

“Mirror of All Christian Kings” or Marauding Machiavel?

Shakespeare's Ambivalent Treatment of Henry V.

by Nicholas Metcalf.

Henry V was the last of Shakespeare's English history plays and occupies a key place in the sequence which begins with Richard II, and concludes over a hundred years later with Richard III.¹ It is one of Shakespeare's most popular plays and is widely regarded as being a celebration of heroic actions under a heroic king.²

A reader or viewer coming into the play from the earlier Richard II and Henry IV plays notices some interesting structural features; the use of a Chorus to help guide us through the action, and the virtual absence of asides and soliloquies. For the most part we are not permitted to share either Henry's private responses, or those of the surrounding figures to the decisions which dictate the action. Consequently getting a clear idea of how Shakespeare intended us to view Henry is rather difficult. Indeed critics have long been at odds as to whether he is using his hero to extol the virtues of Christian kingship, or the values of Machiavellian power politics. This paper, taking its cue from one of the play's most controversial incidents, the killing of the French prisoners in Act IV, will consider Shakespeare's treatment of Henry.

Perhaps the most celebrated critical response to the play has been that of E. M. W. Tillyard, who argued that Shakespeare's histories upheld the traditional belief in the providential guidance of temporal events to a divinely planned conclusion. The sovereign, as described by Tillyard, was regarded by Elizabethans as an integral, indeed sacral part of the social hierarchy, which in turn was an integral part of the universal hierarchy. The Elizabethan world picture enables us to perceive themes through symbolic images: Society as harmony emanating from the inner harmony of the sovereign (or discord emanating from the sovereign's inner disharmony); society as an organism, the "body politic", whose health reflects the spiritual health of its head, the sovereign; and lastly the sovereign as the sun pre-eminent among the planets in times of order. The "roi soleil" was one of the most persistent Elizabethan commonplaces;

"And therefore is the glorious planet Sol
 In noble eminence enthron'd and spher'd
 Amidst the other; whose med'cinable eye
 Corrects the influence of evil planets
 And posts like the commandment of a king,
 Sans check, to good and bad".

Troilus and Cressida (1. 3, 89-94.)

A dominant opinion in the sixteenth century was that rebellion was sinful even against the worst of sovereigns. This was clearly stated in A Homily against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion, one of the most authoritative of the many statements of absolutist doctrine: "A rebel is worse than the worst prince and rebellion worse than the worst government of the worst prince". To ensure the security of the kingdom, the sovereigns subjects had to be constrained "in mutual well-beseeming ranks" to "march all one way".³ Any rupturing of this pattern, like the usurpation of the throne, could result in chaos since the state was a component of the divine order. Both Tillyard and John Dover Wilson saw this tetralogy in particular as upholding the divinity of kingship, stressing the sin of Bollingbroke's rebellion and God's punishment of the nation. According to this thesis Henry V, not inheriting his father's guilt, is ultimately claimed as the ideal king—patriotic and pious—and the whole tetralogy is neatly rounded off on a note of triumph.

The Chorus and movement of the play do seem to support the Tillyard view of Henry as Shakespeare's ideal of a model Christian king. A. R. Humphreys notes how the Richard II and Henry IV plays look towards it; "towards England's unity restored after usurpation and division". And as the play is followed in the sequence by the chaos of the Henry VI and Richard III plays, it seems to "shine like an hour of glory between two periods of storm".⁴

In the play Henry is described by the Chorus as being the "mirror of all Christian kings" (2, 6), who will lead the honour-seeking and expectant youth of England against the French, who seek to avoid war through "pale policy." We are told in Act III of England's "brave" and "majestical" fleet (5, 16) filled with "cull'd and choice-drawn cavaliers" (5, 24) who travel towards Harfleur and destiny. The narrative is pacy and energetic with many references to speed;

"with reasonable swiftness add

More feathers to our wings;” 1. 2. 307-8

“Dispatch us with all speed, lest that our King
Come here himself to question our delay,
For he is footed in this land already.” 2. 4. 141-3

“Thus with imagined wing our swift scene flies
In motion of no less celerity
Than of thought.” 3. Chorus. 1-3

It all culminates in the battle at Agincourt in Act IV, and in the final act King Henry returns to London to be welcomed by his people as a conquering hero. The action is then completed by the marriage with Katherine and the peace treaty with France.

