POLITICAL THEORIES IN SHAKESPEARE'S

SECOND TETRALOGY

APPROVED:

Eugene P. Wright
Major Professor

Toby C. Nichols, Jr.
Minor Professor

Howard L. Ford
Consulting Professor

William T. Belcher
Chairman of Graduate Studies in English

Robert B. Toulouse
Dean of the Graduate School

Bashner, Debbie A., Political Theories In Shakespeare's Second Tetralogy. Master of Arts (English), August 1973, 117 pp., bibliography, 30 titles.

Thesis: Shakespeare's second tetralogy, while in the process of exposing the divine-right and the Machiavellian theories, also shows how the divine-right order breaks down and paves the way for practical Machiavellianism.

The two basic political concepts during the English Renaissance were the divine right of kings and practical Machiavellianism. The divine-right concept refers to the belief that kings ruled by God's direct appointment, and Machiavellianism refers to the qualities and duties of the prince who rules as a result of political power, as outlined by Machiavelli's The Prince ("Prince" is Machiavelli's word for any ruler). Machiavelli says that the prince of a country is chief commander of the armed forces, chief priest, chief of government, chief executive, chief of ceremonies, and chief politician. The first chapter of this study attempts to give a clear discussion of both the divine-right and the Machiavellian theories.

Both theories are reflected in Shakespeare's second tetralogy, which consists of Richard II, I Henry IV, II Henry IV, and Henry V. Richard II is the reflector of the divine-right theory in five ways: King Richard's speeches regarding his divine right, the other characters' belief in his divine right, the use of the sun-king image, the doctrine of rebellion, and the general political order. Chapter Two discusses Richard II as the representative of the divine-right theory.

All four plays in the tetralogy reflect practical Machiavellianism. Both Henry IV and Henry V are the spokesmen for Machiavellian politics. Henry IV, or Bolingbroke, portrays the methods and the behavior of the Machiavellian prince. Chapter Three discusses Bolingbroke as the Machiavellian character. Henry V, or Hal, portrays the Machiavellian prince in almost every way--qualities, methods, behavior, duties, and relationships. He is considered the ideal Machiavellian prince. Chapter Four discusses Hal as the ideal or the consummate Machiavellian prince. Chapter Five summarizes and concludes the study.

Within the body of the thesis, there is also a discussion of the divine-right political order as it moves toward practical Machiavellianism. For instance, in Richard II, the divine-right world is first shown to be intact; then, it is shown to crack little by little until it is smashed by the usurpation of Henry Bolingbroke. In I and II Henry IV, things continue from bad to worse. Though Henry IV is efficient, he has no hereditary right to the throne; hence, there is frequent, almost constant, rebellion. Once the rebellion is crushed, Henry gets sick and dies. Things appear to take another downward leap. However, by the time Henry V opens, there has been a complete break with the unquiet past. The reign of Henry V marks a restoration of order because he has both the hereditary right and the political efficiency.

It can be said that Richard II failed because he emphasized his divine right to rule, not his divine responsibility to rule wisely and effectively. The reign of Henry IV was plagued by constant rebellion because he had no hereditary right, and because he chose largely to ignore the divine-right principles in practice. Henry V was successful because

he had both hereditary right and political knowledge. He was also able to maintain a balance between divine right and practical Machiavellianism. Richard II was too dependent upon his divine right; Henry IV was too dependent upon Machiavellianism; but Henry V ruled by both divine right and Machiavellian policy.

POLITICAL THEORIES IN SHAKESPEARE'S SECOND TETRALOGY

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the North Texas State University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

Debbie A. Dashner, B. A.

Denton, Texas

August, 1973

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

ELIZABETHAN POLITICAL THEORIES

In critical circles, theories concerning the meaning of Shakespeare's two tetralogies are fairly well divided. The most traditional view, as stated by W. B. Yeats, is that Shakespeare had no interest in the state save in its color, ceremony, and pageantry.[1] He passively accepted the Tudor ideas of monarchy. Sir Sidney Lee says that he was primarily interested in writing good historical drama.[2] However, there are others who have tried to claim Shakespeare for both of the major concepts portrayed in his history plays--either for divine right or for Machiavellianism. Within this group, he has been shown by Barbara Lewis as an ardent royalist on one extreme,[3] and on the other extreme, he has been shown by Irving Ribner as somewhat of a challenger to the orthodox Tudor monarchial concepts.[4] In addition, Lily B. Campbell has said that Shakespeare deliberately chose topics from past history that would parallel the current Elizabethan political scene.[5] When the two tetralogies have been studied as a unit, they have been seen primarily as a support of the traditional divine-right theory.[6] They have also been interpreted in the manner of Sir John Davies to mean that it is better to endure a weak king, like Richard, rather than to be led into civil war because of the usurpation of Bolingbroke and the Lancastrians.[7] On the other hand, viewing the two tetralogies as a unit has led some critics, like E. M. W. Tillyard, to see the

eight plays in the pattern of the Tudor myth, [8] which was an Elizabethan historical interpretation slanting all previous English history to the glory of the Tudor monarchs.

Because the second tetralogy is generally considered the superior, artistically speaking, far more critical work has been done on it. If the second tetralogy is viewed as a separate unit from the first tetralogy, then the idea that Shakespeare is challenging the traditional order of things becomes possible. This idea is said to be true because of the superior knowledge and effectiveness of Bolingbroke, despite Richard's hereditary right. Harold Goddard has even said that Shakespeare completely ridicules the divine-right concept. [9] Lewis modifies the assertion by saying that Shakespeare ridicules Richard's concept of the divine-right theory, not the divine-right theory itself. [10] Shakespeare is said to be for the divine-right theory itself because the ideal prince, Hal, has both hereditary right and political knowledge. [11] The second tetralogy also has been interpreted to be about the education and glorification of Prince Hal, or King Henry V, who was considered the ideal king of past English history. [12] Study has been done on the weakness of Richard as a man and as a king. [13] Much has been said about the Machiavellianism of Bolingbroke and Hal; however, these studies have not properly understood that ideal Machiavellianism is little more than practical politics.

This present study shows the existence of the two main Elizabethan political concepts in the second tetralogy primarily by discussing the three major political characters contained within these plays: Richard, Bolingbroke, and Hal. First, there is a discussion of the various aspects of the divine-right and the Machiavellian theories. Then, each of

these characters is shown to fit into one of these patterns. For instance, Richard is clearly the spokesman for the divine-right concept of rule; Bolingbroke and Hal are shown to be Machiavellian princes. Bolingbroke exhibits the best example of the "seeming" character of the Machiavellian prince while Hal shows the best example, in practice, of the many varied duties and relationships of the Machiavellian prince. It is critically impossible to say that Shakespeare was for or against either of these concepts, since nowhere did he leave an expository statement of his opinions. This study simply tries to study the theories as theories reflected in the second tetralogy.

The divine-right concept results from the general Elizabethan interpretation of cosmic order. According to Elizabethans, earthly order harmonizes with heavenly order. Hence, disorder in the heavens means that there will be disorder on earth. Order is ordained by God.[14] Tillyard says that "the universe is a unity in which everything has its place; it is the perfect work of God. Any imperfection is caused by man. With the fall of man, the universe became corrupted. Yet, in spite of this corruption, it still has the marks of God's perfection."[15] This cosmic order is demonstrated in three ways: "a chain, a series of corresponding planes, and a dance to music."[16] This chain consists of beings from high to low, animate to inanimate. Man, animal, vegetable, and mineral are the general classifications, and within each classification there are various ranks. The second demonstration of cosmic order is shown by four corresponding planes or relationships: God and the angels, the physical universe, the state, and man. The physical universe is called the macrocosm, the state is called the body politic, and man (or society) is

the microcosm. God created the physical universe and man, the microcosm, who fits into the macrocosm of the universe. The state relates to both the macrocosm and the microcosm. This relationship is better understood in the Elizabethan order of leadership. God is Chief over the angels and over all the works of creation; the sun is chief over the stars; fire is chief over the elements; the king is chief over the state; the head is chief over the body; justice is chief over the virtues; the lion is chief over the beasts; the eagle is chief over the birds; and the dolphin is chief over the fishes.[17]

The cosmic dance is the most difficult expression of the Elizabethan interpretation of cosmic order because it is more intangible in its relationship to reality. It has been said that God created the universe in perfect order with everything in its place. It can be said that the concepts of the chain and the planes primarily deal with order on earth while the cosmic dance deals with heavenly order (in its relationship to earthly order). This dance expresses the necessary harmony between earthly order and heavenly order.[18] It was the medieval interpretation of the old Greek idea that God created the universe by the use of music. Music binds all things together. The universe is said to be continually dancing to the music or the harmony of the earth and the heavens, or, to use another term, the "singing of the spheres."[19] As the planets and the stars dance to the "singing of the spheres," so do the things of the earth imitate the dance of the heavenly bodies.[20] The cosmic dance has a direct relationship to the idea of "degree," another term for the many classifications already noted.[21] The cosmic dance to music describes the harmony which must exist between heaven and earth.

The Elizabethan state then is a part of the larger cosmic order. The state is a monarchy ordained by God. It is governed by the rightful king, who is considered "the organic nucleus of the cell-State." There is to be due and proper succession. Without this due and proper succession, all order will be upset. [22] The ideal state is bound together by unquestioned obedience. [23] The key terms of ideal Tudor politics can be said to be "Order, Degree, Non-resistance, Right-divine, and God's deputyship." [24] Naturally, the divine-right concept is a part of this ideal state. According to Fritz Kern, the divine-right concept is an accumulative theory with the rudiments dating back, in some cases, prior to the early Middle Ages. The idea continued to develop until it reached its peak in the seventeenth century. In full development, the divine-right theory has three major points: "the monarchial principle, the belief in an individual monarch's particular right to govern, and the irresponsibility of the king (to anyone but God);" To elaborate a little on these points, "the monarchial principle" refers to the belief that monarchy is the only true form of government. This individual's peculiar right to govern refers to "a right inalienable and independent of human agency." This right stems from heredity "(legitimism)" and from "divine consecration (sacral character of the king)." The "irresponsibility of the king" simply means that he is unlimited "(absolutism)." [25] In theory, the king was supposedly limited by law. [26] That is, he had to obey the laws made by Parliament. In practice, there was no guarantee that he would do this. If the monarch failed to respect and enforce the law, and if he failed to protect his subjects properly, the divine-right tradition not only permitted, but encouraged the people to revolt against and replace the reigning king. [27]

R. J. Dorius states that divine right has mutual responsibilities for the king and his subjects. [28] The king is to possess certain qualities ("kingliness") [29] necessary for governing himself and his kingdom. He is to be strong-willed, stern, but at the same time, he is to be available when needed, and willing and ready to listen to advice. [30] He is to exercise "prudence" and "economy" in affairs of state. [31] Since the state is ordained by God, it is a part of natural law. [32] In a natural process, sometimes things grow too much. The wise gardener trims the weeds and other forms of excessive growth. In the state, sometimes the weeds, or the nobles, grow too great. The wise ruler, like the wise gardener, must trim his weeds to protect the state, especially himself, from their excesses. He must stop trouble before it gets started. He must be alert at all times. [33] Since God entrusts rulers with the gifts of life and power, to use them wrongly is a sin against God and the state. Also, careless use of these gifts paves the way for ambitious upstarts, who may use both for their own purposes. [34] A wise ruler is never supposed to interfere with the family inheritance, by confiscating lands, for example. This interferes with the succession of kings; it even presents a pretext to depose a rightful king. [35] If the king does not fulfill his duties, especially the duty of checking the excesses of his subordinates and his nobles, God will stir up rebellion. [36] These are the basic duties of the king toward his subjects. The duty of the subjects to their king is simple--unquestioned obedience, unless commanded to violate God's commandments. Otherwise, to resist or disobey in any form is to disobey God. [37]

Because order is ordained by God, it is a sin to disrupt order in any way. Rebellion is one of the most sinful means by which this

disruption takes place. [38] The Book of Homilies of the English Church says that the monarch and his council are the earthly counterparts of the heavenly order. The monarch rules directly by God's appointment. Tillyard quotes the following passage from the homilies:

> As it is written of God in the Book of Proverbs "Through Me kings do reign; Through Me counsellors make just laws; through Me do princes bear rule and all judges of the earth execute judgment." [39]

Tillyard goes on to say, "Vengeance belongs to God, but the kings will act as God's vice-gerents." [40] Acting as God's avenger is the primary role and state of the king. All disobedient persons are automatically condemned to eternal punishment. Subjects are to obey evil rulers as well as good ones. [41] Jesus' statement to Pilate is used as one of these texts: "You could have no power if it did not come from above." [42] Also, David refused to hurt King Saul, the Lord's Anointed, despite Saul's continual attempts on David's life. The people are to be patient with an evil ruler. How can the subjects know if he is bad? There are always the wicked who will take advantage of a vulnerable prince, such as one who is too kind, too young, or female. Secondly, there will always be different opinions. If rebellion is allowed against the evil ruler, how can it eventually be prevented against the good one because of this difference of opinion? Furthermore, God sends evil rulers (as well as good ones) to punish a people's sins. To rebel would be another wrong. Instead, the subject should pray both that the evil ruler improve and that he should live a better life himself so that the curse can be removed. Rebellion is regarded as terrible, in addition to its being sinful, because it represents the sin of pride which destroys all order, just as Satan's pride

had brought about the condition of chaos before creation. Rebellion is worse than war. The Elizabethans were afraid that rebellion meant not only common disorder, but chaos, similar to the state before creation.[43] The Mirror for Magistrates states that any relaxation of God's pressure will mean pre-creation chaos once more.[44] Because rebellion is such a terrible sin, the rebel cannot be bound to any other loyalty or decency. He has no respect. The rebel is like an unnatural sickness, corrupted blood, in the natural state.[45] There were four causes for rebellion: ambition, ignorance, the attempt to reinstate a rightful king, or to depose a tyrant; and of these four, only the latter two were recognized by God as just. The tyrant is one who is considered to be beyond the reach of prayers, such as one who had gained the crown by force.[46]

With the supremacy of divine cosmic order, from which springs divine political order, comes the role of history in the English Renaissance. His- is God's fulfillment of His will in the affairs of men.[47] One of these major patterns of history is the Tudor myth, beginning with Henry VII and culminating in Elizabeth. This myth slanted all previous English history toward the blossoming of the Tudors. There are two basic aspects of the myth. First, the union of the families of York and Lancaster through the marriage of Henry Tudor, sole remnant of the house of Lancaster, and Elizabeth of York was a providential ending to "an organic piece of history." Henry was a descendant of Owen Tudor, who was the husband of Henry V's widow. Owen Tudor, in turn, was a direct descendant of Cadwallader, last of the British kings. This fact leads to the second aspect of the Tudor myth: Henry kept alive the old Welsh belief that King Arthur would return and that he and his heirs were Arthur incarnate. Henry

tried to extend this myth by naming his eldest son Arthur. In the ancient legends, the return of Arthur was to bring back the golden age. The age of Elizabeth was called the "golden age" to imply that the prophetic age had come true. The age of Elizabeth is golden, corresponding to the dawning of the great year when all heavenly bodies have returned to their rightful positions in the firmament.[48]

The Tudor myth is, according to Tillyard, the prevailing Elizabethan view of English history.[49] More specifically, there are five major Tudor historians whose compilations of views constitute the orthodox interpretations of the period from Richard II to Henry V, the period of the second tetralogy. The first of these is Polydore Vergil.[50] He says that Richard was wrong in eliminating the Duke of Gloucester and in confiscating the Lancastrian estates. He believes that Henry Bolingbroke acted well under the circumstances and does not believe that he was deliberately responsible for Richard's death. However, Vergil also says that Richard was not naturally mean. Though he praises Bolingbroke's character, he never allows one to forget that he was a usurper and that he was a criminal in letting Richard die. Vergil is a moralistic historian. His pattern shows the justice of God punishing and working out the effects of a crime until prosperity is established in the Tudor monarchy. His history studies the period from Richard II to Henry VII. One interesting point he makes is that Edward IV, of the house of York, came to the throne after God had punished the Lancastrians by the Wars of the Roses for Bolingbroke's usurpation. Vergil briefly outlines the Tudor myth.[51]

The second of these significant historians of the Tudor period is Edward Hall. Hall is the first English chronicler to show in full the

new method of moralizing in history which came with the decline of the Middle Ages, the weakening of the Church, and the rise of nationalism. He also introduces a dramatic style of writing history, and he develops and settles the Tudor myth. He carries the myth through the triumphal reign of Henry VIII. The marriage of Henry VII to Elizabeth, daughter of Edward IV, unifies his history of the period from Henry IV to Henry VIII. He shows the reign of Henry IV as the beginning of discord and division and the reign of Henry VIII as the example of heavenly matrimony because of the birth of Elizabeth. His chapters have interesting titles.

(1) the unquiet time of Henry IV

(2) the victorious acts of Henry V

(3) troublous season of Henry VI

(4) prosperous reign of Edward IV

(5) pitiful life of Edward V

(6) tragical doings of Richard III

(7) politic governance of Henry VII

(8) triumphal reign of Henry VIII

The theme of his history is disorder (civil war) and the union and "degree" hinging upon it.[52] The most terrible civil war had been healed forever by the marriage of Henry VII and Elizabeth. From this marriage comes the triumphal Henry VIII.

