National Library of Canada
Canadian Theses Service
Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Service des thèses canadiennes

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, tests publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30.

NL-339 (r. 88/04)

Canadä

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

The Mixture of Styles in *Henry V*

by

Anne Elizabeth Ross

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF Master of Arts

Department of English

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

Spring 1987

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-43262-4

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR Anne Elizabeth Ross

TITLE OF THESIS The Mixture of Styles in *Henry V*

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED Master of Arts

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED Spring 1987

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(SIGNED) AERoss

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

348 Scarboro Ave. S.W.
Calgary, Alta
T3C 2H3

DATED Dec 19 1956

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled The Mixture of Styles in *Henry V* submitted by Anne Elizabeth Ross in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in English

C. Q. Drummond

Supervisor

Linda Woodbridge

Robt. J. [illegible]

Date: November 14, 1986

DEDICATION

For my Father and Mother

and

Uncle Donal.

ABSTRACT

The mixture of styles in Shakespeare's work as it is explained by Erich Auerbach is examined first. In contrast to *Henry IV, Part II* which Auerbach discusses, in *Henry V* Shakespeare separates rather than mixes styles until the penultimate scene of the play. The play reveals a contrast of styles not a mixture of styles.

Shakespeare provides multiple perspectives by creating parallels between the high and low scenes. The Chorus, given in the main in an epic style provides an aristocratic perspective that aspires to heroic ideals. The characterization of Henry is realistic and biographically complex. It shows the distortions of preconceived formulations such as that of the chorus. Auerbach's contention that Shakespeare's is not a popular spirit is discussed. *Henry V* encompasses a great range of characterization of the low common soldier, the farcial, intermediate, and profoundly serious.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to Dr. C. Q. Drummo[illegible]culous and conscientious supervision of this thesis.

I would like to thank Dr. Linda Wo[illegible]uragement, support, and the benefit of her stimulating graduate Shakespeare course.

Without Annalise Acorn and Bill Wood[illegible]ould never have kept up my enthusiasm. Thank you both.

Table of Contents

Chapter Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. CHORUS 11

III. HENRY 24

IV. SOLDIERS 39

CONCLUSION 60

BIBLIOGRAPHY 65

I. INTRODUCTION

In his chapter on Shakespeare entitled "The Weary Prince" in his *Mimesis*, Erich Auerbach asserts that "However important the influence of antiquity may have been on Shakespeare, it could not mislead him, nor yet other dramatists of the Elizabethan period, into [the classical] separation of styles".[1] He explains that "Shakespeare and many of his contemporaries are averse to completely detaching a turn of fortune which concerns a single person or a limited number of persons from its general context of events and presenting it on a single level of style, as the tragic poets of antiquity had done...".[2]

Auerbach's analysis of the mixture of styles in *Henry IV Part II* is based on the notion that Shakespeare's perspective consciousness, and the idea of polyphonic cosmic coherence of the Renaissance, is the reason for the variety and multiplicity of life presented in his work. He considers this perspectival view to be the fullest and most comprehensive representation of reality. In order to explain the nature of the mixture of styles, Auerbach traces the gradual emergence of the Christian aesthetic which challenged and finally superseded the classical separation of styles. According to Auerbach, the Christian aesthetic, which developed from the depiction of reality in the New Testament, furnished the model for the mixture of styles as it culminated in the work of its two most prominent and innovative practitioners, Dante and Shakespeare.

Auerbach's explanation of the classical separation of styles proceeds from an analysis of the classical aesthetic as it was most fully formulated when the rhetorical analysis of the levels of style had been crystallized into strict categorizations in the Hellenistic period. That rhetoric, as it developed in the ancient world, provided classifications of subject matter and style and was central to the development of the aesthetic theory of the separation of styles is emphasized by Auerbach's analysis. Reality was treated according to a priori theoretical categorizations that classified "subjects in *genera*, and invested every subject with a specific form of style as the one garment becoming it in virtue of its nature[...]".[3] Examining the nature of the separation of styles in the collection of Auerbach's essays *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature*, one finds that in "classical aesthetics, subject matter and the manner of its treatment came to be divided into three categories: there was the great, tragic, and sublime then the middle, pleasing, and inoffensive; finally the ridiculous, base, and grotesque."[4] The ancient writer makes use of prescribed formulations of style in the treatment of his subject matter; he makes use of defined rhetorical *topoi* in the selection and treatment of his material; he finds or invents the characteristics of virtue or vice which he intends to praise, blame, or illustrate according to "fixed, aprioristic model concepts."[5] The application of rhetorical *topoi* to the treatment of reality makes the treatment of character and event static; literature exists to explain or exemplify the accepted and preformulated models of virtue and vice, success and failure. The depiction of reality in the New Testament, encompassing the effects of the life of Christ on the humble fishermen with whom he lived, necessitated the mingling of the sublime and the low styles, which, according to the ancient aesthetic categories, should be kept distinct.

---

[1] Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature* (Princeton, 1974), p. 323. All subsequent references are to this edition.

[2] Auerbach, p. 322.

[3] Auerbach, *Mimesis*, p. 45.

[4] Auerbach, *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature* (Minneapolis, 1959), p. 207.

[5] Auerbach, p. 39. All subsequent references to Auerbach are from *Mimesis*.

Perhaps the most important reason that the literary depiction of Christian history came to supersede the classical restriction of styles was that its subject matter did not fit into any of the known categories of genres: "A scene like Peter's denial [of Christ] fits into no antique genre. It is too serious for comedy, too contemporary and everyday for tragedy, politically too insignificant for history--and the form that is given it is one of such immediacy that its like does not exist in the literature of antiquity."[6] The triumph of Christianity over the classical cultures represents a fundamental and radical re-evaluation of the nature of the sublime and matter which may be considered to aspire to the highest aesthetic dignity.

The central and most historically significant event in the Christian drama, the birth of Christ, emerges as the highest and most profound expression of human dignity. The story of Christ's birth, given in all its circumstantial and humble details, prepares the ground for the flourishing of a low style of simple, direct expression which nevertheless encompasses the most important themes of the Christian drama:

> That the King of Kings was treated as a low criminal, that he was mocked, spat upon, whipped, and nailed to the cross--that story no sooner comes to dominate the consciousness of the people than it completely destroys the aesthetics of the separation of styles; it engenders a new elevated style, which does not scorn everyday life and which is ready to absorb the sensorily realistic, even the ugly, the undignified, the physically base. Or -- if anyone prefers to have it the other way around -- a new *sermo humilis* is born, a low style, such as would properly only be applicable to comedy, but which now reaches out far beyond its original domain, and encroaches upon the deepest and the highest, the sublime and the eternal.[7]

Further, with the emergence of the mystery plays and the influence of late medieval preaching, the strict separation of genres of tragedy and comedy was challenged by the grotesque, but ultimately naive mixture of the tragic and comic in the depiction of the scenes of the drama of Christ. The influence of the depiction of reality in Christian literature and drama, then, developed what has become the central aesthetic sensibility of Western literature. The inclusiveness of Shakespearean drama, the representation of a great range of humanity mingling aristocrats with commoners and commoners with kings stems, ultimately, from the inclusiveness of the Biblical portrayal of Christ. Further, and more importantly, the rich scale of stylistic register in Shakespeare's drama, allowing for an extensive penetration of psychological states and a great range and shift of mood in the portrayal of character, was only made available when the most homely, sensuous, realistic detail was brought into alignment with the most noble sentiments. Auerbach argues that the Christian reorientation of the ancient stylistic categories prepared the ground for the flowering of Shakespere's genius in depicting the multiple perspectives and the multiple conditions of life.

---

[6] Auerbach, p. 45.

[7] Auerbach, p. 72.

Auerbach's analysis of the gradual emergence of a Christian aesthetic attitude reveals that the growth of literary expressiveness was the result of the Christian adaptation of classical rhetoric, which comes to encompass a more inclusive view of reality. The two most essential elements of this growth are the Christian depiction of sensuous realistic detail and the depiction of the creatural nature of man. The elaboration of the events of Christ's life enphasize his corporeal nature; the representation of Christ is given in its dramatic immediacy. There is a concern to elaborate his humble origins, to include the everyday domestic details and to emphasize the seemingly trivial circumstances of his life. Everywhere Christ is depicted with all the trappings of his lowly, creatural-corporeal existence. Far from the antique conception of the decorum of degree which proscribed the depiction of the everyday interconnections of characters of high stature, the depiction of Christ necessitates the inclusion of everyone with whom he associated. The depiction of Christ is not confined by the limits of antique stylistic decorum; it does not maintain one register but rather it exhibits a wide range of mood, placing dialogue which rises from the simple, direct style of conversation to a high register charged with sublimity. Homely colloquial idiom and phrasing is no longer excluded from the serious and the sublime, and it can be interfused into the most penetrating representations of self-revelation and attestations of faith, providing a rich scale of stylistic register and a deep penetration of psychological and emotional states.

It is not difficult to see that Shakespeare is a master of this mixed style. One has only to think of the tragedies *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, and *King Lear* to provide examples of the way Shakespeare mixes stylistic register and incorporates the most serious and penetrating probings of reality with seemingly trivial and common concerns:

> Hamlet's half real, half pretended insanity rages, within a single scene and even a single speech, through all levels of style. He jumps from the obscene to the lyrical or sublime, from the ironically incongruous to dark and profound meditation, from humiliating scorn leveled at others and himself to the solemn assumption of the right to judge and proud self-assertion. Lear's rich, forceful, and emotional arbitrariness has in its incomparable sublimity elements that strike us as painfully senile and theatrical. The speeches of his faithful fool themselves tear at his mantle of sublimity; but more incisive are the stylistic ruptures which lie in his own nature: the excesses of emotion, his impotent and helpless outbursts of anger, his inclination to indulge in bitterly grotesque histrionics. In the fourth scene of act 2 he falls on his knees before his wicked daughter Regan, who has hurt and is still hurting him most grievously, in order to act out as it were the step he is expected to take (that is, to ask Goneril, his other daughter, to forgive him). This is an extreme and theatrical gesture of bitterly grotesque self-humiliation. He is always ready to exaggerate; he wants to force heaven and earth to witness the extremes of his humiliation and to hear his complaints. Such gestures seem immeasurably shocking in an old man of eighty, in a great king. And yet they do not in the least detract from his dignity and greatness. His nature is so unconditionally royal that humiliation only brings it out more strongly. Shakespeare makes him speak the famous words "aye, every inch a king," himself, from the depth of his insanity, grotesquely accoutered, a madman playing the king for a moment. Yet we do not laugh, we weep; and not only in pity but at the same time in admiration for such greatness, which seems only the greater and more indestructible in its brittle creaturality.[4]

Auerbach contends that Shakespeare, sensitive to the limits of antique realism resulting from the strict adherence to the classical decorum of style, degree, and subject matter, could not be seduced by the theoretical categorizations of styles. Where classical drama sought to achieve stylistic purity, fashioning its subject matter according to strictly conceived genres and rhetorical formulas, Shakespeare's drama reveals the fluidity of genre and style which Sidney, confronted with the Elizabethan drama in its embryonic stages, disparagingly characterized as a species of "mongrel".[9] The influence of the classical decorum is evident in Sidney's description of genre:

---

[4] Auerbach, p. 316-17.

> ...all their plays be neither right tragedies nor right comedies, mingling kings and clowns, not because the matter so carrieth it, but thrust in the clown by the head and the shoulders to play a part in majestical matters, with neither decency nor discretion so as neither the admiration and commiseration nor the right sportfulness is by their mongrel tragi-comedy obtained.[10]

The hybrid nature of the early Elizabethan drama that so offended Sidney's taste is isolated by Auerbach as the particular virtue of Shakespeare's dramatic achievement. By resisting theoretical categorization of style and genre Shakespeare's drama encompasses more of the paradoxical nature of life; it encompasses a wider range of mood and can reflect a wider psychological movement. The multiplicity of persective "often contributes nothing at all or at least very little to the progress of the action; [...] instead [it] consists of a sympathetic counterpoint - a parallel or contrary motion on various levels of styles."[11] The interaction of persons of high and low station, the mingling of domestic realistic detail in scenes of serious import, and the frequent mixing of comedy and tragedy, the sublime and the trivial would have been inconceivable to the aesthetic tastes of the ancients. It is, according to Auerbach, the fulfillment of the medieval-Christian tradition. The constant mixture of styles in Shakespeare's work

> ...is rooted in the popular tradition, and indeed first of all in the cosmic drama of the story of Christ. There are intermediate steps and it is also true that a variety of folkloristic motifs not of Christian origin have forced their way in. But the creatural view of man, the loose construction with its numerous accessory actions and characters, and the mixture of the sublime with the low cannot in the last analysis, come from any other source than the medieval Christian theatre, in which all these things were necessary and essential. Even the participation of the elements in a great destiny has its best known model in the earthquake at the time of Christ's death (Mathew 27: 51ff.), and this model remained very influential during the Middle Ages (cf. Chanson de Roland, 1423ff or *Vita Nova*, 23). Yet now, in the drama of the Elizabethans, the superstructure of the whole has been lost; the drama of Christ is no longer the general drama, is no longer the point of confluence of all streams of human destiny. The new dramatized history has a specific human action as its centre, derives its unity from that centre, and the road has been opened for an autonomously human tragedy.[11]

Auerbach's analysis of the mixture of styles in Shakespeare's work is incisive in its explication of the influence of the medieval-Christian heritage; it places Shakespeare in historical perspective and elucidates the peculiar conditions of the Renaissance which made Shakespeare able to develop a distinctly human tragedy more profoundly mysterious than the *De Casibus* tradition of the Middle Ages or even the classical tragedies. He says:

> ...in Elizabethan tragedy and specifically in Shakespeare, the Hero's character is depicted in greater and more varied detail than in antique tragedy, and participates more actively in shaping the individual's fate. But it is also possible to describe the difference another way: one might say that the idea of destiny in Elizabethan tragedy is both more broadly conceived and more closely linked to the individual character than it is in antique tragedy. In the latter, fate means nothing but the given tragic complex, the present network of events in which a particular person is enmeshed at a particular moment. To whatever else may have happened to him during his life, so long as it is not part of the prehistory of the present conflict, to what we call his "milieu," little attention is given and apart from age, sex, social

---

[9] Sir Philip Sidney, "An Apology for Poetry" in *Criticism: The Major Texts*, W. J. Bate, ed. (New York; Chicago; San Francisco; Atlanta; 1952), p. 103.

[10] Sidney, p. 103.

[11] Auerbach, p. 322.

[12] Auerbach, p. 323.

> status, and references to his general type of temperament, we learn nothing about his normal existence. The essence of his personality is revealed and evolves exclusively within the particular tragic action; everything else is omitted.[13]

Auerbach contrasts the nature of the classical drama with the Elizabethan and particularly the Shakespearean drama in reference to the development of character:

> ...the subjects of antique tragedy are almost exclusively taken from the national mythology, in a few cases from national history. These were sacred subjects and the events and personages involved were known to the audience. The "milieu" too was known, and furthermore it was almost always approximately the same. Hence there was no reason to describe its special character and special atmosphere. Euripides challenged the tradition by introducing new interpretations, both of action and character, into the traditional material. But this can hardly be compared with the multiplicity of subject matter, the freedom of invention and presentation which distinguish the Elizabethan and modern drama generally. What with the variety of subject matter and the considerable freedom of movement of the Elizabethan theatre, we are in each instance given the particular atmosphere, the situation, and the prehistory of the characters. The course of events on the stage is not rigidly restricted to the course of events of the tragic conflict but covers conversations, scenes, characters, which the action as such does not necessarily require.[14]

Auerbach accounts for the variety of the Elizabethan subject matter by referring to the particular world view that grew up as the result of the widening historical perspectives of the Humanists:

> Humanism with its program of renewal of antique forms of life and expression creates a historical perspective in depth such as no previous epoch known to us possessed: the humanists see antiquity in historical depth, and, against that background, the dark epochs of the intervening Middle Ages. In addition there is in the sixteenth century the effect of the great discoveries which abruptly widened the cultural and geographic horizon and hence also men's conception of possible forms of human life.[15]

This perspective conscious is the hallmark of Shakespearean drama. "Consciousness of the manifold conditions of human life is a fact with him, and he can take it for granted on the part of his audience."[16] The perspectival view is accomplished, according to Auerbach,

> ...by the joint use of several methods. Tragic actions in which public or other tragic events occur, alternate with humorous, popular, and rowdy scenes which are now closely, now sometimes more loosely connected with the principal action. Or again in the tragic scenes themselves, and with the tragic heroes, there appear fools and other humorous types who accompany, interrupt, and -- each in his own way -- comment on what the heroes do, suffer, and say. Finally, not a few of Shakespeare's tragic characters have their own innate tendency to break the stylistic tenor in a humorous, realistic, or bitterly grotesque fashion.[17]

Auerbach suggests that the Falstaff episodes in the histories are examples of the alternation of tragic and comic scenes. His example of the interview between Poins and Hal taken from *Henry IV, Part II*, illustrates the mixture of high and low registers in Hal's speech. His analysis serves to illustrate the the creatural elements which are contrasted to the more noble and aristocratic sentiments:

> The motif is introduced by Poins, and then immediately taken up by the Prince in a humorous vein with an undertone of rhetorical preciosity that serves to emphasize the contrasts: "it discolours the complexion of my greatness" versus "small beer." Goaded on by Poins's second reply, the Prince playfully develops the theme: "small beer" now becomes a wretched creature that has sneaked into the noble recesses of his consciousness against all law and order, as it were. Now other "humble considerations" occur to him and put him out of conceit with his own greatness. From among them, with wittily charming impertinence, he falls upon the very Poins who stands before him: is it not a

---

[13] Auerbach, p. 319.

[14] Auerbach, p. 319.

[15] Auerbach, p. 322.

[16] Auerbach, p. 322.

[17] Auerbach, p. 315.

> shame to me, he argues, that I should remember your name, your face, and even the inventory of your clothes.?[18]

The interview with Poins furnishes Auerbach with evidence of the elements of the mixture of styles in Shakespeare's work and suggests the influence of the Christian aesthetic in developing a creatural conception of tragic characters:

> A large number of the elements of the mixed style are mentioned or alluded to in these few lines: the element of physical creaturalness, that of lowly everyday objects, and that of the mixture of classes involving persons of high and low rank; there is also a marked mixture of high and low expressions in the diction, there is even use of one of the classical terms which characterize the low style, the word "humble."[19]

The humour derives from the incongruity of aristocratic sentiment debased to the level which cannot support such noble posturing:

> The comic disapproval of the fact that a person of such rank should be subject to weariness and the desire for small beer, that his mind should be obliged so much as to notice the existence of so lowly a creature as Poins and even to remember the inventory of his clothes, is a satire on the trend -- no longer negligible in Shakespeare's day -- toward a strict separation between the sublime and the realm of everyday realities.[20]

No one can deny that in *Henry IV, Parts I* and *II*, Shakespeare combines the sublime and the low, the serious and the trivial, the tragic, and the comic and creates a play of rich variety, vitality and multiple perspectives. In these plays, Shakespeare mixes styles in seemingly inexhaustible proportions. The suitability of the subject matter, the story of the prodigal Prince consorting with "the boon companions of his youthful follies"[21] everywhere furnishes Shakespeare with comparisons of high and low style. Shakespeare's method is to create an alternating sequence of scenes; scenes conceived in the high style focus attention on aristocratic ideals and sentiments and are contrasted to the low, comic scenes which are concerned to depict life in its sensuous and creatural particularity.

Falstaff and Hal continually make rhetorical contrasts of style. The urbane and witty style of Euphues and the aristocratic style of Cambises are not infrequently brought into contact with a homiletic strain replete with proverbial illustrations culled from ordinary everyday life (albeit inverted to suit Falstaff's less than moralistic point of view). Falstaff's commentary on the serious action provides a perspective on social hierarchy which could not be encompassed by any other character without seriously jeopardizing the maintenance of stylistic decorum of degree and place. At the battle of Shrewsbury, he is allowed to break the stylistic tenor and comment on the chivalric ideals much in the way the fool in *Lear* and Hamlet's ravings at serious points in the action disrupts an otherwise sustained unity of mood and action in the high style. Everywhere the action of the high scenes is contrasted to that in the low; Hal's witty and urbane dialogue is contrasted to the verbal penury of the drawer Francis; the King's reprimanding his son for his irresolute behaviour is first played out in parody in the Boar's Head; and the chivalric ideals of the warrior Hotspur are first caricatured in Hal's rendition of his reputation for valour.

---

[18] Auerbach, p. 313.

[19] Auerbach, p. 313.

[20] Auerbach, p. 312.

[21] Auerbach, p. 312.

While Auerbach's analysis of the mixture of styles in *Henry IV, Part II* reveals Shakespeare's tendency to combine an exhuberant mixture of styles throughout the play, when we apply the theory to *Henry V*, we are faced with a play more starkly conceived, simpler in structure, sparer in style and more symmetrical in the contrasting perspectives it affords. Where in *Henry IV, Parts I* and *II* the indecorous behavior of the Prince allowed Shakespeare to create a rich mixture of stylistic contrasts throughout the play, in *Henry V* the constraints of the subject matter, the chronicling of the heroic victor of Agincourt, necessitated that he maintain a strict regard to stylistic decorum, isolate the high and low registers, and refrain from mixing personages of high and low degree. Where in *Henry IV, Parts I* and *II*, Shakespeare was free to improvise and expand the historical account of the prodigal Prince, in *Henry V* the historical facts of the King's victory of Agincourt made it necessary that he bring his method of multiple perspectives to bear more closely on the outlines of history provided in the chronicles.

Thus, *Henry V* is conceived according to a stricter adherence to stylistic decorum. Hal's coming of age in *Henry V* is marked by the observance of kingly decorum. While in the interview with Poins, which Auerbach discusses, the Prince apologizes, disingenuously, for his acknowledgement of such low characters and concerns, in *Henry V* he assumes the mantle of majesty and does not allow himself to revert to the creatural level of *Henry IV, Parts I* and *II*. As Auerbach explained it, the wretched creature, small beer, "sneaked into the noble recesses of his consciousness against all law and order."[12] In *Henry V*, the Prince become King submits himself to the law and order of kingly decorum. Indeed, while in *Henry V*, Poins has been edited out of the cast, the other "boon companions of [Henry's] youthful frolics"[13] go unrecognized; their presence is not worthy of the King's regard. Having assumed the station of the king, the Prince assumes the idiom of that role. He does not remember the likes of Pistol, Bardolph, and the boy-page since it does not accord with his station that he should.

This observance of decorum marks Shakespeare's disposition of styles within the play. *Henry V* is more sharply divided into contrasts encompassed within a large unit of measurement; Shakespeare prefers to separate styles more distinctly between the scenes; there is less improvization of aristocratic material in the low scenes. Shakespeare concentrates his effects; he infrequently allows a single character to "break the stylistic tenor in a humorous, realistic, or bitterly grotesque fashion,"[14] but rather maintains one register. The contrast of aristocratic scenes and the low life scenes which follow is more distinctly drawn. The whole of the first act and the last scene of the play are deliberately public and ceremonious with no mixture of low and high personages or of low and high idioms. The impression of simplicity that the play conveys allows Shakespeare to concentrate his styles into a series of vivid contrasts; the scenes are closely aligned; they are organized according to the perspectival view; however, the styles are contrasted, they are not mixed. Rather than allow the styles to be mixed throughout the play, Shakespeare isolates them so that they provide distinct contrasts to one another. High scenes are balanced by low scenes with little mixture of styles until the penultimate scene with Williams.

---

[12] Auerbach, p. 312.
[13] Auerbach, p. 312.
[14] Auerbach, p. 315.

In *Henry V*, Shakespeare does not allow individual characters to be openly critical of the serious action, to break ~~the~~ stylistic tenor of the high scenes. The coordination of perspectives encompassed in the play is more strictly conceived because the focus on war is more centrally located; the play reveals a great degree of unity of action that is modulated according to different stylistic perspectives. Where the action in other plays takes place in different settings and reveals characters with a variety of occupations at hand, the action of *Henry V* is centrally oriented to the conflict in France. Even the Eastcheap scenes which distract attention from the departure of Henry's forces, operate with the possibility of going to war as a background. As a result the scenes tend to be more sharply conceived and reveal a large degree of internal unity and coherence. Shakespeare provides commentary on the main action by creating parallel scenes which reveal similar rhetorical structures, dialogue, and theme.

