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The Theatrical Rhetoric of Edward III

LESLEY THOMSON

CRITICISM and analysis of Edward III has focused primarily on whether or not Shakespeare’s presence can be discerned in it. Far less attention has been given to the play’s theatrical elements, although they would have been especially effective in its original context. This is because Edward III is a play that not only explores and dramatizes the power of rhetoric, but in doing so also systematically manipulates the audience into experiencing and responding to the effects of its persuasive strategies. If they worked, a contemporary spectator’s experience of the play in performance would have been comforting, reassuring, even inspiring. The focus here, therefore, is on the cumulative and mutually reinforcing structural patterns—of language, actions, and especially of sounds—that constitute the play’s persuasive techniques. This is not to claim that the play is a coherent whole; to our eyes and ears at least it is an uneven work, perhaps as a consequence of revision and/or collaboration. But it is nevertheless a viable performance-text which, I suggest, would have been successful theater four hundred years ago because of both its subject matter and its theatrical strategies and devices. Although the play is unlikely to have challenged spectators’ expectations, the relatively mild pro-English propaganda is, as it were, theatrically enabled and confirmed by various complementary techniques of audience manipulation woven through the play from start to finish. To my mind the most pervasive and theatrically effective of these are: an emphasis on the act and language of persuasion; the control of character exits; business related to weapons and kneeling; and references to or the use of sounds, especially of battle. Each element is, of course, integrated with the others in the play’s structure; but by isolating them in turn one can demonstrate how and why they work effectively together to create the rhetorical whole. The significance of this internal coherence would be diminished, however, without the external context, especially when the focus of the work was the not too distant past of a country and an audience for which history and xenophobic nationalism were inseparable, powerful forces.

The Rainge of Edward the Third seems to have been relatively popular in the period just after it was written—there were two editions within three years (SR, 1595; Q1, 1596; Q2, 1599)—and the reasons for its subsequent disap-
pearrance from the stage are probably related to its negative treatment of the Scots. The play’s initial success was likely due at least in part to the euphoric mood of the years immediately after the defeat of the Spanish Armada; an audience saw King Edward and his son defeating France, a past threat to England’s power analogous to Spain in the present. English history is important not only as a context but also, of course, in the play itself; indeed, generically Edward III is almost purely “history” (however altered). It is comedy only insomuch as it moves “upward” to a happy ending, and certainly not tragedy—quite remarkably, there is not a single onstage death, even of a minor figure, in the course of the action. As other critics have noted, this is history drawn on and manipulated to dramatize a message about kingship, honor, and success—in fact, it is a morality tale (with psychomachia) in which the hero reforms and is rewarded. In showing first King Edward’s triumph over himself, then England’s over France, the play would have satisfied the expectations of spectators who well knew that Edward had defeated John and that the Black Prince was not killed in the battle. Indeed, although the play has been described as having two distinct parts—King Edward and the Countess, then King Edward and King John—in fact it has a single, overarching frame: the developing King/Prince, father/son relationship, begun in the first scene, continued even in the Countess scenes, then picked up again in earnest when the battle with France begins.

For the purposes of this study of the play’s effectiveness onstage, the question of who and how many wrote it is immaterial (although plural authorship seems probable). The quarto is a play-text that was, as the title page says, “sundry times printed about the Citie of London.” This ambiguous phrasing raises questions about venue, only to leave them unanswered. As Georgio Melchiori notes, the play requires simply a minimal upper level (for the Countess in her castle in act 1)—no trap, no discovery space, no large props (bed, tomb, banquet table). If the title-page vagueness means that the play was performed in more than one place, the basic requirements make good, practical sense; and if when the play-text was set down the venue was unknown, the authors made the best of it. Indeed, as written, Edward III would have been playable and persuasive in virtually any space having an upper platform and a rear wall with doors. Further, if the quarto was printed from an authorial manuscript, as Fred Lapides concludes and Melchiori concurs, then it provides evidence of what mattered to the authors; certainly, as this study will show, the intricate use of repetition indicates a coordinated thematic purpose. In fact, those responsible for the play-text as we have seen it seem to have been possessed of considerable sophistication in the art of play-making and to have known what modern readers often forget: that in a theater the words, actions, and sounds working together are the tools of persuasion aimed explicitly at an audience.
enlisting Lodowick to write poetry, to wooing the Countess directly, to urging her to woo herself on his behalf:

