UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE - FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA

ÚSTAV ANGLOFONNÍCH LITERATUR A KULTUR

Political Rhetoric in Shakespeare's Drama

MAGISTERSKÁ PRÁCE

Vedoucí magisterské práce (supervisor):

Mgr. Helena Znojemská, Ph.D.

Zpracoval/a (author):

Bc. Anna Malá

studijní obor (subject/s):

Anglická Filologie

Praha, srpen 2019

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto magisterskou práci vypracoval/a samostatně, že jsem řádně citoval/a všechny použité prameny a literaturu a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného či stejného titulu.

V Praze dne .....

I declare that the following MA thesis is my own work for which I used only the sources and literature mentioned, and that this thesis has not been used in the course of other university studies or in order to acquire the same or another type of diploma.

Prague, date .....

Poděkování:

Chtěla bych tímto poděkovat vedoucí mé magisterské práce Mgr. Heleně Znojemské, Ph.D. za dobré rady, trpělivost a zejména čas, který mi věnovala. Zároveň děkuji prof. PhDr. Martinu Procházkovi, CSc. za podnětné připomínky a děkuji prof. PhDr. Martinu Hilskému, CSc. za inspiraci, díky které tato práce vznikla. Mé poděkování patří také mé rodině, zejména mému manželovi a mé mamince za jejich trpělivost a nekončící podporu.

Abstract

This thesis focuses on political rhetoric in William Shakespeare's plays. It approaches History plays, Roman plays, and Tragedies in order to compare whether the rhetoric used differs among the genre in connection to the state system which it presents - Republic or Monarchy, with the intention to describe the difference. The main criteria for this description are the imagery and rhetorical strategies used in specific situation both by the ruler and by some of the subjects concerning the ruler.

Abstrakt

Tato magisterská práce se soustředí na politickou rétoriku ve hrách Williama Shakespeara. Porovnává historické hry, římské hry a tragédie za účelem analýzy rétoriky a identifikace jejích rozdílů a jejich případného spojení s vyobrazeným státním systémem - republika nebo monarchie, a jejich rozboru. Hlavním kritériem pro tento rozbor je obrazotvornost a rétorické strategie použité ve specifických situacích vladařem nebo jeho poddanými ve vztahu k vladaři.

Table of Contents

Introduction

> "Cicero, father of the latin eloquence, calleth an historie the witnesse of tymes, maistres of life, the lyfe of remembrance, of trouthe the lyght, and messager of antiquite."[1] From the words of sixteenth century English philosopher Sir Thomas Eliot it is evident that the Elizabethans respected and valued history and its wisdom as much as the teachings of the philosophers of Classical antiquity. Even though his words were written before the playwright's birth Sir Eliot seems to have predicted William Shakespeare's great work of Histories and Roman plays: "he that is perfectly instructed in portrayture, and hapneth to rede any noble and excellent historie, wherby his courage is inflamed to the imitation of vertue, he forth with taketh his penne or pensill, and with a graue and substanciall studie, gatherynge to him all the partes of imagination, endeuoureth him selfe to expresse liuely, and (as I mought say) actually, in portrayture, nat only the faict or affaire, but also the sondry affections of euery personage in the historie recited, whiche, mought in any wise appiere or be perceiued in their visage, countenance or gesture."[2]

It seems clear that William Shakespeare would have sufficient resources to depict the society of Rome of over millennia ago, as well as that of England and Europe of the preceding centuries. The sources for his works are well known, and also strongly influenced by the current cultural and political situation in Elizabethan England, from Tacitus, Livy, and also Plutarch (and his *Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans*) for his Roman plays to a much more common works like the histories of Edward Hall or Holinshed, and even Thomas Moore's *History of Richard III.* In Tudor England, as Goy-Blanquet explains, historiography became a national pastime, because of the "Tudor thirst for respectability."[3] History as a genre would have been very popular, and as Ivo Kamps claims "read for moral edification" in Elizabethan England as well as old Greek and

[1] Sir Thomas Elyot,"Book I", *The Booke Named The Governor*, London: Renaissance Editions 1998, p5
[2] Sir Thomas Elyot,"Book I", *The Booke Named The Governor*, London: Renaissance Editions 1998, p29
[3] Dominique Goy-Blanquet, "Elizabethan Historiography and Shakespeare's sources", ", *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History plays, Michael Hattaway e.d.*, Cambridge:Cambridge University Press, 2002 p111

Roman authors, offering Shakespeare not only the material but also an interested audience for which produce both historical and antique stories and their rhetoric.

The audience of Shakespearean theatre was largely well acquainted with classical rhetoric due to the education system of Early Modern England. Anyone in the audience who had at least Grammar School education, which was common for all the male children of middle and lower middle classes, would from today's point of view be extremely well versed in Latin rhetoric and literature, or even as Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor state, probably have an even better knowledge of it "than most present-day holders of university degree in classics."[4] The study material of Tudor England, which has been preserved, consisted largely of Latin texts, from which Shakespeare and his contemporaries, as Bill Bryson claims, "would have learned every possible rhetorical device and play – metaphor and anaphora, epistrophe and hyperbole, synecdoche, epinanalepsis and others equally arcane and taxing."[5] With the texts themselves being studied, and their translations (particularly Sir Thomas North's translation of Plutarch) being common, the audience would probably be capable of enjoying Shakespeare's elaborate work with language, and notice a possible attempt at representing the rhetoric of old Rome in his Roman plays compared to his version of the kings of a closer history, a possible differentiation between monarchy and republic.

The skill of rhetoric was valued and ever-present, as the opening words from William Puttenham's book *The Arte of English Poesie* exemplify and explain in great detail:

> "For to say truely, what els is man but his minde? which, whosoeuer haue skil to compasse, and make yeelding and flexible, what may not he commaund the body to perfourme? He therefore that hath vanquished the minde of man, hath made the greatest and most glorious conquest. … Therefore the well tuning of your words and clauses to the delight of the eare, maketh your information no lesse plausible to the minde than to the eare: no though you filled them with neuer so much sence and sententiousnes. Then also must the whole tale (if it tende to perswasion) beare his iust and reasonable measure, being rather with the largest, than with the scarcest. For like as one or two drops of water perce not the flint

[4] Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor (eds), *The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works,* (Oxford:Claredon Press, 1994)
[5] Bill Bryson, *Shakespeare*, (London: William Collins, 2007), p38

> stone, but many and often droppings doo: so cannot a few words (be they neuer so pithie or sententious) in all cases and to all manner of mindes, make so deepe an impression, as a more multitude of words to the purpose discreetely, and without superfluitie vttered: the minde being no lesse vanquished with large loade of speech, than the limmes are with heauie burden. Sweetenes of speech, sentence, and amplification, are therfore necessarie to an excellent Orator and Poet, ne may in no wise be spared from any of them."[6]

In shorter words of Peter Mack, "Rhetorical training provided Elizabethans with ways to use their classical reading to construct arguments in practical life", which "achieved practical goals and advanced carreers."[7]

William Shakespeare was born and lived in a monarchy, and the importance of the figure of a monarch was rather important for the daily life of the people. This would be even more prominent than in the previous centuries mostly due to the religious Reformation initiated by Henry VIII, which brought on the end of monasteries which would aid common people and especially destitute people, and even more directly by the introduction of *The book of Common Prayer*. This compulsory religious text had been enforced in 1549 by Henry VIII, banned by his daughter Mary I, and re-enforced in 1559 by Elizabeth I, each time with changes and additions even to the main text of prayers, as is evident from James A. Deveraux's paper on the Book of Common Prayer.[8] These are examples of a centralising monarchic power, but Elizabethan England had also many aspects of republic embedded into its structure. Primarily, there was of course the parliament, limiting the power of the monarch, but the common people had a relatively more democratic say in their local affairs as well. This is clear from the usage of the word 'Commonwealth', as defined by Sir Thomas Smith in his work *De Republica Anglorum* (1583) "a common wealth is called a society or common doing of a multitude of free men collected together and united by common accord and coveanauntes among themselves, for the conservation of themselves as well in peace as in war" [9] This definition of the state of England, in this

---

[6] George Puttenham, *Arte of English Poesie,* (London, 1589)
[7] Peter Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric:Theory and Practice*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009) p105
[8] Devereux, James A. "Reformed Doctrine in the Collects of the First 'Book of Common Prayer.'" *The Harvard Theological Review*, vol. 58, no. 1, (1965), pp. 49–68
[9] Sir Thomas Smith, De republica anglarum: the maner of gouernement or policie of the realme of England (London, 1583), p.10

particular meaning, was by 1800 widely accepted and supported by other authors, and the meaning of the word was understood as synonymous to the term 'Res publicas' or the Republic, as is stated in a paper by the Early Modern Research Group.[10] The commonwealth society consisted of small self-governing societal units under the rule of noblemen and the monarchy. As the Early Modern Research Grou explains, "rulers of a commonwealth included those who were also subjects; there was what he called a 'fourth sort', the local office holders, who created an 'unacknowledged republic' of self-governing free men within a monarchical and aristocratic framework, the mixed state that Smith championed."[11] These self-governing men would create the backbone of daily life for the common people. William Shakespeare was therefore well used to the customs associated with both monarchy and republic in his own daily life.

This thesis will focus primarily on the analysis of the possible differences in political rhetoric between the representations of monarchies and republic in Shakespeare's work. The attention will be divided between the rhetorical strategies, concepts, and techniques. The first chapter is concerned with strategies of persuasion; both pointed at the in-play audience, and aimed at the ruler themselves. In this context public speeches of rulers will be evaluated as well as the speeches of their advisors towards them.

Because of its frequent use, particularly in both the Roman plays and the Tragedies, the body of the ruler and its representation will be discussed as well as that of the body politic. A specific focus will be placed upon speeches commenting on the body of the ruler, because they present criteria and values imposed on the person of a ruler by their society, advisors, and subjects; and body politic describing the perceived structure and function of the society. The body politic is crucial because of the contemporary understanding of the functioning of a realm, since, as Thomas Elyot wrote in his preface eto his 1531 *The Booke Named The Governor*, "a publik weale is a body lyuyng, compacte or made of sondry astates and degrees of men, whiche is disposed by the ordre of equite and gouerned by the rule and moderation of reason."[12] The common wealth was then also identified with the body politic at least in a manner of description of its inner function. This part of the work

[10] Early Modern Research Group, "Commonwealth: the Social, Cultural, and Conceptual Contexts of an Early Modern Keyword", The Historical Journal, vol. 54, no. 3, 2011, pp. 659–687.p660
[11] Early Modern Research Group, "Commonwealth: the Social, Cultural, and Conceptual Contexts of an Early Modern Keyword"." The Historical Journal, vol. 54, no. 3, 2011, pp. 659–687.p661
[12] Sir Thomas Elyot,"Book I", *The Booke Named The Governor*, London: Renaissance Editions 1998, p5

should theoretically show both different approaches in the two depicted societies as well as different imagery.

To showcase the previously identified differences and similarities, and to approach the oration techniques, the last and most pivotal focus will be the public speeches of rulers, and battle speeches. Both the public and battle speech in themselves combine all of the motifs, structures and strategies listed above, and present the approach of the ruler towards his people.

Art of Persuasion

In this chapter, I would like to look closely at strategies of political persuasion used in Historical plays, Tragedies, and Roman plays. In political situations, the art of persuasion is used by characters of political power, monarchs, rulers, and military leaders, to persuade and manipulate characters of lower positions, as well as by characters of subordinate position to persuade those above them. It seems that power and responsibility play a rather complex role in the art of persuasion, not only when the character is demonstrating their power in order to subdue another or to scare another character, but also when a character shifts that responsibility to another person or an entity, whether the responsibility is positive, and is used in a strategy similar to bribing or flattery, or whether they shift their responsibility in a negative form, equalling more to a blame, or by creating a whole new figure of authority in the act of creating a standard for other characters to follow. In each scenario the effect of the persuading speeches are focused on the, more or less admitted, use of pathos and ethos. When looking at William Shakespeare's plays, I have identified three main strategies of political persuasion used by the characters – the strategy of shifting responsibility, the strategy of shifting power, and the strategy of setting a standard. In the subchapters I would like to look closely at these rhetoric strategies.

Strategy of shifting responsibility

One prominent strategy used mostly by characters in a position of power, rulers, monarchs or leaders, is the one of shifting responsibility and power. This strategy seems to resonate strongly with the manner in which responsibility is often portrayed by these characters as a heavy burden which brings little rewards. This seems to be the case especially for the characters of kings in Shakespeare's histories. Richard II speaks of the crown as of a burden already before his abdication scene, when in the second scene of the third act he finds his situation desperate; he speaks of the death of kings and claims that:

> …some have been deposed; some slain in war,
> Some haunted by the ghosts they have deposed;
> Some poison'd by their wives: some sleeping kill'd;
> All murder'd: for within the hollow crown
> That rounds the mortal temples of a king
> Keeps Death his court and there the antic sits,
> Scoffing his state and grinning at his pomp,
> Allowing him a breath, a little scene,
> To monarchize, be fear'd and kill with looks,
> Infusing him with self and vain conceit,
> As if this flesh which walls about our life,
> Were brass impregnable, and humour'd thus
> Comes at the last and with a little pin
> Bores through his castle wall, and farewell king! (*Richard II*, III, ii, 1566-1580)

Here Richard speaks of his kingship as of a corrupting power which ruins a man's character, preparing him for a classical tragedy downfall. In his speech, Richard paints kingship as a curse, but is later still reluctant to let go of it. A similarly pessimistic outlook on the duties and responsibility of a king is delivered before the battle of Agincourt by Henry V, after speaking to his subjects in a disguise:

> Upon the king! let us our lives, our souls,
> Our debts, our careful wives,
> Our children and our sins lay on the king!
> We must bear all. O hard condition,
> Twin-born with greatness, subject to the breath

Of every fool, whose sense no more can feel
But his own wringing! What infinite heart's-ease
Must kings neglect, that private men enjoy! (*Henry V*, IV, i, 20762083-)

What seems to be obvious from both of these speeches is that in Shakespeare's monarchy the ruling figures understand the burden of responsibility, and connect it quite naturally to the crown. The re-occurrence of this topic suggests that, just like for example the two bodies of a king, the burden of the crown and responsibility is one of the stable motifs behind the scenes of many plays and their political meanings. It is therefore not surprising that Shakespeare's kings from histories would use the responsibility as a weapon in a verbal match.

For *Henry V* , the shifting of responsibility is a notorious aspect of the king's rule and actions. Already in the beginning of the play, the king claims his conquest of France to stem not only from his alleged right to the French throne, but also from the insult carried out by the French prince, while the audience is aware of the decision to attack France long before this. Later when deciding about the fate of the traitors and French-hired assassins before sailing to France, the king allows the men, unaware of the king's knowledge of their crimes, a chance to comment upon a minor judgement. When they react mercilessly, the king blames them for his own merciless action towards them, saying, "The mercy that was quick in us but late / By your own counsel is suppressed and killed." (Henry V, II, ii, 80-81), successfully blaming the man for both their crimes and for their punishment.

Later, when threatening the city of Harfleur, the king uses similar strategy to rid himself of the responsibility for the possible upcoming bloodshed:

How yet resolves the governor of the town?
This is the latest parle we will admit;
Therefore to our best mercy give yourselves;
Or like to men proud of destruction
Defy us to our worst: for, as I am a soldier,
A name that in my thoughts becomes me best,
If I begin the battery once again,
I will not leave the half-achieved Harfleur
Till in her ashes she lie buried. (*Henry V*, III, iii, 1-10)

In this speech, the king explains what shall happen if the town does not capitulate and open the gates. He opens his speech with the agency seated in himself, but soon moves it into a third person. The horrors which he describes in the following lines, using horrible imagery of bloodshed and violence connected to theme of family, would evidently be inflicted by the king's army according to his decision, and therefore be a responsibility of the king, but he succeeds in removing the responsibility from himself completely: What is't to me, when you yourselves are cause, /If your pure maidens fall into the hand /Of hot and forcing violation?"(Henry V, III,iii,1291-1292). From this part of the monologue further, the responsibility falls clearly on the governor of the town for his decision and then on an impersonal force causing the violence. This strategy seems to be a mere echo of the aforementioned famous tennis balls scene in the first act, which the king blames the whole war with all its death and suffering on Dauphin´s jest:

> And tell the pleasant prince this mock of his
> Hath turn'd his balls to gun-stones; and his soul
> Shall stand sore charged for the wasteful vengeance
> That shall fly with them: for many a thousand widows
> Shall this his mock mock out of their dear husbands;
> Mock mothers from their sons, mock castles down;
> And some are yet ungotten and unborn
> That shall have cause to curse the Dauphin's scorn. (*Henry V*, I,ii,429-436)

The king begins with a general, impersonal description of a catastrophe, and then focuses on the personal level of the possible tragedy. He calls forth an impersonal power to cause a personal tragedy for many. In both cases the king emphasizes the effect on people, victims, and alludes to family – widows, sons, mothers. His general strategy seems to be to build up the strength of argument and its personal effects, created by vivid and specific images of people. In this case the shift is even more prominent, because in the opening, the king does pronounce the opening of the acts violence in the first person, but then he even supports his shift of blame for the massacre from himself and his soldiers to the Dauphin by putting it in the mouths of the victims.

A similar, although subdued, strategy is used by a man on his way to become a king – Gloucester in *Richard III.* While speaking to Lady Anne in the first act of the play, Gloucester manages to do the unimaginable and to transfer the blame for the murder of her

husband, committed by him, to the widow, blaming her indirectly through her beauty and attractiveness. This scene is important for two main reasons – it manifests the character of Richard to the audience in act adding strength to that what had been said in the monologue, and it showcases his ability to manipulate people and use rhetoric sufficient to help him get to the position of a king. Richard shows that he already possesses the rhetoric abilities of a king as well as their strategies.