Hall borrows much from Vergil. Like Vergil, Hall begins his history with the quarrel between Bolingbroke and Mowbray and Richard II's inability to cope with it. There is only a brief mention of Woodstock's murder. According to Hall, Bolingbroke's crimes were usurping the throne and allowing Richard to be killed against his oath. Accordingly, God

punished Henry by making his reign unquiet and postponed full vengeance until a later generation, because Henry repented. Hence, Hall echoes the orthodox Elizabethan belief that Bolingbroke was a usurper who apparently signified all that a usurper and, of course, a rebel, was supposed to signify, as has been already said. The house of York was jealous when Richard II was deposed. Hall continues to explain how Henry V postponed the day of reckoning by his political wisdom and personal piety. He learned from past history to choose good advisors and to banish his evil companions. He tried to atone for his father's sin by reburying Richard in Westminster. Yet, wise as he was, he was still not able to divert danger from the house of York. With Henry VI, the curse was realized in dreaded form--a child for a king. The house of Lancaster collapsed with Henry VI, and the Wars of the Roses began. [53] The third of these major historians, Raphael Holinshed, borrows much from Hall, but with little understanding. He blurs the Tudor myth. [54]

The fourth of these major historians is Sir Walter Raleigh. [55] Raleigh sees a rhythm of history in that the crime of a king is visited on his grandson. The cycle begins with Edward III. "Edward III killed his uncle, the Duke of Kent." [56] Edward's grandson, Richard II, has to suffer for this deed. Henry IV broke his faith; his grandson Henry VI suffered for that. Henry VII, though a wise and politic prince and the instrument of God's justice upon Richard III, sinned in having Stanley and Warwick executed. His grandson Edward VI continued the suffering by dying at an early age. Campbell adds one additional point to Tillyard's account regarding Raleigh's history. She states that Raleigh believed the house of Tudor had ended after Elizabeth, the granddaughter of Henry VII, as an additional punishment for Henry's deed. [57]

The fifth major historian is Sir John Davies of Hereford.[58] Davies has elements of both Hall and Raleigh in addition to some ideas of his own. He agrees that Richard II suffered for the crime of Edward III, as Raleigh had said. Davies adds that Richard might have prospered if he had dealt justly with Bolingbroke when Mowbray accused him of treason. Bolingbroke is a usurper, but he is efficient. After Henry V, Richard's murder makes itself felt in saintly, but non-political Henry VI. Davies' central theme concerns civil war. He also mentions the main theme of Hall, the horrible disorder of the Wars of the Roses and the blessed order of Tudor peace. Davies moralizes to say that it is better to obey a bad king than run into civil war. Yet, he adds that kings must be strong and active like the sun. His examples of "sun-kings" are Edward III, Henry IV, Henry V, and Edward IV.[59]

The divine-right concept furnished the theory and ceremony of Tudor politics. Although no Elizabethan would admit it, in practice, the Tudors used Machiavellian concepts in the everyday business of state. As far as the average Elizabethan was concerned, Machiavelli was synonymous with the Devil himself.[60] This quotation from A Treatise of Treasons against Queen Elizabeth will illustrate how the average Elizabethan felt about anything Machiavelli had to say:

> And that is it, that I cal a Machiavellian State and Regiment; Where Religion is put behind in the second and last place: Where the civil Policie, I meane, is preferred before it, and not limited by any rules of Religion, but the Religion framed to serve the time and policy: . . . where it is free to slaunder, to belie, to forswear, . . . to invade, to depose, to imprison, to murther,

> and to commit every other outrage, never so barbarous (that promiseth to advaunce the present Policie in hand) without scruple, feare, or conscience of hel or heaven, of God, or Devil: and where no restraint, nor allurement is left in the heart of a man, to bridle him from evil, nor invite him to good: but for vaine fame only and feare of lay lawes, that reache no further than to this body and life: that cal I properly a Machiavellian State and Governance. [61]

To the Elizabethan, the Machiavellian "prince" was the cruel, villainous tyrant with his ambitious schemes and unprincipled maxims of government. Richard III was the Elizabethan Machiavellian; no one in the second tetralogy can truly be considered such a villain. The Elizabethan Machiavellian was characterized, in popular lore, by treacherous ways of killing (usually poisoning) and by atheism. [62]

The Elizabethan interpretation of Machiavelli comes from a second-hand acquaintance with The Prince through a book by Innocent Gentillet, generally known as Contre-Machiavel. In actuality, Machiavelli's The Prince is primarily a practical manual of the do's and don't's of statecraft. In contrast to the divine-right concept, he does not concern himself with abstract principles; he concerns himself with facts based on past history. Specifically, he is primarily concerned with the qualities and duties of all kinds of rulers. Machiavelli begins his discussion of the nature and course of the prince by describing the types of princes. First, there is the one who has become prince of his country by favor of its fellow-citizens. [63] This individual is blessed by a "happy shrewdness." [64] He has become prince either by the favor of the people or of the nobles. The

favor of the people is preferred because the aims of the people are more honest than those of the nobles. The people are easier to please if they are not oppressed. If the prince does not oppress the people, he will more than likely preserve the popular good will. If an individual has been made prince by the nobles, he should first of all strive to win the will of the people. The non-hereditary prince has to take extra care in matters such as these, but generally, Machiavelli's advice can apply to any ruler, hereditary or not. [65]

The overall goal of the prince is to maintain the state at any price. To accomplish this goal he has many specific duties. Machiavelli names four major loyalties that the prince has. The first and most important loyalty is to the people. He must keep their good will at all times. This is usually done by avoiding harsh measures, such as demanding extraordinary taxes or confiscating lands or property. The prince should not forbid his subjects to bear arms. The prince should live with the people he rules; he cannot afford to abdicate. With regard to his overall goal, that of maintaining the state, he must remain in control. [66] If the prince conquers another territory, he will leave the people alone, save for requiring them to pay tribute and keeping puppet governors or kings over them. That is to say, he will do these things if he wants to stay in control over these conquered people. [67]

The prince cannot afford to incur the hatred and contempt of his subjects. [68] The prince should behave in a somewhat varied manner toward his subjects. For instance, he must appear to be liberal, but in practice he must be extremely frugal. He cannot be too good, but he must be evil if necessary. [69] It is in this capacity that the prince

must play "the hypocrite and the dissembler." [70] He must seem to have all of the virtues without necessarily possessing any of them. The prince must seem to be "merciful, faithful, humane, religious, and upright." It is better yet if he really possesses these qualities. But he should be so conditioned that, when necessary, he can change to the opposite. For instance, if he can preserve the state by turning to evil ways, he should do so. The prince should have a flexible mind; he should be able to run with the times. Yet, Machiavelli adds, the prince should not go contrary to goodness and virtue, unless it is absolutely necessary. [71]

Furthermore, the prince must maintain a good reputation. [72] By using the cloak of religion for his "noble enterprises," the prince can do this quite successfully. [73] The prince should also display "grandeur, courage, gravity, and determination." [74] He should always display his dignity. [75] He must take care not to develop the reputation of being "variable, inconstant, effeminate, pusillanimous, and irresolute," [76] even though in practice he may have to be any or all of these. The people must remain ignorant of the contradiction.

It has been noted that the prince must appear merciful; yet Machiavelli goes on to say that he must not be wishy-washy in the process. In order to keep a strong, united state, the prince must be firm in enforcing the law and in following through with any threats that he might make. Machiavelli says that the prince should not mind being called cruel if this cruelty keeps his subjects loyal. In fact, he says that a few demonstrations of cruelty are more merciful than an excess of mercy. It is good for the prince to be loved as well as feared, but if there is a choice to be made, it is better to be feared. This is fear brought about

by the expectation of punishment for wrongs.[77] Yet, the prince must also be careful with these "displays of cruelty."[78] Capital punishment should be used sparingly.[79]

Machiavelli says that it does not matter about the prince's private life, so to speak, just as long as he looks well. He must be careful that he seems all of the virtues, and above all, he must watch what he says. Whether or not he chooses to be virtuous, he must take care that he says nothing against "charity, integrity, humanity, uprightness, and piety."[80] However, Machiavelli adds that in actuality sometimes the prince must practice craft and deceit in order to maintain the state. Yet, the people must never be able to see through this contradictory behavior.[81]

The second major loyalty of the prince is to the military. The Machiavellian prince should have an excellent knowledge of the art of war and military organization. He should know how to organize and discipline an army. The wise prince should be prepared in peacetime as well as in wartime.[82] The wise prince should command his own troops. To keep his soldiers in line, the prince must play up to them in ways which they admire. According to Machiavelli, the prince must appear "militaristic, cruel, haughty, and greedy."[83] Naturally, he must not be considered cruel when commanding an army.[84] Finally, the prince should reward those who want to enlarge the city and the state.[85]

The third major loyalty is to his subordinates, particularly to his ministers. The prince should delegate a certain amount of authority and responsibility to a group of wise ministers of his choosing. Machiavelli names two types of ministers who will be useful to their prince:

those who understand by "quickness of perception," and those who understand by "other's explanation."[86] Machiavelli gives some criteria for the choice of these ministers. Good ministers think more of their prince than of themselves. They seek the advantage of the state more than their own advantage. Good ministers only give advice when they are asked. The prince must play up to his ministers in a certain way. He should honor and reward these faithful ministers. These ministers have shared in the toil and cares; it is only right that they should share in the honors with their prince. The prince must show that he cannot be deceived. The prince should always be ready to listen to advice. He should give his ministers the idea that the more freely each speaks, the more acceptable he will be.[87] Also, a prince should be angry if someone does not tell him the truth.[88] The prince should only allow these men to tell him the complete truth. Outside of these ministers, the prince should not listen to anyone else. Flattery infiltrates when the prince listens to others besides his ministers. After hearing his advice, the prince must think on what he has heard and then decide what to do.[89] The prince must listen to advice, but he should follow advice only when it suits him to do so. In his circle of ministers, the prince must not believe too quickly everything that he hears. Neither should he be a creature of impulse. But he must be careful not to demonstrate too much distrust. Especially for the sake of his ministers, he must not appear to be overly cautious or intolerant.[90]

The fourth major loyalty is to his allies. First of all, the prince should be careful with whom he aligns himself. He should avoid aligning himself with a stronger country, especially if that country intends to

attack another.[91] Though the prince must be careful in making alliances, he must have good allies to help defend his borders.[92] The prince must behave toward his allies in a certain way. He should be faithful to his allies as long as it advantages him to be so. Yet, if it is in his interest to be crafty and deceitful, then he should be so. But he must take care that he does not acquire the reputation among his allies of being crafty and deceitful.[93]

These are the major duties of the prince. Machiavelli mentions some additional details regarding the jobs of the prince. The prince must be aware of ambitious self-seekers.[94] He must "curb this ambition."[95] The wise prince should always see to it that there is a continual need for his authority.[96] When the occasion arises, the prince should cleverly "nurse some enmities" against himself,[97] because he becomes great by overcoming challenges. To defeat the whims of Fortune, the prince should be hasty and direct because Fortune is a female. Therefore, one must "strike and beat her." This requires youth, rashness, and energy.[98] Finally, in addition to taking care of the present, the wise prince plans for the future.[99]

Machiavelli certainly seems to show a very contradictory individual as his prince. There are many qualities that the ideal prince should have: generosity, rapacity, cruelty, mercy, faithlessness, faithfulness, effeminacy, pusillanimity, ferocity, bravery, affability, haughtiness, lasciviousness, chastity, sincerity, cunning, facility, inflexibility, gravity, frivolity, religion, and scepticism.[100] He should have all of these so that he will be able to function in <u>any</u> situation. Of course,

Machiavelli sees the impossibility of one individual possessing all of these traits, but he says he should have as many as he can.[101]

Tillyard interprets Machiavelli in this manner: He says that Machiavelli denies the existence of natural law and of a fixed order. He believes, rather, that men are basically evil. Disorder is the natural state of men; civilization is a matter of expediency, almost a necessary evil.[102] Any type of thinking which denied the existence of order, civilization, and the basic nobility of humanity was outside the general mode of thinking of most Elizabethans. However, Tillyard seems to have misunderstood Machiavelli. Machiavelli does not deny the existence of a fixed order; it is simply not his concern in his discussion of the principles of statecraft.

CHAPTER II

DIVINE RIGHT--RICHARD II

Given the basic political theories of the English Renaissance, how do these theories manifest themselves in Shakespeare's second tetralogy? Richard II, the first of the tetralogy, deals with the divine-right concept and the beginning of the breakdown leading to Machiavellianism. In I and II Henry IV the peak of the initial breakdown occurs. There are remnants of the divine-right concept, but the controlling philosophy is Machiavellianism. Then, Henry V shows something resembling a restoration to order. The divine-right frame seems to be restored, but the picture within the frame is definitely Machiavellian. The order of Henry V seems balanced between the two theories, while the other three plays seem to exemplify either divine right or Machiavellianism. Richard II exemplifies divine right, both in concept and order, in at least five ways.

First, King Richard himself illustrates the divine-right theory several times. He tries to act like a divinely ordained king under the divine-right order. During the quarrel between Bolingbroke and Mowbray, Richard is in control. Like a king, he lets each one state his grievances against the other. He stands apart and listens, commenting on occasion. He tries to bring the two lords to peace with one another, but he is unsuccessful. Therefore, within the tradition of knightly trial by combat, he agrees to let them settle their dispute on the jousting field. In this speech, Richard makes a decision very much like a king.

We were not born to sue, but to command,
Which since we cannot do to make you friends,
Be ready, as your lives shall answer it,
At Coventry, upon Saint Lambert's Day.
There shall your swords and lances arbitrate
The swelling difference of your settled hate.
Since we cannot atone you, we shall see
Justice design the victor's chivalry.
Lord Marshal, command our officers-at-arms
Be ready to direct these home alarms.[1] (Richard II,I,i,195-205)

At Coventry, Richard orders both combatants to come forward and to state their names and reasons for jousting. He follows the formalities required in both of the situations. Then, he does a very unpolitical thing. Just as the combatants are ready to charge each other, he stops the joust. When Richard does this, he clearly shows that he has abdicated his control of the situation and therefore of the two combatants because his ending the joust shows stupid tyranny and indecision. He shows that he has no consideration for the views of others when he publicly embarrasses the two combatants in the way that he does. Not only is he interfering with a favorite tradition in the eyes of the nobles, but he also reveals how wishy-washy he is by his inability to make up his mind regarding a very simple decision. It is only one of his many acts that contribute to his downfall. But more will be said of this later.

Beginning with Act III, Richard makes many statements regarding his divine right. By use of the sun-king image, Richard states that because he rules by divine right, he cannot be deposed or even opposed. He says

that as thieves who rob at night, tremble, run away, and hide when the sun rises, so Bolingbroke, the thief who plans to steal the crown, will run away now that the king has returned to England. Richard goes on to say that when Bolingbroke casts his eyes upon the figure of God's majesty, he will not be able to stand upright to look at him. Richard shows how confident he is regarding his divine right when he says that there is nothing on earth that can unking him:

> Not all the water in the rough sea
> Can wash the balm off from an anointed king.
> The breath of worldly men cannot depose
> The deputy elected by the Lord. . . . (III,ii,54-57)

Only God, Who made Richard king, can unmake him king. Furthermore, he seems indirectly to challenge Bolingbroke:

> For every man that Bolingbroke has pressed
> To lift shrewd steel against our golden crown,
> God for His Richard hath in heavenly pay
> A glorious angel. Then, if angels fight,
> Weak men must fall, for Heaven still guards the right. (III,ii,58-62)

Richard certainly sounds like he is in control.

Richard still relies on his divine right when he hears of the advances of his opponent. Aumerle helps remind him that he is king. Richard then says, "Is not the King's name twenty thousand names?/ Arm, arm, my name! A puny subject strikes at thy glory. . ." (III,ii,85,86). In self-pity, he says that those who break their faith with him break their faith with God as well (III,ii,101). He compares himself to Christ betrayed by Judas (III,ii,132). When Richard meets Northumberland in Act

III, scene iii, he gives a very stirring statement of his divine right. He says three things. First, he says that no one, save God alone, can relieve a rightfully anointed king of his responsibilites. Second, he says if any man attempts to replace him, he is guilty of blasphemy, of the worst kind of stealing, and of confusing right and breaking order by usurpation. Third, he threatens Northumberland with the wrath of God, which shall be manifested eventually by civil war. Richard also alludes to the aspect of divine right which says that he is responsible to God alone when he mentions, "My Master, God Omnipotent." Richard's statements also set forth the orthodox result of rebellion and usurpation--confusion of right and disruption of divine order. Richard again shows himself a staunch believer in the ceremonious power of divine right: "What must the King do now? Must he submit?/ The King shall do it. Must he be deposed?/ The King shall be contented. Must he lose/ the name of king?" (III,iii,143-146). In the deposition scene, he still believes that the rebels sin when he says,"God pardon all oaths that are broke to me! . . ." (IV,i,214). Richard also feels that his Pilates cannot wash their hands, which are tainted with sin (IV,i,239-242). After Richard is deposed, he still speaks of divine right. He still believes that he is the rightful king. Richard's very last words echo his undying belief in divine right: "That hand shall burn in never-quenching fire that staggers thus my person. . ." (V,v,108,109).

The second way by which the divine-right concept is manifested in Richard II is by the statements of the other characters. No one ever denies that Richard rules by divine right. Gaunt is the first one, besides Richard himself, to speak of Richard's divine right. His two

speeches on divine right are orthodox statements regarding action against a king.[2] They are also examples of the patience which good subjects were supposed to exercise under a weak king.

Put we our quarrel to the will of Heaven,
Who, when they see the hours ripe on earth,
Will rain hot vengeance on offenders' heads. (I,ii,6-8)

Gaunt maintains his position upon the duchess' taunts of cowardice.

God's is the quarrel, for God's substitute,
His deputy anointed in His sight
Hath caused his death. The which if wrongfully,
Let Heaven revenge, for I may never lift
An angry arm against His minister. (I,ii,37-41)

Carlisle makes another strong statement regarding divine right.

That Power that made you King
Hath power to keep you King in spite of all. (III,ii,27-29)

Speaking to Bolingbroke and Northumberland, who are deposing Richard, Carlisle further defends the "divine-right" principle by saying:

What subject can give sentence on his king?
. . . . . .
And shall the figure of God's majesty,
His captain, steward, deputy elect,
Anointed, crowned, planted many years,
Be judged by subject and inferior breath? . . . (IV,i,121,125-128)

The emphasis of the words "Anointed, crowned" can refer to the aspects of the divine-right theory, such as the consecration and the sacral character of the king already noted. The abbot still believes Richard is the rightful king, and he plans a counter deposition.

Even York, who later gives his loyalty to Bolingbroke, has something to say about divine right. In II,iii,96, he calls Richard "the anointed king." Before meeting Richard at Flint Castle, York refers to Richard's "sacred head." York uses part of the sun-king image when he says that, "his eye, as bright as the eagle's lightens forth. . ." (III,iii,68-70). Richard looks like a king. He has an air of authority about him. These are ceremonious aspects of divine right. York again refers to Richard's "sacred head" when dust is thrown upon it (V,ii,30).

Bolingbroke does not deny Richard's divine right in spite of the fact that he eventually usurps it. When Richard stops the joust and sentences Bolingbroke to six years' exile, he says, "Your will be done," an echo of biblical language. This can refer possibly to the divine-right concept. He shows acceptance of divine right by use of the sun-king image.

> That sun that warms you here shall shine on me,
> And those his golden beams to you here lent
> Shall point on me and gild my banishment. (I,iii,144-147)

Though he speaks of the dimming of the image, he nevertheless accepts it (III,iii,63-67). After his accession, Bolingbroke says, "I shall pardon him as God shall pardon me" (V,iii,131). This seems to indicate that he believed he had broken the divine-right frame. Exton believes that he has done a double wrong by killing Richard; he has not only killed a man, but also he has killed an anointed king (V,v,115-117).