The pace of the action allows us little time for thought or reflection. At times one gets the impression that Shakespeare is in a hurry to finish, having tired of a character who had already featured in two earlier plays. There is a certain hollowness about Henry in this play as perhaps in the end, Shakespeare may have simply settled for a kind of heroic facade in his treatment of the king.

Shakespeare’s sources for the play were the Chronicles of Raphael Holinshed and an anonymous late sixteenth century drama called Famous Victories. For the most part he follows his sources closely, however some of the most interesting and revealing moments occur when Shakespeare either re-works, or completely leaves his sources. In these instances Henry’s motives and actions become strangely equivocal. The ordering of the killing of the French prisoners is one of these moments.

Although mentioned in Holinshed, the incident is not mentioned at all in Famous Victories and it is difficult to know how Shakespeare intended it to be received by audiences. Gary Taylor has written about the unwillingness of many producers to show the order being carried out, and insists that the text requires it to be clearly shown on stage. He relates how during one performance Le Fer, fresh from his rather comic battlefield encounter with the awful Pistol, had his throat cut centre stage, and because he had his helmet off, his face could clearly be seen by the audience. The killing of a recognizable character in such a brutal manner adds great pathos to the incident especially if, as in the 1979 B. B. C. production, Le Fer is portrayed as an engaging and seemingly innocuous little Frenchman. Taylor also writes of Constable having his throat cut while laying prone in

his armour, helplessly trapped by the equipment he had earlier donned for protection.⁶ This ghastly image is a powerful anti-war statement and would seem to support the views of those critics who take issue with Tillyard, and view the play and its hero as celebrating "the brazen throat of war".⁷ We are moreover reminded of the Chorus' chilling opening gambit;

"Then should the warlike Harry, like himself, Assume the port of Mars,
and at his heels, Leashed in like hounds, should famine, sword and fire
Crouch for employment".

(Prologue, 5-8.)

Hazlitt was the first critic to openly attack Henry. In his *Characters of Shakespeare's plays*, he claims that Henry;

"...because he did not know how to govern his own kingdom, determined to make a war upon his neighbour's. Because his own title to the crown was doubtful, he laid claim to that of France. Because he did not know how to exercise the enormous power which had just suddenly dropped into his hands to any one good purpose, he immediately undertook (a cheap and obvious resource of sovereignty) to do all the mischief he could".⁸

Hazlitt here gets a little carried away and may be confusing the historical Henry with the character we find in the play. Nevertheless he is not alone in condemning the king. A. P. Rossiter has suggested that by the time Shakespeare reached Henry V, he had settled for shallow propaganda on behalf of a character whom he already knew enough to loathe.⁹ W. B. Yeats remarked that Henry is "as remorseless and undistinguished as some natural force". John Masefield went further claiming that Henry is neither hero nor thinker; "he is a common man, whose incapacity for feeling enables him to change his habits whenever interests bids him ...He impresses one as quite common, quite selfish, quite without feeling'. These remarks seem consistent with H. C. Goddards view of Henry as the "perfect Machiavellian prince".¹⁰ The killing of the prisoners could easily be interpreted as the act of a ruthless Machiavel. The French are down, but an alarum (4, 6, 35) indicates that they are about to regroup. Killing them is an expedient way of making sure they stay down.

