



Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences

Department of English Language and Literature

**NATIONALISM, ENGLISHNESS AND NATION BUILDING IN
SHAKESPEARE'S *RICHARD II* AND *HENRY V***

Emine Seda AĞLAYAN

Master's Thesis

Ankara, 2010

**NATIONALISM, ENGLISHNESS AND NATION BUILDING IN
SHAKESPEARE’S *RICHARD II* AND *HENRY V***

Emine Seda AĞLAYAN

Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences
Department of English Language and Literature

Master’s Thesis

Ankara, 2010

KABUL VE ONAY

Emine Seda ÇAĞLAYAN tarafından hazırlanan “Nationalism, Englishness and Nation Building in Shakespeare’s *Richard II* and *Henry V*” başlıklı bu çalışma, 16 Haziran 2010 tarihinde yapılan savunma sınavı sonucu başarılı bulunarak jürimiz tarafından Yüksek Lisans Tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.


Prof. Dr. Deniz BOZER (Başkan)
Prof. Dr. Himmet UMUNÇ (Danışman)
Doç. Dr. Nur AKKERMAN
Doç. Dr. Hande SEBER
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Şebnem KAYA

Yukarıdaki imzaların adı geçen öğretim üyelerine ait olduğunu onaylarım.

Prof. Dr. İrfan ÇAKIN

Enstitü Müdürü

BİLDİRİM

Hazırladığım tezin/raporun tamamen kendi çalışmam olduğunu ve her alıntıya kaynak gösterdiğimi taahhüt eder, tezimin/raporumun kağıt ve elektronik kopyalarının Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü arşivlerinde aşağıda belirttiğim koşullarda saklanmasına izin verdiğimi onaylarım:

- ☐ Tezimin/Raporumun tamamı her yerden erişime açılabilir.
- ☐ Tezim/Raporum sadece Hacettepe Üniversitesi yerleşkelerinden erişime açılabilir.
- ☒ Tezimin/Raporumun 3 yıl süreyle erişime açılmasını istemiyorum. Bu sürenin sonunda uzatma için başvuruda bulunmadığım takdirde, tezimin/raporumun tamamı her yerden erişime açılabilir.

16.06.2010



Emine Seda ÇAĞLAYAN

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my endless gratitude to my thesis advisor, Prof. Dr. Himmet UMUNÇ for his great support, encouragement and patience. He not only made me love Shakespeare but also opened up new academic horizons to me by his extensive knowledge and experience.

I owe a special word of gratitude to Yrd. Doç. Dr. Alev BAYSAL for her invaluable guidance, everlasting encouragement and never-ending support all through my study. She became the source of my inspiration and made the hard process of writing a thesis easier by her constant motivation.

I would also like to thank Dr. Neslihan EKMEKÇİOĞLU for motivating me to study Shakespeare in my graduate education and present papers at the Shakespeare Institute at Stratford-upon-Avon which earned me great experience and increased my enthusiasm to specialize in Shakespeare studies.

Also, I would like to thank all of my distinguished professors and my thesis committee for their scholarly support and valuable comments and suggestions.

My deepest greatfullness must also be extended to my dear parents, Gülден and Sertaç ÇAĞLAYAN and to my brother Serhat ÇAĞLAYAN for their consistent trust, love and support. Without their enduring encouragement, and especially my mother's great care and devotion, I would not have accomplished this thesis. I would also like to express my indebtedness to my dear friends for their support and Emre MAZANOĞLU who has never left me alone by his support and patience in the process of producing this thesis and become one of my best companions at Bilkent University Library.

ÖZET

ÇAĞLAYAN, Emine Seda. *Shakespeare'in 2. Richard ve 5. Henry Oyunlarında Milliyetçilik, İngilizlilik ve Ulus Oluşturma*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara, 2010.

İngiliz milliyetçiliğinin kökeni, 8. yüzyıldan başlayarak Anglo-Saxon Dönemi'ne dayanır. İngiliz milliyetçilik duygusu, yüzyıllar boyunca, politik, ekonomik ve kültürel alanlardaki gelişmelerle arttırılmıştır. Ancak, İngilizlilik duygusu, Tudor Hanedanı'nda, özellikle 7. Henry, 8. Henry ve Kraliçe 1. Elizabeth dönemlerinde en çok hissedilmiş, politik açıdan ele alınmıştır.

Elizabeth Dönemi oyun yazarı ve bir vatansever olan Shakespeare, milliyetçiliğin ve İngilizlilik duygusunun artışını ve ulus oluşturma düşüncesini, Ortaçağ İngiliz tarihini ele aldığı “Tarihi Oyunlar” olarak bilinen, tarihsel oyunlarında yansıtmıştır. Tarihi Oyunlar'ında, cesareti ve adil bir yönetim kurma kararlılığı ile halkın onayını kazanan mükemmel kralı ve ideal ulus kurucusunu ele almıştır. Ayrıca, sınıf farkı gözetmeksizin tüm ulusu kahramanca liderliği ile birleştiren kral anlatışmıştır. Kralın gücünü kötüye kullanması, adaleti sağlamakta başarısız olması ve özellikle kendi istekleriyle Tanrı'dan aldığı yetkilere dayanarak sürdürdüğü despot yönetim anlayışı çerçevesinde ortaya çıkan politik sorunu da dile getirmiştir. Bu nedenle, *II. Richard* (1595) ve *V. Henry* (1599) oyunları, ideal bir kralın özelliklerini ortaya koyması ve 2. Richard gibi zayıf bir krala halkın karşı çıkışını anlatması açısından önemlidir. 5. Henry ise kahraman kişiliği ve vatansever konuşmalarıyla ulusal birliği sağlayan mükemmel bir hükümdar olarak takdim edilmiştir. *II. Richard* oyununda, Kral 2. Richard'ı tahttan indirdikten sonra Kral 4. Henry olarak tahta çıkan Bolingbroke'un haklı isyanı ele alınmaktadır. Bolingbroke, gücü, kararlılığı, yasalara ve geleneklere duyduğu saygı ve adil uygulamalarıyla İngiliz halkını önemsemesi ile II. Richard'tan daha etkili bir ulus kurucusu olarak tasvir edilmiştir. Tüm ulusun, 2. Richard'ın haksız uygulamalarıyla ezilen orta sınıfın ve soylu kişilerin, Bolingbroke'a destek vermesi mücadelesinin ulusal bir harekete dönüştüğünü göstermektedir. *V. Henry* oyununda ise, *IV. Henry 1&2* oyununun savurgan ve görünüşte sorumsuz olan prensi Hal, boş gençlik yıllarını babasının ölümünün ardından geride bırakan, politika, din ve savaş alanlarında kendini geliştirmiş Kral 5. Henry'e dönüşür.

Sıradan bir asker gibi davranarak, mütevazılığı ile tüm İngilizlerin sevgi ve saygısını kazanır, ayrıca Harfleur ve Agincourt Savaşları'nı yalnızca kumanda etmez, bu savaşlarda askerleriyle birlikte omuz omuza savaşır ve onlarla kurduğu yakın ilişkiyi gösterir. Oyunda, milliyetçilik duygusu, Henry'nin kahraman kişiliği ve askerlerini efsane atalarının güçlü ve cesur torunları olarak öven, sınıf farkı gözetmeden tüm İngiliz askerlerinin kardeşliğini vurgulayan vatansever konuşmaları ile kabartılır. Koro'nun teşvik edici söylevleri ve orta tabaka ve soyluların, yabancı düşmana karşı verdikleri kahramanca mücadele oyunda İngilizlilik duygusunu arttıran önemli hususlardır.

Shakespeare, ortaçağ İngiliz tarihini ve dönemin politik olaylarını, Elizabeth Dönemi'nde tartışılan mutlak gücün kullanılması, yabancı bir devlet tarafından işgal edilme tehditi ve milli birliği sağlayarak İngilizlilik duygusunu arttıran mükemmel kral düşüncesi gibi önemli konulara göndermeler yapmak için kullanmıştır. Ayrıca, 1588 yılında İspanya Donanması'na karşı kazanılan zafer sonrasında artan vatanseverlik duygusuna ve İngiliz milliyetçiliğine atıflarda bulunmuştur.

Anahtar Sözcükler

William Shakespeare, *II. Richard*, *V. Henry*, Elizabeth Dönemi, milli duygu, İngilizlilik duygusu, ulus kurma, vatanseverlik, tarihi oyunlar

ABSTRACT

ÇAĞLAYAN, Emine Seda. *Nationalism, Englishness and Nation Building in Shakespeare's Richard II and Henry V*. Master's Thesis, Ankara, 2010.

The origins of English nationalism date back to the Anglo-Saxon era, beginning in the eighth century. The English national sense is promoted by the major developments in political, economical, social and cultural fields throughout the centuries. However, the sense of Englishness is mostly felt and politically exercised during the Tudor period, especially during the rule of Henry VII, Henry VIII and Elizabeth I.

As a patriotic Elizabethan dramatist, Shakespeare presents the rise of the national sense, Englishness and the idea of nation building in his history plays, usually referred to as "The Histories" which are based on medieval English history. In his Histories, he also demonstrates the idea of a perfect monarch and a nation builder whose courage and determination to establish a just rule attracts the public opinion. The monarch who unites the whole nation regardless of class distinctions under his heroic leadership is also emphasized. He also questions the political problem of the monarch's abuse of his power, failing to exercise justice and having a despotic rule essentially related to his consent and divine rights. In this regard, his *Richard II* (1595) and *Henry V* (1599) are significant as they vividly put forth the qualities of an ideal monarch and depict the public opposition to a weak monarch such as Richard II. Henry V is presented as a strong monarch who maintains the national unity by his heroic self and patriotic rhetorics. In *Richard II*, the righteous rebellion of Bolingbroke, who ascends the throne as King Henry IV after deposing King Richard II, is presented. Bolingbroke is portrayed as a more effective nation builder than Richard II by his power, determination, respect to laws and customs and consideration of the English people by his just practices. The public support of Bolingbroke, that of both the commoners and the nobility, who have been suppressed by Richard's unjust acts, demonstrates that Bolingbroke's struggle turns out to be a national movement. In *Henry V*, the prodigal and seemingly irresponsible Prince Hal of *Henry IV* 1&2 turns out to be a perfect monarch, King Henry V, who left his frivolous youth behind after his father's death and matured in

politics, religious affairs and warfare. He gains the love and respect of all the English people by his modesty as he acts as an ordinary soldier; moreover, he not only leads his troops personally at the battles of Harfleur and Agincourt, but he also fights side by side with his soldiers and displays his fellowship with them. The sense of nationalism is aroused in the play by Henry's heroic self and patriotic rhetorics at Harfleur and Agincourt, praising the soldiers as strong and courageous descendants of the legendary ancestors and emphasizing the brotherhood of all the English soldiers regardless of their classes. The inspiring orations of the Chorus and the heroic fight of both the commoners and the nobility against a foreign enemy are also presented as important matters which arouse the sense of Englishness in the play.

Shakespeare also uses the medieval English history and politics to allude to some major issues of the Elizabethan era such as the question of use of the absolute power and the idea of a perfect monarch, who maintains the national unity and arouses the sense of Englishness. Moreover, he refers to the rise of patriotism and the sense of English nationalism after the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588.

Key Words

William Shakespeare, the sense of English nationalism, Englishness, nation building, patriotism, history plays, the Elizabethan era, *Richard II*, *Henry V*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

KABUL VE ONAY	i
BİLDİRİM	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ÖZET	iv
ABSTRACT	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
INTRODUCTION: THE RISE OF ENGLISHNESS AND NATION BUILDING IN ANGLO-SAXON, MEDIEVAL AND TUDOR ENGLAND	1
CHAPTER I: THE IDEA OF NATION BUILDING AND DIVINE KINGSHIP IN <i>RICHARD II</i>	39
CHAPTER II: <i>HENRY V</i> : THE HEROIC SELF AND THE PATRIOTIC RHETORIC	93
CONCLUSION	143
WORKS CITED	147

INTRODUCTION

THE RISE OF ENGLISHNESS AND NATION BUILDING IN ANGLO- SAXON, MEDIEVAL AND TUDOR ENGLAND

The sense of nationalism emerged in England in the Anglo-Saxon period, but developed and was shaped through events such as the Norman Conquest in 1066 and the Hundred Years' War between 1337 and 1453 in the middle ages. However, the sense of Englishness reached its peak in the sixteenth-century when England gained a powerful position in Europe under the rule of the Tudor monarchs, Henry VI and Henry VIII and competed with strong countries such as Spain, France and the Netherlands in politics, economy and warfare. The Elizabethan Era was particularly important for the development of the English national sense as it was the age of the defeat of the Spanish Armada, which was an illustrious victory over Spain in 1588 and increased the English patriotism. The idea of a perfect monarch and an ideal nation builder were also emphasized by the heroic image of Queen Elizabeth I, who achieved to maintain the national unity and aroused the sense of Englishness during her reign. The English history is also rich in ideal nation builders and perfect monarchs, who are strong, courageous and determined to elevate the English nation. In this sense, Shakespeare presented in his history plays a growing sense of nationalism, Englishness and the idea of nation building.

The origins of Englishness in history can be traced back to the legend of Brutus, the mythical founder of Britain. This idea was reiterated through the Arthurian legends in the Anglo-Saxon period and adopted by the Normans down to the time of Henry III. As Robert J.C. Young has stated, “[e]ventually the conquering Arthur came to be seen as the hero of the whole population, uniting the Britons with the Angles and Saxons and drawing them together into a single British nation” (15). Especially, in the Anglo-Saxon period, the Venerable Bede demonstrated through his *Ecclesiastical History of the English People* that England had an ecclesiastical unity which preceded the development of a political unity (Hastings 36). Bede referred, in his work, to “the time when the English nation received the faith of Christ”, and emphasized the religious unity of the East and West Saxons, East Angles and Northumbrians as follows (2):

Daniel, the most reverend Bishop of the West Saxons, who is still living, communicated to me in writing some things relating to the Ecclesiastical History of that province, and the next adjoining to it of the South Saxons, as also of the Isle of Wight. But now, by the pious ministry of Cedd and Ceadda, the province of the Mercians was brought up to the faith of Christ, [...], and how that of the East Saxons recovered the same, after having expelled it, and how those fathers lived and died, we learned from the brethren of the monastery, which was built by them, and is called Lastingham. What ecclesiastical transactions took place in the province of the East Angles, was partly made known to us from the writings and tradition of our ancestors. (2-3)

These lines clearly demonstrate that the different tribes were all united by the ecclesiastical unity and their lives were recorded by the monasteries and reached to the next generations by the religious writings. For Bede, the ethnic origins of the English people, whether Celtic or Anglo-Saxon, were not important to create a nation. Yet, in the eighth century, England was not a nation in the modern sense with a cultural, political and territorial unity, but was seen as an ecclesiastically united country whose people were called under the general name “English”. In this context, one can refer to three kinds of unities: the first was the territorial unity whereby England was one single country. Bede drew the borders of Britain so as to include the Scots and the Picts as parts of this unity. The second unity was ecclesiastical, and in this sense, Canterbury became the centre of Christianity in England, with the Archbishop of Canterbury as the head of all the churches in the country. The third unity was related to the civic and political unity of England. Accordingly, the ethnically separate Germanic tribes, which were mainly the Saxons, the Angles and the Jutes, formed what Bede called the “English” nation. In this totalizing concept of “Englishness” were also included the Britons, the Picts and the Scots, the other peoples living in Britain. Thus, one may argue that Bede’s account of the various peoples in his time as the “English” nation was the first historical record of idea of Englishness and the English national identity. Although Bede mainly focuses on the ecclesiastical unity of the peoples in his time, his understanding of this unity “is at least as much that of the nation as that of the church, while being implicitly a history of Britannia too” (Hastings 38).