A specific case of shifting responsibility can be found in *Julius Caesar*, especially in speeches of the character Brutus. His strategy is not to move the responsibility towards another character or even an entity, but to remove it from himself and his co-operators. He achieves this by hiding his decisions behind proverbs and general rules while considering the assassination of Caesar, in the first scene of the second act:

> It must be by his death: and for my part,
> I know no personal cause to spurn at him,
> But for the general. He would be crown'd:
> How that might change his nature, there's the question.
> It is the bright day that brings forth the adder;
> And that craves wary walking. Crown him?
> And then, I grant, we put a sting in him,
> That at his will he may do danger with.
> The abuse of greatness is, when it disjoins
> Remorse from power: and, to speak truth of Caesar,
> I have not known when his affections sway'd
> More than his reason. … (*Julius Caesar*, II,i,610-621)

Brutus manages to portray the murder of his friend an impersonal necessary deed. He avoids using any agency of his own, or even the first person pronoun, apart from a sentence in which he claims he has no selfish motives. He uses animal imagery repeatedly while talking about Caesar and his assassination, here the adder is the opening motif to represent him and illustrate Brutus' interpretation of his character. In this manner, he tries to indirectly blame Ceasar for the planned assassination, using his character and more common proverbial wisdom to create a credible reason for his cause:

> … But 'tis a common proof,
> That lowliness is young ambition's ladder,

Whereto the climber-upward turns his face;
But when he once attains the upmost round.
He then unto the ladder turns his back,
Looks in the clouds, scorning the base degrees
By which he did ascend. So Caesar may.
Then, lest he may, prevent. And, since the quarrel
Will bear no colour for the thing he is,
Fashion it thus; that what he is, augmented,
Would run to these and these extremities:
And therefore think him as a serpent's egg
Which, hatch'd, would, as his kind, grow mischievous,
And kill him in the shell. (*Julius Caesar*, II,i,621-635)

In the end of this speech the motif of the adder and general animal imagery return in full force, bringing on the resolution. In comparison to the kings, the speeches of Brutus seem to come from a far weaker resolution at first. While the kings use the strategy of shifting blame deliberately and systematically, Brutus seems to be persuading himself as well as his audience. On the other hand, what the speeches of Brutus lack in their initial resolution and strategy, they gain in their logical structure, which supports the strategy while it unfolds, hiding the pathos behind a seemingly logical argument. Brutus' talent for persuasion lies deeply in the repetitive schemes he uses, a feature which reflects well both on the era Shakespeare was depicting in his character, but also with the character himself. Moreover, it seems that Brutus tends to repeat the same the same strategy and even sets of schemes for a stronger effect, as can be seen in a comparison of both of these speeches:

Our course will seem too bloody, Caius Cassius,
To cut the head off and then hack the limbs,
Like wrath in death and envy afterwards;
For Antony is but a limb of Caesar:
Let us be sacrificers, but not butchers, Caius.
We all stand up against the spirit of Caesar;
And in the spirit of men there is no blood: (*Julius Caesar*, II,i, 775-781)

In this speech the primary imagery is that of a body and a sacrifice, this time the symbolism of the images is more openly stated for each character. Again, a general truth is

stated to represent the logic of the argument, and Brutus' good intentions, and even though he does use the first person pronoun it is only in the plural, creating a unity of the plotters, but also avoiding personal responsibility. Brutus attempts to further show his innocence of desiring violence in his following sentences:

> O, that we then could come by Caesar's spirit,
> And not dismember Caesar! But, alas,
> Caesar must bleed for it! And, gentle friends,
> Let's kill him boldly, but not wrathfully;
> Let's carve him as a dish fit for the gods,
> Not hew him as a carcass fit for hounds:
> And let our hearts, as subtle masters do,
> Stir up their servants to an act of rage,
> And after seem to chide 'em. This shall make
> Our purpose necessary and not envious:
> Which so appearing to the common eyes,
> We shall be call'd purgers, not murderers.
> And for Mark Antony, think not of him;
> For he can do no more than Caesar's arm
> When Caesar's head is off." (*Julius Caesar*, II,i, 782-802)

The ending of the speech is again a return to the opening image, closing the logical structure. The two speeches seem to share the same strategy although in one case the speaker is persuading himself, and in the other, his resolution in the deed is stronger and maintaining a specific approach while persuading others to share his view. In both Brutus opens the utterance with one motif, in the second act it is the motif of animal symbolism for Caesar – a wasp, or a snake. In the latter speech it is the motif of blood and bloodshed, a motif of sacrifice (to be discussed in chapter Body of the Ruler). Than he changes the motif, as if to elaborate of his thoughts, in both cases the middle part of the speech turns more theoretical, with universal statements about politics and the human nature, as if borrowing strength from the universal truths. But for the final lines he returns to the opening motif, and encloses the whole thought in it, creating a compact and effective speech.

Strategy of shifting power

Another strategy frequently used by characters in situations of persuasion in Shakespeare's plays is the strategy of shifting power. What differentiates this strategy from the strategy of shifting blame is that the power and implied responsibility is used as a bribe or flattery instead of a threat or a burden. This can be achieved in two possible ways, in the more plain use of this strategy the character openly emphasizes the power, status or abilities of the character they are persuading, or in the alternative usage, the character who is in a superior position verbally belittles his own power or status in relation to the other character in order to imply the same effect. This strategy seems to be again rather prevalent in the History plays, for example in the character of king Richard III, who, while on his way to the throne, keeps pretending to place himself as inferior to other characters who then readily fall for his manipulation.

One example of such situations is present in the already discussed dialogue happening between Richard III and Lady Anne. After blaming the lady for the death of her husband, her guilt implicated in her beauty and attractiveness, Richard manages to shift not only blame onto her but the power as well. By offering her his sword to end his life if she hates him so, he gives her the power over his life. He even emphasizes this by claiming to be ready to kill himself if the lady so commands, giving her the ultimate choice between killing him or marrying him. While it is still Richard who controls the whole situation, also the one who holds the blade, his strategy creates enough of pressure on the other character to make her agree to his proposal. This seems to be a favoured strategy of Richard who uses his position, persona or even his malformations in offer to manipulate people, giving them only two choices – to oppose him, often in a rather serious manner, or to agree with him. He uses the decency of other characters against them, and usually the possibility of opposing Richard would force a character to do a deed against the human nature, like killing a person or accusing a powerful person of deceit straight into their face.

The latter strategy appears for example in Richard's meeting with the mayor of London, after having executed a man on the city grounds without informing the mayor beforehand. He proceeds to imply the major's higher position and his own obedience as given, while connecting them to the guilt of the beheaded nobleman.

> Gloucester:
> What, think You we are Turks or infidels?

Or that we would, against the form of law,
Proceed thus rashly to the villain's death,
But that the extreme peril of the case,
The peace of England and our persons' safety,
Enforced us to this execution? (*Richard III*, III,v,2111-2116)

When first the mayor doubts the nobleman's guilt, Richard connects the issua with the question of his own identity – to doubt the guilt of the man, the mayor would have to proclaim that Richard, a man of royal blood, and his allies are infidels and disrespect the law. Therefore he would have to prove not only the man's innocence, no presumption of innocence applied, but also Richard's guilt of a serious crime. By joining these two things together so obviously, Richard gives the mayor no chance to object.

Lord Mayor:
Now, fair befall you! he deserved his death;
And you my good lords, both have well proceeded,
To warn false traitors from the like attempts.
I never look'd for better at his hands,
After he once fell in with Mistress Shore.

Gloucester:
Yet had not we determined he should die,
Until your lordship came to see his death;
Which now the loving haste of these our friends,
Somewhat against our meaning, have prevented:
Because, my lord, we would have had you heard
The traitor speak, and timorously confess
The manner and the purpose of his treason;
That you might well have signified the same
Unto the citizens, who haply may
Misconstrue us in him and wail his death. (*Richard III*, III.v,2117-2131)

The mayor evidently falls under the influence of the strategy as he tries strongly to avoid any suspicion of disagreeing with Richard. In a response to this, Richard further emphasizes the pretentious respect for the authority of the mayor, while doing so, he quite specifically explains what would have presumably happened if he had followed the

protocol, as he claims he had wished to, while mixing in a vague notion of his own actions. In this way he is not even forced to lie about anything except his intentions, takes the emphasis away from his person and focuses it on the ‘loving friends’, the executed man and on the mayor himself.

Strategy of setting standard

Setting a standard seems to be another strategy frequently used by Shakespeare's characters in their manipulation schemes. This strategy works on motivation or intimidation of the addressee by creating a standard to which they should conform or, which, on the contrary, they should avoid. These standards are often drawn from religion or history, always using the authority of a culturally accepted source, or represented by the manipulating character themselves, as is the case in *Macbeth.*

In Henry V, the king uses this strategy multiple times when urging his soldiers forward in the famous siege speech:

> … On, on, you noblest English.
> Whose blood is fet from fathers of war-proof!
> Fathers that, like so many Alexanders,
> Have in these parts from morn till even fought
> And sheathed their swords for lack of argument:
> Dishonour not your mothers; now attest
> That those whom you call'd fathers did beget you.
> Be copy now to men of grosser blood,
> And teach them how to war. And you, good yeoman,
> Whose limbs were made in England, show us here
> The mettle of your pasture; let us swear
> That you are worth your breeding; which I doubt not;
> For there is none of you so mean and base,
> That hath not noble lustre in your eyes.
> I see you stand like greyhounds in the slips,
> Straining upon the start. The game's afoot:
> Follow your spirit, and upon this charge
> Cry 'God for Harry, England, and Saint George!' (*Henry V,* III, i, 1108-1125).

The king evokes the ancestors of the warriors in order to motivate them: the fathers, compared to "Alexanders" who were presumably brave and honourable and the mothers whose honour is to be kept. He sets the standard of stereotypical warlike masculinity, and asks the nobles to become the standard within it. He claims to see the standard within them as well in order to motivate them. He seems to strive to create an example both imaginary

and real. What Henry is using here for the imaginary example is the typical stereotype of male values and honour combined with a personalised message concerning their own families.

This style of ~~a~~ motivation by setting standard is common also among the advisers of rulers. The opening act of the play Henry V contains the same strategy used by the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of Ely, who try to persuade the king to support his claim over France with a military action for their own personal profit (the profit of the church):

> Look back into your mighty ancestors:
> Go, my dread lord, to your great-grandsire's tomb,
> From whom you claim; invoke his warlike spirit,
> And your great-uncle's, Edward the Black Prince,
> Who on the French ground play'd a tragedy,
> Making defeat on the full power of France,
> Whiles his most mighty father on a hill
> Stood smiling to behold his lion's whelp
> Forage in blood of French nobility.
> O noble English. … (*Henry V*, I,ii,96-104)

The bishop of Canterbury is here very specific, even instructive, similarly to the motivational speech of the king. One of the reasons for this use of the ancestry-line on the king in this situation could be one of the main themes of the second tetralogy – legitimacy and the right to the crown, which the king's father, Henry IV had taken from Richard II. The king is inclined to listen to the archbishop, because he seems to have partly decided already before, but also because he seems to be seeking divine approval for his and his father's actions in private prayer (Henry V, IV,i). What is also interesting is the use of the same expression with which the king opens his siege speech – the "Noble English".

> Ely:
> Awake remembrance of these valiant dead
> And with your puissant arm renew their feats:
> You are their heir; you sit upon their throne;
> The blood and courage that renowned them
> Runs in your veins; and my thrice-puissant liege

Is in the very May-morn of his youth,
Ripe for exploits and mighty enterprises.

Exeter:
Your brother kings and monarchs of the earth
Do all expect that you should rouse yourself,
As did the former lions of your blood. (*Henry V*,I,ii,112-121)

This could be read as the two characters using the standard of the king's predecessors and his equals in order to motivate the king, and emphasize the family imagery. They base their argument very much on the royal line, ancestry, and the right to the throne. They seem to try to show that not only was there never a better chance for such a conquest, but also that the other relatives who ruled before him would have been glad to see it happen, implying their agreement with the cause and the means. They also seem to imply a certain sovereign power of preceding kings over the current king, possibly relying on the relatively universal concept of the authority of elders. While this strategy might be effective on any monarch, carrying the honour of his fathers, it could be even more effective on a king whose right to the crown is relatively dubious, and who might therefore need victory as proof of his dynastic right, cancelling the problematic nature of his claim, and should therefore even more follow the example of the rulers into whose lineage he wishes to be accepted.

The same king uses the same strategy of setting a standard of the people who he is speaking to once more in his st. Crispin speech, but this time he is not so much distinguishing between the people before him, as between the ones there at the time and those at home. First he again uses a very specific image of the situation, with details, even a direct speech, of the future surviving soldier:

He that shall live this day, and see old age,
Will yearly on the vigil feast his neighbours,
And say 'To-morrow is Saint Crispian:'
Then will he strip his sleeve and show his scars.
And say 'These wounds I had on Crispin's day.' (*Henry V*, IV,iii,45-49)

He therefore makes his motivation speak to everyone personally. He uses not the image of the army as a whole but every single one as an individual, who if successful, shall be the example to his neighbours – a realistic vision, easily implicable, but effective. This can be

built on the king's presumed knowledge of the commoners and their life from his early life. And then continues to speak of the noble ones a little more specifically:

> Old men forget: yet all shall be forgot,
> But he'll remember with advantages
> What feats he did that day: then shall our names.
> Familiar in his mouth as household words
> Harry the king, Bedford and Exeter,
> Warwick and Talbot, Salisbury and Gloucester,
> Be in their flowing cups freshly remember'd.
> This story shall the good man teach his son;
> And Crispin Crispian shall ne'er go by,
> From this day to the ending of the world,
> But we in it shall be remember'd; (*Henry V*, IV,iii,49-59)

Here the motivation is strategically multi-layered. The king is promising the soldiers of low classes their fame and pride, putting them on the same line as the highest nobility, but also assuring the nobility who might not be so easily persuaded by the previous part, of their virtual immortality in the words of the commoners. Their names shall live on in a similar fashion like those of the heroes of old in songs sang by the fire. In the last part of his speech the king emphasizes unity:

> We few, we happy few, we band of brothers;
> For he to-day that sheds his blood with me
> Shall be my brother; be he ne'er so vile,
> This day shall gentle his condition:
> And gentlemen in England now a-bed
> Shall think themselves accursed they were not here,
> And hold their manhoods cheap whiles any speaks
> That fought with us upon Saint Crispin's day. (*Henry V*, IV,iii,60-68)

In the last part of his address, the king again puts all of his soldiers on the same social level, but only if they show bravery in battle. He again alludes to them being set on a high pedestal, even implying it will make the gentlemen at home feel ashamed. The stereotypical masculinity is used again, this time very openly. It seems interesting that having gotten into a situation for which examples and standards are hard to find, the king

manages to make an example for his men of themselves and their possible future. This strategy is similar to the one adapted by the Earl of Richmond speaking to his soldiers before the battle against Richard III:

> Then, if you fight against God's enemy,
> God will in justice ward you as his soldiers;
> If you do sweat to put a tyrant down,
> You sleep in peace, the tyrant being slain;
> If you do fight against your country's foes,
> Your country's fat shall pay your pains the hire;
> If you do fight in safeguard of your wives,
> Your wives shall welcome home the conquerors;
> If you do free your children from the sword,
> Your children's children quit it in your age.
> Then, in the name of God and all these rights,
> Advance your standards, draw your willing swords. (*Richard III*, V,iii,256-267)

Although Richmond applies the strategy on a much shorter section of his speech, it uses a similar approach. It paints a vision of the future after the victory, using the family imagery. Richmond's speech is much less personal and based on ideals and religion, probably because of the formal way in which his whole character and his cause is presented. His soldiers should be relatively easy to motivate in their situation and so an emphasis on unity or levelling differences would be out of place. Moreover, his fight against Richard III is very much the fight of good against evil, and the mention of a soldier bragging of his victory would spoil it, but the underlying points of the speeches are almost identical – fight bravely and be rewarded by a happy life, respect and legacy.

The masculinity and gender stereotypes used by Henry V are used a lot in the same strategy by the character of Lady Macbeth. In an interesting turn, she also does not need any outside source for her comparisons - she uses herself as the standard in order to manipulate her husband:

> Macbeth:
> I dare do all that may become a man;
> Who dares do more is none.

Lady Macbeth:
What beast was't, then,
That made you break this enterprise to me?
When you durst do it, then you were a man;
And, to be more than what you were, you would
Be so much more the man. Nor time nor place
Did then adhere, and yet you would make both:
They have made themselves, and that their fitness now
Does unmake you. I have given suck, and know
How tender 'tis to love the babe that milks me:
I would, while it was smiling in my face,
Have pluck'd my nipple from his boneless gums,
And dash'd the brains out, had I so sworn as you
Have done to this. (*Macbeth*, I, vii, 48- 62)

Similarly to Henry V, Lady Macbeth uses the ideals and stereotypical characteristics of the sexes in order to support her argument. What is interesting in this usage is that in describing the masculine qualities, both Henry V and Lady Macbeth stick to the typical and condemn the trespass against them. But when speaking of the feminine characteristics, Lady Macbeth uses the ideal of a caring mother and claims her ability to completely abandon those on the request of her husband. This seems to accentuate her plea to him and is evidently made to intimidate him by both the strength of the graphically specific visual imagery invoked and by the unnatural quality of the action presented. In comparison to his wife's 'ability' to abandon all her maternal instincts, his incapability to keep his word and commit a murder is diminished. Moreover, Macbeth is not only compared to his wife and to the manly ideal, but also to his own former self. Lady Macbeth is not using the image of the possible future, probably because that has already been stated by the witches and is the whole motivation of their actions and has not changed since. Instead she makes her husband look back to his state of determination.

She continues the persuasion by instructing her husband: "We fail!/But screw your courage to the sticking-place, /And we'll not fail. …"(*Macbeth*,I,vii, 64-66). To which he responds by saying "Bring forth men-children only;/For thy undaunted mettle should compose/Nothing but males."(*Macbeth*, I, vii, 78-80). She here almost places their success and fate on his manliness and his manhood. With which he agrees in his response and

instead of being assaulted by her remarks as he is in the beginning of their dialogue, he is encouraged and determined. It is interesting, that what Lady Macbeth uses in a private situation – an argument with her husband – is in many ways comparable to the war speeches of leaders to their men. Her speech is cruel and attacking more than encouraging. This highlights not only the nature of her character, but mainly the gravity of the situation – it is an argument between married couple, but it shall decide the future of the country just like a crucial battle.

In conclusion, it seems that the typical material for a standard is set ideals – gender stereotypes and religious values. But for these to work, they are combined with personal imagery, especially the imagery of family. The closer the source of the standard is the stronger the achieved persuasion seems to be – soldiers in a regular battle are given their ancestors for an example, while the same men before a hopeless battle are to see the example to follow in their own selves. The general ideals are mixed with specific detail and instruction for a realistic and personal effect.

In Roman plays the same manner of persuasion and motivation by setting standard is used on multiple occasions, even in rather similar strategies. Mostly again, it is the motivation of following a stereotype or an influential idolised figure, that is used for the standard. For example in *Julius Caesar*, Cassius begins his manipulation of Brutus by gaining virtual authority by comparing himself to a standard from the past:

> I, as Aeneas, our great ancestor,
> Did from the flames of Troy upon his shoulder
> The old Anchises bear, so from the waves of Tiber
> Did I the tired Caesar. … (*Julius Caesar*, I,ii,178-181)

Cassius likens himself to the founder of Rome, giving himself extra credibility similarly to Shakespeare's king Richard II comparing himself to Christ, even though Richard's connections are more consistent and less open. Simultaneously, he undermines Caesar by painting him as the old and weak, a person in need of physical help facing a challenge they themselves came up with, in a culture which evidently values physical fitness rather highly.

Following this, Cassius continues his manipulation by using Brutus' ancestor of the same name, and his deeds, which presumably preserved Rome and its democracy:

O, you and I have heard our fathers say,
There was a Brutus once that would have brook'd
The eternal devil to keep his state in Rome
As easily as a king. (*Julius Caesar*, I,ii, 249 - 252)

Here Cassius uses multiple strategies similar to those applied in *Henry V.* He uses the motif of unity through common background and the stories told of the heroes of the past, a short extract reminiscent to the St. Crispin speech, highlighting the importance of oral tradition. He also uses the ancestor as an authority over Brutus and as a standard which he should live up to, a persuasive rhetoric used by the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of Ely in the first act.

It is notable that the same strategies are used, yet in a consistently shorter form. Moreover, the other aspect of the persuasion of Brutus – the connection of Caesar to a negative standard is rather multi-layered when another conspirator, Casca, accuses Caesar of desiring the end of the republic or of his influence leading to it. By claiming that Caesar was offered the crown three times, and by none else but by his closest ally, he points to a scene, stereotypically connected to deceit, known to Elizabethan audience:

… I saw Mark
Antony offer him a crown;—yet 'twas not a crown
neither, 'twas one of these coronets;—and, as I told
you, he put it by once: but, for all that, to my
thinking, he would fain have had it. Then he
offered it to him again; then he put it by again:
but, to my thinking, he was very loath to lay his
fingers off it. … (*Julius Caesar*, I,ii,327-234)

In this scene, the image of Caesar is similar to the one of Richard III refusing to accept the crown from the citizens. The negative standard is the connection to royalty, perceived as tyranny.