The incident is however one of several in the play where Shakespeare seems to set Henry up as a remorseless and warmongering Machiavel, only to then complicate our response by then having him behave in a manner more in line with the Tillyard notion of the heroic Christian king. We notice that it is after all the French who wantonly kill the boys guarding the luggage “against the law of arms”. Shortly before this cruel act, Shakespeare has one of the boys woo the audiences sympathy with a lengthy address that denounces the “roaring devil” Pistol. In the 1979 B. B. C. production, this “arrant piece of knavery” seems to justify Henry’s order to kill the prisoners. It therefore appears like an act of righteous outrage; “I was not angry since I came to France/Until this instant”. (4, 7, 52-53.) However the text has Henry order the killing of the prisoners before the discovery of the French atrocity. The killings are not an act of retribution, but rather one of military necessity. Henry acts to save his small army who can not afford to sit around guarding prisoners of war. It is the decisive act of the battle.

Military necessity or not, there is something rather chilling in Henry’s actions. It is hardly gallant conduct and leaves one reflecting back to who was responsible for this awful war in the first place. We recall that the expedition to France was made in accordance with the wishes of Henry’s father, himself a supreme Machiavel, to;

“.....busy giddy minds
With foreign quarrels, that action, hence bourne out,
May waste the memory of the former days”.

(2 Henry IV, 4.5, 214-216.)

This kind of foreign invasion was one of the strategems recommended by Machiavelli for the maintainance of domestic order. In the Prince he commends Ferdinand of Aragon for his astuteness in avoiding subersion by this method;

“At the start of his reign he attacked Granada; and this campaign laid the foundation of his power. First, he embarked on it undistracted, and without fear of interference; he used it to engage the energies of the barons of Castile who, as they were giving their minds to the war, had no mind for causing trouble at home. In this way, without their realizing what was happening, he increased his standing and his control over them”.¹¹

Shakespeare's feelings about the realities of power politics had earlier been expressed by Phillip, the bastard son of Richard Coeur de Lion, in *King John*. Concerning the politic peace made by John and Phillip of France, the Bastard exclaims this betrayal of principle by both sides;

"Since the King breaks forth upon commodity,
Gain, be my Lord for I will worship thee".

(*King John* 2.1, 597-598.)

Temporal gains and losses would appear to be the sole object of Canterbury's worship as Henry V opens. The mood in the first scene is one of Machiavellian expediency as Canterbury and Ely discuss a bill that would give the king "all the temporal lands which men devout/By testament have given to the church". (1. 1. 9-10.) The language is tense, pragmatic and colloquial; "Twould drink the cup and all". According to Canterbury, Henry sways to the clergy's wish to go to war because of their "offer" to finance the campaign. However for the audience this remains problematic. A discussion has clearly taken place between the King and the Archbishop in the undramatised past. This somehow complicates our response as to who is really responsible for the war. Is it the Archbishop? The King? Or the gathered noblemen?

Canterbury's monumental and tiresome epistle on the Salic Law, which concludes rather humorously in proof that Henry's claim to the French throne is as "clear as the summer sun", does little to resolve the tension. In the B. B. C. production the Archbishop and noblemen seem to have a common vision of the "honey bee" kingdom that is described. David Gwillim's look of puzzled amusement during the long harangue suggests that he has either heard it all before, or has already decided upon "the big wars that make ambition virtue".¹² In the 1944 film, Olivier gives a similar impression. He also uses a number of visual jokes; the Archbishop forgetting names of people and places, fumbling and then dropping his papers, and everyone, including Henry ending up on the floor sorting them out. The question arises as to whether Shakespeare, by allowing the audience to see, and indeed laugh at, the dubious genesis of Henry's famous victory is setting him up for an exploration of the imperfect man that lies beneath Ceremony's "intertissued robe of gold and pearl". (4. 1, 248.)