This earlier concept of the national identity and Englishness was further reiterated by King Alfred in the ninth century. Alfred, the King of Wessex who ruled between 871 and 899, drastically contributed to the development of the sense of Englishness in the

ninth century as a strong and courageous nation builder. His role in the rise of the sense of nationalism in England was remarkably constructive. He expanded the tribal kingdom of Wessex into the territorial kingdom of England, and as D.J.V Fisher has claimed, he “was the first king in England who identified himself with the ‘English’” (225). Alfred contributed to the development of the sense of Englishness and the national identity by his achievements in the areas of education and translation of the Latin works into English. He gave the utmost importance to the education of the “English” people. He wanted them to be intellectual people so that they could be conscious of their own identity and past. As Christopher Brooke has pointed out, “Alfred found time to let his imagination roam in other fields; to think of monasteries and libraries and books which even laymen could read” (116). He encouraged the translation of the Latin books into English so that the Christian literature would be available to the English people. He developed a vernacular literature and translated *Bede’s Ecclesiastical History of the English People* into English along with the works of Boethius and Pope Gregory. His choice of Gregory’s *Pastoral Care* was important as it emphasized the importance of the education of the laity, and as Fisher has stated, “the translation of parts of Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History* made Englishmen aware of their past” (229). Hence, the English people were not ignorant people, but became highly knowledgeable about their own past and national identity. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, which gave an account of the political history of the period and were written in seven manuscripts, displayed Alfred’s interest in history as it reflected the traditions of the English nation in his time. Although it dealt with all the English kingdoms, it mostly focused on the history of the West Saxon royal dynasty. So, one may argue that it was a national chronicle and became an account of the English history; because, in the chronicle, “from 865 until 891 the history of the wars and of Alfred’s successful leadership is related in considerable detail” (Fisher 232). In *The Parker Chronicle*, one of the manuscripts, the account of Alfred’s military activities during the Danish invasions in 885 is given as follows:

In this year the baove-mentioned host separated into two, one part east and the other part to Rochester, and besieged the city; and they built another fortification around themselves; and the citizens, however, defended the city until Alfred came to their relief [885] with levies. Then went the host to their ships and abandoned that encampment, and were there deprived of their horses, and soon the same

summer went oversea. And the same year king Alfred sent a naval force into East Anglia. (76)

The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle was also important since it was written in English, in an age when historical, legal and diplomatic documents were almost written in Latin. However, Latin lost its power especially in the ninth century as the spoken Latin completely disappeared in the country and the Latin studies began to decline. In such an atmosphere, the first compilation of the Chronicle was made and gave the English people an account of their history in their vernacular language. In other words, it became the first history of England written in English (Garmonsway xiii-xiv).

The Danish invasions of England in the tenth century completely wiped out all the other kingdoms and gave Alfred's kingdom, which was Wessex, the opportunity to restore the national unity in the country (Hastings 39). Here, Alfred appeared as an effective nation builder and maintained order and peace, which had been destroyed by the Danish invasions, in the country. Alfred was the leader who won the first great victory over the Danes by his courage and military skill. As Austin Lane Pool has argued,

[t]he resistance which Alfred and his brother organized against the Danish invasion of Wessex has been called 'the first clearly recorded campaign in England' and his reign is certainly the earliest to reveal an English king who appreciated the nature of his military problems, who sought a solution by the intelligent application of his available military resources, and who, when these resources were proved defective, reorganized or modified them. (130)

With these lines, King Alfred is depicted as a successful military strategist who was highly knowledgeable about the art of war. He was not only a legendary king, but also a strong and courageous warrior and improved the military structure of his kingdom. Moreover, he increased the military capacity of the West Saxons to protect the English coasts from the attacks of the Danish naval forces. He was the first English king who realized the importance of a fleet for both defence of the nation and offence of any possible foreign attack, and became the founder of the first English naval forces. In this respect, as Fisher has pointed out,

[...] in 875 and 882 he used naval forces and in 885 took the initiative by sending a ship army to East Anglia. In 897 the Chronicle records that 'king Alfred had long ships built to oppose the Danish warships. They were almost twice as long as the

others. ... They were both swifter and steadier and also higher than the others. They were built neither on the Frisian nor the Danish pattern but as it seemed to him himself that they could be mostly useful.' (220)

Among Alfred's political achievements was the unification of the laws of various kingdoms in England, which, since the early Anglo-Saxon times, had existed as separate and independent political and linguistic entities. Hence, one may argue that he also improved his kingdom's legal system. Alfred's attempt to unify the states of the Anglo-Saxons has been stressed by Fisher who has asserted that "the importance of Alfredian laws lies in the fact that it was the first legislation of England since the reign of Offa, that it applied to all lands under English rule" (231). Alfred extended his power into areas which had been ignored by the previous kings, and unified them so as to create the English nation. By making English the common language for all the peoples in England, Alfred achieved the linguistic unity, and all the laws were written in English. Therefore, as Adrian Hastings has pointed out, "the unity of a shared vernacular law was reflected sufficiently in the life of the people as a whole" (39). So, Alfred laid down the fundamental principles of Englishness through the creation and establishment of a national language, a national literature and a national law.

The vernacular literature of Anglo-Saxon England in the tenth and eleventh centuries which included parts of the Old Testament, the chronicles, laws, the sermons and poetry had a major impact on the development of the sense of nationalism in England (Hastings 41). In other words, the chronicles depicted the history of the English people and their former kingdoms; the laws were in English and arranged to regulate the English way of life; the poetry reflected the English literary taste. Hence, the English people developed a national literature and culture where they could represent the English national identity. The historical writers from Tacitus onwards became interested in poems which celebrated the national heroes and depicted the past (Whitelock 204). The heroic poems of the Old English literature such as *Beowulf* and *The Battle of Maldon* were significant as they dealt with the heroic past and heroic warriors. The elegiac poetry such as *The Wanderer* and *The Seafarer*, which were about the sentiments of people in typical situations, contributed to the development of the Anglo-Saxon literature. The development of prose writing emerged through chronicle writing. As Whitelock pointed out, "the Chronicle is a remarkable achievement, a historical

source of the first importance over centuries, which allows us to study the development of prose writing” (218). English writing also has a major role in the development of a vernacular literature. The translations, which were made from various Latin texts, enriched the flourishing English literature. As Geoffrey R. Elton has emphasized, “[...] the emerging English could from the first lay claim to a high degree of native self-sufficiency” (*The English* 4). Thus, England gradually acquired the prime characteristics that constituted Englishness. These were what Adrian Hastings rightly termed “a range of factors behind the English leap into early nationhood” (43).

The Norman Conquest of England in 1066 had a negative impact on the development of a sense of Englishness in England. Historically, the Norman Conquest radically altered the Anglo-Saxon elements of the English state and transformed England into a state of French feudalism. As Lloyd and Jennifer Laing have pointed out, “the Normans certainly introduced new elements into English life which were gradually absorbed, and brought about the gradual disappearance of others” (237). Most radically, the English language, which had made a great progress, was replaced by French in both administration and laws. Moreover, the English literary writing disappeared as a new ruling class emerged. The new rulers were the people whose interests were in France rather than England. So, one may argue that, to put it in Hastings’s words, “Norman rule is held to have wiped out whatever there was of nationhood existent in the preceding age” (43). All the constructive developments in the use of English language, the emergence of the national literature and the strengthening of the administration and legal systems were destroyed by the Norman Conquest.

However, despite the colonizing and radically transforming effects of the Norman Conquest, the English people managed to maintain and nurture the sense of nationalism in the following centuries. Also, the Normans as the feudal overlords and conquerors facilitated the re-emergence of the sense of English nationalism. This was because they were not so powerful in social and intellectual life and had what Hastings called an “institutional inferiority” (44). The Anglo-Saxon economic structure was maintained by William the Conqueror and legal system was extended, but the basis remained that of Anglo-Saxon England. England preserved her Anglo-Saxon qualities also in culture.

Though the vernacular literature suffered from the Norman Conquest, painting and sculpture remained Anglo-Saxon (Laing 238). So, it became easy for the English people to reconstruct their own identity by overthrowing the hegemony of the Norman traditions. England showed her self-consciousness by preserving the English language against French after the Conquest and reviving the Anglo-Saxon traditions of monetary system, legal practice and the field of the arts. In this respect, Thorlac Turville-Petre argues that after the Norman Conquest, Medieval England in the early twelfth century established a centralized administration which “reached out to the local communities through a chain of officials, royal courts, and judicial commissions” (8). In other words, the administration system was strengthened as it covered the whole country. This central administration united the country’s different regions and proved that it would privilege the common interests of the English people. While the supremacy of the crown was maintained, an alliance between the king and his vassals was also established. The English shires were represented in the parliament in two significant issues of medieval England: taxation and military service. The centralized administration was also very effective in creating a national unity among the English people, because Westminster could easily make a royal propaganda by emphasizing the need for national unity in the case of a foreign attack. In this sense, Turville-Petre further argues that

[...] paying for one’s country and fighting for one’s country became the experience of wider and wider sections of the population, strengthening--whether they liked it or not— their sense of national identity and commitment. (8)

The practice of the Common Law, which came into being in the twelfth century through various statutes and legal arrangements, shows that it was considered to be a valuable national institution. What was significant in the Common Law was that it was applied to the whole country despite some local variations. As David Loades has stated, it “was in one sense the king’s law, but more importantly it was the law of the whole community, evolved over many centuries to meet a collective need” (5). Hence, the Common Law started a unified legal system and consolidated England as a political unity. So, by the thirteenth century, Medieval England embodied all the necessary elements that were needed for the formation of a nation. As a body politic, England had a territory, a

particular history, cultural traditions, a set of legal practices in Common Law, a centralized administration and economy and the shared rights privileging common interests of the English people. The national language remained as the only element which was necessary for the nation-building. As Michael Ignatieff has pointed out, “it [was] language that provide[d] the essential form of belonging” (7) and constructed the English national identity. Although Latin and French were still used in administration and at the court, the common people’s language was English. Indeed, writing in Latin or expressing in French did not fully represent the national identity of the English people. Gradually, especially from the fourteenth century onwards, the usage of English as a national language began to be a common practice. It became the language of pleading in the king’s courts in 1362 and replaced French as the language of the royal court, and Chaucer’s writings as well as those of his contemporaries clearly indicated this trend. Hence, English paved way as a national language and emerged “as the culturally dominant language of the kingdom” (Rex 105). In this regard, Englishness was explicitly emphasized and became the defining element of the national identity.

Politically, in the fourteenth century, Englishness was consolidated through a stable administration and military gains. The national security against foreign enemies such as France and the Scots was completely established. The Treaty of Paris in 1303 eliminated the possibility of any threat from France. The Welsh were defeated and their leaders were executed. The Scots surrendered to England in 1304 after their rebel leaders William Wallace and Simon Fraser were eliminated. England began to evolve into the dominant power of the British Isles, and the process for a United Britain got underway (Turville- Petre 15).

King Richard II, King of England of House of Plantagenet and the son of Edward, the Black Prince, ruled England between 1337 and 1399 until he was deposed. He was an intensely ambitious man and established a tyrannical rule where he suppressed his subjects and violated the order and peace in the country. In this sense, Richard II’s reign is important in terms of presenting the attributes of an ideal nation builder and how a weak king is replaced by a more efficient ruler. As Bryan Bevan argues, Richard’s wish to exercise his absolute power led him to series of mistakes and misjudgements which

brought about his deposition and murder (128). As also presented in Shakespeare's *Richard II*, the historical Richard failed to exercise justice, violated laws and made his people suffer by unjust practices. Richard's tyranny started by his execution of noblemen known as the Lords Appellant, who took over the rule in 1387 as a reaction to Richard's too much dependance on his flatterers in his decisions on affairs of state. For Gerald Harriss, Richard's aim to murder the nobility was "not a plot or even the suspicion of a plot, but first, personal revenge and secondly, the belief that they were impediments to his regality" (*Shaping* 479). Thus, one may argue that Richard decided to destroy the noblemen to protect his kingship by avoiding any further threat of opposition and avenge their taking over the rule in 1387. Yet, the turning point for Richard's despotic rule became the duel between the Dukes of Hereford, who is Richard's cousin and called Bolingbroke in *Richard II*, and Norfolk, who is Mowbray in Shakespeare's play. The significance of this duel was that Richard banished both lords without giving any valid explanation and engendered the Duke of Hereford's rise, which would depose Richard. In the duel, the two lords accused each other of treason, and, confronted in Richard's presence expecting him to exercise justice and deciding on the rightful party; however, he punished both men with exile. Bryan Bevan describes the real motive behind Richard's decision as follows:

It is difficult to analyse the King's sentiments, but they would have been mixed. A natural dread lest his cousin Bolingbroke should triumph in the fight, to be acclaimed by the people, might have seem to him the most probable outcome, for Henry was the more experienced jousting. (132)

Hence, Richard was afraid of Hereford's rising popularity among the people and succeeding him as the next monarch. That is why, he thought that if he sent the last of the Lords Appellant away, he would remove any threat of opposition to his kingship. But, he made another error of judgement as the Duke of Hereford returned from the exile by having gotten stronger and, having gained the support of powerful lords and commoners, and ascended to the throne as King Henry IV after he deposed Richard II in 1399. As Harriss has pointed out, "Henry was leading a counter-revolution on behalf of the old retinue structures and could count on all who had been, or feared to be, dispossessed" (487). In other words, the Duke of Hereford was supported by the suppressed subjects who were weary of Richard's despotic rule. In *Richard II*,

Shakespeare presents Richard's failure to be an ideal nation builder and the people's disgust of his unjust practices in the Earl of Northumberland's words:

Now, afore God, 'tis shame such wrongs are borne
In him, a royal prince, and many mo
Of noble blood in this declining land (II.i.238-240)

As indicated in these lines, the nobility was destroyed by Richard's illegal acts and follies, and England has been corrupted under the rule of a weak monarch. Harriss further depicts Richard's failures which led to his deposition as follows:

Similarly the full justification for Richard's deposition was set out in the detailed list of his unjust acts: the destruction of his greater nobility, the oppression of other subjects, the perversion of government, prodigality with the crown estate, the oppression of the Church, placing himself above the law, and acting deceitfully. (*Shaping*, 493)

The fifteenth century had profound significance for the development of the English national sense and appearance of a perfect nation builder, Henry V. What distinguished this century from the previous centuries was the developments, especially, in the economic sphere. The international trade of England defined the character of the medieval English nationalism in the fifteenth century. England had to control the Wales, Ireland and Scotland to provide the security of her trade and it had two powers which it could rely on: the "divine help" and "naval supremacy" (Hastings 55). In fact, it was through these two powers that the nature of sixteenth-century Englishness was foreshadowed, because England's national identity in the sixteenth-century was defined and consolidated by the same powers. The point has been further stressed by Adrian Hastings who maintains that "the groundings of late medieval English nationalism lay in economics, geo-political facts, the maintenance of power both at sea and over England's first empire –its Gaelic neighbours. All this precedes the sixteenth century" (55). The strengthening and significance of Englishness in the fifteenth century was mainly due to the achievements of King Henry V, who ruled England from 1413 to 1422. Although in the fifteenth century the Renaissance had made its full impact in Italy, Henry V was not much influenced by the new cultural, intellectual and political developments the Renaissance had initiated in Italy. He was primarily determined to "realise the highest ideals in his own culture" (Starkey 148). He diligently carried out

the duties of a perfect monarch and an ideal nation builder by his just and egalitarian rule in England and by his heroic struggle against France during the Hundred Years' War, which was fought between 1337 and 1453. In this sense, Gerald Harriss states that "good governance went hand in hand with preparation for a major war, and their common theme was justice" (593). With his victories in France, he turned the tide of the war with France into the advantage of England, and with him the Hundred Years' War reached a new stage whereby Englishness and English nationalism came to the fore. As Turville-Petre has stated, "it is the national identity that distinguishes the English from the feared French or the despised Scots, and it is national unity that will save the people" (4) during a foreign attack.