Then take thyself a little way aside,  
And tell myself a king doth dote on thee;  
Say that within thy power doth lie  
To make him happy and that thou hast sworn  
To give him all the joy within thy power  
Do this, and tell me when I shall be happy.  
(212–17; my emphasis)"11

As the Countess later points out (2.1.250–75), Edward's purpose is, of course, to persuade her to break her marriage vows. But the concern with the breaking or keeping of vows is much broader, echoing through the play and helping to determine an audience's evaluation of the characters. The King's exchange with the Countess's father, which follows her defiant departure in this scene, brings the matter to the surface. When Warwick innocently asks how he can help, the King reminds him, with a flourish of self-righteous rhetoric that is ironic only to an audience, of the proper relationship between vows and deeds:

...O thou world, great nurse of flattery,  
Why dost thou tip men's tongues with golden words,  
And peise their deeds with weight of heavy lead,  
That fair performance cannot follow promise?  
(302–5)11

Warwick's soliloquy at the end of this segment effectively uses repetition to emphasize how he will try to persuade his daughter to break her " vow made by the name of God": "I'll say she must forget her husband Salisbury"; "I'll say an oath can easily be broken"; but also, "I'll say it is my duty to persuade; / But not her honesty to give consent." (2.1.357, 60, 66–67). At the end of his verbal attack on his daughter, Warwick clearly acknowledges his equivocation and heightens an audience's awareness of what he is doing: "Thus have I, in his majesty's behalf, / Apparelled sin in virtuous sentences" (2.1.410–11). Not surprisingly, when the Countess refuses his father responds, "Why, now thou speakest as I would have thee speak, / And mark how I unsay my words again" (2.1.431–32). In the final confrontation between the Countess and King, when she threatens suicide to keep her marriage vow unless he will "swear to leave [his] most unholy suit" (2.2.182), Edward is brought to reformation, expressed in apposite terms:

Even by that power I swear, that gives me now  
The power to be ashamed of myself.

This vow ends the first movement of the play; but its larger rhetorical purpose is to initiate the rest of the action by persuading the audience that Edward is once more worthy of admiration. And from this point he is indeed portrayed as an honorable English king who keeps his word and performs what he promises.

The concern with oath-keeping does not disappear from the play, however; rather, in the latter half the honor of the French is called into question in similar terms and circumstances. The most notable of these is when Prince Charles's guarantee of Salisbury's safe passage is countersigned by King John, who says, "Thou and thy word lie both in my command, / What canst thou promise that I cannot break?" to which Charles responds, "What, am I not a soldier in my word?" (4.5.80–81, 92). When Charles adds that King Edward would not have broken a promise made by his son, King John relents, significantly enhancing the contrast between the two made by the broader theatrical rhetoric. In the context of the play's concern with language, it is not merely incidental that the defeat of the French is caused partly by their misunderstanding of a prophecy. Edward's triumph over John is, not surprisingly, confirmed with words about vows when the former mocks his prisoner: "So, John of France, / See you keep your word: / You promised to be sooner with ourself / Than we did think for, and 'tis so indeed" (5.1.199–201). As repeatedly happens through the play—whether in the contestatory exchanges between characters, or in the elaborated speeches describing battles, or in the persuasion of one character by another—the devices of rhetoric are both apparent and effective. The winners use words better than the losers, and any audience can hear it.

Exits

Character exits are among the most basic elements of a play, but they can also be used as a subtle but effective means of confirming or qualifying a character's control and power at any point in the action. As such, exits can be a significant aspect of a play's visual rhetoric, helping to persuade an audience to accept its message. Those responsible for Edward III seem to have known and capitalized on this structural device—the essence of which is repetition—to demonstrate and emphasize the key steps in the process toward the English triumph. Interestingly, the first exit is led by Prince Edward, speaking a vow of readiness to die (which he will keep), and initiating a forward movement his father will soon counter.
Within this school of honour I shall learn
Either to sacrifice my foes to death,
Or in a rightful quarrel spend my breath.
Then cheerfully forward, each a several way;
In great affairs 'tis naught to use delay.

(1.1.165–69)

King Edward maintains this momentum until the Countess, at the end of a long persuasion urging him to “stay,” says “More gracious than my terms

13. It is worth noting that not only does each of these three exit contribute to
the audience’s sense of the characters who make them, but that each is
explicitly put in the context of language: the Prince’s vow, the Countess urging
the King to persuade himself, and her refusal to listen to his suggestion that
she break her marriage vow.