The high style scenes focus on the public dimension and as such they create a series of contrasts of public oratory. It is typical of this play that Shakespeare allows characters to deliver long set speeches which exist to develop a rhetorical swell of feeling in the auditors (both in the play and in the audience). The Chorus is seen straining to persuade the audience of the glorious and heroic nature of Henry; the Archbishop creates a panegyric at the beginning of the play to the rhetorical prowess of Henry and to the wonder of his 'miraculous transformation'; the counsellors mount a climactic crescendo exhorting Henry to embark on the enterprise to France; and the speeches of Henry and those of Exeter acting as his ambassador are contrasted to the set pieces of the French King and the Dauphin. Henry's speeches themselves are always characterized by a concern to convince his auditors, and his persuasive strategies are various. He delivers speeches that are carefully calculated to respond to the expectations of his audience; they are carefully adapted to his estimations of the character, temperament, and predispositions of his auditors.

Thus the play is given as a public pageant or spectacle conceived in a mood of exhortation. It is an exhibition of politic persuasion and has the flavour of the rather stark and operatic declamation of the rhetorical drama of Marlowe and his imitators. That Shakespeare created his scenes according to the commonplace set pieces familiar to the Renaissance audience is apparent from the first. The play contains many ~~of the~~ set scenes Wolfgang Clemen distinguishes: the counsel scene, the siege scene, the threatening scenes, and the wooing scene formed the very fabric of rhetorical drama. The Chorus contributes to reinforce the aristocratic perspective of these scenes. In an effort to applaud the virtuous acts of the legendary King Henry, Shakespeare marshalls all the arts of demonstrative oratory at his command.

The action of the high scenes, however, is continually brought into contrast with the more personal context of the Eastcheap scenes and perhaps more importantly, in the fourth act, the public oratory of the King is brought into coordination with the concerns of the lowest common soldiers. In *Henry V* Shakespeare does not allow the aristocratic perspective to dominate the presentation of the King. If he presents the King from a public and aristocratic perspective in the Chorus, in the commentary on Henry's character given by his nobles, and in his own speeches, Shakespeare also presents a perspective on the King which encompasses more personal and popular concerns. While *Henry V* reveals similarities with the rhetorical drama of Marlowe and his imitators, it introduces a popular motif into the high sounding rhetoric by creating the scene with the King amongst the commoners (a scene which was ultimately derived from such popular plays as *George-a-Greene*). Shakespeare brings Henry into contact with his soldiery at all levels and is made to justify his claim and cause in France in the low idiom of plain, simple, and direct discourse. Far from the rhetorical speeches of the preceding scenes this scene develops a very real dialogue; the King discusses his war in a dialectical discourse with the soldier Williams and is forced to justify his claims. The veneer of aristocratic decorum is maintained in the Williams episodes, for the King consorting with the low soldiers is given as a dramatic contrivance; the King in disguise is divested of his public persona; he play acts the part of a "gentleman of a company" amongst his peers. In placing him amongst his soldiers in the penultimate scene with Williams, Shakespeare evaluates his public persona in the context of more personal concerns; he evaluates the aristocratic perspective from a more popular point of view.

That Shakespeare prefers to maintain a strict observance of decorum and to separate out the styles until the penultimate scene with Williams in the fourth act suggests the dominant conception of the play. The coordination of perspectives encompassed in *Henry V* is more strictly conceived because in this play Shakespeare is concerned to depict a vast range of rhetorical styles of persuasion. He brings the contrasting motivations of Henry, his nobles, and his soldiery into conflict and coordination. Shakespeare reveals their different attitudes to war as well as the variety of their command of the rhetoric of persuasion.

As in *Henry IV, Parts I and II*, Hal, Hotspur, and Falstaff work as a triad of conflicting perspectives in regard to the theme of honour, so in *Henry V*, the King, Pistol, and Williams work to encompass multiple perspectives with Fluellen acting as comic mediator. Where in *Henry IV* Falstaff's verbal flytings with honour severely diminished an unalloyed reverence for chivalric gesture and romantically coveted honour, in *Henry V* the Pistol episodes reveal Falstaff's irreverence carried to nihilistic extremes. The bombastic rhetoric of Pistol is everywhere a counterpart to the declamatory speeches of the higher characters. In their unholy trinity of vice, Pistol, Bardolph, and Nim represent anti-life: they are embodiments of everything inimical to the possibilities of value. Because their actions do not suit their deeds, they reveal the potential to misuse language so that meaning is dislocated by their hypocrisy and cozenings. However, the characterization of Fluellen and Gower, and the night-scene characters Williams, Court, and Bates provide an example of real merit. Though they do not, and indeed cannot, match their noble sentiments with dignified sentences, they refurbish the meaning of honour and value because their words so completely reveal their inward conditions. That Shakespeare brings the King, in disguise, into connection with the common soldier Williams attests to his concern to evaluate character according to criteria of virtue regardless of degree. Shakespeare makes the King support his cause in the plain language of the humble soldier. Where in *Henry IV, Part I* Hal provided a mixture of noble sentiments with the most humble and creatural considerations for comic effect, in *Henry V* Shakespeare abases the "Great Titan" in order to evaluate his condition of worthiness against the serious demands of his soldiery. Stripped of his royal privilege the King cannot rely on the privilege of his position or the language of state. That Shakespeare brings the King into connection with the common soldier, makes him, in disguise, discuss the war and the justification of his cause in plain, simple English attests to his realization that the most high sounding rhetoric must be matched with an inner nobility that needs no ornament or elaborate artifice to suit out its claims.

The Chorus that opens the play refers to the "heaven of invention" that will project the heroic King in his true likeness; Shakespeare's dramatic invention in the scenes within the play seeks to show the King as he is seen by his soldiers and to evaluate his cause without reference to the rhetoric of state or the panegyrics of chroniclers. Thus, though in *Henry IV, Parts I and II* the mixture of styles is encompassed throughout the play, and provides a satire on the trend towards the strict separation of styles, in *Henry V* the contrast of styles is more centrally organized into a separation of styles and personages until the fourth act which brings the multiple perspectives into conflict and coordination. Where in *Henry IV, Parts I and II* Hal's presence in the tavern scenes afforded Shakespeare the opportunity to mix a great range of styles, in *Henry V* Shakespeare maintains the stylistic decorum of the King acting out his public role and provides a series of parallels of theme, character, and rhetoric which present a constant evaluation of that role. *Henry V* provides a partial caveat to Auerbach's discussion of the mixture of styles in Shakespeare's work. Rather than create a play in which styles are continually mixed, he isolates the styles until the interview with Williams that develops the popular concerns of the play. In *Henry IV, Parts I* and *II* the mixture of styles is, in large part, the result of the inclusion of Falstaff and Hal in the low scenes; it is the result of including characters who command a great range of style and allowing them to break the stylistic tenor of the high scenes. In *Henry V* Shakespeare does not allow individual characters to be openly critical of the serious action. However, the parallels he constructs and the contrivance of the plot bring the aristocratic ideals under scrutiny. Shakespeare invents a plot which brings the styles together in the night scene before the battle of Agincourt. It is in this scene that Shakespeare includes the polyphonic cosmic coherence which Auerbach discusses. He creates a perspective which views the King in his creatural condition. The demands of war are discussed by a series of characters with different sensibilities and therefore "every chord of human destiny [is seen to arouse] a multitude of voices to parallel or contrary motion".[25]

---

[25] Auerbach, p. 323.

II. CHORUS

Faced with the prospect of dramatizing the life of Henry V, the glorious victor of Agincourt, Shakespeare could not but have been struck by the popular and romanticized estimations of his character. Historically he was the story-book Prince; the force of his personality and will enabled him to stay the march of Providence. He was the King whose reign turned back the tide of history and provided a brief pause and respite to the incessant disorder of the civil wars that plagued his father. According to the popular renderings of the Tudor myth he was marked out for a special destiny. If his life was cut short, his glorious exploits attested to his remarkable character; he was considered an exemplary monarch who, like Alexander and Achilles, was cut down in the very prime of life, at the peak of his achievements. The familiar story of Henry V, his dissolute youth, the miraculous conversion, and the short but uniformly glorious reign has the pattern of a folk legend, a saint's life, or the *Res Gestae* of famous Romans. The story of Henry V had all the trappings of epic or legend.

As the play was to be delivered to an audience delighted with the prospect of national expansion in Ireland, proud of its recent defeat of the Spanish Armada, and receptive to favorable comparisons of English heroes with classical ones, it is not surprising that Shakespeare does not stray too far from the popular estimate of Henry V given currency in Holinshed's chronicle account. Holinshed's description of Henry V reads:

> This Henrie was a king, of life without spot; a prince whome all men loved, and of none disdained, a capteine against whome fortune never frowned, nor mischance once spurned, whose people him so severe a justicer both loved and obeied (and so humane withall) that he left no offense unpunished, no freendship unrewarded...a paterne in princehood, a lode-star in honour, a mirrour of magnificence.[16]

In *Henry V*, the Chorus provides an epic perspective on Henry close to the chronicle estimations of his worthy character. The Chorus which opens the play aspires to ascend the brightest heaven of invention and to sustain a "swelling scene" (1. 0. 4.). He hopes to be able to magnify his subject matter, to create images of cosmic grandeur and to amplify the momentous action and the lofty ambitions of the martial Harry. However, he does not feel adequate to the task and doubts the possibility of encompassing his majestic theme within the humble dimensions of the "wooden O" (1. 0. 13.). He denies that he is inspired by a fiery muse, characterizes his spirit as "unraised," and says that his talents are not capable of conjuring up the lofty pitch of a heroic portrait. The Chorus, then, disarms criticism by adopting a humble persona and by acknowledging a fledgling capacity. He shifts the responsibility to the audience to contribute to the raising of a lofty pitch and exhorts it to let the actors "ciphers to this great account,/On your imaginary forces work" (1. 0. 17-18.).

The aspirations of the Chorus to sustain a high sublime style, to marshall all the terms of rhetoric at his command, and to create a pageant of the exploits of Henry V is in keeping with contemporary justifications of the history play. The Chorus addresses the expectations of the Elizabethan audience accustomed by *Tamburlaine* and other spectacles of heroic action to expect the bombastic rhetoric of heroic portraiture. In his book *The Heroical Histories* David Riggs explains what the Renaissance audience would have expected from the history play: "When Elizabethan playwrights troubled to write about their 'histories' they found virtues that later readers have tended to ignore. Where modern scholarship looks for allusive didactic commentary on Renaissance politics and the ways of Providence, Shakespeare's contemporaries were more likely to begin by expressing their enthusiasm for a visual and rhetorical display of heroic deeds."[21]

---

[16] Quoted from Geoffrey Bullough, *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare* vol. iv. (London, 1957), p. 408.

Shakespeare's Chorus in *Henry V* seems to address these expectations directly. That it represents "visual and rhetorical display"[22] is borne out by an analysis of its linguistic particulars. In *Henry V* Shakespeare takes in the main elements of what J. V. Cunningham describes as "Marlowe's manifesto" in his opening to *Tamburlaine* and creates a counterstatement to the sustained style and the unity of time, place, and action encouraged by imitations of classical drama. In his explanation of Marlowe's intention Cunningham states that

> This play involves a high subject matter, *war*, and by implication and the enjoinment of decorum a *stately* style, a high and royal style. The effect will be largely one of language and of rhetoric, for there "you shall hear," and you shall hear what is grand, or even grandiose, a "threatening the world," expressed in "high astounding terms."[23]

In *Henry V*, Shakespeare does not intend to sustain the high style, though his disclaimer is couched in apology and qualification. He includes a Chorus that aspires to create the epic effects of *Tamburlaine* in order to evaluate a hyperbolic style. In *Henry V* Shakespeare comments on the limitations of the sustained high style by giving full range to a hyperbolic, bombastic style and then allowing it to be deflated in the successive scenes. He maintains a multiplicity of perspectives by isolating the rhetoric of praise in the hyperbolic style of the Chorus and by comparing its estimation of Henry with the action of the dramatic inset material. The linguistic features of the Chorus, the emblematic pageant-like representation of heroic historical events are meant to provide a pictoral and aural frame that is contrasted to the dramatization within that frame. While the drama does not allow for omniscient commentary on the action, the device of the Chorus approaches the kind of free indirect narration in its inclusion of elements of a particular frame of mind or characteristic idiom of the speaker. The Chorus is an ethopoetic creation;[24] it is the mouthpiece of the view of the ordinary Englishman proud of his nation's achievements and receptive to the glorious panegyrics of conquering heroes and aspiring minds. The ideal of heroic action set up by the Chorus creates expectations of heroic adulation, acclamation, and patriotic sentiment. However, the dramatic material makes the audience skeptical of the Chorus's unqualified praise.

The opening apostrophe to the muse of fire is couched in exhortation. Shakespeare encompasses the Tamburlainian effects of stirring rhetoric and vivifying heraldic imagery even within a portrait denouncing any claims to such command. He adopts the Tamburlainian strategy of piling appositional phrases in order to give vigor and energy to the opening apostrophe to the muse of fire. He uses epithets culled from the stores of the epic muse, referring to the "warlike Harry" (1. 0. 5.). He inflates Henry's prowess to that of the pagan divinity Mars, and submits the abstract, famine, sword, and fire, to heraldic treatment as the hounds of war leashed in and crouching at heel for employment. Even the rhetorical questions "Can this cock-pit hold/The vasty fields of France? Or may we cram/Within this wooden O the very casques/That did affright the air at Agincourt?" serve to trumpet the heroic theme. The strategy is not unlike Hal's own praise of Hotspur which Vernon relates, that "by still dispraising praise [he] valued with you".[11] By using the diminishing words "cock-pit" and "cram," Shakespeare diminishes the repute of the stage but at the same time he magnifies the prospect of such a spectacle; he makes the subject even more grandiose by suggesting that the mirror he provides is paltry and unworthy of "so great an object." Indeed, he creates a grotesque visual image of the scale of the conflict of France and England which resembles that of Tamburlaine's foes visualizing the opposite shore as "fair Europa mounted on her bull ".[12] when he suggests that

---

[21] David Riggs, *The Heroical Histories* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1971), p. 7.

[22] Riggs, p. 7.

[23] J. V. Cunningham, *The Collected Essays of J. V. Cunningham* (Chicago, 1976.), p. 85.

[24] "*Ethopoeia* (frequently called *prosopoeia* in classical rhetorics) is the figure of "impersonation." It is a stylized reconstruction of what some person, or some person's ghost (eidilopoeia) or some thing [he] *sic* would have said on a particular occassion". Riggs, p. 42.

> ...within the girdle of these walls
> Are now confined two mighty monarchies
> Whose high upreared and abutting fronts
> The perilous narrow ocean parts asunder (1. 0. 19-22.).

The [illegible]flict is seen in the image of metamorphosed landscape in epic proportions; the personification of the cliffs [illegible]r and of Calais as two hostile animals lashing out at one another illustrates unrestrainable and violent aggression. Everything contributes to activate the image. The adjective "upreared" and the present participle "abutting" contribute verbal strength and the mildly redundant "parts asunder" enforces the active quality of the image. It is important that there is nothing homely or concrete about the image; it illustrates a predilection for raising humanity to the level of myth as though we were witnessing the conflict of divine personages. It draws "its comparisons from sweeping vistas, creates a sense of spatiousness and infinite horizons".[13] The propensity of the Chorus to exaggeration is apparent, too, in its preference for including large round numbers. He says that a "crooked figure may/Attest in little-place a million" and urges the audience to "Piece out our imperfections with your thoughts:/Into a thousand parts divide one man/And make imaginary puissance" (1. 0. 23-25.). Thus, though the Chorus denies it is capable, given the technical limitations, of dramatizing such an action, it shows itself perfectly capable of portraying fearful and awe - inspiring effects by creating vivid word paintings.

The Chorus in *Henry V* is an unrealistic device which Shakespeare uses to underline the distortion of the chronicle views of history given in a linear nar ative reportage. By creating the appositional device of the Chorus Shakespeare contrasts the episodic narration of events of the epic mode, which creates a strict chronology and sequence to events (and can frequently impose a determination of cause and effect according to Divine Providence) with the potentialities of the drama, which can elicit a particular dramatic suspense and a sense of time that is not sequential. The Chorus suggests a temporal displacement; it views the past from the vantage of the future, although it attempts to create the effects of immediacy and immanence. However, it has the tendency of monocular historical enthusiasm for the past to make characters and events static; it flattens character into heraldic gestures and romanticizes events in the unrealistic manner of the ballad that Falstaff relishes when in *Henry VI, Part II*, he says he will make a ballad to commemorate his valour "with mine own picture on the top on't, Coleville kissing my foot".[14] Such is the kind of literary artifice the Chorus imposes on life; it exalts war as a literary theme to be viewed as romance and suggests the kind of glorification prominent in the popular *Mirror for Magistrates*, which includes a heroic portrait of War close to that of the first Chorus:

---

[11] *Henry IV, Part I*, 5. 2. 59.
[12] Marlowe, Christopher, Quoted in Harry Levin, *The Overreacher: A Study of Christopher Marlowe* (Cambridge, 1952), p. 134.
[13] Harry Levin, p. 13.

> ...in glitterying arms yclad
> With visage grym, stern lookes and blackely hewed;
> In his right hand a naked sworde he had,
> That to the hiltes was al with blud embrewed:
> And in his left, (that kinges and Kingdomes rewed)
> Famine and fyer he held, and therewythall
> He razed townes and threw down towers and all.[15]

It is suggestive that the Chorus is seen straining to heighten the style, to use artifice consonant with the praise it intends to effect. The Chorus's constant appeals to the audience to "work, work, your thoughts" is meant to encourage the spectators to recreate the heroic ideals in their imaginations. However, Shakespeare's encouragement to recreate the "loftie image" of heroic virtue is modified by a more intimate and humble address. The character of the Chorus in *Henry V* combines the Marlovian techniques of bombastic rhetoric with the intimate address to the audience characteristic of the morality tradition. The Chorus's apologies serve to call attention to the use of bombastic rhetoric which heightens and sublimates character to the level of myth. The humble persona that the Chorus adopts makes the hyperbolic figures seem strained, excessive, and elusive.

Far from achieving the effect of Marlovian drama, to inspire the imitation of the heroic ideals personated in the players, the Chorus's bombastic rhetoric creates a mood of doubt, illusion, and hesitancy. While the Chorus introduces the play with a flourish of bombastic rhetoric, the mood is quickly interrupted by the Chorus' apology and its intimate directions to the audience:

> But pardon gentles all,
> The flat unraised spirits that hath dared
> On this unworthy scaffold to bring forth
> So great an object (1. 0. 8-11.).

The apology is an elaborate parenthetical construction. It comes between the percussive rhythm of the opening apostrophe and the exhortations of the audience in the imperatives that follow, "Suppose...Piece out...Think..." (1. 0. 19-26.), that resume the epic mood. By relying on the audience's ability to use its imagination to recreate heroic ideals, the Chorus calls attention to the unrealistic nature of such a heroic personification of character.

---

[14] *Henry IV, Part II*, 4. 3. 47-48.

[15] *Mirror for Magistrates* quoted in Robert Ornstein, *A Kingdom for a Stage* (Cambridge, 1972), pp. 177-78.

Indeed, the ideal of heroic action set [illegible] by the Chorus is contrasted to the dramatic material which establishes a counterpoint of mood and style and provides a contextual revaluation of the mood inspired by the Chorus. The dramatic action is distinct from the Chorus's portrayal in that it develops characters in their immediacy and not according to historical preformulations. It suggests the disparity between historical accounts of Henry V and a realistic view which provides a more complex biography. The dramatic action suggests that Henry is a character "fraught with background";[16] it evaluates the present circumstances in the light of Henry's past. Similarly it shows the consciousness with which Henry projects a public image; it suggests the immanence of the future affecting a character's decisions. The contrasting perspectives of the dramatic action and the Chorus, then, supply an evaluation of the way in which heroic portraits are developed. The Chorus's evaluation is limited to the description of virtues to be praised and does not portray a character in the light of his prehistory.[17]

The Chorus's presentation of events is seen to be partial and simplistic, a distortion of martial values at the expense of a fuller and more comprehensive view of humanity. The chivalric ideals the Chorus espouses blind it from seeing the variety of Englishmen, both base and noble, that participate in war. The anticipation of a heroic pattern of action personated in the players is constantly diminished; it is consistently qualified by the parallels Shakespeare creates between the main plot and the subplot action of the dramatic inset material. In a play about oratorical persuasion, Shakespeare creates a frame which is itself hortatory, an appeal to the audience to be persuaded by its panegyrics.

Thus the effect of the Chorus in the play is to create anticipations that are frustrated or qualified by the dramatic action and gradually modulate the hyperbolic flourish of the beginning with a more sober and realistic consideration of English ideals. The interruption of the swelling effects on the Chorus to the first act is reiterated in the Chorus to the second act, which must admit the treachery of the nobles, and finally in the Chorus before the night scene the romance of war is subdued when the Chorus must describe the fearful anticipations of the men before the battle at Agincourt. Thus, as the first Chorus creates an anticipation of epic activity that is frustrated by the deliberately boring legal argumentation of the first scene, so the first scene of act two is a similar reversal of the expectations set up by the Chorus. The parallels that Shakespeare creates between the dramatic action and the estimation of events created in the Chorus reveal the naive and too generous enthusiasm of the Chorus for all Englishmen. The second Chorus exhorts the audience to imagine the marshalling of forces at Southampton and suggests the alacrity with which all Englishmen are arming in a united effort and a common cause, and the tone is characterized by optimistic enthusiasum. The Chorus's panegyric suggests that "honour's thought /Reigns solely in the breast of every man" (2. 0. 3-4.) and characterizes the English in an epic fanfare as English Mercuries.

---

[16] Auerbach, p. 12.

[17] The Chorus's portrayal is premised on the intention to invent topics of praise that will establish the lofty image of a heroic image and to inflame the spectators to aspire to the high ideal. As David Riggs explains, it is the product of the historical themes that were taught in Renaissance grammar schools. "As he read a narrative account, the student was taught how to isolate its 'agents'; reconstructing it in his commonplace book, he learned how to fashion the exemplary acts of those agents into brief lives, each organized around its opposite 'topic.' In the case of the playwright, the exemplary biography becomes a 'history': a loose, episodic structure, organized around set oratorical themes, which aims to produce an 'eloquent' or 'moving' rendition of its central character in action". Riggs, p. 40.

The scenes following the Chorus provide an ironic contrast to the Chorus' celebrations. Instead of the noble and loyal representatives of the commonwealth, Shakespeare provides a vivid and macabre portrait of betrayals. The first scene of Eastcheap illustrates the avaricious and atavistic temperaments of the base strings of Henry's soldiery, which is closely followed by the discovery of the treacherous nobles Scrope, Grey, and Cambridge. Far from glossing its motivations as a sense of national responsibility or even a desire for honor or fame, the Eastcheap group reveals its intentions to plunder. Instead of the loyal followers upholding feudal obligations projected by the Chorus, Shakespeare provides a debased equivalent in his portrait of the quarrelling curs[31] and in the silver tongued traitors.