The third way by which the divine-right concept is shown is by the reference to the doctrine of rebellion under divine right. Gaunt and York both are opposed to rebellion, even though they have many grievances

against Richard. They are both examples of good, patient subjects under a bad king. Richard states first the perpetual nature of divine right when he says that only God can relieve him of his stewardship of England. No one can take his sacred scepter without being guilty of stealing, usurping. He also states the common view of rebellion, that it will lead to civil war. God will avenge this deed. Speaking of Bolingbroke, Richard says to Northumberland,

> He is come to open
> The purple testament of bleeding war.
> But ere the crown he looks for live in peace,
> Ten thousand bloody crowns of mothers' sons
> Shall ill become the flower of England's face,
> Change the complexion of her maid-pale peace
> To scarlet indignation, and bedew
> Her pastures' grass with faithful English blood. (III,iii,93-100)

The Bishop of Carlisle makes the most noteworthy statement illustrating the divine-right doctrine of rebellion and its dire results. He prophesies that outright civil war will result if the divine frame is broken by a usurper.

> And if you crown him, let me prophesy,
> The blood of English shall manure the ground
> And future ages groan for this foul act,
> Peace shall go to sleep with Turks and infidels,
> And in this seat of peace tumultuous wars
> Shall kin with kin and kind with kind confound,
> Disorder, horror, fear, and mutiny

Shall here inhabit, and this land be called
The field of Golgotha and dead men's skulls.
Oh, if you raise this house against this house,
It will the woefulest division prove
That ever fell upon this cursed earth. (IV,i,136-147)

The last lines of this speech could indicate very well the fear of a return to pre-creation chaos as a result of disorder.

The fourth way that the divine-right concept is seen is by frequent use of the sun-king image. The comparative assumption of this image refers once more to the order of Elizabethan leadership. The king is the head of the state as the sun is head of the stars. Peter de la Primaudaye says in The French Academie regarding the sun-king image:

> For as God hath placed the sun in the heavens as an image of His divine nature, which lighteneth, heateth, quickeneth, and nourisheth al things for man's use, either in heaven or earth: so the sovereign magistrate is the like representation and light in a city or a kingdom, especially so long as the feare of God, and observation of justice are imprinted in his heart. [3]

The constant image of the sun is said to impress upon the reader's mind the magnificence, the majesty, and the sanctity of sovereignty. [4] These thoughts are all aspects of divine-right kingship. For the most part, the sun does not shine in Richard II; it is beginning to dim, as will be seen when the crack within the divine-right frame is discussed.

The fifth way in which the divine-right concept is shown is by the general political order. The strong supporters of divine right, in addition to Richard himself, illustrate fully that the general order is

still the divine-right frame. The world of divine right has been called by Tillyard the world of "the medieval, the antique, the ceremonial."[5] It is a world where keeping the rules of the game matters more than winning or losing.[6] This world still has an intact nobility. It is a remote world, a world confined to the courtly class.[7] On the surface, the common people do not figure very importantly. Disapproval of rebellion especially figures in this order which desires order at almost any price. The sun-king image, the Christ image, and the garden image are fit images for the divine-right frame. Richard by divine right is secure in his position, or so he thinks. There is every reason to believe that the divine-right frame is little more than a frame because there is evidence of trouble everywhere. Truly, with the death of Richard and all of his generation, so to speak, the intact world of divine right will be gone. Richard is the last of the old order, the last of the truly medieval kings. A. E. Steel says that Richard II is

> the last king ruling by hereditary right, direct and undisputed, from the Conqueror. The kings of the next hundred and ten years . . . were essentially kings de facto not de jure, successful usurpers recognized after the event, upon conditions, by their fellow-magnates or by parliament.[8]

Though theoretically the divine-right frame is intact, there are all kinds of signs that say all is not well. The frame has already begun to crack at the beginning of the play; then, it is smashed by the act of usurpation. Richard cannot control Bolingbroke and Mowbray. He cannot make up his mind regarding what to do with them. Also, when he stops the joust, he is interrupting the chivalric tradition of trial by combat, a

very real part of the divine-right world. By his action, for all practical purposes, he has relinquished all of his power, leaving it to fall into the hands of ambitious upstarts, as the section of the divine-right theory regarding the king's responsibility said would happen if the king did not tend his garden. Gaunt speaks of trouble beginning and increasing even though he does not speak of rebellion. He severely criticizes Richard's actions; he says that his conduct makes him less and less a king. Dying Gaunt says that Richard is actually the sicker one. In his great speech on England, Gaunt says that England has made a shameful conquest of itself, referring to the actions of Richard. He makes reference to Richard's sick reputation, accusing him of carelessness, of being led by flatterers, and of enslaving himself by leasing out his land. He also makes reference to Gloucester's death. Richard's actions are further severely criticized by York. He wonders just how much more he can take, especially when Richard commits what has been called "an act of stupid tyranny," [9] his seizure of the Lancastrian estates. After this final tyrannical act, Richard leaves England, which has troubles of all kinds, to fight in the Irish wars. Unrest and even rebellion stir among the nobles, egged on by Northumberland. They are disgusted by Richard's confiscation of the Lancastrian estates, by his issuance of blank charters, by his forced loans, and by all other kinds of exactions. Also, the common people are irritated by high taxes.

In short, Richard has used his divine right, his gift from God, to do as he pleases. According to divine-right responsibility, he has broken every rule in the book. His actions do not show that he has the welfare of England and his people at heart. Neither does he

seem to display any of the aspects of "kingliness." A good example of this is seen in the way that he handles the joust. He has promised Bolingbroke and Mowbray that they may settle their differences on the jousting field. Then, when the joust is ready to begin, he forgets about the whole idea of a joust. This is inexcusable indecisiveness. Furthermore, he plans to banish Bolingbroke for ten years. Gaunt persuades him to shorten the sentence to six years, and Richard thus changes his mind, showing once again that he is easily swayed. Richard will not listen to advice as good kings are supposed to do. He will listen only to his favorites or his parasites.

By the beginning of Act II, Bolingbroke has broken his exile and has become a rebel against his king. Furthermore, word is reported that the nobles have fled to Bolingbroke. Worcester resigns his office and scatters the king's household. By Act III, order has definitely broken down. The government of Richard puts up a feeble verbal fight, but Richard collapses before the strength of Bolingbroke and his men. It is as though Richard blushes upon seeing Bolingbroke, instead of Bolingbroke blushing upon seeing the "majesty" of Richard. Bolingbroke advances to the place of Richard. The new order takes over without a blow; Richard abdicates in self-pity. In Act V, Richard tells Northumberland that he will be sorry very shortly for crowning Bolingbroke; he has been deceived into thinking that he will receive half the kingdom. He also says that Bolingbroke will regret that he trusted Northumberland. He will learn that he who deposes one king can more easily depose another with little encouragement. The change of ruling houses does not improve things. Order continues to break down. Bolingbroke has just been crowned when there is

a plot against him, led by Aumerle, the abbot, and others. Furthermore, the first mention is made of Bolingbroke's "unthrifty son." Then, Richard is killed, and Bolingbroke must bear the moral responsibility of his death. Things continue from bad to worse in the Henry IV plays.

There are four types of imagery that show that things are out of order. First, there is the weakened sun-king image. In Act II, scene iv, the Welsh captain says:

> And meteors fright the fixed stars of heaven.
> The pale-faced moon looks bloody on the earth,
> And lean-looked prophets whisper fearful change. (9-11)

In this same speech, there is the first mention of the weakened sun. Also, it is said that signs like these are signs of either the death or the fall of kings. Salisbury then brings the application close to home--to Richard:

> I see thy glory like a shooting star
> Fall to the base earth from the firmament.
> Thy sun sets weeping in the lowly west,
> Witnessing storms to come, woe, and unrest.
> Thy friends are fled to wait upon thy foes,
> And crossly to thy good all fortune goes. (19-24)

This passage seems to foreshadow exactly what is to happen. The first two lines echo Richard's lines comparing himself to Phaeton when he encounters Northumberland. His "weeping sun" seems to relate to Richard's wallowing in self-pity. The first two lines can also foretell how Bolingbroke outshines him and how he loses his shadow as he sees his reflection in the mirror. Salisbury indicates that Richard's sun has about lost its heat.

The last two lines refer to the scene of Richard's panic when he hears of Bolingbroke's advance, his lapse into self-pity, and his jumping to conclusions. Line five means that all his former servants and nobles have gone to Bolingbroke.

Bolingbroke uses disordered sun-king imagery:

King Richard doth himself appear,
As doth the blushing discontented sun
From out the fiery portal of the east
When he perceives the envious clouds are bent
To dim his glory and to stain the track
Of his bright passage to the Occident. (III,iii,62-67)

When Richard comes down from Flint Castle to face Bolingbroke, he draws the characteristic rhetorical picture of simple descent in keeping with his earlier royal splendor.

Down, down I come, like glistering Phaeton,
Wanting the manage of unruly jades. (III,iii,178)

This is another image of the falling sun. Specifically, this image alludes to Phaeton, the son of the sun god. He tried to drive his father's chariot, but the horses were too fierce for him, and he was thrown out. Like Phaeton, Richard was too weak for the fierce horses, Bolingbroke, Northumberland, and all of their faction. With regard to the image of the falling sun, the fact that the sun falls suggests that a condition similar to pre-creation chaos is at hand. This was the fear that Elizabethans had if order was disrupted. When the sun is in its place in the heavens, there is order in Heaven and on earth. When the sun is out of place, there is disorder in Heaven.[10]

When Richard is deposed, he has two things to say about his falling sun. He says that he is now a snow-king standing before the sun of Bolingbroke, who will melt his snow into water drops. Then, he scans his face in the mirror. He looks for his royal, dazzling brilliance. It is this quality that he values best, but he has lost it.

> 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 outfaced by Bolingbroke?
> A brittle glory shineth in this face--
> As brittle as the glory is the face. (IV,i,281-288)

Richard seems to say that the face of the king, the sun chosen by God, who in times past used to blind anyone who would try to look upon him straight, has now been blinded by the sun of men. Only the remnant of the sun-king is there, and the glory is brittle now, fit only to be broken to pieces. Richard's action can also be symbolic of how with the first evidence of rebellion, the order came crashing down as easily and as quickly as he dashed the mirror to the ground. Because Richard II was the last of the kings holding a direct hereditary right to the throne, this action can symbolize the destruction of the divine-right concept. Richard sees that by his abdication of the throne, he transfers the royal qualities of the sun to Bolingbroke.[11] The obvious meaning of this transfer of the sun is the transfer of the ruling house from Plantagenet to Lancaster.

When Bolingbroke has been proclaimed king, he is then the image of the sun. Yet, the sun is symbolic of divine right, and Bolingbroke has little hereditary right. He becomes king on human terms. Be that as it may, the symbols of divine right are being used with Bolingbroke, though not as much. The shadow of divine right remains with Bolingbroke and the Lancastrians. Now, all say, "God save Bolingbroke!" York has never advocated rebellion against the "sacred head" of Richard, as York calls him before Flint Castle (III,iii,9) and when he describes the scene where Richard and Bolingbroke ride together in London (V,ii). In the latter passage, York says that Richard's head is sacred; yet, a few lines down, he says that heaven has had a hand in these events, a reference to Richard's replacement (V,ii,37). Even after Bolingbroke has been crowned, Richard goes to his grave believing he is the only true king, and Exton still believes that he has killed an anointed king. However, Northumberland now refers to the "sacred state" of Bolingbroke (V,vi,6). This obvious confusion of right is brought about by the usurper. When divine-right terms are used for the true king and for the usurper, the thoughtful individual can easily wonder, "Whom do I obey in order that I may obey God?" Because the usurper confuses right, he endangers all order.

The second image showing that all is not well is the image of the betrayed Christ. In Act III, Richard hears that Bushy, Bagot, and Green have made peace with Bolingbroke. Richard, not understanding the word play of the messenger, hastily compares himself to Christ, and Bushy, Bagot, and Green to three Judases. The divine right has been betrayed. When Richard comes to abdicate, he again compares himself to Christ.

Yet I well remember

The favors of these men. Were they not mine?

Did they not sometimes cry 'All hail' to me?

So Judas did to Christ. But He in twelve

Found truth in all but one, I in twelve thousand

none. (IV,i,168-171)

He also accuses them of playing Pilate, conceding him to his enemies as Pilate delivered Jesus to be crucified. Though Pilate washed his hands of his deed, he still bore the moral responsibility. Richard says that these rebels cannot wash away the grave sin of deposing a divinely anointed king no matter how many times they ceremonially wash their hands.

Though some of you with Pilate wash your hands,

Showing an outward pity, yet you Pilates

Have here delivered me to my sour cross,

And water cannot wash away your sin. (IV,i,239-242)

The third image showing that all is not well is the image of the neglected garden. Under divine right, the king is supposed to rule his kingdom with the same care and diligence as a gardener tending his garden. A garden full of weeds echoes a kingdom full of troubles, excesses. Reference has already been made to the fact that the divine-right world is a world of an intact nobility. As in everything else, this is theoretical only. The Duchess of Gloucester says that the plants of royal blood have been cut by Richard's part in the death of the Duke of Gloucester, one of the seven sons of Edward III. The Duchess describes the unnaturalness of this death by contrast of the natural ways of removal of the branches. Royal blood is sacred; therefore, nature has been disturbed.

Edward's seven sons, whereof myself art one,
Were as seven vials of his sacred blood,
Or seven fair branches springing from one root.
Some of those seven are dried by nature's course,
Some of those branches by the Destinies cut.
But Thomas . . .
One vial full of Edward's sacred blood,
One flourishing branch of his most royal root,
Is cracked, and all the precious liquor spilt,
Is hacked down, and his summer leaves all faded,
By envy's hand and murder's bloody ax. (I,ii,11-21)

The Duchess uses the very sharp and direct words "cracked" and "hacked" to describe Gloucester's unnatural death. Gaunt makes reference to "this other Eden" being leased out to favorites. By this act, Richard had made himself Landlord of England, not king. Instead of delegating rule of the land, Richard should have tended it like the faithful gardeners. Gaunt also calls himself a long-withered flower (II,i,134). Richard's waste and neglect contribute to the decay of the political order. In Act II,iv, the point at which all order breaks down, the Welsh captain mentions "withered bay trees," foreshadowing the defeat of Richard.

The climax of the image of the neglected garden is Act III, scene iv. It is a very elaborate political allegory. Richard should have trimmed and dressed his land as the gardeners have done to York's garden. England is called a "sea-walled garden" (III,iv,43). The gardeners compare unruly children to dangling apricots. These unruly children cause their father to take oppressive measures to curb this unruliness. In order for for the apricots to dangle, there must be support underneath so that they

will not fall flat. (The apricots are the people, who should be supported by the king. However, in Richard's garden, the fruitful people are not supported; the weeds are.) Then, the gardener gives directions for this plant and that plant and for this weed and that weed. For instance, he instructs that twigs that grow too fast must be removed. What his lines really mean is that the ambitious nobles in the kingdom must be dealt with properly. There must be no extremes. All must be kept very tidy. Weeds must be pulled up from around the plants or they will kill them. The plants are the kings and the productive citizens. Kings must protect themselves from weeds, or ambitious nobles around them. Yet, Richard has not been a diligent gardener. The gardener's servant says that the garden of England is full of weeds, or ambitious nobles:

> . . . her fairest flowers choked up,
> Her fruit trees all unpruned, her hedges ruined,
> Her knots disordered, and her wholesome herbs
> Swarming with caterpillars. (III,iv,44-47)

In this passage, the whole land is said to be out of order. The land is out of order because rebellion has come. The neglectful gardener Richard, who has opened the way for this disorder, has fallen. The weeds who held Richard up by eating him, first sheltered by Richard's strong leaves as king, have been trimmed by Bolingbroke, the usurping but careful gardener. The gardeners call Richard a wasteful king; he should have cut off needless branches to save the kingdom and himself. Richard never speaks of garden images, but only of the sun and the betrayed Christ. This is as much as to say that Richard only speaks of right, not responsibility.

Richard's wasteful stewardship contributes to the breakdown. When Richard was king, he seems to have "played." That is to say, he never stops to consider the effect his actions will have on the people; he simply wants to do whatever he pleases whether the people like it or not. For instance, he does not stop to think that the people may not tolerate high taxes; he does not stop to think that noblemen might not like to have their lands taken from them; all he can see is that he can have money so that he can fight in the Irish Wars. He very indiscreetly, to say the least, expresses his joy over the death of Gaunt. All Richard sees by the death of Gaunt is that more land and more money are coming to him. He listens to nobody but his favorites. He does not consider the essence of the words spoken by Gaunt and York. He never uses his opportunities to size up situations and plan; he simply falls back on his divine right. He wastes time by going to Ireland when he could begin looking into the effects of his actions and trying to help the situations of the country. Then, when he knows that Bolingbroke is on his trail, instead of facing his situation as it is and trying to remedy it, he wastes more time by engaging in rhetorical mud-slinging and self-pity. Furthermore, he fails to take advantage of things when Bolingbroke yields to him. Instead, he gives in to Bolingbroke. In Pomfret Castle, Richard admits that he has wasted time. A king who wastes time also wastes power and a kingdom. This waste of time ties in with the neglected garden, and these two factors make way for rebellion. Then, the breaking point is his confiscation of the Lancastrian estates.

The fourth image showing that all is not well is the image of sickness. During the quarrel between Bolingbroke and Mowbray, Richard tries

to set himself up as a doctor. He says, "Let's purge this choler without letting blood" (I,i,153). Yet, he cannot heal the quarrel of the two without allowing them to have their joust. Gaunt says that Richard, king of England, is sick unto death, though Gaunt himself is on his death bed. Gaunt says that Richard is not only sick, but he is a careless patient who does little or nothing about his sickness. He entrusts his anointed person to the care of those who wounded him in the first place, his favorites, or rather, his parasites (II,ii,97-100). Naturally, when the king is sick, he makes the country sick. This reference to sickness fits in with the images of the neglected garden and wasted time. The neglected garden and wasted time are the reason for the sickness of Richard. The Bishop of Carlisle foretells more sickness unto death by his use of references to "Golgotha and dead men's skulls" if Bolingbroke is crowned (IV,i,137-144). Richard jumps to a conclusion about death, graves, epitaphs, and the defeat of kings when the bishop and Aumerle are trying to calm him down (III,ii,145-165). Toward the end of his abdication speech, he feels that he will soon die (IV,i,219). When Richard is imprisoned, he goes to Northern England, where "sickness pines the clime" (V,i,77). With Bolingbroke in power, sickness begins to show in his garden with his "unthrifty son" (V,i). The sickness in Richard II culminates in the death of Richard. Now Bolingbroke's conscience is sick. His inner unrest seems to mirror the outer unrest of the nation. This factor can only foreshadow more sickness, more trouble to come.

