationalization: "And 'tis no little reason bids us speed / To save our heads by raising of a head" (280-281). In Act 3, scene 1, Glendower's use of anaphora illustrates that he, like Hotspur, is vain:

. . . At my nativity
The front of heaven was full of fiery shapes
Of burning cressets, and at my birth
The frame and huge foundation of the earth
Shaked like a coward.

(13-17)

Later, in Act 4, scene 1, the isocolon in Worcester's speech focuses on his concern for the rebel cause and his anxiety in regard to the effects of Northumberland's absence on the rebellion:

. . . It will be thought
 By some that know not why he is away,
 That wisdom, loyalty, and mere dislike
 Of our proceedings kept the earl from hence.

And think how such an apprehension
 May turn the tide of fearful faction
 And breed a kind of question in our cause.

(62-68)

Finally, in Act 5, scene 1, anaphora and isocolon in the king's speech point out that the rebels have deceived the king and created the war situation which now exists:

. . . You have deceived our trust
 And made us doff our easy robes of peace
 [isocolon]
 To crush our old limbs in ungentle steel.
This is not well, my lord; this is not well
 [anaphora].

(11-14)

Later in this scene, in the king's speech, isocolon again notes how the rebels played upon the weak and stirred up the rebellion, an action considered a sin in the Tudor Doctrine:

These things, indeed, you have articulate,
Proclaimed at market crosses, read in churches,
 To face the garment of rebellion
 With some fine color that may please the eye
 Of fickle changelings and poor discontented,
 Which gape and rub the elbow at the news
 Of hurlyburly innovation.

(72-78)

Because the rebels themselves are politically astute enough

to know that other politicians will lie, they do not expect the king to keep his promise to them. The anaphora in the following lines spoken by Worcester in Act 5, scene 2, provides evidence of this political insight: "It is not possible, it cannot be, / The king should keep his word in loving us" (4-5). Not only have these rebels broken with Tudor Doctrine, in the sense that they have rebelled against their king, but Worcester indicates that they must take the responsibility for Hotspur's actions against the king. In scene 2, the antithesis stresses Worcester's sense of blame:

All his offenses live upon my head
 And on his father's. We did train him on;
 And, his corruption being ta'en from us,
 We, as the spring of all, shall pay for all.

(20-23)

In this same scene, isocolon and polyptoton emphasize Worcester's lies as he refuses to tell Hotspur the truth about the king's peaceful offer:

I told him gently of our grievances,
 Of his oath-breaking [isocolon], which he mended
 thus,
 By now forswearing that he is forsworn
 [polyptoton].
 He calls us rebels, traitors [isocolon]. . . .

(36-39)

In the end, the rebels do pay for their rebellion against the king. As in the case of the taverners, the rhetorical figures highlight the lack of moral integrity in the characters of this group.

CHAPTER V

THEMES AND RHETORICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Thus far, I have examined the contributions of the figures to the development of the play's action and its characters, both major and minor. All of the elements of a drama, however, would be insignificant without the emergence of meaning through the elements. A study of the rhetorical figures as they contribute to meaning in the play reveals that the figures also emphasize the major themes of I Henry IV.

One of the major themes of the play is rebellion and its consequences. In Act 1, scene 1, the antithesis introduces the theme of rebellion by revealing the civil disorder it has caused and the hope that the country can now come together:

. . . Those opposed eyes
Which, like the meteors of a troubled heaven,
All of one nature, of one substance bred,
Did lately meet in the intestine shock
And furious close of civil butchery,
Shall now in mutual well-beseeming ranks
March all one way and be no more opposed

Against acquaintance, kindred, and allies.

(9-16)

The characterization of the rebels further emphasizes the theme of rebellion. In Act 1, scene 3, the anaphora and isocolon in Hotspur's speech point out the plight of those who rebel:

But shall it be that you, that set the crown
Upon the head of this forgetful man,
 And for his sake wear the detested blot
Of murderous subornation [anaphora and isocolon]--
 shall it be
That you a world of curses undergo [anaphora].

(160-164)

According to Tudor Doctrine, the rebel will be punished by God.

In Act 5, scene 1, the isocolon and anaphora in the king's speech stress the deceit and brutality which result from rebellion, and express the need for rebellious action to stop:

. . . You have deceived our trust
 And made us doff [isocolon] our easy robes of
 peace
 To crush our old limbs in ungentle steel.
This is not well, my lord; this is not well
 [anaphora].

.

And be no more an exhaled meteor,
 A prodigy of fear, and a portent
Of broached mischief [isocolon] to the unborn
 times?