The figurative exaggerations of the virtues of the English in the Chorus are contrasted to the dramatic material. While the Chorus suggests that the English are votaries of Mercury, the messenger God who equips them with talaria, the dramatization focusses on the possibility that the English follow Mercury in his capacity as the God of tricksters and thieves. The pictorial image of "swords from hilts unto the point" impaled with "crowns imperial" suggesting the Tamburlainian aspiration to be the conqueror of kingdoms takes on a sinister dimension as it is directly associated with the Eastcheap fellows turning their attentions to the prospect of plunder in France. While the sword image, in its positive aspect, represents the Christian king's duty to use his secular sword against infidels, Shakespeare's method makes the motives imputed to the English in the Chorus suspicious. The blood brought to the patriotic Englishman's cheek by the laudatory picture that the Chorus echoes from the chronicles in the image of the diminutive England as a bastion of the virtuous a "model...like little body with a mighty heart" (2. 0. 16-17.) recedes when the Chorus must admit of treacherous bosoms. Exceptions to the Chorus's ideal Englishman are found in the dramatic material which presents the imitations of virtue in the lowlife characters and the abominable and blasphemous dissimulations of the treacherous nobles. The Chorus' exclamatory apostrophe to England conjecturing, "What mightst thou do, that honour would thee do,/Were all thy children kind and natural" (2. 0. 18-19.) is couched in the subjunctive. The Chorus' dreamlike wish is set against the indicative dramatic facts and is meant to comment on the rift between idealistic chronicling of history in the heroical mode that Marlowe made popular, and the more realistic portrayal of the inward circumstances and the personal motivations of historical personages.

---

[31] Derek Traversi, *Shakespeare from Richard II to Henry V* (Stanford,1957), p. 175.

It would seem that the Chorus is curiously myopic about certain classes of characters. He seems to be concerned only with aristocrats and aristocratic values. The second Chorus entirely ignores the Eastcheap scenes and rather directs the audience to see:

> The King is set from London, and the scene
> Is now transported, gentles, to Southampton.
> There is the playhouse now, there must you sit,..(2. 0. 33-35.).

If Ben Jonson's sneer at the use of the Chorus, that "wafts you o'er the seas"[39] is directed at the unrealistic device of this Chorus, the exclusion of the low characters from his account is a tell-tale sign of his unrealistic ideals of his nation.

Similarly, the third Chorus creates a romantic and chivalric portrait of Henry's soldiery. Appealing to manly virtues he exhorts the audience to:

> ...follow!
> Grapple your minds to sternage of this navy,
> And leave your England, as dead midnight still,
> Guarded with grandsires, babies, and old women,
> Either past or not arrived to pith and puissance.
> For who is he, whose chin is but enriched
> With one appearing hair, that will not follow
> These culled and choice-drawn cavaliers to France? (3. 0. 17-25.)

The appeal to masculine virtues and warlike qualities is not unlike Nashe's justification of the history play in *Pierce Penniless*:

> Nay what if I proove Plays to be no extreame; but a rare exercise of virtue? First, for the subject of them (for the most part) is borrowed out of our English Chronicles, wherin our forefathers valiant acts (that have been long buried in rustie brass and worme eaten books) are revived, and they themselves raised from the Grave of Oblivion, and brought to pleade their aged Honours in open presence: than which, what can be a sharper reproofe for these degenerate effeminate days of ours?[40]

Though Nashe's commentary is directed at an account of Talbot in *Henry VI, Part I*, it is particularly apposite to a consideration of the Chorus. Though the Chorus aspires to the aristoctratic ideals of chivalry and hopes to inspire the like sentiments in his auditors, the representation of war in all its realistic detail in Henry's speeches does not present such a glorified picture of war. Shakespeare includes an implicit criticism of the romantizations of war even while he creates a Chorus that celebrates its glory.

The Chorus does not maintain a consistent tone throughout the play but rather changes to suit the circumstances he is describing. The Chorus which introduces the fourth act furnishes an entirely different portrayal of Henry's soldiery, and the style is in direct contrast to the anticipations and celebrations of the Choruses that have preceded it. It celebrates Henry's care for his soldiery and characteristically provides a popular account of the King amongst the commoners that contradicts the dramatic material. He says:

> ...O now, who will behold
> The royal captain of this ruined band
> Walking from watch to watch, from tent to tent,
> Let him cry, "Praise and glory on his head!" (4. 0. 28-29.).

---

[39] Ben Jonson. *Every Man In His Humour*, prologue, l. 15.

[40] Quoted in David Riggs *The Heroical Histories*, p. 16.

The Chorus' narration is entirely misleading about the dramatic action. Henry addresses only his peers, and when he goes amongst his soldiers in disguise, he seeks solitude and is accosted by Pistol, eavesdrops on the conversation between Fluellen and Gower, and is summoned by Court, Bates, and Williams to enter into conversation and not the reverse. However, aside from the blatant contradictions between the Chorus' account and the dramatization, the fourth Chorus provides an interesting fusion of styles that creates an entirely different atmosphere from the panegyrics of his former utterances. Shakespeare takes in the Marlovian habit of emphasizing the verbal elements of a speech but makes them contribute to the atmosphere of fear and foreboding rather than as a means of energising the verse. The whole portrait is given in a sombre and subdued mood very different from the exuberant, vigorous, and exhiliarating idiom that characterized the Chorus previously. The effect is not unlike the mature idiom of the tragedies which makes the verbal elements function like adjectives thereby encompassing an atmospheric portrait with great economy of statement:

> Now entertain conjecture of a time
> When creeping murmur and the poring dark
> Fill the wide vessel of the universe.
> From camp to camp through the foul womb of night
> The hum of either army stilly sounds (4. 0. 1-5.).

There is none of the battle music that characterized the previous Choruses; the paeans to glory are replaced by dreadful anticipation and gloom. Shakespeare manages to create a great sense of insecurity. No longer confident of their prowess, the Chorus captures the sense of foreboding and presents the English as the underdogs of a trial heavily stacked in the opponents' favour. While there is some Latinate diction it is subdued by the homely and concrete portrayal.

In his discussion of "Medieval Idiom in Shakespeare" L. A. Cormican explains that Shakespeare's mature idiom is "able to speak of the ordinary necessary things without letting the verse become too slack."[41] He distinguishes two characteristics of this idiom:

> These two powers of Shakespeare's mature idiom (to deal familiarly with immense and mysterious things, and significantly with little things) are accompanied by others of great practical importance to the dramatist, especially the use of significant detail, economy of statement, the maintenance of a conversational tone (even in the most intense speeches and most private soliloquies), and the presentation of the human experience in the process of being made."[42]

The fourth Chorus combines the details of the quotidian world into a profoundly moving portrait of the night scene before the battle of Agincourt. Shakespeare does not cloak the sentiments in allusions to classical mythology, nor does he anthropomorphize nature; he creates a great sense of unseeable but pervasive forces by using participles to describe the scene. The sense of mystery created is "neither too ethereal nor too palpable."[43] "The invisible, mysterious world is vividly felt but its mysteriousness is not obliterated."[44] Night is accoutered in the garb of *Macbeth*. "The 'light thickening', the 'good things drooping', 'the black agents rousing to their preys' in *Macbeth* are..."the concrete forms of agencies transcending the human world...".[45] Similarly, the Chorus's description of the "creeping murmur" and "poring dark" that "fills the wide vessel of the universe" creates resonances of a supra-sensible world, perceived but intangible. Night is alternately a "vessel," a word that develops associations of a sacramental-vessel or chalice, and a "foul womb" which evokes a sense of great creating nature, or finally; "the cripple, tardy-gated night/Who like a foul and ugly witch doth limp/ So tediously away," which suggests, in the context of Agincourt, associations with the gates of heaven. Night is a premonition of the final reckoning, an anticipation of the Last Judgement. Similarly, the description of the Frenchmen "secure in soul" who play "the low-rated English at dice" is suggestive of hell's compatriots dicing for souls.

---

[41] L. A. Cormican, "Medieval Idiom in Shakespeare", *Scrutiny* 17 (1950), p. 188.
[42] Cormican, p. 192.
[43] Cormican, p. 188.
[44] Cormican, p. 192.

Aural effects are personified in the concrete particulars of the scene. The portrait encompasses a cosmic dimension. The sense of inertia in the adjectival phrases "stilly sounds" and "secret whispers" coupled with the spectral images of faces in the "paly flames" and "umbered face" of battle are contrasted to the sounds of human activity in the "armourers, accomplishing the knights." The fact that these human noises are described as "piercing the night's dull ear" is not unlike the blanket of the night imagery of *Macbeth*. Far from the use of classical epithets denoting individual characteristics of particular soldiers, Shakespeare gives a general description of a community of souls. They are seen from a macrocosmic level, as it were, looking in on them from above or without in the manner of a Hardy novel or an Eisenstein film, which focuses down on the particular elements of their appearance and thereby creates a sense of their insignificance and powerlessness. They are "presented...unto the gazing moon," who seems indifferent to their plight, and their gestures invest their "lank lean cheeks" and "war worn-coats" with a pitiful aspect. The result of the fourth Chorus's portrait of the pathetic and gloomy atmosphere of the night scene anticipating the battle of Agincourt is to provide an ironic contrast to the more exhilarating anticipations of war in the second Chorus when the soldiers were fresh and enthusiastic to set out to France "and sold the pasture now to buy the horse." The Chorus appeals to the audience's sympathies for the weak and wearied soldiers, and for the moment this utterance holds the attention on the depredations of war. However, the play encompasses a great deal of dramatic irony, for the audience knows that the "ruined band" will indeed be victorious no matter how much the odds seem to be against them.

The fifth Chorus reminds the audience of the larger frame of reference outside the narration of events as they proceed in the Chorus and in the dramatization of the events on the stage; he reminds the audience of their own preconceived ideas about Agincourt and their preformulations of the action:

> Vouchsafe to those that have not read the story
> That I may prompt them--and of such as have,
> I humbly pray them to admit th'excuse
> Of time, of numbers, and due course of things...(5. 0. 1-4.)

The Chorus lays bare the dramatic irony of the situation and calls attention to itself as a conceptualization of history written after the fact. The Chorus 'runs before the action' of the stage present: it is a recreation of events within that frame. In contriving such a device Shakespeare hit upon the perfect medium for presenting the disparity betweeen historical evaluations of events given in chronicle narrations of epic poetry and the dramatic presentation of history, which can encompass more of the feel of life as it was lived. What better way of alerting the audience to its preconceived and preformulated impressions of history and the characters of history so loudly proclaimed in the chronicles of fame? Shakespeare plays with this disparity. The Archbishop alludes to the chronicles rich with the famous exploits of Edward the Third, and Fluellen, in his enthusiasm for Henry, remembers the fame acheived by his ancestors:

---

[45] Cormican, p. 191.

> Your grandfather of famous memory, an't please your majesty, and your great-uncle Edward the Plack Prince of Wales , as I have read in the chronicles, fought a most prave pattle here in France (4. 7. 87-90.).

The reference to "prave pattles" in France can only serve to comment ironically on the present dramatic situation, for history is in the making even as Fluellen speaks, and perhaps the "pravest pattle" to be recorded in the English chronicles is Henry's victory at Agincourt.

The Chorus contributes a peculiar dramatic irony too in its relation to the audience. It constantly refers to the audience as "gentles" disregarding the composition of the Elizabethan audience representing all classes. As the Chorus personifies the ordinary Englishman's views, he encompasses the popular aspiration to be inspired by the representation of worthy actions exemplified in heroical portraits. However, as we have seen, the Chorus's view of the action changes, and in the fifth Chorus he praises Henry not for his loud and noisy victory but rather as a pious and humble victor. He describes Henry as

> Being free from vainness and self-glorious pride,...
> Giving full trophy, signal, and ostent
> Quite from himself, to God (5. 0. 20-22.).

The Chorus presents the citizens, in contradiction to Henry, as ready to receive Henry with all the pomp and circumstance of a Roman triumphal march:

> The Mayor and all his brethren, in best sort,
> Like to the senators of th' antique Rome
> With plebians swarming at their heels,
> Go forth and fetch their conqu'ring Caesar in -- (5. 0. 25-8.).

As the Chorus throughout focuses attention on the national spirit, it is not unseemly that the juxtaposition of the Christian King and the almost pagan idolatry of the citizens is meant to suggest that as a Christian nation, in the fifteenth century and in the present time of the Chorus's narration, the aspiring mind must be chastened with a deeper understanding of what accounts for praise of their Englishness.

Thus the Chorus serves to cast the mind of the auditors forward in anticipation of events; it agrees with the popular estimation of the glorious victor of Agincourt, but it also serves to focus attention on the Chorus's own perspective, which is a mirror of the audience's expectations of the history play. Shakespeare does not endorse the rather crude formulations of the effects of the history play to affect the audience directly and to inspire them to imitate the ideals personified in the players; rather, he approaches the audience from a psychologically sophisticated point of view.

It is inconceivable that Shakespeare did not expect the audience to hold in its mind the various points of view presented in the Chorus and to respond actively to the different rhetorical styles in the play. They would respond to the Tamburlainan swelling rhetoric as well as the pitiful accents of the portrayal of the night scene. As Wolfgang Clemen observes:

> ...on this stage, the spoken word alone, working on the imaginations of the audience, had to give shape to everything that would be visibly present on the stage in later days.[46]

L.A. Cormican, too, emphasizes the potentiality that the intimate stage of the Elizabethans afforded the dramatist:

> ...the bare Elizabethan stage is not the result of mere ignorance or of a merely crude economy; the bare stage has something of the symbolism of the bare cell of the monk--it is what it is partly because of the widespread belief that the physical apparatus of life is its least important part.[47]

What really counts in Elizabethan drama and in Shakespeare's drama in particular is words. It is above all a spoken form. The audience, accustomed to listening to sermons and rhetors of all shapes, from the country ballad monger to the high alderman and courtiers, would have been highly receptive to the nuances of style and tone which Shakespeare presents in his drama. Shakespeare accords them that capacity and expects them to respond to the disparity between the Chorus and the action and to keep the different styles in memory as they view the action and the rhetors in the play.

The references to the imagination scattered throughout the Chorus provide examples of Shakespeare's awareness of the suppleness of the imagination which enables men to link events and to contrast perspectives. In the third Chorus he includes a reference to the flexibility of the imagination:

> Thus with imagined wing our swift scene flies
> In motion of no less celerity
> Than that of thought...(3. 0. 1-3.).

Similarly in the fifth Chorus:

> So swift a pace hath thought, that even now
> You may imagine him upon Blackheath, (5. 0. 16-17.)

and again:

> But ~~now behold~~,
> In the quick forge and working-house of thought,
> How London doth pour out her citizens (5. 0. 23-24.).

The Chorus that opens the play includes a reference to his function that is an ironic commentary on the ludicrousness of the perceived need for a Chorus to brook the abridgement of time, carrying the action "here and there, jumping o'er times/ Turning th' accomplishment of many years /Into an hourglass" (1. 0. 29-30.). He says:

---

[46] Clemen, p. 43.
[47] Cormican, p. 199.

> And thence to France shall we convey you safe,
> And bring you back, charming the narrow seas
> To give you gentle pass--for if we may
> We'll not offend one stomach with our play (2. 0. 37-40.).

The Chorus's concern for the audience's well-being can only be disingenuous. That an audience can digest the change ~~of time and~~ space in a play without the effort or apparent difficulty is an implicit commentary on the Humanist imitation of classical drama, which called for the unity of time, place, and action. If Marlowe's Tamburlaine is a manifesto on style, Shakespeare's Chorus provides implicit hints of his criticism of such rigid and undramatic conventions. The Chorus implies Shakespeare's stylistic concern to maintain an effective disposition of interrelated scenes that continually interanimate each other and give the effect of life in all its variety. Speaking of Shakespeare's language, L.A. Cormican explains it as

> ...a way of combining words which maintains constantly before our attention the vast complexities of a given situation, drawing out its implications by the strictly dramatic method of setting the various items of the situation in constant interaction. The mature Shakespeare idiom is, among other things, a continuously effective device for exploring and contemplating a given human scene; it is a language which(in a manner closely similar to Hebrew) transcends the great limitation of language, that it must present things in succession. It resembles Wagner's device of thematic harmony which is not so much a succession of chords, but melody laid on melody, each recalling an important theme or interest; it resembles musical harmony in the full use it makes of the suggestive overtones which words set-up when combined in certain ways.[41]

The multiple perspectives Shakespeare creates in the scenes and in the texture of the language is a continuously effective device for developing resonances. The dramatic action is never the episodic narration with the monotonous feeling of a child's story; and then he did this and then he did that, and then he did this. In *Henry IV* Shakespeare develops a resonating perspectival view that is organized around a thematic concern -- to show different perspectives on honor. In *Henry V* Shakespeare focuses the attention on different interpretations of history; he gives that of the Chorus (and implicitly elicits that of the audience), he has the Archbishop comment on the King, and of course he allows Henry to dramatize himself.

It is appropriate that the epilogue that closes the play should be composed in sonnet form. The Chorus calls attention to its formulation of events and to the artifice of its own contrivance. The framing devices Shakespeare employs depend upon the mood of the play and the complexity of the problems encompassed within the play. It is particularly appropriate that the peripety in the sonnet comes, in the Petrarchan manner, after the eighth line and with the shift from Henry V to his son. The sonnet is an imitative device that suggests the swing of history from the glorious reign of the father to the ignoble disorder of the son. It suggests the insecurity of history, and the mutability of glory -- a motive to the pattern of history and to the demise of Henry. It suggests that fortune made his sword but that his brief and glorious reign was an interruption of a pattern of retribution which must needs be carried out in the realm of Henry VI. The Chorus takes the orthodox view of the Tudor myth and explains Henry's reign in terms of it. It is in order to praise Henry that the Chorus alludes to the interpretation, for only such an important figure could have stayed the will of Divine Providence and postponed the vengeance that must necessarily run its course. The Chorus emphasizes the element of cosmic destiny and not the "prevention" of characters in shrewdly orchestrating the events of history to their own designs. That Shakespeare includes this view in his portrayal of Henry in his speeches is the purpose of the chapter that follows.

---

[41] Cormican, p. 188.

III. HENRY

If the Chorus in *Henry V* exists to supply the estimation of Henry from the vantage point of the contemporary Elizabethan looking back at his 'glorious reign' and is developed according to contemporary justifications of the history play, the dramatization of Henry within that frame provides a more realistic view of the famous Henry that secures the impression that he was a shrewd and calculating monarch, eminently capable of manipulating popular opinion and conscious of the need to project an interpretation of his acts and character that would supply a symbolic countenance. Throughout the play he is seen orchestrating events and supplying the interpretation of those events; he is seen creating his own personal mythology. If in *Richard II*, Shakespeare provides a characterization of the poet-king, in *Henry V* Shakespeare provides a portrait of the orator-king. The characterization of the King is fascinating because Shakespeare presents the character of a monarch who is the "creator as well as the creature of political mythology, the author as well as the hero of his legend."[49]

The action of the dramatic material provides a contrasting perspective to the unrealistic interpretation of Henry in the Chorus. Where the Chorus supplies the idealism of heroic portraiture, the action provides a realistic account of the King. Henry is seen creating a public image. He anticipates and prevents future criticism and provides justifications of his acts which project an unsullied heroic image. Further, his character is developed in reference to his prehistory. The character of Henry V is "fraught with background"; the characterization of the King is constantly brought into contact with references to his former self amongst the Eastcheap companions. Shakespeare creates a biographical portrait in depth. The King's actions in the present circumstances are constantly contrasted to those of his past.

That Shakespeare, in the first scene of *Henry V*, introduces the theme of prevention in the interview between Canterbury and Ely is not accidental. Ely asks Canterbury at the beginning of the scene what prevention they can afford themselves in deterring the expropriation of church lands proposed in the Bill from the Commons. Shakespeare characteristically loads the terms of the statement to bring an ambiguity to bear on the situation. The word 'prevention' in its double meaning brings the conflict of *Henry V* into focus. In its theological sense the word means "to go before with spiritual guidance and help; said of God, or of his grace anticipating human actions or need to meet with welcome or succor." In its more mundane usage the word means "to stop, keep, or hinder" a person from doing something and refers to the human capacity to anticipate events.[50]

Within the play, Shakespeare provides a focus on the interpretation of events according to a Providential destiny but also from the perspective of human contrivance of events. The play begins *In medias res*. It develops the character of Henry in reference to his former self amongst the Eastcheap fellows. The Archbishop is convinced, at the beginning of the play, that the King has undergone a spiritual transformation or conversion. He expresses wonder and amazement at the transformation he presumes the Prince to have undergone:

---

[49] Ornstein, p. 137. Note that Ornstein's remark refers to the Henry of *Henry IV, Part I*.

[50] Definitions quoted from the OED.

> The courses of this youth promised it not.
> The breath no sooner left his father's body
> But that the wildness, mortified in him,
> Seemed to die too...(1. 1. 25-28.).

The Archbishop's estimation of the King's reformation is decidedly literary. It is not unlike the parable of the prodigal son returned unto the fold in the Bible (Luke 15) or the story of Saint Augustine's *Confessions* of his spiritual transformation. The Archbishop explains the displacement of wilful desire and passion by reason. An allusion to Greek mythology furnishes him the imagery that explains the right ordering of the soul. Hercules's labour of cleansing the Augean stables provides a background for the image of the flood scouring faults. Similarly, his description of hydra-headed wilfulness suggests the efforts of the epic hero in Greek, British, and Irish mythology. The serpent, desire, is subdued by the hero, Apollo, Saint George, or Saint Patrick, and the maintenance of order prevails as a result. The Archbishop's explanation develops the suggestion of spiritual purification; the body is envisaged as a vessel that is sacramentally purged of all ills.

It is important that the Archbishop's rather literary expression of the King's reformation is countered by Ely's suggestion of conscious intent. The Archbishop's description of the event is decidedly romantic; it excludes the creatural. Indeed, the events seem to be the intervention of the gods; the fate of the King seems arranged in a scenario reminiscent of the classical *Deus ex machina.* Further, it is not far from the medieval concept of kingship. The coronation ceremony represented a sacramental relation. The anointing of the King was seen to be the transformation of his body: no longer merely a man, he took on a sacred dimension. Thus Shakespeare presents two conflicting points of view on the nature of the King's reformation at the outset of the play. The allegorical or even hagiographical nature of the Archbishop's explanation is contrasted to the creatural view expressed by Ely. Ely's suggestion of conscious intent induces the Archbishop to acknowledge that "miracles are ceased" (1. 1. 67.), and therefore a more literal explanation of the King's reformation must be sought.

That Shakespeare provides a contrast between the creatural view and a more unrealistic and sublime explanation of the King's reformation at the outset of the play attests to his concern to evaluate the springs of human action. The contrast makes explicit the disparity between the Humanist view, which sees the fate of the individual as the direct result of his character and his free will; the classical view, which portrays character in relation to the gods protecting the hero under a divine aegis; and the Christian view, which allows God's grace to influence the fate of a particular individual. The interest in *Henry V* is to hold these conflicting estimations of character constantly before the audience, to show how the King takes advantage of such romantic estimations of his character, and ultimately to show how the chronicling of historical events takes hold of the public events of the life of a hero and obscures the creatural.

It is to withhold judgement on the particular nature of the King's motivation that Shakespeare presents Henry V in his public dimension without recourse to his personal and private feelings. However, there is abundant evidence to support the view that the Prince has, as Ely suggests, submitted himself to a strict surveillance and self-consciously maintains kingly protocol and propriety. Henry himself alludes to his efforts to govern his behavior in accordance with a noble and aristocratic ideal. He suggests that he maintains a strict self-scrutiny, monitoring his words and gestures in reference to what is expected of a King. Explaining the keeping of state appropriate to a Christian king, he says:

> We are no tyrant, but a Christian king,
> Unto whose grace our passion is as subject
> As is our wretches fettered in our prisons (1. 2. 241-43).

The pronouncement is extreme in its imagery; it reflects a violent submission of passions to reason, and a stern observance of order. Shakespeare takes in the elements of the Tamburlainian rhetorical drama but provides a portrait of a 'hero' that is more complicated and more dramatically interesting. Henry is depicted in the "glaring colours" of *Tamburlaine*; his speeches are delivered with the "fortissimo of formalized ritual".[31] However, this is not the only style he commands. Indeed the development of the king in *Henry V* shows his ability to use a homiletic style, the Tamburlainian bombastic style, and intermediary styles that are more subdued and quiet as well as wittily urbane. Shakespeare's rearrangement of the chronicle play materials and the consciousness with which Henry V uses rhetoric reveal Shakespeare's intention to show the King's calculated control of events.