CHAPTER III

THE MACHIAVELLIAN CHARACTER--

BOLINGBROKE

As with the breakdown of any existing order, the breakdown of the divine-right structure brought about the need for a new order. The actions in Richard II are the first steps in any revolution--the revolt of the nobility. As a part of this breakdown, Henry Bolingbroke, the son of John of Gaunt, emerges. He also acts as part of the replacement and the new order. Bolingbroke can be seen as the spokesman for true Machiavellian politics, the ideas stated in The Prince.[1]

Though primarily Machiavellian, there are a few remnants of the divine-right order under him. For instance, when he takes over, he says, "In God's name, I'll ascend the regal throne" (Richard II,IV,i,113). After Richard has been deposed and Bolingbroke has been proclaimed king, he "inherits" Richard's qualities of the sun.[2] Northumberland wishes Bolingbroke's "sacred state" all happiness (V,vi,6). There is some indication of the divine-right idea when Bolingbroke says, "God befriend us as our cause is just" (I Henry IV,V,i,120). His son, John of Lancaster, calls his father, "God's substitute" (II Henry IV,IV,ii,28), and Bolingbroke again prays "if God doth give successful end to this debate. . ." (II Henry IV,IV,iv,1). Bolingbroke still sees the necessity for kings to imitate the sun, a divine-right concept; though, in contrast to his predecessor Richard, he imitates the sun in truth, not merely in

theory. He contrasts his youth to Richard's; he made his appearance brilliantly.

> . . . But like a comet I was wonder'd at (I Henry IV,III,ii,47).

On the other hand, Richard made himself so common that men's eyes were "sick and blunted," and afforded him

> . . . no extraordinary gaze,
> Such as is bent on sun-like majesty
> When it shines seldom in admiring eyes;
> But rather drowzed and hung their eyelids down,
> Slept in his face and render'd such aspect
> As cloudy men use to their adversaries. (I Henry IV,III,ii,47)

Bolingbroke has only the mere rudiments of the divine-right frame. His picture is Machiavellian. Bolingbroke has no "right" to rule since he is the son of John of Gaunt, only the third son of Edward III, and therefore far down the line of succession; hence, he cannot have the divine consecration or the sacral character of a king. He cannot make any claim to "absolutism" and "irresponsibility to anyone but God" because he simply has no "right" to make such a claim. He owes his power entirely to the support of the people and of the nobles. Owing one's power to popular support is a trait of the Machiavellian prince.

Whether or not Shakespeare's Bolingbroke is considered a Machiavellian schemer depends largely on how one interprets his words and his actions in Richard II and in the Henry IV passages where he looks back on his youth. The first reference to his actions is made by Richard in Richard II.

> Ourself and Bushy, Bagot here, and Green

Observed his courtship to the common people--
How he did seem to dive into their hearts
With humble and familiar courtesy,
What reverence he did throw away on slaves,
Wooing poor craftsmen with the craft of smiles
And patient underbearing of his fortune,
As 'twere to banish their affects with him.
Off goes his bonnet to an oyster wench.
A brace of draymen bid God speed him well
And had the tribute of his supple knee,
With 'Thanks, my countrymen, my loving friends,'
As were our England in reversion his,
And he our subjects' next degree in hope. (I,iv,23-36)

With regard to this passage, one must remember who is speaking--King Richard. Because Richard was relatively unpopular at this time of his life, one can easily suspect jealousy of Bolingbroke's popularity. Simple jealousy is possible because of Richard's judgment in general, which is shown by his almost indifferent attitude toward the reactions of the people and by his seizure of the Lancastrian estates. Then, derogatory judgment given by one's opponent is seldom to be trusted. Therefore, in view of these considerations, this one passage is not sufficient to show Bolingbroke having an ulterior motive in his actions.

Regarding Bolingbroke's own words and actions in Richard II, one must debate whether or not he seeks the crown from the beginning. First of all, to support the idea that he does not seek the crown, Gaunt says before the quarrel that to his knowledge he knows that Bolingbroke has

no long-established malice against Richard. At banishment, Bolingbroke makes no open protest of his sentence of exile. He does not speak of any sorrow to Richard as Mowbray does. Furthermore, his early statement regarding the sentence of exile in general is revealing: "How long a time lies in one little word!/ Four lagging winters and four wanton springs/ End in a word. Such is the breath of kings" (I,iii,213-215). His father cannot understand why he does not speak to his friends. Perhaps he is so preoccupied with what has happened that he hardly sees his friends. Then, when he is alone with his father, he expresses his grief regarding his exile. York says that Bolingbroke is loyal. When Bolingbroke returns to England, he says nothing about rebellion, not even to his eventual supporters. This is indeed most interesting behavior for a conspirator. Furthermore, Bolingbroke knows that he is a traitor by his actions. He openly confesses it. It seems that if he were a conspirator, he would not be so open in saying it. He states why he has broken his exile and why he has come in person to carry out his business (II,iii,70-71; 115-136). His reasons make perfectly good sense. When his Uncle York makes mention of his "fault," Bolingbroke does not seem to understand his reference. Bolingbroke insists that Berkeley support him in the recovery of his inheritance; yet, Berkeley reads nothing into Bolingbroke's words. Instead, Berkeley's first reaction is to give Bolingbroke all his due. Bolingbroke tells Bushy, Bagot, and Green that they have misled Richard about him. Before Flint Castle, he feels that he breaks no law. York has just finished saying that Richard should have their heads for what they have done. Bolingbroke's reply is, "Mistake not, Uncle, further than you should" (III,iii,15). York then says that he should not allow himself to be

mistaken about the heavens. Bolingbroke's reply is that he does not oppose the will of the heavens. Then, Bolingbroke promises to surrender all of his arms and power to Richard if Richard will officially recall him from banishment and give him his inheritance. When he sees the king approaching, he seems to speak words of sympathy regarding him. Northumberland relays Bolingbroke's conditions. Then, Richard complains about what the others plan to do. Bolingbroke and his party say nothing. When face to face with Richard, Bolingbroke says that he comes for his own. According to what he has been talking about all along, he wants his estates. He repeats that he will give true service if his conditions are met. It is Richard who jumps to the conclusion that he wants the crown.

When Bolingbroke has become king, he seems quite willing to take moral responsibility for Richard's death. He does not try to hide the fact that he wished him dead and admits that such a wish is a shortcoming. It would seem that if he had intended his death, he would try to hide the fact that he had even wished him dead. Later, Bolingbroke tells his cousin Warwick that he had no intention to take the crown at the time Richard said that Northumberland was not to be trusted.

Northumberland, thou ladder by the which

My cousin Bolingbroke ascends my throne-- (II Henry IV,III,i,70-71).

Bolingbroke does not deny that he took the crown whether he had intended to or not. He says that the nation was in so much difficulty that he was compelled to take over for Richard. He seems to say that at the time the action seemed like the thing to do.

Though then, God knows, I had no such intent,

But that necessity so bowed the state

That I and greatness were compelled to kiss— (III,i,72-74).

Bolingbroke's statement "then God knows, I had no such intent " has been interpreted to mean that only God knows if he had any intention to take the crown. Then, on his death bed, his statement "God knows" has also been interpreted to mean that only God knows if he secretly plotted to take the crown. Dover Wilson indicates that Bolingbroke was somewhat a dupe of the nobles who helped him and that he really did not know what he was doing. [3] Supporting Wilson's idea, Bolingbroke does say to his son, "Thou seek'st the greatness which will overwhelm thee" (II Henry IV,IV,v,97). Furthermore, Bolingbroke might be innocent of any secret intentions, because one of the orthodox reasons for rebellion, in addition to ambition, was ignorance.

By Shakespeare's time two views of Bolingbroke were known. The Lancastrian supporters considered him an ideal hero, an ideal king, one inspired by God. [4] The Yorkist supporters considered him a spiritual, moral, and physical leper, ambitious, unscrupulous, cunning, and cruel. Naturally, the Tudors tried to reconcile these views. Hence, the Elizabethans inherited two contradictory views through Vergil and Hall. [5] Furthermore, if Shakespeare follows Holinshed's interpretation that Bolingbroke was a victim of Fortune, then Bolingbroke could have been, at the outset, an innocent dupe.

These are the possible reasons why Bolingbroke might have not sought the crown. There are, of course, some loopholes to this argument. The first possible hint that he has something up his sleeve occurs right before he leaves England in exile. He speaks of England as "My mother, and my nurse, that bears me yet!" (I,iii,306). This might mean that he

will get help from England, from the people. In his very courteous thanks to Hotspur, Bolingbroke promises to return the favor "as my fortune ripens with thy love" (II,iii,48). The words "fortune ripens" can be interpreted as an early indication that he intends to depose Richard. There is furthermore the question of Bushy, Bagot, and Green. Judging by the reasons that he gives, he certainly has grievances against these three. But would that be cause to execute unless he has purposes for himself? Furthermore, why does he take charge of the matter? Why does he act like a king in this circumstance? He says that he must justify his actions to "wash his hands." Before Flint Castle, Bolingbroke asks Hotspur, "What, will not this castle yield?" (III,iii,20). If Bolingbroke seeks the crown, then, his sending Northumberland to relay the conditions to Richard takes on a new significance. He sends a powerful nobleman to "request" that Richard come down into the presence of Bolingbroke. When Bolingbroke faces Richard, Richard assumes that Bolingbroke wants the crown. He says, "For do we must what force will have us do./ Set on toward London, Cousin, is it so?" (III,iii, 207,208) Bolingbroke replies in the affirmative. This statement is the strongest so far in support of the idea that he has planned all along to take the crown. As soon as he hears that Richard has adopted him as his heir, his immediate reply is, "In God's name, I'll ascend the regal throne" (IV,i,113). For one who is not seeking the crown, he certainly does not resist very much when it is offered to him. Carlisle is arrested and sentenced as were the lords at the beginning of Act IV. Also, why would he need to say that Richard must surrender "in common view?" He wants to be careful to proceed without suspicion. It would seem that if one were not seeking the crown, he would not concern

himself with all of these details. After Richard has been deposed and taken to the Tower, Bolingbroke is very quick and businesslike about revealing his coronation plans. He seems perfectly secure in his future plans; he does not show any hesitation. Also, if many of the characters are intended to be mirror characters, then this is more evidence that he has been plotting against Richard all along. For instance, Bolingbroke accuses Mowbray, who serves the king. Hence, he is really accusing the king. He condemns Bushy, Bagot, and Green, all favorites of the king; hence, it is possible that he really would like to accuse and condemn the king and treat him in the same manner as he treats them. These incidents can serve as mirrors of the main plot.

A key passage to understanding his past words and actions is his own statement to his son in I Henry IV,III,ii. He tactfully reproves his son for his very unprincely conduct, and he contrasts it to his own youth.

> Had I so lavish of my presence been,
> So common-hackneyed in the eyes of men,
> So stale and cheap to vulgar company,
> Opinion, that did help me to the crown,
> Had still kept loyal to possession,
> And left me in reputeless banishment,
> A fellow of no mark nor likelihood.
> By being seldom seen, I could not stir
> But like a comet I was wondered at,
> That men would tell their children "This is he."
> Others would say, "Where, which is Bolingbroke?"
> And then I stole all courtesy from Heaven,

And dressed myself in such humility
That I did pluck allegiance from men's hearts,
Loud shouts and salutations from their mouths,
Even in the presence of the crowned King.
Thus did I keep my person fresh and new,
My presence, like a robe pontificial,
Ne'er seen but wondered at. And so my state,
Seldom but sumptuous, showed like a feast,
And won by rareness such solemnity. . . . (III,ii,39-59)

It is this passage which causes one to take a second look at his words and actions in Richard II. Ribner calls this speech a confession from his own mouth that he was playing a part.[6] The general thrust of his statements here seems to say to his son regarding his very low behavior: "My boy, if I had carried on like you have been doing with all of these ruffians, I would never have become king. I became king largely because the people preferred my behavior to that of Richard's. Richard was deposed largely for his unkingly conduct. My boy, do not let your unprincely actions depose you in the minds of the people before you even take the throne." Bolingbroke does praise himself a good bit in this passage. He knows that he was a good youth. Generally, those who truly possess these fine qualities do not speak of them so openly as Bolingbroke has in this passage. Also, he could be justifying his own ends by attacking his opponent, though his accusations are certainly true, as the entire play of Richard II shows. These statements therefore do not necessarily prove that his words and actions in Richard II are to be interpreted maliciously.

The next passage which has been used as proof of his intentional Machiavellianism is another statement to his son.

> God knows, my son,
> By what bypaths and indirect crooked ways
> I met this crown. . . .
> To thee it shall descend with better quiet,
> Better opinion, better confirmation.
> For all the soil of the achievement goes
> With me into the earth. It seemed in me
> But as an honor snatched with boisterous hand.
> And I many living to upbraid
> My gain of it by their assistances,
> Which daily grew to quarrel and to bloodshed,
> Wounding supposed peace. All these bold fears
> Thou see'st with peril I have answered,
> For all my reign hath been but as a scene
> Acting that argument. (II Henry IV,IV,v,184-199)

These lines have had both favorable and unfavorable explanations. Dover Wilson has said that Bolingbroke was borne upward by a power beyond his control. He truly wants to do something to avenge the Duke of Gloucester's death, but he has no steady policy or procedure. Once he sets things in motion, he is the servant of Fortune to go wherever she wilt. Whimsical Fortune is what is meant by "bypaths and indirect crooked ways." Wilson goes on to support his claim further by pointing out that with all of his political acumen, Bolingbroke does not really seem to know his way around in the world. [7] He seems almost bewildered. There are a few lines

that might change the interpretation of these same passages. He continues to talk to his son:

> And all my friends, which thou must make thy friends,
> Have but their stings and teeth newly ta'en out.
> By whose fell working I was first advanced
> And by whose power I would might lodge a fear
> To be again displaced. Which to avoid
> I cut them off, and had a purpose now
> To lead out many to the Holy Land,
> Lest rest and lying still might make them look
> Too near unto my state. Therefore, my Harry,
> Be it thy course to busy giddy minds
> With foreign quarrels, that action, hence borne out,
> May waste the memory of the former days. (II Henry IV, IV, v, 204-216)

He says, for instance, in this speech that he could not trust those who first helped him in his rise to power because they, who knew how to depose a rightful king, would know how to depose a usurper. He says that these former helpers had to be removed from his sight. Judging by his actions, it seems that he had executed those who openly rebelled, and the rest he planned to keep busy by taking them on the crusade that he had long wanted to make. Crusading would prevent these would-be rebels from investigating the means of his rise to power.

There are two other actions that might say something about his overall purpose or lack of purpose. First, he refuses to ransom Mortimer because he had been proclaimed heir to the throne by Richard II. Bolingbroke says that Mortimer can starve to death for all he cares.

Bolingbroke calls him a traitor, which he naturally would be in his eyes since he had something which Bolingbroke did not have--a hereditary right to the throne. He does not want Mortimer around because of the insecurity of his own claim. Second, when Prince John promises that the griefs of the rebels will be heard, he breaks his word and delivers them to execution. It is never said whether or not his father directly sent him to do this. But there is no word that his father ever rebuked the duplicity of his son's behavior. These two actions can more quickly cause one to take a second look at his actions in Richard II than any of his words.

Whether Bolingbroke is deliberately or accidentally Machiavellian, his actions have the appearance of Machiavellian practices. One type of Machiavellian prince is able to reach the crown by favor of his fellow-citizens.[8] He possesses "happy shrewdness."[9] This type of prince has to be especially sensitive to popular approval. This is almost his first order of business. Bolingbroke had the support of the common people whether he courted it or not. In Richard's statement of Bolingbroke's behavior to the common people, there is a definite indication of such support. He wanted to be certain that Richard's deposition was public. He wanted Richard to surrender in common view. When Richard and Bolingbroke rode into London, the people were unanimously in favor of Bolingbroke's replacing Richard. Later as king, Bolingbroke relates to his son the importance of having a good reputation among the common people and having their support.

> Had I so lavish of my presence been,
> So common-hackneyed in the eyes of men,
> So stale and cheap to vulgar company,

Opinion, that did help me to the crown,

Had still kept loyal to possession,

And left me in reputeless banishment. (I Henry IV,III,ii,39-44)

Bolingbroke retained this support throughout his reign. As Machiavelli advises, princes must preserve the good will of the people they rule. On this subject, Bolingbroke realized something that his predecessor Richard never did. Richard never considered the people he ruled. Hence, he alienated them.

Second, Bolingbroke, at the outset, has the support of the nobles: Northumberland, Ross, Beaumont, Berkeley, and all of their supporters. Ribner says that Northumberland is Bolingbroke's tool among the nobles.[10] Worcester resigned his service, and all of Richard's household servants ran to Bolingbroke. Bolingbroke has the sympathy of his Uncle York, though not the approval for the rebellion. Then, he gains the reluctant support of Aumerle by pardoning him. Machiavelli says that if a prince is able to have the support of the nobles as well as the people, all the better.[11] Ribner says that Bolingbroke uses Northumberland and Hotspur by lying and deceitful statements of friendship.[12]

With Bolingbroke having almost unanimous support of the country, he then proceeds to clean up the mess before beginning anew. He has Bushy, Green, and their accomplices executed, for the Machiavellian must dispose of the supporters of the former prince.[13] He has the rest of Richard's supporters arrested in London. He has the Bishop of Carlisle arrested because he speaks against dethronement. Even Richard is arrested by Bolingbroke. Now, Bolingbroke is ready to begin anew as a Machiavellian politician. Shortly after his accession, Richard is killed, in

conformance with the Machiavellian precept that the former prince must be removed.[14] Yet, the new prince cannot do it; others must do things like that so that they can take the blame. Exton fills this role for Bolingbroke.[15] The plot against Bolingbroke by Aumerle shortly after he has been crowned is crushed with an iron hand.[16]

As has been stated, the overall goal of the prince is to maintain the state at any price. In order for Bolingbroke to do this, Richard must die. As long as he is alive, Bolingbroke's title is insecure; hence, the nation remains divided.[17] The hereditary title must be emphasized, especially when one does not exist.[18] A divided state is naturally a weak state; the prince must maintain a strong state. To stay in control, Bolingbroke must stand firm against even the appearance of rebellion. For instance, in I Henry IV he dismisses Worcester because there is "danger and disobedience" in his eye (I,iii,16). Wise princes rely on themselves, not on the will of others. Bolingbroke seems almost Tudor-like in his ways: "I'm going to run things."