Felix Raab has written of the dualistic attitude the Elizabethans held towards Machiavelli; "He horrified them, instructed them, entertained them—in fact he affected

them over the whole attraction/repulsion spectrum".¹³ The effect of this dualism was that political leaders were victims of a kind of "political double think", whereby they sincerely believed themselves to be true and devout Christians, while at the same time felt increasingly justified in ignoring Christian precepts in their political dealings. In a world that was shaped by and charged with the will of God, human strength was becoming a very problematic virtue.¹⁴

Readers of the second tetralogy have by the time they reach Henry V have been introduced to a consummate master of Machiavellian intrigue in the form of John of Lancaster in Henry IV Part 2. John's betrayal of his promise of clemency to the rebels ensures that they will not be around to lead treasonable troops in the future. The act is made even more disturbing by his pious adoption of the ceremonial view of kingship as he calls his father "God's substitute". (2 Henry 4.2,28.) We of course remember how he got into this position by a Machiavellian show of power against the annointed king. What is disturbing is that a moral view of kinship has been exploited as a gloss over an action so clearly motivated by political expediency. The form and substance are not congruent. What John says conflicts with what he does and the result is an unresolved tension at the end of the play.

John's invocations of God and Providence are an attempt to make respectable policies that he, a practical and ruthless man of affairs, had decided to follow. This is also consistent with Machiavelli's observation that there is nothing more important than for the Prince "to seem to have the appearance of piety". In Henry V the king frequently calls on God. Both the victory and the carnage at Agincourt are attributed to God:

"O God, thy arm was here!
And not to us, but to Thy arm alone,
Ascribe we all! When without stratagem,
But in plain shock and even play or battle,
Was ever known so great and little loss
On one part and on th'other? Take it, God,
For it is none but Thine!"

(4.8,105-111.)

Yet this comes shortly after the audience has learned of the ten thousand French who have been slaughtered, and the names of their noblemen who lie dead in the field. One

wonders therefore about the nature of a God who supports Henry's cause so devastatingly.

This sense of doubt about the validity of the king's religious belief deepens when we are told of the effects of the war on France and the French people by the Duke of Burgundy. It is interesting to note how Shakespeare introduces this new character very late in the play. As a result his words attract renewed attention:

"And as our vineyards, fallows, meads and hedges,
Defective in their natures, grow to wildness,
Even so our houses and ourselves and children
Have lost, or do not learn for want of time,
The sciences that should become our country,
But grow like savages—as soldiers will
That nothing do but meditate on blood—
To swearing and stern looks, diffused attire,
And everything seems unnatural".

(5. 2, 54-62.)

In the light of this revelation it is difficult to sympathize with Henry in attributing the victory to God, for Shakespeare makes us realize in intimate human terms the price at which it has been gained.

Further evidence supporting the Machiavellian argument can be found in the first act of the play, where the Archbishop gives us a lyrical account of Henry's reformation from "courses vain"; a reformation which in the Henry IV plays at times seemed too slick to be sincere:

"Hear him debate of commonwealth affairs,
You would say it hath been all in all his study.
List his discourse of war, and you shall hear
A fearful battle rendered you in music.
Turn him to any cause of policy.
The Gordian knot of it he will unloose,
Familiar as his garter; that, when he speaks
The air, a chartered libertine, is still,
And the mute wonder lurketh in men's ears

To steal his sweet and honeyed sentences”.

(1. 1, 41-50.)

Henry’s rejection of his former Eastcheap companions also smacks of Machiavellian expediency. In the Prince, Machiavelli wrote that “the first impression one gets of a ruler and his brains is from seeing the men that he has about him”.¹⁵ There is now no room for Falstaff and his power of humorous re–definition of the action. In an act as cold and pre-meditated as the order to kill the French prisoners, Henry rejects his old friend, an act which “killed his heart”. (2. 1, 84.) In Act IV, Fluellen equates Henry’s rejection of his old friend with a classical precedent; “As Alexander kill’d his friend Cleitus being his ales and his cups, so Monmouth (Henry), being in his right wits and his good judgements, turn’d away the fat knight with the great belly doublet”. (4. 7, 44-48.) Alexander killed his best friend while in a drunken rage. Henry is very sober when he turns away from Falstaff. A possible imputation of Fluellen’s remarks is that Falstaff is now so much a part of the past that he cannot even remember his name.

