

A Rhetorical Approach to Teaching Shakespeare in Secondary Schools

Author of 35 plays and more than 150 sonnets, the Great Bard, William Shakespeare, has become, as one critic notes, “an institutionalized rite of civility” (Greenblatt 1). Furthermore, this same critic goes on to assert that, “the person who does not love Shakespeare has made, the rite implies, an incomplete adjustment...to culture as a whole” (Greenblatt 1). Shakespeare’s genius is indisputable and for this reason, he is still taught in English classrooms at all academic levels. However, generally when the works of Shakespeare are taught in a school setting, they are taught with an emphasis on his poetic and thematic qualities. While these are both undoubtedly magnificent avenues to exploring Shakespeare’s works, if these are the only things that students and teachers feel the need to learn from the great playwright, then they are missing out on another, equally compelling opportunity for interaction with the mastermind: a rhetorical approach.

During the time of Shakespeare’s youth, mainstream grammar school instruction focused on rhetoric, and both the Bard and his audience would have been privy to the rhetorical choices Shakespeare

made in writing his plays. Rhetoric was a crucial skill for divulging meaning and creating understanding during this time period, so much so that he and “his contemporaries, convinced that rhetoric provided the most natural and powerful means by which feelings could be conveyed to readers and listeners, were trained in an analytical language that helped at once to promote and to account for this effectiveness” (Greenblatt 64). Ignoring such a rich and compelling component of Shakespeare’s craft in the modern classroom, especially when the works of William Shakespeare are perpetually among the top ranking most common taught texts in public schools, is inexcusable. Shakespeare clearly intended for his audience to experience his plays in light of their conscious knowledge of rhetoric. Thus, I argue that Shakespeare should be taught, not solely from thematic, poetic, or other commonly used angles, but rather from a rhetorical standpoint in addition to these other proved and valuable methods of instruction.

As any person who has studied rhetoric will attest, there are hundreds of different rhetorical figures available for use by an author in his or her compositions. Shakespeare himself “knew and made use of

about two hundred” (Greenblatt 64). With so many figures available for study, it is as easy to get stuck in a rut of teaching rhetorical tropes as it is to get stuck in the rut of teaching literary devices. However, rhetoric is more than just a collection of terms used to name stylistic figures implemented by an author; rhetoric is “the study of effective speaking and writing. And the art of persuasion” (“Silva Rhetoricae”). Thus, there are many aspects of rhetoric found in Shakespeare’s works, beyond simply rhetorical figures, which are valuable in the instruction of secondary school students. While there are many options for teaching these other principles of rhetoric as well, for the purpose and scope of this paper, I will focus on the teaching of Shakespeare to secondary students from a rhetorical perspective with an emphasis on the first three canons of rhetoric: Invention, Arrangement and Style.

Invention:

The first step in any process of communication is to nail down a topic. Once a person has decided what to say, the next step is to decide how to say it and to consider what options he or she has at his or her disposal to help express that topic. This process of deciding upon a topic

and how to go about discussing it is known as invention, or the discovery of arguments. In the classroom situations every day that demand students express some idea to some audience, thus necessitating invention. To codify this process, Aristotle, considered one of the most influential rhetoricians of all time, devised what he called ‘the topics,’ which were essentially go-to ways of arguing a specific claim successfully. These included “definition, comparison, relationship, circumstances, [and] proofs” (Lamb 108). It is incredibly useful for students to realize that when they are arguing a specific claim that there are ways of doing this that have been proven and can help them in their own argument constructions. Explicitly teaching students about the Topics is extremely helpful to students because they are then able to choose from a toolkit of techniques they have mastered, a far less intimidating task for students than simply hoping that their argument is convincing enough to pass.

Throughout Shakespeare’s works there are instances when each of these basic topics, these techniques, is utilized successfully to create a claim. While I will not pretend to have identified every instance, I have

pulled a couple of examples from one scene in Shakespeare's play, *Henry V*, which will illustrate this point and can be useful in the classroom.