The play’s shift of focus to Prince Edward includes a series of exits which
effectively demonstrate his ability to exercise power. In 4.4 three heralds
enter in succession, first from King John, then from Prince Charles, then from
Prince Philip, each offering Prince Edward a reason to surrender. It is surely
not accidental that these emissaries offer three temptations, which Edward
refuses in Christlike fashion. Furthermore, the importance of words is under
scored when he sends each of the heralds away with instructions about
what he should “tell” the man who sent him (4.4.81–86, 95–100, 110–22). The
self-control of the Prince in dispatching what are essentially three “wooers”
is an important element in the portrayal of him as a force for good in his own
right.

Command her, woo her, win her any ways
To be my mistress and my secret love.
I will not stand to hear thee make reply:
Thy oath break hers, or let thy sovereign die.

(2.1.344–47)

Warwick remains on stage (speaking the soliloquy discussed earlier), then the
Countess enters to hear her father, as he says, “in his majesty’s behalf, / [Ap-
parel] sin in virtuous sentences” (2.1.410–11). She, of course, rejects this
second “wooing” as she has rejected the first, earning her father’s praise. The
long scene finally ends with first Warwick signalling his exit, then his daugh-
ter cueing her own. That the Countess has maintained control in the face of
both the King’s and her father’s extended arguments is given a particularly
theatrical emphasis when for the second time she departs of her own accord.

A later sequence in 2.2 might have been specifically designed to have the
exits illustrate and confirm King Edward’s misuse of his authority in service
of his private desires rather than his public responsibilities. As he waits to
hear the outcome of Warwick’s persuasion of his daughter, the arrival of

Prince Edward reminds the King of his military duties. Seemingly reformed,
he calls to his son, “Come, boy, forward, advance! / Let’s with our colours
sweet the air of France.” But at that moment, Lodowick enters with news of
the Countess’s arrival; to his son King Edward says, “Go, leave me, Ned, and
jewel with thy friends”; to Lodowick, “Go, fetch the countess hither in thy
hand”; and when Lodowick brings her, he is told to “go” (2.2.99–100, 106,
109, 116). The end of the King’s infatuation with the Countess is signalled
when, at the conclusion of the scene, he returns to directing exits in prepara-
tion for battle (2.2.139–59). His restored control over himself and his world
is confirmed in a later scene-ending, forward moving couplet: “That orderly
disposed and set in ray, / Let us to horse, and God grant us the day” (3.3.227–
28).

Two often-related pieces of business add to the visual dimension of the
play’s persuasive movement towards the chivalric triumph of England’s King
and Prince.14 The use of various weapons and the action of kneeling are both
altogether typical kinds of action in the plays of the period, on which these
playwrights have capitalized with considerable nuance. The play begins with
an act of knighting power when Edward makes Artois Earl of Richmond, which,
although there are no stage directions, was presumably accompanied by some
ceremony of bestowal and submission. Then almost immediately a sword is
drawn by King Edward or Lorraine (depending on how the stage direction is
interpreted15) and if Lorraine draws first, then Edward does so in response,
either way demonstrating his readiness to fight for England’s rights—before
he is distracted by the Countess. When the two meet, the Countess kneels to
the King (“In duty lower than the ground I kneel,” 1.2.107), but he immedi-
ately raises her, beginning his demeaning infatuation. Edward himself ac-
knowledges his unkingly subservience in opposite terms, “She is as
imperator over me and I to her / Am as a kneeling vassal . . .” (2.2.40–41).
This unnatural reversal is brought to an end only when the Countess finally takes control of the stage and of Edward—"I'll part a little from thee"; "Stir not, lascivious, king, to hinder me"—as she produces her explicitly symbolic "wedding knives." Furthermore, it seems she kneels again here, since when Edward has been brought to see reason by her threat of suicide to preserve her marriage vows, he twice tells her to "arise" (192, 196).

The first confrontation between King Edward and King John, in 3.3 at the center of the play, is a battle of words, not swords, and given this play's concern with language, I suggest that the reasons are thematic rather than dictated by stage limitations or an outmoded dramatic emphasis on speech over action. Furthermore, as is the case in the play overall, the Prince gradually takes over the exchange here, using the language of the popular words/ swords dichotomy to assert what he will later do:

Look not for cross invectives at our hands,
Or railing execrations of despite:
Let creeping serpents hid in hollow banks
Sting with their tongues; we have swords
And they shall plead for us and our affairs.