(11-14, 19-21)

In this same scene, the place in the dialogue between Worcester and the king stresses that rebellion does not just happen, but must be actively sought by someone: Worcester insists, "I have not sought the day of this dislike." The king retorts, "You have not sought it! How comes it then?" (26-27). Later in this scene (in lines 72-78 which previously noted how the rebels preyed upon the weak) the isocolon in the king's speech also emphasizes the ease with which rebellion is stirred. The final reference to rebellion comes in Act 5, scene 5. The antithesis in the king's last speech reflects Tudor Doctrine as the king notes that the rebellion has been effectively put down: "Rebellion in this land shall lose his sway, / Meeting the check of such another day . . ." (41-42). In Tudor Doctrine, rebellion would always be checked because it usurped the divine right of God's chosen ruler.

In contributing to the theme of rebellion, the rhetorical figures in I Henry IV help to highlight the lack of integrity which accompanies rebellion. The figures also point out the unrest in the state which is caused by rebellion and the unrest in the individual who

rebels. According to Shakespeare, the consequences of rebellion are costly.

Similarly, the figures help to emphasize the theme of immorality. This theme emerges primarily through the element of characterization, as this paper's discussion on the figures' contribution to character will support. In the court, the king, for example, demonstrates corruption and immorality. In Act 4, scene 3, the isocolon in Hotspur's speech highlights Henry's wrongful acts:

In short time after, he deposed the king;
 Soon after that deprived him of his life;
 And in the neck of that tasked the whole state;

Disgraced me in my happy victories,
Sought to entrap me by intelligence;
Rated mine uncle from the council board;
 In rage dismissed my father from the court;
Broke oath on oath, committed wrong on wrong.
 . . .

(90-92, 97-101)

As noted in the discussion of the rebels' characterization and in the discussion of the rebellion theme, the figures highlight the corrupt natures of other members of court, the rebels. They are politically corrupt because they have aided the king in his immoral act of gaining the throne. They are also immoral under the Christian principles of the

Tudor Doctrine because, as king, Henry should be followed at all costs.

The figures also note the corruption of the tavern world. This study has shown that the figures emphasize Falstaff's vices. In Act 2, scene 4, for example, the isocolon in Hal's speech vividly depicts Falstaff as the picture of evil: "That villainous abominable misleader of youth, Falstaff, that old white-bearded Satan" (439-440). The figures point out that the other taverners demonstrate immorality similar to that of Falstaff. The antithesis, for instance, in the dialogue between Gadshill and Chamberlain in Act 2, scene 1, is significant in summing up the character of the taverners. Gadshill comments, "Give me thy hand. Thou shalt have a share in our purchase, as I am a true man." Chamberlain responds, "Nay, rather let me have it, as you are a false thief" (88-91). In emphasizing dominant qualities in the characters of court and tavern, the rhetorical figures contribute to the corruption/immorality theme.

In addition to the themes of rebellion and corruption/immorality, the play also addresses the issue of a Christian or Machiavellian king. The analysis of the figures highlights both Christian-like principles and Machiavellian traits in the prince's actions and speech. The most significant example appears in Hal's first soliloquy at the end of Act 1, scene 2. Shakespeare's isocolon, polyptoton,

and antithesis stress Hal's Machiavellian strategies:

And, like bright metal on a sullen ground
 [antithesis],
 My reformation, glitt'ring o'er my fault
 [antithesis],
 Shall show more goodly and attract more eyes
 [isocolon]
 Than that which hath no foil to set it on.
 I'll so offend to make offense [polyptoton] a
 skill,
Redeeming time when men think least I will
 [antithesis].

(200-205)

Likewise, the figures note Hal's seeming Christian virtues; for example, he is genuine and honest with his father in regard to his commitment to the state. He also praises virtue in others, for instance, in his enemy even after Hotspur is dead. In the final scene of the play, Hal's use of anastrophe and his action that follows reveal compassion for Douglas. The inversion draws the reader's attention to Douglas's fate being in Hal's hands:

. . . At my tent
The Douglas is, and I beseech your grace
 I may dispose of him.

(22-24)

Hal, however, does not dispose of Douglas's life, but humanely sets him free.

Whether Shakespeare in this drama is promoting one type of rule over the other, one cannot say. The playwright may instead be suggesting a compromise between the two types. All we can say for sure is that I Henry IV traces the beginning development of a ruler who exhibits both Christian-like and Machiavellian qualities and who becomes an extremely successful ruler in the succeeding plays, 2 Henry IV and Henry V. In highlighting both Christian and Machiavellian traits in Prince Hal, the rhetorical figures contribute to the play as a study in kingship.