Scene 5.2 in the play *Henry V*, is quite possibly one of the greatest love scenes ever written. Many teachers teach this portion of the text by solely examining the figurative language and verbal prowess of King Henry, which allowed him to woo Princess Catherine, a woman who did not even speak Henry's language. While this is a valid means of instruction for this passage of the play, Shakespeare is offering so much more to our students. If a rhetorical eye is used, this scene quickly becomes not only a model of poetic artistry, but also one of the most successful arguments ever made. Instead of the gushing, love-struck suitor, King Henry is recognized for the clever, accomplished rhetorician he truly is and that, more than wooing Catherine, he is using the Topics to argue that it would be wise to marry him—he is employing masterful invention.

King Henry, affectionately called Harry, begins his argument with a strategic attempt to utilize the Topic of 'comparison' saying, "An

angel is like you, Kate, and you are like an/ angel” (5.2.108-109). By drawing this comparison he is attempting to win over Catherine by lauding her with compliments and equating her to beautiful things. This first attempt, however, is unsuccessful, due to Harry’s inaccurate assessment of his audience; he mistakenly assumes these flatteries will compel Kate to accept his proposal, but as Kate does not possess English skills sufficient to understand what the comparison means, he has not yet won his audience.

Harry then endeavors to invoke the Topic of ‘circumstances,’ listing a number of ways he could prove his love at a future time if given the correct circumstance. He promises:

“if you would put me to verses, or to dance/ for your sake, Kate, why you undid me... or if I could win a lady at leap-frog, or by vaulting into my saddle/ with my armour on my back, under the correction of bragging/ be it spoken, I should quickly leap into a wife. Or if I might/ buffet for my love, or bound my horse for her favours, I could/ lay on like a butcher” (5.2.131-139).

On and on he continues, stating situation after situation in which he could prove to her his love, but because of their present circumstance, living in different countries and never having met, none of these are possible; hence, Kate will simply have to trust that Harry will provide as he says he will. Harry makes headway with his argument using this the Topic of 'circumstance', but Kate raises an important concern: marrying him would make her a traitor to her own country. Once more Harry's failure to consider his audience loses him his argument. He is forced to redirect his tactics and select yet another Topic to support his argument.

His next choice of Topic is a 'definitional' approach in which he redefines himself as not an enemy to France, but rather a "friend of/ France" (5.2.165-166). After this definitional distinction is made, Kate is far more open to the rest of Harry's more emotional and poetic appeals. His wooing continues and he eventually convinces the beautiful Catherine to be his bride, all in perfect rhetorical form. Using this scene helps students understand first, what a Topic is and second, how each of the Topics employed by Harry either strengthened or failed to strengthen his overall argument. Furthermore, analyzing this scene in this way

allows students access to the text in a way that poetic and dramatic instruction does not. Students will begin to see how incredibly easy, and certainly valid, a rhetorical approach is in approaching Shakespeare's genius.

The next step in the process of teaching Shakespeare rhetorically would be to have students practice using the Topics themselves. A great way to scaffold this process, until they are comfortable with the topics as a whole, is to have them imitate Shakespeare's techniques using a different subject matter. One teacher states that the instructional method of presenting a model text and then having students imitate that, "can help the student learn how it feels to write in [a form] other than his normal idiom; the exercise may help free him from inflexible, perhaps tedious, habits of expression" (Larson 1064). Thus, using a rhetorical approach to Shakespeare may the doors of understanding to many students who feel lost after approaching the Bard from the traditional angles. Rhetoric gives students another strategy with which to decode Shakespeare and as well as opportunities for growth in their own writing.

Arrangement of Arguments:

Once a student has decided what they are arguing and how to develop that argument he or she must then decide how to order these arguments. This part of the process is known as arrangement.