The connection of this scene to the one in *Richard III* is evidently highlighted by the anachronism in Casca's description of another of Caesar's clothing actions, again one performed by Gloucester in *Richard III* (I,ii)*: "*Marry, before he fell down, when he perceived the / common herd was glad he refused the crown, he / plucked me ope his

doublet and offered them his /throat to cut." (*Julius Caesar*,I,ii,354-357) It is the only moment of the play in which this anachronism appears and therefore seems to be purely intentional. Casca then here plays not only on the republican values of the character of Brutus, but also with the knowledge of the audience and the associations.

Casca goes on to describe the scene with the actions of the crowd. He represents the crowd as a diseased body in a tone similar to the depiction of the English troops before the battle of Agincourt (*Henry V*, IV,ii,2003.2020) as a threat which is disgusting, dirty, and contagious:

> … And then he offered it the third
> time; he put it the third time by: and still as he
> refused it, the rabblement hooted and clapped their
> chapped hands and threw up their sweaty night-caps
> and uttered such a deal of stinking breath because
> Caesar refused the crown that it had almost choked
> Caesar; for he swounded and fell down at it: and
> for mine own part, I durst not laugh, for fear of
> opening my lips and receiving the bad air. (*Julius Caesar*, I,ii,327-343)

His presumed love for democracy has a tone of irony because of his contempt of the people. It is possible that the anachronism connected to the scene similarity is placed here only as a nod towards the audience (similarly to a conversation between Hamlet and Polonius concerning Julius Caesar in act V, scene I), but it could be used to indicate that Casca's accusations towards Caesar's character, (not his actions, because the audience is shown that he is eager to accept the crown) are a fabricated fiction.

The strategy of setting a standard is rather more complicated in *Coriolanus*, where the crucial task required of the main character is to accommodate such a standard and become a part of it, by showing his battle wounds and scars while campaigning for consulship, but he refuses to do so:

> Coriolanus:
> What must I say?
> 'I Pray, sir'--Plague upon't! I cannot bring
> My tongue to such a pace:--'Look, sir, my wounds!

I got them in my country's service, when
Some certain of your brethren roar'd and ran
From the noise of our own drums.' (*Coriolanus*, II,iii,1475-1480)

Most of his arguments against the custom is the same dislike of the common people as is presented in the speech of Casca. This resentment is later one of the reasons for his downfall. Later in the same scene, Coriolanus proceeds to go on his campaign to gain the voices of the common people and comments upon the nature of custom:

Better it is to die, better to starve,
Than crave the hire which first we do deserve.
Why in this woolvish toge should I stand here,
To beg of Hob and Dick, that do appear,
Their needless vouches? Custom calls me to't:
What custom wills, in all things should we do't,
The dust on antique time would lie unswept,
And mountainous error be too highly heapt
For truth to o'er-peer. Rather than fool it so,
Let the high office and the honour go
To one that would do thus. (*Coriolanus*,II,iii,1546-1556)

The first interesting aspect of this extract is the rhyme – in this moment Coriolanus speaks in couplets while the majority of the play is in blank verse, making his speech even more memorable. Here he criticises the habit of acting according to customs, because it stands between him and the reward which he believes he deserves. Yet he cannot bring himself to break it completely. Custom is the basis for the influence of stereotypes and standards on which much of the persuasion in Shakespeare's plays is built.

Moreover, it seems that a great majority of the standards used in strategies of persuasion in the ancient plays are based on physical ideals of the society. While in the speeches present in History plays and Tragedies the imagery of physical body is used as well, the context for its usage seems to be rather different.

Body of the Ruler

The representation of a ruler is generally important throughout Shakespeare's plays, whether it is the portrayal of their rule, their personality or even their physical body. This stems not only from the dramatic approach of creating a realistic multi-dimensional character, but also from the political thinking of 16th century in which the ruler played a crucial role for more aspects of the life in the kingdom than in later periods of history. As William Baldwin wrote in the mid-16th century "the goodness or the badness of any realm lieth in the goodness or badness of the rulers."[13] It would have been understood that the character of the ruler influences everything in the realm, especially its people and their lives, because "If the ministers are good, the people cannot be ill,"[14] and vice-versa.

The Double Body of the king is an Early Modern English concept, which is best explained by a 16th century philosopher, Edmund Plowden "[T]he King has in him two Bodies, a Body natural, and a Body politic. His Body natural (if it be considered in itself) is a Body mortal … But his Body politic is a Body that cannot be seen or handled, consisting of Policy and Government, and constituted for the Direction of the People."[15] This second body of the king is therefore theoretically immortal and does not depend on the king's physical condition, but on his rule and capability.

In the History plays the appearance and physical condition of a Christian king seems to represent his character and it is also a means of the political rhetoric, representing his position and capability as monarch. This could stem already from the previous type of theatre, the mystery plays, in which thy typical tyrant depicted was, as Besnaut and Binot claim "Herod, often represented as being plagued by various infirmities, a mirror of his crimes."[16] So the appearance and health of a king seem to be a reflection of his rule, just like the vitality and 'goodness' of the realm. There seem to be two levels of this perception of the body of the king – while it should be clear to the Elizabethan audience that Richard III's appearance is a sign of his corruption based on theatrical conventions, the characters around Richard do not reflect on it in any way in connection to his political position. There therefore seems to be a distinction between the theatrical thinking and political thinking.

---

[13] William Baldwin; e.d. Lilly B. Campbell *The Mirror of the Magistrates*, Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 1947
[14] Baldwin, p
[15] Edmund Plowden, *Les Commentaries*, London, 1575
[16] Marie Héléne Besnault, Michel Bitot, "Historical legacy and fiction: the political reinvention of King Richard III", *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History plays, Michael Hattaway e.d.*, p108

One of the prominent elements of the whole reoccurring motif of the body of the ruler is the notion that the body of a ruler is not their own, but in a way the property of the whole nation/his people. The body of the king is considered from multiple points of view, symbolical and physical. In the Ancient plays, the notion of the ruler's body seems to be very literal and physical whilst the symbolic double body of the king appears much more in the History plays. It is in accordance with the ideals of the Roman society, valuing physical health, and focusing on physical fitness in education of its offspring.

In *Coriolanus*, the plot evolves strongly around this notion of the importance and publicity of the body of the ruler. The language of the play as a whole is relatively body oriented, and the importance of physical proof of a man's deeds is highlighted early in the play. Already before Coriolanus returns from the battle, Volumnia shows her excitement concerning her son's possible wounds, exclaiming "O, he is wounded; I thank the gods for't." (*Coriolanus*, II,I,1039). It is the opposite of what would be expected of a mother to be grateful for, and she is juxtaposed with the worried wife whom she repeatedly scolds. The mother's seemingly sadistic joy is evidently tied to her having high ambitions for her son, she is well acquainted with his condition and keeps a count of his scars, as she shows while stating "He had, before this last expedition, twenty-five wounds upon him." (*Coriolanus*, II,I,1071). This combination of obsession with physical fitness combined with physical injury could be connected to the idea of a sacrifice – the better the sacrifice given to a deity, the stronger the effect should be, and therefore, Coriolanus' scars are, in their own way, a valuable sacrifice for his country, as Volumnia puts it, "Good man, the wounds that he does bear for Rome!" (*Coriolanus,* IV,ii,2628). But like religious sacrifices, this one seems to need to be made official by the means of a public spectacle. When Coriolanus wishes to get a position in the senate, he is required to show off his body and scars to the general public in order to get their vote, Cominius tells him that while stating:

> Rome must know
> The value of her own: 'twere a concealment
> Worse than a theft, no less than a traducement,
> To hide your doings; (*Coriolanus*, I, ix, 795-798)

Cominius here implies that Rome, personified, needs to know the value of itself – how much men are willing to sacrifice for it, but also the worth of her own people, and to deny her that would be a crime. In this sense, Rome is not only personified, but also made into a

sort of a deity, for whom sacrifice is made. The wounds and scars seem to be this sacrifice, and they are given a great amount of value.

Coriolanus also uses a very effective metaphor of wounds as mouths without a tongue, when the he is persuaded to go and try to get the votes from the people, but till decides to trick the people out of their votes, because he still resents the thought of showing his wounds to the public:

> Third Citizen:
>
> …for if he show us
> his wounds and tell us his deeds, we are to put our
> tongues into those wounds and speak for them; so, if
> he tell us his noble deeds, we must also tell him
> our noble acceptance of them. Ingratitude is
> monstrous, and for the multitude to be ingrateful,
> were to make a monster of the multitude:…
> (*Coriolanus*, II,iii, 1427 – 1436)

Here the citizen explains the function of this whole process, as well as the function of the multitude of the people. He uses the imagery of putting tongues into the wounds and speaking for them. Here this act is portrayed as the duty of the people. The citizen explains this almost on an action-reaction principle, leaving out anomalies or personal preferences of the people, as if the opinion and reactions were uniform. The citizen's speech speaks of the common people in a an almost distinguished tone, yet it warns against the terrible destructive power of wronged unified citizens. This terrible force of the wronged multitude is the same one that manifests itself in *Julius Caesar,* and similarly to the happenings in that play, in the end divides the multitude. It is building upon the body allegory used in act I, scene II by Menenius Agrippa, identifying the people of the city as body members, emphasizing the unity of all body members speaking for the wounds of one, or turning against them.

The image of wounds as mouths is likewise used by Mark Anthony when he speaks for Caesar during his funeral, showing people Caesar's wounds in order to move them and claims:

I tell you that which you yourselves do know;
Show you sweet Caesar's wounds, poor poor dumb mouths,
And bid them speak for me: but were I Brutus,
And Brutus Antony, there were an Antony
Would ruffle up your spirits and put a tongue
In every wound of Caesar that should move
The stones of Rome to rise and mutiny. (*Julius Caesar*, III, ii,1769-1774)

Here Mark Anthony asks the wounds to speak for Caesar, but also bids the people to listen, he is using the strategy of shifting responsibility. The body of the ruler here is his testimony, and speaks for him almost literally just like his deeds for the people which are presented in the same scene. Compared to Brutus' speech in the same scene, which is based solely on abstract ideals and morals, on pathos and pathos presented as logos, the image of the body and speaking wounds is a physical embodiment of those ideals This shows the symbolic power of the body of the ruler over the people. Mark Anthony does exactly what he had promised to the body of Caesar, while apologising for initially making peace with the traitors:

Over thy wounds now do I prophesy,—
Which, like dumb mouths, do ope their ruby lips,
and utterance of my tongue—
A curse shall light upon the limbs of men;
Domestic fury and fierce civil strife
Shall cumber all the parts of Italy; (*Julius Caesar*, III,i,1488-1494)

This shows that he does not use the wounds as mouths wishing to speak only to move the crowd; he uses the same image in private with the body of his friend. The whole extract is riddled with body imagery, strengthening the motif of the body of the ruler and hinting at the body politic. In this speech he shows much more agency over what is going to happen, but here he does not hide behind the abilities of Brutus, like he does in his speech to the people.

The only other appearance of the speaking wounds metaphor in Shakespeare's work is in *Henry IV Part* 1, in the speech of Hotspur, who attempts to justify his brother in front of the king. Even though he is not speaking of a general principle, but of a particular situation of his brother, Hotspur seems to point at the evolution of this idea.

Revolted Mortimer!
He never did fall off, my sovereign liege,
But by the chance of war; to prove that true
Needs no more but one tongue for all those wounds,
Those mouthed wounds, which valiantly he took (*Henry IV Part 1*, I,iii,418-422)

Here it seems to show the change between the system of monarchy and democracy. In democracy the multitude of people speak for the wounds of one, while in monarchy one tongue is enough to speak for multiple wounds. It is possible that it could be the mouth of the king representing his subjects, for as Richard II puts it, "Is not the king's name twenty thousand names?" (*Richard III*,ii,1492).

The way in which the body of the ruler is presented in the History plays seems to suggest the virtual irrelevance of physical fitness for the rule of a Christian king. Richard III is a good example of this approach. He temporarily reaches his goal of becoming the king even though he is visibly unhealthy. It could be said that he manages to hide both his deformed body but also his twisted mind by his wit and rhetoric. He himself does not seem to consider his condition a obstacle in gaining the crown, while he does acknowledge that it bars him from other pursuits:

But I, that am not shaped for sportive tricks,
Nor made to court an amorous looking-glass;
I, that am rudely stamp'd, and want love's majesty
To strut before a wanton ambling nymph;
I, that am curtail'd of this fair proportion,
Cheated of feature by dissembling nature,
Deformed, unfinish'd, sent before my time
Into this breathing world, scarce half made up,
And that so lamely and unfashionable
That dogs bark at me as I halt by them; (*Richard III*, I,i,9-18)

Here Richard places a lot of importance on his physical deformity, which Besnault and Bisnot call "a sign of both unnaturalness and enormity"[17] but does by no means seem to

[17] Marie Héléne Besnault, Michel Bitot, "Historical legacy and fiction: the political reinvention of King Richard III", *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History plays, Michael Hattaway e.d.*, Cambridge:Cambridge University Press, 2002 p106

think that it would bar him from achieving his desired position. Richard is going along the lines of political thinking here, realising that for the Christian king the state of his physical body is unimportant. This is supported by no noble male character in the play referring to or pointing out to what in a Roman play would be a clear obstacle for a man with the ambition to rule.

> And therefore, since I cannot prove a lover,
> To entertain these fair well-spoken days,
> I am determined to prove a villain
> And hate the idle pleasures of these days. (*Richard III*, I,i,28-31)

Richard makes his deformity the culprit of his actions, the thing which drives him to his heinous crimes, by which he reverses the logic of the dramatic tradition which tells the audience that his appearance is a reflection of his sins and character. In accordance to this, the only ones who seem to point to his physical condition are women whom he had wronged, Queen Margaret and Lady Anne. [18]

While *Richard III* shows that a week body is not an obstacle for a ruler, moreover, in other plays a king's physical weakness is presented as a result of his responsibility. The sleep of a king is a prominent case of this. It is a frequent image used in Shakespeare's plays, as the sleeplessness seems to be a common malady of kingship and an effect of the crown. It is implied many times that kings have their head full of worries concerning their kingdom the insomnia is as(Z. Tavlin states "a symptom" of their kingship[19]. Prince Hall states in Henry IV, that "Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown"(Henry IV, Part 2, III,i,1705), upon seeing his father ill, with the crown laying on his pillow, blaming the crown for his father's hardships. Later, his son, Henry VI, in *Henry VI, part III*, echoes the speech of the

[18] Queen Margaret addresses Richard, then Gloucester, with a salve of names based both on his character and on his appearance in Act I, scene III (lines 680-697) while cursing him for his previous treachery. Another moment when somebody insults Richard by speaking of his deformity is when he attempts to do what he himself had previously said he cannot - become a lover and Lady Anne calls him "thou lump of foul deformity" (*Richard III*, I,ii,224). Both of these women had been negatively affected by Richard's actions, and can be more susceptible to his vices, but neither of them have a significant power to stop him on his quest.

[19] Zachary Tavlin, "Sleep and Insomnia in Levinas and Shakespeare's Henry IV", *Literary Refractions* No. 1 - Year 5 12/2014, p8

hardships of kings, also pointing out similar hardships in the life of a king, and similar beauty in the life of a subject, in this case a shepherd:

> His wonted sleep under a fresh tree's shade,
> All which secure and sweetly he enjoys,
> Is far beyond a prince's delicates,
> His viands sparkling in a golden cup,
> His body couched in a curious bed,
> When care, mistrust, and treason waits on him. (*Henry VI Part III*, II,v,1151-1156)

Henry VI escalated the hardships of the previous kings into a different dimension – not only does he worry about the fate of his country and people, not only does he feel like his subjects put the responsibility for their lives onto him, he also worries about his subjects attempting to depose of him, plotting behind his back. Another royal character who is bothered by their sleep is the aforementioned Macbeth. The lack of sleep seems to be a semi-physical manifestation of the burden of kingship, and its toll can be heightened by dirty consciousness. For for Henry IV, Henry V and Henry VI, the crown is a burden causing lack of sleep partly because of the problematic start of their lineage and because of rational worries which come with the responsibility, therefore, the sleep problems do not take an extreme toll. Macbeth on the other hand is followed by the guild for a deadly sin, just like Richard III, and their nightmares and visions (*Richard III*, Act V, scene III) are an extreme version of the guilt and its depiction.

The concept of the state of the king's body as a reflection of his rule figures prominently in the abdication scene of Richard II. After the king realises the fragile nature of his physical body, he begins to focus on it, and elaborate. So when he is asked to speak of his sins and wrong in order to abdicate and give his crown to Henry Bolingbroke, he chooses to use a mirror as a guide:

> They shall be satisfied: I'll read enough,
> When I do see the very book indeed
> Where all my sins are writ, and that's myself.(*Richard II*, IV,i, 2263-2245)

It seems that the notion of actions and sins leaving physical marks upon the person is used here. It is conveyed through a metaphor which Shakespeare uses repeatedly (in *Romeo and Juliet* act I, scene III, lines 464-479) for example – the human face being like a book which

can be read for their deeds, emotions, and character. But instead of speaking about his sins, Richard speaks of his previous fame:

> [Re-enter Attendant, with a glass]
> Give me the glass, and therein will I read.
> No deeper wrinkles yet? hath sorrow struck
> So many blows upon this face of mine,
> And made no deeper wounds? O flattering glass,
> Like to my followers in prosperity,
> Thou dost beguile me! Was this face the face
> That every day under his household roof
> Did keep ten thousand men? was this the face
> That, like the sun, did make beholders wink?
> Was this the face that faced so many follies,
> And was at last out-faced by Bolingbroke?
> A brittle glory shineth in this face:
> As brittle as the glory is the face;
> [Dashes the glass against the ground]
> For there it is, crack'd in a hundred shivers.
> Mark, silent king, the moral of this sport,
> How soon my sorrow hath destroy'd my face. (*Richard II*, IV,i,2265-2283)

From the start he begins describing his life in battle imagery, with sorrow striking blows at his face and causing wounds. His care for his external appearance makes him seem feminine, and this possibly vain femininity is further supported by a clear allusion to Christopher Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus* commenting on the face of Helen of Troy "Was this the face that launch'd a thousand ships,/And burnt the topless towers of Ilium". He constantly compares his physical being to his rule, power. Richard II seemed to have expected the crown to keep his physical form safe, and is shocked at his own vulnerability. But still his face fails to manifest the aftermath of ruling which he expects, this could point to Richard II as a weak and distant king, show the juxtaposition between his own opinion of his rule and the reality.

In contrast, in the Roman Plays the health of a ruler is presented as the predisposition to their rule. In *Julius Caesar* for example, the health of the ruler is also presented in a

manner reminiscent of the battle imagery when his ascension to the throne seems imminent. The scene is set as a battlefield, though one of a flooding river and Cassius portrays Caesar and himself as the leader and his men, who being bid forward follow the order eagerly:

> For once, upon a raw and gusty day,
> The troubled Tiber chafing with her shores,
> Caesar said to me 'Darest thou, Cassius, now
> Leap in with me into this angry flood,
> And swim to yonder point?' Upon the word,
> Accoutred as I was, I plunged in
> And bade him follow; so indeed he did. (*Julius Caesar*, I,ii,162-168)

The reversal of situations at the end can be relatively ambiguous. On one hand it is Caesar who initiates the action, and then only waits for the reaction of his follower, as a leader should. On the other it already shows Caesar as a follower of Cassius, as a man who will readily speak but will not be so quick to act. Cassius is at once the abiding citizen, jumping in the water in his clothes, and the brave figure of the scene from the start.

