

Shakespeare's Rhetoric

— From His Narrative Style to His Dramatic Style —

Shakespeare's transition from his narrative (in the histories) to his dramatic style (in *Hamlet*) suggests to be the one from his political to his ethical side, that is, from his 'complaisant' to his 'daemonic' side. Granville-Barker says, "*Hamlet* is the triumph of dramatic idea over dramatic action and of character over plot." In order that I may investigate into what such transition and triumph resulted from, my eyes are focussed mainly on his rhetoric, which has both sides of content and form.

Form in rhetoric ought to express content in it effectively, but Shakespeare often utilized the form without content for the purpose of characterization.

Falstaff's parody, Hamlet's eloquence, and Othello's 'rhetoric of substance' resulted from his inclination of thinking more of content than of form in rhetoric. In relation to his rhetoric I explain them in chap. 3, 4 and the conclusion of this article. Especially in chap. 4, I say that Elizabethan audience paid attention to the eloquence of Hamlet, and that I have acquired a new interpretation of the famous phrase, 'To be, or not to be,' through making clear the logic of eloquence, that is, the logic of the poet running away from his inward feelings in spiral. This new interpretation, which I think is quite unique, comes to the conclusion that both 'suicide' and 'revenge' opinions on the third soliloquy can be unified, and I believe that this interpretation is right even from the aforesaid standpoint of Elizabethan audience.

Shirō Naitō