The harsh treatment of his former friends continues when they are in France. When Henry hears the report that “one Bardolph, if your majesty know the man” is likely to be hanged for plunder, the text permits not the slightest semblance of recognition of their former friendship; “We would have all such offenders so cut off”. (3. 4, 107-108.) Gary Taylor relates how Richard Burton did react when hearing Bardolph’s name in his portrayal of Henry.¹⁶ Kenneth Branagh, in his film version of the play, went even further and showed a flashback to their tavern days together before gesturing his approval of the execution.

All this however should not really come as much of a surprise because in the very first act of Henry IV Part 1, Henry, then Prince Hal, tells us exactly what he is going to do. When left alone at the end of the second scene, he delivers this telling soliloquy:

“I know you all, and will a while uphold
 The unyok’d humour of your idleness.
 Yet herein will I imitate the sun,
 Who doth permit the base contagious clouds
 To smother up his beauty from the world,
 That when he please again to be himself
 Being wanted, he may be more wond’red at

By breaking through the foul and ugly mists
Of vapours that did seem to stangle him".

(1 Henry IV, 1. 2, 194-201.)

We notice how like Richard II, Henry compares himself to the sun. The "base contagious clouds" and the "foul and ugly mists" are presumably Falstaff and his friends at the tavern. Eventually Henry, the allegorical "sun", will break through these clouds and mists;

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

(1 Henry IV, 1. 2, 211-215.)

However in Henry V, Shakespeare's treatment of the king is sufficiently ambivalent to complicate our response, and suggest a different interpretation of his behavior towards his former friends. It could for example be argued that Bardolph, Nym and Pistol are realistic reminders from Shakespeare of the rag-tag element that accompanies any army. The execution of Bardolph may well be a case of "necessary harshness".¹⁷ The king's determination not to stand for any unnecessary desecration from his men certainly seems justified in the light of Pistol's earlier remark; "Let us to France, like horseleeches, my boys/To suck, suck the very blood to suck". (2. 3, 58.)

Indeed if we re-consider Canterbury's earlier remarks about Henry, regardless of his concern for the wealth of the Church, and his anxiety to secure Henry's support for his own political ends, we notice that there is no trace of irony in his image of Henry as "full of grace and fair regard". Moreover in the discussion between Canterbury and Ely, there is no hint by either that Henry is implicitly threatening them in order to gain support for the war. On the contrary, he is described as a "true lover of the Holy Church". It is interesting to bear this in mind when considering Henry's famous speech at Harfleur:

"If not, why in a moment look to see

The blind and bloody soldier with foul hand
 Defilethelocksofyourshrill—shrieking daughters;
 Your fathers taken by the silver beards,
 And their most reverend heads dashed to the walls;
 Your naked infants spitted upon pikes,
 Whiles the mad mothers with their howls confused
 Do break the clouds, as did the wives of Jewry
 At Herod’s blood—hunting slaughtermen”.

(3. 3, 34-41.)

This is the characteristic Shakespearian imagery of disorder at its most horrific. The raw ferocity of the outburst is quite stunning and is vaguely reminiscent of the Prologue, where the Chorus compared Henry to Mars. The threat to out do Herod initially seems inconsistent with the notion of Henry as a heroic Christian prince. So too does the shifting of responsibility for these fearful consequences on to the citizens of Harfleur. Earlier in the famous “Once more unto the breach” speech, the imagery of tigers, blood, cannon and death is really sinister. C. Hobday relates how heroic figures in Shakespeare’s plays like Richard I, the Black Prince and Julius Caesar are invariably compared to lions. The lion was regarded as a noble beast, and yet in Henry’s speech, he urges his men to “imitate the action of the tiger” (2. 1, 6), a creature notorious for its cruelty.¹⁸ In Titus Andronicus, Aaron and Tamora are compared with tigers, as are other cruel figures in Shakespeare’s plays like Richard III, Regan and Goneril.