An audience would doubtless have participated vicariously in the chivalric ceremony in which King Edward has armor, helmet, lance, and shield ritualistically bestowed on his son. When the victorious Prince soon reappears with his now "dividred lance" and the body of Bohemia, he "Kneels and kisses his father's hand" (3.4.1–2, 76). He remains on his knees until his bloody sword is brought in for the King to knight him with it saying, "Arise, Prince Edward, trusty knight at arms. / This day thou hast confounded me with joy. / And proved thyself fit heir unto a king" (104–6). Significantly, King Edward's "arise" to the prince here verbally and visually echoes the two confrontations between the King and Countess, which it implicitly counters. Also noteworthy is that the King does not appear for more than fifty lines between 4.2.79 and 5.1—an unusual aspect of the play which seems inexplicable, at least in dramatic terms, unless viewed in the context of the building up of the Prince.

During the central portion of the play many other swords would be seen as the battle continues, but as is usually the case with hand-held props, unless the action is sufficiently unusual or important, no mention is made in stage directions or dialogue. Similarly, when the six citizens, "in their shirts, bare-foot, with halters about their necks" plead with King Edward for mercy, their kneeling would be a given, even had Edward not made it a condition of their submission (4.2.77). Although in his initial rejection of the citizens' pleas Edward calls for "drums' alarum" and "threat'ning swords" (5.1.9–10), it is significant that Phillip's intervention brings the King to assert that "we / As well can master our affections / As conquer other by the dint of sword" (5.1.50–52)—an explicit reminder of his internal and external victories charted in the play. Then comes a final combination of kneeling and sword when, in another royal act of peace and triumph, the King knights Copeland (94).

"Sheathe up your swords" King Edward commands his followers when, as dramatic convention dictated, he closes the play. But the more important and longer, penitulize speech is spoken by Prince Edward; it is he who encapsulates the metadramatic significance of the theatrical persuasion the audience has heard and seen. He imagines a future—the audience's present—in which "many princes more" will repeat his triumphs, only wishing that his heroic deeds "were now redoubled twofold."

So that hereafter ages, when they read
The painful traffic of my tender youth,
Might thereby be inflamed with such resolve
As not the territories of France alone,
But likewise Spain, Turkey, and what countries else
That justly would provoke fair England's ire,
Might at their presence tremble and retire.

(5.1.229–35)

Sounds

Unlike other history plays of the same period (from the late 1580s to the early 1590s), Edward III has no extended dumb shows, little pageantry, and no onstage battles. Indeed, as already demonstrated here, the play is mostly talk, much of it overtly rhetorical. But it is not completely without elements typical of history plays—it uses sounds. In fact, sounds are central to the play both structurally and thematically; they help to create and confirm its message or meaning. The quarto includes thirteen stage directions for a sound, and nine occasions when either one of these sounds is referred to or a character calls for or mentions a sound in what amounts to a cue, since such sounds are virtually certain to have been performed and heard. In addition, several times characters describe events or make analogies in terms of sounds, thereby emphasizing their significance. The thematic import and persuasive effect of all these are cumulative.

"Just into the play is the direction "Sound a horn," which an obviously in charge King Edward immediately recognizes as "A messenger," and sends Audley to get him (1.1.50.1–51). By the end of the first scene, the King is enthusiastically preparing for war. When he tells Prince Edward it is time to leave his books and become a soldier, the Prince replies, "As cheerful sound-
ing to my youthful spleen / This tumult is of war’s increasing broils, / As, at the coronation of a king, / The joyful clamours of the people are, / When Ave, Caesar! they pronounce aloud” (1.1.160–64). These words not only convey the Prince’s inexperience in the realities of war but also anticipate sounds to come. At the start of 2.2, Derby enters from France and “At another door, Audley with a Drum”—that is, a drummer—but the drum is silent because the King is by now intent on conquering the Countess rather than Scotland or France. Soon after, clearly acknowledging a conventional signal, Derby says, “The Trumpets sound, the king is now abroad” (2.2.21). Ironically, this flourish for his kingly entrance initiates the segment in which Edward’s psychomachia—the inner battle between love and war, man and monarch, Countess and Prince—reaches its full intensity. Later in the scene, just as the King is asking Lodowick when he will receive an answer from the Countess to his illicit suit, he is interrupted by the sounds of war. His annoyed response warrants full quotation.