The most important aspect of the Machiavellian prince is his behavior. The prince must seem all virtue, goodness, piety. It is better yet if he truly is all of these, but he must always seem to be. And he must always say that which is good. At first glance, Bolingbroke could pass as an ideal knight. He seems to possess mercy, faithfulness, humaneness, religion, and uprightness, all strict Machiavellian traits;[19] Bolingbroke adds humility, friendship, and forgiveness. For instance, he seems very devout. In Richard II, he testifies before his father, King Richard, and Mowbray of his innocence before God. He almost says, "I have lived in all good conscience toward God."[20] Later, like a true knight,

he refers to loyalty to God as one of the vows of a knight. He also fights in God's Name.

That he is a traitor foul and dangerous

To God of Heaven, King Richard, and to me.

And as I truly fight, defend me Heaven! (I,iii,39-41)

He prays before he fights. He looks upon the joust with Mowbray as a "holy joust." He ascends the throne "in God's name." He pardons Aumerle as "God shall pardon me." He accepts moral responsibility for the death of Richard. In this regard, he wants to do whatever he can to acquit himself of this offence, in this case, what devout medieval Christians did for acts of penance: he wishes to go on a crusade as an act of holy penance.

This same devout attitude continues in the Henry IV plays. In I Henry IV, he calls his soldiers to be the soldiers of Christ (I,i,20). In this same scene, he is just about ready to go on the crusade when rebellion in the ranks keeps him at home. However, he is never discouraged of his intentions. Till the day that he dies, he continues to hope that there will be some way that he can go on the pilgrimage. The strength of his intention is revealed in the last years of his life when he says that all preparations, such as the army and the navy, have been made. The regents who will take command while he is gone have been appointed. Therefore, he seems never to have lost hope. In II Henry IV, he says to his cousin Warwick,

You, Cousin Nevil, as I may remember--

When Richard, with his eye brimful of tears,

Then checked and rated by Morthumberland,

Did speak these words, now proved a prophecy?
"Northumberland, thou ladder by the which
My cousin Bolingbroke ascends my throne"--
Though then, God knows, I had no such intent. (III,i,67-72)

Bolingbroke has an "if the Lord wills" attitude. In II Henry IV, he says, "Now, lords, if God doth give successful end to this debate. . . (IV,iv, 1,2). Bolingbroke accepts the chastisement of God in his life without complaint. He sees this chastisement in three manifestations: unrest in the realm, his son's behavior, and his sleeplessness. Yet, he is steadfast, in spite of these. His last words before he is carried into his "death chamber" are a praise to God. "Laud be to God! Even there my life must end. . ." (IV,v,236). Machiavelli says that princes who use the cloak of religion for their purposes do well. Wise princes must, at least, appear pious. If Bolingbroke's ends are always purely political, then, he has integrated his religion well.

Bolingbroke seems to be humble. He says that he "dressed himself in humility" (I Henry IV,III,ii,51). He has shown himself to be humble before God. He obeys his king until he breaks his exile. He shows rightful duty and respect to King Richard when he meets him upon his return from exile; kneeling before the king, he still treats him with respect. Bolingbroke also shows his humility in that he is polite and courtly to the common people in the same way that he is to those of his own class. He humbly accepts his supporters' persuasion that he take the crown. He does not care for a lot of high and mighty salutations. For instance, in the scene with Aumerle and his mother, he acts like a good nephew trying to calm his aunt, not like a high and mighty king.

As king, he does not scorn taking kindly advice from his servants. In II Henry IV, Warwick advises him to sleep. Bolingbroke says, "I will take your counsel" (III,i,107). Furthermore, he recognizes his own human limitations. In Act IV, scene iv, he talks over his fatherly concern for his son Hal as friend to friend. He shows more of his humility in that he does not think it beneath his dignity to ask for help from his servants when he gets sick over hearing the news of Northumberland's death. He then asks his servants to take him back to the Jerusalem chamber. Bolingbroke seems humble in that he is not a great talker. He does not make a poem out of everything as does Richard. His words are few and plain spoken. If one interprets the passage about his humility as a youth as a Machiavellian play, then he acts humble because he believes it is how a king should behave. Yet, there are some actions which can be construed as genuine humility, which Machiavelli says is even better than seeming.

Bolingbroke seems to have a forgiving spirit. The noblest example of this is in Richard II. In Act IV, scene i, right before he accepts the crown, Bolingbroke talks of his intention to recall the banished Mowbray and restore him to his title and his lands. Though Bolingbroke had considered Mowbray his enemy, he knew that he had not been treated fairly, just as Bolingbroke himself had not been treated fairly. Then, when Bolingbroke hears that Mowbray is dead, he wishes him eternal bliss (Richard II,IV,i, 103,104). When Richard abdicates, Bolingbroke has nothing against him personally. This idea is further shown when Bolingbroke receives news of Richard's murder. He says openly that he loves the murdered man (Richard II,V,vi,40). If one interprets this scene as a Machiavellian play, then Exton is rebuked in public but praised in private. The wise prince will

see to it that his servants take the blame for his orders. The wise prince must always be in the clear. As Hamlet says, these "are actions which a man might play" (Hamlet, I, ii, 84).

Bolingbroke seems to be very polite and genteel.[21] In Richard II, Richard tells how Bolingbroke extends his courtly behavior to the common people. That is, Bolingbroke bends his knees, removes his hat to ladies, shakes hands, smiles, and curtsies. He shows "humble and familiar courtesy."

Off goes his bonnet to an oyster wench. . . .

With "Thanks, my countrymen, my loving friends. . . ." (I, iv, 31, 34) "I appreciate your kindness, your favor," he seems to say. Again, it must be remembered that Machiavelli urges acts of friendship and courtliness to win the support of the people. Ribner points out that this is the way of "happy shrewdness" of the prince who comes to power by favor of his fellow-citizens.

Bolingbroke continues this same courtliness and politeness in his appreciative disposition toward his friends. In Richard II, when Bolingbroke has just returned from exile, Northumberland tells Bolingbroke how far it is to Berkeley. Bolingbroke's reply shows his appreciation for help.

Of much less value is my company

Than your good words. . . . (II, iii, 19-20)

Hotspur and Northumberland pledge to help Bolingbroke in his attempt to receive his inheritance rights. Bolingbroke thanks Hotspur for his help as he has Northumberland.

I thank thee, gentle Percy, and be sure

I count myself in nothing else so happy
As in a soul remembering my good friends.
And as my fortune ripens with thy love,
It shall be thy true love's recompense.
My heart this covenant makes, my hand thus seals it. (II,iii,45-50)

Ribner says that Bolingbroke plays the Machiavellian "dissembler and hypocrite" in his words to Northumberland and his party. He simply uses these nobles to gain their support.[22] This is said to be true largely because once Bolingbroke is fairly settled, that is to say, about as settled as he ever would be in his unquiet reign, he deals very firmly, in fact, a little on the rough side, with his first and strongest supporters, and he threatens dreadful consequences for them if they do not obey.

Despite his Machiavellian ways, friendship seems to mean a great deal to Bolingbroke. In I Henry IV, Bolingbroke shows his regret that acquaintances and allies have been fighting each other.

March all one way, and be no more opposed
Against acquaintance, kindred, and allies. . . .[23] (I,i,15-16)

Bolingbroke remains a friend to his nobles, but the nobles turn out to be "fair weather friends" to Bolingbroke. His love for the Percys continues after they have betrayed him and have both been killed. In II Henry IV, III,i, he remembers how Northumberland and Richard were great friends. Yet, Northumberland betrayed his friend two years later. The implication in this passage is that Northumberland and Bolingbroke were best friends, since Bolingbroke refers to him as "the man nearest my soul" (III,i,61). They worked together like brothers. Now Northumberland had betrayed his best friend. Bolingbroke is broken in spirits because of his friend's

betrayal and sad when he hears that Northumberland is dead, even though he was his political foe. He is so sad that he gets sick. If Bolingbroke is truly a good friend, then, Machiavelli says that this is better than seeming.

Bolingbroke has a strong sense of moral rightness. In Richard II, Bolingbroke seems to be roused to righteous indignation when he accuses Bushy and Green of their serious moral offense against Richard,

A happy gentleman in blood and lineaments,
By you unhappied and disfigured clean.
You have in manner with your sinful hours
Made a divorce betwixt his Queen and him,
Broke the possession of a royal bed. (III,i,8-13)

Bolingbroke has earlier called Bushy, Bagot, and the rest of Richard's favorites, grafters of the state, and he had vowed to dispose of those "caterpillars of the Commonwealth." Bolingbroke's moral sense seems to be offended when he discovers that his cousin-king is in some way responsible for his uncle's death. He demonstrates this disgust in Act I, when he is quarreling with Mowbray. By condemning Mowbray, he indirectly blames King Richard for the death of the Duke of Gloucester.

That Mowbray hath received eight thousand nobles
. . . for your Highness' soldiers,
The which he hath detained for lewd employments,
Like a false traitor and injurious villain. . . . (I,i,88-91)

Bolingbroke again shows that he is still disgusted with this action in

Act IV, scene i. Bolingbroke cannot understand treating a kinsman in an unnatural manner. Bolingbroke takes upon himself the moral responsibility for the death of Richard.

One of his concerns for his son is that he is not leading the best moral life for a prince. Bolingbroke desires that his son keep himself morally pure, to keep himself "unspotted from the world."[24] He seems to say that it is especially essential for his life as heir to the throne. Bolingbroke again shows his righteous indignation against immorality when, on his death bed, he speaks to Hal. He is afraid for England's sake, since morally weak, unprincely Hal will succeed him. He specifically reveals his concern in these lines:

> Harry the Fifth is crowned. Up, vanity!
> Down, royal state! All you sage counsellors, hence!
> And to the English Court assemble now,
> From every region, apes of idleness!
> Now, neighbor confines, purge you of your scum.
> Have you a ruffian that will swear, drink, dance,
> Revel the night, rob, murder, and commit
> The oldest sins the newest kind of ways?
> . . . . . .
> For the fifth Harry from curbed license plucks
> The muzzle of restraint, and the wild dog
> Shall flesh his tooth on every innocent. (II Henry IV, IV, v, 120-127, 130-133)

These lines certainly seem to reveal Bolingbroke as a stern, morally upright man. The Chief Justice says that Bolingbroke is "uprightly innocent" (II Henry IV, V, ii, 39-41). Uprightness is a quality of the

Machiavellian prince, especially the reputation of being so, as the Chief Justice indicates about Bolingbroke, Machiavellian princes must always be concerned about appearances. Bolingbroke seems to have and in some cases does have all of these traits. He certainly says nothing against the virtues, because he wants to exhibit a moral reputation. He has set a noble example.

It has been said that Machiavellian princes are to be firm against all insurrection so that they will be able to maintain a strong state, which is the overall goal of the prince. The state is held together by the fear of punishment. Bolingbroke is a very firm king. He tolerates no insubordination. From the very beginning of his reign, this is the case. In Richard II,V,iii, after he has pardoned Aumerle, he then sends the obvious conspirators to their execution. In I Henry IV,I,iii, Worcester simply looks like he has treachery in mind, and Bolingbroke sends him away. Bolingbroke is adamant about the prisoner issue. He says very simply to Hotspur, "You have a short while to deliver your prisoners, or else, you will be punished."

> Send me your prisoners with the speediest means,
> Or you shall hear in such a kind from me
> As will displease you. My Lord Northumberland,
> We license your departure with your son.
> Send us your prisoners, or you will hear of it. (I Henry IV,I,iii, 120-124)

As a result of Bolingbroke's seemingly unfriendly attitude, the Percys rebel. Later, Mortimer and Glendower join with the Percys. Hotspur furthermore enlists the aid of Douglas and the Scottish rebels. Yet, at the Battle of Shrewsbury, all oppositon is crushed by Bolingbroke's

forces. It has been said by Ribner that Bolingbroke would have to have disposed of Northumberland anyway because the Machiavellian usurper is not supposed to keep those who first helped him come to power, unless he has further use for them.[25] These examples clearly show that Bolingbroke does not play favorites. He will treat everyone the same where the law is concerned, regardless of the consequences for himself. He intends to see that justice is done and that law and order are upheld. At the end of his conference with Hal in Act III, he makes a statement which indicates his determination to crush all rebellion.

A hundred thousand rebels die in this. . . . (III,iii,160)

There is the implication given by Machiavelli that a king is not a good leader unless he tempers justice with mercy,[26] a feat Bolingbroke accomplishes very well. He is as merciful to the penitent as he is firm to the rebellious. This trait again is demonstrated from start to finish. In Richard II, Bolingbroke's first act as king is to pardon Aumerle's rebellion. He says that Aumerle's offense was only intended, not committed. Therefore, since there was some doubt, he set him free. However, it is understood that Bolingbroke pardons him in the trust that he will never try anything again. He says to Aumerle,

Your mother well hath prayed, and prove you true. . . . (V,iii,145)

Bolingbroke is also merciful to Carlisle and Exton. Bolingbroke spares the life of Carlisle, though he considers him a threat. He even lets Carlisle choose where he will banish himself (Richard II,V,vi,24-29). Instead of executing Exton for killing Richard, he banishes him (Richard II,V,vi,43-44). Bolingbroke reveals kindness balanced against firmness when he gives Hotspur a little time to deliver the prisoners. He offers

pardon to Hotspur and to Worcester if they will surrender their power.

> We love our people well, even those we love
> That are misled upon your cousin's part.
> And, will they take the offer of our grace,
> Both he and they and you--yea every man--
> Shall be my friend again and I'll be his.
> So tell your cousin, and bring me word
> What he will do. But if he will not yield,
> Rebuke and dread correction wait on us
> And they shall do their office. . . .
> We will not now be troubled with reply.
> We offer fair, take it advisedly. (V,i,104-114)

Bolingbroke shows his merciful attitude by his offer of pardon, his patience, and his reasonableness. He gives the offenders time to decide what they will do. However, the rebels refuse to submit, and Worcester and Vernon are sent to their execution. Before they are sent, Bolingbroke reminds them of his previous offer; they had made their own decision to die. This is a perfect example of tempering justice with mercy. Also, Bolingbroke does not execute all offenders. "Other offenders we will pause upon" (V,v,15). Blunt and Westmoreland testify to the mercifulness and reasonableness of Bolingbroke. It is good for princes to have the reputation of being merciful, provided that they do not misuse this mercy. Judging by his reaction to plots, there is no way that Bolingbroke could ever be too lenient.

The question regarding Prince John's tricking the rebels into surrender becomes important in the scheme of Machiavellian politics. He

promises them a hearing of their grievances if they will disband their armies, and the rebels obey. Because of the disbanded forces, the power of the rebels is completely broken by the time they are officially arrested for treason. With regard to this incident, if Bolingbroke had done the same as his son John, then, under the Machiavellian code he would be justified if his action was necessary to maintain the state, or if the reasons for giving his word no longer existed. Maintaining the state in this case means crushing the rebellion. This incident is also an example of Machiavellian craft and deceit.

Bolingbroke believes that princes should always display their royal dignity. This too is a quality of the Machiavellian prince,[27] for princes are supposed to have the majesty of sovereignty.[28] There are at least two stated examples of Bolingbroke's view of this "majesty." Referring once more to the first scene alone with his son, he says,

> By being seldom seen, I could not stir
> But like a comet I was wondered at . . .
> Thus did I keep my person fresh and new,
> My presence, like a robe pontificial,
> Ne'er seen but wondered at. And so my state,
> Seldom but sumptuous, showed like a feast,
> And won by rareness such solemnity. . . . (III,ii,46,47,55-59)

The word "state" means dignity in this passage. On his death bed, he again makes mention of the importance of royal dignity. Bolingbroke says that princes will have more power and more influence if they are not so

free with their public appearances. When Richard's "buddy-buddy" nature is contrasted, Bolingbroke certainly impresses one as very stately, serene, and majestic.

Bolingbroke is not alarmed by his own fears. Rather, he meets his challenges. His attitude of taking care of the present is shown by his balance of justice and mercy. Rebellion does not cause him to panic as it did his predecessor Richard. He knows that there is trouble, and he faces it. He simply deals with it in a quiet and orderly way. Unlike Richard, he is not hesitant to assert himself as king. Bolingbroke also shows that his fears do not oppress his strength because he is hard working and resourceful. He does as wise princes are supposed to do--make their fortune and plan for the future as well as take care of the present. Bolingbroke is very businesslike from start to finish. This attitude is the result of the fact that he takes his work so seriously. In I Henry IV,I,i, Bolingbroke is just about ready to go on his Crusade when he hears that there is rebellion loose in the land. He realizes that he must put the welfare of England before his personal welfare. He cannot leave while the country is in trouble. In this same scene, he shortly begins to mope about his son Hal. Yet, he realizes that he cannot dwell on that at the moment because he has to deal with rebellion. His first concern is the welfare of England and keeping order. When he is in public conference, he sticks to the issues, speaking plain and to the purpose. He does not seem to have a flippant, authoritative attitude; "I don't want to be bored with this." He sits back in the manner of an impartial jury, hears both sides of the question, puts two and two together, and then decides. In I Henry IV,I,iii, this businesslike attitude is seen.

He defines the issues at hand: Hotspur refuses to turn over his prisoners; Bolingbroke suspects that Mortimer has revolted; he hears Hotspur complain. Then, he makes the decision based on law. He has kept himself out of the conference. In Act III, scene ii, Blunt enters and tells the king that Douglas and the Scottish rebels met to plan further rebellion. Bolingbroke has just concluded his first serious conference with Hal; yet upon hearing the news, he is all ready to do his part in quenching the rebellion. He has two things already planned. Hal will go forth on Wednesday. He himself will march forward on Thursday.

> Our meeting
> Is Bridgenorth. And, Harry you shall march
> Through Gloucestershire, by which account,
> Our business valued, some twelve days hence
> Our general forces at Bridgenorth shall meet.
> Our hands are full of business. . . . [29] (I Henry IV,III,ii,175-179)

His quick planning of the action to follow shows his businesslike disposition. In Act V, scene v, Bolingbroke again shows his businesslike attitude. As soon as he has delivered the chief instigators of the Percy rebellion to their execution, he still sees more business to do.