> The torrent roar'd, and we did buffet it
> With lusty sinews, throwing it aside
> And stemming it with hearts of controversy;
> But ere we could arrive the point proposed,
> Caesar cried 'Help me, Cassius, or I sink!'
> I, as Aeneas, our great ancestor,
> Did from the flames of Troy upon his shoulder
> The old Anchises bear, so from the waves of Tiber
> Did I the tired Caesar. And this man
> A wretched creature and must bend his body,
> If Caesar carelessly but nod on him. (*Julius Caesar*, I,ii,169-180)

Cassius uses this scene to showcase Caesar's weakness of health, but also his own change of heart. After emerging from the river into which he so willingly jumped on Caesar's order, he is ashamed to even be Caesar's subject. His story of lost loyalty is supposed to be followed, just like Cassius thinks he as a person should be.

The battle imagery serves to imply that just like failing in the swim, Caesar would fail in battles, which is a daring implication considering, that Caesar had just returned victorious. The manner in which Caesar calls out for Cassius to save him is particular as well. By implying that the drowning man had called out his name, stated that his survival depended completely on him, Cassius gains a sense of importance. It singles him out. He elaborates on his own importance when he compares himself to Aeneas carrying Anchises (as discussed on page 27). He speaks this all in the first person, placing a strong emphasis on the word "I" before commenting from the outside. As R.A. Yoder states, " After multiple times stating things in the first person, while painting this glorious vision of him-self, he switches to a third person, so that his lamenting sounds like a righteous indignation." The indignation sounds similar to the one which he expresses over Brutus being the subject of Caesar, so after boasting about his own qualities, Cassius manages to adopt the tone of an impartial spectator. After connecting Caesar to the old Anchises, respected but weak and past his best days, he criticises him openly. As Yoder further comments "In the end he calls Caesar careless, emphasizing what he had said earlier – Caesar is not only capable of failure, but also careless and reckless, therefore unable to foresee the failure coming."

While Cassius continues to persuade Brutus to rebel against Caesar, he narrates his experience with Caesar. It is striking that his major emphasis is on Caesar's physical state instead of his possible political failures or even his alleged despotism. In his own speech it seems, that Cassius is not against the power unified in the hands of one man, but against the man who would hold it:

> He had a fever when he was in Spain,
> And when the fit was on him, I did mark
> How he did shake: 'tis true, this god did shake;
> His coward lips did from their colour fly,
> And that same eye whose bend doth awe the world
> Did lose his lustre: I did hear him groan:
> Ay, and that tongue of his that bade the Romans
> Mark him and write his speeches in their books,
> Alas, it cried 'Give me some drink, Titinius,'
> As a sick girl. Ye gods, it doth amaze me
> A man of such a feeble temper should

So get the start of the majestic world
And bear the palm alone. (*Julius Caesar*, I,ii,180-192)

Here he does arguably try to explain that a man of a feeble health should not be the only one to rule a country. In order to do so, he takes his previous battle parallel further and speaks of Caesar's illness on a campaign. His argument, which is almost solely *ad hominem*, is not based on criticising real Caesar as a real person, but on comparing the myth of Caesar a god to Caesar a man. Cassius is attacking the manner in which he is celebrated by the common people, by presenting his physical vulnerability. One by one, in a listing sequence, the strengths of his appearance are taken and undermined; a common sickness like the fever could take 'the luster' of his eyes and dimish all that is valued in him. Moreover, the gender comparison is used here. Caesar's commanding voice, a representation of his strength, is reduced not only to a weak one, but to a feminine one. With his voice Caesar loses his ability to command which has been shown in the earlier scene. Therefore, he cannot rule as the only ruler, a dictator or a king, because his strength could fail him, and his reign could fall apart at any moment.

Cassius here uses a new twist on the already mentioned rhetorical strategy of setting a standard. He sets the standard of what he perceives as the common people's expectations and illusions of Caesar, and shows him falling short of it. He places him on an unrealistic pedestal in a manner which seems to sound like the opinion of all, and then demotes to the level of a normal human being. It is striking that while Cassius seems to disregard Caesar as an incapable man, he sees his success and cannot deal with the situation. As Myron Taylor commented, for Cassius "Cesar is only a man, and a rather frail man at that. And yet this same Caesar is master of the world."[20] Taylor goes on to explain that this is an even greater problem in the eyes of Cassius due to his Epicurean nature, and that this nature is what drives him forward in plotting the assassination. In his attempt to motivate Brutus, he uses this approach to fate:

Why, man, he doth bestride the narrow world
Like a Colossus, and we petty men
Walk under his huge legs and peep about
To find ourselves dishonourable graves.

[20] Taylor, Myron. "Shakespeare's Julius Caesar and the Irony of History." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 24, no. 3, 1973, pp. 301–308. P302

Men at some time are masters of their fates:
The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars,
But in ourselves, that we are underlings. (*Julius Caesar*, I,ii,226-232)

He intentionally creates a hyperbolical juxtaposition between the position of Caesar and that of Brutus and himself, he attempts to show them as very common men of no significance and future, while they are both evidently important citizens of Rome. Calling Caesar Collosus, Cassius creates an embodiment of his fame and perceived greatness and also again refers to the body of the ruler, the body which he had previously claimed to be flawed. Moreover, by claiming that the faults is not in the stars, he is denying any possibility that Caesar would be the leader by the will of the Gods or fate, like the Christian king who is supposed to be God's representative. This, as Taylor explains, combined with Cassius' belief in the fate being in each man's hands then means that physically 'incapable' Caesar could not have been aided by supernatural forces in his quest for power and therefore must have used foul play. Caesar's physical vulnerability then undermines all his achievements as a leader and a ruler, while making him completely unfit for kingship.

In conclusion it seems that the manner in which the body of the ruler is looked at and described in Shakespeare's plays is not only connected to the religious and ideological ideals of the society, like Rome's focus on physical fitness in citizens, but also directly connected to the manner in which the ruler of the society would be chosen. In a republic in which a leader would be elected, their physical body is understood as a predisposition, a source of information concerning the person's ability to rule well. This system very much resembles a possible evaluation of military leaders in a monarchy, and compliments the military character of the Roman society as well as the leader characters. In Shakespeare's depiction of a monarchy in which the crown should theoretically be handed down according to the lineage, without any choice of in the matter, the body of the king is given and whether it is appropriate for the position is not disputed. However, after some time of rule, the body of a king becomes a testament to their rule, bearing the toll of the hardships of worries and possible battles, literal or abstract, as is shown in Richard II's speech. It seems to be the difference between predisposition and causality. A small exception to this is Richard III, who seems to "embody the fallen nature of man, the sins of corrupt

humanity foregrounded in the emblematic body of a misshapen, self-crowned king"[21]. The important aspect here is self-crowned, Richard III's rule is shown to be against the will of God, especially in the battle speech of to-be-victorious Richmond, and he is shown to be vile enough to deserve his deformity even before being crowned. Richard III, is presented as a tyrant, not a king, and therefore his body is the forewarning of his rule's deformity, identified by the character of Margaret[22]. This is overlooked by the majority of characters, because they follow the contemporary political thinking, a perception of the body of the ruler as insignificant for their ability or right to rule.

[21] Marie Héléne Besnault, Michel Bitot, "Historical legacy and fiction: the political reinvention of King Richard III", *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History plays, Michael Hattaway e.d.*, Cambridge:Cambridge University Press, 2002 p110

[22] Marie Héléne Besnault, Michel Bitot, "Historical legacy and fiction: the political reinvention of King Richard III", *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History plays, Michael Hattaway e.d.,* Cambridge:Cambridge University Press, 2002 p114

The Crown

The crown as a symbol appears in History plays of course, but also in tragedies and Roman plays. Even in plays which are not concerned with the monarchy, the crown is the ultimate symbol of power, but it can also be a symbol of the burden of responsibility. Its meanings and symbolism can also change in the course of the play depending on the situation of the ruler. In the speeches of Richard II, a rightful king by blood, the crown is first the symbol of the king's divine power, he speaks of his crown as of the guarantee of his divine protection, while also connecting it inseparably to his person, when he feels victorious saying 'The breath of worldly men cannot depose/The deputy elected by the Lord:/…/ To lift shrewd steel against our golden crown' (Richard II, III, ii, 55-58). Here, as Parvini explains, "Richard does not entertain, or perhaps does not wish to entertain, the prospect of Bolingbroke simply ignoring the ideological implications of facing an anointed king."[23] He seems to believe in the ideology and rely on it almost naively. But as his situation grows worse, he is confronted with his own fragility, and turns on the crown as on a burden dragging him down. In act III, scene ii, (1566-1580) he makes the crown from a symbol of the royal power into a curse, controlling the king. The image of the hollow crown filled with manipulators detrimental to the king comes from John of Gaunt's dying speech to the king, but here Richard II takes the image much further, from flatterers to death. He speaks of the crown and implies the double body of the king – what the crown lends to the king is not only power and authority, but also the sense of being invincible, which is dangerous. While the crown itself sits around his mortal head, the king is given his second body, and as a results seems to forget about the faults and weaknesses of his real physical body, until he is reminded of the reality by an injury. He combines the description of the king in a dual manner, as a normal, material body, and as something grander, a supernatural being. It seems here, that Richard II hates his crown, and might be willing to be rid of it, but he associates his two bodies too strongly, and does not seem to realise that the physical body could be alive after being left by the royal one – for Richard a king is born a king and dies a king, and cannot separate his life from the crown. The king seems to predict his own death coming shortly after his abdication.

In his abdication scene this becomes even more apparent, because while having previously identified the crown as the source of his misery, he is still very hesitant to give it away.

[23] Neema Parvini *Shakespeare's History plays: Rethinking Historicism* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012)

Furthermore, he seems to insist on the ‘usual’ manner of lineage – for a new king to begin his rule the previous one has to die – “Long mayst thou live in Richard's seat to sit, /And soon lie Richard in an earthly pit!” (Richard II, IV,i,2188-2189) He seems to show this also in his first reaction to the request for him to resign, using the shape of the crown for symbolism, especially the hollowness:

> …Here, cousin, seize the crown;
> Here cousin:
> On this side my hand, and on that side yours.
> Now is this golden crown like a deep well
> That owes two buckets, filling one another,
> The emptier ever dancing in the air,
> The other down, unseen and full of water:
> That bucket down and full of tears am I,
> Drinking my griefs, whilst you mount up on high. (*Richard II*, IV,i,2169-2178)

The choice of words, ‘seize’ is mocking Bolingbroke, pointing to the fact that the abdication stationed for the lords and legitimacy is forced. He also again points to the hollowness of the crown, making it a well this time, a portal in which the two kings meet for a brief moment before one ascends leaving the other one to sink. Richard’s imagery is getting exponentially more vivid as he loses his power, as if investing his last energy in his final speeches. This is shown also in the following lines:

> Now mark me, how I will undo myself;
> I give this heavy weight from off my head
> And this unwieldy sceptre from my hand,
> The pride of kingly sway from out my heart;
> With mine own tears I wash away my balm,
> With mine own hands I give away my crown,
> With mine own tongue deny my sacred state,
> With mine own breath release all duty's rites:
> All pomp and majesty I do forswear;
> My manors, rents, revenues I forego;
> My acts, decrees, and statutes I deny:

God pardon all oaths that are broke to me!
God keep all vows unbroke that swear to thee! (*Richard II*, IV,i,2190-2203)

Here Richard goes through the coronation ceremony in reverse. The speech is rather theatrical and very illustrative, as it gains momentum with a repetitive scheme, a parison, it becomes ceremonious. The king seems to remember his own proclamation "Not all the water in the rough rude sea/Can wash the balm off from an anointed king;"(RII,III,ii,1462-1463) In his words and actions, that is still true, because only a king can depose a king, and so he deposes himself. The four repetitive verses combine the physical attributes of kingship with common physicality – as if Richard's own physical body is ridding him of his symbolic body, through all that is connected to it, be it the physical or abstract. He speaks in the royal couplet which appears and reappears in Shakespeare's plays, but which he fails to use in the opening act of the play (he has other characters, e.g. Bolingbroke and John of Gaunt completing his couplets). He seems to favour his anointment above all other attributes of royal sovereignty, emphasizing his strong belief in God as the source of royal power. But after giving all this to Henry Bolingbroke, he seems to only expect death, because there is no life after abdication for him.

Another notable aspect of the symbolism of the crown is again related to the frequently mentioned marital character of the relationship between the king and his land, or here, between the king and his crown. When Richard is being separated from his wife, he exclaims that:

Doubly divorced! Bad men, you violate
A twofold marriage, 'twixt my crown and me,
And then betwixt me and my married wife.
Let me unkiss the oath 'twixt thee and me;
And yet not so, for with a kiss 'twas made. (*Richard II*, V,i,2406)

Richard himself calls his situation a double divorce of a twofold marriage, but even though he had recently given up on one part of then marriage, that to his crown, he is unwilling to reverse the oath he had sworn to his wife. By his following speech it becomes evident that by keeping his wife bound to him, he is keeping his connection to a part of the sublime body of the king – he hopes that she will help him remain remembered and revered by his subjects, echoing his previous mention of the king's name being twenty-five thousand names. The crown and the queen are frequently mentioned together, two attributes of the

kingly power and seemingly always in that sequence. In Hamlet, for example, this sequence appears repeatedly, both in the speech of the king's ghost and in the speech of the new king. The murdered king while explaining his fate and the reason for his current state, to his son uses these words:

> Thus was I, sleeping, by a brother's hand
> Of life, of crown, of queen, at once dispatch'd;
> Cut off even in the blossoms of my sin,
> Unhous'led, disappointed, unanel'd,
> No reckoning made, but sent to my account
> With all my imperfections on my head. (*Hamlet*,I,v,779-785)

His complaint lists the things he had been depraved of placing the life first, followed by the crown and then by the wife. He then continues to mourn the fate of his soul, having died without the last unction before dying. This fact is the basis of most of the plot – had the father died after receiving his last rites, his ghost would not have roamed the earth and he would not have been able to ask his son to avenge him. It is worth discussing that Shakespeare would use a primarily Catholic tradition as such an important plot device. While again listing three wrongs that had been done to him, he emphasizes not having received the eucharist, being deprived of his position, and not receiving the anointment. In this second list, while also a list of three trespasses, he does not mention the severing of his marital ties. In his later soliloquy, his brother echoes the same list of privileges he had gained by the crime:

> But, O, what form of prayer
> Can serve my turn? 'Forgive me my foul murther'?
> That cannot be; since I am still possess'd
> Of those effects for which I did the murther-
> My crown, mine own ambition, and my queen.
> May one be pardon'd and retain th' offence?
> In the corrupted currents of this world
> Offence's gilded hand may shove by justice,
> And oft 'tis seen the wicked prize itself
> Buys out the law; but 'tis not so above. (*Hamlet*, III, iii, 2312-2322)

So while Hamlet fears that Claudius might be pardoned, Claudius assumes that he may not be as long as he has the benefits which the sins had brought him. Again he lists the same objects – the crown and the queen, and again in this order. It is contrasting that while for the father and the prince, the new marriage seems to be the more important transgression, to both the dead king and the new one the crown is far more important.

Later when manipulating Laertes, Claudius lists his attributes again, this time using them as a leverage adding weight to his words. Here the queen is missing from the list completely, of course, but the succession of the other things named is again telling us about the priorities of the king himself or of what he precieves as the general priority when communicating with his subject:

> Claudius:
> They find us touch'd, we will our kingdom give,
> Our crown, our life, and all that we call ours,
> To you in satisfaction; but if not,
> Be you content to lend your patience to us,
> And we shall jointly labour with your soul
> To give it due content. (*Hamlet*, IV,v,3077-3082)

While essentially plotting to kill Hamlet, the king lists the kingdom first, then the crown, followed by his life, and his possessions. This might be either meant to emphasize his enthusiasm for Leartes' cause almost to the point of intimidation, given that the cause does not call for such means or words, or show that Claudius would sooner sacrifice others than engage himself directly in the cause, which is symbolical of what he is planning at the very moment.

Compared to this burden placed on the crown, when Caesar is offered his crown in *Julius Caesar*, there is no negative connotation connected to it for him in his own view. It is purely the symbol of higher power than what he already had achieved, the reward placed upon him by the people. The conspirators on the other hand see it as a threat to the Republic and themselves. As R.A. Foakes states, "the main motive for Brutus' rebellion is that Caesar "would be crown'd" (*RII*.i.12-17); Caesar is like a lion, the king of beasts, among the herd of Romans (I.ii.106) and more dangerous than danger."[24] The crown is a

[24] Foakes R.A. "An Approach to *Julius Caesar"*, *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 5, No. 3 (Summer, 1954), pp. 259-270, p266

powerful weapon in his hands, as is responsibility in the seeming understanding of the Roman characters. While, compared to History plays, there is no mention of the burden a crown places on its wearer in the speech of the characters, the effect of the crown itself is present in the character of Caesar, as Yoder states, "familiarly in Shakespearean tragedy the crown, actual or figurative, works the progressive isolation of its wearer."[25] Caesar becomes isolated and vulnerable, which partly leads to his demise.

The very fact that Caesar can accept or refuse the crown, as he is said to do three times, shows the difference between the Republic and Monarchy. Even in Coriolanus the crown is spoken about even though there is no monarchy or even the possibility of it. When Menenius Agrippa speaks with the people in Act I, scene I, he uses the image of the crown to indicate the leadership of the head over the body. It is Agrippa who speaks about the crown again, when celebrating the returning Martius Coriolanus exclaiming "Now, the gods crown thee!"(*Coriolanus*, II,i,1108) While the image of the crown seems to bear no negative connotations itself, and only stands for glory and power, it seems to be the reason for the downfall of both Caesar and Coriolanus. This implies that a situation in which the quest for power is open, and the price is presented as a reward without a tax on those who get it, is portrayed in Shakespeare as society shattering. This could be connected both to Elizabethan perception of kingship and leadership, but also to the echo of the Wars of Roses still present in the minds of the people.