Thus, it may be argued that the concept of war was an influential element in the development of the English national consciousness, because it served the recognition of cultural and linguistic differences and united the people for a common purpose of defending their nation against a foreign enemy. In this respect, the Hundred Years' War strongly inspired the English people with Englishness and a vibrant sense of nationalism. Therefore, Henry V and the ecclesiastical authorities resorted to various strategies to awake in the people a strong and lasting sense of nationalism. The point was made by means of political propaganda that a war against France was both legal, moral and based on divine will. As Christopher Allmand points out,

[t]he sustaining of public involvement was rapidly becoming part of the growing art of the management of war. Although the word 'propaganda' did not come into use until the mid-nineteenth century, we may none the less use it conveniently to describe a number of activities which had one aim in common, to encourage and secure the widest possible involvement of a nation in war. (*The Hundred* 137)

It is strongly asserted in these lines that the participation of the whole nation to the war was necessary for victory. Hence, various means such as political and religious tactics to inspire the English people to fight in the war against France were carried out. However, the use of religion was the most effective way of propaganda that England mostly benefited during the Hundred Years' War. The English people were convinced that the cause of war was just and England would win victory over France by the divine support. Shakespeare represents this idea in his history play, *Henry V*, where religion is

highly used to encourage the weak and outnumbered English soldiers. King Henry V asserts that the victory will be won over a foreign foe by the divine help as follows: “Now we are well resolv’d; and by God’s help, / And yours, the noble sinews of our power, / France being ours” (I.ii.222-225). Hence, with these lines, Henry assures that along with the armed forces, divine power will bring glory to the English.

The Hundred Years’ Wars against France is fundamental to understand how England’s victory over France contributed to the awakening of the sense of English nationalism. However, the death of Henry V brought about some problems. When Henry VI, who was just nine months old, succeeded him, England lost her political unity. Not only the territories in France were lost, but also the country was divided up between the Houses of York and Lancaster, and this led to the Wars of the Roses, which, as a civil war, completely undermined the national unity of England. In other words, between the periods of 1461 and 1485, “five kings of three different dynasties” (Starkey 149) ruled England whereby the national unity the country had acquired was completely lost.

Besides the political, economical and religious aspects, some cultural elements also contributed to the development of the English national sense in the late Middle Ages. Writing in English had a profound influence on the development of Englishness. It created the sense of belonging and encouraged the English people to become more conscious of their own community and past, and “the desire to belong to this larger protecting community was the urge behind nationalism” (Turville-Petre 11). Especially, Henry V was particularly sensitive for the use of the English language for his own official correspondence, and hence, he contributed greatly to the development of Englishness in late medieval England. The point has been emphasized by John A.F.Thompson, who stated that “instead of Latin and French, in 1399 Henry of Lancaster laid claim to the throne in English and from 1395 the use of English generally became more common in wills. In the letters of Henry V, the language was always English” (76). Henry, grown in a cultured environment, read books in Latin and French and supported the translation of these works into English. He, for instance, commissioned John Lydgate to translate *The Fall of Troy* into English. In this regard, Lydgate describes Henry’s aim in the composition of the book when he says, Henry

“wanted ‘the noble story’ to be freely available ‘in oure tonge, ... as in latyn and frensche it is’” (qtd. in Starkey 148). The translation of Gaston Phoebus’ *Livre de la Chasse* into English as *The Master of the Game* was made by Edward, duke of York, when Henry was the prince (Allmand, *Henry V* 420).

Henry V’s usage of English set an example and encouraged other members of the ruling class to use English in their business or official recordings. As Allmand has pointed out, “[i]n governmental circles a move towards the use of English was also in the making” (421). In this regard, the royal administrative documents, dated 1410 and 1417, were written in English and hence, the use of English became a matter of national pride and status. Moreover, historical narratives in the form of chronicles offered an account of the nation’s origins and development, and explained the sources of the contemporary situations. In this sense, *Chronica Majora* by Mathew Paris gave the narrative account of the earliest English rulers such as Brutus. Paris’s other chronicles such as *Flores Historiarum*, which dealt with the effectes of the Barons’ Wars in 1265, *Historia Anglorum* and *Abbreviatio Chronicorum* also highlighted the prominence of writing about the nation in the national language (Turville-Petre 2-4). These chronicles not only give extensive knowledge about medieval English nation and presented the historical development, but they also inspired the sense of Englishness by developing a consciousness of the national past. The chroniclers such as Geoffrey of Monmouth, Robert Gloucestre and Robert Manning, who wrote the historical accounts of the English nation between 1290 and 1340, focused on three factors while presenting the nation: its territory, its people and its language. In this sense, as Turville-Petre pointed out, the chroniclers gave the people the sense that “[they were] English first because [they inhabited] England, secondly because [they were] the descendants of the first English settlers, and thirdly because [they spoke] the language of England” (14).

After the Wars of the Roses, the Tudor monarchs from Henry VII onwards followed a policy of national unity and focused on the reunification of a divided country. Especially, from the point of view of Englishness and English nationalism, as Hans Kohn has stated,

[t]he end of the Hundred Years War and the rise of the House of Tudor marked a milestone in the development of the English nation. The defeat in France and the withdrawal from the Continent in the long run strengthened England and laid the foundations for her greatness. (69)

It is strongly asserted in these lines that the Tudor dynasty started a new era in the development of the English national sense. The divided nation after the Wars of the Roses was reunified and the national unity was maintained. Moreover, the Tudor rulers regarded their subjects and ruled the country not according to their own will, but to the consent of the people and laws. While they were deciding on political, economical, social and military concerns and regulating the institutional system, they always relied heavily on the will of the people. For instance, when England broke up with Rome and established the Church of England, the national church was embraced by all the English people, because Henry VIII fully persuaded the English people that “the action he took was not outside the English tradition” (Mackie 568). So, with the Tudors, England became one of the major powers in sixteenth-century Europe. It not only displayed its strength in politics, economics and warfare, but also rose as a united nation under the good rule of perfect Tudor monarchs.

As the first Tudor monarch, Henry VII, rearranged the structure of the government and strengthened the existing institutions when he acceded to the throne. As David Loades has suggested, “it was not only necessary to restore the authority of a Crown shaken for the second time in a generation by usurpation and brief civil war; it was also necessary to restore it in such a way that it rested upon the underlying strength of the institution” (3). He revived the court, which was an older institution, so that it could enforce the law. He established the Court of Star Chamber which was “a government-controlled court pronouncing jurisdiction over the hitherto unrestrained nobles, and used it to suppress much of their irresponsible activity” (Trinkaus 230). However, while he was carrying out the political reforms, he respected the English traditions and had the support of the English people. He protected and promoted the national interests of England in commerce. E.M. Tillyard supports that “Henry VII was the nation’s Solomon. He saw that foreign conquest did not suit an island and he combined firmness with sound policy: and he knew the advantages of trade” (63). Hence, he reformed the economic system of England. The economic relation with the Netherlands was shaped

in favour of the English interests and “in his political treaties with all countries, the welfare of the English merchant was carefully consulted, either in special clauses or in supplementary instruments” (Mackie 218). Henry VII aimed to make England a self-sufficient and independent nation at sea. In this regard, he encouraged the English merchants and passed The Navigation Acts in 1485 to regulate and maintain state control of foreign trade as well as giving rights to the English merchants. According to these acts, the king’s subjects could no longer use foreign shipping for both import and export if there was sufficient English shipping. One may argue that Henry’s such attempt favoured the rights of the English merchants and not only promoted national economic system, but also strengthened the merchants’ position among the powerful maritime nations of the age. Furthermore, in foreign politics, Henry reformed the Anglo-Scottish relations, which had been a serious problem since 1314 when Scotland became an independent country. In this sense, Charles Trinkaus states that the Scottish rulers took the support of France instead of England and started the two century commitment to the foreign policy of France (230). However, Henry VII ended this allegiance by proposing the marriage of his daughter Margaret to the Scottish king James IV. In this regard, Trinkaus further describes the successful reign of Henry VII as follows:

The favorable conclusion of valuable commercial treaties with the Burgundian Netherlands, the successful marriage alliances with Scotland, and the growing prestige of England in European affairs, all attest to Henry’s diplomatic ability. When the fifty-two-year-old king died in 1509, he left to his son, Henry VIII, a stable and prosperous government with a degree of unity and strength [...]. (230)

Following in the footsteps of his father, Henry VIII had a vital role in the development of the English national sense and the growth of Englishness. As G.R. Elton has pointed out, his reign “witnessed a series of successful actions elevating both his monarchy and the nation’s independence and power to new heights” (“Henry VIII” 49). For him, England’s foreign policy was one of the most fundamental concerns, because he wanted to strengthen England’s position in European politics as “England was seeking a new role in the world” (Palmer 106). When Henry VIII came to the throne, a number of powers such as France, Spain and the Netherlands consolidated in Europe and established a hegemonic position. But, despite its modest resources and low population compared with Spain or France, England had a significant economic power as London

was a growing trade center. The English military capabilities were also vital as the “English archers retained a reputation on European battlefields long after military technology had outstripped them” (Palmer 112). In this respect, Henry VIII’s first act was to build up England’s military strength to dissolve the French influence on Scotland and break the ‘Auld Alliance’ between the two countries to have a powerful position in European politics. Such an intervention was also significant to maintain national security as “in the first half of the century the northern borders [of England] were insecure mainly because of the Franco-Scottish ‘Auld Alliance’ and the Scottish king’s readiness to open up a second front in the Anglo-Scottish relations” (Doran, *England* 42). Hence, one may argue that the reason of the Scottish wars in 1513 and 1542 was to provide the national security; to keep Scotland under control and avoid the building of the Auld Alliance when England was at war with France. Henry declared war on France in 1512 and 1543 to claim the ancestral lands of Normandy, Gascony and Anjou together with the crown of France as his rightful inheritance. Henry achieved to besiege Calais and Therouanne, which were important for England’s military reputation in the Hundred Years’ War, in 1513 and this victory aroused an enthusiasm among the English people (Doran 18).

Though the annulment of his marriage to Catherine of Aragon and his wish to marry Anne Boleyn seemed to be a private issue, it had significant political consequences for England. He tried to cooperate with Rome to achieve his divorce, yet there was no compromise on the part of Rome. For C.R.Routh, he “made up his mind to put pressure on Rome. In November he called Parliament in order to use its anti-clericalism to force the Pope’s hand. He intended also to subject the Church completely to his own authority” (31). So, he passed the Act of Appeals in 1533 and the Act of Supremacy in 1534, “which brought about the Reformation in England and the breach with Rome” (Routh 31). On May 16, 1532, he was acknowledged as the ‘Supreme Head of the Church in England and Wales’ by the English clergy. The Church of England was established, and England ceased to be dependent on foreign powers in religious matters. As Routh has further emphasized, “The Act of Appeals forbade any appeals from the Archbishops’ courts to Rome in cases involving wills or marriages. The divorce now could be legally settled in England” (31). Henry VIII was both the sole head of the

Church of England and the king of England. Joel Hurstfield explains the significance of the Act of Appeals for England as follows:

We call this event the English Reformation and the term is valid provided it is taken to describe a profound change in the constitution and society, perhaps more important than the religious change with which the term is associated. (206)

One of the reasons why the break with Rome became a national issue which greatly touched the English national sense was that Henry VIII involved the Parliament in the process of separation and represented “his great matter as a cause of the commonwealth” (Greenfeld 51). It was no longer his private issue, but became a national matter by the inclusion of the Parliament, and so, the English nation. Keith Randell describes the Reformation Parliament as “the most important parliament in the nation’s history” since it played a central role in the revolutionary events and gave full political support. Some historians claim that Henry VIII and his ministers would have achieved the Reformation even had Anne Boleyn not been a reason and divorce not been an issue as they supported “the idea that England was a fully sovereign and independent entity in which no person and no institution should owe an allegiance to foreigners” (Randell 33). Therefore, one may argue that the main aim behind the break with Rome was to end the dependence on a foreign power for the national religious issues and maintain the national sovereignty in ecclesiastical matters. Liah Greenfeld also supports this idea and states that Henry VIII had a particular aim in passing the Act of Appeals as she further adds that

[...] even those who refuse to view the Act of Appeals as the moment of the definitive reinterpretation of the term empire admit that it was indeed Henry’s aim and expressed wish to imply in its application to England that England was a sovereign polity separate from the rest of the Christendom. (51)

As indicated in these lines, Henry’s purpose was to save England from the domination of Rome and lead an autonomous policy in religion. In this respect, the Act of Appeals had a vital role in the foundation of the English nation. He called the English monarch an empire and, thereby, qualified himself as an emperor. This was title enabled him to by-pass the authority of the Pope over monarchs. Accordingly, the Act of Appeals along with the Act of Supremacy “rejected the foreign jurisdiction of papal sovereignty over the indigenous affairs of the church” (McEachern 1). In other words, both Acts gave

complete sovereignty to the king as the supreme leader of both the nation and the church. Hence, one may argue that Henry VIII guaranteed two national interests by these Acts; he appropriated the local power of the papacy and took over the control of national religious affairs. He had all the powers of the Pope, and the Crown became the only place for the ex-papal powers to reside. Henry was the only and ultimate authority in both politics as the monarch and the religious affairs as the head of the English Church. The elimination of the Pope's authority in England displayed that the king could also be the religious leader of the nation (Randell 40).

One of the major consequences of breach with Rome was the emergence of the Reformation in England. The Reformation relatively contributed to the improvement of England's institutional structure as the Church of England was established, and all the power and privileges, which had been once in the hands of the Pope, resided in this national institution. As Keith Randell has pointed out,

[...] it has been customary to contrast a state in which an institution (the Church) with its independent legal system and owning about one third of the country's landed property was controlled by a foreign power- the pre-Reformation situation- with a modern nation state in which all final authority resided in the monarch- the post-Reformation situation. (46)

Therefore, it can be clearly seen that the pre-Reformation Church had formed a state within a state, and hence avoided the development of the modern political and ecclesiastical institutions in England. By the English Reformation the abuses by the Church were abolished, and the authority of the church was transferred from Rome to the King and the Parliament, and the ecclesiastical property was brought under the control of the Crown (Routh 33).

Therefore, the royal supremacy was legally established, and the authority of Rome in England was completely eliminated. The clergy also lost its authority to decide on ecclesiastical matters, and the whole power was centralized in Henry VIII's supreme authority as the supreme head of the Church of England, which was a national church and provided "an emotional focal point for many Englishmen" (Sharpe 117). Though Henry replaced the papacy, he never claimed to have a spiritual power or to get into religious matters such as celebrating the mass or ordaining priests. What he was

interested in was the legislation and administration matters of the rituals or doctrines, in other words, he defined the doctrines and regulated the rituals (Routh 34). So, one may argue that while Henry VIII was dissolving his relations with Rome and establishing the national Church of England, he was in fact focusing on institutional nationalism and Englishness in every sense.