What drum is that that thunders forth this march,
To start the tender Cupid in my bosom?
Poor sheepskin, how it brawls with him that beateth it!
Go break the thund’ring parchement; bottom out,
And I will teach it to conduct sweet lines
Unto the bosom of a heavenly nymph;
For I will use it as my writing paper,
And so reduce him from a scolding drum
To be the herald and dear counsel-bearer
Betwixt a goddess and a mighty king.
Go, bid the drummer learn to touch the lute,
Or hang him in the braces of his drum,
For now we think it an uncivil thing
To trouble heaven with such harsh resounds.
Away

(2.2.46–60)

When Lodowick has exited, Edward continues, soliloquizing in the conventional language of the Petrarchan lover, until he asks, “How now?” (72). As Melchiori suggests, this question is probably the King’s response to hearing the drum again. Certainly Lodowick immediately enters with the news that “the drum that stroke the lusty march / Stands with Prince Edward, your thrice valiant son” (73–74). King Edward, guiltily seeing his son as a reminder of the Queen and his own adulterous intentions, says he will “master” himself and calls to the Prince. Just then, however, Lodowick announces the Countess’s arrival, causing Edward to dismiss the Prince and admit the Countess. Her entrance initiates their final verbal skirmish, in which she triumphs—and, with the end of the Countess episode, the action turns to battle with France.
from the King to the Prince. This moment can also be seen as the culmination of a sequence which has demonstrated the moral value attached to being willing to risk one’s life for horror love or war—as the Countess and Prince have done, but King John and Prince Phillip have not.

From the middle of act 3 to the middle of act 4 there is a fairly long stretch of action with neither stage directions nor dialogue cues for sound. Furthermore, before the next sound is heard, King John repeatedly mentions the ominous silence—"the world is hushed and still"; "Silence attends some wonder?"; Where or from whom proceeds this silence?", "now the under earth is as a grave", / Dark, deadly, silent, and uncomfortable" (4.5.3, 6, 8, 17–18). He then exclaims, "Hark, what a deadly outcry to I hear?" having, with the audience, heard "A clamour of ravens" (4.5.18.1). Coming after a lengthy offstage silence in a play-long sequence of sounds, this "clamour" would be especially raucous and jarring. The segment ends with King John trying to put on a brave face; he commands Phillip, "Away, and comfort up my soldiers, / And sound the trumpets, and at once dispatch / This little business of a silly fraud" (4.5.53–55).

The next scene contains the play’s most extended battle sequence—although by the standards of other contemporary histories it is meager, relying as it does almost completely on sound and evocative dialogue. An "Alarum" accompanies the entrance of Artois and Prince Edward, another is signalled when King John comes on, and the sounds of battle probably continue through the scene. At the same time, the disarray of the French is lamented by Prince Charles in terms which might also be responding to actual sounds: "Our drums strike nothing but discouragement, / Our trumpets sound dishonour and retire" (4.6.30–31). Moreover, the description of the events in such terms is evidence of a metadramatic self-consciousness about the rhetorical function of the sounds in the play.

The entrance of victors and vanquished starts the next scene as a "Retreat sounded" punctuates the Prince’s mocking, "Now John in France, and lately John of France" (4.7.01–1). Following more irony-laden gloating from Prince Edward comes the direction "Sound trumpets, enter Audley" (4.7.17.1). The sounding of trumpets at the entrance of the nonroyal, wounded Audley is unusual, and the dialogue gives no clue to its significance here. But perhaps this use of sound is a way of confirming Audley’s temporary role as a kind of substitute father to the Prince during the King’s extended absence from the stage from 4.3 to 5.19. Certainly, in both his words (especially in 4.4) and his actions through this segment, Audley articulates and embodies ideas which need to be conveyed to both the Prince and the audience. Acceptance of death and unwavering service are spelled out and demonstrated by Audley, then practiced by both father and son in subsequent scenes. In helping to guide audience understanding and response, here and through the play, Audley is one element in the play’s theatrical rhetoric.