---

[25] Yoder, R. A. "History and the Histories in Julius Caesar." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 24, no. 3, 1973, pp. 309–327. P313

Body Politic

The symbolic body of the ruler is closely linked to their authority (as explained on page 32) and therefore it can be also used as one of the tools for criticism of their rule, as the metaphor of the symbolic body can represent their faults and weaknesses in an illustrative manner. In *Richard II,* John of Gaunt in a striking death-bed speech combines the body politic and the body of the ruler in order to make the king see the wrong in his ways. Here the body of the ruler is symbolic for the whole realm in the sense of the second body of the king, a concept which is important throughout the play, especially in the speeches of the king himself (e.g. *RII*,IV,i). Neema Parvini implies that John of Gaunt is forced to this manner of wording his complaints by what he calls "Richard's linguistic prison"[26] – the king only allows arguments which align with his, previously discussed, perception of the concept of kingship. John of Gaunt begins to imply his criticism by suggesting the king's illness:

> King Richard II:
> Should dying men flatter with those that live?
>
> John of Gaunt:
> No, no, men living flatter those that die.
>
> King Richard II:
> Thou, now a-dying, say'st thou flatterest me.
>
> John of Gaunt:
> O, no! thou diest, though I the sicker be.
>
> King Richard II:
> I am in health, I breathe, and see thee ill. (*Richard II*, II,i,771-776)

While the king at first takes his remark as referring to his physical body, it is soon clear that Gaunt is actually referring to Richard's symbolic body. Gaunt's statements have an even greater value, because throughout Richard II and his speeches, the relationship between the king's two bodies is crucial and illustrates his mental state. It is also remarkable for the character, that here he primarily thinks of his physical body being ill, as he seems to fail to separate between the two bodies of the ruler, but also claims later that

[26] "Ideology in Richard II and Henry IV." Shakespeare's History plays: Rethinking Historicism, by Neema Parvini, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 2012, pp. 174–214.p188

the crown deceives the ruler to believe in their own immortality (Richard II, III,ii,1575-1580). Richard's understanding of kingship is much more traditional than that of his successors, and therefore, as Ronald R. Macdonald states, "Gaunt is constrained to use the language of sacred kingship."[27]

As John of Gaunt continues to clarify his claim concerning the king's poor health, he subtly claims God as his witness. He calls on his authority to support his claim:

> Now He that made me knows I see thee ill;
> Ill in myself to see, and in thee seeing ill.
> Thy death-bed is no lesser than thy land
> Wherein thou liest in reputation sick;
> And thou, too careless patient as thou art,
> Commit'st thy anointed body to the cure
> Of those physicians that first wounded thee:
> A thousand flatterers sit within thy crown,
> Whose compass is no bigger than thy head;
> And yet, incaged in so small a verge,
> The waste is no whit lesser than thy land. (*Richard II*, II,i,777-786)

Opening with the antanaclasis in the first two lines, John of Gaunt goes into a great depth in describing the illness of the symbolic body, which comes to the foreground of the speech. These words of his are later echoed by the king himself in his beach speech (Richard II, IV,i, 2299-2302) and his abdication speech (focused on at page 49). It seems that the words of Gaunt here carry a certain amount of foreboding. He also criticises the king for being ruthless, in his behaviour as a patient, but already the metaphor of the king as a patient waiting for physicians to help him is a criticism in itself, for it ought to be the ruler who brings the solution when, as John of Gaunt implies, his realm is doing poorly. John of Gaunt then uses an even harsher form of criticism and manipulation:

> O, had thy grandsire with a prophet's eye
> Seen how his son's son should destroy his sons,
> From forth thy reach he would have laid thy shame,
> Deposing thee before thou wert possess'd,

[27] Ronald R. Macdonald, 'Uneasy Lies: Language and History in Shakespeare's Lancastrian Tetralogy', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 35:1 (Spring 1984), p. 27.

Which art possess'd now to depose thyself.
Why, cousin, wert thou regent of the world,
It were a shame to let this land by lease;
But for thy world enjoying but this land,
Is it not more than shame to shame it so?
Landlord of England art thou now, not king:
Thy state of law is bondslave to the law; And thou— (*Richard II*, II,i,, 788-798)

So here John of Gaunt uses the same strategy as the Archbishop of Canterbury in *Henry V*. He abandons the conceit of the king's body to focus on his bloodline and the opinion of his ancestor, whom he has the advantage of having known, he himself being the king's older relative. He uses frequent repetitions of words, for example the antanaclasis of words 'possessed' and 'depose', and also the anthimeria of the word 'shame', to help to add emphasis to his argument. John of Gaunt also again foretells what is coming for the king – deposing himself later – and builds an expectation which later helps to justify his son's actions in forcing the king to an abdication. The response of the king is based on the same metaphors:

King Richard II. A lunatic lean-witted fool,
Presuming on an ague's privilege,
Darest with thy frozen admonition
Make pale our cheek, chasing the royal blood
With fury from his native residence.
Now, by my seat's right royal majesty,
Wert thou not brother to great Edward's son,
This tongue that runs so roundly in thy head
Should run thy head from thy unreverent shoulders. (*Richard II*, II,i,798-807)

Respecting the given conceit of the body and royal lineage, the king threatens the dying man with death. He attempts to echo his uncle's speech with a similar pattern of repetitions, but falls short. He also mentions a sickly image of himself, with pale cheeks, an image which clashes with the fury he mentions earlier. The same royal blood is also the reason why John of Gaunt is able to say what he does without a harsh punishment. The king here uses a metonymy of the nobleman's own physical body, stepping up the aggression of the verbal attacks in doing so

John of Gaunt:
May be a precedent and witness good
That thou respect'st not spilling Edward's blood:
Join with the present sickness that I have;
And thy unkindness be like crooked age,
To crop at once a too long wither'd flower.
Live in thy shame, but die not shame with thee! (*Richard II*, II,i,814-819)

The image of blood and family continues, referring to the banishment and future conflict between Richard II and his cousin Bolingbroke. Like in the opening paragraph of John of Gaunt's scolding of the king, bad behaviour and sickness are connected – the king's bad decisions as a ruler are detrimental to himself in his second body, to his land, and to all his people, his noblemen and family included. After his death, his honour and memory should remain stained, a terrible fate, but later in the play it seems that what the king fears more is being forgotten, when he urges his wife to speak of him (Richard II, V,i,2369-2384)

This image of the king endangering and infesting the land with infirmity is a perversion of the Elizabethan understanding of the body politic. As Edward Forset wrote in 1606, as the primary physician of the realm it was the sovereign who had to administer the remedy to any maladies that arose, even to the extent of severing or amputating a diseased limb, if necessary[28]. This possible amputation is exemplified by the execution of a noble, as both Bolingbroke and Henry V do in their plays[29].

Body politic as such appears not only in plays concerning monarchies; it is a rather complex but expressive motif, used in Shakespeare's work mostly as a long conceit, which presents the realm as a united functional body, and may present its members, castes and social structures incorporated as body parts. While *Richard II* deals mostly with the symbolic body of the king, the rest of the mentioned plays focus primarily on the body politic in its most usual meaning which is speaking about the realm - the Commonwealth – as an organism. This conceit is a rather effective method of conveying a political opinion for its illustrative nature - a well-functioning organism would be the embodiment of a well governed realm, while disease and maladies can easily represent disfunction and even relatively point to the culprit. It is a means of communicating a character's political

[28] Edward Forset, *A Comparative Discourse of the Bodies Natural and Politique*, London, Oxford University Press, 2004
[29] B.J.Dobski and D. Gish, *Shakespeare and the Body Politic,* p9

persuasion in a clear manner, and in Shakespeare's plays, it seems to be used in order to suggest a return to what the speaking character perceives to be or declares to be the normal status quo, therefore enforcing order. Exactly this happens in Coriolanus during a rebellion of the citizens. In this case it is used in order to silence the citizens speaking against the leaders, therefore re-enforcing social classes and structure.

> There was a time when all the body's members
> Rebell'd against the belly, thus accused it:
> That only like a gulf it did remain
> I' the midst o' the body, idle and unactive,
> Still cupboarding the viand, never bearing
> Like labour with the rest, where the other instruments
> Did see and hear, devise, instruct, walk, feel,
> And, mutually participate, did minister
> Unto the appetite and affection common
> Of the whole body. The belly answer'd— (*Coriolanus*, I,i,88-98)

Here the system of the body politic is used rather explicitly; the roles are given out to the people and the government. The complaints of the rebellious body parts echo exactly the difficulties of the hungry citizens. Their functions are listed as well as their complaints, at first creating the impression, that Menenius Agrippa is sympathetic with the people, but this idea is quickly discarded:

> Sir, I shall tell you. With a kind of smile,
> from the lungs, but even thus—
> For, look you, I may make the belly smile
> As well as speak—it tauntingly replied
> To the discontented members, the mutinous parts
> That envied his receipt; even so most fitly
> As you malign our senators for that
> They are not such as you. (*Coriolanus*, I,i,88-106)

So after addressing some the possible arguments that the people might have against the senators who hold the majority of resources, seemingly being understanding of the starving citizens, Menenius Agrippa seems to emphasize his own fat well-fed belly or his influence over the highly positioned, when in line 101 he asks the citizen to look at his ability to

make the belly smile. He might do this in order to even more connect himself with the belly, or to distance himself with pure juxtaposition from the famished common people. The hinted contrast between the well-kept body of Menenius Agrippa and the poor people echoes the role of illness from *Julius Caesar*, possibly signifying that from the point of view of the healthy characters the sick ones are also morally decayed. Therefore the reaction of the speaker of the rebels is appropriately indignant:

> Your belly's answer? What!
> The kingly-crowned head, the vigilant eye,
> The counsellor heart, the arm our soldier,
> Our steed the leg, the tongue our trumpeter.
> With other muniments and petty helps
> In this our fabric, if that they- (*Coriolanus*, I,i,107-112)

The citizen acknowledges the purpose and function of all the other body parts, with praise and respect for all the parts of society which they represent, something which Agrippa mentions but briefly. The difference in priorities is clear.

Agrippa proceeds to emphasize the connection between the citizen he is talking to and the rebellious body-parts by scolding both for their lack of patience. His reply seems to be deliberately prolonged; again, while pretending to try and calm the citizens, he is actually deliberately stirring the conflict up:

> Menenius Agrippa:
> Note me this, good friend;
> Your most grave belly was deliberate,
> Not rash like his accusers, and thus answer'd:
> 'True is it, my incorporate friends,' quoth he,
> 'That I receive the general food at first,
> Which you do live upon; and fit it is,
> Because I am the store-house and the shop
> Of the whole body: but, if you do remember,
> I send it through the rivers of your blood,
> Even to the court, the heart, to the seat o' the brain;
> And, through the cranks and offices of man,
> The strongest nerves and small inferior veins

From me receive that natural competency
Whereby they live: and though that all at once,
You, my good friends,'—this says the belly, mark me,—

First Citizen:
Ay, sir; well, well.

Menenius Agrippa:
'Though all at once cannot
See what I do deliver out to each,
Yet I can make my audit up, that all
From me do back receive the flour of all,
And leave me but the bran.' What say you to't? (*Coriolanus*, I,i,124-144)

Here it is Agrippa who goes into a further anatomical detail for his metaphor, but even though he does mention some of the body parts previously listed by the citizen, he focuses on the more symbolical and perceivably noble body parts such as the heart and the brain, taking care to call them different metaphors than those that had been used. While the metaphors used by the citizen were almost royal in nature – "kingly crowned head" "counsellor"– Agrippa takes care to rephrase them into the language of the court. He then incorporates the limbs, and all other mentioned members, under the metonymy of the system of veins and nerves. This unifies the body as a network of the complex chain of provision, but also denies the importance of the other members, painting them simply as passively waiting for their allowance. The belly, In Agrippa's interpretation, demands trust that its actions are just without providing a proof. The belly claiming to have only the bran left is denied by Agrippa's connection to it and his own presentation of himself, as mentioned previously. He then applies his metaphor to truly express his contempt and disrespect for the citizens he is dealing with:

The senators of Rome are this good belly,
And you the mutinous members; for examine
Their counsels and their cares, digest things rightly
Touching the weal o' the common, you shall find
No public benefit which you receive
But it proceeds or comes from them to you

And no way from yourselves. What do you think,
You, the great toe of this assembly? (*Coriolanus*, I,i,146-153)

In this part of his speech Agrippa declares all of the work of the citizens as meaningless and without merrit, he is using the rather functional metaphor of a functioning body, but abusing it to show only one rather specific point of view. He proceeds to use the body – metaphor to instruct the citizen:

First Citizen:
I the great toe! why the great toe?

Menenius Agrippa:
For that, being one o' the lowest, basest, poorest,
Of this most wise rebellion, thou go'st foremost:
Thou rascal, that art worst in blood to run,
Lead'st first to win some vantage. (*Coriolanus* 1,i, 155-159)

Here Agrippa allows his disdain for the 'extremities of the body' loose while attacking the leader of the rebellion. His insult is thoroughly thought-out, and similarly to his previous conceit, works exactly in his favour in order to manipulate the citizens. The manner in which the conceit is conceived here lists everyone as a member of the body, every citizen and office have a part, even if by others it is a part rather useless, base or even degrading.

This could be interpreted as a republican perception of a realm and its society. In this scheme the king's position is mostly dual, his second body encompasses the whole nation as on the first cover The Leviathan by Thomas Hobbes, but he also stands above the body of the kingdom, taking care of it from his position of power. The two manners of the concepts of the body politic seem to be in accord with the different perception of the body of the ruler in the different portrayals of the two manners of ruling a realm.

Rhetoric of leadership

The focus of this chapter is both the Public speeches and Battle speeches. Public speeches combine symbolic of kingship and leadership as well as strategies of persuasion, but also use and identify the manners of addressing the subjects. The intent of public speeches is a relatively versatile persuasion of the subjects in which they differ from the battle speeches. The purpose as well as imagery of battle speeches is much more specific, they represent not only the approach of the ruler towards their subjects, but also focus on the speaker's approach to the conflict and the enemy. The battle speeches are also used to dramatize and illustrate the battles they present, and will therefore be treated separately.

Public speeches

In this chapter a long close reading of the speeches of Brutus and Mark Anthony as well as Richard III and Buckingham is used to illustrate and further analyse the usage of aforementioned strategies. The first speech used is that of Brutus from *Julius Caesar*. Here Brutus attempts to support his act of assassination of Caesar in the eyes of the people of Rome. He begins by addressing them, in a tone similar to Henry V in his St. Crispin's speech:

> Brutus. Be patient till the last.
> Romans, countrymen, and lovers! hear me for my
> cause, and be silent, that you may hear: believe me
> for mine honour, and have respect to mine honour, that
> you may believe: censure me in your wisdom, and
> awake your senses, that you may the better judge. (*Julius Caesar*, III,ii,1545-1550)

He seems to try and effectively bribe the people by speaking respectfully to them, expressing an opinion which is the polar opposite of what Cassius seem to hold of the general public. Brutus addresses them as equals and at first seems to appeal to the logos and ethos. He highlights the nationality which connects them all, as R.A. Foakes explains, being a "Roman should in itself indicate certain qualities in a man".[30] This expectation is what Brutus builds on throughout his speech. He also puts a great emphasis on the second person pronoun, and seems to use the strategy of shifting power, this time in the direction of the audience, in order to get the listeners on his side. He goes on to address a certain group of people specifically in order to present his argument to everyone:

> If there be any in this assembly, any dear friend of
> Caesar's, to him I say, that Brutus' love to Caesar
> was no less than his. If then that friend demand
> why Brutus rose against Caesar, this is my answer:
> —Not that I loved Caesar less, but that I loved
> Rome more. (*Julius Caesar*, III,ii,1551-1556)

Here he dives into a more personal manner of address. He presumes the possible reactions of the people and dismantles them before they are uttered. He works on portraying his act

[30] Foakes R.A. "An Approach to *Julius Caesar"*, *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 5, No. 3 (Summer, 1954), pp. 259-270, p267

as a deed of love, instead of the act of hatred and selfish evil that are usually closely connected to murder. For this purpose Brutus creates a bi-polar logic which completely excludes spite and personal interests as possible motives:

> Had you rather Caesar were living and
> die all slaves, than that Caesar were dead, to live
> all free men? As Caesar loved me, I weep for him;
> as he was fortunate, I rejoice at it; as he was
> valiant, I honour him: but, as he was ambitious, I
> slew him. There is tears for his love; joy for his
> fortune; honour for his valour; and death for his
> ambition. (*Julius Caesar*, III,ii, 1556-1563)

He creates a situation of two possibilities and no options between them, the so called false dichotomy, forcing an agreement from the people by what could even be called an argumentum ad absurdum. He then goes on to list emotions which are both noble, and understandably relatable to his audience, and into the same equation he places the motive for the act

> Who is here so base that would be a
> bondman? If any, speak; for him have I offended.
> Who is here so rude that would not be a Roman? If
> any, speak; for him have I offended. Who is here so
> vile that will not love his country? If any, speak;
> for him have I offended. I pause for a reply. (*Julius Caesar*, III,ii,1563-1568)

Here he eliminates any possible criticism by implying attributes of “vile” and “base” to the people who would criticise him. He then waits for a reply almost in a ‘let them speak now or remain silent’ manner’, putting responsibility onto individuals, using peer pressure in his advantage. By his argument shifting to the people from his deed, he makes it seem generally accepted that the murder had been in the best interest of Rome and its people. Similarly to Richard III (*Richard III*, III,v,2090 - 2182) he only gives binary possibilities based on ethos and pathos, but presented as logical argumentation, leaving no space for disputation. The response of the people is exactly according to the manipulation: “None, Brutus, none.” After the entrance of Mark Anthony, Brutus proceeds to involve him in the situation as a benefactor:

> Here comes his body, mourned by Mark Antony: who,
> though he had no hand in his death, shall receive
> the benefit of his dying, a place in the
> commonwealth; as which of you shall not? With this
> I depart,—that, as I slew my best lover for the
> good of Rome, I have the same dagger for myself,
> when it shall please my country to need my death. (*Julius Caesar*, III,ii, 1576-1582)

Brutus here seems to go back to his speech to the conspirators (Julius Caesar, II,i), presenting the murder of Caesar as a sacrifice to make a "dish fit for the Gods" (Julius Caesar, II,i,782). A deed that had to be done for the benefit of all, for which there is no punishment, and in which there was no selfish motive, because even those completely uninvolved receive equally as much as those who had committed it. Brutus takes this even further, claiming that he would not only kill, but also die for his country if the circumstances were asking it. He attempts to set a new precedent in the expectations of both the people and the rulers. He manages to underline it furthermore with asking everyone to honour Caesar's memory and bringing attention to the conspirators allowing Mark Anthony to speak:

> Good countrymen, let me depart alone,
> And, for my sake, stay here with Antony:
> Do grace to Caesar's corpse, and grace his speech
> Tending to Caesar's glories; which Mark Antony,
> By our permission, is allow'd to make.
> I do entreat you, not a man depart,
> Save I alone, till Antony have spoke. (*Julius Caesar*,III,ii, 1594-1599)

The wording of the plea is peculiar, because with the situation, it should be expected that the crowd would stay for the sake of Caesar's memory. Brutus here attempts to take not only the credit for allowing the praise and lament to happen, but also for the people attending it. He again speaks to the general public but puts emphasis on individuals. Mark Anthony takes over in a manner which connects to Brutus' speech in a similar, but less grand tone:

> Friends, Romans, countrymen, lend me your ears;
> I come to bury Caesar, not to praise him.

The evil that men do lives after them;
The good is oft interred with their bones;
So let it be with Caesar. The noble Brutus
Hath told you Caesar was ambitious:
If it were so, it was a grievous fault,
And grievously hath Caesar answer'd it. (*Julius Caesar*,III,ii, 1617-1624)

He speaks to the people in a triple address, just as Brutus had, but already in the second line he is in disagreement with Brutus' words. He omits no chance to repeat the main arguments of Brutus – that he, Brutus is an honourable citizen, and that Caesar was ambitious. From the start Anthony's speech sounds less staged than Brutus' – while they both build up their arguments gradually, Brutus works with the audience while he himself seems well secure of his opinion. In contrast to this, the speech of Mark Anthony has a pondering quality as if his thoughts were flowing freely and his opinion forming as he moves along. This improvised quality is partly achieved by the frequent repetition of the main points around which Brutus' argument was built and which are now freshly on the mind of the audience. His words never clash with Brutus' openly, but slowly build on his binary possibilities, to show the wider scheme:

Here, under leave of Brutus and the rest—
For Brutus is an honourable man;
So are they all, all honourable men—
Come I to speak in Caesar's funeral.
He was my friend, faithful and just to me:
But Brutus says he was ambitious;
And Brutus is an honourable man.
He hath brought many captives home to Rome
Whose ransoms did the general coffers fill:
Did this in Caesar seem ambitious?
When that the poor have cried, Caesar hath wept:
Ambition should be made of sterner stuff:
Yet Brutus says he was ambitious;
And Brutus is an honourable man.
You all did see that on the Lupercal
I thrice presented him a kingly crown,

Which he did thrice refuse: was this ambition?
Yet Brutus says he was ambitious;
And, sure, he is an honourable man. (*Julius Caesar*,III,ii,1625-1643)

Mark Anthony weighs his own experience of Caesar, as well as the presumed people's experience of Caesar, in a situation previously discussed in the play by the conspirators, and his actions against the word and honour of Brutus. He begins with the personal, and moves into more and more public and known to gradate his examples, even adding criticism of Caesar's weakness for the pity of the poor; he ends with the events of past days which should be still a fresh memory to most of the audience, and again only presents Brutus' word and honour as a counter argument.