Nevertheless in the speech before the gates of Harfleur, Henry is neither confusing the Christian God with Mars, nor following the teachings of Machiavelli. Shakespeare has him merely speaking in the vein of the historical Henry V who, according to Kelly, “invoked against the city the ultimatum that God dictated to the Israelites for their use against enemy cities”.¹⁹ The medieval and Renaissance Christian God had many varying features. One was that of the “God of Battles” prayed to by Henry (4. 1, 282.), who supported his chosen people against their enemies and his. Henry’s remarks that “War is His beadle, was is His vengeance” (4. 1, 164.); that war is the scourge by which God punishes offending people was a contemporary belief. So too was the convention whereby a city that created unnecessary bloodshed by useless resistance was subject to total devastation. Moreover it was customary for the commander of the conquering force to disclaim responsibility for the consequences. Significantly we notice that after the surrender, Henry

commands his men to "use mercy to them all". (3. 3, 54.) His threats, although horrific and terrifying, never materialize because they are so terrifying. A. R. Humphreys cites this as evidence of Henry's skill as a leader, claiming that threats are his ultimate weapon and save his army just when "winter is coming on, and sickness growing".²⁰

The ambivalence in Shakespeare's treatment of Henry is again evident in the "little touch of Harry in the night" scene. This slow moving, rather low key scene does not appear in any of Shakespeare's sources, and prepares us for the debate between Williams and Henry in the English camp. The Chorus helps with its splendid hushed description of the night; the whispering voices of the soldiers, distant sounds of bells and cocks crowing as dawn nears. An audience, tense with expectation at the prospect of a mighty battle is held back as Shakespeare re-directs our attention to the debate.

Henry begins in a mood of quiet satisfaction:

"Methinks I could not die anywhere so
contented as in the Kings company, his cause
being just and his quarrel honourable".

(4. 1, 125-127.)

Williams replies; "That's more than we know", and proceeds to solemnly point out that if the cause be not good, "the king himself hath a heavy reckoning to make". Henry never really answers his objection. He could have simply asserted like Richmond at the Battle of Bosworth, that "God and our good cause fight upon our side". (Richard III, 5. 3, 241.) Instead his reply is awkward and unconvincing:

"So, if a son that is by his father sent about
merchandise do sinfully miscarry upon the sea,
the imputation of his wickedness, by your rule,
should be imposed upon his father that sent him;
or if a servant, under his master's command,
transporting a sum of money, be assailed by robbers,
and die in many irreconciled iniquities, you may
call the business of the master the author of the
servant's damnation".

(4. 1, 143-150.)

The problem is however that the "business of the master" is precisely what Williams questions. Nevertheless the soldiers seem satisfied with Henry's answer that; "Every subjects duty is the kings; but every subjects soul is his own". Dramatically the scene is powerful. Shakespeare allows the audience to interpret the action through the eyes of characters with different points of view; Henry and his ideal of a great military success, and the common soldiers facing a much bleaker prospect of chopped legs, arms and heads. The long soliloquy Henry delivers after the soldiers exit is quite revealing:

"O ceremony, show me but thy worth!

What is thy soul of adoration?

Art thou aught else but place, degree, and from,

Creating awe and fear in other men?"

(4. 1, 237-240.)

And a few lines later:

"'Tis not the balm, the sceptre, and the ball,

The sword, the mace, the crown imperial,

The intertissued robe of gold and pearl,

The farced title running force the king,

The throne he sits on, nor the tide of pomp

That beats upon the high shore of this world—

No, not all these, thrice—gorgeous ceremony,

Not all these, laid in bed majestical.