It is clear that Henry VIII's political and diplomatic priority was the English national interests. Hence, he made other attempts to strengthen the sense of English nationalism during his reign. As Routh has also argued, "Henry VIII wanted to play a leading part in foreign affairs" (36). In Europe, France had an aggressive naval policy; Spain united with the Netherlands and established a powerful navy, and the Scottish navy was a threat to England. Henry VIII was aware of the fact that he had to strengthen the English navy so that England would have a powerful position in international politics. Routh further points out that "Henry's achievement was considerable. He built the largest and most powerful navy in the world, he revolutionized its armament [...] Henry may well be called the founder of the Royal Navy" (37). So, Henry VIII was not only the king of England, or the supreme head of the English Church, but also the founder of the English navy, which defeated the Invincible Spanish Armada in 1588. In this sense, as Palmer has stated, Henry "has been honoured as the originator of the modern navy and his reign seen as a turning point towards what under Elizabeth would be an 'oceanic strategy'" (106). He laid the foundation of the great navy, which would defeat the most powerful countries of the sixteenth-century such as Spain. So, one may argue that Henry VIII held a national foreign policy to play a leading and active role in Europe. He gave priority to national security and avoided any foreign invasion or civil war, which was a significant problem for other nations at that time in Europe. In domestic affairs, he was the supreme power holding the ultimate authority. He made Parliament his ally, established good relations with the House of Commons and became the supreme authority in England (Routh 39). Routh further explains the national character and achievement of Henry's reign as follows:

[...] he made the English people aware of themselves: [...]: he built and mannered them the finest navy in the world: he implanted in them a respect for government and an affection for the Crown as head of government: he guided a great politico-

religious along conservative lines so that for the most part he carried the nation with him. (39-40)

These lines clearly demonstrate that Henry VIII acted as an ideal nation builder as he established a powerful navy and strengthened England against any foreign attack. He also administered both the politics and the religious affairs and achieved to win the support of the nation. As for the sense of English nationalism in the Elizabethan Era, it was fashioned by various developments in the sixteenth-century. The Elizabethan sense of nationalism embodied a militant and Protestant character. England had to fight against Spain, which was the new threat for her national unity and cope with the religious conflicts between the Protestants and Catholics. Hans Kohn stresses the achievement of the Elizabethan Era as follows:

In the Elizabethan period the growth of power and of wealth, the beginning of colonial expansion, the increased literary activity, produced a feeling of intense patriotic pride, which had, however, nothing yet of the deeply-rooted, ever-present and all-pervading character of modern nationalism. (71)

As indicated in these lines, England became one of the major powers of Europe in Elizabethan Era and grew rich by the imperialistic campaigns. It is also emphasized that the idea of contemporary nationalism which is made up of fervent patriotism and a deep sense of Englishness was born in Elizabeth's reign. Hence, Queen Elizabeth I was a great character who supported the growing English national consciousness in the sixteenth-century. She became "the symbol of England's uniqueness and greatness" (Greenfeld 65), and the English national sentiment was identified with her personality. The people's trust in, and love of Queen Elizabeth aroused a strong sense of patriotism, which unified the nation and strengthened the national pride. As Carole Levin has stated, Elizabeth "was the symbol of national unity, especially at the time of the Spanish Armada" (8). During the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588, she presented such an inspiring heroic self that all the English people, both the commoners and the nobility, regardless of class distinctions united under her valiant leadership. Indeed, Greenfeld points out that the national sentiment "became a widely shared, legitimate way to look at the world, which at the end of the century was already a powerful force with its own momentum. It was allowed to become embedded in the English culture and could no

longer be rooted out” (65). The sense of nationalism, which reached its climax in the Elizabethan Era, has developed over the years and become an integral part of the English character.

The English people identified England with the glorious character of their queen who became a national hero and a perfect nation builder. For national interests, she refused to marry a foreign monarch or an English noble and, thus, deliberately refrained from endangering the national interests of England. As she held a foreign policy objective to provide the national security, she commanded the English troops personally against Spain for victory in the defeat of the Invincible Armada. She never lost control with the people, established intimate relations with even the lowest layers of the society, so she achieved to unite them for a national common purpose and convince them that they belonged to a particular community. In this respect, Routh points out that she became the “semi-religious, almost a semi-deified idol” who “was exactly what the English people needed, looked for and enthusiastically accepted as a rallying point for their national life and their individual patriotism” (205). Elizabeth was a legitimate monarch as all the oppositions to her accession due to her mother, Anna Boleyn’s illegitimacy were dissolved; moreover, she was divinely sanctioned and the English people found the necessary courage and power to arouse patriotic senses when confronted the strong foreign enemies in her great personality.

The foreign policy of Elizabethan England and its relationships with other powers in Europe are significant in order to understand the development of the sense of English nationalism. For most of the late medieval and early Tudor period, the English foreign policy depended on two aspects: the hostility to France and the friendship with Burgundy (Doran, *Elizabeth* 12). While during the first half of the sixteenth-century, England had been regarded as the third most powerful country in Europe after France and Habsburg Empire, during the second half of the century, it was Spain which emerged as a major power in Europe. As Susan Doran has argued, in the first half of the sixteenth-century, England’s military power was rather weak to compete with the other European powers. Demographically, the country was strong enough, and it did not have a standing army. Moreover, the expenses of a war were far more costly than England

could afford. The weapons and fighting tactics were still in the medieval format and, hence, fell far behind the technological and strategical developments witnessed in European warfare (Doran 7). So, it was during Elizabeth's reign that England modernized and upgraded its military capability. Obviously, there was an urgent need for such improvements because, as a Protestant monarchy, England was under the threat of the continental Catholic powers, especially of France and Spain. Indeed, as regards France, the government was "deeply worried that Henry II [of France] would challenge Elizabeth's right to the throne and seek to supplant her with his new daughter-in-law, Mary Queen of Scots" (Doran 16). Elizabeth, just like her father Henry VIII, recognized that Scotland was a serious threat for the English national unity. So, she signed the Treaty of Edinburgh and thus, tried to establish a closer alliance with Scotland (Doran 16). In the meantime, Spain was the most significant rival of England in the second half of the sixteenth-century. The hostility between the two nations began in the late 1560s, and, as Susan Doran has rightly pointed out that "there developed a serious breach between the two powers which was never fully repaired" (27). Spain had already become a major power which controlled trade with the New World and had the monopoly of its trade. England was naturally opposed to this Spanish hegemony. The commercial matters such as the Spanish treasure ships, the rights of the English merchants to trade beyond Europe heated up the conflict between the two countries. Elizabeth held a national attitude in this commercial conflict with Spain and "she did not recognise the papal treaties, which had partitioned the New World between Spain and Portugal, and she supported the right of her subjects to trade anywhere they chose" (Doran 28). Throughout the 1570s and early 1580s, England improved her military power. A powerful fleet was created and the English army gained strength by new weapons and military strategies. Moreover, a strong cause of nationalism began to be shared by all the people, and it was this sense of nationalism and widespread patriotism that mobilized England against Spain.

In 1588, the great war between England and Spain broke out. Spain's military strategy was fronted by the determinism and patriotism of the English people to win the war. The English people from every social class united without distinction under the heroic leadership of Elizabeth. She commanded the English troops personally, which increased

the sense of unity and fellowship among the soldiers. Hence, she awakened the sense of Englishness and patriotism in her soldiers. In her famous speech at the Battle of Tilbury on the eve of the Spanish Armada's attack on England, she emphasized equality among her subjects and identified herself with her soldiers:

Let tyrants fear: I have so behaved myself under God I have placed my chiefest strength and safeguard in the loyal hearts and goodwill of my subjects. Wherefore I am come among you at this time but for my recreation and pleasure, being resolved in the midst and heat of the battle to live and die amongst you all, to lay down for my God and for my kingdom and my people mine honor and my blood even in the dust. (Marcus, Mueller and Rose 326)

As indicated in these lines, with expressions like, "My subjects" or "for my people", she aroused a sense of national homogeneity by emphasizing Englishness and created the sense of national unity. Shakespeare, who draws a parallel between Elizabeth and Henry and makes a reference to the politics of his time in *Henry V*, presents the perfect monarch and the heroic self in Henry's character. Just like Elizabeth, Shakespeare's Henry V addresses his troops personally and exhorts them at the battles of Harfleur and Agincourt against the powerful enemy, France, by his patriotic rhetorics. He encourages his soldiers and arouses the sense of Englishness and patriotism emphasizing the unity among the soldiers from different social classes and immortality of the day in his 'Crispin Crispian Speech' at the Battle of Agincourt as follows:

This day is call'd the feast of Crispian:
He that outlives this day, and comes safe home,
Will stand a tip-toe when this day is nam'd,
And rouse him at the name of Crispian.
He that shall live this day, and see old age,
Will yearly on the vigil feast his neighbours,
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 feasts he did that day. Then shall our names,
Familiar in their mouths as household words,
Harry the King, Beford and Exeter,
Warwick and Talbot, Salisbury and Gloucester,
Be in their flowing cups freshly remember'd. (IV.iii.40-53)

Therefore, the two leaders, the historical Elizabeth and Shakespeare's Henry V are heroic monarchs who achieve to maintain national unity in a chaotic atmosphere of a war. They encourage their soldiers by their patriotic rhetorics and personal command of

the troops. The national unity is particularly important for victory in both the sixteenth-century and the medieval era. The whole nation, both the commoners and the nobility, should fight as a single body in harmony to defeat the foreign enemy. In this sense, the Elizabethans acted together as a nation to thwart the Spanish invasion. As J.E. Neale has pointed out, the national unity was fully demonstrated at the face of a great danger in the defeat of the Spanish Armada:

In England, [...], all had been in activity; impounding Catholics- the gentry in private houses, others in prisons- mustering, training, and arming the people to resist a landing, mobilizing the fleet, and ordering the several ports, subject to the burden known as ship-money, to supply additional vessels. (277)

These lines clearly demonstrate that all the English people were on campaign; the army and the naval forces were strengthened, the people were prepared to fight against the foreign foe. Elizabeth's attitude in international affairs also had a great significance in defining the national identity of England in the sixteenth-century. She had a conservative approach, which is considered to be "cautious" by Susan Doran, who argues that "[a]lthough Elizabeth took counsel over foreign policy, she of course held strong opinions of her own. She had her own brand of prejudices and convictions, which came into play whenever decisions had to be made" (*Elizabeth* 63). Taking both views into account, it may be argued that Elizabeth led a strict policy in foreign affairs, and her main objective was to provide the national security of England during her reign. She aimed to earn England a powerful and permanent place on the international stage. She fought against Spain and reached an understanding with France. Her cautious approach to the preservation of the Protestant cause was another indication of her concern about national security (Doran 64). In this respect, one may argue that she gave priority to the national interests of England; that is why, she acted cautiously while taking decisions on foreign matters and considered the English interests when she regulates the relations with foreign countries. She did not want to violate the harmony and order in the country and aimed to protect England from any kinds of foreign invasions. In other words, what mattered to her was the peace and security of England.

Elizabeth's foreign policy was shaped according to the principle of protecting the rights of her own nation, and she displayed the same cautious approach considering the

English interests in commerce. She also privileged England's economic interests by protecting and extending the English trade. Therefore, she gave diplomatic support to the English merchants to encourage them to find new markets and sources of materials both in Europe and beyond. Hence, at abroad, Elizabeth's major aim was to elevate England in both international politics and trade while domestically she gave priority to the improvement of living conditions in the country. As Joel Hurstfield has stressed, she paid much attention to the social welfare of England and worked for it:

The state too, in the shape of the county or town, was assuming some degree of responsibility for the orphan, the sick and the aged. Unevenly, pragmatically, the governing classes saw that their strength and the survival of their society were bound up with the recognition of social responsibility for their fellow Englishmen. (218)

It is strongly asserted in these lines that Elizabeth devoted herself to serve her nation as a perfect monarch and ideal nation builder. She was conscious of her duties towards her subjects and knew that her life depended on their welfare as a successful reign could only be maintained by the support of the public. She did not see her subjects as slaves, who had to be suppressed, but as dear countrymen, with whom a strong nation would be built. Hence, Elizabeth was, infact, aware of the fact that disregarding the national interests and welfare of England would lead England to a foreign invasion or a civil strife, which would bring calamity and chaos to the nation, as the weaker the country became, the more it was vulnerable to civil disorders of foreign interventions.

Apart from the improvements in the military force, both in army and navy, strenghtening the position in European politics and unification under the leadership of heroic and perfect monarchs, it may be argued that religion was also a significant element in the development of the sense of English nationalism under Tudor England. For Liah Greenfeld,

[...] it was owing to the Reformation, more than to any other factor, that nationalism spread as wide as it did in the sixteenth century, and a whole new stratum was added to those who could find the idea of nation appealing. (53)

Henry VIII introduced England to its vernacular Bible and gave it a central place in the English church. Hence, as Rex has pointed out, "the most lasting positive contribution

of Henry VIII's Reformation to the popular religion of England was the official sanctioning of the English Bible" (104). In other words, the printing of the English Bible contributed to the development of Englishness in the sixteenth-century. The English Bible became relatively influential in the rise of sense of nationalism, since it was not only read in the national language but also apprehended and evaluated by the English people within the principles of the Anglican Church which was the national church. By the printing of the English Bible, Henry VIII brought uniformity to the nation "by having one uniform manner and course of praying throughout the realm" (Rex 129). The use of English in religious operations was also significant in terms of arousing the sense of Englishness. Hence, the success of the English Reformation in the rise of sense of nationalism mostly lies in the abolition of the use of foreign languages such as French and Latin in the religious practices and the increasing importance of the vernacular language. The Church's liturgy, which had, once, been read in Latin, was translated into English. So, one may argue that the Reformation led to the development of the vernacular religious culture in England.

Henry VIII's break from Rome paved the way for Protestantism which greatly provoked the English national consciousness. The break from Rome earned England a new and sovereign identity and pride as an autonomous nation in religious affairs. Protestantism, which was a rising religious sect in Tudor England, was also effective in evoking Englishness, because it was the faith which was supported in the Old Testament. The reason why the Old Testament was so fundamental for the English people was that it referred to the divinely chosen people with whom the English people identified themselves as the second Israel. As Allmand has stated, England was "a nation likened to Israel, specially protected by divine power" (*Henry V* 410). The idea of divine support was fundamental as the English people depended their triumph over Spain in the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588 also on the divine help. Accordingly, especially after 1588 and the triumph over the Spanish Armada, "most people came to regard being Protestant as part of being English" (Sharpe 117).

Therefore, there were various aspects in religion which increased the sense of nationalism and formed a national identity: being English implied being a true

Christian; the English people were divinely sanctioned as England was separated from other nations and distinguished by God; the strength and glory of England was the interest of His Church, which was the national church and had a self-governing structure; and the triumph of Protestantism was a national triumph (Greenfeld 52). Moreover, the reading of the vernacular Bible aroused the sense of individual dignity among the commoners in England. Greenfeld argues that this awakening gave them “a position from which they were to view their social world in a new way, but it opened a new, vast terrain to the possible influences of the national idea” (54). The sense of dignity made common Englishmen a part of new aristocrats and clergymen, the men of new learning and the new religion. So, their Englishness was confirmed by the new social statute they were elevated and their destiny was tied to the destiny of the English nation. This change in social hierarchy created the sense of belonging to the nation and “the national consciousness to which the reading of Bible made common Englishmen so receptive, reinforced the effects of reading and further strengthened the sense of dignity and respect for the individual which resulted from it” (Greenfeld 54).

One may argue that the English Renaissance in the sixteenth-century was one of the milestones in the development of the sense of English nationalism. The Renaissance fostered the English people to “examine their local soils and specific differences” (Porter and Teich 2) so as to become aware of themselves as the English. By the Renaissance, the feudal bonds of lordship and economic organisation broke up. The religious changes and the breakthroughs in science, technology and, especially, art contributed to the development of a new social order and a new sense of self which was more liberal and equal throughout the Europe (Porter and Teich 3). In this respect, a new sense of English identity emerged in the sixteenth-century and the goals of civility were redefined by the effect of these liberal and egalitarian ideals of the Renaissance. In other words, with the emergence of the English Renaissance, the national identity of sixteenth-century England depended on equal and free individuals. As M.M. Reese has stated, “when at the Renaissance, the religious and philosophical of the Middle Ages went out of fashion and man was restored to the centre of the universal stage, puny no longer but [...] free” (8). As the scholastic way of thought of the Middle Ages was weakened in the Renaissance, the man gained respect and became the main focus of any

artistic, literary and philosophical studies. He was also liberated as he was no longer suppressed by despotic practices of the Church. In this respect, the rationality and individuality of man became important and, as Greenfeld has pointed out,

[...] the nation was perceived as a community of free and equal individuals. This was at its core a Humanist notion, and it was based on several premises. Among these, the principal premise was the belief in man as an active, essentially rational being. Reason was the defining characteristic of humanity. Its possession, namely the ability to consider and choose between alternatives, entitled one to decide what was best for oneself and was the basis for the recognition of the autonomy of the individual conscience and the principle of civic liberty. (30)

As indicated in these lines, according to the Humanist perception, the man had a centralized and effective role in life. Since the individuals were equal, they had equal rights to participate in collective decisions, which provided them with political participation and active membership in their own political and social community. As Greenfeld has further stated, “nationhood, England’s being a nation, actually meant such participation” as the nationhood was equated with political citizenship (45). The people had the chance of serving their society and contributed to the maintenance of national welfare. Hence, the idea of citizenship emerged within a national context in sixteenth-century England.