I speak not to disprove what Brutus spoke,
But here I am to speak what I do know.
You all did love him once, not without cause:
What cause withholds you then, to mourn for him?
O judgment! thou art fled to brutish beasts,
And men have lost their reason. Bear with me;
My heart is in the coffin there with Caesar,
And I must pause till it come back to me. (*Julius Caesar*,III,ii,1644-1651)

Anthony's speech here builds stronger pathos than before, again attempting to seem unprepared and almost vulnerable. Anthony's speech again widens the possibilities given by Brutus, asking people to mourn while claiming to not be in discord with Brutus. Interestingly Mark Anthony never claims to be in agreement with Brutus, only to not speak against his words, therefore making his whole speech an elaboration on avoiding binary options. His emotional speech, highlighted by exclamations and a self-proclaimed need for a pause due to emotions, contrasts with Brutus' logically structures argument. While both of the speeches mostly build on Pathos and Ethos, Anthony's does so openly while Brutus conceals his speech in Logos mainly through juxtapositions and repetitions. In his following lines, he subtly creates a divide between the people and the conspirators:

O masters, if I were disposed to stir
Your hearts and minds to mutiny and rage,
I should do Brutus wrong, and Cassius wrong,
Who, you all know, are honourable men:

I will not do them wrong; I rather choose
To wrong the dead, to wrong myself and you,
Than I will wrong such honourable men. (*Julius Caesar*,III,ii,1666-1672)

Mark Anthony here subtly mentions stirring rage and mutiny for the first time of many. The repetition of "honourable men" reaches its highest frequency, while slowly beginning to distinguish a group of men who do not belong to the people, but are so elevated above others, that Anthony rather does injustice to himself and the people, identifying himself as one of the people again, and to the dead, a taboo in most cultures, to avoid wronging Brutus and his co-operators. Here therefore Mark Anthony manages to assign the very vices of ambition and despotism, which Brutus aims to attribute to Caesar, to the conspirators.

Following this subtle attack, Mark Anthony aims to produce positive emotions in a manner similar to that seen in Henry V, in St. Crispian's speech:

But here's a parchment with the seal of Caesar;
I found it in his closet, 'tis his will:
Let but the commons hear this testament—
Which, pardon me, I do not mean to read—
And they would go and kiss dead Caesar's wounds
And dip their napkins in his sacred blood,
Yea, beg a hair of him for memory,
And, dying, mention it within their wills,
Bequeathing it as a rich legacy
Unto their issue. (*Julius Caesar*,III,ii,1673-1682)

He presents a specific vision of possible future, with physical details easily imaginable. While this vision is by no means as strong as that in St. Crispin speech, because it shows far less images of life and family, and primarily does not present the future of the audience listening, it succeeds in presenting the opinion Mark Anthony wishes the people to have of Caesar without presenting it as his own. He even manages to connect to Brutus' imagery of Caesar as a sacrifice, by calling his blood sacred, and presenting him in a manner reminiscent of a saint, whose remains are a sacred and treasured possession. He then proceeds to speak of the life of that saint, reminding the people of their memories of Caesar instead of Brutus' version of him (1714-1718), and to show the full extent of the

assassination, turning it from an idealistic act, a necessary execution, into a gruesome act of violence:

> Look, in this place ran Cassius' dagger through:
> See what a rent the envious Casca made:
> Through this the well-beloved Brutus stabb'd;
> And as he pluck'd his cursed steel away,
> Mark how the blood of Caesar follow'd it,
> As rushing out of doors, to be resolved
> If Brutus so unkindly knock'd, or no;
> For Brutus, as you know, was Caesar's angel:
> Judge, O you gods, how dearly Caesar loved him! (*Julius Caesar*,III,ii,1719-1727)

Here for the first time Mark Anthony uses negative adjectives relatively freely when talking about the murderers of Caesar and the murder itself, with one exception which is the 'well-beloved Brutus'. Brutus is presented as beloved by both the people, and Caesar – a sentiment which Brutus himself mentioned in his speech is gradually turned to point the most guilt towards him. Mark Anthony uses the natural flow of blood out of a wound to present another vivid image of Caesar as a friend eager to reconcile – using the value put on male friendships by the Roman society to support the returning positive attitude towards Caesar. This of course also matches with the Christian ideology of turning the other cheek. In this speech Shakespeare combines the Roman ideals with the Christian ideology, possibly for a stronger effect on the audience.

Mark Anthony's rather specific presentation of the wounds has a purely rhetorical purpose. He of course has no way to know which wound was cut by whose hand, but by assigning specific wounds to specific people, Mark Anthony materialises the deed and ruins the previous attempts at its moralising explanation. He then supplies a stylised explanation of his own:

> This was the most unkindest cut of all;
> For when the noble Caesar saw him stab,
> Ingratitude, more strong than traitors' arms,
> Quite vanquish'd him: then burst his mighty heart;
> And, in his mantle muffling up his face,
> Even at the base of Pompey's statua,

Which all the while ran blood, great Caesar fell.
O, what a fall was there, my countrymen!
Then I, and you, and all of us fell down,
Whilst bloody treason flourish'd over us.
O, now you weep; and, I perceive, you feel
The dint of pity: these are gracious drops.
Kind souls, what, weep you when you but behold
Our Caesar's vesture wounded? Look you here,
Here is himself, marr'd, as you see, with traitors. (*Julius Caesar*,III,ii,1728-1742)

The ideology used here goes back the Roman version of the body of the ruler, in which the physical body and its state is significant and has to be worthy of the position its owner carries. In Mark Anthony's account, the mighty Caesar was not killed by a group of mere men with daggers attacking him. He was killed by treachery, the betrayal of a person so close to him it burst his heart and took away all his life force. Caesar did not die as a punishment for his ambition or a precaution made for the safety and freedom of the people, but because he believed in the Roman ideals of friendship between men too much to survive the ingratitude and treason of his dear friend Brutus. Similarly to Brutus' account, it is ideology and values for which Caesar died, but here his death was caused by his own excessive belief in those values.

In this part of the speech the constant repetition of Brutus' honour is omitted, as Mark Anthony speaks with the people in a manner similar to a king speaking to his subjects in a motivating manner – he speaks from a point of authority but does not point it out, on the contrary presents his unity with them by a constant usage of even gratuitous plural first person pronouns. He addresses them repeatedly, each time highlighting himself as one of them. He even interprets their own emotions back to the crowd, and then praises them for it in a confirmation strategically similar to Brutus' questions – a person speaking up against this interpretation would only bring shame to themselves in front of the crowd. In his next address, Mark Anthony is even more personal with the crowd:

Good friends, sweet friends, let me not stir you up
To such a sudden flood of mutiny.
They that have done this deed are honourable:
What private griefs they have, alas, I know not,
That made them do it: they are wise and honourable,

And will, no doubt, with reasons answer you. (*Julius Caesar*,III,ii,1754-1758)

The argument of ethos returns yet again, but is undermined yet again – this time it is their private motives which had caused them to commit the crime, therefore Brutus' explanation is overruled and the honour of the perpetrators is turned from the sole motive of their actions to the only possible saving grace of criminals. Moreover, Mark Anthony once again refuses attempting to 'stir' the crowd, while giving the crowd directions both for their emotions and their actions.

In the final part of his speech Mark Anthony builds on Ethos, but in an unusual manner – he tries to build report on the basis of his reputation as a 'plain man', therefore defending himself and denying any intentional provocation or manipulation of the crowd at first. He seems to define himself on the juxtaposition of not being that what Brutus is. Following this defence, however, he for the first time openly calls for a rebellion, through an image already discussed in the body of the ruler – wounds as speaking mouths. Here the symbol alludes not only to justice for those who cannot speak for themselves, but as in Coriolanus, also to the ideals of republic. Once more, Mark Anthony manages to clearly put a division between himself – a man of the people, democratic and plain; and Brutus – and orator capable of manipulation, motivated by personal motifs to a crime.

I come not, friends, to steal away your hearts:
I am no orator, as Brutus is;
But, as you know me all, a plain blunt man,
That love my friend; and that they know full well
That gave me public leave to speak of him:
For I have neither wit, nor words, nor worth,
Action, nor utterance, nor the power of speech,
To stir men's blood: I only speak right on;
I tell you that which you yourselves do know;
Show you sweet Caesar's wounds, poor poor dumb mouths,
And bid them speak for me: but were I Brutus,
And Brutus Antony, there were an Antony
Would ruffle up your spirits and put a tongue

In every wound of Caesar that should move
The stones of Rome to rise and mutiny. (*Julius Caesar*,III,ii,1760-1774)

In the final part of his speech, while claiming to be no orator, his speeches are reaching their height in rhetoric – he uses escalating lists and alliteration, repeated repetition of both words and sounds. In juxtaposition to his previously repetitive phrase of accusation and its denial, his current speech feels freed and unrestrained, therefore heartfelt and honest. He continues developing the polarity between himself and Brutus, using it to present what had been his objective all along, and finally calls for the rebellion. Mark Anthony himself is hiding his agency behind both Brutus and the possible powers of his speeches, and Caesar, whose wounds are presumed to be in accordance with 'stirring the blood'. The resulting speech is powerful especially in comparison to the other important characters in the play – while both Julius Caesar and Brutus both operate with what may be called a cult of personality, Mark Anthony gives space to the personas of other characters others, while controlling and manipulating the amount and effect of it. He is therefore a character of the Roman plays who uses a version of the strategy of shifting responsibility and power in order to move the crowd towards his goals, but in other's name.

A comparable situation can be found in Richard III when lord Buckingham presents the function of a king to Richard III. Here although the leader described is well alive, again a friend or a helper of a leader is speaking of them in order to manipulate the people in their favour, while avoiding exposing manipulation of the people:

Duke of Buckingham:
Ah, ha, my lord, this prince is not an Edward!
He is not lolling on a lewd day-bed,
But on his knees at meditation;
Not dallying with a brace of courtezans,
But meditating with two deep divines;
Not sleeping, to engross his idle body,
But praying, to enrich his watchful soul:
Happy were England, would this gracious prince
Take on himself the sovereignty thereof:
But, sure, I fear, we shall ne'er win him to it. (*Richard III*, III,vii,2277-2286)

Immediately in the first line there is a similarity with both of the previously analysed speeches – Buckingham creates a polarity in order to represent the qualities of Richard Gloucester. His whole utterance is divided into a repetitive structure based on this polarity; each pair of comparisons is worded in the same structure for a further juxtaposition of their content. The qualities and vices are represented on specific activity, companions, and the purpose of aforementioned activity. The final crown of the speech is again the missing intention – just like Mark Anthony claimed to not want to raise the people, so does Buckingham claim that Richard has no interest in the crown. Similarly to Anthony foretelling the effects Caesar's will would have on the people, so does Buckingham predict what effect Richard Gloucester's rule would have upon the kingdom.

The following utterance is tainted with ambiguous and even slightly sarcastic remarks, but does not fail to point the attention of the listening crowd towards the intended aspects of the possible ruler:

> Duke of Buckingham:
> Two props of virtue for a Christian prince,
> To stay him from the fall of vanity:
> And, see, a book of prayer in his hand,
> True ornaments to know a holy man.
> Famous Plantagenet, most gracious prince,
> Lend favourable ears to our request;
> And pardon us the interruption
> Of thy devotion and right Christian zeal. (*Richard III*, III,vii,2307-2314)

Here the general meaning slightly clashes with the word choice. The general praising tone of the speech attempts to portray Gloucester as a God-fearing man, further building on the point of the previous speech - that a man of that very quality needs to be the one to next sit on the throne. Approximately every second line adds a positive attribute to the character of Richard Gloucester, he is being called 'a holy man' as well as a 'gracious prince', but the 'props' which are to prove his qualities are identified as such. The word-choice throughout the lines 2306 to 2310 can be read both as a situational irony from the writer or as a subconscious blunder of the character hinting at the concealed truth of the meta-staged scene. To add another level, Richard Gloucester seems to try to imitate the previous king

of his name, Richard II, the last truly legitimate king who was considered to be more occupied with his religion than his rule:

> My lord, there needs no such apology:
> I rather do beseech you pardon me,
> Who, earnest in the service of my God,
> Neglect the visitation of my friends.
> But, leaving this, what is your grace's pleasure? (*Richard III*, III,vii,2315-2319)

Richard here is evidently attempting to come off as modest and pious, but in the end his speech seems servile, his previously strong rhetoric is deteriorating with his rise to power. The use of singular possessive pronoun in line 2317 distances him from his audience, unlike Mark Anthony's use of plural personal pronouns which helps him become one of the people. It is his God he is worshipping, not 'their' God. The final effect of this could be either a hidden criticism for the less religious nobleman in attendance, an emphasis on one's self in their relationship with God, or even a signal that Richard Gloucester worships something different than everybody else – from what is apparent throughout the play, Richard only worships himself and the crown. A couple of lines bellow, the argument begins to resemble that of Brutus:

> Duke of Buckingham:
> You have, my lord: would it might please your grace,
> At our entreaties, to amend that fault!
>
> Richard III (Duke of Gloucester):
> Else wherefore breathe I in a Christian land? (*Richard III*, III,vii, 2325-2327)

This is reminiscent of the aforementioned oration Brutus gives to the crown. Once again, the actions of the character are shielded from any judgement by their alleged reason, and a false causality fallacy. The reason needs to be based on the basic value of the society addressed in their speech. While in Brutus' case it is the patriotism and loyalty to Rome, in Gloucester's case it is Christian values and obedience to God's will. The final effect of the argument is similar to the use of ethos, butin this instance the supporting moral strength comes from the indisputable character of the values used, and the only manner in which this argumentation can be attacked is the one used by Mark Anthony – denying the connection between the deed and its proclaimed motivation.

Elaborating on the argument, Buckingham presents his plea to Gloucester as a burden, not a sought-after prize. This strategy is even more effective and believable, because the 'rule as a burden' is a motif well used in Shakespeare's plays, as has been discussed in previous chapters. In the process of pretending to persuade Gloucester to accept the offered crown, Buckingham presents all the possible reasons to his audience – the noblemen:

> Duke of Buckingham:
> Then know, it is your fault that you resign
> The supreme seat, the throne majestical,
> The scepter'd office of your ancestors,
> Your state of fortune and your due of birth,
> The lineal glory of your royal house,
> To the corruption of a blemished stock: (*Richard III*, III,vii,2328-2333)

Here Buckingham uses the persuasive strategy of mentioning ancestors and predecessors as an authority, which is used by advisors on rulers throughout the plays, therefore talking to Gloucester as if he were a king already. He puts a great emphasis on the repetition of the second person personal pronoun, focusing the attention solely on Gloucester and omitting any possible other contenders for the throne. He continues his plea with a personification and imagery reminiscent of the body politic:

> Whilst, in the mildness of your sleepy thoughts,
> Which here we waken to our country's good,
> This noble isle doth want her proper limbs;
> Her face defaced with scars of infamy,
> Her royal stock graft with ignoble plants,
> And almost shoulder'd in the swallowing gulf
> Of blind forgetfulness and dark oblivion. (*Richard III*, III,vii,2334-2340)

England here is the feminine depiction seen also in Henry V. It is an image which invokes vulnerability and need for care and protection, while it also appeals to the medieval concept of the ruler as the husband of the land. While depicting a land as a female figure is a very common and ancient image throughout many cultures (from Irish Aisling and Hybernia, to other European countries, like Italy, Russia, and France, and also in personifications of Eastern nations, like Japan's goddess Amaterasu), it is frequently paired

with a neutral or male representation (e.g. John Bull), and the female version seems to mostly be used in similar situations – to raise the need to protect and care for the land, defend it from injustice, aggression or corruption. The bodily imagery here is very vivid, and shows the country in a grave danger and under distress. Having previously marked Gloucester as the only possible saviour, Buckingham here depicts the reasons why such a saviour is necessary. His argument is based on emotions, and from the point of view of the audience forces Gloucester to accept, taking any agency from him.

> Which to recure, we heartily solicit
> Your gracious self to take on you the charge
> And kingly government of this your land,
> Not as protector, steward, substitute,
> Or lowly factor for another's gain;
> But as successively from blood to blood,
> Your right of birth, your empery, your own.
> For this, consorted with the citizens,
> Your very worshipful and loving friends,
> And by their vehement instigation,
> In this just suit come I to move your grace. (*Richard III*, III,vii,2341-2351)

The manner in which Buckingham addresses Gloucester here is ambiguous in its effect – it can be meant to represent his respect of Gloucester in order to inspire similar sentiment from the other onlookers, but it also grants the refusal which follows. Had Gloucester accepted this plea, he would have gone directly against the pious and modest image of himself that this whole scene is attempting to create. The wording of the passage again subtly reinforces the Gloucester's right to the throne in the minds of the on-scene audience, and works to even more focus the attention onto his figure. The repetition of the second person possessive pronoun is here almost abused, and while it is calculated to seem appealing to Gloucester, actually manipulates the noblemen to think the throne and right to rule already Gloucester's and only by his refused, not given to him by their will. Buckingham here uses similar rhetoric figure as Mark Anthony – a triad in line 2357. Gloucester is also again presented as already being the king in the last line, by being addressed 'your grace.' His negative reaction to that is a strong confirmation of character, as Gloucester seemingly proves himself immune to flattery and manipulation:

I know not whether to depart in silence,
Or bitterly to speak in your reproof.
Best fitteth my degree or your condition
If not to answer, you might haply think
Tongue-tied ambition, not replying, yielded
To bear the golden yoke of sovereignty,
Which fondly you would here impose on me;
If to reprove you for this suit of yours,
So season'd with your faithful love to me.
Then, on the other side, I cheque'd my friends.
Therefore, to speak, and to avoid the first,
And then, in speaking, not to incur the last,
Definitively thus I answer you. (*Richard III*, III,vii, 2352-2364)

He proves his awareness of the possible reading of his reaction, and explains both. This is again ambiguous in effect, because it on one hand slightly shows how fore-thought the scene is, similarly to Buckingham's remarks earlier, but it also presents Gloucester as a self-aware man who cares about his good name and considers the opinions of other. He speaks of the difficulty to navigate such a satiation, explaining his motifs for speaking, slightly similarly to Mark Anthony. After doing so, he finally gets to his argument:

Your love deserves my thanks; but my desert
Unmeritable shuns your high request.
First if all obstacles were cut away,
And that my path were even to the crown,
As my ripe revenue and due by birth
Yet so much is my poverty of spirit,
So mighty and so many my defects,
As I had rather hide me from my greatness,
Being a bark to brook no mighty sea,
Than in my greatness covet to be hid,
And in the vapour of my glory smother'd.
But, God be thank'd, there's no need of me,
And much I need to help you, if need were;
The royal tree hath left us royal fruit,

Which, mellow'd by the stealing hours of time,
Will well become the seat of majesty,
And make, no doubt, us happy by his reign.
On him I lay what you would lay on me,
The right and fortune of his happy stars;
Which God defend that I should wring from him! (*Richard III*, III,vii, 2365-2384)

Gloucester here is the one who acknowledges the obstacles on his way to the throne, while still maintaining that he does have the right to it. In the process of refusing it, he succeeds in pointing out both his 'greatess' and 'glory'. He mentions his physical defects, but this is, as previously discussed, not a concern in a Christian king, and is not referred to again by any of the characters. Indeed he only refuses out of modesty and self-criticism. He mirrors Buckingham's speech when referring to the royal heir and the late king, and uses imagery and wording of a rather hyperbolical respect for the figure of his own brother. It is a style of discourse he adapts when talking about the king with other characters as well, for example in act II scene III.