Can sleep so soundly as the wretched slave,

Who, with a body filled, and vacant mind,

Get him to rest, crammed with distressful bread;"

(4. 1, 253-263.)

It is interesting how in this, Henry's only real soliloquy, the symbols of kingship he evokes are the same as those catalogued by Richard II during his deposition. However unlike Richard, Henry realizes that without these symbols and the concepts they represent, he would just be a man like other men. He also knows that ceremony sets him apart and without it he cannot rule. Were Henry intended to be solely a Machiavel, surely this

soliloquy should reveal a mind conscious of the trade off of moral excellence for effective political leadership. Instead the reverse is disclosed. Henry's policy is always the servant of his unconditional moral stance. The ceremony he speaks of in the soliloquy seems meaningful; after all his commitment to the cause succeeds in uniting a disparate gang of individuals like Fluellen, MacMorris, Jamy and Gower into an army. And Bates and Williams who question the justice of his cause do follow him into battle.

The action of the play concludes harmoniously. Henry marries Katherine. The tension created by the debate with Williams is eased by the glove incident. Fluellen, portrayed throughout the B. B. C. production as an essentially moral and upright Welshman, satisfies an audiences craving for justice by thrashing the immoral Pistol with a leek. Admittedly the Chorus does strike a discordant note by mentioning the subsequent strife and disharmony of Henry VI's reign. But that however is in the future. The ambivalence that is woven into Shakespeare's presentation of Henry V may in the end be just a case of "*res dura, et regni novitas me talia cogunt/Moliri, et late fines custode tueri*".²¹

FOOTNOTES.

1. I do not include either the later pseudo-history plays King Lear and Cymbeline, or Henry VIII which was co-written with John Fletcher.
2. Humphries, p681.
3. Henry IV Part 1, 14-15.
4. Humphries, p669.
5. Taylor, Oxford Henry V, p32.
6. Taylor, To Analyze Delight, p117.
7. John Milton, Paradise Lost, XI, 713.
8. Hazlitt, p285.
9. Rossiter, passim.
10. Goddard, passim.
11. Machiavelli, p120.
12. Othello (3. 3, 384.)
13. Raab, passim.
14. Manheim, passim.
15. Machiavelli, p124.
16. Taylor, Oxford Henry V, p51.
17. Humphries, p211.
18. Hobday, p108; Shakespeare Studies, 1968.
19. Kelly, p31.
20. Humphries, p693.
21. Virgil; Aeneid i, 563.

"Harsh necessity, and the newness of my kingdom, force me to do such things and to guard my frontiers everywhere".

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

1. G. BULLOUGH, Narrative and Dramatic Sources of William Shakespeare.
Volume IV, Routledge, 1975.
2. H. C. GODDARD, The Meaning of Shakespeare, 1951.
3. W. HAZLITT, Collected Works, Vol 4. P. P. Howe(ed). 1967.
4. C. H. HOBDAY, "Imagery and Irony in Henry V", Shakespeare Studies, 1968.
5. R. HOLINSHED, Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland. AMS 1976.
6. A. R. HUMPHRIES (Ed.), The Penguin Henry V.
7. H. AKELLY, Divine Providence in the England of Shakespeare's Histories,
Harvard, 1970.
8. MACHIAVELLI, The Prince, Penguin Classics.
9. M. MANHEIM, The weak king dilemma in the Shakespeare History Plays,
Syracuse, 1973.
10. F. RAAB, The English Face of Machiavelli, London 1965.
11. A. P. ROSSITER, "Ambivalence: The Dialectic of the Histories" in Angel with
Horns, 1951.
12. G. TAYLOR, To Analyze Delight, Newark, 1985.
13. G. TAYLOR (Ed), Henry V, The Oxford Shakespeare, Clarendon Press, 1982.
14. E. M. W. TILLYARD, The Elizabethan World Picture, London, 1943.
15. E. M. W. TILLYARD, Shakespeare's History Plays, London, 1944.