The national sentiment in Renaissance England found expression in literature. The writers in the sixteenth-century contributed to the development of the national culture. In other words, they, in their works, considered the national community they addressed. In this respect, as Andrew Hadfield has stated, “neither literature nor nation could be taken as stable entities and were always in process of being redefined, partly as a result of their interaction and interdependence” (1). John Bale and Roger Ascham were the representators of the English nationalism in the early modern period. They wrote with strong anti-alien feelings and defended England against the attacks of foreigners. In this regard, Bale accused Polydore Vergil of not presenting the English intellectual values and “polluting our english Chronicles most shamefully with his Romish lies and other Itallish beggarys” (Greenfeld 42). He urged the learned Englishmen to write the chronicles of England. Ascham, in *The Schoolmaster*, attacked Cicero as he had a poor judgement of England in his writings. He also wrote *Toxophilus*, which was written “for

Englishmen ... in the Englyshe tongue” (qtd. in Greenfeld 43) to display his love and duty towards both his king and country. Both writers defined the distinctiveness of England in their works by comparing it to other ancient and contemporary societies such as Rome and Greece.

The Chaucerian revival also contributed to the cultural creativity of the age as William Thynne edited and published his manuscripts (Greenfeld 43). The novelists such as Thomas Nash, John Lyly and Thomas Deloney were the other writers who highlighted the English traditions in their works. Sir Thomas Elyot, who published *The Governor* in 1531, also focused on nationhood and the duty he owed “to my naturall contray” (qtd. in Greenfeld 43). He supported that the Renaissance and Englishness were complementary. He displayed that the Renaissance was compatible with England as the Renaissance learning was highly integrated with the educational programme of the English upper class (Starkey 156).

The other vehicle to express the national sentiments in the Renaissance was the verse. As Starkey has pointed out, “the main theme of poetry in the English Renaissance was its deployment for the same political purposes as prose” (157) which were to create a national literature and arouse the sense of nationalism. The two great poets of the early sixteenth-century, Sir Thomas Wyatt and Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey experimented with new forms and new meters as Surrey invented blank verse and introduced a new metrical regularity to English. He also displayed his attachment to England as he used English place-names such as ‘Norfolk’, ‘Surrey’ and ‘Windsor’ in his poetry. In other words, both poets remained traditional in vocabulary and poetic diction while they innovated in form (Starkey 158). The sermons which followed the tradition of *The Book of Martyrs* and the secular literature in English became significant means to present Englishness, as well. In other words, the prevailing sense of English nationalism, which was structured by religion, politics and rationalism, was further represented by the development of a national literature. Hence, a new group of intellectuals, who researched and wrote chronicles, poems and plays about England in English emerged. Historians like Raphael Holinshed, Edward Hall, Camden and Warner wrote histories of

England and specific historical eras, Playwrights like Shakespeare and Marlowe dramatized the periods of English history (Greenfeld 76).

The perception of history in the modern sense was the consequence of the revival in classical learning and humanist tradition emerged by the Renaissance. The historical writers of the Renaissance recovered the spirit and purpose of the classical historians of Greece and Rome, and discredited the medieval belief that the record of man's actions was of trifling significance (Reese 1). In this sense, as Lily Bess Campbell has pointed out, "it must be remembered that history written as a continuous narrative and integrated by creative minds was in the modern world a development of the Renaissance" (18). It was also concluded, in the Renaissance, that history was not simply the record of the past events, but was concerned with causes, motives and consequences. As Reese has stated, the Renaissance historians imitated the classical Greek historians who "broke away from the mere compilation of genealogies, military expeditions and payments of tribute, and approached the past in a true spirit of enquiry. They analysed the causes, effects, and implications of the events they wrote" (1). Along with the important events, the actors of these events and the manners in which the actions were done gained significance (Campbell 25). The fundamental principles in the study of history embodied in the idea of humanism and classical learning were various. According to Campbell, the Renaissance men used history to gain fame for their native countries and explain the rise and fall of the nations. In other words, the basic use of history in the Renaissance was to present the tenets of statecraft. As history was also the source of examples, it displayed the past experiences of men and of nations (20). Then, it may be argued that the supreme aim of history in the Renaissance was to teach moral and political lessons by using examples and to glorify the native cities.

Patriotism became the moving undertone to the sixteenth-century history writing. The historians "abandoned universal history for a more concentrated study of their own peoples" (Reese 11). In this respect, to deal with the national traditions became more intense and more widespread in the study of history. So, it may be argued that the concern of history in the Renaissance was to find the basic patterns of the national past.

In this respect, as Miculas Teich and Roy Porter have maintained, the development of the national past as a consequence of the Renaissance liberated the nation as follows:

Yet the discovery of a pristine past- or, as we might say, this invention of a historical past- was in its own way the most profound of all acts of emancipation, a break from the positivism of feudalism, from ritual deferral to custom, and from the tutelage of the church. (5)

The chronicle writing, which had begun in the Middle Ages, continued into the Tudor period, and there developed a strong sense of national historicism. In the sixteenth-century, any book written in English demonstrated the power of the national language and history of the English people. Thus, all books in English contributed to the writing of England as a nation. However, “many contributed to that writing in a more direct way as well: by being about England. And of those none had a greater impact than the many massive chronicle histories of England” (Helgerson 314). One may argue that the sixteenth-century writing of English chronicles made the English people aware of their own past. Yet, the first English chronicle in the sixteenth-century, *Anglica Historia* (1512), was not written by a native chronicler, but by an Italian humanist, Polydore Vergil, who was patronized by the first Tudor rulers, Henry VII and Henry VIII. Though Vergil wrote in Latin, as Campbell has pointed out, “the nine editions of his work to 1651 were all published on the Continent”, therefore “it made a knowlegde of English history accessible to readers outside England” (60). Moreover, Edward Hall’s *Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Families of Lancaster and York* (1547), which dwelled upon the period from Richard II to Henry VII and Thomas More’s *The History of Richard The Third* were the first histories of England written in the sixteenth-century.

The chronicles of the latter half of the century such as Richard Granfton’s *Chronicle at Large* (1569), Raphael Holinshed’s *Chronicles* (1577) and John Stow’s *Chronicle* (1580) and *Annals* (1592) had a more nationalistic spirit. Shakespeare heavily borrowed from the chronicles of Raphael Holinshed and Edward Hall for his history plays. In this regard, Campbell depicts the two chroniclers as “universally accepted as having furnished Shakespeare with much of the material for his history plays” (72). The chronicles dealt with different kinds of issues including economics, politics, the common men and women along with aristocratic men, the civic pageantry, guilds and

mercantile activities. So, one may argue that these chronicles did not only dwell upon the kings and their deeds, but included everything related to England and the English people. Accordingly, as Helgerson has pointed out, “if it happened in England or involved an Englishman”, these chronicles would deal with it (315). The historical greatness of England was particularly emphasized in the chronicles. Richard Helgerson further stresses that these chronicles encouraged people from every social class by informing them about their own history and identity. He asserts that

by including economic as well as political issues, women and commoners as well as the nobility, defendants as well as their official accusers, Parliament, as well as the King, chronicles provided a national, more than an imperial, perspective on the English history and England’s communal identity (315).

In this respect, one may argue that the sixteenth-century chronicles played a crucial role in the formation of the English national identity. They did not only become the expression of the sovereign power, but also the expression of the common rights, interests and the past of the English people. The two important works, apart from the ones mentioned above, which encouraged the national and religious consciousness of England, were John Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments* (1563) and Richard Hakluyt’s *Principal Navigations of the English Nation* (1589). Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments* united the national and religious consciousness of England as Hakluyt’s *Principal Navigations of the English Nation* described the entire world by the accounts of the English voyagers and expanded England’s sovereign power (Helgerson 316).

Though Edward Hall’s *The Union of the Two Noble and Illustrate Famelies of Lancastre and Yorke* and Raphael Holinshed’s *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland* provided much of the material for Shakespeare’s *Histories*, he changed some of the facts to suit the medium of his plays. Hence, as Allardyce Nicoll and Josephine Calina have stated, Shakespeare’s dramatic work “stands apart from, and independent of, all actuality as expressed by historians” (v). His deviations from the chronicles include omissions and added materials. For instance, he omitted Holinshed’s long account of Richard’s Irish expedition and Northumberland’s leading Richard into an ambush between Conway and Flint (Ure xxxii).

The primary source for Shakespeare's *Richard II* is Holinshed's account of the last two years of Richard II's reign, which begins with Richard's arrival at Windsor on 29 April 1398 and assignment of Mowbray and Bolingbroke a day for trial by combat and ends with the exhibition of Richard's corpse in March 1400 (Ure xxxi). He also strayed from this limitation of the dates as he presented Gloucester's death as one of the major sources of the struggle between Mowbray and Bolingbroke. He abridged and changed the chronological order of the events which were recorded by Holinshed along with some minor deviations and invented factual points. Ure further describes the main deviations as follows:

- (1) the character and behaviour of John of Gaunt; (2) The Duchess of Gloucester's meeting with Gaunt in i.ii; (3) nearly all Isabel's part, her grief, her parting with Richard, and her womanly behaviour (in Holinshed, as in history, she was a child of eleven); (4) the character and behaviour of the Duchess of York in Act v; (5) the Garden scene, iii.iv; (6) much of the character and behaviour of Richard, especially in the last two Acts; (7) the part played in the tragedy by Northumberland. (xxxii-xxxiii)

Hence, Queen Isabel has an unhistorical maturity in Shakespeare's *Henry V* and the conversation between the queen and Bushy is Shakespeare's invention. York's confusion and the uneasiness of his mind on the justification of a rebellion against Richard II, who is the legitimate king, is the part of Shakespeare's portrayal of the duke. York's asking for the Duchess of Gloucester's help is Shakespeare's invention to acknowledge the audience on her death (Ure 69).

Holinshed's *Chronicles* is the main source from which Shakespeare derived the historical material for *Henry V*. The passages such as Canterbury's speech on the Salic Law and some parts of Henry's speeches with the conspirators in II.ii. demonstrate that Shakespeare used Holinshed's account of Henry V's life as his inspiration. However, Shakespeare used Hall's chronicle for the conversation between Henry and his nobles in I.ii. and for the Constable's description of the English soldiers in IV.ii. (Walter, *King V* xxxi). Shakespeare used Hall also as the source of the themes he emphasized in the play. The idea of national unity, which is also stressed in the title of Hall's chronicle as *The Union of the Two Noble and Illustrate Famelies of Lancastre and Yorke*, is strongly indicated. The theme of honour, which is highlighted especially in Henry's Agincourt oration is derived from Hall's description of Henry (Walter xxxii).

In fact, Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* with its Arthurian antiquarianism and rewriting of Arthurian romances and Shakespeare's Histories which were almost completely derived from medieval English history both contributed greatly to the strengthening and predominance of patriotism in England. Shakespeare contributed to the rise of Englishness during the sixteenth-century especially by his history plays. Especially in his second tetralogy, which covers the period from the reign of Richard II in the fourteenth century to the accession of Henry VII, the first of the Tudor kings, he is "concerned with political issues – with wars between states, with internal conflicts, and with the rise and fall of princes" (Keton 25). In other words, the major concern of the history plays was to present the foreign wars, rebellions and the replacement of the weak monarchs by more powerful nation builders. A history play appeals to the sense of nationalism and fosters patriotism more than a comedy or a tragedy as it is concerned with communities of men, especially with nations. Hence, as Samuel Taylor Coleridge has pointed out, "one great object of his [Shakespeare's] history plays, [...] was to make his countrymen more patriotic; to make Englishmen proud of being Englishmen" (97). Therefore, these plays are important as they awaken patriotic feelings and bind the English people together.

Shakespeare's concern with the English history is based on the prevalent sense of nationalism and patriotism after the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588. The rising sense of Englishness is reflected in his history plays, which deal with the medieval English history and make references to the Elizabethan Era. In other words, Shakespeare's plays concerning the English history echo the political events of his age and reflect the atmosphere of patriotism and increasing the sense of nationalism in England after the glorious victory over Spain. As a result of the rise of nationalism which follows the defeat of the Invincible Armada, the history of England became an attractive and popular subject. In this respect, George W. Keeton explains the reason why history plays are so popular in the sixteenth-century as follows:

The reason is chiefly to be found in the newly gained pride of Englishmen in their national heritage; in a unified kingdom; in a popular if at times wilful sovereign; and in defiance of Spain and the Pope. It was only in the years after the defeat of the Armada and during the retreat of the dark shadow which Philip II had cast over

the country that Shakespeare began dramatic composition, which were already well known and popular on the Elizabethan stage. (226)

As indicated in these lines, the English nation is united under the heroic leadership of a perfect monarch, Queen Elizabeth I and wins an illustrious victory over Spain. This great English triumph becomes a model for Shakespeare's history plays as he refers to the achievements of medieval kings. In this sense, he depicts to the English society of his time the historical past of the nation as "the contemporary situations could be seen in the mirror of history" (Campbell 125). He makes use of the common history as the subject of his history plays, thus, enhances the national identity. As Charles Barber has stated, the history plays "are both about the late Middle Ages and about Shakespeare's own age" (10). In other words, the plays depict the Medieval English kings; John, Richard II, the three successive Henrys and Richard III and the coming of the Tudors. In this regard, Shakespeare presents the rising English national sense and reflects the spirit of the sixteenth-century in his history plays as he celebrates the greatness of England. He, in these plays, deals with the ideas of the State and Society in England in a nationalistic concept (Keeton 226). These ideas appear in the most developed form in his two history plays, *Richard II* and *Henry V*. Then, these two plays, which I will analyze in the following chapters, are written with a strong sense of nationalism "when the sense of national struggle against the greatest power of the age [Spain] was at its height" (Hastings 56).

In *Richard II*, Shakespeare deals with the deposition and murder of a legitimate and divinely sanctioned, but weak monarch, Richard II by a more efficient ruler, Henry Bolingbroke, who succeeds the throne as King Henry IV and presents the characteristics of an ideal nation builder. He saves England from the unjust practices of Richard II and establishes a just and egalitarian administration regarding laws and considering his subjects. As Greenfeld states, he, in the play, clearly puts forward the idea that

[...] the monarch was a member of the nation and received his authority to rule from it. He could not do to a nation as to his own property, and ruled not over a territory, but an elite, in the common interest. So long as the monarch did rule in the common interest, the rest of the nation owed him or her their gratitude and obedience, but if the trust was betrayed, the monarch was a tyrant, and could be deposed. (58)

In this sense, Shakespeare presents how Richard II abuses his power and violates laws and customs and fails to exercise justice while Bolingbroke rises as a strong and determined nation builder by the public consent. In *Henry V*, the sense of patriotism and solidarity of all the classes of the English nation, both the commoners and the nobility, against a foreign enemy is inspired. As Barber has pointed out, “In *Henry V*, the troubles of the Lancastrian monarchy [in *Henry IV*] are temporarily smoothed over, as Henry IV’s son, the warrior king Henry V, leads his English army to the conquest of France” (8-9). Henry appears as a perfect monarch, who maintains the national unity and eliminates the distinctions between the monarch and the nation by his personal leadership of the troops at the battles of Harfleur and Agincourt. The play also presents how the transformation of wanton and seemingly irresponsible Prince Hal of *Henry IV 1&2* to the legendary King Henry V arouses the sense of Englishness by his heroic self and patriotic rhetorics. In this respect, it is displayed that Henry’s succession to the throne is approved by the public and he leads the English nation to glorious victories over France at Harfleur and Agincourt.