Buckingham then changes his line of argumentation from flattery and pleas to seemingly sound arguments. He opens with the common ground, agreeing with Gloucester, only to go on and explain why that opinion needs to be changed. Buckingham primarily states the general opinion on the legitimacy of the prince, and reasons why Edward would not be the next king. He states those accusations as facts which is deliberately misleading in the same way as the majority of the other arguments presented in this part of the speech. After stating the relative facts, he goes on, switching for pathos, abandoning the respectful tone of his previous speech:

These both put by a poor petitioner,
A care-crazed mother of a many children,
A beauty-waning and distressed widow,
Even in the afternoon of her best days,
Made prize and purchase of his lustful eye,
Seduced the pitch and height of all his thoughts
To base declension and loathed bigamy
By her, in his unlawful bed, he got
This Edward, whom our manners term the prince.

More bitterly could I expostulate,
Save that, for reverence to some alive,
I give a sparing limit to my tongue.
Then, good my lord, take to your royal self
This proffer'd benefit of dignity;
If non to bless us and the land withal,
Yet to draw forth your noble ancestry
From the corruption of abusing times,
Unto a lineal true-derived course. (*Richard III*, III,vii,2394-2411)

Buckingham here does his best to portray the possible future ruler, prince Edward, as a the product of sin, but he primarily dishonours his parents. The previous king is mostly not accused directly, neither is he made responsible, because hat would be too much over the boundaries of what was acceptable to say for a nobleman. Moreover, had the accusations been any more aggressive towards the king, it could damage the façade being built for Gloucester in the eyes of the citizens, had he not reacted negatively. Buckingham manages to present Richard's situation as a dilemma of two options in a similar strategy to that of Brutus. One of the options is a disgrace to the blood-line, the other is the acceptance of duty. Similarly to Brutus, according to whose speeches, whose choice was the disgrace or even possible end of Rome of a murder, Gloucester's situation is constructed out of arguments and rhetoric, similarly to that of Brutus, but because Buckingham explains the choice for him, it is even more effective on the onlookers.

After Gloucester refuses to have these "cares heaped upon" (2415) him, Buckingham lays the final resolve upon him, in which uses a praising characteristic only usable for a Christian king:

Duke of Buckingham:
If you refuse it,—as, in love and zeal,
Loath to depose the child, Your brother's son;
As well we know your tenderness of heart
And gentle, kind, effeminate remorse,
Which we have noted in you to your kin,
And egally indeed to all estates,—
Yet whether you accept our suit or no,

Your brother's son shall never reign our king;
But we will plant some other in the throne,
To the disgrace and downfall of your house:
And in this resolution here we leave you.—
(*Richard III*, III,vii,2415-2429)

The tenderness of heart, and "effeminate remorse", would be the criticism for a leader in a Roman play, or even a military leader, but for a king in History plays, it can be used as a valuable characteristic. Gloucester's priorities are set to be his family and faith, and based on both of these, he is forced to later accept the throne – because if he does not, the family is deposed and disgraced, and a king which was not chosen by the royal lineage, and therefore by God, would sit on the throne. Buckingham here assumes the role of the evil here, but manages to stay justified in his actions by speaking in the plural – not taking all the agency onto his own person – and by keeping his motivation seemingly selfless. The notion of selfless motivations is kept by Richard III, who presents his acceptance in a bitter oration:

Cousin of Buckingham, and you sage, grave men,
Since you will buckle fortune on my back,
To bear her burthen, whether I will or no,
I must have patience to endure the load:
But if black scandal or foul-faced reproach
Attend the sequel of your imposition,
Your mere enforcement shall acquittance me
From all the impure blots and stains thereof;
For God he knows, and you may partly see,
How far I am from the desire thereof.

Lord Mayor of London.
God bless your grace! we see it, and will say it.

Richard III (Duke of Gloucester).
In saying so, you shall but say the truth. (*Richard III*, III,vii,2440-2450)

Once more, the later written Richard II is echoed here, when now Richard III describes his new power and position as a burden bucked onto his back. Again, Richard openly explains

his plan for the possible reactions of the public, and also explains his emotions to the audience. It is a general characteristic of the public orations, that the on-stage audience has their emotions, reactions, and even perceptions explained back to them. It is a very effective manipulative strategy, its power enforced by the praise and validation the speaker gives to his audience for not protesting against the interpretation.

It seems from both of the speeches that the strategy of shifting responsibility from the orator to another character is a useful tactic used by a great majority of characters with political power, it is however interesting to identify in which direction the power is shifted. By characters who seem to hold the power, such as the rulers, the power is shifted either in the direction of the people, or towards the higher power – God or multiple deities, the ideals, values and principles. By characters of lower positions, noblemen, advisors, and allies of the rulers, the power can be again shifted towards the people, or towards the ruler himself – usually creating a much more successful report in the name of the ruler, than if the ruler were to praise himself. The body of the ruler is used, as well as the motifs of the family and society, which are combined with direct addresses and personal pronouns.

All of the speeches use the values of the addressed on-stage audience combined with the values of the intended audience, to present motivations of characters. These are typically presented in false dichotomies frequently formed into repetitive schemes to strengthen the argument and to turn a question into a clear-cut dilemma with only one morally acceptable answer. This seems to stem from the contemporary Elizabethan education in which, as Peter Mack claims and illustrates in *Elizabethan Rhetoric: Theory and Practice* in chapter "Everyday Writing: notebooks, letters, narratives", the people were primarily taught to identify a moral argument from a text, separate it and line with other moral arguments of similar meaning, and use to the advantage of their cause. This skill would be, as Mack further explains, required in any official matter such as court hearings and disputes, and therefore recognised by the audience of the play and appreciated. [31]

[31] Peter Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric:Theory and Practice*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009) p, 85

Battle speeches

Battle speeches in Shakespeare's plays seem to fulfil many more functions than only to introduce a battle into the play. They often provide the dramatic effect, for the lack of dramatization, and mostly represent the character of that particular side of the conflict. In battle speeches, multiple plays offer the speeches from both sides of the trenches. This provides an opportunity to compare and juxtapose the approaches of the two sides at war, and to shape further the sympathies of the audience. It seems that regularly this approach is intended to present the motifs of the leading characters and their followers through rhetoric and imagery used during these speeches.

One of the prime examples is the St. Crispin speech from Henry V, for which the audience is given the French counterpart. Both sides of the battle field, so the audience is offered more information than from a single perspective, but the speeches still provide a culmination of those. As has been discussed previously, in his speech Henry V invokes a sense of unity in order to raise the spirits of his men. In a great juxtaposition to his own speech from Act III, where he addresses each group, noblemen and peasants, separately and in a rather different manner, here he attempts to unify as much as possible, and promises further unities to come:

> We few, we happy few, we band of brothers;
> For he to-day that sheds his blood with me
> Shall be my brother; be he ne'er so vile,
> This day shall gentle his condition:
> And gentlemen in England now a-bed
> Shall think themselves accursed they were not here,
> And hold their manhoods cheap whiles any speaks
> That fought with us upon Saint Crispin's day. (*Henry V*,IV,iii,2295-2302)

This all seems to stem from the character's past presented in the two previous plays, as well as from his discussion with his soldiers earlier in the same act – the king is rather proficient at speaking with his subjects. It helps to create a further ambiguity in the character, and serves as one of the moments in which the king acts in the way presented by the choir. It might also work to show that during the public speeches, the rulers act most in the way in which they are, or wish to be, remembered, and the possible pretence and

calculation are at the heighest. It also distinguishes the king from his opponents, whose Grandpre speaks solely to the noblemen:

> Constable of France:
> To horse, you gallant princes! straight to horse!
> Do but behold yon poor and starved band,
> And your fair show shall suck away their souls,
> Leaving them but the shales and husks of men.
> There is not work enough for all our hands;
> Scarce blood enough in all their sickly veins
> To give each naked curtle-axe a stain,
> That our French gallants shall to-day draw out,
> And sheathe for lack of sport: let us but blow on them,
> The vapour of our valour will o'erturn them. (*Henry V*,IV,iii, 2179-2188)

It is already pointing towards the lack of chivalry, that the character making the speech before the battle is the constable, not the Dauphin himself. The ‘princes’ are almost flattered into action, but the real focus of the speech is the condition of the English army. Of course one of the functions of this extensive description is to portray the dire situation of Henry V and his men for the audience, but for that purpose, in this particular play, there is also the chorus of the play. It also works to show the almost arrogant expectations of the French, making their downfall after the battle even more prominent and satisfying. It also hints at the absence of the chivalrous values, boasted about by Henry V, in the French camp. The noblemen are fully aware that the battle is not a fair one, and are motivated by this fact to join it. Their intent is to slaughter a defenceless enemy:

> 'Tis positive 'gainst all exceptions, lords,
> That our superfluous lackeys and our peasants,
> Who in unnecessary action swarm
> About our squares of battle, were enow
> To purge this field of such a hilding foe,
> Though we upon this mountain's basis by
> Took stand for idle speculation:
> But that our honours must not. What's to say?
> A very little little let us do.

And all is done. Then let the trumpets sound
The tucket sonance and the note to mount;
For our approach shall so much dare the field
That England shall couch down in fear and yield. (*Henry V*,IV,iii,2189-2201)

So the only honour presented by the French nobility is participating in the battle, not letting others take care of what should be their duty for them, but otherwise the whole situation is rather disgraceful. The opinion or emotions of the common men are completely omitted, and they are only briefly mentioned. While of course the words of Henry V are purely rhetorical and carry no actual offer, they create the illusion that the king wants only the men who believe in his cause fighting by his side:

O, do not wish one more!
Rather proclaim it, Westmoreland, through my host,
That he which hath no stomach to this fight,
Let him depart; his passport shall be made
And crowns for convoy put into his purse:
We would not die in that man's company
That fears his fellowship to die with us. (*Henry V*,IV, iii, 2268-2274)

Henry V's words echo the medieval heroic notion of courage and honour. Similarly to the previously discussed speeches of Brutus and Richard III, he builds his cause on one of the basic values of Christian society in order to motivate and manipulate his men into action. Based on his previous confrontation with the soldiers in the camp the king is aware of the men's doubts, and their reliance on his responsibility for their souls. Here the king who frequently uses responsibility as a burden in order to force other characters into submission, shifts the responsibility back onto the men by symbolically offering a choice. He also takes the time to present his motivations

The fewer men, the greater share of honour.
God's will! I pray thee, wish not one man more.
By Jove, I am not covetous for gold,
Nor care I who doth feed upon my cost;
It yearns me not if men my garments wear;
Such outward things dwell not in my desires:
But if it be a sin to covet honour,

I am the most offending soul alive.
No, faith, my coz, wish not a man from England:
God's peace! I would not lose so great an honour
As one man more, methinks, would share from me
For the best hope I have. (*Henry V*,IV,iii,2257-2268)

The king makes the explanation more plausible by stating it similarly to a confession. He manages to deny many of the potential motivations in the eyes of the soldiers, greed, and even ambition, for the favour of the most socially acceptable motive of a warrior. This goes well in hand with the fact that the king manages to refurbish his motifs to fit the ears of his audience each time – in act I, scene II, the king claims to wage war against France in order to claim his ancestral right, but then shifts the agency towards Dauphin, because of his offensive actions, during his 'tennis ball speech'. In the final act however, he states his motifs completely differently:

No; it is not possible you should love the enemy of
France, Kate: but, in loving me, you should love
the friend of France; for I love France so well that
I will not part with a village of it; I will have it
all mine: and, Kate, when France is mine and I am
yours, then yours is France and you are mine. (*Henry V*,V, ii, 3154-3159)

Speaking to a princess the king re-imagines his motifs for waging war yet again; using an emotion he can rightfully expect to be acceptable to a woman he is wooing, and fitting the circumstances. He incorporates his justification into the courting, turning his whole campaign into the courting of France. In the final two lines of this utterance, he manages to word the outcome of the negotiation to sound like a mutually advantageous through this argumentation.

One of the aspects of his speeches is their one-sidedness. In contrast to Richard III, Buckingham, and Brutus, who all present two options and possible outcomes of a situation, albeit one of them is usually unacceptable, Henry V uses either motivation or intimidation, in each case moving the agency towards the addressee of his speech. He omits describing or even acknowledging other possible outcomes. In his St.Crispin speech he does not even mention the French army, and almost completely leaves out the possibility of losing for the great majority of his speech. His focus is on his honour and the honour of his men.

The second battle speech for the French nobility contains similar imagery as the speeches of king Richard II (especially in Act III, scene II), where the weather and the land itself are opposing the supposed aggressor:

> Grandpre:
> Why do you stay so long, my lords of France?
> Yon island carrions, desperate of their bones,
> Ill-favouredly become the morning field:
> Their ragged curtains poorly are let loose,
> And our air shakes them passing scornfully:
> Big Mars seems bankrupt in their beggar'd host
> And faintly through a rusty beaver peeps:
> The horsemen sit like fixed candlesticks,
> With torch-staves in their hand; and their poor jades
> Lob down their heads, dropping the hides and hips,
> The gum down-roping from their pale-dead eyes
> And in their pale dull mouths the gimmal bit
> Lies foul with chew'd grass, still and motionless;
> And their executors, the knavish crows,
> Fly o'er them, all impatient for their hour.
> Description cannot suit itself in words
> To demonstrate the life of such a battle
> In life so lifeless as it shows itself. (*Henry V*, IV,ii,2003.2020)

The English here are portrayed almost as a vision of plague. This second speech is rather more serious than the first one, because from this one it is clear that the army is described as the personification of death. The effect of this is very ambiguous; on one hand it gives a slight sense of urgency to the battle from the French side as well, because the sick soldiers are now like an infection in their land, the horsemen of the apocalypse. The imagery used is very visual and vivid, and could be rather counterproductive – instead of motivating the men to the battle it sounds intimidating. The description of the English army here is slightly similar to that of the common people presented by Casca (Julius Caesar,I,ii,338-343), to motivate the conspirators. It could be the one strategy which presents fighting ill and possibly dying men as necessary and even honourable – protecting the realm from their disease.

The speeches are fundamentally different in all aspects – one is given by the king for his men, while the other one is given by a higher ranked soldier for the nobility. Henry V's speech focuses on honour and future joys of victory, depicting in clear and specific imagery the glory of his men, who are unified into one family, a band of brothers. The French speech is based on present horrors of the enemy and only briefly mentions honour, the only mention of future it brings is the image of the crows waiting for the dead.

A similarly dual example appears in the final act of Richard III, where after the dual visions of the ghosts, both leaders give speeches to their army. The first one presented is that of Richmond, who claims to have God on his side:

> More than I have said, loving countrymen,
> The leisure and enforcement of the time
> Forbids to dwell upon: yet remember this,
> God and our good cause fight upon our side;
> The prayers of holy saints and wronged souls,
> Like high-rear'd bulwarks, stand before our faces;
> (*Richard III*, V,iii,3744-3748)

Richmond has every reason to believe his words in this instance as he had been told so repeatedly by the spirits of those 'wronged souls' over the preceding night, yet it still is a powerful strategy of an oration. Again the future winner of the battle and a king-to-be is giving his men exactly the motivation which will resonate with them the best, but for once there is a reason to believe it is not only a figure of speech. He then goes even further, speaking about the enemy and his men:

> Richard except, those whom we fight against
> Had rather have us win than him they follow:
> For what is he they follow? truly, gentlemen,
> A bloody tyrant and a homicide;
> One raised in blood, and one in blood establish'd;
> One that made means to come by what he hath,
> And slaughter'd those that were the means to help him;
> Abase foul stone, made precious by the foil
> Of England's chair, where he is falsely set; (*Richard III*, V,iii, 3750-3758)

Here Richmond only builds on the expectations he may have of the men fighting for Richard III. He builds on religion and social norms which do not approve of Richard III's actions, but has no proof. There again is similarity to Brutus' argument here – Richmond is doing his best to make his cause the common cause; and in an echo of Gloucester before his coronation, avoiding any suspicion of self-interest. His logic is faltering because he does not list any reason why the men who hope in Richard III's downfall would fight for him, yet he does not state or even hint at the possibility of the soldiers deserting. Possibly as a result of this weakness of his argument, Richmond quickly changes the focus from the army and Richard III to the king only:

> One that hath ever been God's enemy:
> Then, if you fight against God's enemy,
> God will in justice ward you as his soldiers;
> If you do sweat to put a tyrant down,
> You sleep in peace, the tyrant being slain;
> If you do fight against your country's foes,
> Your country's fat shall pay your pains the hire; 3765
> If you do fight in safeguard of your wives,
> Your wives shall welcome home the conquerors;
> If you do free your children from the sword,
> Your children's children quit it in your age. (*Richard III*, V,iii,3758-3769)

Here Richmond presents his argument in a very clear logos. He speaks of the cause and effect, the action and reaction, presented as axioms. He makes his argument work by the repetition of schemes, which are the strongest and most prominent in this central part of his speech. The repeated duality, creating an isocolon, drives the oration strongly. Similarly to Henry V Richmond speaks of the future of his men, but does not paint detailed images. He uses the present tense to speak of the generally sounding rules of the world he is trying to convey in the form of a common sense, to portray the positive future in short relatable examples. Ones that are universal for most of the men in his army, who probably care more about their families and their future than the ideals of chivalry and honour. After making sure that his attempt had been presented sufficiently, he expects the soldiers to act on it, once more returning to his cause being behind the battle:

Then, in the name of God and all these rights,
Advance your standards, draw your willing swords.
For me, the ransom of my bold attempt
Shall be this cold corpse on the earth's cold face;
But if I thrive, the gain of my attempt
The least of you shall share his part thereof.
Sound drums and trumpets boldly and cheerfully;
God and Saint George! Richmond and victory! (*Richard III*, V,iii,3770-3777)

While the agency is on Richmond, he does not accept it completely, claiming once more that his war is that of God. As Barbara Tuchman states, "While desirable in any epoch, a 'just war' in the 14th century was virtually a legal necessity as the basis for requisitioning feudal aids in men and money. It was equally essential for securing God on one's side, for war was considered fundamentally an appeal to the arbitrement of God."[32] For the first time here he acknowledges the possibility of failure and death, but only for himself – in Richmond's speech death is exclusive to him, but victory would be shared with all from the noblest to the basest of his men. His speech is ended on an optimistic note, reminiscent of Henry V's siege speech from Act III. Similarly to Henry V he ends his speech with the exclamation of the names in which they are fighting for. Richmond's oration is a combination of all the speeches described before – he focuses on the past and current state and deeds of his enemy and his soldiers, but refrains from attacking and blaming those soldiers; builds argumentation on the social norms of his people – Christian values of God and justice, and family. He motivates the people by presenting their unity in victory.