The most important and specific theme in I Henry IV, however, deals with honor. This theme, like the themes of corruption/immorality and a study of kingship, develops through the element of characterization, primarily through the development of Henry, Hotspur, Falstaff, and Hal; the theme also emerges in the development of minor characters. The figures emphasize the qualities of honor in all of the characters. In the case of the king, as pointed out in the discussion of characterization, the figures accent the dishonor he exhibited in gaining the throne. In the character of Hotspur, in Act 1, scene 1, the anadiplosis in the king's words depicts Hotspur as a son who is the epitome of honor, "the theme of honor's tongue" (81). Throughout the development of Hotspur's character, the figures focus on

his honor more than on any other quality, suggesting an excess of honor. In contrast, from beginning to end, the figures note the absence of honor in Falstaff. He displays no honor in any area of his life, and certainly not on the battlefield. In Falstaff's catechism on honor in Act 5, scene 1, the ploce, using the two words no and honor, most clearly illustrates Falstaff's total lack of honor (129-139). In the minor characters, also, the figures draw attention to the theme of honor. The epistrophe in Worcester's speech, for example, notes the dishonor on the part of himself and the other rebels when he confesses, "We, as the spring of all, shall pay for all" (5.2.23). In presenting examples of dishonor, excessive honor, and no honor Shakespeare clearly focuses on his major theme.

Shakespeare does not, however, stop at revealing undesirable types of honor. Instead he continues to develop the theme by portraying Prince Hal as a symbol of the concept of honor. The figures' part in emphasizing the expedient honor of Hal helps the audience to understand that Hal's realistic view of honor is more virtuous and productive than that of any other character in the play. We see the virtue in the prince's honor especially in the final act of the play when on the battlefield--as he saves his father's life--the antithesis accents Hal's honor: "It is the Prince of Wales that threatens thee, / Who never promiseth but he means to pay" (4.41-42). Again in scene 4

of Act 5, the antithesis in the prince's speech over the body of Hotspur clearly reveals Hal's honor as he pays tribute to his enemy: ". . . This earth that bears thee dead / Bears not alive so stout a gentleman" (91-92).

Shakespeare's rhetorical figures highlight the honor of Prince Hal and thereby contribute to the play's greatest statement of meaning.

This study reveals that the rhetorical figures contribute to Shakespeare's complex and effective style, while at the same time they enhance the play's action, characters, and themes. Of the figures used, Shakespeare employs those of repetition and structure more than the other types. The repetition figures, as the term implies, function to repeat significant points. The structural figures create a fluent style, which enhances meaning by contributing to clarity. Of the structural figures used, Shakespeare uses isocolon more than any other. In many cases, isocolon repeats as well as adds fluency.

In some passages of I Henry IV, the rhetorical figures alone convey the message of the context. They do not impede understanding, but instead reiterate and clarify. In most passages, however, the figures are only part of the whole, only one technique of Shakespeare's complex style, used in conjunction with the other artistic elements to create a literary work rich in meaning. This study not only confirms the preponderance of the rhetorical figures in I Henry IV,

but it also illuminates the figures' role in enhancing other dramatic elements of Shakespeare's style.

WORKS CITED

- Alexander, Franz. "A Note on Falstaff." Henry The Fourth, Part 1. By William Shakespeare. Ed. James L. Sanderson. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1962. 269.
- Baldwin, T. W. William Shakspeare's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke. Vol. 2. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1944. 2 vols.
- Boas, Frederick. S. Shakespeare and his Predecessors. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904.
- Bond, R. Warwik, M. A. The Complete Works of John Lyly. Vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1802.
- Bradley, A. C. "The Rejection of Falstaff." Henry The Fourth, Part 1. By William Shakespeare. Ed. James L. Sanderson. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1962. 256-259.
- Brooks, Cleanth, and Robert B. Heilman. "Dramatic Balance in Henry IV, Part 1." Henry The Fourth, Part 1. By William Shakespeare. Ed. James L. Sanderson. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1962. 158-172.
- Burnet, John. ed. The Ethics of Aristotle. New York: Arno Press, 1973.
- Butler, H. E., M. A. The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian. 4 vols. London: William Heinemann, 1922.

- Campbell, Lily B. Shakespeare's "Histories": Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy. San Marino, California: The Huntington Library, 1958.
- Charlton, H. B. Shakespeare Politics and Politicians. Great Britain: The English Association, 1929.
- Clark, D. L. Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance. New York: Columbia University Press, 1922.
- Corbett, Edward P. J. Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Crane, Milton. "The Worlds of Prose and Verse in Henry IV, Part 1." Henry The Fourth, Part 1. By William Shakespeare. Ed. James L. Sanderson. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1962. 247-252.
- Danby, John F. Shakespeare's Doctrine of Nature: A Study of King Lear. London: Faber and Faber, 1949.
- Dodds, E. R. Plato: Gorgias. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959.
- Doran, Madeleine. "Imagery in Richard II and in Henry IV." Henry The Fourth, Part 1. By William Shakespeare. Ed. James L. Sanderson. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1962. 235-246.
- Dowden, Edward, LL.D. Shakespere: A Critical Study Of His Mind and Art. London: Routledge, and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1962.
- Drake, Nathan, M. D. Shakespeare and His Times. Paris: Baudry's European Library, 1838.