Classically, speeches were arranged rather rigidly in the following order: introduction, statement of facts, division, proof, refutation, conclusion (Silva Rhetoricae). However, as the study of rhetoric has evolved to include more than simply oration, so too has the rigidity surrounding the proper arrangement of a text. Arrangement is now useful when creating an argument not only in speech, but also in texts meant to be read or even viewed. Thus, according to one source, “proper arrangement of material into a cohesive structure...will [typically] include the introduction, a brief overview, proofs, refutations and conclusion,” but not always (Lamb 108-109). An effective persuasive piece may include all of the aforementioned components, or a portion of them, and these could appear in several different configurations depending upon how the author decides he or she wants the piece to flow.

Shakespeare was very aware of the rhetorical canon, arrangement. For example, he chose to arrange all of his plays in the traditional 5-act sequence. However, making students aware of this fact alone does not do much for enriching their experience with the bard. Instead, a better application would be to look specifically at how Shakespeare's arrangement in a particular work creates an effect on his audience. An example a teacher might use to show how Shakespeare makes use of arrangement would be to compare and contrast a few of Shakespeare's works looking specifically at his choices regarding arrangement.

To illustrate this process I have selected two of his sonnets, sonnets numbers 78 and 130. For obvious reasons, sonnets are most commonly taught with a focus on their figurative language and poetic properties, but again, a rhetorical approach can increase the density of knowledge students glean from Shakespeare. The sonnet is a highly structured genre and there are certain expectations associated with the form, including adherence to strict rhyme and meter, as well as the topic itself, which usually centers on a lover expressing his adoration for the object of his love. Looking beyond the poetic properties employed by Shakespeare,

we see in a comparison between these two sonnets, that Shakespeare was a master of arrangement as well as poetry.

Shakespearean Sonnet 78 is a textbook sonnet in form and topic. The speaker argues that his lover is not only his muse, but also the muse of every other love poet. The sonnet begins by introducing a brief overview of his claim: that this woman is his “muse/ and...every alien pen hath got my use” (1-3). Then, Shakespeare supports his claim by offering proofs of how he knows she is the ultimate muse, saying things like, “thine eyes, that taught the dumb on high to sing” (5). Finally, the speaker makes his conclusion and gives the reason for why his argument is important in the first place, requesting of his love: “yet be most proud of that which I compile...thou art all my art” (9-13). He is writing this piece not only to flatter, but also to articulate his desire for her to love him above all others. After looking at the components of arrangement in this piece, discuss with students the effectiveness of this arrangement. Example questions include: What would have happened if he had started with his conclusion, begging her to love him above all others? Would he have seemed needy or perhaps more direct? What if he had not included

proofs and instead used refutations? Questions like these can help students realize that authors make intentional choices and that these choices create specific effects.

After discussing this first sonnet, have students look at Sonnet 130. This sonnet, while still following the structure of a sonnet in terms of meter, rhyme and line number, twists the norm for subject matter and follows a different order in its arrangement. Its argument is that, while his lover is not perfect, he prefers her to any other woman. This sonnet begins, “My mistress’ eyes are nothing like the sun” (1). Not only is this an insult, but it is not much of an overview of what will follow; it is a proof. This speaker then presents more proofs: “coral is far more red than her lips,” “her breasts are dun,” “black wires grow on her head” and on and on he continues (2-4). After presenting his audience with proofs of his lady’s unattractiveness, he finally reveals to what end; he concludes, “And yet, by heaven, I think my love as rare/ As any she belied with false compare” (13-14). His love, though dismally realistic, is more authentic than a man who would be less blunt. After picking

apart this sonnet it is clear that, as far as arrangement is concerned, all it contains are a series of proofs and a conclusion.

After students have identified the parts of arrangement in Sonnet 130, the next step is first to discuss this sonnet individually, considering the effectiveness of its arrangement. Example discussion questions include: Why does this speaker berate and insult his lover? What effect does this have on the overall feel of this piece? Would the effect have been the same if the conclusion had come first? What if he had given a brief overview of his argument at the beginning? Then, when students have discussed these elements, have them compare and contrast this sonnet to the Sonnet 78. Emphasize how the arrangement is strengthening the argument of the piece and what effect this argument has on the way audience interacts with the text. Help students recognize that while each is written in the same genre and same rigid form, Shakespeare was able to manipulate the arrangement to produce two different, highly effective arguments; this shows students both the freedom rhetoricians have, even in the most rigid of genres, as well as the power of effective arrangement.