> And since this business so fair is done,
> Let us not leave till our own be won. (I Henry IV,V,v,43-44)

In Act V, he still demonstrates that same quick planning of the courses of action to follow as he had previously done in Act III,

> This then remains, that we divide our power.
> You, Son John, and my cousin Westmoreland
> Toward York shall bend with your dearest speed,

To meet Northumberland and the prelate Scroop,
. . . . . .
Myself and you, Son Harry, will toward Wales,
To fight with Glendower and the Earl of March. (V,v,34-37, 39-40)

Bolingbroke is also very resourceful. He does all that he can do at a given time. At the beginning of I Henry IV, he has already sent for Worcester, Hotspur, and the rest to answer for their attempts to turn Hal against him. At the end of his first serious conference with Hal, Bolingbroke makes mention of setting forth Westmoreland and his son John already in efforts to scotch the rebellion. In II Henry IV,IV,iv, hoping still to go on the crusade, Bolingbroke already has prepared the army and the navy. He has already chosen his regents to serve in his absence. He will be all ready to go when the last remnants of rebellion are crushed. Therefore, Bolingbroke cannot be said to be idle. He makes the most of the time at hand, in conformance with the Machiavellian precept that wise princes take care of the present as well as plan for the future.[30]

Bolingbroke has a good relationship with his subordinates. In Richard II, Northumberland comes in to report that he has carried out his orders to crush the rebellion. Bolingbroke greets him with "Welcome, my lord" (V,vi,4). When Northumberland has told the news, Bolingbroke thanks him as friend to friend. He thanks Fitzwater for his good work as one friend to another. Bolingbroke is able to share some of his feelings with his subordinates. For instance, he shares much of his worries about Hal to Westmoreland. Westmoreland seems to be one of his closest servants. Bolingbroke is polite though bordering on anger with Worcester. Yet, he gives him a polite phrase of dismissal.

You have good leave to leave us. When we need

Your use and counsel, we shall send for you. (I Henry IV,I,iii,20-21)

He again shows this politeness in I Henry IV,III. All that he asks them to do is to leave his son Hal and him alone. Yet, the way in which he says it is very revealing.

Lords, give us leave. The Prince of Wales and I

Must have some private conference. But be near at hand,

For we shall presently have need of you. (III,ii,1-4)

After he has conferred with Hal, Blunt enters with news to report. Bolingbroke says, "How now, good Blunt? Thy looks are full of speed" (162). In II Henry IV, he calls his servants "dear lords" (III,i,108). In II Henry IV,IV, he calls his servants, "my gentle friends" (v,1). Wise princes are supposed to take care that they do not offend those who work closely with them. Bolingbroke honors his subordinates. It seems that he has chosen wisely. All of his advisors seem to be interested in the state and in service to their prince rather than in themselves. This is the main criterion for the ministers of the Machiavellian prince.[31]

Bolingbroke is an example of the practical man of action. He reflects, he plans, and he acts. Does Bolingbroke represent a new political order, or is he merely a usurper within the divine-right frame? The world of Richard II is a cracked divine-right frame. The world of Bolingbroke is practical Machiavellianism, but it is torn by frequent rebellion, not to mention the inner unrest of Bolingbroke's conscience. Yet, there is no widespread discontent outside the ranks of the barons as there was under Richard. Hence, there is far more order in the world of Bolingbroke, a world which is not supposed to represent a rigid natural

order. Tillyard says that the world of the Henry IV plays is the world of Shakespeare's England.[32] It has been said that Richard II shows the first stage of most revolutions, rebellion in the nobility.[33] In the Henry IV plays, the rebellion has spread to the lower classes, the second or third stage of a revolution depending upon whether the society has two or three social structures. However, this rebellion is a moral or social standard of rebellion, in contrast to the political rebellion in the nobility.

In the Henry IV plays, there is rebellion among the nobility from the beginning to almost the end of Bolingbroke's reign. The Percys refuse to hand over their prisoners as the king had commanded. Then there is the Percy rebellion. This constitutes the major political action in I Henry IV. In II Henry IV, there is a rebellion among the Catholic clergy and the nobles, Hastings, Mowbray, and Bardolph. There are also remnants of the Percy rebellion. Then, as soon as the battles stop, Bolingbroke becomes ill. The unrest of the nation becomes mirrored by the unrest of his conscience over his past life and by his son's behavior. He never had time for peace. Campbell says that in the Henry IV plays, the political theme is the rise and fall of a conspiracy, and the constant efforts to maintain the order that had been established.[34] Order is maintained despite constant unrest. The order portrayed from Richard II to the Henry IV plays is a change from the rule of tradition to the rule by might and by efficient men.[35] It is the change from the strictly divine-right frame to the practical frame of Machiavellianism.

The change in the political order is mirrored somewhat by the Falstaff scenes. Dorius says that Falstaff is the culmination of the fatness

of corruption beginning in Richard II. The Lancastrians did not like "fatness" in matters of state. They likened "fatness" to the excesses and the sickness, lack of prudence, lack of economy, in short, all of the bad memories under Richard II.[37] In contrast, the Lancastrians believed in prudence, moderation, and economy in affairs of state. They used the figure of "leanness" to illustrate their gardens.[38] This corruption, which Falstaff culminates, begins with the images of the fat garden and the sick body politic in Richard II. Falstaff is the sickness of the state,[39] another indication that things go from bad to worse from the last of the Plantagenets to the first of the Lancastrians. Also, Falstaff's mockeries represent the lowered moral standards, a result of the broken divine order. Falstaff mocks the passing medieval world. He mocks the office of the king, the representative of justice.[40] Then, he mocks duty, courage, death, glory of the conqueror, soldiers, and leadership. The corruption personified by Falstaff represents how the usurpation by the Lancastrians has confused right. There are not the same absolute standards as there were before the usurpation. Falstaff also can be said to mock the knightly tradition because he is a knight, but he certainly does not believe in the ideals of medieval knighthood. He even mocks the ceremony of the accolade. The exalted tradition of knighthood is now a big laugh. Referring to himself as a good man, he makes a hard, rough, slap at manhood.

> If manhood, good manhood, be not forgot upon the face of the earth, then am I a shotten herring. There live not three good men unhanged in England, and one of them is fat and grows old. . . .
>
> (I Henry IV,II,iv,141-145)

He also mocks heroism by talking about the robbery in which he has just participated as if it were a heroic exploit.[41] He mocks the office of the king and of royalty in general by pretending to be the king rebuking his son. Then, he pretends to be the Prince. There also seems to be a possible laughing reference to the usurpation of Bolingbroke when Falstaff is in the process of changing to play Hal.

> Depose me? If thou dost it half so gravely, so majestically, both in word and matter, hang me up by the heels for a rabbit-sucker or a poulter's hare. (I Henry IV,II,iv,478-481)

At the Battle of Shrewsbury, he mocks honor and the vanity of it.

> Honor pricks me on. Yea, but how if honor prick me off when I come on? How then? Can honor set to a leg? No. Or an arm? No. Or take away the grief of a wound? No. Honor hath no skill in surgery, then? No. What is honor? A word. What is in that word honor? What is that honor? Air. A trim reckoning! Who hath it? He that died o'Wednesday. Doth he feel it? No. Doth he hear it? No. 'Tis insensible, then? Yea, to the dead. But will it not live with the living? No. Why? Detraction will not suffer it. Therefore I'll none of it. Honor is a mere scutcheon. (I Henry IV,V,i,131-143)

He also mocks death.

> To die is to be a counterfeit, for he is but the counterfeit of a man who hath not the life of a man. But to counterfeit dying when a man thereby liveth is to be no counterfeit, but the true and perfect image of life indeed. The better part of valor is discretion, in which better part I have saved my life. (I Henry IV,V,iv,116-121)

He also mocks the "honor and glory" of war by his playful actions. He believes that honor, glory, valor, are all farces. He seems to mock the nobility in general when he says, "If I do grow great, I'll grow less; for I'll purge, and leave sack, and live cleanly as a nobleman should do" (I Henry IV,V,iv,167-169). He mocks soldiership. A lie in the throat was the worst kind of a lie, and the one accused of it could only be answered by a challenge to mortal combat. Yet, Falstaff treats this "lie" casually and flippantly. He does not answer the challenge as a true knight should. He also mocks courtly manners.

> You call honorable boldness impudent sauciness.
>
> If a man will make courtesy and say nothing, he is virtuous.
>
> (II Henry IV,II,i,134-136)

He also mocks the office of the justices. He mocks what most people call truth. What most people call truth is really a lie. Falstaff, who takes nothing seriously,[42] symbolizes the fact that nothing can be taken seriously because the divine order has been broken, and right has been confused.

In II Henry IV, there are more Falstaff scenes than in I Henry IV. The increase can indicate more corruption as a result of the broken order. Corruption, which began under Richard II, has still not been checked. Order has not been restored because there is not a rightful king as the controlling nucleus of the cell-state: the reigning king has no hereditary right to the throne. Way is paved for somewhat of a restoration to order--way for Prince Hal, eventually King Henry V. Hal checks this "fatness," this corruption symbolized by Falstaff, before it is too late, by

banishing him when he is clearly in control of things. Hal crushes this rebellion as his father had crushed the literal rebellion. These two examples are a clear contrast to Richard's actions, or lack of action; Richard let fatness and corruption grow until it got out of hand and swallowed him up.

CHAPTER IV

THE IDEAL PRINCE--HAL

The world of Richard II shows the breakdown of the divine-right frame, paving the way for practical Machiavellianism. The world of the Henry IV plays is a world having the remnants of the divine-right frame with a Machiavellian picture. Then, the world of Henry V is somewhat a balance between divine right and practical Machiavellianism. It is to a certain extent a restoration to order. The best evidence of restoration is the character of Hal himself. He personifies many things. Hal has the eloquence, elegance, and ceremony of Richard II, not to mention his hereditary right; then, he has the piety and political know-how of his father, Henry IV. The reign of Henry V is not one racked by internal rebellion, as the reign of Henry IV had been. Rather, the reign of Henry V is one of internal peace, prosperity, and glory for all England. [1]

The world of Henry V, despite the consummate Machiavellianism of its leader, is still a world having the remnants of divine right. For instance, the Archbishop of Canterbury says to Hal, who is now King Henry V: "God and His angels guard your sacred throne" (I,ii,7). When Hal unmasks the conspiracy before his departure to France, he considers himself God's substitute. There is a reference to the role of the king as God's avenger.

. . . . . .

though they can outstrip men,

they have no wings to fly

from God. War is His beadle,

war is His vengeance. (IV,i,175-179)

There is also a reference to the anointing with holy oil (IV,ii,276), calling to mind the consecration or the sacral character of the king, an aspect of divine right. Hal also uses the sun-king image in a few instances. He threatens the French king in sun imagery.

But I will rise there with so full a glory
That I will dazzle all the eyes of France--
Yea, strike the Dauphin blind to look on us. (I,ii,278-280)

Later when cheering his dispirited soldiers before the Battle of Agincourt, the sun-like qualities of generating fresh life and vigor are assigned to him.

That every wretch, pining and pale before,
Beholding him, plucks comfort from his looks.
A largess universal like the sun
His liberal eye doth give to every one,
Thawing cold fear, that mean and gentle all
Behold, as may unworthiness define,
A little touch of Harry in the night. (IV,Prologue,41-47)

At the end of the play, Hal is called "star of England," an example of sun-king imagery (Epilogue, 6).

Primarily, Hal is the practical man of action, the Machiavellian, like his father. Hal has an advantage over his father in that he has a hereditary right to the throne. Yet, he does not stop with this awareness. Very unlike Richard II, he has taken many steps beforehand to maintain this hereditary right. He is under no illusion regarding the means of how the Lancastrians came to the throne. First, he must have

the support of the people, support gained by pretending to be friends with Falstaff and all of his ruffians.

I know you all, and will a while uphold
The unyoked humor 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 wondered at
By breaking through the foul and ugly mists
Of vapors that did seem to strangle him.
If all the year were playing holidays,
To sport would be as tedious as to work.
But when they seldom come, they wished-for come,
And nothing pleaseth but rare accidents.
So, when this loose behavior I throw off
And pay the debt I never promised,
By how much better than my word I am,
By so much shall I falsify men's hopes.
And like bright metal on a sullen ground,
My reformation, glittering over 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. (I Henry IV,I,ii,218-240)

This passage has been interpreted two major ways. It has been said by some that teen-age Hal really wants to associate with Falstaff and his company, but because he is Prince of Wales, he must have a good reason for befriending commoners.[2] Teen-age Hal can also be deceived by his true motives for associating with Falstaff. But the usual interpretation is that Hal means exactly what he says and that he knows exactly what he is doing all of the time.[3] He studies these ruffians like a language so that when he becomes king, he will know how to rule them. One of Bolingbroke's subordinates, Warwick, testifies to this idea:

> The Prince but studies his companions
> Like a strange tongue, wherein, to gain the language,
> 'Tis needful that the most immodest word
> Be looked upon and learned, which once attained,
> . . . comes to no further use
> But to be known and hated. . . .
> The Prince will in the perfectness of time
> Cast off his followers, and their memory
> Shall as a pattern or a measure live,
> By which His Grace must mete the lives of others,
> Turning past evils to advantages. (II Henry IV,IV,iv,68-77)

This interpretation seems to support his following words and actions. He laughs and jests with these companions as he pleases. Then, when he wishes to be the upright, true young prince, he can become so as quickly as one can change masks. For instance, shortly after word of Falstaff's robbery reaches the sheriff, the sheriff comes to the tavern to arrest him. Prince Hal covers for him. Falstaff has been around as plain as

day; yet when the sheriff comes, Hal tells Falstaff to hide while he in "true face and good conscience" (II,iv,550) lies to the sheriff about his whereabouts. Hal has been frolicking along; then, he immediately puts on the mask of "true face and good conscience." With the official language of a prince, Hal lies to the sheriff.

> The man, I do assure you, is not here,
> For I myself at this time have employed him.
> And, sheriff, I will engage my word to thee
> That I will, by tomorrow dinnertime,
> Send him to answer thee, or any man,
> For anything he shall be charged withal. (I Henry IV,II,iv,561-566)

Then, as soon as the sheriff leaves, he removes his official mask and replaces it once more with his "playful" mask. To his father, he plays the weak, tempted, but penitent son after his rebuke which he knew that he was going to receive, as he and Falstaff had already pretended together in sport. He does not tell his father of his purpose for his association as he has already soliloquized to the audience. He pretends that he cannot help himself. Then, after this conference, he returns to the tavern with the ruffians. He also knows how to play the honorable knight when it is necessary. Hal, following all the rules of "chivalrous design of knightly trial," challenges Hotspur to mortal combat. Vernon, one of the tools of the enemy, supports this idea. Hal knows Hotspur and his plans. He said earlier in the scene with his father that he has used Hotspur, not, as Hotspur thought, Hotspur using him. He had wanted Hotspur to think that he was a waster so that he could meet him and defeat him on that account, thereby winning a new reputation, a reputation worthy of a prince (I Henry

IV,III,iii,146-148). Then, after the large part of the Percy rebellion is crushed, he resumes his "playful" mask among the ruffians. This seems to be the last mask that he wears before he becomes king.

By playing these parts, Hal seems to use the reverse means of his father to gain popular approval. While Bolingbroke received his popularity from his upstanding conduct as a youth, Hal irritates the respectable by playing the role of the ruffian until it is time for him to become king. Then, he will suddenly change before everyone's very eyes and show his true self, which will be the pious, yet the practical, self-controlled Henry V. To use modern terms, Hal appears to have been using some kind of a surprise element in his climb for popular approval. His own words in his first soliloquy suggest the plan. It is as though he says, "As long as I am the Prince, I will not let the people know my true self. I will let them believe that I am a filthy, drunken ruffian. Then, when I become king, I shall immediately break with my past life and be my real self. This action will so surprise the people that they will believe a miracle has taken place, and they will never cease to support me." (The Archbishop later confirms this "miracle" in Henry V,I,i,24-37) Hal follows through with his purposes, which he has planned since the beginning. Shortly, after his coronation, he banishes Falstaff and all of his former companions, using these official words:

> Presume not that I am the thing I was,
> For God doth know, so shall the world perceive,
> That I have turned away from my former self,
> So will I those that kept me company. (II Henry IV,V,v,60-63)

The second line again seems to indicate that he will surprise everyone by his behavior. For him this sudden radical change in his behavior would mean continual popular support.

Things seem to have worked out just as Hal has planned from the beginning. At the beginning of his reign, he has the support of Prince John of Lancaster, Prince Humphrey of Gloucester, Thomas, Duke of Clarence, and the Chief Justice. He also has the respect of the Church. The Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Ely marvel at his change. He is called "a true lover of the Holy Church" (Henry V,I,i,23). Yet, the Archbishop continues to say that no one would ever have believed that he would have turned out to be so good a king. Hal has also gained the respect of the entire Court. There are some indications of support among the commons: Corporal Nym says, "The King is a good King. But it must be as it may" (Henry V,II,i,131). There is only one attempted conspiracy, and it is crushed before the conspirators are able to take up arms. His reign is relatively peaceful. Hal also has the support of the soldiers. He stirs them on to fantastic victories over the French. Therefore, Hal has everything going for him right from the start.

As it has been said about Bolingbroke, it can also be said about Hal that he has all of the qualities of the Machiavellian prince. Like his father, Hal seems to be very religious. He shows that he has an "if the Lord wills" attitude by his words:

> Our coronation done, we will accite,
> As I before remembered, all our state.
> And, God consigning to my good intents.[4] (II Henry IV,V,ii,141-143)

The Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Ely testify to Hal's devout

behavior; "A true lover of the Church" the minute he became king,

Consideration like an angel came

And whipped the offending Adam out of him,

Leaving his body as a paradise

To envelop and contain celestial spirits. (Henry V,I,i,28-31)

In the same discussion, the Archbishop says that Hal knows theology like a bishop. Hal charges the Archbishop in the Name of God to beware of false use of his holy office. He says that he wants a claim to the French throne only if the Church says that there is a legitimate claim. He charges the Archbishop:

For we will hear, note, and believe in heart

That what you speak is in your conscience washed

As pure as sin with baptism. (Henry V,I,ii,30-32)

After the Archbishop has given the detailed discussion of this claim, Hal asks, "May I with right and conscience make this claim?" (Henry V,I,ii, 96). He says that with God's help and the nobles' he will either persuade France to submit to English rule or he will force her to submit (Henry V,I,ii,222-223). He says to the French ambassadors:

We are no tyrant, but a Christian king,

Unto whose grace our passion is as subject

As are our wretches fettered in our prisons. (Henry V,I,ii,241-243)

In the same context, Hal says that he goes to France according to the will of God. Hal is called "the mirror of all Christian kings" (Henry V, II,Prologue,6). Upon dealing with the conspirators, he twice says that he prays that God will forgive them of their sins against His substitute. He believes that God has delivered those conspirators into his hands.