The scene with the English counsellors that begins the play is a public resolution scene that has little to do with the determination of events. The resolution that it dramatizes is seen to have been a foregone conclusion. There is no real debate in question; rather, it exists to reveal Henry's ability to galvanize support and reconcile doubts in public display. Everything contributes to revealing the King's 'prevention' and his powers of stage-managing a public spectacle. Henry's call for the Archbishop's justification of his projected plans to invade France emphasises Henry's ability to suit his speech to the hearer. Secure in the knowledge that the Archbishop is predisposed to avert the bill of the Commons by supporting the French war, Henry stages a public spectacle which makes the initiation to go to war seem a result of the Archbishop's counsel. The speech is a rhetorical *tour de force*; Henry defuses any future criticism or censure of his person and his cause by making the projected plans (which we have every reason to believe he has already decided upon) the result of his counsellors' exhortations. The speech is characterized by a homiletic strain that is not unlike Hal's censorious insinuations to Falstaff in *Henry IV*. Shakespeare includes insinuations that the King's 'conjuration' of the Archbishop is double edged: while he makes himself the agent of the Archbishop's counsel, he is not unconscious of the glozing arguments that the Archbishop will utter as a testimonial to the rightness of his cause. Henry's 'conjuration' of the Archbishop is remarkably similar, in tenor, to Holinshed's account:

> ...neither the ambitious desire to enlarge his dominions, neither to purchase vaine renowne and worldlie

---

[31] Clemen, p. 47.

> fame, nor anie other consideration had mooved him to take the warres in hand; but onlie that in prosecuting his juste title, he might in the end atteine to a perfect peace, and come to enioie those peeces of his inheritance, which to him of right belonged: and that before the beginning of the same warres, he was fullie persuaded by men both wise and of great holinesse of life, that upon such intent he might and ought both begin the same warres, and follow them, till he had brought them to an end iustlie and rightlie, and that without all danger of Gods displeasure or perill of soule.[11]

Henry's 'conjuration' of the Archbishop accords with Holinshed's account, for it is as the result of the Archbishop's "holy" persuasions that the King is seen to broach the war. Shakespeare complicates the picture, however, by making the speech to the Archbishop fraught with ambiguity. Henry adopts the manner of a pious innocent who earnestly seeks the trustworthy counsel of the learned and submits himself to the tutelage of that reverend Authority. He underlines that he trusts the faithfulness of the Archbishop to his duty as the protector and guardian of the Christian community, saying that he is sure that his arguments will be sacrosanct, that what he says will in his "conscience [be] washed/ As pure as sin with baptism" (1. 2. 30-1.); it will be sworn under the sacraments of the church and his holy office.

However, Shakepeare includes the sense that Henry knows exactly what the Archbishop is up to. The form of the utterance is described by Auerbach in his discusssion of *Macbeth*: "The form of discourse employed in this passage -- a form which is insidiously implied or 'insinuated' without being stated -- was well known to antiquity. Quintilian treats of it in his ninth book, where he discusses the *controversiae figuratae*, and the great orators offer examples of it."[11] Shakespeare makes a complicated use of the figure, for the insinuation works on a personal level, developing an insinuation of complicity with the Archbishop, and at the same time it is implicitly a public rebuke of his blasphemous designs. It comes as an imputation of guilt, accusing Canterbury of wilfully subordinating his duty as the guardian of souls to more material concerns.

That Henry begins his speech in the subjunctive mood when speaking of the rendering of account and then shifts to the future indicative suggests that he anticipates Canterbury's designs. He underlines the effects of the Archbishop's persuasion:

> For God doth know how many now in health
> Shall drop their blood in approbation
> Of what your reverence shall incite us to.
> Therefore take heed how you impawn our person,
> How you awake our sleeping sword of war;
> We charge you in the name of God take heed.
> For never two such kingdoms did contend
> Without much fall of blood, whose guiltless drops
> Are everyone a foe, a sore complaint
> 'Gainst him whose wrong gives edge unto the swords
> That makes such waste in brief mortality (1. 2. 18-28.).

That the statement is given in the form of an admonition to the Archbishop to regard his duty and to speak like a prelate allows Shakespeare to develop the mood of insinuation. Given the context of the utterance (that the King knows the predisposition of Canterbury to encourage war), the speech comes as an imputation of the glozing designs of the Archbishop. The King anticipates the Archbishop's testimonial to his rightful claims. Henry takes advantage of his knowledge of the Archbishop's complicity in serving his secular ends rather than adhering to the precept of the Christian church to promote the 'secular sword' only in causes that threaten Christendom. Henry's admonitions to Canterbury implicitly censure his blasphemous dissimulation by reminding him of the nature of his office.

---

[11] Holinshed's *Chronicles*, III, 132-3, quoted in Ornstein, p. 183, note 9.
[11] Auerbach, pp. 325-326.

Henry describes his admonition to the Archbishop as a "conjuration." The implicit intent of the statement is to enumerate the conditions of religion and sanctity under which the Archbishop will speak. The King solemnly entreats, as if under oath, the arguments of Canterbury. However, the alternate meanings of the word, "to be sworn to a conspiracy"; "in primitive or superstitious rites to summon up the devil"; and "to issue a magic spell or incantation," suggests the sense in which Henry "conjures" the Archbishop.[14] That Henry is entirely aware of the material concerns of the prelate, the conscious and deceitful bribes offered him by the Church, and aware of the indifference to spiritual concerns with which Canterbury performs his office is suggested by his speech. That the Archbishop takes the sanctity of his office lightly and will willingly enter into a complicity with the King's cause in France regardless of the offense to Christendom in broaching war against Christian souls is implicit in the rhetorical devices the King uses to insinuate a layered meaning. Henry's speech is an admonition to the Archbishop to do his office fairly, according to the dictates of the Church, but also it is an exhortation to provide a religious justification of the cause that is tendentious, that is heavily weighted in favour of the English claim.

Shakespeare makes fruitful use of the ambiguities of diction, grammar, and mood. The utterance is delivered as a series of moral admonitions: "We pray you to proceed...And God forbid... that you should fashion, wrest or bow your reading...For God doth know... Therefore take heed how you impawn our person...Under this conjuration speak..." Henry makes the agent of his conjuration God by framing his utterances as indirect commands. By doing so he allows that the strength of the hortatory subjunctive will depend on the force of the injunction of God's command as it affects the Archbishop's conscience. As he knows the Archbishop is predisposed to support the war, he judges that the force of this injunction will be weak. Similarly, that he does not say; "explain the justice and righteousness of this cause" but says "justly and religiously unfold" creates an implication that Henry is exhorting the Archbishop on how he should frame the speech. It is the diction that establishes the most ambiguity. The phrase "fashion, wrest or bow your reading" develops the sense of a sophistical rendering of account. "Fashion" can mean "create" (as a glozing text), be captious or sophistical. As Gary Taylor explains in his footnote, the word expresses the sense "give a false or counterfeit shape to...".[15] The word "wrest" creates the sense of dislocating meaning to suit a particular cause. Similarly, the phrase "nicely charge your understanding soul" is clearly meant to suggest sophistry and tendentiousness. The word "nicely" in its original meaning means "precisely" as in the phrase "make nice distinctions". Taken together the phrases would seem to mean "do not challenge or oppose your rational faculty, commit sophistry, make delicate distinctions, obscure your soul to the truth." The phrase "whose right/Suits not in native colours with the truth" seems like a call to the Archbishop to deliver arguments that suit the English cause. The most important meaning of the word "colour" in this context is its use as a rhetorical term as in "figures, terms, or colours". The whole thrust of the speech, then, calls attention to the "colouring" in rhetoric that the Archbishop will give his speech. While Henry does not in soliloquy explain, as in *Henry IV*, Act I, "I know you all," his insinuations point to his understanding of the Archbishop's designs.

---

[14] Definitions quoted from OED.

[15] Taylor, p. 100, quoting OED.

Indeed the whole discussion of the claim to France reveals Henry's power to orchestrate a dramatically climactic sequence of speeches. After calling for the public justification of war, he introduces a caveat of conflict into the resounding echo of voices supporting and exhorting him to broach war. The sequence has the feel of a debate, but in fact the atmosphere of dialectical give and take is completely lacking. By establishing a mood of hesitant and unfirm resolve, questioning his cause and claim, Henry moves his counsellors to plangent exhortation. Indeed throughout the sequence Henry provides a vivid contrast of sober and cautious contemplation to the fervent and highly pitched enthusiasms of his counsellors. Throughout the sequence, his is the dissenting voice. He orchestrates the sequence of speeches so that he remains the passive and undecided member to be convinced by the arguments of those around him. Henry's seeming indecision, then, enforces the sense that the counsellors must buttress their arguments of legality with all the rhetoric at their command. The organization of the scene, then, emphasizes the cumulative structure. It proceeds from legal argumentation, the determining of precedents, to emotional exhortation. The sequence reveals the gradual suppression of rational argument in favour of rhetorical persuasion.

The climax of this sequence establishes the most figuratively elaborate speeches in the play. Exeter's "government as music" speech and the Archbishop's "bee kingdom" speech elaborate the medieval concept of government as order and harmony. Far from using the estimation of cosmic coherence and the harmonious working together of all the distinct parts of the nation in unison as a reflection of the King's conception of government and war, Shakespeare emphasizes that it is the view of the King's counsellors. The Archbishop's bee speech forms the climax of this "conflict sequence" and is deliberately placed in the penultimate position: it forms the clinching argument to the figurative elaborations that preceded it. It is an elaborate analogy illustrating the cosmic coherence, which, according to Canterbury, pervades the ordering of man's estate and of the natural world. Canterbury's method is that of the medieval allegorist or exegete. He deduces his conclusions from an analogy that could work just as well to dispute his claims. While he argues that the order of obedience exemplified in the bee kingdom teaches a peopled kingdom how to manage its various elements, the Archbishop ignores the implications of war for the particular souls that carry it out.

In his resolution speech, Henry picks up the imagery and rhetorical organization of his counsellors' arguments and thereby achieves a sense of closure of unanimous support and commitment to the sequence of argumentation. Henry's resolution speech echoes the three part structure which characterized the ordering and speeches of his counsellors. Each sentence contains what Harry Levin in his book, *The Overreacher*, calls an absolute alternative:[36]

> Now are we well resolved, and by God's help
> And yours, the noble sinews of our power,
> France being ours we'll bend it to our awe,
> Or break it all to pieces. Or there we'll sit
> Ruling in large and ample empery
> O'er France and all her almost kingly dukedoms,
> Or lay these bones in an unworthy urn,
> Tombless, with no remembrance over them.
> Either our history shall with full mouth
> Speak freely of our acts, or else our grave,
> Like Turkish mute, shall have a tongueless mouth,
> Not worshipped with a waxen epitaph (1. 2. 222-232.).

The speech feels like that of a man adjusting his words to the expectations of his auditors. Henry takes up the imagery of his counsellors when he refers parenthetically to the "noble sinews of our power." As Exeter and Canterbury had so fervently insisted on the functioning of the parts in coordination and under the direction of one arm, so Henry's metaphor makes the nobles the energizing force supporting his resolution. Similarly, Henry reiterates the Archbishop's fanciful bee analogy and its fairy-tale atmosphere imagining himself the Emperor of all he surveys. The phrase "Ruling in large and ample empery" is not unlike the Archbishop's description of the emperor of the bees who "busied in his majesty surveys/The singing masons... The civil citizens...The poor mechanic porters..." (1. 2. 197-200).

It is significant that Henry's speech is characterized by an aspiration for fame. Henry takes up the counsellor's exhortations to "look back into [his] mighty ancestors" to "Go...to his great grandsire's tomb" and to remember his glorious victories which provided a chronicle "as rich with praise/As is the ooze and bottom of the sea/With sunken wreck and sumless treasures" (1. 2. 102-3.). The resolution speech is composed in accordance with the counsellor's exhortations to Henry to achieve the conditions of fame. It picks up the particularly pagan elements of the Archbishop's praises. Fame is to be achieved and recorded on earth without consideration of an afterlife. The challenge Henry sets himself is to achieve immortality in stone or to "lay these bones in an unworthy urn/Tombless with no remembrance over them."

The resolution speech is organized around one of the topics of praise in classical rhetoric, namely, *fortitudo*. The high pitch of resolution is not unlike the resolution in Tamburlaine's speeches. Henry takes in the mainspring of the Tamburlainian aspiration to be the conqueror of kingdoms and makes an uncompromising series of absolute alternatives. He makes a personal manifesto to achieve fame as the mainspring of his action; it is a testament of an unparalleled and insatiable lust for kingdoms and glory. In Henry's vituperative attack on the Dauphin's insult, the aspiration for personal glory is not given in itself as a sufficient motivation for war; Shakespeare reduces the sense that the cause of war is personal vengeance or a chivalric challenge. Indeed he diminishes the sense of paired challenges that characterized his portrayal of Hal and Hotspur. The King is not countered with the Dauphin; rather he is viewed in respect to his fellow countrymen. Henry's reply to Exeter's remark about his threatening of the Dauphin secures the focus on Henry's calculated control of his rhetoric. He says "We hope to make the sender blush at it" (1. 2. 299.) to Exeter's commendation, "This was a merry message" (1. 2. 288.). The shift of mood from violent invective to sober judgement suggests the premeditation with which Henry speaks. Shakespeare underlines the conscious deploying of rhetoric to gain certain ends, not as the unleashing of passion, violent aggression, or personal vengeance.

---

[36] Levin, p. 23.

The speech about the Dauphin is carefully calculated to shame him. Henry's threatening is balanced with a concern to illustrate the consequences of war and to denigrate the Dauphin's scornful and condescending appraisal of his person. The speech is tailored to the arrogant challenge of the Dauphin, proud of his physical prowess and eager to test his mettle without a thought to how his actions affect the lives of those others who will perish as the result of his puerile one-upmanship and proud boasts. Rather than an overture to war, Henry's retort to the Dauphin's insult is an object lesson on the consequences of war. Henry's estimation of the Dauphin's arrogant attitude is implicit in his figures and in the sardonic inferences to his appraisal of Henry's character.

The speech encompasses a range of mood. It begins courteously in magnanimous gesture to the messengers in balanced sentences which are firmly end-stopped and mounts to a climactic pitch by enjambing the lines:

> We are glad the Dauphin is so pleasant with us.
> His present and your pains we thank you for.
> 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 (1. 2. 259-263.).

Harry creates an ethopoetic speech framing the condescending attitude of the Dauphin in the speech:

> We never valued this poor seat of England,
> And therefore, living hence, did give ourself
> To barbarous license -- as 'tis ever common
> That men are merriest when they are from home (1. 2. 269-272.).

As Hal to Poins was wary of the common road of men's thoughts and knew that the popular mind would see only hypocrisy in a show of grief for his father's illness, so Henry gages his rebuke according to the image he knows the Dauphin holds of him. He answers the deprecatory estimation of his "frolicsome" nature with a mounting rhetoric that is not unlike Tamburlaine's raising of his bloody flag in "kindled wrath." But where Henry's rhetoric mounts to possess the Dauphin with fear and show his resolution, it is also modulated with more serious concerns. He answers him tit-for-tat by making his metaphors match the tenor of the Dauphin's attitude to war. As Henry perceives that the Dauphin views war as sport or a game between chivalric challengers, he suits the vehicle of his metaphor to the tenor of that attitude but makes it an implicit rebuke of his egotism. The metaphor of tennis balls turned to gunstones that will strike the Dauphin's soul with vengeance secures the bellicose strain that projects a fearful aspect, but at the same time the sheer threatening of the message is brought into alignment with the serious consideration of the consequences of war on the innocent victims it destroys in its wake. In the first part Henry takes up the element of sport or game which he considers to be the Dauphin's attitude. But Henry does not allow the element of sport to remain the central effect of the imagery. He takes up the vehicle of the metaphor by making the verbal elements imitate the action of gunstones flying:

> And tell the pleasant Prince this mock of his
> Hath turned his balls to gunstones, and his soul
> Shall stand sore charged for the wasteful vengeance
> That shall fly from them -- for many a thousand widows
> Shall this his mock mock out of their dear husbands,
> Mock mothers from their sons, mock castles down;
> Ay, some are yet ungotten and unborn
> That shall have cause to curse the Dauphin's scorn (1. 2. 281-288.).

In riddling way the mock used as a noun and then turned into a verb that effects the ravages of innocent victims of war links the Dauphin's attitude to the consequences. Henry keeps any suggestions of pride from entering into his attitude; he carefully counters any note of arrogance by referring his project to God's will, and the maledictions that he prognosticates will be levelled at the Dauphin by his own people. That Henry picks up the word "savour" which was used in the ambassador's message from the Dauphin emphasizes Henry's rhetorical command. The Dauphin's messenger relayed that he "savoured too much of [his] youth." Henry's closes his denunciation of the Dauphin with the statement, "His jest will savour but of shallow wit/When thousands weep more than did laugh at it." This utterance creates a firm sense of closure and secures the emphasis that the speech is a calculated answer in the terms most appropriate to the Dauphin's meaning but fraught with an extra weight of significance. That the word "savour" forms part of a closed couplet shows Henry's mastery of disposing his materials. He leaves the damning assertion of irresponsibility to the end of his rejoinder to the Dauphin. He picks up the tone of the Dauphin's rebuke and counters it with claims that are more important than a witty bandying of words. His gesture thereby is given in graphic clarity: the rhetorical disposition of the material is given order and dramatic impact and his meaning is securely emphasized and underlined.

While in the first act, Henry's "prevention" is implicit, in the scene with the traitors it is explicit. It is apparent from the beginning of the scene that Henry knows the false semblances of loyalty of the traitors. Henry's speech to Scrope develops the homiletic tendency of the speeches to the Archbishop and to the Dauphin, though he is more frank in his exposure of his guilt. As he turns the Archbishop's rhetoric into an implicit rebuke of his glozing designs, and scornfully criticizes the Dauphin's puerility, so in the episode with the traitors does he make the traitors accuse themselves. Prepared in the opening segment of the scene to pardon "the man committed yesterday/That railed against our person" for the reason that "it was excess of wine that set him on," (2. 2. 40-42.) he is counselled by Scrope, Grey, and Cambridge against the use of mercy and admonished to "let him be punished...lest example/Breed, by his sufferance, more of a kind." Their general principle becomes the reason for their own punishment when the discovery of their plot is made:

> The mercy that was quick in us but late
> By your counsel is suppressed and killed.
> You must not dare, for shame, to talk of mercy,
> For your own reasons turn into your bosoms,
> As dogs upon their masters, worrying you--(2. 2. 76-80.).

Henry's orchestration of events in this scene is masterly in the way he makes his punishment of the traitors seem entirely justified. It is the mark of praise in Holinshed's account that Henry was "...so severe a justicer [that he was both] loved and obeied (and so humane withall) that he left no offense unpunished, no freendship unrewarded...."[51] This scene makes explicit how a shrewd rhetor, conscious of his actions, projects an untarnished countenance before the public eye by supplying the justification of the action. Henry makes it seem condign punishment to exact the demands of retribution by making the counsel come from the traitors' own mouth.

Henry consistently maintains a firm control of his passion. He dispenses justice with impersonality and even indifference. After having submitted the traitors to the laws of the kingdom and the mercy of God, he returns to the cause at hand. He takes advantage of the treachery as an indication of God's approbation, saying:

> We doubt not of a fair and lucky war,
> Since God so graciously hath brought to light
> This dangerous treason lurking in our way
> To hinder our beginnings...(2. 2. 181-94.).

Just as Henry says he will "hear, note, and believe in heart," the Archbishop's justification and uses it to enforce the impact of his resolution speech, so does he resolve the Dauphin's insult into an inspiration to his soldiers saying, "for God before,/We'll chide this Dauphin at his father's door" (1. 2. 307-8.). Similarly he makes the discovery of treason seem a harbinger of success. The ability to turn the situation to his advantage, to shed an optimistic light on the action, and to project a sense of unanimous support to the expedition is evidence of his virtuosity as a political manipulator. Henry marshalls his forces in an emphatic mode. This mode is the idiom at the end of the first act at Southampton:

> Therefore let every man now task his thought
> That this fair action may on foot be brought (1. 2. 309-10.).
>
> Cheerly to sea, the signs of war advance:
> No king of England, if not King of France (2. 2. 189-190.).

In both scenes Henry's mood changes from invective to exhortation. As Henry resolves the Dauphin's insult into an encouragement to war, so in the second scene does he use the treachery to marshall his forces. His mood changes from that of an injured innocent betrayed by his closest bed fellow to that of the impartial judge and finally to an optimistic and enthusiastic encouragement to war.

---

[51] Bullough, p. 408.

Because the play is organized around a series of set speeches that must be held in the mind and which provide ironic contrasts to one another, Shakespeare emphasizes Henry's rhetoric by parodying it in the low, comic scenes. He does not completely diminish the effectiveness of the King's rhetoric by holding it up for criticism but develops subtle reflections on the public character of a monarch who is constantly conscious of the effects he intends to create through his rhetoric. Shakespeare creates a multiplicity of perspectives on the King by creating a subject that mirrors, in parody, the rhetoric of the King, but which ultimately exists to supply a view of the action from a less public and more personal frame of reference. These sequences support Auerbach's contention that Shakespeare's method is to set up alternate styles which serve to provide contrasting views of a similar theme. That the Eastcheap scenes serve to comment ironically on the justice of the King is apparent from the first. Henry is seen by the Eastcheap fellows as the king who killed Falstaff's heart. Nim observes that "The King hath run bad humours on the knight" (2. 1. 16-17.). He contends that "The King is a good King, but it must be as it may. He passes some humours and careers" (2. 1. 120-1.). Shakespeare parallels Henry's judgement of the traitors with the report of Falstaff's death by the Hostess. That she forgives Falstaff everything and forgets the abuse and disdain with which he used her is meant as a reflection on the king's treatment of the traitors. Her justice is all forgiveness and personal sentimentality; his is all impersonal, unflinchingly impartial, and he refers the traitors not to [illegible] own forgiveness but to that of God. He makes the traitors, and ultimately Falstaff, responsible for their own souls.

It is important that Shakespeare creates an ending to the second Eastcheap scene that mirrors Henry's change of mood after judging the traitors. Henry's rallying cry to his fellows to support him in an enterprise that will be "like glorious to all" is directly paralleled by Pistol's baldly opportunistic cry to his

> Yokefellows at arms,
> Let us to France, like horseleeches, my boys,
> To suck, to suck, the very blood to suck" (2. 3. 48-50).

The sense of closure gained by the repetition and sententious rhythm of the last line of Pistol's exhortation is a scurrilous parallel to Henry's rhyming at the end of act two. While Henry makes everything seem impersonal, the result of larger forces not merely contingent on his personal aspirations, the sense of fellowship Pistol projects is premised on the hopes of plunder and self-aggrandizement. Where Henry projects a sense of union to a greater cause, Pistol's momentous and vigorous urgency is propelled by the need to earn.[11] The scenes are quickly juxtaposed and comically closed, when, in the scene that caps the sequence, the French King introduces the counsel speech with the dramatic continuer, "Thus comes the English with full power upon us" (2. 4. 1.), coming directly after the departure of the Eastcheap band of "sworn brothers in filching" ([illegible]. 43.). The French king's solemn declaration of the fearfulness of the English preparation shows Shakespeare's masterly employment of peripety, or the sudden shift or change of mood. Shakespeare keeps up an alternation of scenes developed to a patriotic pitch modulated with scenes which temper and qualify this mood by a display of English baseness. By continually changing these perspectives Shakespeare can prevent one view's dominating or taking precedence over the other while maintaining an accurate and realistic portrayal of the range of temperaments and motives of the English. The Archbishop's analogy of the bee kingdom was developed to show that "a thousand actions once afoot / End in one purpose, and be all well borne / Without defect" (1. 2. 211-13.). The parallels developed serve as an ironic commentary on the Archbishop's trust in the unity in diversity.

---

[11] The word is used in its double sense when Pistol explains his grief for Falstaff at the beginning of scene three act 2. He uses it to mean grieve for Falstaff but quickly counters this with the sense to "make money" as the result of the loss of their provider. See Taylor, p. 140.