Teachers wishing to illustrate Shakespeare's mastery of arrangement are by no means required to do so using only sonnets. However, it is worth noting that using highly structured forms, like sonnets, makes it easier for students to compare and contrast the techniques used in each; using sonnets allows them to zero in on the component parts of the arrangement, without the confusion resultant of stylistic differences between two different genres or differences caused by stylistic liberties available in a less rigid form. After students grasp the concept of arrangement, a teacher can then broaden the scope to include different, more complex Shakespearean genres, fostering discussions of arrangement within these genres and also discussions of arrangement in two different genres focused on the same topic.

Considerations of Style:

The third canon of rhetoric is known as style. Rhetorical style is typically the most closely aligned method for analyzing Shakespeare

approached by teachers in their more traditional modes of teaching his works. As one teacher states, style takes in to consideration:

sentence length and variety, diction, euphony, coherence, paragraphing figures of speech. Figures of speech encompass such techniques as the use of analogy, simile, metaphor, parallelism, antithesis, ellipsis, alliteration, assonance, climax, personification, hyperbole, litotes, irony, paradox, oxymoron, and erotema...such techniques help convey complex ideas clearly. (Lamb 109).

Shakespeare uses many of these stylistic elements throughout his works and teachers are wonderfully adept at pointing out how Shakespeare's work exemplifies the highest quality of English style. However, looking at style through the lens of rhetoric is slightly different than looking at style in the traditional literary way. It is important that students see that Shakespeare's use of style was not simply to create beautiful language, but that his style also strengthened the persuasiveness of the arguments he made in his works.

One such example of how Shakespeare employs style to create a persuasive argument comes from his play, *Julius Caesar*. In Act 3 Scene

2 both Brutus and Antony give speeches at the funeral of Caesar aimed at persuading the Roman crowd to agree with their respective claims regarding Caesar's murder. To assist students in grasping the importance of style in a persuasive argument, have them analyze each speech stylistically and then compare the two. I have analyzed these speeches for stylistic components and pulled a few examples from each.

One of the first things to note is that Brutus' speech is written in prose, whereas Antony's is written in iambic pentameter. Iambic pentameter is commonly associated with high class or virtuous characters in Shakespeare's plays, and thus the decision to have Antony speak in this form, gives his speech a greater sense of authority and virtue. It also shows that Antony has taken more thought as to what he will say, because it takes more effort to speak in a specific meter than to simply speak prosaically. Thus, Antony is already using style to his own persuasive purposes, suggesting he is a more virtuous and noble source of knowledge than his opponent.

Next one might note that Brutus uses the imperative or command form of speech repeatedly in his oration, saying things like, "hear me,"

“be silent,” “believe me,” and “awake your senses” (3.2.13-16).

Commands are used as a way to gain submission from another party, whereas in Antony’s speech, he does not use the imperative and instead uses synecdoche as he asks his “Friends” to “lend me your ears” (3.2.70). By referring to their ears in place of the person themselves, he suggests that he is humble and is submitting himself to the audience rather than the other way around. He does not want to impose his will on others and instead asks for only the smallest part of them that they can offer of themselves and still allow him to relay his message: their ears. Thus, again Antony uses his stylistic elements to his advantage in gaining the approval of his crowd to create an appearance of humility rather than dominance.