Shakespeare also demonstrates in his history plays that a perfect monarch is necessary for the rise of the sense of nationalism. The Tudor rulers depended on the will of their subjects who began to participate in the political process. They did not act like tyrants; on the contrary, they ruled the country according to laws. In this sense, as Allmand has stated, “the king had an obligation to rule well; if he failed, the unity thus visibly represented would be broken. England must be a kingdom of truth, justice and respect for the law; in this way the hearts of the people would be won” (*Henry V* 404). By making references to his time, in his plays, Shakespeare presents that an ideal national builder should regard the laws of his country and consider his subjects as his beloved countrymen rather than slaves or mean subject who are to be suppressed. The national unity is only maintained by the leadership of a heroic monarch personally leading his soldiers and acting as an ordinary man as one of those soldiers fighting at the battlefield. In this sense, as Greenfeld has stated, “in the sixteenth century English nationalism mostly centered on the figure of the monarch” (50). In other words, the monarch, who represents the divine will, should consider the national welfare and fulfil his duties

towards his subjects as a just ruler. Helgerson further highlights Shakespeare's concern with the monarch as follows:

Kings and aspirants to kingship provide most of the excitement and pathos in his English history plays, as well as in his tragedies and romances whether based on chronicle sources or not. Even in comedy, a genre that is supposed to feature people of middle or lower rank, Shakespeare gives rulers a surprisingly large role. (319)

As indicated in these lines, he attaches importance to the presentation of the monarch as the symbol of the English nation and portrays the political institution "as a speaking, feeling and acting body" (McEachern 12). In this sense, in *Henry V*, Shakespeare demonstrates the attributes of a perfect monarch, who achieves to unite his nation under his heroic self. He presents the severe consequences of violating laws in *Richard II* as Richard confiscates Bolingbroke's title and property illegally and paves the way for his fall and ruins the national unity. In these plays, he deals with the idea of perfect ruler and nation builder, who wins the public support by his power, courage and determination to defend the national honour against a foreign foe, and that a weak monarch should be replaced by a more effective nation builder for the welfare of the nation.

The representation of the ideal monarch in Shakespeare's history plays eliminates barriers between the ruler and the ruled, and strenghtens the corporate feeling of the nation. In other words, as Allmand has pointed out, "the crown symbolized the visible unity of a country's people, [...] the stones set in the crown represented the king's subjects who, together, existed to defend its interests" (*Henry V* 404). So, one may argue that the monarchy, in Shakespeare's history plays, serves to the construction of a more unified nation. Shakespeare shows the integrity between the king and the country in these plays. In this sense, for Shakespeare, the English nation is not only the nation of the kings, queens and aristocrats, but also the nation of the commoners. He represents the sixteenth-century idea that a nation is based on equality between the commoners and the nobility. In this sense, as Greenfeld has stated,

the idea of nation appealed to the constantly growing middle class, no less than it did to the new aristocracy. It justified the de facto equality between the two in many areas, as well as the aspirations of the members of the former stratum for

increased participation in the political process and more power. It made them proud of their station in life whatever it was, for they were first and foremost Englishmen.
(49)

Hence, the sense of English nationalism which Shakespeare celebrates in his history plays unites different people from different social classes. In *Henry V*, for instance, the ones who fight on the heroic war and will live to tell the legendary story have the sense of equal fellowship as the band of brothers regardless of their classes. Henry emphasizes the solidarity of all the classes and sees himself not as a king but a part of the band of soldiers who fight heroically when he says:

We few, we happy few, we band of brothers;
For he to-day that sheds his blood with me
Shall be my brother; be he ne'er so vile,
This day shall gentle his condition. (IV. iii. 60-63)

Accordingly, a perfect monarch in Shakespeare's history plays not only establishes a just and egalitarian rule, but he also fights side by side with his soldiers at the battlefield. He impresses the public by his power, courage and determination to defend the national honour of his country. Rather than acting as an aloof sovereign suppressing his subjects by unfair and despotic practices, he regards their rights. If the monarch makes his nation suffer, his deposition and replacement by a more efficient nation builder for the national welfare is justified.

In conclusion, the emergence of the sense of nationalism and Englishness dates back to Anglo-Saxon England, but develops throughout centuries and the English nation is built by certain events and practices such as the use of English as a national language, the creation of a vernacular literature, the innovations made in administration, legislation, religious institutions, armed forces and navy. The glorious victories over powerful foreign enemies such as France in the Hundred Years' War and Spain in the defeat of the Spanish Armada arouse Englishness and patriotism. The perfect monarchs such as King Alfred, Henry V, the Tudor monarchs, especially Queen Elizabeth I, who maintain the national unity and lead their soldiers to win great battles by their heroic self are also important as they increase the English nationalism. They also act as ideal nation builders, and while they sustain the domestic order and peace, they also strengthen

England's position in international politics. Shakespeare contributes to the rise of the sense of English nationalism by his history plays, which deal with the medieval English history and makes references the politics of his time through the fifteenth century monarchs. In *Richard II*, he puts forth an ideal nation builder in the character of Bolingbroke and the fall of a weak monarch in Richard while he presents the attributes of a perfect monarch with a heroic self in *Henry V*.

CHAPTER I

THE IDEA OF NATION BUILDING AND DIVINE KINGSHIP IN *RICHARD II*

Shakespeare's *Richard II* deals with the deposition of a rightful king, Richard II, who ruled England between 1377 and 1399, and the usurpation of power while revealing complex and extensive interrelationships in national life. The play not only displays the dethronement of a legitimate king, Richard II and his death due to his crimes and follies, but also Bolingbroke's political rise as the new monarch. He is the legitimate king with divine right to rule; however, he acts as a weak ruler who fails to exercise justice and abuses power by privileging the authority of the monarch over the authority of the law. He leads the country into a chaotic situation as he obstructs the national unity by the vacuum of just authority. His deposition by Bolingbroke, who succeeds the throne as Henry IV, is the consequence of his illegal acts.

The main reason of Bolingbroke's return to England by the support of powerful lords and public after being unjustly punished with exile for six years and deprived of all his possession, is to reclaim his rightful patrimony. Bolingbroke takes the throne as a more efficient and strong sovereign as Richard loses the crown due to his weakness and inability to maintain a just government. Hence, as Robert C. Jones has pointed out, the play "dramatizes the forcible replacement of an ineffectual king, son to a heroic father, by an apparently more able leader" (*These* 69). In this respect, one of the main concerns of the play is kingship and its requirements embodied in the idea of nation building. In other words, what it means to be a king, the relationship between the king and his country, and the plight of the country that is weakly governed are the issues that are problematized in the play. As Edward Dowden has pointed out, in this play, Shakespeare analyses the characters of Richard and Bolingbroke, "the weak king who could not rule, and the strong king who pressed him from his place" (248), to evaluate their suitability as nation-builders and display a model of monarchic rule, which is needed in England. Thus, the main concern of this chapter is to illustrate what happens if the royal authority is misused and what happens if it is promoted by justice. The idea of power, justice and ideal monarch will be also discussed. It will be presented that

while Richard, as a weak king, abuses power and violates the laws and feudal customs by an autocratic rule, he also fails to put down the rebellion started by Bolingbroke as he firmly relies on his divine kingship and believes that no subject can give retribution to a divinely elected king. Due to his deficiency in exercising justice, he cannot maintain the national unity and displays his inability as a nation builder. On the other hand, Bolingbroke is presented as an anti-hero, a strong king, who firmly executes the laws and complies with the feudal traditions. As opposed to Richard, Bolingbroke acts as a pragmatic ruler and maintains the national unity as he wins the support of both the commons and the nobles by his rightful rebellion, and is appreciated as an effective nation builder by the whole nation.

In this play, Shakespeare seems to be implicitly posing various political questions to make people think about the consequences of ill practice of political power. Through his dramatisation of a political crisis, he seems to be asking what the good monarch is and what a nation should do both morally and legitimately when faced with a bad ruler who commits unlawful acts. Robert Ornstein deals with the same issue in detail and questions: “When a king recklessly endangers the foundations of law and plunders his country, what is an honourable subject to do?” (114). With this question, he brings forth another important issue to be discussed. That is whether a nation must suffer under an unjust king or give sentence on his king. Shakespeare in this play analyzes the answers of these questions by presenting the deposition of Richard II along with Bolingbroke’s successful rise. Lord Ross, who formerly serves Richard and joins Bolingbroke when he sees Richard’s abuse of power and Bolingbroke’s just assertion of his rights, implies that Richard’s degradation is necessary for the national welfare; otherwise, as he says:

We see the very wrack that we must suffer;
And unavowed is the danger now,
For suffering so the causes of our wrack. (*Richard II*, II.i.267-269)

Therefore, it can be clearly seen that the English people are aware of the fact that Richard’s breaking of laws and misapplication of power will ruin the country. In a sense, they foresee the severe consequences of Richard’s lawless acts and how they will suffer. With these lines, they comprehend that if they continue to endure his autocratic rule and disregard the upcoming jeopardy of destruction of national unity, it is certain

that they will agonize. Hence, in these lines, Ross proclaims the national displeasure and pronounces that the single release is opposing Richard's unjust practices and ending his bad management as in Bolingbroke's rebellion and usurpation of the throne. As indicated in Ross' words, Richard's deposition is considered as inevitable by the English people for a just administration.

Shakespeare associates the past and the present in *Richard II* and interprets the issues of his time by the exemplarity of the past. The question of power, law and administer of justice was highly discussed in the Elizabethan Era. The arrival of the new queen not only brought the hope of change but also fear. In Norman Jones' words, "For English people the late 1550s were not a happy time, and the uncertainty of a change of government added a layer to their distress that would deepen over the next few years" (*Birth* 4). The 1560s were troubled years for the English society where the disease, crime, unemployment and poor business opportunities left people unsecure. As Alison Weir further states, "England was not a wealthy country and its people endured relatively poor living standarts" (3). Therefore, Elizabeth had to use her power effectively to end this chaotic situation in the country and ensure people that she would maintain national harmony and achievement. However, she confronted various problems before she established her absolute authority. There were disputes among the powerful noble classes on the legitimacy of Elizabeth and whether her monarch was just. Though Elizabeth was the next heir to the crown by the authority of Henry's will which was validated by an Act of Parliament, her legitimism was intensely discussed (MacCaffrey 15). The motive behind her reject was that her mother, Anne Boleyn was beheaded by Henry VIII for treason and their marriage was dissolved. As Henry did not declare her legitimate, due to her tendencies towards Protestantism, she became the target of ambitious and disloyal Englishmen who had designs on the English throne (Weir 4).

The English nation faced with a religious tension which would bring social division by Elizabeth's new regime. She was expected to change religion; re-establish the Protestant faith and execute the Catholics, which would destroy the national unity and arouse the sense of revenge in the society. In this respect, the fear of civil war over religion

emerged in the society as the extremists of both sides were willing to kill the opponents. The Catholics had burned the heretics in Mary's reign while the government had sent many Protestants into exile. Hence, hostile and angry, the Protestants were ready to do the same massacre to the Catholics if they had an opportunity (Jones, *Birth* 11-12). However, this would only give rise to a split among the English people by deep religious differences and lead England to deterioration. In the light of these developments, it can be argued that Elizabeth I came to the throne in a chaotic situation which she, decisively and strongly, had to cope with to bring peace and order to the country. In other words, the maintenance of stability in England depended on Elizabeth's ability to act as a strong sovereign using her absolute power effectively. She was acknowledged as a rightful monarch having authority by divine appointment as there was no other heir to ascend the throne and hope to end the lawlessness and violence in the country when the Queen Mary I had died.

In the 1580s and 1590s, comparisons were also made between Richard II and Elizabeth I, who was accused of the same follies as those of Richard through the greater part of her reign. So, according to E. Pearlman, the play displays that "the fall of King Richard has contemporary application" (82) and mirrors the problems of misgovernment and lack of authority. In other words, the history of Richard II had allusions for both Elizabeth and the other gentlemen in her court. As Lily B. Campbell emphasizes, "in the play Shakespeare reiterated the charges against Richard that had been so often laid at Queen Elizabeth's door" (211). Just like the historical Richard, Elizabeth was accused of being dominated by her favourites and neglecting the good counsel of the trusty advisers experienced in state affairs. Thus, the issue of the flatterers and their influence on the monarch was important and highly discussed during the Elizabethan Era. Richard had been charged with leaving the government to a small number of courtiers and as Campbell states, Elizabeth surrendered the affairs to Robert Dudley, who was the son of the Duke of Northumberland and thought to have an intimacy with the Queen. Sir Christopher Hatton was another courtier who was first made a gentleman-pensioner and then appointed to the Office of the Lord of Chamberlain although he was not a lawyer. The accusation that Elizabeth gave her favourites undue power was also repeated in regard to Sir Francis Walsingham and Robert Cecil (174-175). The correlation between

the reign of Richard and that of Elizabeth was also reflected in the letters of Elizabeth's courtiers who were aware of the parallel drawn between Elizabeth and the deposed Richard. Sir Francis Knollys claimed that he did not misguide the queen and 'play the partes of King Richard the Second's men' in a letter he wrote in 1578. Similarly, Henry Lord Hunsdon wrote in 1588: "I never was one of Richard II's men" (qtd. in Chambers 353).

Another charge made against Elizabeth was that she could not administer the national funds and not only made huge debts but also imposed high taxes on people to finance the wars. She fought in Ireland, armed against the Spaniards, aided the French and the Dutch, but this cost Elizabeth much treasure and she "leased out her kingdom" (Campbell 200) as Richard did by heavy taxation. The financial impositions of the monarch to supply funds for military expenditures created social unrest. Though assessment met only a small part of the monetary demands of the nation, it was still felt to be burdensome as the common men were not wealthy and suffered as they were obliged to pay the grievous taxes. Moreover, the richest inhabitants were forced to sell their assets to meet the tax demands (Doran, *Elizabeth* 7). Therefore, one may argue that the social displeasure, which strengthened Bolingbroke in his righteous rebellion and led to Richard's deposition, was also on the agenda of the Elizabeth's reign.

Though Shakespeare's *Richard II* was written in 1595 and published in 1597 before the Essex revolt which occurred between 1599 and 1601, Essex's supporters arranged the Lord Chamberlain's company, which was Shakespeare's company, to stage the play on the eve of the rebellion. Hence, as Campbell has pointed out, the play "was used by Essex's friends as a curtain-raiser to his rebellion" (189). In this respect, a parallel can be assumed between Essex's revolt and the play, which "dramatizes the deposition and murder of the last King of England whose claim to legitimacy rested on divine right" (Hodgdon 129). So, it may be argued that the conflict between Bolingbroke and Richard II in the play was interpreted by both the rebellions and the monarch as the reflection of the conflict between the Earl of Essex and Queen Elizabeth. As Campbell discusses, "the crowning recognition of the historical parallel came from Elizabeth herself" (191) as she identified herself with the fallen king when she confronted the Essex

insurrection. In this regard, “[a]t the time of Essex’s execution she complains that “this tragedy had been played 40 times in open streets and houses,” and she carried her self-identification with the title character so far as to exclaim: “I am Richard II, know ye not that?” ” (Kantorowicz 183). In other words, Elizabeth saw herself in Shakespeare’s portrayal of a legitimate king with divine right to rule who is opposed by one of his powerful subjects and deposed. Hence, in the light of these developments, it may be argued that Shakespeare, in the play, reflects the contemporary concerns, that is, if the sovereign is not powerful and the authority of the crown is weakened by unjust practices, what the consequences will be. He deals with the history of Richard to present the political principles of the Elizabethan Era with reference to the rights and duties of the monarch. He uses history as a political mirror as he “believed that history could teach moral and political lessons” (Cubeta 2), and warns people and Elizabeth that the royal authority, though legitimate and divinely elected, can be made to abdicate just like Richard whose follies lead to his deposition and murder.