Henry's address to his soldiers at Harfleur is similarly developed with a dramatic continuer that deflates the inspiration he effects in his soldiers. Henry's address to his soldiers, before the breach at Harfleur is meant to inspire them to fight lustily and is tricked out with the most realistic depiction of the soldier at war. The effect of Henry's rhetoric is directed explicitly to the senses with none of the subtle conception of his former speeches. Henry is Aristotle's orator who understands the psychology of rhetoric. He creates a graphic portrayal of the aspects of the soldier he intends his men to imitate. He creates a catalogue of the senses and furnishes each item with a pictorial image that is meant to captivate the hearer in imitation of the image. It is a step by step enumeration of the process of brutalizing the mind to the task of war. The verbs he uses emphasize the hardening of any sympathetic emotions. He conjures his soldiers to steel their minds, concentrate their attention and "*imitate* the action of the tiger...*stiffen* the sinews, *conjure* up the blood / *Disguise* fair nature...*lend* the eye a terrible aspect...*set* the teeth and *stretch* the mind...*Hold* hard the breath and *bend* up every spirit / To his full height". His address is close to an exhortation to unleash the passions. While the rhetoric is bombastic, it matches the needs of the situation: it shows Henry's understanding of the affective character of graphic visual imagery and percussive imperatives. The speech is a concentration of Tamburlainian bombastic imagery. However, that the "imitation" is made so explicit is perhaps a sidelong glance at the justification of the history play as an imitation of martial virtue. Shakespeare makes it explicit that the emotions of war call men to be "copy...to men of grosser blood" (3. 1. 24.).

Henry's highly pitched address to his soldiers at Harfleur is put into apposition with the ballad-like extension ~~of it fit~~ for pusillanimous ears. The astounding terms of Henry's paean to war are resolved into the battle music suited to the Eastcheap band. The momentum of Henry's speech is continued in Bardolph's entrity "On, on, on, on, on! To the breach, to the breach" (3. 2. 1.). However, the inspired afflatus of Henry's speech is quickly turned to comic flatulence. As Henry waxes to a warlike strain of a redoubtable and truculent bellicosity, so the stuff of the following scene marks the waning of such warlike humours. Nim explains the spirit of valour according to the Renaissance humour psychology and excuses his cowardice by reference to his deterministic formula ~~for it:~~

> Pray thee corporal, stay. The knocks are too hot, and for mine own part I have not a case of lives. The humour of it is too hot, that is the very plainsong of it (3. 2. 2-4.).

Pistol takes up Nim's "plainsong" and develops his own unelaborated melody espousing the unadorned truth of war:

> 'The plainsong' is most just, for humours do abound.
> Knocks go and come, God's vassals drop and die,
> And sword and shield
> In bloodyfield
> Doth win immortal fame (3. 2. 5-9.).

Pistol's representation of battle music is a confusing mixture of "plainsong" rewritten in the metres of the ballad. Shakespeare creates an aural metaphor for the cowardly retreat of the Eastcheap fellows. The boy supplies the second to the duet of the tripping versifiers. He interjects his wish that he were in an alehouse in London, and Pistol supplies a metrical agreement:

> If wishes would prevail with me
> My purpose would not fail with me
> But thither would I hie (3. 2. 13-15.).

The ballad metre that Pistol so imperfectly commands is perfected with the Boy's refrain which caps the sequence:

> As duly
> But not as truly
> As bird doth sing on bough (3, 2. 16-18.).

Pistol and the boy alternate voices in the manner of a song for high and low. Their singing together reflects ironically on the "consent" or singing together of Exeter's music analogy. In plain chant the tenor is the voice which is held while other voices provide a counterpoint. In this poetic chant the tenor is held on the cowardice of the base strings of Henry's soldiery. Their poetic modulation of Henry's exhortation "to the breach" is brought back to its true tenor when Fluellen picks up the refrain and goads them: "Up to the breaches you dogs! Avaunt, you cullions!" (3. 2. 14-20.). The contrast of temperaments is given point by Nim's repetition of his formula, "These be good humours! Your honour runs bad humours." While these soldiers are viewed as derelict in their duty, the sequence serves, as Falstaff's catechism of honour did, to offset the sustained martial rhetoric and to provide a less enthusiastic portrayal of war.

Shakespeare everywhere develops sequences which show the character of the King "perspectively" (to take the French King's description of Henry's vision at the end of the play [5. 2. 308.]). While the audience discovers, in the scene which follows his command to kill the prisoners, that the French have assaulted the boys guarding the luggage, as Gary Taylor notes, "Henry did *not* order the killing as a punitive measure for the French raid on his camp, but as a defensive response to the French counterattack (which in the event included, or got no further than, killing the boys)."[15] Just as Shakespeare parallels Henry's friendship with Falstaff with that of the Hostess, and makes the King clearly responsible for the execution of Bardolph while issuing instructions to his commanders to use lenity and mercy to the French, so does he show Henry's sympathy for Suffolk's death in no way clouding his vision of the necessity for killing the prisoners. In *Henry V*, Shakespeare offers a constant evaluation of the King by offering retrospective justifications of his actions which in no way diminish the sense that his commands are issued in full consciousness of the posssible desolation. Henry constantly sees beyond the situation and takes the least penurious course. The audience, however, is never apprised of Henry's intentions until after the fact. In the case of Harfleur the ultimatum is meant to provide a grisly parallel to the delicate and precious language lesson of Katherine. Shakespeare places the warlike rhetoric of Henry side by side with the portrait of gentility in order to bring the consequences of war's desolation clearly before the audience.

---

[15] Taylor, p. 243.

That it was Shakespeare's intention to bring the destructiveness and brutality of war clearly before the audience is evidenced by the development of the parallel in the closing scene of the play. The last Act forms a counterpart to the opening Act: they are both public, formal and ceremonious. They are, however, opposite in their intentions: the second scene of Act I develops the resolution to go to war while the last scene of Act V reveals the determination to secure peace. They [illegible] both, to a certain extent, public resolution scenes that have nothing to do with the actual determination of events. The resolutions that they dramatize are seen to be foregone conclusions. In the second scene of the first Act, Henry has already decided to go to war; in the last scene of the concluding Act, the wooing of Katherine is a magnanimous gesture on the part of the King, for as he underlines to the French King, she is part of the spoils of war, "She is our capital demand, comprised / Within the forerank of our articles" (5. 2. 96-7.).

The French King's image of peace is a modulation of the Chorus's image of "the high upreared and abutting fronts" of the English and French cliffs as horses lashing out at one another. He enjoins Henry:

> Take her, fair son, and from her blood raise up
> Issue to me, that the contending kingdoms
> Of France and England, whose very shores look pale
> With envy of each other's happiness,
> May cease their hated, and this dear conjunction
> Plant neighbourhood and Christian-like accord
> In their sweet bosoms, that never war advance
> His bleeding sword 'twixt England and fair France (5. 2. 333-40.).

Burgundy too, in his lengthy elaboration of the spoil and desolation wreaked on France, comments on the effects not only to the land but to the character of the people:

> Even so our houses and ourselves and children
> Have lost, or do not learn for want of time,
> The sciences that should become our country,
> But grow like savages -- as soldiers will
> That nothing do but mediate our blood --
> To swearing and stern looks, diffused attire,
> And everything that seems unnatural (5. 2. 56-6".).

These juxtapositions of the attitudes of war and peace are developed most fully in Henry's wooing of Katherine. The rhetoric of Mars that won him Harfleur must be given over to the pleasing and inoffensive strain of Venus, for as the French king says "the cities are turned into a maid -- for they are all girdled with maiden walls that war hath never entered" (5. 2. 309-10.). The wooing scene alleviates the tragic potential of the action presented but secures the perspective focus Shakespeare maintains on the King: he is seen as the soldier-lover, a role that is perhaps a contradiction to his former attitudes but which will be the ultimate testing ground of his powers of persuasion.

IV, SOLDIERS

Although Auerbach explains the pronounced mixture of styles in Shakespeare's work, he does not regard Shakespeare's spirit as a popular one capable of taking the concerns of the low and middle classes seriously or tragically. Even while Auerbach attests to Shakespeare's perspective consciousness and his ability to dramatize the manifold conditions of life, he considers that the depiction of character is carefully graded in accordance with class. In his discussion of Shakespeare's mixture of characters from high and low classes, Auerbach argues that Shakespeare "does not, as the Middle Ages did, conceive of 'everyman' as tragic. He is also more consciously more aristocratic than Montaigne." Auerbach goes on to explain that in Shakespeare's work, "the *humane condition* is reflected very differently in the different classes, not only in practical terms but also from the point of view of aesthetic dignity."[60] Returning to this discussion later in his essay, he gives a fuller explanation of this separation of styles according to class:

> He does not take ordinary everyday reality seriously or tragically. He treats only noblemen, princes and kings, statesmen, commanders, and antique heroes tragically. When common people or soldiers or other representatives of the middle or lower classes appear, it is always in the low style, in one of the many variations of the comic which he commands. The separation of styles in accordance with class appears more consistently in him than in the medieval works of literature and art, particularly those of Christian inspiration, and it is doubtless a reflection of the antique conception of the tragic. It is true, as we have said, that in him tragic persons of the higher classes exhibit frequent stylistic lapses into the corporeal-creatural, the grotesque, and the ambiguous; but the reverse is hardly so. Shylock would seem to be the only figure which might be cited as an exception.... Shakespeare's world-spirit is in no way a popular spirit -- a point which distinguishes him basically from his admirers in the *Sturm und Drang* period and the romantic period. The dynamic throbbing of elemental forces which we feel in his works has nothing to do with the depths of the popular soul with which the men of a later age connected it. From this point of view it is instructive to compare Shakespeare's and Goethe's populace scenes. The first scene in *Romeo and Juliet*, where the servants of the Montagues and Capulets meet, has much in common with the meeting of the peasant leaders with troopers from Bamberg at the beginning of *Götz von Berlichingen*. But how much more serious, more human, and more intelligently interested in the events are Goethe's characters! And if in this case it might be objected that the problems developed in *Götz* concern the people directly, no such objection can be sustained if we compare the populace scenes in the Roman plays, in *Julius Caesar* or *Coriolanus* with those of *Egmont*. It is not only any such sympathetic penetration of the popular soul which is foreign to Shakespeare; he shows nothing precursory of the Enlightenment, of bourgeois morality, and the cultivation of sentiment.[61]

Stated thus, Auerbach's conceptualization of Shakespeare's world spirit is formulated too absolutely. His analysis of the "aristocratic" spirit of Shakespeare's sensibility is misleading. It is undoubtedly true that in the populace scenes in the plays Auerbach discusses, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Corialanus*, and *Julius Caesar*, the low scenes provide, essentially, a comic contrast to the more serious action. The portrayal of the lower classes in these plays is everywhere unsympathetic and derogatory. Even in *Henry IV, Part I*, and to a lesser extent, in *Henry IV, Part II*, the low scenes are essentially comic in spirit even while they exist to comment on the more serious action of the aristocratic scenes. However, the picture is more complicated when we consider the middle and lower classes in the representation of the common soldiers in

Henry V.

---

[60] Auerbach, p. 314.

[61] Auerbach, p. 328.

One must be wary of making statements about the nature of the mixture of styles in Shakespeare's work without providing a context within the development of his canon. As we have seen, L. A. Cormican explains that the mature Shakespearean idiom is a way of creating resonances in the style which contributes a great range of effects on the tone and the mood of even the low scenes. While at the beginning of his career, Shakespeare's portrait of the lower classes tends to be encompassed in a low style that is frankly comic and even burlesque, his development in the second tetralogy exhibits a more serious consideration of the lower classes and this development is the result of his gradual mastery of a plain style that is capable of a sympathetic rendering of everyday life.

In the course of the Henriad, Shakespeare concentrates his efforts on showing how the actions of the aristocracy affect all levels of society. The development of Shakespeare's talents in representing low characters in their own idiom without trivializing or in any way diminishing them is very much more developed in *Henry V* than in both *Henry IV, Parts I* and *II*. It is undoubtedly true that Shakespeare represents the lower classes more realistically in *Henry IV, Parts I* and *II*. One has only to recall the farcical depiction of the Jack Cade rebellion in *Henry VI* to realize that Shakespeare does not allow the depiction of low life to assume the broad humour of burlesque that is so much like the caricatures derived from the stark outlines of personages in the morality play.

While Shakespeare's method is to allow the low scenes to develop "base comparisons" to the strictly sustained high style, the mixture of styles encompassed in the low scenes is premised on an aristocratic perspective. In *Henry IV, Parts I* and *II*, the effects of the aristocratic action on the lives of the commoners is suggested obliquely in atmospheric interludes or in the ironic commentary provided by Falstaff in his recruitment of the common soldiers. The development of the lower classes is suggested impartially; the emphasis is on the treatment of the characterization of the aristocratic characters, Hal and Falstaff.

In general the development of the common soldiers in *Henry IV, Parts I* and *II* is given only in outline. They are included in Falstaff's inventory of the pathetic charges he has recruited for the wars. As the lower classes are developed in relation to Falstaff, it is not surprizing that their development is negligible. Falstaff is a compromise character; he exists as a liminal figure caught between two worlds but maintaining allegiance to neither. Falstaff's infantrymen in both *Henry IV, Parts I* and *II* are so grossly pathetic that they cannot be accorded our serious attention. Our sympathies are overwhelmed by Falstaff's securing the least capable members of the commonwealth to serve as his foot soldiers. Even while there is an undertone of criticism of Falstaff's abusive application of the press, and a sidelong glance at the wars which treat common soldiers as so much cannon fodder, the comedy of the scene precludes a serious expression of their miserable condition. Even in *Henry IV Part II*, where the soldiers are given some room to speak for themselves, the portrayal of their serious concerns is overshadowed by the comedy of Falstaff. They are abstractly or even allegorically developed as a list of their names illustrates. Feeble, Shadow, Mouldy, Wart, and Bullcalf can hardly be considered highly realistic portraits of the lower classes.

In the course of the Henriad there is a marked shift in the stylistic mixtures Shakespeare creates in the representations of the sensibilities of high and low characters. In *Henry V* Shakespeare creates a whole range of stylistic registers for the representations of Henry's soldiery that range from the ludicrous and farcical, through intermediate stages, to the most profoundly serious. For the characterization of Pistol and Nim, he uses the typed exaggerations of character of the comedies and the early histories. These characters are a carry-over from the Falstaff plays. Similarily, he bases his characterization of Fluellen according to a satire of an exaggerated and affected style. However, Williams is given a plain and substantial style and the organization of the thematic material assures that his serious demands do not go unrecognized.

One of the most striking structural features of *Henry V* is the manner in which Shakespeare makes the particular case come into contact with a larger perspective or set of values. Within a play concerned with war, he creates scenes which develop a series of conflicts amongst the English soldiers. Shakespeare creates scenes which contrast the King's conception of mercy and justice with that of his soldiery and he develops these contrasts in relation to an allusive framework that creates resonances of the Last Judgement. Finally, within a play that poignantly deals with the death of Falstaff, Shakespeare creates a continual evaluation of the nature of penance and true contrition; the traitors exhibit a perfunctory penance, Falstaff's death is narrated by the Hostess with all the appropriate misreadings of his sense of reckoning, and the King and his soldiers are presented as if their deaths were imminent. Shakespeare brings his method of multiple perspectives to bear on these themes by constructing parallel scenes that mirror the dialogue and rhetorical style of the aristocratic scenes and thereby brings the popular concerns of the soldiers into alignment with their King.

Loosely conceived, the play reveals a sucession of conflicts. The motivations of the King, the Pistol group, and the professional and common soldiers in going to war are brought into coordination; the conflicting perspectives serve to comment on one another. Within the larger conflict between France and England, Shakespeare focuses attention on the internal conflicts between the different levels of his soldiery. Directly following Henry's resolution to invade France, Nim and Pistol are revealed in their farcical dispute over the possession of the Hostess. The professional soldiers, too, are revealed in arguments, and of course, the King's dispute with Williams develops into a gage that pits the common soldier against the King.

The action at Eastcheap is premised on the betrayal of Nell Quickly who was "troth plight" to Nim and has since taken up with the swaggering Pistol she so abhorred in *Henry IV, Part II*. If her taking up with Pistol is meant to suggest the shifting loyalty and relativity of these low characters, the volatility and defensiveness of this company serve as a grotesque comic parallel to the serious rallying for war. At the beginning of the scene there is no thought of supporting Henry's cause; rather the domestic dispute centres on the quarrel for the possession of the Hostess with Nim's oblique resolve to be revenged on Pistol for the theft. The rapid interchange of insult and defiance is contrasted to the King's threatening manner in his vociferous denunciation of the Dauphin's insult. However, while the King's invective serves his policy as a public display of his firm resolve, the quarrels of these characters seem to be never-ending; they are marked by a tendency to be frigid applications of stock invective that could be applied to any situation. The deliberate contrast of style between the King and these low life characters is meant to expose the patterned, repetitious, and limited comprehension of those who represent reality to themselves in schematic and predictable formulas.

Shakespeare deliberately creates the sense that the quarrel could be played out *ad infinitum*. The dominant mode of speech is vituperation; however, this mode degenerates into comedy as these characters turn everything into insults to their honor which must be countered with chivalric gages of valorous defense. Swords are alternately drawn and sheathed with each new insult or threat, so that the first short scene reveals their violent and dramatic "rhythm and repetition of drawing and sheathing."[62] That these characters apply to every situation the possibility of the gage for settling disputes is part of the comedy of the scene. Unable to communicate and appease each other by compromise or forgiveness, these characters apply the rules of trial by combat to everything. Pistol announces his reliance on the gage to test his mettle and to try his cause by a chivalrous issue to arms when he rebukes Nim and calls him to trial "as manhood shall compound" (1. 1. 94). That this pretentious bravery is a travesty of aristocratic valour and is everywhere deflated is illustrated in his easy acceptance of terms which prohibit the execution of the challenge. Grateful for an excuse to justify his forswearing arms, he takes Bardolph's threats as negating the challenge. In the stilted and old-fashioned manner of the stage villain explaining his actions to the audience, Pistol excuses the shrinking from action with the reason "An oath of mickle might and fury shall abate" and "Sword is an oath and oaths shall have their course" (2. 1. 63; 2. 1. 97). Pistol's speeches are conceived in the manner of sententious antique drama. As Auerbach describes it, "In antique tragedy the philosophizing is generally undramatic; it is sententious, aphoristic, is abstracted from the action and generalized, is detached from the personage and his fate."[63] The fact that Pistol's utterances are given in the future tense and the impersonal voice underlines his propensity to apply stock generalizations to the particular case. The pun on "sword" and "s'word" reveals the sense in which Pistol suits the chivalric code to his purposes. Swords are included in his speeches in order to [illegible] ance into the semblance of trial by ordeal, but, at the same time, they are reduced to elided words that provide the protection he seeks behind the role.[64]

Pistol's *braggadochio* is deliberately contrasted to the action of the main plot; he is the *miles gloriosus* figure of the Roman play; his astounding terms are sheer afflatus. Pistol is conceived as a dramatic cliche, an outmoded player in the declamatory stage tradition in the hyper-inflated vein of King Cambises. His speeches take in the characteristics of the high style; they are replete with Latinisms, Frenchisms, archaic wording, inversion, mythical allusion and analogy, euphuisitic phrasing and chiming alliteration. In the debased coinage of his balladizing wit, the high style is applied indiscriminately to all subjects; or if there is any discrimination it is only that everything is too base and low for the attention of the lofty personage he takes himself to be. His is the Tamburlainian scorn of everything base-born and lowly. His term "base tick" (2. 1. 28.) for Nim underlines this tendency. Nim is visualized as a bothersome little flea to be flicked off.

---

[62] Taylor, p. 123.

[63] Auerbach, p. 324.

[64] The metrical stiffness of Pistol's speeches, his wooden responses to Nim's threatening manner, and the farcical repetition of evasions is remarkably similar to Beckett's schematic characterizations. Challenges dissolve challenges much in the farcical manner of Beckett's drama, where characters set up the conditions for action that is ultimately evaded.

Pistol constantly speaks *ex cathedra*; he applies his seemingly copious wit to even the most paltry subjects. His testy defiance of Nim's term "solus" reveals his characteristic tendency to supply repetitious amplification. He takes the word and hurls it back at Nim as though it were a concrete object:

> "Solus" egregious dog? O viper vile!
> The solus in thy most marvellous face,
> The solus in thy teeth, and in thy throat,
> And in thy hateful lungs, yea in thy maw pardy--
> And which is worse, within thy nasty mouth.
> I do retort the solus in thy bowels,
> For I can take, and Pistol's cock is up,
> And flashing fire will follow (2. 1. 43-50.).

Taken as a parallel to the King's defiant figure of the tennis balls turned to gunstones, this speech reveals the characteristic tendency of Pistol to take words at their literal value. His speech is a kind of verbal slapstick. His catalogue seems based on the "literalizing of common figurative expressions like 'swallow an insult', 'lie in the throat', and hurling 'defiance in the teeth'."[65] As Shakespeare so frequently has comic characters take the vehicle of a metaphor literally, without understanding its tenor, so Pistol sniffs out the scurrilous reference with his dog's direct sense of smell without pausing to construe any further meaning. The offensive term "solus," the meaning of which Pistol does not comprehend, becomes a disease infecting all the parts of Nim's body. Pistol's trivial invention amplifies the threat. Each phrase is essentially grammatically equivalent; the second and third lines are exact copies of one another's form and the next two lines merely repeat the threat by adding the conjunction "and" or an affirmative variant "yea." The utterance is bawdily graded, starting as a metaphorical cliche, something akin to saying one would deliver an insult to another's face, and ending up the physiological catologue at the end of the scale, at the bowels. The commonplace extension of the insulting reference is distorted and perverted in Pistol's mouth. *Gradatio*, which normally tends to ensure weight and accumulated insistence on the particular details enumerated according from least to most important in apothegms uttered by serious characters, becomes, in Pistol's distempered invention, a further indication of his limited, crass, and salacious imagination.

Pistol's speech is characterized by bombast. Shakespeare's conception of Pistol shows an intention to admit elements of diction the delicacy of which cannot be connected with the normally plain, pithy, and emphatically direct form of utterance. The regular and emphatic nature of the native plain style metre used in

---

[65] Taylor, p. 124.

Pistol's utterances parcels out the thought and ensures a methodic surety of voice. The general paucity of meaning and the frigid applications of figures that overstate a simple meaning work to undermine and challenge the serious sound of the rhythms. Pistol's offer to shake Nim's hand in reconciliation is a good example of his ridiculous refusal to call anything by its proper name. He says:

> Give me thy fist, thy forefoot to me give.
> Thy spirits are most tall (2. 1. 63-4.).

The native metre and the use of monosyllables creates a rhythm of terse, pithy sententiousness; however, the content of the line mocks the rhythm. The image of the hand as an animal's paw is ridiculous and indecorous. Similarly, the inversion of object and verb is a staple of Pistol's idiom. Such an inversion smacks of the inverted ordering of French grammar. The note of subtlety, delicacy, and preciosity associated with such archaic inversions is excessive and ironic when combined with the native style metre which has as its characteristic a tendency to direct predication and plain statement. A sampling of Pistol's inversions reveals that this device is by no means an inconsequential and infrequent variation of his style. It is his central mode of thought, his consistent habit of mind. The second act alone is replete with a catalogue of inversions. Pistol inverts adjectives and nouns, ["I thee defy again" (2. 1. 60.)], personal pronouns and verbs, ["Thinkst thou my spouse to get" (2. 1. 70.)], and objects and verbs ["to the spital go..and her espouse" (2. 1. 71, 75.)]. In the interests of keeping up metrical regularity, Pistol allows himself a rather generous poetic license. The line is filled out with superfluous adjectives that do nothing to contribute to the sense other than to supply repetitious copiousness:

> O braggart vile, and damnèd furious wight!
> The grave doth gape and doting death is near.
> Therefore ex-hale (2. 1. 57-9).