His opponent, Richard III, uses the very opposite of Richmond's words. It is unusual that both of them indicate that they have been speaking about these arguments in front of their men before, but it clearly is to indicate that they are set in their ways of speaking, moreover in their public speaking and therefore these speeches are strongly representative of their public persona. Richard opens his speech by insulting the opponent:

What shall I say more than I have inferr'd?
Remember whom you are to cope withal;
A sort of vagabonds, rascals, and runaways,

[32] Barbara Tuchman, *A Distant Mirror* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978)

A scum of Bretons, and base lackey peasants,
Whom their o'er-cloyed country vomits forth
To desperate ventures and assured destruction. (*Richard III*, V,iii,3830-3835)

His imagery is that of disgust, the soldiers who are to be 'coped' with are presented like a sickness or even demonic spawns. Richard III avoids attacking the leader of the army here, but takes care to disgrace his choice of men. The imagery is rather similar to that of the French marshal, but in this instance, it is meant to be debasing and motivating, because while the imagery is similar, in this instance it is not meant to present an unfair battle. He also manages to turn the fight into a battle between nations – the English against the Bretons, coming from France, thus diverting attention from the original reason of the conflict, his succession to the crown, to an invasion. He is motivating his men by fear of the others, which seems to be false, considering that Richmond's army, as Richmond proclaims, fights under St.George. Richard is attempting to evoke the enmity of a war instead of a civil war among countrymen

Richard III continues his speech in a week echo of Richmond's repetitive, crescendo, argumentation- "You sleeping safe, they bring to you unrest; /You having lands, and blest with beauteous wives, /They would restrain the one, distain the other."(*Richard III*,V,iii, 3836-3839) He goes over the same topics as his opponent, but with comparably lesser eloquence. He is presented seemingly attempting a similar scheme as Richmond, but failing at achieving similar effect. His threats are weaker than Richmond's promises, and he seems to be losing his gift of manipulation through speech. He goes on to speak about his opponent, but even his criticism is stale in comparison to Richmond's fiery phrasing:

And who doth lead them but a paltry fellow,
Long kept in Bretagne at our mother's cost?
A milk-sop, one that never in his life
Felt so much cold as over shoes in snow? (*Richard III*, V,iii,3839-3842)

As R. Hassel states, "a fourth of Richond's military oratory is *ad hominem*, as against nearly three-fourths of Richard's" [33]. His criticism of Richmond has the primary effect to portray his opponent as unlikeable and unworthy. The similarity of the structure of their argument makes this battle of orations much more clearly cut. The winner is apparent

[33] Hassel, R. Chris. "Military Oratory in Richard III." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 35, no. 1, 1984, pp. 53–61.

before the orations are even finished. He seems to be ambiguous whether his motive is to present the enemy and his army as intimidating or as miserable, in a manner similar to that of the French marshal. His men are motivated to not fail against such a

> Let's whip these stragglers o'er the seas again;
> Lash hence these overweening rags of France,
> These famish'd beggars, weary of their lives;
> Who, but for dreaming on this fond exploit,
> For want of means, poor rats, had hang'd themselves:
> If we be conquer'd, let men conquer us,
> And not these bastard Bretons; whom our fathers
> Have in their own land beaten, bobb'd, and thump'd,
> And in record, left them the heirs of shame.
> Shall these enjoy our lands? lie with our wives?
> Ravish our daughters? (*Richard III*, V,iii,3843-3853)

Richard's strongest argument here is that of the nationalities and their previous conflicts. He uses the notion of family and ancestors, the persuasive strategy of presenting a standard. This is probably the strongest point in his argumentation. He includes himself in with the group as well, in comparison to Henry V using the same image in Act III, he lists himself among the men whose fathers fought in France, enforcing the national identity argument. He Ends his argument with rhetoric questions which impose threats, but more than a glorious victory or a brave defence of the country, he proposes a negative – not being ashamed, not being ruled over, not having the lands and wives taken dishonourably. Richard had lost all motivation himself, and the only driving force he can offer his men is negative motivation, instead of victory the absence of fear and shame.

> Hark! I hear their drum.
> Fight, gentlemen of England! fight, bold yoemen!
> Draw, archers, draw your arrows to the head!
> Spur your proud horses hard, and ride in blood;
> Amaze the welkin with your broken staves! (*Richard III*, V,iii,3855-3859)

In his final lines to his men, Richard III, manages to give orders, finally showing some appreciation for his men, once more enforcing their national identity, but this moment of

energy is stopped by the news of betrayal and Richard III again turns to ruling by terror and to kill his hostage.

A parallel comparison between the two pairs of battle speeches is the type of motivation presented. In speeches of the potentially victorious speakers, the motivation is positive (common good, common future, service of God, service of the country). Their people, Richmond's and Henry V's are driven by promises, their role in their own future being identified and highlighted, not by threats. Those who Shakespeare presents as good military leaders use threats against their enemies (Henry V, III,iii) not against their own men. A good real-life example of that skill and tactics is the Tilbury Speech of Queen Elizabeth I, in which she first ensures her men that she trusts them even though her advisors do not, promises to fight for her country (even though evidently figuratively), and then extensively talks about the value and abilities of her men. She speaks of their virtues already presented, and claims them to mean that more success is to come. She promises them a great and famous victory, and a reward for their bravery. In her speech, she is involved with her people and wants to share their victory, but very similarly to Richmond, her ancestor, in *Richard III.* She only speaks of her own possible death. Her speech is even more similar to Richmonds in that she also uses short schemes, particularly isocolons, in the central part of her speech. Concerning that the speech was given five years before *Richard III.* was written, this parallel does not have to be accidental.

Another example of positive battle leadership is the character of Coriolanus. In the first act he is shown winning a battle, and while most of the time he is situated to be a man of war with very little relation to people, and minimal rhetoric and political skills, his manner of finding men for a battle resembles the previously mentioned winning battle speeches. Being offered by Cominius to retire from the battle, and upon refusal to take the men who best will suit him, he proceeds to motivate the army into following him:

> Coriolanus:
> Those are they
> That most are willing. If any such be here—
> As it were sin to doubt—that love this painting
> Wherein you see me smear'd; if any fear
> Lesser his person than an ill report;
> If any think brave death outweighs bad life

And that his country's dearer than himself;
Let him alone, or so many so minded,
Wave thus, to express his disposition,
And follow Coriolanus. (*Coriolanus*, I,vi,695-704)

Coriolanus primarily leads by the persuasive strategy of setting a standard. While asking the men to go and fight he manages to present himself as the Standard of a brave patriotic citizen without having to word it bluntly. He idealizes war as art, the blood in which he is smeared being called a painting, but remains grounded in the reality enough to be persuasive. He places the agency upon the men, asking them to call out in a fashion very similar to Brutus's speech, only in this case the ones remaining silent would be shamed by their failure to respond to the ideals of Rome. The values of his society are strongly incorporated again, and praised and even presented in his manner of speaking. As M. Westm states, Coriolanus here is showcasing his knowledge of Roman rhetoric, "the chief index of his formal eloquence is the periodic tricolon composed of three if clauses that introduces his appeal for volunteers… Rhetoric is here linked with moral generosity"[34]. Coriolanus here is generous with sharing praise, accepting and welcoming, and from his words it seems that one man of such ideals would be enough, singling anyone out for potential glory. As T. Clayton states, in this scene "his charisma wins not only admiration but service"[35]. He is celebrated, but manages to share his momentary popularity:

[They all shout and wave their swords, take him up in their arms, and cast up their caps]
O, me alone! make you a sword of me?
If these shows be not outward, which of you
But is four Volsces? none of you but is
Able to bear against the great Aufidius
A shield as hard as his. A certain number,
Though thanks to all, must I select
from all: the rest

[34] Michael Westm Myron Silberstein, "The Controversial Eloquence of Shakespeare's Coriolanus", *Modern Philology* , Vol. 102, No. 3 (February 2005), pp. 307-331)
[35] Thomas Clayton, "'So our virtues lie in th'interpretation of the time': Shakespeare's Tragic Coriolanus and Coriolanus, and Some Questions of Value," *Ben Jonson Journa*l 1 (1994): 162.

Shall bear the business in some other fight,
As cause will be obey'd. Please you to Markh;
And four shall quickly draw out my command,
Which men are best inclined. (*Coriolanus*, I,vi,705-717)

After winning more volunteers than he has the use for, Coriolanus replies by praising the people again, deducing their ability in combat from their previous actions (similarly to Elizabeth I's speech). He then reminds them of what he sees as the greater threat, and proceeds to choose a smaller group of the best, while managing to keep the rest of the men unoffended. For this he again relies on the values – the cause must be obeyed, the rest of the men will have their chance to shine elsewhere. He manages to make a dangerous mission become the reward for bravery and Roman virtues.

It is then evident that successful military leaders of Shakespeare do not threaten their men, nor do they explain their own cause and motifs to them, they bring the cause closer to the men. They appeal on their already present values, and allow the men to see their own motivation, whether it be peace, glory, or a safe future for their families. While the motives of the successful and the unsuccessful military leaders in Shakespeare may be equally selfish, the successful ones are those who manage to make their men see their own cause in the fight.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it seems that a difference between the political rhetoric of the monarchy and the republic can be identified in specific categories. There seems to be a difference in the employment of the strategies of persuasion as well as in the specific imagery used in the speeches.

It mostly seems that the strategies of persuasion differ in their use between the Roman and English rulers. The strategy of shifting responsibility is used extensively by the kings, probably because in Shakespeare's monarchy the ruling figures understand the burden of responsibility, and connect it quite naturally to the crown. The burden is then used as a weapon against the enemies, a threat meant to scare the subject or even another ruler (as in the case of Henry V's "tennis ball speech") into obedience, usually in order to avoid accepting responsibility for the punishment which would come. In Roman political rhetoric, responsibility is used as a sign of power, which has to be achieved through consistent hard work. It is therefore spoken of mostly in the manner of a reward.

This is mirrored in the approach to the symbol of the crown. The rulers of Shakespeare's kingdoms seem to realise full well, that "uneasy lies the head that bears the crown"(*Henry IV Part* 2,III,i,1735) and find this fact to be a common shared experience between kings (Henry IV and Henry V, Richard II and Henry IV etc.). The Romans seem to only see the power and glory behind the crown, and its potential on the head of the wrong man. Regardless of the perceptions of the characters, the crown has the same effect on the characters who are crowned, or even said to be crowned – it isolates them and leads to their deterioration.

The strategy of shifting blame seems to be used equally by characters who wish to rid themselves of guilt for a deed which had already been done. As R.A. Yoder states, "when great men bend to base deeds, they depend upon the "richest alchemy" of Brutus to show, by transforming murder into sacrifice, that theirs is not the guilt of the plebes."[36] Even then though, it depends strongly on the ideals of the society in which the character is based. For example, Brutus would not be able to shift the blame for the murder of a ruler onto the ruler for their ambition, let alone to justify it by the political thinking of the society in a Christian monarchy, because the monarch would be considered to be chosen by God, and

[36] Yoder, R. A. "History and the Histories in Julius Caesar." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 24 (1973), pp. 309–327. p324

their ambition to be their birth right. Henry V's emotional justification for his conquest of France (*Henry V*,V,ii,3154-3159) would hardly be acceptable in Shakespeare's logical Rome.

This is the case also in the strategy of setting standard – the standards are dependent on the ideals of the depicted society. While the Christian people, and even Christian kings, tend to be motivated by the standard of their ancestors and family in general, the Romans generally tend to be manipulated by the loyalty to Rome and their belonging to a larger society, while the family is rarely mentioned. A standard which is common is that of the character's sex, masculinity and femininity seems to be universal in both worlds in Shakespeare's interpretation.

The concept of the body of the ruler is similarly dependent on the manner in which the ruler is placed in his position. In the monarchy the body of the king is seen as a testimony to their rule, bearing the marks of their hardships or even sins. This, as has been explained above, stems already from Mystery plays and their representation of Herod.

In Shakespeare's Rome, the body of the ruler is a very valid criterion for accepting or refusing a ruler. The body is both the physical proof of their ability to rule, and the testimony to their previous service. In both Republic and monarchy, the body of the ruler does not seem to be fully the property of the ruler, but a public one. In Coriolanus, the Romans are even able to exercise their right to the body of the possible ruler before voting for him.

In a similarly detailed difference, the manner of presenting the common-wealth differs. While Richard II declares "Is not the king's name twenty thousand names? /Arm, arm, my name!" (*RII*, II,ii, 1492-1493) presenting a unity of realm under the king, Menenius Agrippa speaks of the body parts creating an effective commonwealth, counting the "kingly crowned head" among them. It is further notable that once Caesar is to be crowned, he becomes, in the speeches of Cassius, a twisted version of the monarch. He is not a part of the co-operating realm, nor the representation of the realm, but a terrifying "colossus" above all the other citizens and even noble men of high position, erasing the previously established hierarchy.

Concerning the techniques, all of the speeches use the values of the addressed on-stage audience combined with the values of the intended audience, to present motivations of

characters. These are typically presented in false dichotomies frequently formed into repetitive schemes to strengthen the argument and to turn a question into a clear-cut dilemma with only one morally acceptable answer. This scheme and bold schemes in general seem to have a much stronger presence in the Roman plays. The rhetoric of the Roman plays is very methodical, at times almost robotic. As C. Knights comments, the characters "play a role up to the hilt, but at the expense of character; thus there is nothing spontaneous about them, even in a great effort they seem to be merely going through the motions."[37] Knights sees this as a manner of representing the very different republican Roman society and mentality, as he explains further, "forms are everything, although the world their forms defined is rapidly falling apart. As Rome disintegrates, they cling to the images or illusion of what they are supposed to be for Rome's sake."[38] This is especially true about Brutus, whose rhetoric is the embodiment of structured schematic classical oration. It is therefore strongly in contrast with the tone of Mark Anthony, who, while he does use repetitions of clauses and themes, is in its more natural character closer to that of a king.

As has been showcased in the previous chapters, the rhetoric of kings in History plays openly builds on pathos mostly. Rhetoric used in Roman plays is much more oriented towards logos, and especially pathos built by schematic structures to resemble logos as much as possible. The reliance on ethos seems to be relatively balanced between the two plays, but the representation of a personal worth and good name, especially concerning the rulers, has different requirements.

The rhetorical techniques of tropes and schemes are also used with contrasting frequency. The characters of rulers of Rome use mostly schemes to form their speeches (an exception to this is Mark Anthony to an extent) creating rather formal orations. The rulers of History plays seem to tend to use tropes to illustrate their meaning, as is evident from Henry V's tennis-ball speech as well as from his wordplay on the word 'crown' (HV, II,i,2070-2100), as well as Richard II's abdication speech.

Moreover, as Dolores M. Burton presents "it is possible to simulate the oratorical period by constructing sentences where one or two group beta clauses are attached to the initial

[37] L. C. Knights, "Shakespeare's Politics: With Some Reflections on the Nature of Tradition," *Proceedings of the British Academy*, XLIII (1957);
[38] L. C. Knights, "Shakespeare's Politics: With Some Reflections on the Nature of Tradi- tion," *Proceedings of the British Academy*, XLIII (1957);

constituents of the main clause in order to offset the weight of several beta clauses attached to the final constituents of the main clause. These left-branching sentences produce the effect of roundness even when the number and the position of the constituents are not so perfectly balanced around a centrally located main clause." And as Michael Westm Myron Silberstein adds, the number of these left-branching sentences is far higher in Roman plays than in History plays, exemplified in their work by Richard III[39]. To quote Dolores Burton once more, "the increase seems to be associated with Shakespeare's attempts to imitate the round structure of the oratorical period and thus to create a Roman style.[40]" This would then point to an intentional attempt on Shakespeare's side to convey not only the imagery and concepts of the Roman society as compared to the medieval and early modern European one; to multiple attempts at using rhetorical schemes reflecting on the depicted society; but also to the effort to faithfully recreate the oratorical tone and techniques of the era, which, as has been stated in the opening chapter, the majority of his audience would be able to recognize.

[39] Michael Westm Myron Silberstein, "The Controversial Eloquence of Shakespeare's Coriolanus", *Modern Philology* , Vol. 102, No. 3 (February 2005), pp. 307-331), p 315

[40] Dolores M. Burton, Shakespeare's Grammatical Style: A Computer-Assisted Analysis of "Richard II" and "Antony and Cleopatra" (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1973), 53. 27.

Primary Texts

Shakespeare, William, *History of Henry V*, Basingstoke: Macmillan 2007

Shakespeare, William, *History of Richard II,* Basingstoke: Macmillan 2007

Shakespeare, William, *History of Richard III,* Basingstoke: Macmillan 2007

Shakespeare, William, *The Tragedy of Macbeth,* Basingstoke: Macmillan 2007

Shakespeare, William*, The Tragedy of Julius Caesar,* Basingstoke: Macmillan 2007

Shakespeare, William, *Coriolanus,* Basingstoke: Macmillan 2007

Shakespeare, William, *The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark,* Basingstoke: Macmillan 2007

Bibliography

Baldwin, William; Lilly B. Campbell e.d., *The Mirror of the Magistrates*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1947

Barton, Anne "Shakespeare and the Limits of Language," *Shakespeare Survey* 24 (1971): 27.

Besnault, Marie Héléne, Bitot, Michel "Historical legacy and fiction: the political reinvention of King Richard III", *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History plays,* Michael Hattaway *e.d.*, Cambridge:Cambridge University Press, 2002

Burton, Dolores M., *Shakespeare's Grammatical Style: A Computer-Assisted Analysis of "Richard II" and "Antony and Cleopatra"*,Austin: University of Texas Press, 1973,, 53. 27.

Bryson, Bill, *Shakespeare*, London: William Collins, 2007

Clayton, Thomas, "'So our virtues lie in th'interpretation of the time': Shakespeare's Tragic Coriolanus and Coriolanus, and Some Questions of Value," *Ben Jonson Journal*, no. 1, 1994.

Devereux, James A. "Reformed Doctrine in the Collects of the First 'Book of Common Prayer.'" *The Harvard Theological Review*, vol. 58, no. 1, 1965

Dobski, B.J. and Gish, D. , *Shakespeare and the Body Politic,* London, Lexington Books, 2015

Early Modern Research Group, "Commonwealth: the Social, Cultural, and Conceptual Contexts of an Early Modern Keyword" *The Historical Journal*, vol. 54, no. 3, 2011, pp. 659–687

Foakes R.A. “An Approach to *Julius Caesar”*, *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 5, No. 3 Summer, 1954, pp. 259-270,

Forset, Edward, *A Comparative Discourse of the Bodies Natural and Politique*,

Goy-Blanquet, Dominique, “Elizabethan Historiography and Shakespeare’s sources”, *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare’s History plays,* Michael Hattaway e.d, Cambridge:Cambridge University Press, 2002

Hassel, R. Chris. “Military Oratory in Richard III.” *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 35, no. 1, 1984, pp. 53–61.

Knights, L. C. "Shakespeare's Politics: With Some Reflections on the Nature of Tradition," *Proceedings of the British Academy*, XLIII 1957

Mack, Peter, *Elizabethan Rhetoric:Theory and Practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009

Macdonald, Ronald R., ‘Uneasy Lies: Language and History in Shakespeare’s Lancastrian Tetralogy’, *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 35:1 Spring 1984

Parvini, Neema, *Shakespeare's History plays: Rethinking Historicism*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012

Puttenham, George, *Arte of English Poesie*, London, 1589

Ronberg, Gert. “A way with words: the language of English Renaissance literature”, *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Volume 47, Issue 1, Spring 1996, Pages 94–95

Sir Thomas Smith, *De republica anglarum: the maner of gouernement or policie of the realme of England*, London, 1583, p.10

Sir Thomas Elyot,"Book I", *The Booke Named The Governor*, London: Renaissance Editions 1998,

Tavlin, Zachary, "Sleep and Insomnia in Levinas and Shakespeare's Henry IV*", Literary Refractions* No. 1 - Year 5, 12/2014

Taylor, Myron. "Shakespeare's Julius Caesar and the Irony of History." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 24, no. 3, 1973, pp. 301–308.

Tuchman, Barbara, *A Distant Mirror*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978

Westm, Michael, Silberstein, Myron "The Controversial Eloquence of Shakespeare's Coriolanu"s, *Modern Philology* , Vol. 102, No. 3 February 2005, pp. 307-331)

Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds), *The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works,* Oxford: Claredon Press, 1994

Yoder, R. A. "History and the Histories in Julius Caesar." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 24, no. 3, 1973, pp. 309–327.