- Ellis-Fermor, Una. The Frontiers of Drama. London: Methuen and Company, Ltd., 1945.
- Empson, William. Some Versions of Pastoral. Norfolk, Connecticut: New Directions Book, 1935.
- Evans, Ifor. The Language of Shakespeare's Plays. London: Methuen and Company, Ltd., 1952.
- Fraunce, Abraham. The Arcadian Rhetoric. Menston, England: The Scolar Press Limited, 1969.
- Gauss, Christian. Introduction. The Prince. By Niccoli Machiavelli. Trans. Luigi Ricci. New York: The New American Library, 1952.
- Goddard, Harold C. The Meaning of Shakespeare. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.
- Grimaldi, S. J. William M. A. Aristotle, Rhetoric I: A Commentary. New York: Fordham University Press, 1980.
- Harbage, Alfred, ed. William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, 1969.
- Himelick, Raymond. Samuel Daniel's Musophilus. West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University Studies, 1965.
- Hobbs, Thomas. Aristotle's Treatise on Rhetoric: An Analysis of Rhetoric. Oxford: D. A. Talboys, 1833.
- Hubbell, H. M. Cicero: De Inventione. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960.
- Hunter, William B. Jr. "Prince Hal, His Struggle Toward Moral Perfection." Henry The Fourth, Part 1. By William Shakespeare. Ed. James L. Sanderson. New

- York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1962. 172-182.
- Johnson, Samuel. "The Inimitable Falstaff." Henry The Fourth, Part 1. By William Shakespeare. Ed. James L. Sanderson. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1962. 253.
- Knights, L. C. "Henry IV as Satire." Henry The Fourth, Part 1. By William Shakespeare. Ed. James L. Sanderson. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1962. 152-157.
- Machiavelli, Niccoli. The Prince. Trans. Luigi Ricci. With introduction by Christian Gauss. New York: The New American Library, 1952.
- Mitchell, Giles and Eugene Wright. "Hotspur's Poor Memory." The South Central Bulletin. Winter (1983): 121-123.
- Murphy, James Jerome. Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.
- . Three Medieval Rhetorical Arts. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971.
- Nicoll, Allardyce. Shakespeare. London: Methuen and Company, Ltd., 1961.
- Peacham, Henry. The Garden of Eloquence. Menston, England: The Scholar Press Limited, 1971.
- Puttenham, George. The Arte of English Poesie. Menston, England: The Scholar Press Limited, 1968.

- Ribner, Irving. The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1957.
- Robertson, D. W. , Jr. Saint Augustine: On Christian Doctrine. New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1958.
- Shaaber, M. A. "The Unity of Henry IV." Henry The Fourth, Part 1. By William Shakespeare. Ed. James L. Sanderson. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1962. 224-234.
- Shaw, G. B. Henry IV. Dramatic Opinions and Essays. Vol. 1. New York: Brentano's, 1909. 423-434.
- Spurgeon, Caroline F. E. Shakespeare's Imagery And What It Tells Us. Cambridge: University Press, 1968.
- Thompson, A. Hamilton. Bede: His Life, Times, and Writings. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1935.
- Thompson, W. H. The Phaedrus of Plato. New York: Arno Press, 1973.
- Tillyard, E. M. W. "On the Structure of Henry IV." Henry The Fourth, Part 1. By William Shakespeare. Ed. James L. Sanderson. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1962. 221-223.
- Traversi, D. A. "Henry IV, Part 1: History and the Artist's Vision." Henry The Fourth, Part 1. By William Shakespeare. Ed. James L. Sanderson. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1962. 137-152.
- Vickers, Brian. Classical Rhetoric in English Poetry.

- London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1970.
- . The Artistry of Shakespeare's Prose. London: Methuen & Company, Ltd., 1968.
- Wilson, J. Dover. "Falstaff and the Plan of Henry IV, Part 1." Henry The Fourth, Part 1. By William Shakespeare. Ed. James L. Sanderson. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1962. 182-203.
- Wright, Eugene Patrick. "Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama." Critical Survey of Drama. Salem: Salem Press, 1985.
- . "Hal and Francis in King Henry IV, Part 1: Another View." McNeese Review, XXII (1976): 62-69.
- . Thomas Deloney. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1981.
- Zeeveld, W. Gordon. "Food for Powder -- 'Food for Worms.'" Shakespeare Quarterly, III (1952): 249-253.