Pistol's inclusion of polysyllables and Latin words is indecorous and ironic in a similarly deflating way. The words "egregious" and "marvellous" in the "solus" invective addressed to Nim sound portentous and and important to those incapable of paraphrasing their meaning. Unable to address himself to Pistol's meaning, Nim marks only the tone of mesmeric regularity in the phrasing. As Gary Taylor points out in his edition, Nim's rebuke "I am not Barbason, you cannot conjure me" (2. 1. 51), responds to Pistol as an exorcist. "The Latin *solus*, the verb *take*, and Pistol's style in general--its rhythms, its repetitions, and perhaps too its orotund paucity of meaning--remind Nim of the rigmarole of exorcists."[44] To the naive and superstitious imagination of Nim, Pistol's forging capacity with words is an alchemical power; the mesmeric regularity of his verse is that of a devil attempting to dislocate the true meaning into blasphemous shapes. Indeed, Pistol's use of French and Latin words to fill in slackened rhythms and a failing store of stock invectives or reasons that suit his case often sabotage his intentions. The fourth line of the "solus" invective proves Pistol's inability to sustain rhetorical repetition without pause over eight lines. The fourth line, "And in thy hateful lungs, yea in thy maw pardie," shows the strain of unmitigated adherence to the six-four syllabic pattern. The two-syllable addition of "Pardie" makes the utterance seem perfunctory, merely the filling out of a rhetorically bellicose formula and the bastardization of the French *Par Dieu*. It merely marks the change, in the next three lines, to the four-six pattern. Similarly, Pistol uses Latin words to elevate his utterance as a means of breaking off any further discussion:

---

[44] Taylor, p. 125.

> I have, and I will hold, the quondam Quickly
> For the only she, and--*pauca*, there's enough (2. 1. 75-6.).

The Latin "pauca," meaning in few words, provides an assurance that reasons have been given that substantiate Pistol's justified claim to the Hostess; it is rather like writing QED at the end of a proof. Pistol uses the legal marriage and feudal service phrase "to have and to hold," to serve as his defense of his territory against Nim's challenge. His guarantee, however, is a kind of atavistic defense of his territory much like a dog's defense of his domain. Pistol masks his lack of claim in legalistic jargon and phrasing; he considers the words "I have and I will hold, the quondam Quickly" adequate means to convince Nim of the surety of his possessions.

If Pistol's speech is characterized by an exaggerated Ciceronian copiousness, Nim's speech is based on an exaggerated Senecan brevity. Nim's cryptic mutterings expose a kind of perverse determinism and laconic menace. He does not name his intentions; the object of his thought is never wholly transparent in the grammatical mazes he creates, but remains suppressed. The sententious brevity and repetition of the formulas "It must be as it may" and "That's the humour of it," lend a curious conclusiveness and mesmeric determinism to his utterances. Where Pistol's speech is characterized by histrionics and over-amplification, Nim's is marked by an expressionistic nihilism and despair closely resembling modern open-ended examples of the despairing sublime.[17]

Nim's mind is fixated on revenge but his feelings remain inchoate and amorphous. He seems only half conscious -- he does not bring that which he contemplates explicitly to his consciousness. Resolved to stake his life on achieving revenge, he nevertheless suppresses the consequences of his hazarding all at the risk of his life when he says "Faith, I will live as long as I may, that [illegible] certain of it, and when I cannot live any longer, I will do as I may. That is my rest, that is the rendezvous of it" (2. 1. 13-5.). Nim prefers statements that resolve completely, that achieve a firm sense of closure. He pays little attention, however, to the premises of his conclusions. His generalizations on the nature of things are characteristically relative. He uses the moral imperative "must" in order to achieve a sense of absoluteness even within a formula which ironically illustrates uncertainty in his repetition, "Things must be as they may." He prefaces his statements with a denial of responsibility, making everything seem inscrutable but within the framework he imposes his formula of conclusions. He says:

> I cannot tell. Things must be as they may. Men may sleep, and they may have their throats about them at that time, and some say knives have edges. It must be as it may. Though Patience be a tired mare, yet she will plod. There must be conclusions. Well, I cannot tell (2. 1. 19-23.).

---

[17] See Auerbach on Baudelaire, p. 204.

Nim does not make himself the agent responsible for anything. He does not make himself the subject of an active statement but rather prefers to frame his utterance in the subjunctive mood and then state facts which link up to his partly submerged or obscured conclusions in his application of a didactic proverb.

That reconciliation is not a real possibility for these characters is revealed in the abrupt change in Pistol's style. The *braggadochio* and bombast of the threatening Pistol is magically transformed to the lyrical sweetness of the courtly lover in the manner of Sidney's "My true love hath my heart and I have his."[68] He says:

> A noble shalt thou have, and present pay,
> And liquor likewise will I give to thee,
> And friendship shall combine, and brotherhood.
> I'll live by Nim and Nim shall live by me.
> Is not this just? For I shall sutler be
> Unto the camp, and profits will accrue.
> Give me thy hand (2. 1. 102-8.).

The shift of modes so quickly achieved reveals the relativistic and opportunistic nature of Pistol. The sweet style, with its patterned phrasing and balanced symmetrical syntactical structure, creates a strong sense of harmonious closure. However, the material considerations provide an ironic commentary on Pistol's resolution. Harmony can be achieved only when profits accrue, greed is surfeited, and friendship becomes a bargain to submit themselves to a quest for greater commodities.

The rank of professional soldiery is also introduced by a scene of conflict, though the tone of this conflict has not the menace of the atavistic and ominously unconscious quarrels of the Eastcheap group. Fluellen and MacMorris, representing the Welsh and Irish elements of the British forces, strike up an argument, which, while it is interrupted, closes with MacMorris' rebuke to Fluellen that:

> I do not know you so good a man as myself. So Chrish save me, I will cut off your head (3. 3. 72-3.).

and ends with Fluellen's insistence that:

> ...when there is more better opportunity to be required, look you, I will be so bold as to tell you I know the disciplines of war. And there is an end (3. 3. 78-81.).

In contrast to the materialistic dispute of Nim and Pistol, Fluellen and MacMorris carry out an argument over their respective honours. In contrast to the portrait of "quarreling curs"[69] that Shakespeare conveys in the scenes in Eastcheap, these characters are less animalistic in nature. Their intention is to do good service and to fight well for Henry's cause. Jamy makes this explicit, saying:

> By the mess, ere these eyes of mine take themselves to slumber, ay'll do gud service, or I'll lig i'th' grund for it. Ay owe Got a death, and I'll pay't as valorously as I may, that sal[illegible]rely do, that is the brief and the long (3. 3. 56-60.).

The conflict between Fluellen and MacMorris is a conflict of personality -- a clash of antagonistic temperaments rather than a clash of opinions of importance. Indeed, rather than dialogue, Shakespeare sets up their conversation as a series of non sequiturs, in which they "mistake each other" (3. 3. 74) and parry at cross purposes at what each takes to be the other's meaning. The quarrel is provoked, in the main, by Fluellen's incorrigible enthusiasm for debate about the ancient wars. Indignant in his support of ancient authority, he reveals his disgust at what he presumes to be the state of Captain MacMorris's imperfect knowledge of the literature of war:

---

[68] Sidney

[69] Traversi, p. 175.

> By Cheshu, he is an ass, as in the world. I will verify as much in his beard. He has no more directions in the true disciplines of the wars, look you, -- of the Roman disciplines -- than is a puppy dog (3. 3. 16-19.).

"Armed with his pocket Tacitus or his folio Plutarch,"[70] Fluellen challenges MacMorris to a verbal duel:

> Captain MacMorris, I beseech you now, will you vouchsafe me, look you, a few disputations with you, as partly touching or concerning the disciplines of the war, the Roman wars, in the way of argument, look you, and friendly communication? Partly to satisfy my opinion and partly for the satisfaction, look you, of my mind. As touching the direction of the military discipline, that is the point (3. 3. 37-43.).

Fluellen's idiom seems derived from an English grammar manual in desperate need of revision. The archaic wording and the highly formal manner with which he broaches the discussion bespeaks not timorousness, but an old fashioned respect for the observances of polite and respectful address. Though he has just finished calling MacMorris "an ass in the world", his use of the middle English words *beseech* (to implore or seek earnestly, to beg) and *vouchsafe* (to be gracious enough or condescend to give or grant)[71] reveals the "affability as in discretion" he means to use toward MacMorris. The redundancies of his circumlocutory syntax reveal his imperfect command of the English language.

Vouchsafe in and of itself implies a reciprocal action and therefore the prepositional phrase "with you" is redundant. Fluellen's tendency to be lax with his prepositions is further revealed in the structure "I will verify as much in his beard" (3. 3. 15-6.). He has a tendency to make direct correspondences rather than to recognize the comparisons or similitudes he makes: "He has no more directions...than is a puppy dog" (3. 3. 16-8.); "He is an ass as in the world" (3. 3. 15.). His fondness for, or perhaps his pride in his ability to vary his material is evident in the symmetrical balancing of "Partly to satisfy my opinion and partly for the satisfaction, look you, of my mind" (3. 3. 41-2.). The disposition of the structure into balanced parts with a variation of the verb used alternately as a verb and then as a noun (satisfy, satisfaction) would normally be an eloquent device if the balanced pair of clauses carried a different weight of meaning. As it is, the statement is merely a tautology, since the satisfaction of his opinion comes to the same thing as the satisfaction of his mind.

Fluellen's punctuation of his sentences with the verbal tick "look you" is meant to emphasize his meaning much in the way a foreigner, unsure that his words are supplying his intentions, will add gesture and facial expressions as reinforcements which pantomime his meaning. That the phrase is a directional phrase rather than a phrase like "you know," suggesting agreement, reveals Fluellen's innocuous but humorously officious nature. His intention is to call MacMorris to a formal debate as to the nature of his directions, to supply him with the *vade mecum* of the discipline of war. However, he puts it to him delicately and with indirection in order to dispel any note of condescension. At the start he hints that he wants a disputation "partly touching or concerning the disciplines of the war" and at the end of the statement, feeling that he has supplied all the appropriate niceties, he makes his intention more explicit saying: "As touching the direction of the military discpline, that is the point" (3. 3. 42-44.). The addition of an alternate subject of the subordinating clause reveals the linearity and repetitively additive nature of his disposition of his thoughts.

---

[70] Taylor, p. 68.

[71] Quoted from the OED.

Fluellen's prose compounds his sense rather than emphasizes it. The inertia of his prose is in direct contrast to the energy of that of MacMorris, whose speech is characterized by its tendency to be composed of incomplete utterances:

> It is no time to discourse, so Chrish save me. The day is hot, and the weather and the wars and the King and the dukes. It is no time to discourse.The town is besieched. An the trumpet calls us to the breach, and we talk and, be Chrish, do nothing, 'tis shame for us all. So God sa' me, 'tis shame to stand still, it is a shame by my hand. And there is throats to be cut, and works to be done, and there ish nothing done, so Chrish sa' me law (3. 3. 48-55.).

MacMorris seems incapable of containing his guilt long enough to predicate his statements. The series of subjects seems like a catalogue of his guilt. He strings along a series of subjects, "the day is hot, and the weather and the wars and the King and the dukes" without supplying a verb to complete the statement. He does not seem capable of subordinating his thoughts but merely makes conjunctive statements out of everything. The tendency of his guilt to overwhelm his reason is revealed in the statement: "And there is throats to be cut, and works to be done, and there ish nothing done, so Chrish 'sa me law." The yoking of his oath "so Chrish sa' me law" with the need to cut throats reveals his unthinking obedience in the seeming contradiction. His sentences run in to one another, he frequently interrupts himself, but, nevertheless, his sheer excitement and his feeling of the responsibility incumbent on him to do good service reveal his purposeful nature. Fluellen's prose is heavily punctuated and periodic; MacMorris' impatient and frustrated personality is mirrored in the sharp staccato utterance, and the partial phrases he strings together reveal his nervous intensity.

MacMorris is conceived in the manner of Hotspur; his speeches are condensed so that they exhibit all the features of exclamation and they are given without any record of response from his auditors. His violent attack on Fluellen at the end of the sequence; "I do not know you as good a man as myself. So Chrish save me, I will cut off your head" comes as a comic condensation of his habitual orientation. Unable to act purposefully he turns his frustrations on Fluellen as an object of war. Thwarted from doing good service in war he takes hold of the available conflict as a substitute. He is conceived in one attitude and shows an inflexibility that makes him incapable of relaxing the "hard favored rage" (2. 1. 8.) that Henry, in his address to his soldiers at Harfleur, wished to conjure in them. Though MacMorris does not seem the brutalized soldier of whom Burgundy, in his enumeration of the desolations of war, speaks at the end of the play, MacMorris' conscience will not let him rest: "'tis a shame to stand still" (3. 3. 53.). He reveals the wooden and immovable attitude of Henry's soldier who "[stiffens] the sinews, [conjures] up the blood, and [disguises] fair nature with hard-favoured rage" (3. 1. 7-8.).

This sequence of challenges and conflicts is superseded by a scene which brings the King into coordination with all the ranks of his soldiery, and, though not directly, calls him to account for the justice of his war. The first scene of act four is the longest and most complicated scene of the play. Coming, as it does, after the scenes which reveal the internal conflicts among Henry's soldiery, this scene is cumulative: it represents all the ranks of the soldiery in a panoramic sweep. As Henry in disguise walks amongst his troops, he is brought into contact either directly, or, as an eavesdropper, with his soldiers. The scene places the war in a personal context. It illuminates the costs of war by providing a portrait of the men who purpose to hazard their lives in obedience to their king's command. In *Henry IV, Parts I* and *II*, the pathetic charges that make up Falstaff's army are not accorded our serious attention and the application of the press resolves into farce, while, in contrast, in *Henry V*, Williams, Court, and Bates are accorded some of the most serious and important consideration in the play.

Henry's interview with Pistol provides a thematic anticipation of the more weighty considerations of the discussion with Williams. Pistol's concern is to evaluate the worth of the disguised soldier before him by his station:

> Discuss unto me: art thou officer,
> Or art thou base, common, and popular? (4. 1. 38-9.)

Pistol's intention is to distinguish the class of the soldier before him, to place him in the social hierarchy so that he will know how to address him. In accordance with his pusillanimous nature, Pistol will be assured that this soldier's station is low before he launches into his recurrent strain of bragging. That Pistol resorts to his inflationary idiom and contends that he is "As good a gentleman as the Emperor" (4. 1. 43.), underlines the dramatic irony of the scene. The King, divested of his accoutrements, is constrained to speak like the common soldier while Pistol exaggerates his station to that of an Emperor.

While the interview contributes an element of farce in its mixture of high and low characters, the dramatic irony is suggestive of a more serious theme. The King, in accordance with his disguise, is divested of his public role and the pomp and circumstance which attends his station. The awe and reverence with which he would normally be regarded by the likes of Pistol is kept in abeyance. When the King insinuates that Pistol's hyperbolic estimation of himself makes him "better than the king" (4. 1. 42.), Pistol counters the implicit threat of accusation with an automatic ejaculation of patriotic pride:

> The King's a bawcock and a heart of gold,
> A lad of life, an imp of fame;
> Of parents good, of fist most valiant.
> I kiss his dirty shoe, and from heartstring
> I love the lovely bully. What is thy name? (4. 1. 43-50.)

Confident that his interlocutor is of low station but fearing the imputation of treacherous slander, Pistol covers himself by perfunctory panegyrics. However, the speech is interesting in the combination of low and high elements. While Pistol does not speak his mind directly, the portrait he creates of the King is a confusing mixture of familiarity and respect. He reduces the King to the status of boon companion but maintains the "form" of obedient servitude. The catologue of virtues Pistol admires is concluded with the consideration, "Of parents good, of fist most valiant" (4. 1. 47.). In keeping with this bastardized form of the rhetorical topics of praise counselled by the Renaissance rhetoric books, Pistol accounts for the worth of the King by referring to his parentage and his martial virtue. As David Riggs explains:

> Definitions of individual worth based on "deeds" and "parentage," for example, were presented in grammar school manuals of rhetoric as instruments to be used in the analysis and imitation of set passages from classical history and literature ... the rhetorical commonplaces that were taken to formulate a Herculean hero might be so reformulated as to define a fifteenth century English aristocrat or even an upstart French shepherdess.[72]

However, the portrait is comically closed by Pistol's verbal genuflection:

> I kiss his dirty shoe and from heartstring
> I love the lovely bully (4. 1. 48-9.).

While the gesture takes the form of a flourish of respectful obedience, it is deflated by the representation of the King's creaturalness. That the King should have "dirty shoes" and that he should be referred to as "bully" is totally out of keeping with the decorum of the high style attitude Pistol assumes.

This interview, then, is meant to direct attention to the sycophantic and pandering nature of Pistol. It focuses attention on Pistol's superficial estimation of worth by satirizing his concern to know the class of the soldier and to regard the formalities of degree.

The King's overhearing the dispute of Fluellen and Gower serves, too, to anticipate the more serious discussion with Williams. Fluellen's reprimand of Gower's noisiness reveals his propensity to apply general principles to the particular case: "If the enemy is an ass and a fool and a prating coxcomb, is it meet, think you, that we should also, look you, be an ass and a fool and a prating coxcomb? In your own conscience now?" (4. 1. 76-9.) The King commends Fluellen's observations and principles saying:

> Though it appear a little out of fashion,
> There is much care and valour in this Welshman (4. 1. 82-3.).

The interview with Williams, then, is meant to expose the principles of the King. The night scene coming as it does, as a play within a play, anticipates the working out of the central concern of *Henry V*. In contrast to the public scene of justification of his cause that the King maintained with the Archbishop, now Henry is forced to speak as a private man and to justify his cause to the common soldier. While the gage scenes which lead up to the scene revealed characters arguing at cross purposes with each other and hardly communicating their meaning to one another; the dialogue between Williams and the King is more nearly a dialectical discussion in which each interlocutor understands and attends to the other's meaning. Thus the gage which is the result of their argument is premised on a real debate in contrast to the previous arguments between Pistol and Nim, Fluellen and MacM[illegible].

---

[72] Riggs, pp. 23-24.

The scene centres the attention of the play on the personal considerations of war apart from any public concerns. As it mixes high and low personages and engages them in debate, it acts as a leveller. That the scene is temporally placed on the night before the determining battle of Agincourt is suggestive. It describes the anticipations of all men and therefore focuses on their anticipations of the reckoning they will make at the Last Judgement. The issue of war is placed within a larger context and the King's presence is brought into conjunction with God's providence.

Responding to Williams, who asks what Erpingham thinks of their plight, Henry creates a metaphor of apprehensive gloom saying that 'his commander' thinks that they are "Even as men wrecked upon a sand, that look to be washed off the next tide" (4. 1. 95-6.). The King acknowledges his essential creaturalness, emphasizes that his apprehensions are the same as his soldiers, and creates a vivid picture of unaccommodated man. The discussion which follows develops the consideration of the justice of the cause. William's imputation of the guilt which will redound on the King if his cause is unjust is apocalyptic. The King's reply is given in a parable style reminiscent of the imagery of Christ's teachings to his apostles. He concentrates on the distinction to be made between personal and public guilt, a distinction that is essentially in concurrence with that made by St. Thomas Aquinas. Joseph Pieper, in his book ***The Four Cardinal Virtues***, explains the distinction between the social whole and the individual members that represent its parts. Justice, he argues, is accorded separately and severally to these distinct entities:

> Thomas would always insist that in actual fact individual persons, ***personae privatae***, have a reality, an ontological status of their own, and cannot be simply reduced to the reality of the social whole. The human community, the state, Thomas says, is so constructed that the deeds and works of the individual are not of necessity the deeds and works of the whole; and similarly a functioning of whole as such is possible that is not identical with the functioning of the individual member."[11]

Henry's propositions make this dichotomy explicit and reveals his essential disagreement with Canterbury, who speciously reasoned that the diversity making unity was essentially harmonious and directed to one cause and the good of the whole. Henry makes his understanding of God's justice resemble the justice he has exacted on the traitors and on Bardolph; he makes it the responsibility of the individual. The King closes his admonition to Williams with the advice that "every soldier in the wars [should] do as every sick man in his bed: wash every mote out of his conscience. And dying so, his own death is to him advantage; or not dying, the time was blessedly lost wherein such preparation was gained" (4. 1. 170-5.). The King's counsel to Williams is to provide a general principle of justice and to provide an illustration of the application of that justice which serves as an exemplum.

Henry's arguments to Williams are given in a plain and simple style which uses analogy as the staple of instruction. Henry illustrates the complex theological argument of the difference between the social whole and the individual with reference to common everyday activities. He sets up analogies of the responsibility of the father to the son and the master to the servant, as parallels to the responsibility of the King to his soldiers. Though Henry's speech rises to include more eloquent devices of persuasion, they are directly the result of the simple organization with which he began. The parallelisms and the balanced phrases are simply the result of the device of listing analogies in an effort to amplify meaning. As Brian Vickers points out, "The function of this plain style is simply to be non-rhetorical, to establish an impersonal basis to the argument."[14] The analogies establish a contact with a community of thought available and applicable to every man. It is a homiletic style which uses a plain and simple rhetoric to underline meaning in an effort to teach.

---

[11] Joseph Pieper, *The Four Cardinal Virtues: Prudence, Justice, Fortitude, and Temperance* (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1966.), p. 72.

The victory at Agincourt is developed according to a series of contrasting perspectives on the nature of heroic worth organized around the theme of justice. The gage between Williams and the King comes as a culmination of a sequence of parallels which develops a constant evaluation of justice and mercy in the play. As Fluellen is seen, at the end of the play, acting as the comic nemesis of Pistol, scourging and reprimanding him for his faults, the King's pardon of William's rebuke is meant to serve as a commentary on his justice and on his rhetoric. Ultimately, he accords with Fluellen's principles and allows the common soldier to stand up for his oath.

Throughout the play Shakespeare deliberately creates a contrast between the principles of the professional soldiers and the unprincipled motivations of the Eastcheap 'sworn brothers in filching' intent on plunder. The contrast is loosely organized around the theme of mercy. Directly after Henry has delivered his ultimatum to withhold mercy from the citizens of Harfleur if they do not surrender, Pistol comes imploring pardon, or rather with an offer of backsheesh, if Fluellen will pardon his cause and ask Exeter for a pardon for what he considers to be Bardolph's misdemeanor. Pistol supplies the cue that Fluellen so enthusiastically takes up to point the moral to the situation. Pistol exonerates Bardolph's theft of the pax by blaming his plight on the fickleness of Fortune:

> Bardolph, a soldier firm and sound of heart,
> Of buxom valor, hath by cruel fate
> And giddy Fortune's furious fickle wheel,
> That goddess blind
> That stands upon the rolling resting stone--(3. 6. 24-28.).

He makes a ballad-like narration of the dilemma:

> Fortune is Bardolph's foe and frowns on him,
> For he hath stol'n a pax
> And hanged must 'a be. A damnèd death--
> Let gallows gape for dog, let man go free,
> And let not hemp his windpipe suffocate.
> But Exeter hath given the doom of death
> For pax of little price (3. 6. 38-44.).

Anxious that no one should mistake the moral of Fortune and the mutability she signifies,[15] Fluellen gives a verbose exegesis of fortune in the form of an exemplum:

---

[14] Brian Vickers, *The Artistry of Shakespeare's Prose* (London, 1978), p. 164.

[15] Gary Taylor quotes A. R. Humphreys's note on this passage: "Pistol mixes up two traditional images of Fortune, as the power turning the wheel on which men rise and fall, and as the blindfold figure balancing on the rolling stone of change and chance". Taylor, p. 187.

> By your patience, Ensign Pistol: Fortune is painted blind, with a muffler afore her eyes, to signify to you that Fortune is blind. And she is painted also with a wheel, to signify to you -- which is the moral of it -- that she is turning and inconstant and mutability and variation. And her foot, look you, is fixed upon a spherical stone, which rolls and rolls and rolls. In good truth, the poet makes a most excellent description of it; Fortune is an excellent moral (3. 6. 29-37.).