A few last qualities to note in the two speeches are that in Brutus’ speech, he uses several instances of parallelism. For example he relays his reasoning for killing Caesar using parallel structure: “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” (3.2.23-25). By using the same structure of ‘as he was’ followed by

some adjective, and then 'I' followed by some action Brutus committed, Brutus attempts to present his crime as a simple cause and effect argument. He suggests that Caesar's murder was inevitable when considering the pattern set in motion by Brutus' previous encounters with the Emperor. Caesar had become ambitious and so Brutus in response had to kill him. In this way he is trying to lighten the gravity of the crime he committed in hopes of persuading his audience to believe that his act was not as bad as it seems. This approach seems effective in persuading his audience, until Antony responds.

Antony uses a different approach: the careful repetition of a few key words. Over and over he states that "Brutus is an honourable man" (3.2.79). He also repeats several times the idea that "Brutus/ Hath told you Caesar was ambitious" (3.2.74-75). In doing this Antony is carefully trying to first establish Brutus as a man of honor and, thus, somebody in a position to be listened to, and second, that Brutus held an obvious opinion regarding the kind of man Caesar was: in this case a negative one. Antony recounts many times that Brutus negatively referred to Caesar ambition by reviewing some of the 'ambitious' feats of Caesar,

which actually turned out to be great victories of Rome. When the citizens of Rome realize that Caesar's ambition was, in reality, a positive thing for their republic, they are then enraged at Brutus, because he was supposed to have been 'honorable.' Thus Antony successfully slanders Brutus, without saying one ill-word towards him, a very persuasive technique.

After students have discussed these and other stylistic pieces of the speeches, they will be prepared to discuss why Antony was ultimately more successful than Brutus. Once students have done this, have them consider questions such as the following: Are there stylistic techniques Brutus could have employed that would have caused the audience to agree more with him? What if Antony had used different techniques? How would these have hindered or improved his argument? Doing this will allow students to practice analyzing the stylistic choices of Shakespeare as tools of persuasion rather than tropes used to make his writing sound prettier and more poetic. Studying Shakespeare's work in this manner then prepares students to be more aware of the persuasive effects of their own stylistic choices in writing.

Conclusion:

Shakespeare was, and still is, one of the greatest masters of English in the history of the language. Teachers rightly continue teaching his works as exemplary models of what literature ought to encompass and what an author ought to inspire within his audience. However, teaching Shakespeare merely from a poetic or literary standpoint negates a huge portion of what Shakespeare considered when composing his plays and sonnets: rhetoric. A rhetorical approach to teaching his works is another way that teachers can successfully emphasize Shakespeare's genius and come closer to helping students unmask the true intent the Bard sought when he composed his art so many centuries ago.

Works Cited

- Burton, Gideon. "Arrangement." *Silva Rhetoricae: The Forest of Rhetoric*. Brigham Young University, 26 Feb. 2007. Web. 21 Nov. 2012. <rhetoric.byu.edu>.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. "General Introduction." *The Norton Shakespeare: Volume I*. 2nd ed. Greenblatt, Cohen, Howard & Maus. New York City: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2008. 1-78. Print.

Lamb, Brenda. "Coming to Terms: Rhetoric." *The English Journal*. 87.1 (1998): 108-109. Web. 14 Nov 2012.

Larson, Richard L. "Teaching Rhetoric in the High School: Some Proposals." *The English Journal*. 1058-1065. Web. 14 Nov 2012.

Shakespeare, William. "Henry V." *The Norton Shakespeare: Volume I*. 2nd ed. Greenblatt, Cohen, Howard & Maus. New York City: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2008. 1542-1543. Print.

Shakespeare, William. "Julius Caesar." *The Norton Shakespeare: Volume I*. 2nd ed. Greenblatt, Cohen, Howard & Maus. New York City: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2008. 1588-1589. Print.

Shakespeare, William. "Sonnet 78." *The Norton Shakespeare: Volume I*. 2nd ed. Greenblatt, Cohen, Howard & Maus. New York City: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2008. 1780. Print.

Shakespeare, William. "Sonnet 130." *The Norton Shakespeare: Volume I*. 2nd ed. Greenblatt, Cohen, Howard & Maus. New York City: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2008. 1798. Print.