When King Edward reappears, he is in the act of assuring Queen Phillipa that Copeland will be punished for disobeying her orders. They are interrupted by the six citizens of Calais pleading for mercy, to whom the King replies, “Mine ears are stopped against your bootless cries. / Sound drums, alarum, draw threat’ning swords!” (5.1.9–10). There is no stage direction for sound or action, and probably there would have been none since the citizens’ continued pleas, and especially Phillipa’s intervention on their behalf (another of the play’s verbal persuasions), bring Edward around to the view that “a peaceful quietness brings most delight” (56).

The final direction for sound is “After a flourish sounded within, enter a herald” (5.1.175.1); he announces that, contrary to earlier report (and as most in the audience would already have known) Prince Edward has triumphed over France. At this news the proud King and father proclaims “Sound trumpets, welcome in Plantagenet!” (186); despite the absence of a confirming stage direction, there can be little doubt that now he is obeyed. Indeed, probably all the stops were pulled out for the entrance of the triumphant Prince with King John and his son prisoners, the climax of the action.

The cumulative effect of the principal verbal, visual and aural devices employed throughout the play and discussed here is to celebrate the dynamic line which had or ginated with Edward III and was to end with Elizabeth I. Sounds, and actions such as kneeling, using a sword, and exiting are mostly lost on a reader, making it too easy to underestimate or even forget their effect on an audience. But in Edward III it is just these elements which infuse the dialogue with meaning and would have prompted Elizabethan spectators to agree that all was well in their England. In the theater, the audience would have been given an experience of what this history play is both about and demonstrates: its successful use of the power to persuade.

Notes


2. This view of the play can be contrasted with that of Larry S. Champion ("As we are to this perilous time": Ideological Ambivalence in The Boyne of King Edward III and the English Chronical Plays, “English Studies 1988: 117–29). After summarizing the prevailing critical interpretation of the play as Tudor propaganda which an audience would have accepted, he argues: “The essential flaw in such an approach is that it assumes not only a universal perspective but also an audience basically sympathetic to the monarchy and its policies and prompt to respond communally and patri- oatically” (118–19). He goes on to develop his view that this kind of theatrical propaganda was in attempt to control the politically restive in the audience. Consc-
quently he sees the play as meta-dramatically ironic to the point of being potentially subversive, a view with which it will be apparent I do not agree.

3. A summary of the available information about the quarto’s registration and publication together with a discussion of its probable date of composition can be found in Georgio Melchiori’s introduction to his edition of the play (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 3–9.


5. Richard Proudfoot notes, “it is unclear whether ‘about’ should be construed as within or without the city.” See: *The Reign of King Edward The Third* (1996) and *Shakespeare.* *Proceedings of the British Academy* 71 (1985), 162.


7. See Melchiori’s Textual Analysis (173), in which he cites Fred Lapide’s old-spelling edition.

8. See Richard Proudfoot’s British Academy lecture for a discussion of the stage-worthiness (pp. 162–63) of the text and its “high degree of shapeliness and coherence” (166).

9. All quotations are from Melchiori’s Cambridge edition.

10. Melchiori believes that this scene sets out views about the poet’s art expressed elsewhere by Shakespeare (Introduction, 39).

11. *Power(s)* occurs twenty-three times in the play; *say(s)* thirty-six times.


13. This is not in the source; see Melchiori’s note to 2.1.302–8, which suggests a deliberate change in the characterization of Edward here. In this play, *word(s)* occurs twenty-eight times, *promise(ies)* six, *out* sixteen, *swear* eleven, *sworn* seven times and *tongue* in ten-thirteen occasions.


15. In his summary of the sources for this scene Melchiori notes that this exit is only in Freinet (191–92); its origins in one of the sources does not, of course, diminish its dramatic effect.

16. See Melchiori’s extended discussion of the chivalric elements of the play, especially the “ceremonial occasions” (41), which of course include swords and kneeling, although he doesn’t consider them specifically.

17. See Melchiori’s note to 1.1.107.

18. This business is not in the play’s sources and this is the only stage direction in plays of the period specifying wedding knives (see the entry for *knife* in *A Dictionary of Stage Directions in English Drama* 1580–1642, Alan C. Dessen and Leslie Thomson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).)

19. The *words* in words pun also occurs at 3.1.189, 3.3.191–94, 4.4.128–29.

20. When the King is organizing the attack, he specifically “temper[s]” the Prince’s “lusty spirit” with Audley’s “gravity” (3.3.220–26).