Fluellen's explanation reveals his fondness for abstract generalization, his allegorical habit of mind, and his characteristic habit to find out the didactic purport of a figurative expression.[14] As Fluellen later tells Gower when explaining his "comparatio" between Alexander and Henry, "...there is figures in all things" (4. 7. 30.). However, Fluellen is frequently too exuberant in the application of his classical creed. When he understands Pistol's insinuation of a bribe, Fluellen counters him:

> For if, look you, he were my brother, I would desire the Duke to use his good pleasure, and put him to executions. For discipline ought to be used (3. 6. 52-55.).

The contrast of Fluellen's retributive justice and Pistol's extortionary mercy is reiterated in Pistol's farcical battle with the Frenchman LeFer (the only depicted battle in the play). In a scurrilous parallel to Henry's speech to Harfleur, Pistol declares an ultimatum to the Frenchman. Pistol's malapropisms and misreadings of the Frenchman's utterances are developed like an elaborate anadiplosis, one word suppling the cue to the next:

> Pistol: ...What is thy name? Discuss.
>
> French soldier: *O siegneur Dieu!*
>
> Pistol:(aside) O Seigneur Dew should be a gentleman.--
> Perpend my words, O Seigneur Dew, and mark:
> O Seigneur Dew, thou diest, on point of fox,
> Except, O Seigneur, thou do give to me
> Egregious ransom.
>
> French Soldier: *O prenez miséricorde! Ayez pitié de moi!*
>
> Pistol: 'Moy' shall not serve, I will have forty 'moys',
> Or I will fetch thy rim out at thy throat
> In drops of crimson blood.
>
> French Soldier: *Est-il impossible d'échapper la force de ton bras?*
>
> Pistol: Brass, cur? Thou damned and luxurious mountain goat,
> -Offer'st me brass?
>
> French Soldier: *O pardonne-moi!*
>
> Pistol: Sayst thou me so? Is this a ton of moys?--
> Come hither boy. Ask me his slave in French
> What is his name (4. 4. 5-22.).

Just as in the sequence in Eastcheap, Pistol's fury abates when Bardolph utters an oath which provides a loophole through which Pistol can maintain both the semblance of valor and the security of cowardice, so here the offer of crowns prompts his rapid volte-face: "Tell him, my fury shall abate, and I/The crowns will take".

---

[14] Fluellen's expression is related to that of the scoolmaster Holofernes who exemplifies the "Elizabethan schoolmaster [who] frequently taught their pupils 'copie' and variety by giving many duplicate meanings--thus 'foaming-out synonyms' as John Hoskins so tartly described it." Brian Vickers, *The Artistry of Shakespeare's Prose* (London, 1968), p. 64.

In a parallel reference, he underlines his equivocation; "As I suck blood, I will some mercy show" (4. 4. 58.).

Pistol's false mercy and Henry's pragmatic denial of mercy to the French prisoners is brought into juxtaposition in the scene that follows. The constant refrain that is Pistol's, Nim's, and MacMorris' valorous show of defence is brought into conjunction with Henry's command to kill the prisoners. As Gary Taylor explains:

> ...after the comic and unreal hyperbole of Nim's and MacMorris's and Pistol's talk of throat-cutting, it is Pistol, the high priest of ***grand guignol***, who actually and before our eyes cuts a man's throat. This could be a moment at once endearing, pathetic, and terrible, when an audience chokes on its own laughter.[17]

After Henry orders the killing of the prisoners, Pistol utters

> ...the last word, "***coup la Gorge***." This can be not only or crudely funny, but powerful and even, in Pistol's absurd way, moving. After all, in capturing LeFer Pistol stands on the brink of wealth; in killing him, he kills two hundred crowns, thereby at play's end returning to England more destitute than ever. This is, so to speak, Pistol's moment of choice, and his moment of greatness: first reacting to the King's command with a look of fiscal outrage, hesitating, eyeing LeFer, pausing, and then with a shrug, returning to the bravado of "***Coup' la Gorge***" as he cuts the man's throat.[18]

Characteristically Shakepeare combines comedy with the most serious and central concerns of the play. Fluellen infers that the King's command to kill the prisoners is a fitting exaction of justice for the Frenchman's abhorrent breach of the rules of war. Fluellen is, of course, mistaken in his determination of cause and effect, for the command is not offered as the result of the slaughter of the boys but as a defensive strategy:

> In Shakespeare's text, Henry does not know that the French counter-attack will begin and/or end with a raid on the English baggage train; he does not know that the French have killed or will kill the boys; he acts, dispassionately, simply in order to save his small army, which cannot afford to guard the prisoners while at the same time resisting a second French attack.[19]

Fluellen's exclamation "Kill the poys and the luggage," (4. 7. 1.) then, intimates the faulty coordination of events in his mind. As he links a common verb with two objects, only one of which is actually appropriate, so does he mistake the King's command as an act contingent on the French attack on the boys guarding the luggage.

His elaborate comparison of Henry with Alexander is meant as praise of the King's efficient retaliation. Joseph Pieper explains that one of the elements of prudence described by St. Thomas Aquinas was *solertia*:

> ***Solertia*** is the "perfected ability", by virtue of which man, when confronted with a sudden event, does not close his eyes by reflex and then blindly, though perhaps boisterously, take random action. Rather, with the aid of ***solertia***, he can swiftly, but with open eyes and clear-sighted vision, decide for the good, avoiding the pitfalls of injustice, cowardice, and intemperence.[20]

Fluellen's explanation emphasizes that his parallel is meant to point the contrast betwen Alexander and Henry in regards to the consciousness with which he carried out his actions. He says:

> It is not well done, mark you now, to take the tales out of my mouth ere it is made an end and finished. I speak but in the figures and comparisons of it. As Alexander killed his friend Cleitus, being in his ales and his cups, so also Henry Monmouth, being in his right wits and his good judgements,

---

[17] Taylor, p. 65-66.
[18] Taylor, p. 65.
[19] Taylor, p. 32.
[20] Pieper, p. 16.

turned away the fat knight with the great-belly doublet...(4. 7. 39-44.).

Fluellen takes the "prudent" action of killing the prisoners as an analogy to the judgement and conscious prescience of the King's casting off Falstaff, an action which he applauds. He sees no calumny to be inferred by the relation, for he mistakes the command to kill the prisoners as a justified retaliation against the French breach of the disciplines of war. The fact that Fluellen's climax is abruptly parallel to the entry of the King reveals Shakespeare's desire to show the King's mastery of his passions. For the first time in the play, the King reveals his temper as he admits that "I was not angry since I came to France" (4. 7. 50.). His habitual insouciance and the note of threatening in his Harfleur speech (where one has the feeling that he is merely bluffing) is brought into conjunction with the very real determination:

> ...we'll cut the throats of those we have,
> And not a man of them that we shall take
> Shall taste our mercy (4. 7. 58-60.).

"That coldbloodedness is Henry's personal and -- decisive -- contribution to the victory."[11] The parallels Shakespeare establishes between Henry and the commentary of the low characters points to the contrast of legal and narrative justifications and the dramatic impact of such a repulsive command on the stage. Shakespeare creates a great deal of suspense and irony in his portrayal of Henry's character. He is able to dispense clemency, as the culmination the gage with Williams will show, but also he is capable of withholding it as the situation demands. The scene with Williams serves as a commentary on the double consciousness with which the King must act. The scene develops a situation reminiscent of Hal's merciless manipulation of Francis, the drawer, in *Henry IV, Part I*. Henry seems to entrap Williams in an irreconcilable slander of his person. He allows, in the end, the justice accorded each individual regardless of his station; he gives Williams his due.

Before the confrontation, Henry sounds Fluellen as to the principles of any gage:

> King Henry: What think you, Captain Fluellen? Is it fit this soldier keep his oath?
>
> Fluellen: He is a craven and a villain else, an't please your majesty, in my conscience.
>
> King Henry: It may be his enemy is a gentleman of great sort, quite from the answer
> of his degree.
>
> Fluellen: Though he be as good a gentleman as the devil is, as Lucifer and Beelzebub
> himself, it is necessary, look your grace, that he keep his vow and oath. If
> he be perjured, see you now, his reputation is as arrant a villain and a
> jack-sauce as ever his black shoe trod upon God's ground and his earth,
> in my conscience, law (4. 7. 125-136.).

In this sequence Shakespeare brings to the test Henry's counsel to Williams, in the night scene, that every man must be responsible for the purity of his own soul. As in their gage "the issue...is whether Henry will live up to the standard set by Williams, not vice versa",[12] so in this sequence the audience perceives the issue from the side of Williams. It would seem a gross and unmerciful injustice if the King allowed the punishment of a slander which came, not from the heart, from any inward intention of disloyalty or malice toward the King.

---

[11] Taylor, p. 32.

[12] Taylor, p. 60.

Fluellen's commentary serves to ensure the emphasis on the keeping of oaths. Shakespeare's mixture of characters of high and low degree in this scene serves as a commentary on the high and low styles. It suggests that the high style must be interanimated with the low-style of plain, simple, and direct statement that does not need any ornamentation; the solvent of oaths is an inner conviction not an outward appearance of veracity. The theme of oaths has been carefully prepared for throughout the play. Shakespeare brings Pistol's denial of the possibility of truth in oaths to bear on the situation. In the underworld that Pistol inhabits, all is debased to terms of material account, and men should: "Trust none, for oaths are straws, men's factors are wafer-cakes,/And Holdfast is the only dog, my duck" (2. 3. 45-6.). Shakespeare creates an allusive context of punning references to the Eucharist that is not comprehended by the low life characters but is finally brought into coordination with the central concerns of the King. At the beginning of the second scene, Pistol infers no double meaning in what he takes to be a scurrilous reference to him as "host." He comprehends the word as a scurrilous reference to his keeping a bawdy house but is incognizant of the symbolic "host" of the Eucharist making redemption available through the presence of Grace. That he feels no responsibility to ready himself for the end nor to have faith in God's forgiveness is implied in his blasphemous description of the sacramental wafer in his description of men's faiths as wafer cakes.

The Biblical resonances which go unregarded by Pistol complete the criticism of Pistol's false use of language.[13] The contrast between Pistol and Williams makes this element of feudal obedience explicit. Where Pistol is always ready to flatter, Williams is steadfast in his support of his oath regardless of the consequences of his committing a breach against the laws of social hierarchy.

Shakespeare creates a complex interplay of comic and serious elements in the scene.[14] Where Pistol is easily persuaded by the promise of crowns, Williams will not be bribed or begged off: his honesty has no price. The King's offer of crowns is disdained by Williams. The 'satisfaction' he gives the King for his 'fault' is the surety of his allegiance and his reproof that he made no offense. To this the King bids Exeter to "fill this glove with crowns/ And give it to this fellow" and tells Williams "Keep it fellow/And wear it for an honour in thy cap/Till I do challenge it" (4. 8. 56-59.). Fluellen serves to add levity to the scene and to prevent the seriousness from become cloying and excessively didactic. Fluellen, like the reader of classical fables that he is, points out the moral:

---

[13] See R. McAlindon, *Shakespeare and Decorum* (London, 1973), p. 6. "The moral vices of language, which were formulated almost as precisely as the rhetorical vices, were lying and railing, boasting and idle swearing, flattery and slander (or 'ear poisoning'). In a society where advancement depended so much on acquiring a good name, slander was regarded as an especially vicious crime. And since flattery frequently involved a complaisant attitude to the sins of the great it was thought to be scarcely less dangerous. As for boasting and swearing, one is given the impression -- by secular and religious moralist alike --that Renaissance society was filled with swaggering fellows who thought that the surest way to pass for a gentleman was (as Sir Thomas Elyot put it) to adorn their speech with oaths much as an oration is with figures. Criticism of this fashionable vice, however, was prompted not simply by considerations of restraint and reverence. Behind it was the fear that casual swearing may beget casual forswearing or commit one to a rash and immoral course of action. Behind it, too, was the conviction that the whole order of society -- justice and law itself -- rests on respect for oaths and promises, for the solemn word. In the oath, the word's essential function as a bond is confirmed by civil and divine law."

[14] See Taylor, p. 69.

> By this day and this light, the fellow has mettle enough in his belly. -- Hold, there is twelve pence for you, and I pray you to serve God, and keep you out of prawls and prabbles and quarrels and dissensions, and I warrant you it is the better for you (4. 8. 61-5.).

William's injured rebuke, "I want none of your money," is countered by Fluellen's cheerful good will towards him. Fluellen points out to him that his honour will remain unsullied even while he will have the crowns to mend his shoes:

> It is with a good will. I can tell you, it will serve you to mend your shoes. Come, wherefore should you be so pashful? Your shoes is not so good. 'Tis a good silling, I warrant you, or I will change it (4. 8. 67-70.).

If in *Henry IV, Parts I and II* the slippery tongues of the treacherous nobles were paralleled in the low scenes with the equivocations [illegible] Falstaff, it was a reflection of the nature of the kingship founded on the shifting sand of usurpation and false oaths. In *Henry V* Shakespeare rights his ship of state according to a reinvigoration of language. The inner conviction of William's plain idiom is substantial. His oaths are given with the assurance that he will defend and stand up to his word. That Henry commends and honours Williams reveals his generosity and his understanding that the terms of honour must be a garland to such uncompromising honesty.

In *Henry V*, Shakespeare underlines the conscious prescience of Henry who understands the way to achieve a symbolic countenance. Henry understands that words and deeds must be given symbolic and sacramental significance. He confers honour on Williams for the "satisfaction" of his seeming sin. His honesty is seen to be the right atonement for his supposed fault. The honour that the King gives him, to wear his glove "for an honour in [his] cap" is not unlike the symbolic countenance he gives the battle of Agincourt in his Crispin day speech. There he makes a home-spun symbol of the battle saying:

> This day is called the Feast of Crispian.
> He that outlives this day and comes safe home
> Will stand a-tiptoe when this day is named
> And rouse him at the name of Crispian.
> He that shall see this day and live t'old age
> Will yearly on the vigil feast his neighbours
> And say "Tomorrow is Saint Crispian."
> Then will he strip his sleeve and show the scars
> And say, "These wounds I had on Crispin's day."
> Old men forget; yet all shall be forgot,
> But he'll remember, with advantages,
> What feats he did that day...(4. 3. 40-51.).

In contrast to Gower's description of how such swaggerers return from the battle "with new-tuned oaths," "a beard of the General's cut and a horrid suit of the camp" to deliver their lies "among foaming bottles and ale-washed wits" (3. 6. 79-81.), Henry creates a sense of the sacramental associations the battle will develop in the mind of the common man who shared in it. Shakespeare maintains a balance between his criticism of the romanticization of war and the necessity of symbols for providing models of unity and ideals of loyalty. After he is sure that the battle is theirs, Henry forbids that any man should boast of the Englishman's prowess and offers the victory to God. Enumerating the number of French and English dead, he counters the suggestion of an epic list with a humble offering to God in the exclamation:

> O God, thy arm was here,
> And not to us, but to thy [illegible] alone,
> Ascribe we all. When, without stratagem,
> But in plain shock and even play of battle,
> Was ever known so great and little loss
> On one part and on th'other? Take it God,
> For it is none but thine (4. 8. 104-110.).

It is difficult to interpret Henry's piety. His offering is of the same kind as the symbolic repercussions of a Constantine or an Augustus Caesar. Constantine supplied the monogram *chi rho* to the shields of his soldiers and attributed the victory to God's providence.[15] Henry too supplies a symbolic countenance of God's grace and commands:

> Do we all holy rites:
> Let there be sung *Non Nobis* and *Te Deum* (4. 8. 120-21.).

Whether the symbolic countenance is a practical stratagem ensuring the sense of sanctity and unity or a revelation of the essential piety of Henry is left undeveloped and elusive, a riddle for historians like the riddle of Constantine. More importantly, the symbolic countenance supplies an ideal of humility and submission to a rule larger than man. Henry submits himself to the obedience of an extra-legal authority that judges him as it judges every man.

That Shakespeare means to emphasize the importance of symbols for achieving ideals is reiterated in the encounter between Fluellen and Pistol in the last act of the play. The comic come-uppance of Pistol is premised on his disrespect for ancient tradition. He scorns the leek Fluellen wears on Saint Davy's day as an "honourable respect" and a "memorable trophy of predeceased valour" (5. 1. 65-66.). Shakespeare's justice meted out to Pistol is a farcical punishment suited to his crimes. As he swears by the leek that he will "most horribly revenge," he is given more leek to eat, thereby silencing his *braggadochio* and punishing him with the very symbol he fails to respect.

In the last scene of the play Shakespeare shows that the foundation of peaceful society and fruitful union will depend on the surety of well-kept oaths. The ceremony of the wooing scene is gradually deflated as Henry attempts to convince the Princess that he will be true in love. While Henry begins in flattery and with comparisons of Katherine to the angels, he gradually falls back upon an insistence on the stubbornness with which he will guard his oath and vows. That Katherine cannot fully attend to the elaborations of Henry is part of the comedy of the scene. The scene is similar to the night scene in that the King must relinquish the resources of rhetoric: he must give up the pleasing symmetries and ornaments of his speeches and adapt himself to a plain and simple style that Katherine can comprehend.

---

[15] See Henry Chadwick, *The Early Church* (Harmondsworth, 1967), pp. 125-6.

At the beginning of the scene Henry is copious in his enthusiasm to prove himself true and constant, but his elaborations ultimately fall upon deaf ears. Katherine recognizes the false comparisons intended to flatter her, saying: "*O bon Dieu! Les langues des hommes sont pleines de tromperies*" (5. 2. 113.). When Henry begins to be frustrated by her incomprehension, he takes the tack of the plain king, saying:

> I know no ways to mince it in love, but directly to say, 'I love you'; then if you urge me farther than to say, 'Do you in faith?', I wear out my suit. Give me your answer, i' faith do, and so clap hands and a bargain (5. 2. 126-8.).

As Henry gives her his ~~hand,~~ Katherine understands part of his meaning but not the indecorousness of his chapman's tongue. When Henry waxes poetical, Kate's comprehension wanes. The symmetry of his utterance: "...and Kate, when France is mine, and I am yours, then yours is France and you are mine" (5. 1. 170-2) is not unlike Pistol's change to the sweet style in the second scene of the second act. The deadpan rejoinder of the Princess "I cannot tell vat is dat" (5. 1. 173) deflates Henry's techniques of closure intended to move her to love. As Henry himself admits: "It is as easy for me, Kate, to conquer the kingdom as to speak so much more French. I shall never move thee in French, unless it be to laugh at me (5. 2. 179-82.). Henry takes his humiliating position with equanimity and good cheer. The deflation of his high sentiments of love secures a focus on his creaturalness. His rhetoric cannot win love, but the tacit consent of the Princess amused by his buffetings with words is a more intimate relation of sympathy that does not make false and unrealistic promises before the union. The last words the King utters secure that the foundation of love in marriage is the reconciliation of a bond similar to the bonds of the oaths sworn in allegiance to the King. The King swears that on the day of his marriage he will ask the realm to serve as a witness and security to his oath:

> ...my lord of Burgundy, we'll take your oath,
> And all the peers', for surety of our leagues.
> Then shall I swear to Kate, and you to me,
> And may our oaths well kept and prosp'rous be (5. 2. 355-8).

That truth and honesty are values available to all men regardless of their station or their command of rhetoric is the result of the parallels Shakespeare creates between the great variety of speeches in *Henry V*. In contrast to the elevated style the Chorus praises at the beginning of the play, the conclusion resolves on a style that is humble yet eloquent, because it is an attempt to suit words to inward conditions. In contrast to the virtues the Chorus praises, Shakespeare develops an enumeration of the virtues that constitute the essence of English ideals. The hero-king is virtuous in his humility. His Englishness is the result of his application of rhetoric to the good of the whole, and the style most appropriate to reveal his true sentiments is a plain and honest style.

CONCLUSION

Henry V supplies a partial exception to Auerbach's analysis of the mixture of styles in Shakespeare's work. In *Henry IV, Parts I* and *II*, Shakespeare's perspective consciousness does indeed induce him to bring a "rich scale of stylistic levels" into conflict and coördination.[44] The mixture of styles in these plays is partly the result of Hal's presence in Eastcheap, which allows Shakespeare to break the stylistic decorum strictly conceived, and to improvise the action according to a double perspective. The aristocratic perspective is everywhere countered by the multiple perspectives of the characters of Eastcheap. The high style is constantly mixed up with the concerns of the low characters, and Hal and Falstaff are constantly seen adapting themselves to the situations in which they find themselves. However, in *Henry V*, the multiple perspectives Shakespeare creates are developed according to a more strict adherence to the stylistic decorum of degree and place. In *Henry V* Shakespeare separates out the styles, and he does not allow for the direct mixtures of low and high characters. The polyphonic-cosmic coherence of the fourth act is given as a dramatic contrivance. It is a play within a play wherein the King is brought into conjunction with all levels of his soldiery and is viewed from those perspectives. The second Chorus asks the audience to "Linger your patience on, and we'll digest/ Th'abuse of distance force --perforce-- a play" (2. 0. 31-32.). If the reference to "th'abuse of distance" refers to the keeping of the proper social distance, the word "force" suggests the artificial reconstruction of events in the drama and suggests the operating intelligence of the dramatist who contrives situations which reveal the different interpretations that can be placed on an action by constructions in the plot and in the various and allusive language.

The fact that Shakespeare invents the scene with Williams that brings the King into contact with his soldiery attests to his concern to provide a popular perspective on the aristocratic wars. That he develops such a range of low characters in this play reveals his understanding of the popular soul. In contrast to Auerbach's contention that Shakespeare's is not a popular spirit, the evidence in *Henry V* points to his sympathetic understanding of the middle and lower classes as well as the aristocracy. He gives those that prefer to see only an idealistic view of history the view of the Chorus and the romanticized ending that shows Henry carrying away not only the titles of France but a more estimable prize, the Princess. However, the parallelisms Shakespeare creates, and the consciousness with which he makes the King use his rhetoric provides a more realistic and less giddy evaluation of his famous exploits.

Where in *Henry IV, Parts I* and *II* Hal and Falstaff provide extemporizations on the themes of the high scenes, in *Henry V* the action of the high and low scenes is constantly contrasted to the interpretations of the Chorus. Shakespeare creates a sense of the complexity of the English community by encompassing a great range of English speakers and by contrasting the style of their speech and thought. That *Henry V* includes representatives of the English, Irish, Scottish, and Welsh elements attests to Shakespeare's concern to reveal the ethnic as well as the temperamental diversity of the British. In contrast to the Chorus' depiction of homogeneity, Shakespeare creates a vivid picture of heterogeneity. As he reflects a diverse panorama of characters who exhibit varying degrees of command of the English language, so does he reflect the variety of ideals, or lack of ideals, which inspire the kingdom.

---

[44] Auerbach, p. 323.

The form of *Henry V* is adapted to its subject matter. In a play concerned to evaluate a heroic historical character, Shakespeare makes the structure emphasize the colouring in rhetoric of the various interpretations of Henry within the play. *Henry V* is starkly conceived because Shakespeare intends to make the parallel estimations of the King explicit. Although Shakespeare does make use of the set speech style of the rhetorical drama of Marlowe, he adapts it to his particular purpose. He does not sustain the high heroic idiom but rather tests the conventions within a broader conception. The composition of *Henry V* follows the Marlovian model in providing a sequence of challenges and retorts in long set speeches delivered by characters or messengers: Henry succeeds at Harfleur by the sheer force of his grisly threats to the Governor; the French King and the Dauphin provide counterpoints to Henry's speeches that resemble Bagazeth's reduplications of Tamburlaine's threats; the set speeches of the high characters are counterpointed to the challenges of the lower characters and ultimately they are brought together in the confrontation of the King and Williams. The high astounding terms are contrasted with the plain, simple English of the Williams debate and the sincere expressions of fear encompassed in that scene. As in *Tamburlaine* Marlowe constructed public scenes organized in tryptich groupings, so does Shakespeare stage such ceremonious scenes in the first and final scenes of the play. But while Tamburlaine wins where he woos by his martial prowess, Henry is seen to have to modulate his martial style. That Shakespeare everywhere invents parodic counterparts to the sustained high style suggests that he was critical of such an exclusive view of heroism and the bombastic idiom that disdains the integration of characters from all classes. While Shakespeare includes the epic style of *Tamburlaine* in the Chorus, its view is heavily qualified by the dramatic action. The Chorus' naive and unqualified praise of Henry's heroism is given, at first, in allusions to ancient and mythological figures. This view of heroism is paralleled by Fluellen's eagerness to compare Henry to ancient conquerors. The Welshman's analogies are faulty and based on trivial grounds of comparison. Ultimately the most realistic estimation of the King must not be gleaned through invented topics of praise but rather according to considerations of the context. Even as Fluellen is disposed to judge men by fixed, aprioristic concepts, he adapts his evaluations to the context when the situation so demands. By creating a cast of characters who constantly reflect on the nature of their King, Shakespeare reveals the difficulty of isolating the "character" of a monarch. Men interpret from the outside and can never have a perfect comprehension of the inward thoughts of a monarch. Furthermore, that Shakespeare makes the evaluation of the King so multi-sided in contrast to the heroic portraits of such conquering minds as *Tamburlaine* suggests his comprehension of the naiveté of such one-sided, black-and-white estimations of virtue.