Then, before departure to France, he commends his soldiers into the hands of God (Henry V,II,ii,189-190). He prays that God fill his soldiers with the military spirit (IV,i,306), and on march, Hal prays that the best man shall win.

> And how Thou pleasest, God, dispose the day! (IV,iii,132)

He says that the victory will be God's if they win it (IV,vii,90). True to his word, he has two religious hymns sung after Agincourt thanking God for granting them the victory (IV,viii,128). Hal never says anything against religious devotion or against the Church. Machiavelli says that wise princes should, at least, appear to be pious.[5] It is better yet if they really are, but it is absolutely essential that they appear to be so. Hal certainly appears to be pious.

Like Bolingbroke, Hal reveals a sensitive conscience regarding his father's usurpation and Richard's death. While waiting for Gloucester alone, he prays to God, entreating Him not to punish the Lancastrians by allowing them to lose the upcoming battle. He reveals genuine sorrow for all that has happened, and he has attempted acts of penance:

> Not today, O Lord,
> Oh, not today, think not upon the fault
> My father made in compassing the crown!
> I Richard's body have interred new,
> And on it have bestowed more contrite tears
> Than from it issued forced drops of blood.
> Five hundred poor I have in yearly pay,
> Who twice a day their withered hands hold up
> Toward Heaven, to pardon blood, and I have built
> Two chantries where the sad and solemn priests

Sing still for Richard's soul. More will I do,

Though all that I can do is nothing worth,

Since that my penitence comes after all,

Imploring pardon. (Henry V,IV,i,309-322)

Hal seems to be humble. As Prince of Wales, for instance, the fact that he would be willing to identify and freely associate with commoners such as Falstaff certainly seems to indicate that he does not believe his actions to be beneath his dignity, even though he does have a reason for his association. He does not think it out of place for the Prince of Wales to take Falstaff to battle to put down a key rebellion. Twice he seems to willingly give credit to Hotspur. Vernon recounts Hals's very noble challenge to Hotspur.

He gave you all the duties of a man,

Trimmed up your praises with a princely tongue,

Spoke your deservings like a chronicle,

Making you ever better than his praise

By still dispraising praise valued with you. (I Henry IV,V,ii,56-60)

In his speech over his corpse, Hal calls Hotspur, "brave Percy."

This earth that bears thee dead,

Bears not alive so stout a gentleman.

. . . . . .

But let my favors hide thy mangled face,

And, in even in thy behalf, I'll thank myself

For doing these fair rites of tenderness.

Adieu, and take thy praise with thee to Heaven!

Thy ignominy sleep with thee in the grave,

But, not remembered in thy epitaph! (I Henry IV,V,iv,92-93; 96-101)

Later, when Hal first becomes king, he humbly entreats his brothers to give him moral support, not only as their king, but as their brother as well.

Why then, be sad,
But entertain no more of it, good Brothers,
Than a joint burden laid upon us all.
For me, by Heaven, I bid you be assured
I'll be your father and your brother too.
Let me but bear your love, I'll bear your cares.
Yet weep that Harry's dead, and so will I,
But Harry lives, that shall convert those tears
By number into hours of happiness. (II Henry IV,V,ii,55-61)

He says that he humbles his former self before the Justice who once sent him to prison.

The unstained sword that you have used to bear--
With this remembrance, that you use the same
With the like bold, just, and impartial spirit
As you have done 'gainst me. There is my hand.
You shall be as a father to my youth.
My voice shall sound as you do prompt mine ear,
And I will stoop and humble my intents
To your well-practiced wise directions. (II Henry IV,V,ii,115-121)

In France he identifies with his soldiers by calling himself a soldier. He shows himself as the concerned general over all of his soldiers; yet, he disguises himself and mingles with the common soldiers.

These gestures are a type of humility. He gives all the glory of the English victories to God. When the victory is known in England, the nobles wish for him to carry his bruised helmet and his bent sword before him through the city. But Hal will not have any part of this; he says that he deserves no credit for the victory. Instead, he gives the pile of arms of the defeated, the sign, and the display all to God. Therefore, Hal certainly does seem humble, as Machiavelli says that good rulers should be. Hal really might be so, but since, saving a few instances, he speaks in public, it is hard to determine. Machiavelli says if princes are humble--so much the better, but it is absolutely necessary to give the appearance of humility.

Hal furthermore displays courage. He is much more the courageous soldier than his father. When he is Prince of Wales, he challenges Hotspur to mortal combat and wins. His father has given him command over a large part of the royal forces in crushing the Percy rebellion. He obviously fights well. Later as king, he certainly displays courage and determination when he receives the gift of tennis balls from France. This gift is considered an insult, and he replies accordingly.

> When we have matched our rackets to these balls,
> We will in France, by God's grace, play a set
> Shall strike his father's crown into the hazard.
> Tell him he hath made a match with such a wrangler
> That all the courts of France will be disturbed
> With chaces. . . .
> But this lies all within the will of God,
> To Whom I do appeal, and in Whose name

Tell you the Dauphin I am coming on,

To venge me as I may and to put forth

My rightful hand in a well-hallowed cause. (I,ii,261-266, 289-293)

He angrily promises to meet the French in battle. Unmasking the conspiracy before his departure for France gives him the courage and confidence to say that he feels the outcome will be favorable to the English in the war in France. The French forces are superior in numbers to the English forces, but he shows no fear. He has courage because he believes that God is with him. After he has delivered his message to the French king through Montjoy, he says:

We are in God's hand, Brother, not in theirs.

March to the bridge, it now draws toward night.

Beyond the river we'll encamp ourselves,

And on tomorrow bid them march away. (Henry V,III,vi,178-181)

When the English have made a good showing for themselves, Hal knows that their work is not all done; therefore, setting an example of courageous determination, he encourages his soldiers to keep up the good work until the job is completely done.

Well have we done, thrice valiant countrymen.

But all's not done. Yet keep the French the field. (Henry V,IV,vi,1-2)

Hal certainly does display courage.

Another aspect of his courageous behavior is his almost religious patriotism. This trait is especially seen in his battle speech before Harfleur.

Hold hard the breath, and bend up every spirit

To his full height. 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.
Dishonor not your mothers. Now attest
That those whom you called fathers did beget you.
Be copy now to men of grosser blood,
And teach them how to war. And you, good yeomen,
Whose limbs were made in England, show us here
The mettle of your pasture.

. . . . . .

For there is none of you so mean and base
That hath not noble luster 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,16-27, 29-34).

Hal continues his English chauvinism by drawing strong contrasts between English legs and French legs. He says that one pair of English legs can easily outmarch three pairs of French legs. (III,vi,158-159). He says that the gentlemen in England at that moment will wish that they had fought with him on St. Crispian's Day; they will thereafter hold their manhood cheap (Henry V,IV,iii,64). He brags about the "abounding valor" of the English to one of the messengers of the French king (IV,iii,104). By his continual appeal to their English nationalism, Hal is able to fill

his soldiers with the courage of steel. Of course, from the start, Hal has the approval of the Church to engage in this war; therefore, he believes that it is God's will that he rule France, by persuasion or by force.

Hal consistently displays a solid strength of character. As Prince of Wales, he shows this strength by his companionship with Falstaff. From his early teen-age years until he becomes king, he continues to associate with these ruffians. Yet, he never becomes exactly as they are. He lets the audience know that he knows exactly what he is doing. He is an excellent adapter throughout his young life. He can talk, laugh, and jest with Falstaff and his companions as if he were one of them. Then, he can with "true face and good conscience" speak officially to the justice. When he speaks with his father, the king, he can convince him that he does not disgrace his royal birth. Then, he shows Hotspur that he is as much a knight as he is, both by his words and by his deeds. As long as he is the Prince, he continues to live a double life, both as the companion of the ruffians and as the chivalrous, honorable knight. For political reasons, he flits in and flits out of his roles very cooly as it suits him; he never gets the roles confused. Each "party" for whom he "works" believes that he is genuinely for them whenever he wishes for them to think so. Hal is an individual who acts according to his present political needs rather than according to some definite concept. Yet, he does have a schedule made out for himself. For instance, Hal wants his father and the courtly circle to believe that he has been led astray by "loose company." This seeming weakness is shown by his participation in the robbery, his protection of Falstaff from the law, his continued stay in

the taverns, and his continual association with Falstaff.[6] It is noteworthy that he only speaks openly of his plans to live a double life one time until he banishes his former companions. He has remained true to his purposes over a span of several years. This is his marvelous self-control, his strength of character.

He continues this same inner strength when he becomes king. As king, he no longer lives a double life, but he continues to be calm and cool-headed under all circumstances as wise princes are instructed to be. This cool head he displays from start to finish. When he first becomes king, he inwardly grieves for the death of his father. Yet, as king, he must put aside his personal feelings and comfort and encourage the Court and the people that life must continue. He must hold his head up high, no matter what he feels inside. After the coronation, his first lines to his brothers indicate his efforts to support his own spirits and to encourage the people at the same time.

This new and gorgeous garment, majesty,
Sits not so easy on me as you think.

. . . . . .

Why then, be sad,
But entertain no more of it, good Brothers,
Than a joint burden laid upon us all.
For me, by Heaven, I bid you be assured
I'll be your father and your brother too.
Let me but bear your love, I'll bear your cares.
Yet weep that Harry's dead, and so will I,
But Harry lives, that shall convert those tears

By number into hours of happiness. (II Henry IV,V,ii,44-45,53-61) Then, the young king officially encourages the Justice, who had previously jailed him as Prince of Wales, to uphold law and order in the land. Then, he makes a public declaration of his reformation and officially summons his first Parliament. These are his first official acts as the new king. Then, he cooly and officially banishes Falstaff and all of his companions. To paraphrase his own words: the coronation is done; now he must get to work. When he receives the gift of tennis balls from the French king, he very calmly but firmly answers this insult with a challenge to battle. One of his subordinates says that his answer was a merry message, thereby indicating a rather calm, controlled reply (I,ii, 298). When he is faced with a dangerous conspiracy right before his departure to France, he very cleverly unmasks the plot by handing the conspirators the letters describing their plans. Seeing the letters naturally causes the conspirators to change color from embarrassment. When Hal asks why they have changed color, they confess their fault. After delivering two orations on the sinfulness of their treason, he sends them to their execution. Throughout the whole scene, his manner seems almost playful as well as calm. Hal little by little gets to the point. Machiavelli says that princes are supposed to deliver very high-flown rhetorical speeches before sending capital offenders to their execution. He displays sternness but also sorrow over the incident. Then, after that business, Hal turns to the next order of business--the invasion of France. In battle, he cooly receives the negotiators. He also has a time when his spirits fail him momentarily. This happens when he ponders conscientiously over the heavy burdens and responsibilities of kings till one of his nobles

tells him that his soldiers need him. At once, he shakes himself and goes where he is needed (IV,i,304,325,326).

Hal displays much of the knowledge that is useful for the Machiavellian prince. The Archbishop catalogs the knowledge of Hal. He knows his religion; apparently, he knows the subtleties of theology since the Archbishop says that he can discuss "divinity" (I,i,38). He apparently knows his country and his people thoroughly well because the Archbishop says that he discusses affairs regarding the commonwealth, as if he had been doing so all of his life (I,i,41). All political matters are like toys to him. He solves them just as easily as Alexander the Great solved the Gordian knot (I,i,46). He apparently is an extraordinary speaker because the Archbishop says that the air, which is usually free, seems to stop and listen to him when he speaks. He says that Hal has learned by experience what he knows (I,i,51-52). His learning by experience is an indication of his practical nature, his Machiavellianism.

Hal certainly shows himself to have the expert knowledge of the art of war as all wise princes are supposed to have. The Archbishop says that he can stir men's hearts by his discussion of war in the same manner as music stirs the human heart (I,i,43-44). In practical manifestation of his knowledge of the art of war, he has a good army to defend the Scottish border when he leaves for France. Machiavelli says that good armies will protect borders. Princes should rely upon their own troops.[7] Several of Hal's soldiers are his kinsmen and his brothers. Therefore, they are definitely his men. He gives the order to make all preparations for war before going to France. Hence, the English are well prepared by the time of their arrival in France. It seems as though the English were always

prepared ahead of the French. Hal is in favor of the policy of thorough military victory. He wants his soldiers not only to win the battle but also to crush the army of the opposition. As a part of this policy, he gives the order that all of his men kill their prisoners. Machiavelli advises princes to have a few displays of harshness.[8] He threatens the French to come down from the field and fight or retreat or else they will have no mercy from the English. He fully intends to bring France to her knees, and he is taking no chances. It is also a credit to his abilities since his armies win the battle, in spite of the French numerical superiority. Hal shows that he knows how to organize and discipline an army by his planning, his persistence, and by his relationship with his soldiers. At the end of the day, he compliments his soldiers on their good work so far, but he tells them to continue until their work is all done.

It has been said that as Prince of Wales, Hal was an excellent adapter to all classes of people, both noble and common. As king, he illustrates this adaptability in several ways. The officers of the Church respect him very highly. They call him "a true lover of the Holy Church," and they are pleased with his reformation from the youthful, madcap Prince Hal to the pious, mature, responsible, conscientious King Henry V. Hal, in turn, says what would be necessary for the churchmen to hear. He asks for their advice regarding the invasion of France. He has respect for them. He charges them to carefully investigate the "rightness" of the invasion; he wants no false pretenses for a claim. This is what the officers of the Church would want him to say. He is on constant good terms with the Church. He is pious himself. Hal's respectful manner

shows how the wise prince will behave with the religious element in his kingdom.

His relationship with his subordinates is one of honor and royal courtesy, as it is supposed to be. He gives orders full of courtesy and politeness. He tells his Uncle Exeter to send for the Archbishop in this manner by addressing him as "good Uncle" (I,ii,3). He calls his kinsman Westmoreland "my cousin" (I,ii,4). He seems to have a playful way about doing official business. He is completely confident, completely at ease. His playfulness seems somewhat similar to his ease with his old companions. Exeter says that his answer to the French king was a merry one. Also, Hal listens calmly and patiently to advice. He comments little, reflects, and decides. Princes should give their ministers the idea that the more freely each speaks the more acceptable he will be. Hal seems to give some indication of this to the Archbishop when he charges him to be certain and speak the truth and nothing but the truth with regard to his claim to the French throne. He wants no false pretenses. Then, he sits back and listens, letting the Archbishop say just about what he pleases. Hal appears to have chosen well. None of his advisers are self-seekers. Unselfishness is the chief requirement for the minister to the Machiavellian prince. Machiavelli says that ministers will serve princes that cannot be deceived. There seems to be no way that Hal could ever be deceived under any circumstances. Finally, princes are supposed to show that they trust their subordinates by delegating responsibilities. Hal has a great deal of trust in his subordinates because he lets five go with the French king to arrange the peace agreement, which he gives them permission to "augment or alter, as your wisdoms best shall see advantageable for our dignity" (V,ii,83-88).

Hal also identifies with his soldiers. To them he is the skilled, courageous, but courteous general. When first landing in France, he calls his soldiers, "dear friends" (III,i,1). As it has already been said, Hal lets it be known that he is a soldier, and he has already made an excellent showing of his military prowess as Prince of Wales. He is concerned for their welfare. They are beginning to suffer illnesses; so, he gives the order that they rest for a while before they fight at Harfleur the following day (III,iii,55-57). He calls Erpingham "my good knight" (IV, i,29). He teases Sir Thomas about sleeping comfortably in England, in contrast to the hardships in France. On one occasion, he calls York "brave York" with a gesture of encouragement (IV,iii,131). Then, near the end of Agincourt, he compliments the soldiers with the words "thrice valiant countrymen" (IV,vi,1). He calls Warwick "good cousin Warwick" (IV,vii,183). Hal is probably the most open, as opposed to official, in his behavior and his speech, in his relationships with his soldiers.

Hal is strict, yet merciful, with his enemies whether they are conspirators or foreign enemies. The conspiracy is ruthlessly, but cooly crushed. In addition, Hal wishes the conspirators well and forgives them before they are delivered to their execution. With his foreign enemies, his behavior is the most variable, but always calm and cool. For instance, he is angry when he has been insulted by the gift of tennis balls, but his anger is not obviously shown, judging by the "merry" nature of his speech. When he arrives in France, his attitude is firm and unrelenting when the French will not submit, but it is merciful when they do submit. On first arrival, Harfleur agrees to submit; therefore, Hal orders that the people be treated well. Yet, at the same time, he wants his men to fortify the

city strongly against the French (III,iii,53-54); Machiavellian princes are supposed to keep conquered cities well-fortified. Hal refuses any ransom. Near the end of Agincourt, he orders the French to fight or retreat, or else he will slaughter them like sheep. After the victory at Agincourt, Hal is ceremonially polite to the French king. His opening speech is very official:

> Peace to this meeting, wherefore we are met!
> Unto our brother France, and to our sister,
> Health and fair time of day. Joy and good wishes
> To our most fair and princely cousin Katharine.
> And, as a branch and member of this royalty
> By whom this great assembly is contrived,
> We do salute you, Duke of Burgundy.
> And, Princes French, and peers, health to you all! (V,ii,1-8)

Hal also shows himself a generous conqueror by not obtaining a tight hold on the French people. He wants the French throne, Princess Katharine, and tribute money. He seems to follow the Machiavellian concept of loose imperial rule of another country.