When analyzed within this historical and political context, Shakespeare’s *Richard II* reflects the political questions aroused on the use of the royal power, the necessity of a strong sovereign and the privileges of monarchy in the Elizabethan Era. Shakespeare argues Richard’s deposition in the play through his absolute authority, which is misused, and consequently, leads to his tyrannical administration along with his inability to maintain the national unity as he does not practice laws. As Bryan Bevan has stated, he “had ruled according to his will, instead of accepting the laws and customs of the country” (159). He leads an autocratic rule during his reign as he aims to exercise authoritarian power and makes a series of mistakes and misjudgements that strike the harsh opposition of his subjects and eventually lead to his fall. He firmly believes that his authority must be reasserted and that his weakness and humility must be replaced by austerity and absolute power. He sees himself as the powerful king of England having the ultimate authority from the divine will and his legitimacy:

I had forgot myself: am I not king?
 Awake, thou coward majesty! thou sleepest.
 Is not the king’s name twenty thousand names?
 Arm arm, my name! a puny subject strikes
 At thy great glory. [...] (III.ii.83-87)

These lines clearly demonstrate that as Richard is the legitimate king of England and succeeds the throne by inheritance, he believes that he has the highest power to rule according to his own inclinations and repress his subjects by authority. He associates his kingship to the totalitarian power he wants to exercise and feels overconfident to oppress the people. Hence, when he glorifies his kingship, he disregards his subjects and places his will over the nation. In other words, he does not care about the needs and preoccupations of his subjects and merely asks for passive obedience and submission. In this respect, Bevan suggests that historically “in the 1390s Richard’s style of government became increasingly assertive. A novel emphasis was placed on the powers of the prerogative and on the subject’s obligation to obey” (438). In relation with this quote, it can be asserted that the people had to conform to Richard’s practices without questioning even if they were ill and brought suffering; because, he considered himself as the supreme authority in the country to administer law according to his will as the rightful and divinely sanctioned king. In his play, Shakespeare makes an analogy with the historical Richard and presents Richard II as a tyrannical ruler whose concern is to suppress his subjects by unfair acts and place his authority above law. With the practice of absolute power in mind, he violates the laws of England as John of Gaunt, who is Richard’s uncle and an experienced statesman opposing his inequities, expresses: “Why, cousin, wert thou regent of the world, / It were a shame to let this land by lease” (II.i.109-110). Richard not only establishes a despotic rule, but also degrades the national honour of England as he transgresses laws and customs. In this respect, he rejects the feudal traditions as he disregards the chivalrous ethics of his age and violates the law of inheritance. So, the historical Richard who breaks the codes of royalty and resorts to austerity and autocratic rule, and Shakespeare’s Richard perfectly overlap, and Shakespeare problematizes the abuse of power and the violation of the established codes of royalty and feudalism in his plays.

The play opens with the judicial quarrel between Mowbray, who is the first Duke of Norfolk, and Bolingbroke as the two men accuse each other of treachery to the country and the king. For Bolingbroke, Mowbray has appropriated the wealth which should be given to the soldiers at Calais and “[...] hath detain’d for lewd employments, / Like a

false traitor, and injurious villain” (I.i.90-91). In his accusation, Bolingbroke presents Mowbray as an evil man who is disloyal to the king and should be punished. He is also accused of killing the Duke of Gloucester, who is the king’s uncle, and deluding Richard as a wicked betrayer and an evil counsellor:

That Mowbray hath receiv’d eight thousand nobles
In name of lendings for your Highness’ soldiers,
[.....]
Further, I say, - and further will maintain
Upon his bad life to make all this good,-
That he did plot the Duke of Gloucester’s death,
Suggest his soon-believing adversaries,
And, consequently, like a traitor coward,
Sluic’d out his innocent soul through streams of blood (I.i.88-89, 98-103)

As indicated in these lines, Bolingbroke presents Mowbray both as a fraud and a murderer in his denunciations. It is claimed that Mowbray has embezzled a high amount of money from the court treasury, which has been supposed to be spent for the soldiers. He also asserts that Mowbray has already deserved a harsh punishment as he has deceived the king and not only murdered a noble lord but also planned the whole crime as a sinful criminal. On the other hand, Mowbray strongly rejects Bolingbroke’s accusations which are thought to be unreal statements of a liar and charges him with being a traitor, who is disloyal to the king, as he say:

[...] as for the rest appeal’d,
It issues from the rancour of a villain,
A recreant and most denegrate traitor (I.i.142-144)

The two nobles oppose each other in front of the royal authority that is the king, Richard II, who will give the final decision, so that the righteous side, whose claims have validity, will be revealed. The dispute between Bolingbroke and Mowbray had to be referred to Richard who, as the monarch, would pass his royal verdict in favour of the rightful party. The king is believed to be the lawgiver by his royal authority and power derived from God so is Richard. He is the administrator of justice as the legitimate king and God’s deputy. So, he should settle the problem during the duel, have the both nobles defend themselves and pronounce his justice as he acts as a judge. Accordingly, as Graham Holderness has emphasized, “the two knights, who confront one another in this antique quarrel, stand squarely in the heroic tradition of military manliness” (176)

and represent the established nobility. They precisely assert their claims in the presence of the king, who will be the judicial power, as they challenge each other courageously and want to confront in a combat. Both Bolingbroke and Mowbray, “members of the knightly aristocracy” (Pearlman 73) uphold their personal honour against the accusations of treason within the “rites of knighthood” (I.i.75). The prime concern of the knights is to defend their honour, and they are ready to fight in a single combat by heavy weaponry as in the chivalry which is the main principle of knighthood. In this regard, Bolingbroke denounces Mowbray as follows:

If guilty dread have left thee so much strength
As to take up mine honour's pawn, then stoop.
By that, and all the rites of knighthood else,
Will I make good against thee, arm to arm,
What I have spoke, or thou canst worse device. (I.i.73-77)

These lines clearly display that as a brave and honourable chivalric knight, he strongly challenges Mowbray and calls his opponent to a duel where he will fight with him to death to prove the legality of his claims. It is certain in these lines that the two men will confront within the codes of chivalric tradition in a single combat as chivalrous knights in full armour and defend their honour. In response, Mowbray strongly denies his charges and asks for trial by combat “to defend [his] loyalty” (I.i.67) as he says:

[...] by that sword I swear
Which gently laid my knighthood on my shoulder,
I'll answer thee in any fair degree,
Or chivalrous design of knightly trial;
And when I mount, alive may I not light,
If I be traitor or unjustly fight! (I.i.78- 83)

Hence, Mowbray asserts that he will follow the practices of chivalry and fight honourably when he confronts Bolingbroke. As the duel is expected to end with divine justice, Mowbray trusts in his fair accusations and believes that he will be the victorious knight. Thus, both combatants “invoke a tradition of chivalry which challenges the royal authority Richard wants to exercise” (Page 16). Although Richard aims to prevent the two noblemen from fighting for their righteous causes, they persistently challenge each other and assert that they are willing to confront at a chivalrous duel to prove their accusations. In other words, while Richard wants to silence the two combatants by his

absolute authority, they decisively seek their rights which are given to them by the feudal traditions. Yet, the king remains silent and lets the two disputants settle their affair by mere force. He does not interfere in the problem and abuses his royal power as he cannot exercise justice in such a critical situation. The cause of Richard's failure to exercise justice during the dispute, which will also make him stop the duel, is that he cannot let either man be declared as a rightful party. In May McKisack's words, Richard cannot bear to see either of them win (488). According to Richard, both noblemen should be eliminated as they pose a threat to his kingship. Richard has used Mowbray to kill Gloucester, and it is implicated in Mowbray's words:

[...] For Gloucester's death,
I slew him not, but to my own disgrace
Neglected my sworn duty in that case.- (I.i.150-153)

Mowbray's ambiguous reply to Bolingbroke's allegations increases suspicion of the two men's role in the murder and it is understood from the lines above that Mowbray has been Richard's instrument in Gloucester's murder. In this respect, a victory for Mowbray will expose Richard's crime. On the other hand, a victory for Bolingbroke will add to the growing renown of a man whom the king has seen as a menace to his throne. Hence, he fails to exercise justice as he tries to conciliate Bolingbroke and Mowbray by his absolute power rather than finding out the just side:

Forget, forgive, conclude and be agreed;
Our doctors say this is no month to bleed.-
Good uncle, let this end where it begun;
We'll calm the Duke of Norfolk, you your son. (I.i.156-159)

Therefore, it can be clearly seen that he wants both combatants to renounce their accusations and excuse each other. He does not want them to fight at a chivalrous duel and as in the case of the quarrel; because, he does not want either of them to be triumphant and declared as rightful. So, he demands Gaunt to pacify Bolingbroke as he will settle Mowbray and eliminates the threats posed by both nobles. Yet, by such an intervention, he violates the practice of feudal traditions and interferes with the course of justice. Although Richard openly claims that he was "not born to sue, but to command" (I.i.196), he is unable to have his command obeyed, since he does not sit in judgement and cultivate an image of a powerful king who administers justice. Although

he says to Mowbray that “[l]ions make leopards tame” (I.i.174), he fails to assert his royal power over the two parties as Mowbray refuses to reconcile with Bolingbroke:

Myself I throw, dread sovereign, at thy foot;
 My life thou shalt command, but not my shame:
 The one my duty owes; but my fair name
 Despite of death, that lives upon my grave,
 To dark dishonour's use thou shalt not have. (I.i.165-169)

It is strongly asserted in these lines that he depends on the king's authority as his subject; however, he strongly rejects to blemish his reputation by reapprochement. It is asserted that he is loyal to the king's commands, yet this allegiance is not more powerful than his wish to defend his honour. Even if he loses his life in the duel and Bolingbroke will be declared as the rightful party, he pronounces that what will remain is his courageous challenge to the accusations of treason. So, he prefers death to a compromise with Bolingbroke as he wants to prove that his accusations to Bolingbroke have validity. He places his reputation over his life and as a honourable knight, he wants to defeat his opponent. Similarly, Bolingbroke, who displays his ambitious character even at the beginning of the play in his determined challenge to Mowbray to defend his honour against the accusations of treason and maintain justice, does not accept reconciliation and wants Richard to exercise justice and declare the rightful party. He explicitly expresses that Richard's intervention is shameful and impedes the course of justice as he says:

[...] Ere my tongue
 Shall wound my honour with such feeble wrong,
 Or sound so base a parle, my teeth shall tear
 The slavish motive of recanting fear,
 And spit in bleeding in his high disgrace,
 Where shame doth harbour, even in Mowbray's face. (I.i.190-195)

Therefore, Bolingbroke affirms that he will never declare peace with Mowbray; because, an aggrement is a sign of submission for the virtuous knights, who decisively want to defend their honour, and Richard explicitly obstructs the exercise of justice by his attempts to reconcile the two noblemen. Hence, the challengers throw down their gages for truth and display that they are determined to save their reputation even if they have to oppose the king's authority. Moreover, Richard's intervention dishonours both

combatants; because, as Holderness points out, “the royal intervention also represents an emasculation of the combatants and their chivalric culture” (183). To demonstrate the justness of their claims in accordance with the feudal traditions is also a matter of honour for both nobles. Yet, when Richard commands them to come to terms, he not only fails to maintain justice as the deputy of God, but he also neglects the combatants’ honourable pursuit of their rights. Mowbray pleads Richard II to recognize his honour since, for Mowbray, “[t]he purest treasure mortal times afford / Is spotless reputation [...]” (I.i.177-178). If he is prevented to challenge Bolingbroke, his name will be stained, hence he expresses that “honor was above everything” (Snider 265), even above the authority of the king:

Mine honour is my life; both grow in one;
Take honour from me, and my life is done.
Then, dear my liege, mine honour let me try;
In that I live, and for that will I die. (I.i.182-185)

From the quotation above, it can easily be understood that Mowbray identifies his honour with his life and declares that Richard’s intervention will besmirch his honour, which means death for him. As a chivalrous knight, he wants to exercise the feudal customs and defend his honour in a single combat, where the rightful party will be revealed by divine justice. In this sense, as he values his honour more than anything else, even his life, he beseeches Richard to enable them confront at a duel. Bolingbroke clearly states that such an intervention by Richard is a humiliating act which will make him ashamed and thrust from him his right to fight his enemy according to the feudal traditions as follows:

O, God defend my soul from such deep sin!
Shall I seem crest-fallen in my father’s sight?
Or with pale beggar-fear impeach my height
Before this outdar’d dastard? [...] (I.i.187- 190)

As indicated in these lines, he invokes God to avoid him staining his honour as Richard does not fulfil his duty and exercise justice as God’s representative. Though he claims to have the ultimate power as the divinely sanctioned and legitimate king of England, he does not act so and maintain justice when it is expected from him by his subjects. In this sense, the God’s agent fails to exercise justice and, as a subject seeking his rights,

Bolingbroke, prays God to support him and prevent Richard from insulting his honour. As his agent fails to act as a just and good administer, he pleads God to help them and save them from unfair practices. One may argue that to accept reconciliation represents weakness which does not befit a courageous and chivalrous knight. Thus, Richard is obliged to abandon his absolute authority against such strong and serious oppositions and permit the chivalric practices of the feudal society by setting a day for the trial as the disputants decisively refuse reconciliation and degrade their honour as follows:

Since we cannot atone you, we shall see
Justice design the victor's chivalry. (I.ii.202-203)

Accordingly, he leaves the practice of justice to the divine will as he commands the combatants to be prepared to settle their problem by a chivalrous fight. Although he has not acted as a responsible and fair king administering justice and finding the righteous side during the quarrel, he is persuaded to leave his absolute rule behind by the determined oppositions of the noblemen. However, he, once more, violates the feudal tradition and subordinates the principle of honour to tyrannical authority as he commands the warriors to "lay by their helmets and their spears, / And both return back to their chairs again" (I. iii.119-120) as the ritual joust is about to begin. He abruptly stops the duel and the two knights, eager to fight for their righteous causes, have to accept the decision of the divinely elected legitimate king. In this sense, Larry S. Champion considers Richard's attitude as the practice of his autocratic rule and further expresses that

[...] the play depicts a monarchy methodically attempting to consolidate its absolutist powers by stripping away the rights from an aristocracy that is struggling to retain its privileged position within a feudal hierarchy. (104)

As indicated in these lines, the nobles have the right to defend their honour against accusations in a chivalrous duel in the feudal tradition, but Richard takes the nobles' rights and impedes the course of justice by his despotic interference in the single combat. He also reduces the powerful position of the nobility and treats them as submissive subjects as he acts as an authoritarian ruler. The importance of the knightly combat is that the truth and justice will be maintained as the righteous will be the

victorious within the chivalric codes. Yet, as Nicholas Potter has argued, “by standing in the way of this process Richard is appearing to be obstructing justice” (26). He, himself, does not provide justice in the quarrel between the two nobles as the divinely appointed king of England; moreover, he hinders the practice of divine justice.