Although *Henry V* reveals a structural organization which qualifies Auerbach's contention that in Shakespeare's work there is a continual mixture of style, the general idea of polyphonic cosmic coherence and perspective consciousness remains entirely valid. Auerbach's analysis provides an admirable explanation of the inter-relationship of life and art. It establishes the reflexive interplay between the expression of life as it was lived and the conceptualizations and contemplation of life in artistic representation. In his discussion of Dante, Auerbach contends that his figural approach to reality was the culmination of the Christian historical approach to the world. He says:

> ...figural interpretation is a product of late cultures, far more indirect, complex, and charged with history than symbol or myth. Indeed, seen from this point of view, it has something vastly old about it: a great culture had to reach its culmination and indeed to show signs of old age, before an interpretive tradition could produce something on the order of figural prophecy.[17]

The culmination of the Christian exegetical and allegorical understanding of history, and the inclusiveness of the medieval-Christian church formed the foundation on which Dante built his figures and his mixture of characters from all classes into the unity of the *Divine Comedy*. Similarly, the awakening consciousness of a multiplicity of perspectives and the awareness of a variety of forms of life that derives from the Humanist re-discovery of the classics and the integration of this system with the medieval formulations of life form the foundation of Shakespeare's inclusive view of the world. Shakespeare's work revels a synthesis of pagan and Christian learning. L. A. Cormican explains the inclusiveness of Shakespearean drama in reference to the "mental and spiritual communism" of the Christian church which maintained that "everything in the intellectual and spiritual spheres belongs to everyone."[18] He goes on to explain:

> There is another element in the medieval ethic which is rather more apparent in Shakespeare than in the formal theologians -- the unresolved residue of paganism. The early Church apologists had insisted that no religion is wholly false or bad; the Christian attitude towards paganism was never wholly hostile.[19]

The pagan elements in *Henry V*, the Archbishop's praise, Fluellen's pagan estimation of his prowess, the Marlovian elements of the heroic, aspiring mind, and the continual references to fame and glory in the Chorus and in Henry's own utterances, are brought into conflict and coordination with Christian values and sympathies. If Shakespeare puts Henry to the test according to whether he attains the Christianized pagan virtues of Prudence, Temperance, Fortitude, and Justice, according to classical models, he also creates the requirement that he attain the wholly Christian virtues, Faith, Hope, and Charity. His justice is seen in relation to his denial of Falstaff, an action that according to the classical enthusiast, Fluellen, is laudable, but according to more generous Christian standards reveals a strain of self-possession that is a little too exclusive. If Henry is not niggardly in his open-handed repayment of William's rebuke, his repayment of Falstaff seems a qualification of Holinshed's account of his "humane" and generous nature.[20]

---

[17] Auerbach, *Scenes From the Drama of European Literature* (Minneapolis, 1959), p. 57.
[18] Cormican, p. 300.
[19] Cormican, p. 300.
[20] See passage from Holinshed quoted on page one.

Shakespeare's inclusiveness is the result of his adaptable imagination and the loose construction of the drama he inherited from the medieval mystery and morality plays. He tests stylistic conventions by creating dramatic situations which reveal excessive poeticizations or allegorizations of life. He does not maintain a consistent or rigid allegorization of life, but rather allows the situations of the drama to suggest qualifications to the forms of poetic artifice. While Marlowe's drama provides visual and rhetorical display, Shakespeare's method of multiple perspectives brings this form of drama into scrutiny. While Marlowe's sustained style encourages the raising of spirits to encompass the heroic heights of his conquering heroes, Shakespeare, by breaking the stylistic tenor in the Williams scene, evaluates the effects of such conventions and develops a context which touches on more searching problems. Where Marlowe encourages the adulation of heroic figures, Shakespeare encourages an assessment of the values which contribute characterization of heroes.

The more familiar one becomes with Shakespeare's work, the more it reads like a palimpsest: behind the characters that are more fully realistic and which command a greater range of style and expression, one can detect the remains of the conventional and stereotyped characters with which he began. Fluellen is to Holofernes as MacMorris is to Hotspur as Pistol is to Armado. However, Henry is a compromise between the two extremes of Richard II and Richard III. He is not the Machiavellian Vice figure of the moralities, who consciously manipulates others for no apparent reason other than allegiance to evil. He is a modern, pragmatic monarch in contradistinction to Richard II, who is convinced of the reality of truth in his metaphysical conceits. Richard II is a medieval king who submits himself to the forms and authority of the past. His is the imitation of an ideal; he submits himself to authority and parallels his experience in imitation of the suffering of Christ. Henry V develops the creed of the modern king midway between the medieval symbolic function and the Machiavellian manipulator. To the authority of the medieval view, Henry V brings a great store of experience; his intelligence as a monarch is the direct result of his experience which makes him able to understand the symbolic function of authority without making himself equivalent to it. Henry creates a symbolism around himself much in the way the politic Elizabeth created a mythology of the virgin queen and combined Petrarchan poetics and Machiavellian politics.[illegible] As Henry himself tells Katherine at the end of the play, "nice customs curtsy to great Kings ...we are the makers of manners" (5. 2. 260-2.).

Henry's use of language suggests the development of Shakespeare's own evaluations of the shaping influence of words. In *Richard II* he presents the medieval allegorical habit of mind; in *Henry V* he reveals a king who can suit his rhetoric to the situation and can command a great variety of styles. Shakespeare's development from *Richard II* to *Henry V* reveals his development of the idiom of the lower classes and the development of homiletic material that provides him with an allusive framework that was available to every Elizabethan. That the change in Shakespeare's style from the aristocratic and urbane idiom of the early comedies

---

[illegible] Leonard Forster, *The Icy Fire: Five Studies in European Petrarchanism* (Cambridge, 1969), p. 125.

to the mature idiom of the tragedy began most fully in the explorations Shakespeare made into the common values and idioms of all Englishmen in the histories is suggested by the representation of styles in *Henry V*.

Auerbach's contention that *Henry IV, Part II* reveals a "satire on the trend...toward the strict separation of styles"[12] is applicable as a description of all the plays of the Henriad. These plays, however, reveal a different stylistic disposition. Wherein *Henry IV, Parts I and II* there is a mixture of styles, in *Henry V* there is a contrast of styles. In *Henry V* Shakespeare satirizes the conventions adopted from classical theoreticians that were taken over by practitioners of the sustained style. He creates a very broad depiction of the lower classes. Thus, the central tenets of Auerbach's analysis of Shakespeare's stylistic orientation, his tendency to maintain a multiplicity of perspectives in contrasts of style, is essentially valid, though the organization is adapted to the concerns of *Henry V* to provide explicit contrasts of styles of rhetoric.

---

[12] Auerbach, p. 312.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. PRIMARY SOURCES

Adams, J.C. ed. **Chief Shakespearean Dramas. A Selection of Plays Illustrating the History of the English Drama from its Origins down to Shakespeare.** Cambridge: The Riverside Press, 1924.

Cawley, A. L. ed. **Everyman and the Medieval Miracle Plays**, London: Dent-Everyman's Library, 1967.

Ribner, I. **The Complete Plays of Christopher Marlowe.** New York: The Odyssey Press, 1963.

Shakespeare, William. **Henry V.** Edited by Gary Taylor. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

B. BOOKS BY AUERBACH

Auerbach, Erich. **Mimesis.** Translated from the German by Willard R. Trask. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953. Fourth Printing, 1974.

--- **Literary Language and Its Public in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages.** Translated from the German by Ralph Manheim. New York: Pantheon Books, 1965.

--- **Scenes from the Drama of European Literature.** Foreword by Paolo Velesio: Theory and History of Literature, Volume IX. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1959. Collection copyright, 1984.

C. MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE STUDIES

Artz, F. B. **The Mind of the Middle Ages.** Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Baker, Howard. **An Induction to Tragedy. A Study in the Development of Form in Gorboduc, The Spanish Tragedy and Titus Andronicus.** Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1939.

Berry, Francis. **A Poet's Grammar: Person Time and Mood in Poetry.** Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press Publishers, 1958.

Bevington, D. M. **From Mankind to Marlowe. A Study in the Growth of the Structure in Popular Drama of Tudor England.** Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Bradley, A. C. **Shakespearean Tragedy.** London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1964.

Burkhardt, J. **The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy.** Oxford: Phaidon, reprinted 1981.

Castiglione, B. **The Book of the Courtier.** Translated from the Italian with an introduction by George Bull. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1983.

Chambers, E. K. **The Elizabethan Stage.** 4 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1923.

Croll, M. W. **Attic and Baroque Prose-Style.** Edited by Max Patrick and Robert O. Evans with John M. Wallace. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.

Cunningham, J. V. **The Collected Essays of J. V. Cunningham.** Chicago: The Swallow Press Inc., 1976.

Curtius, E. R. **European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages.** Translated by Willard R. Trask. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953.

Dodds, E. R. **Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety: Some Aspects of the Religious Experience from Marcus Aurelius to Constantine.** Cambridge: At the University Press, 1965.

Doran, Madeleine. **Endeavours of Art: A Study of Form in Elizabethan Drama.** Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1963.

Farnham, Willard E. **The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy.** Reprint[illegible] New York: Barnes and Noble, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1970.

Ford, B. ed. **The Pelican Guide to English Literature.** Vol. II. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1955.

Forster, L. **The Icy Fire: Five Studies of European Petrarchanism**. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1969.

Holmes, G. **Hierarchy and Revolt 1320-1450**. Glasgow: William Collins and Sons Ltd., 1984.

Huizinga, J. **Erasmus and the Age of Reformation**. New York: Harper Torchbooks, Harper and Brotnus, The Cloister Library, 1957.

----. **The Waning of the Midldle Ages: A Study of the forms of Life, thought and Art in France and in the Netherlands in the Dawn of the Renaissance**. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1954.

----. **Men and Ideas. History: The Middle Ages, The Renaissance**. Translated by J. S. Holmes and Hans van Marle. Princeton: Princeton Universtiy Press, 1984.

Kennedy, G. **The Art of Persuasion in Greece**, Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1963.

Levin, H. **The Overreacher: A Study of Christopher Marlowe**. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.

Lewis, C. S. **The Allegory of Love**. Oxford: Claredon Press, 1936.

Martz, L. L. **The Poetry of Meditation: A Study of English Religious Literature of the Seventeenth Century**. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954.

Murray, P. and L. eds. **The Art of the Renaissance**. Singapore: Thames and Hudson, 1981.

Pieper, Joseph. **The Four Cardinal Virtues: Prudence, Justice, Fortitude, and Temperance**. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1966.

Plumb, J. H. ed. **The Pelican Book of the Renaissance**. New York: American Heritage Publishing Co., 1982.

Southern, N. R., et. al. eds. **The Revels History of Drama in England Volume III**. London: Methuen and Co., 1980.

Trimpi, Wesley. **Ben Jonson's Poems: A Study of the Plain Style**. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1962.

Tuve, Rosemund. **Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery**. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Tydeman, William. **The Theatre of the Middle Ages**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Ullman, W. **Medieval Political Thought**. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1965.

Welsford, Enid. **The Fool: His Social and Literary History**. Gloucester, Massachusetts: Peter Smith, 1965.

Willeford, Wilham. **The Fool and His Sceptre**. Chicago: Northwestern University Press, 1969.

Woodbridge, Linda. **Women and the English Renaissance: Literature and the Nature of Womankind, 1540-1620**. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1984.

D. GENERAL STUDIES ON SHAKESPEARE

Altman, Joel B. **The Tudor Play of Mind: Rhetorical Inquiry and the Development of Elizabethan Drama**. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1978.

Bethell, S. L. **Shakespeare and the Popular Dramatic Tradition**. London and New York: Stapels, 1944.

Bullough, Geoffrey. **Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare**. 8 vols. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, New York: Columbia University Press, 1957-75.

Clemen, Wolfgang. **The Development of Shakespearean Imagery**. Cambridge, Massechusetts: Harvard University Press, 1951.

----. **English Tragedy before Shakespeare**. Translated by T. S. Dorsch. London: Methuen and Company, 1955.

Cormican, L. A. "Medieval Idiom in Shakespeare" **Scrutiny** vol. 17 (1950) pp. 186-202 and pp. 298-317.

Farnham, Willard. **The Shakespearean Grotesque: Its Genesis and Transformations**. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971.

Frye, Northrop. **Anatomy of Criticism**. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.

Harbage, Alfred. **Shakespeare's Audience**. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941.

Hirsh, James E. **The Structure of Shakespearean Scenes**, New Haven and London: Yale University Press. 1981.

Hunter, R. G. **Shakespeare and the Comedy of Forgiveness**. New York: Columbia University Press, 1965.

Mahood, M. M. **Shakespeare's Wordplay**. London: Methuen, New York: Barnes and Noble, 1965.

McAlindon, T. **Shakespeare and Decorum**. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd., 1973.

Muir, Kenneth. **Shakespeare's Sources**. London: Methuen and Co., 1957.

Partridge, Eric. **Shakespeare's Bawdy**. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1947. Revised and enlarged edititon, 1968.

Quinn, Michael. ed. **Shakespeare's Henry V: A Selection of Critical Essays**. Casebook Series. General Editor A. E. Dyson, Nashville, London: Aurora Publishers Inc., 1969.

Rabkin, Norman. **Shakespeare and the Common Understanding**. New York: Free Press, 1967.

Rose, Mark. **Shakespearean Design**. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Rossiter, A. P. **Angel with Horns**. Edited by Graham Storey. London: Longman, 1961.

Spivack, Bernard. **Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil**. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958.

Vickers, Brian. **The Artistry of Shakespeare's Prose**. London: Methuen and Company, 1968.

E. GENERAL STUDIES ON THE HISTORY PLAY

Berry, Edward T. **Patterns of Decay: Shakespeare's Early Histories**. Charlottesville, Virginia: University Press of Virginia, 1975.

Blake, N. F. **Shakespeare's Language: An Introduction**. London and Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press Ltd., 1983.

Blanpied, John W. **Time and the Artist in Shakespeare's English Histories**. Newark: University of Delaware Press, London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1983.

Burkhardt, Sigurd. **Shakespearean Meanings**. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.

Calderwod, James L. **Metadrama in Shakespeare's Henriad**. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1979.

Campbell, Lily B. **Shakespeare's "Histories", Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy**. San Marino, California: Huntinton Library Press, 1947. Reprinted London: Methuen, 1964.

Clemen, Wolfgang. "Anticipation and Foreboding in Shakespeare's Early Histories." in **Shakespeare Survey 6** (1953): pp. 25-35.

Craig, Hardin. "Shakespeare and the History Play" in **Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies**. Edited by James G. McManaway et al. Washington D.C.: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1948, pp. 55-64.

Dean, Leonard F. "Richard II to Henry V: A Closer View" in **Studies in Honor of Dewitt T. Stanes**. Edited by Thomas P. Harrison et al. Austin; University of Texas Press, 1967. pp. 37-52.

Doran, Madelaine. **Shakespeare's Dramatic Language**. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1976.

Evans, B. I. **The Language of Shakespeare's Plays**. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1952.

Hapgood, Robert. "Shakespeare's Thematic Modes of Speech: *Richard II* to *Henry V*". **Shakespeare Survey 20**. (1967): pp. 41-9.

Hunter, G. K. "Shakespeare's Politics and the Rejection of Falstaff" **Critical Quarterley 1**. (1959): pp. 236-48.

Laguardia, Eric. "Ceremony and History: The Problem of Symbol from Richard II to Henry V" in **Pacific Coast Studies in Shakespeare**. Edited by Waldo F. McNeir and Thelma Greenfield. Eugene: University of Oregon Press, 1966. pp. 68-88.

Ornstein, Robert. **A Kingdom for a Stage**. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Price, Joseph G. **The Triple Bond: Plays, Mostly Shakespearean in Performance**. London: The Pennsylvania State Universtiy Press, 1975.

Prior, Moody E. **The Drama of Power: Studies in Shakespeare's History Plays**. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1973.

Reese, M. M. [illegible]e of Majesty. London: Arnold, 1961.

Ribner, Irving. [illegible]lish History Play in the Age of Shakespeare. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957. Revised and [illegible]ged edition, New York: Barnes and Noble, London: Methuen, 1965.

Riggs, David. **Shakespeare's Heroical Histories**. Cambridge: Harvard University Pres, 1971.

Saccio, Peter. **Shakespeare's English Kings: History, Chronicle, and Drama**. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Traversi, Derek. **Shakespeare from Richard II to Henry V**. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1957. Reprinted 1[illegible].

Tillyard, E. M. W. **Shakespeare's History Plays** London: Chatto and Windus, 1944. Reprinted, 1964.

Webber, Joan. "The Renewal of the King's Symbolic Role: From Richard II to Henry V." **Texas Studies in Literature and Language**, (1962-3): pp. 530-8.

Zeeeveld, W. G. "The Influence of Hall on Shakespeare's English History Plays." **English Literary History** 3 (1936) pp. 317-53.

F. STUDIES OF HENRY IV, PARTS I and II

Alvis, John. "A Little Touch of the Night in Harry: The Career of Henry Monmouth." **Shakespeare as Polotical Thinker**. Ed. John Alvis and Thomas G. West. Durham, N.C.: Carolina Academic Press, 1981. pp. 95-105.

Barber, C. L. "Prince Hal, Henry V, and the Tudor Monarchy" in **The Morality of Art: Essays Presented to G. Wilson Knight**. Ed. Douglas W. Jefferson. New York: Barnes and Noble; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969. pp.67-75.

Barish, Jonas A. "The Turning Away of Prince Hal" **Shakespeare Studies** 1. (1965) pp. 9-17.

Berry, Edward I. "The Rejection Scene in *Henry IV Part II*" **Studies in English Literature**. 17. (1977) pp. 201-18.

Blanpied, John W. "Unfatered Heirs and Loathy Births of Nature': Bringing History to Crisis in *Henry IV Part II*" **English Literary Renaissance**. 5. (1975) pp. 212-31.

Dickinson, Hugh. "The Reformation of Prince Hal" in **Shakespeare Quarterley**. 12. (1961): pp. 33-46.

Doran, Madelaine. "Imagery in *Richard II* and *Henry IV*." **Modern Language Review** 37 (1942): pp. 113-22.

Hawkins, Sherman B. "On Behalf of Falstaff: The Structural Problem Revisited." **Shakespeare Quarterly** 33 (1982): pp. 278-301.

Hotson, Leslie. "Ancient Pistol" in **Yale Review** 38 (1948): pp. 51-66.

Hunter, G. K. "Shakespeare's Politics and the Rejection Of Falstaff" in **Critical Quarterly** 1 (1959): pp. 229-36.

Jenkins, Harold. **The Structural Problem in Shakespeare's Henry IV**. London: Methuen, 1956.

Kernan, Alvin. "The Henriad; Shakespeare's Major History Plays." **Yale Review**. 59 (1969): pp. 3-32.

McNeir, Waldo F. "Structure and Theme in the First Tavern Scene of *Henry IV Part I*" **Pacific Coast Studies in Shakespeare**. Ed, Waldo f. McNeir and Thelma N. Greenfield. Eugene: University of Oregon Press, 1966.

pp. 89-105.

Shaaber, Matthias A. "The Unity of **HenryIV**" in **Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies**. Ed. James G. McManaway et al. Washington, D.C.: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1948.

Toliver, Harold E. "Falstaff, the Prince, and the History Play" in **Shakespeare Quarterly** 16 (1965): pp. 63-80.

----. "The Political Background of Shakespeare's *Richard II* and *Henry IV*" in **Shakespeare-Jahrbuch** 75 (1939): pp. 36-51.

G. STUDIES OF *HENRY V*

Altieri, Joanne. "Romance in *Henry V*" in **Studies in English Literature** 21 (1981): pp. 223-40.

Barber, C. L. "Prince Hal, Henry V, and the Tudor Monarchy" in **The Morality of Art: Essays Presented to G. Wilson Knight**. Ed. Douglas W. Jefferson. New York: Barnes and Noble; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969. pp. 67-75.

Berman, Ronald S. "Shakespeare's Alexander: Henry V" in **College English** 23 (1962): pp. 532-9.

Boughner, Daniel C. "Pistol and the Roaring Boys" in **Shakespeare Association Bulletin** 11 (1936): pp. 226-37.

Braddy, Haldeen. "Shakespeare's *Henry V* and the French Nobility" in **Texas Studies in Literature and Language** 3 (1961): pp. 189-96.

Brennan, Anthony. "That Within Which Passes Show: The function of the Chorus in Henry V" in **Philological Quarterly** 58 (1979): pp. 40-52.

Collins, David G. "On Re-interpreting *Henry V*" in **Upstart Crow** 4 (1982): pp. 13-34.

Dean, Paul. "A Muse of Fire: *Henry V* in the Light of *Tamburlaine*" in **Quarterly** 32 (1981): pp. 18-27.

Gilbert, Alan H. "Patriotism and Satire in *Henry V*." **Studies in Shakespeare**. Ed. Arthur D. Matthews and Clark M. Emery. Miami: University of Miami Press, 1953. pp. 40-64.

Jorgensen, Paul A. "Accidental Judgements, Casual Slaughters, and Purposes Mistook: Critical Reactions to Shakespeare's *Henry V*." **Shakespeare Association Bulletin** 22 (1947): pp. 51-61.

----. "The Courtship Scene in *Henry V*." **Modern Language Quarterly** 11 (1950): pp. 180-8.

Lenz, Joseph M. "The Politics of Honor: The Oath in *Henry V*" **Journal of English and Germanic Philology**. 80 (1981): pp. 1-13.

Lever, J. W. "Shakespeare's French Fruits." **Shakespeare Survey** 6 (1953): pp. 79-90.

MacIntyre, Jean. "Shakespeare and the Battlefield: Tradition and Innovation in Battle Scenes." **Theatre Survey** 23 (1982): pp. 31-44.

Mendilow, A. A. "Falstaff's Death of a Sweat." **Shakespeare Quarterly** 9 (1958): pp. 479-83.

Rabkin, Norman. "Rabbits Ducks, and *Henry V* **Shakespeare Quarterly** 28 (1977); pp. 279-96.

Stribrny, Zdenek. "*Henry V* and History." **Shakespeare in a Changing World**. Ed. Arnold Kettle. London; Lawrence and Wishart, 1964. pp. 84-101.

Tolman, Albert H. "The Epic Character of Henry V." **Modern Language Notes** 34 (1919): pp. 7-16.

Webber, Joan. "The Renewal of the King's Symbolic Role: From *Richard II* to *Henry V*." **Texas Studies in Literature and Language** 4 (1963): pp. 530-80.

Williamson, Marilyn L. "The Episode with Williams in *Henry V*." **Studies in English Literature** 9 (1969): pp. 275-82.

Wilson, J. Dover. "Martin Marprelate and Shakespeare's Fluellen." **Library** 3 (1912): pp. 113-51, 241-76.