Hal displays some additional Machiavellian traits. The prince is not supposed to be too easily alarmed by his own fears.[9] Hal gives the impression that he is afraid of almost nothing because he is so calm and cool-headed in practically any situation. Wise princes are to rely upon themselves, not upon the will of others.[10] Hal relies on God, but he also relies on his own efforts, not those of other humans. In fact, as it has been noted by his strength of character, he relies on no human. Wise princes are to be the lion and the fox at the same time.[11] Hal is the

lion by his sternness. Yet, he is also the fox because he seems to have all the virtues. He certainly says nothing against the many aspects of goodness. Princes must strive to maintain a good reputation. They acquire good reputations by undertaking great enterprises, by setting noble examples in themselves. [12] Hal leads an army into France in God's Name. The English are victorious. Hal wins glory for himself in the battle, but even more when he gives the glory for victory to God. Hal apparently has no problem regarding his reputation because he is never criticized except by his enemies. Princes must be quiet and modest to satisfy the people. [13] Hal seems to be modest by his display of humility. Yet, princes must be militaristic and cruel to satisfy the soldiers. [14] Hal definitely has the military spirit. His few harsh acts, such as the order to kill all the French prisoners, can be considered cruel. Princes should use capital punishment sparingly, and they should be certain that there is just cause before administering it. [15] Hal definitely fulfills this admonition when he unmasks the conspiracy. Princes should be careful about alliances, especially alliances with stronger countries for the purpose of attacking another country. [16] Hal makes an alliance with Burgundy, a province in the land of France. Yet, Burgundy is nowhere near the strength of England. Hal is at no one's mercy as a result. Wise princes are supposed to avoid being at the mercy of someone else. [17] Princes are to take a stand on everything. Neutrality is not good. [18] There seems to be nothing about which Hal is undecided. He shows himself to be a very decisive individual. Princes should give striking examples of their interior administration, such as reward or punishment. [19] Hal certainly shows his efficiency, his ability to keep order, and his flexibility by his

clever unmasking of the conspiracy. Also, his reign is relatively peaceful.[20] Wise princes should plan for the future. Hal is obviously a planner because he is reported to be familiar with every detail of the machinery of state business. He shows that he has good timing by his order to postpone the audience with the French ambassadors until he has talked with the Archbishop. Then, he will be good and resolved when he meets them. Furthermore, he already had his army well-prepared before arriving at the place of battle. But, he also takes care of the present as wise princes are supposed to do.

Wise princes should live by truth and integrity if they can, if they do not endanger the state in the process. If they must be deceitful to suit their own interests, they should be so.[21] Hal is clever in that he does not so much tell things that are not true as he fails to tell the whole truth. He is very noncommittal, and he loves to play with words. One time with his soldiers, he feels it necessary to test them. In disguise, he does not tell who he is, but he does not really lie. He says that his name is Harry Le Roy. He deliberately mispronounces the French, "le roi." Another time in disguise, he identifies himself as "a friend." He also says that he serves under Sir Thomas Erpingham. In this instance, he does stretch the truth a little (IV,i,94-96). Yet, these deceptions suit his own interests. Therefore, he is justified, according to Machiavelli.

In all of his loyalties and duties, Hal shows himself to be always the king. He always displays royal dignity and strength of character as wise princes are supposed to do.[22] He is always cool-headed. He has been called the personification of official majesty.[23] He does not express

much personal feeling until Act IV. He is all business, but he seems to enjoy every minute of it. In public, he speaks eloquently and officially as he is supposed to do. He is supposed to be the ideal Machiavellian, or practical leader. He knows all types of people, and he knows how to bring out the best in them.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The two basic political concepts during the English Renaissance were the divine right of kings and practical Machiavellianism. The divine-right concept was a theory that grew out of the general Elizabethan interpretation of cosmic order. The divine-right theory refers to the belief that kings ruled by God's direct appointment. In full development, the divine-right theory had three major points: the monarchial principle, (the belief that monarchy is the only true form of government), the belief in an individual monarch's particular right to govern, and the irresponsibility of the king to anyone but God.) Machiavellianism refers to the qualities and duties of the prince who rules as a result of political power as outlined in Machiavelli's The Prince. Machiavelli says that the prince of a country is chief commander of the armed forces, chief priest, chief of government, chief executive, chief of ceremonies, and chief politician.

Both theories are reflected in the second tetralogy. (Richard II reflects the divine-right theory in five ways: King Richard's speeches regarding his divine right, the other characters' belief in his divine right, the use of the sun-king image, the doctrine of rebellion, and the general political order. The political order of Richard II is still the world of the medieval and the ceremonial, a world whose chief characters are members of an intact nobility. It is a world which desires order at any

price and which disapproves of any kind of rebellion or of the slightest relaxation of this order. Richard II himself is certainly the best representative Shakespeare ever created of a king who believes in and operates on the principle of divine right.)

All four plays in the tetralogy reflect practical Machiavellianism. Bolingbroke and Hal are the spokesmen for Machiavellian politics. Bolingbroke is the example of the Machiavellian character of the prince. As Machiavelli instructs, Bolingbroke seems to be devout, humble, morally upright, merciful, yet firm against the appearance of rebellion. He may even be these things sincerely to a certain extent, but more to the point of political practice, Bolingbroke seems to be all these things.

Hal portrays the Machiavellian prince in almost every way--qualities, methods, behavior, duties, and relationships. Hal demonstrates all the traits of his father; in addition, he displays the traits of courage, military prowess, solid strength of character, playful cool-headedness, and a touch of deviousness. Hal knows how to adapt to all types of people, and he knows how to bring out the best in them. He is the epitome of the practical man of action. Furthermore, Hal had some legitimate claim to the throne since Mortimer had proved to be a traitor to England. Hal, therefore, continues his consummate Machiavellian politics with the divine right to the crown.

The findings of this study indicate that the divine-right concept of Richard II broke down because he simply did not have the physical power to fend off the powerful noblemen he offended. The Machiavellian rule of Henry IV was plagued with rebellion because he lacked the divine right

and had to defend his crown with raw power. However, the rule of Henry V was peaceful and calm because he used the best traits of both systems.

This study has shown further that the major Elizabethan political concepts are reflections of the second tetralogy, not necessarily of Shakespeare himself as many critics have tried to show. There have been many studies of Shakespeare's eight history plays viewed as one unit. This view has given rise to many ideas about Shakespeare the ardent divine rightist and Shakespeare the ardent supporter of the Tudor monarchy by means of the Tudor myth, whose outlines some critics have seen in these history plays. Several studies have been done viewing the second tetralogy as a separate unit from the first. This view has given rise to the ideas of Shakespeare the rebel, Shakespeare the political news commentator, and Shakespeare the tutor for princes. Far more study has been done on the second tetralogy than on the first because the second is generally considered the superior work of art.

Studies have been done on the Machiavellianism of Bolingbroke and Hal, but for the most part these studies have not demonstrated a clear understanding of the Machiavellian prince. More studies on the true nature of the divine-right concept as opposed to Richard's divine-right concept need to be done. Another look needs to be taken at his character; he seems to have had far more sympathy in critical circles than he deserves. What would really be helpful, if it could be done, is to study the differences, if any, between Shakespeare and the Elizabethan historians and between his literary contemporaries who also wrote concerning political issues of their time. This type of study might help further to manifest what Shakespeare himself had to say if any significant

variations from his contemporaries could be identified. It would also be a helpful addition to Shakespeare scholarship in general if one could do a study on how Shakespeare's tragic characters developed originally from his portrayal of various historical characters. Such an idea would be next to impossible to prove, but it might provide some new insights.

END NOTES

Chapter I

[1] William Butler Yeats, "Richard II and Henry V, "Discussions of Shakespeare's Histories, edited by R. J. Dorius (Boston, 1964), p. 21.

[2] Sir Sidney Lee, "The Impersonal Aspect of Shakespeare's Art," Elizabethan and Other Essays, edited by Frederick S. Boss (Oxford, 1929), pp. 85-86.

[3] Lily B. Campbell, Shakespeare's "Histories": Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy (San Marino, California, 1958), p. 125.

[4] Barbara Lewis, "Shakespeare's Monarchial Views," unpublished master's thesis, Department of English, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, 1959, p. 17.

[5] Ibid., p. 89.

[6] Irving Ribner, "Shakespeare's History Plays Revisited," Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg, No. 8 (Mai-Juin 1965), p. 856.

[7] Lewis, p. 79.

[8] Harold C. Goddard, The Meaning of Shakespeare (Chicago, 1956), pp. 159-160.

[9] Irving Ribner, The English History Plays in the Age of Shakespeare (Princeton, 1957), p. 169.

10 John Palmer, Political Characters of Shakespeare (London, 1961), pp. 181-182.

11 Ribner, p. 169.

12 Lewis, p. 91-92.

13 E. M. W. Tillyard, Shakespeare's History Plays (London, 1964) pp. 10-11.

14 Ibid., p. 11.

15 Ibid., p. 11-13.

16 Ibid., paraphrase from pp. 11-15.

17 E. M. W. Tillyard, The Elizabethan World Picture (New York, 1944), pp. 101-103.

18 Ibid., p. 101.

19 Ibid., p. 103.

20 Ibid., p. 102.

21 A. P. Rossiter, "Ambivalence, the Dialectic of the Histories," Discussions of Shakespeare's Histories, edited by R. J. Dorius (Boston, 1964), p. 4.

22 Ibid., p. 5.

23 Ibid., p. 12.

[24] Rossiter, p. 12.

[25] Fritz Kern, Kingship and Law in the Middle Ages (Oxford, 1959), p. 5.

[26] Ibid., p. 81.

[27] Ibid., p. 135.

[28] R. J. Dorius, "Prudence and Excess in Richard II and the Histories," Discussions of Shakespeare's Histories, edited by R. J. Dorius (Boston, 1964), p. 25.

[29] Ibid., p. 24.

[30] Tillyard, p. 89.

[31] Dorius, p. 24.

[32] Rossiter, p. 5.

[33] Dorius, p. 31.

[34] Ibid., p. 25.

[35] Ibid., p. 28.

[36] Tillyard, p. 85.

[37] Ibid., p. 66.

[38] Ibid., p. 65.

[39] Ibid.

40 Ibid., p. 66.

41 Ibid.

42 John 19:11. (King James Version)

43 Tillyard, p. 11.

44 Ibid., p. 75.

45 Rossiter, p. 5.

46 Tillyard, p. 88.

47 Ibid., p. 29.

48 Ibid., paraphrase of pp. 29-32.

49 Tillyard, p. 62.

50 Ibid., p. 34.

51 Ibid., paraphrase of pp. 34-38.

52 Ibid., paraphrase of p. 44.

53 Ibid., p. 60.

54 Ibid., pp. 50-51.

55 Ibid., p. 62.

56 Campbell, p. 84.

57 Tillyard, p. 63.

58 Ibid.

59 Mario Praz, "Machiavelli and the Elizabethans," The Flaming Heart, edited by Mario Praz (New York, 1958), p. 130.

60 Campbell, p. 323.

61 A Treatise of Treasons against Queen Elizabeth, 1572.

62 Niccolo Machiavelli, The Prince, translated by Christian Detmold (New York, 1970), p. 40.

63 Ibid.

64 Ibid., paraphrase from pp. 40-42.

65 Ibid., p. 41.

66 Ibid., p. 18.

67 Ibid., p. 71.

68 Ibid., p. 66.

69 Ibid., p. 77.

70 Ibid., p. 78.

71 Ibid., p. 80.

72 Ibid., pp. 98-99.

73 Ibid., p. 80.

74 Ibid., p. 102.

75 Ibid., p. 79.

76 Ibid., pp. 71-72.

77 Ibid., pp. 72-73.

78 Ibid., p. 73.

79 Ibid., p. 78.

80 Ibid.

81 Ibid., p. 64.

82 Ibid., p. 83.

83 Ibid., p. 74.

84 Ibid., p. 102.

85 Ibid., p. 103.

86 Ibid.

87 Ibid., p. 105.

88 Ibid., p. 106.

89 Ibid., p. 105.

90 Ibid., p. 72.

91 Ibid., p. 102.

92 Ibid., p. 80.

93 Ibid., pp. 76-77.

94 Ibid., p. 42.

95 Ibid., p. 79.

96 Ibid., p. 44.

97 Ibid., p. 95.

98 Ibid., p. 114.

99 Ibid., p. 9.

100 Ibid., p. 67.

101 Ibid.

102 Tillyard, p. 21.

CHAPTER II

1 William Shakespeare, "Richard II," Shakespeare: The Complete Works, edited by G. B. Harrison (New York, 1948), I,i,195-205. This and all subsequent textual references to the works of Shakespeare are from this source, unless otherwise noted.

2 Campbell, pp. 194-196.

[3] Peter de la Primaudaye, The French Academie, translated by T. B. (London, 1586), p. 607.

[4] Caroline Spurgeon, Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us (Cambridge, 1968), p. 234.

[5] Tillyard, p. 254.

[6] Ibid., p. 252.

[7] Ibid., pp. 254-255.

[8] A. B. Steel, Richard II (Cambridge, 1941), p. 1.

[9] G. B. Harrison, "Introduction to Richard II," The Complete Works of Shakespeare, edited by G. B. Harrison (New York, 1948), p. 434.

[10] Tillyard, p. 32.

[11] Spurgeon, pp. 234-235.

CHAPTER III

[1] Irving Ribner, "Bolingbroke, a True Machiavellian," Modern Language Quarterly, IX (1948), 178.

[2] Spurgeon, p. 235.

[3] Tillyard, p. 260.

[4] Campbell, pp. 94-95.

5 Ibid.

6 Ribner, p. 179.

7 Tillyard, p. 260.

8 Machiavelli, p. 40.

9 Ibid.

10 Ribner, p. 180.

11 Machiavelli, pp. 40-42.

12 Ribner, p. 180.

13 Ibid.

14 Ibid., p. 183.

15 Palmer, p. 173.

16 Ibid.

17 Ribner, p. 180.

18 Ibid.

19 Ibid.

20 Acts 24:16. (King James Version)

21 Ribner, p. 180.

22 Ibid.

23 The italics are mine.

24 James 1:27. (King James Version)

25 Ribner, p. 180.

26 Machiavelli, p. 71.

27 Ibid., p. 104.

28 Ibid.

29 The italics are mine.

30 Machiavelli, p. 9.

31 Ibid.

32 Tillyard, p. 262.

33 Campbell, pp. 213-254.

34 Ibid., p. 254.

35 Tillyard, p. 262.

36 Dorius, p. 38.

37 Ibid., pp. 38-39.

38 Ibid., p. 35.

39 Dorius, p. 38.

40 Ibid., p. 39.

41 Dorius, p. 39.

42 Campbell, p. 244.

CHAPTER IV

1 E. E. Stoll, "Henry V," Discussions of Shakespeare's Histories, edited by R. J. Dorius (Boston, 1964), p. 125.

2 Palmer, p. 185.

3 Cleanth Brooks and Robert B. Heilman, "Dramatic Balance in Henry IV, Part I," Henry the Fourth, Part I, edited by James L. Sanderson (New York, 1962), p. 169.

4 The italics are mine.

5 Machiavelli, p. 78.

6 Eugene Wright, "Hal and Francis in King Henry IV, Part I: Another View" unpublished essay, Department of English, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, pp. 8-9.

7 Machiavelli, p. 59.

8 Ibid., p. 72.

9 Ibid.

10 Ibid., p. 75.

11 Ibid., p. 76.

12 Ibid., p. 98.

13 Ibid., p. 84.

14 Ibid.

15 Ibid., p. 73.

16 Ibid., p. 101.

17 Ibid.

18 Ibid., p. 99.

19 Ibid.

20 Ibid., p. 9.

21 Ibid., p. 76.

22 Ibid., p. 102.

23 Palmer, p. 247.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Campbell, Lily B., Shakespeare's "Histories": Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy, San Marino, California, the Huntington Library, 1958.

Castiglione, Baldassare, The Courtier, translated by Sir Thomas Hoby, n. p. The National Alumni, 1907.

De la Primaudaye, Peter, The French Academie, translated by T. B., London, 1586.

Ebisch, Walter, A Shakespeare Bibliography, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1931.

Elyot, Sir Thomas, The Boke Named the Governour, London, J. M. Dent & Co., n. d.

Figgis, John Neville, The Divine Right of Kings, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1922.

Goddard, Harold C., The Meaning of Shakespeare, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Kern, Fritz, Kingship and Law in the Middle Ages, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1959.

Machiavelli, Niccolo, The Prince, translated by Christian Detmold, New York, Washington Square Press, 1970.

Palmer, John, Political Characters of Shakespeare, London, Macmillan & Co., 1961.

Ribner, Irving, The English History Plays in the Age of Shakespeare, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1957.

Rogers, William Hudson, Shakespeare and English History, Totowa, New Jersey, Littlefield, Adams & Co., 1966.

Shakespeare, William, Shakespeare: the Complete Works, edited by G. B. Harrison, New York, Harcourt, Brace, & World, Inc., 1948.

Smith, Gordon Ross, A Classified Shakespeare Bibliography--1936-1958, University Park, Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania State University Press, 1963.

Spurgeon, Caroline F., Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us, Cambridge, University Press, 1968.

Steel, A. B., Richard II, Cambridge, 1941.

Tillyard, E. M. W., Shakespeare's History Plays, London, Chatto & Windus, 1964.

_____, The Elizabethan World Picture, New York, Vintage Books, 1944.

Articles

Brooks, Cleanth and Robert B. Heilman, "Dramatic Balance in Henry IV, Part I," Henry the Fourth, Part I, edited by James L. Sanderson, New York, W. W. Norton & Co., 1962, pp. 158-172.

Dorius, R. J., "Prudence & Excess in Richard II and the Histories," Discussions of Shakespeare's Histories, edited by R. J. Dorius, Boston, D. C. Heath & Company, 1964, pp. 24-40.

Lee, Sir Sidney, "The Impersonal Aspect of Shakespeare's Art," Elizabethan and Other Essays, edited by Frederick S. Boss, Oxford, 1929, pp. 85-115.

Praz, Mario, "Machiavelli and the Elizabethans," The Flaming Heart,

edited by Mario Praz, New York, Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1958, pp. 90-145.

Ribner, Irving, "Bolingbroke, a True Machiavellian," Modern Language Quarterly, IX (1948), 177-184.

Rossiter, A. P., "Ambivalence, the Dialectic of the Histories," Discussions of Shakespeare's Histories, edited by R. J. Dorius, Boston, D. C. Heath & Company, 1964, pp. 1-15.

Stoll, E. E., "Henry V," Discussions of Shakespeare's Histories, edited by R. J. Dorius, Boston, D. C. Heath & Company, 1964, pp. 123-134.

Yeats, William Butler, "Richard II and Henry V," Discussions of Shakespeare's Histories, edited by R. J. Dorius, Boston, D. C. Heath & Company, 1964, pp. 20-23.

Publications of Learned Organizations

Carnegie Series in English--No. 1, Lectures on Four of Shakespeare's History Plays, Pittsburgh, Carnegie Institute of Technology, 1953.

Ribner, Irving, "Shakespeare's History Plays Revisited," Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg, 43e année, No. 8, (Mai-Juin), 1965.

Public Documents

A Treatise of Treasons against Queen Elizabeth, 1572.

Unpublished Materials

Lewis, Barbara, "Shakespeare's Monarchial Views," unpublished master's thesis, Department of English, North Texas State University, Denton,

Texás, 1959.

Wright, Eugene, "Hal and Francis in King Henry IV, Part I: Another View," unpublished essay, Department of English, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, n. d.