Richard assembles the parliament and pronounces a sentence of banishment on both Bolingbroke and Mowbray, who have been prevented from defending their honour against accusations, after he interrupts the joust by a tyrannical attitude. He continues to abuse his absolute power and obstructs the exercise of justice as he banishes Bolingbroke from England for a period of ten years without giving any reason as he says:

You, cousin Herford, upon pain of life,
Till twice five summers have enrich'd our fields,
Shall not regret our fair dominions,
But tread the stranger paths of banishment. (I.iii.140-143)

Hence, Richard sends Bolingbroke away with a severe penalty as he will be executed if he returns to England before the term of his exile expires. On the other hand, Mowbray is punished with a perpetual exile so that he can never return to England: “Norfolk, for thee remains heavier doom, / Which I with some unwillingness pronounce” (I.iii.148-149). However, Richard gives unjust retributions to Bolingbroke and Mowbray without explaining explicitly what they are exactly charged with. He does not use his power and administer justice as a strong and decisive king during the quarrel; moreover, he causes the rightful party to be punished just like the wrongful party. Richard also claims that he asserts impartiality towards the two combatants as he assures Mowbray of his right to defend himself against Bolingbroke whose kinship will not sway his judgement:

Mowbray, impartial are our eyes and ears.
Were he my brother, nay, my kingdom's heir,
As he is but my father's brother's son,
Now by my sceptre's awe I make a vow,
Such neighbour nearness to our sacred blood
Should nothing privilege him, nor partialize
The unstooping firmness of my upright soul.
He is our subject, Mowbray; so art thou:
Free speech and fearless I to thee allow. (I.i.115-122)

Therefore, Richard pretends to be the firm defender of justice in the beginning of the quarrel and makes everyone believe that he will act as a judicial power and exercise justice. In this sense, he encourages Mowbray to express his claims openly as he guarantees that Bolingbroke's kindred or royal blood will not give him any advantage in the quarrel. He implies that both nobles are his subjects and the rightful party will be decided in complete neutrality. Hence, although Richard claims that he weighs the accusations of both sides equally to find the rightful party, he, in fact, does not meddle in the problem between the two nobles as a true administrator of justice and decide the righteous side. Richard's impartial attitude which he adopts at the duel between Mowbray and Bolingbroke is maintained explicitly when he sends both of them into exile. He makes the same accusations to the two noblemen and impedes the course of justice as he punishes both the rightful and wrongful parties:

Might from our quiet confines fright fair peace,
And make us wade even in our kindred's blood -
Therefore we banish you our territories. (I.iii.137-139)

These lines clearly demonstrate that both nobles endanger the harmony in the country as they demand to fight at a duel where one of them will be certainly killed so as to maintain the divine justice. So, he announces that he exiles both of them with impartiality, yet he declares a much harsher sentence for Mowbray, which is a lifelong penalty: "the dateless limit of thy dear exile;- / The hopeless word of "never return" / Breathe I against thee, upon pain of life" (I.iii.151-153) while Bolingbroke will live in exile in France "[t]ill twice five summers have enrich'd our fields" (I.iii.141). So, Mowbray will never return to his native country; on the other hand, Bolingbroke's punishment will end after ten years and he will come back to England. Though Richard does not declare whose accusations have validity and which side is righteous in his claims as the judicial power and interferes with the course of justice, he penalizes Mowbray as if he is guilty of treason as Bolingbroke has asserted. In other words, he gives Mowbray's punishment by using his own will without a legal trial. Then, out of his respect for Gaunt, Bolingbroke's father, Richard reduces the term of exile to six years:

Uncle, even in the glasses of thine eyes
 I see thy grieved heart. Thy sad aspect
 Hath from the number of his banish'd years
 Pluck'd four away. [to *Boling.*] Six frozen winters spent,
 Return with welcome home from banishment. (I.iii.208-212)

As stated in the quotation, Richard's early claims of impartiality fail, once more, when he abates Bolingbroke's exile upon Gaunt's agony. He takes advantage of Gaunt's grief on Bolingbroke's unfair punishment and aims to win respect of his subjects by acting as a merciful and just king who cannot bear to see the woe of an old father and forgives his son although he is guilty and deserves his punishment of exile for ten years. But, when Gaunt shows his displeasure upon Richard's unlawful decision and asserts that he knows his true intention, Richard pretends to be the upholder of justice and plays "his role in meting out justice and mercy" (Campbell 197):

Thy son is banish'd upon good advice,
 Whereto thy tongue a party-verdict gave:
 Why at our justice seem'st thou then to lour? (I.iii.233-235)

With these lines, Richard exempts himself from the responsibility of any sort of indictment of unfair practices as he implies that Bolingbroke has been punished in accordance with the justice of the counsel, not with his will and Gaunt is among the decision makers. Though he has decided on the penalties of both Bolingbroke and Mowbray by his own will, he aims to display that the two men have been found guilty of violating the national unity and order by their accusations to each other by the parliament's judgement. In this respect, as Ornstein has pointed out, Gaunt "is tricked by Richard in the third scene into becoming a partner to the banishing of his son" (110). Gaunt's attempt is to be impartial in his decision for the noblemen and maintain his loyalty to the king, and although he is sure of his son's innocence, he punishes him with exile as he hopes that Richard will maintain justice and stop the exercise of the judgement as it is completely unfair. However, Richard's gathering of the parliament functions only to justify his decision. In response, Gaunt expresses his grief on how his impartial attitude towards his son has been exploited by Richard's unjust practice as follows:

A partial slander sought I to avoid,
 And in the sentence my own life destroy'd.

Alas, I look'd when some of you should say
 I was too strict to make mine own away;
 But you gave leave to my unwilling tongue
 Against my will to do myself this wrong. (I.iii.241-246)

In these lines, Gaunt explicitly expresses that he has depended on Richard's justice, which he fails to exercise, when he has made a neutral decision on Bolingbroke's sentence. As indicated in this quotation, Gaunt does not issue a slight penalty to Bolingbroke as he does not want their family ties to be effective in the decision and leaves the exercise of justice to Richard as a lawgiver. But, as Richard undermines the legality of his actions, he not only completely ignores the codes of chivalry by his royal authority, but he also disregards the honour of the combatants who aim to defend themselves against the accusations within the feudal traditions, and punishes them unjustly.

Richard, once again, violates the feudal traditions, abuses the laws and fails to exercise justice when he confiscates Bolingbroke's rightful inheritance. In Snider's opinion, the king is not above the law as he should not violate what is legally established and should secure to every man his rights. Thus, the king's life depends on his subjects, who have common rights, as every member of the feudal society accepts his place, knows his superiors and does not abuse the rights of the ones beneath him. The ruler violating the law "was thus destroying the State, was assailing in its most tender germ the principle of nationality" (262). The king has duties towards his subjects in terms of regarding the feudal hierarchy and maintaining their rights. If he fails to carry out these responsibilities, he turns to be a despotic ruler rather than a national leader.

In the feudal tradition, although all the land belongs to the sovereign, he, the sovereign, has to admit the heir to his predecessor's tenancy (Myers 69). Hence, the tenure is hereditary, and the land passes by from father to son. As Myers has pointed out, "without forgetting his own rights, he [the king] ha[s] no wish to override those of others. We have here, therefore, a sort of social contract" (277). So, there is a bond of loyalty between the king and his subjects; the king should respect people's rights and dispense justice while the subjects should show allegiance to the king. In this respect, one of Richard's most crucial mistakes that leads to his downfall is to claim the

Lancastrian inheritance on behalf of the exiled Bolingbroke after John of Gaunt dies. Though the title and estate of Gaunt should rightly pass to the exiled heir as the oldest son, Richard denies Bolingbroke his rights and illegally seizes Gaunt's lands to finance his military campaigns in Ireland and France. For Lord Ross, who is well aware of Richard's aim: "He hath not money for these Irish wars, / His burthenous taxations notwithstanding, / But by the robbing of the banish'd Duke" (II.i.259-261). Richard's plan is to appropriate Gaunt's lands to afford the Irish campaign as the heavy taxes he has imposed on the people are not enough and he has wasted his own treasure. So, as Ronald Draper states, Richard "makes light of the exploitation of his kingdom in order to pay for a punitive expedition to Ireland" (85). He wants to put down the revolt in Ireland and punish the rebellions, yet with a dictatorial authority disregarding the laws, he collects illegal and grievous taxes from the people, which makes them suffer, and confiscates Gaunt's lands unjustly. Upon the news that Gaunt is dying, he clearly declares his true intention:

Now put it, God, in the physician's mind
To help him to his grave immediately!
The lining of his coffers shall make coats
To deck our soldiers for these Irish wars. (I.iv.59-62)

Hence, Richard has a great wish for Gaunt's death so that he can use his estates to finance his Irish wars. However, Richard's seizure of Gaunt's lands forbids Bolingbroke to possess his father's lands and title, which is his legal right. In this sense, "from being the means of protecting person and property, government in his [Richard's] hands has become the most potent engine of their destruction" (Snider 262). He completely neglects the law of inheritance, which he should protect by the king of England, by his seizure of Bolingbroke's property. As Bolingbroke cannot attain his assets, he loses his power in England, thus Richard not only undermines the law of inheritance, but he also aims to weaken Bolingbroke's potency as a lord. Moreover, he violates the feudal traditions by confiscating Gaunt's land as the law of inheritance is a significant practice in feudal order. In other words, as Pearlman has stated, Richard "violates feudal norms a second time when he undertakes Gaunt's lands, which should properly descend to the Lancastrian heir, Bolingbroke" (75). Richard breaches the feudal codes for the first time when he prevents the exercise of justice between the two noble knights by his injurious

intervention; and he, once more, disregards the customs as he seizes Gaunt's lands. Yet, Richard's lawless acts arouse unrest among the aged and experienced advisors. The Duke of York, who is Richard's uncle, warns him about his unconstitutional and immoral action and implies that Bolingbroke should receive the inheritance that falls to him:

Seek you seize, and gripe into your hands
The royalties and rights of banish'd Herford?
Is not Gaunt dead? And doth not Herford live?
Was not Gaunt just? and is not Harry true?
Did not the one deserve to have an heir?
Is not his heir a well-deserving son?
Take Herford's rights away, and take from time
His charters, and his customary rights;
Let not to-morrow then ensue to-day:
Be not thyself. For how art thou a king
But by fair sequence and succession? (II.i.189-199)

With these lines, York expresses that though Gaunt has died, Bolingbroke is still alive and deserves to take his legal title and estates as a noble heir. He also emphasizes that Richard's kingship depends on the law of inheritance as he has received it from his father, and once Richard violates the custom, he also denies his own kingship. So, the Duke of York calls for full obedience to the laws on inheritance and warns Richard that his act is a breach of the law of succession. Richard has no regard for loyalty to the values which he is obliged to protect as the king of England. His disregard for the customs which form the basis of his sovereignty displays his indifference to his nation and inability to be an effective nation builder. He is negligent to his subjects' rights and practice of the laws as he sees himself as the supreme authority in the country, the master of his subjects, with divine right to rule. Diana Devlin argues that

[...] within a few moments of that death, Richard has snatched John of Gaunt's lands away, depriving Bolingbroke of his inheritance and provoking his return from banishment to claim it. He abuses the very principle, inheritance, on which his power as king is based. This is indicative of his own divided attitude to 'my earth', which he believe was granted him by divine right and is unaffected by what use he makes of it. (72)

Therefore, it can be clearly seen that the royal succession is equated with the principle of son-succeeding-father, which refers to son's legitimate replacement of father. In confiscating what should now belong to Bolingbroke and his right to succeed his father,

Richard undermines the right of succession, according to which he, himself, has ascended to the throne. In other words, the king violates his own way of legitimate succession. The motive behind Richard's such tyrannical attitude is the ultimate power he believes to have as he feels himself responsible only to God and does not feel an obligation to fulfil his duties towards his subjects. Hence, Richard commits an act of illegality and seizes Bolingbroke's inheritance acting against the law: "The ripest fruit first falls, and so doth he; / His time is spent, our pilgrimage must be" (II. i.153-154). Gaunt's death along with Bolingbroke's exile provides Richard the opportunity to establish his own absolute authority. However, as Ornstein has pointed out, Richard "is not so foolish as to seize Bolingbroke's inheritance against all tradition and established right just to get money for his Irish wars" (111). The real design for the banishment of Bolingbroke and seizure of his possessions is Richard's deep-seated fear that Bolingbroke will ascend the English throne as an effective nation builder and install the House of Lancaster as England's ruling dynasty. The point has been emphasized by Bevan:

By his father's death at the age of fifty-nine, Hereford inherited over thirty castles and rich inheritance of Lancastrian estates, The County Palatine of Lancaster where the King's writ had no legal force. Clearly Richard visualized that Henry, when he returned from his six-year exile with unlimited powers, would be an overmighty subject and a dangerous enemy. (139)

As indicated above, Bolingbroke is a powerful noble with a honourable title and a great fortune which he inherits by Gaunt's death. Yet, his power threatens Richard as the divinely elected, legitimate king does not want to have mighty subjects who will oppose his authoritarian rule. Therefore, one may argue that, by banishing Bolingbroke and confiscating all his possessions, Richard seeks to remove the ever-present threat of the Lancastrian dynasty and destroy Bolingbroke's power base in England to secure his kingship. As opposed to Richard, Bolingbroke has close ties with the common people and is famous for his courtesy. He attracts admiration and maintains unity. The same issue is also discussed in *Henry IV 1* when Bolingbroke, as King Henry IV, explains how he has courted popularity:

By being seldom seen, I could not stir
But like a comet I was wonder'd at,
[.....]

And then I stole all courtesy from heaven,
 And dress'd myself in such humility
 That I did pluck allegiance from men's hearts, (III.ii.46-47,50-52)

Therefore, as opposed to Richard, Bolingbroke does not oppress people with an autocratic attitude, and pride; on the contrary, he treats them with modesty and exercises justice to all of his subjects equivalently. He is not only admired but also respected by the people and gains their loyalty. Yet, Richard notes with suspicion Bolingbroke's great popularity as a threat to his own kingship: "[a]s were our England in reversion his / And he our subjects' next degree in hope" (I.iv.35-36). Richard fears that Bolingbroke's popularity goes beyond being an honourable lord, but he is seen as the succeeding monarch by the people. In this respect, as Tim Spiekerman has pointed out, "the departure scene appears to have been but one element in a larger effort by Bolingbroke to enhance his popular standing" (65). He, for the first time in the play, meets people when he leaves England for France and has the opportunity to gain their appreciation by his humbleness. As a result, Bolingbroke has been sent off to exile in France by the common people with affection and respect, and Richard shows his fear about Bolingbroke's emerging power after he leaves:

What reverence he did throw away on slaves,
 Wooing poor craftsmen with the craft of smiles
 And patient underbearing of his fortune,
 As t'were to banish their affects with him.
 Off goes his bonnet to an oyster-wench;
 A brace of draymen bid God speed him well,
 And had the tribute of his supple knee,
 With 'Thanks, my countrymen my loving friends' (I.iv.27-34)

With these lines, he depicts, by hatred and fury, Bolingbroke's behaviours in the departure scene which earn him esteem and make people see him as a more able nation builder. Contrary to Richard, Bolingbroke does not distance himself from the people and shows that he strongly respects their affection. Rather than acting as a tyrannical ruler suppressing the people, he treats them with sympathy. When he kneels down, he destroys the barriers, which separate the monarch and the nation and displays that he considers people not as oppressed subjects but as his friends and dear citizens. As George J. Becker has also stated, "Richard is [...] aware that Bolingbroke has been courting the common people" (22), gaining their adoration and loyalty, and considers

his popularity among the English people as a sign of his loss of the throne. Hence, he is seriously and alarmingly concerned about Bolingbroke's "[...] courtship to the common people / How he did seem to dive into their hearts / With humble and familiar courtesy" (I.iv.24-27) and gets stronger. In this sense, in order to keep the potential danger out of his crown, he explicitly declares that Bolingbroke will definitely not return to England even if the duration of his exile comes to an end:

He is our cousin, cousin, but 'tis doubt,
When time shall call him home from banishment,
Whether our kinsman come to his friends. (I.iv.20-22)

These lines clearly demonstrate that Richard changes Bolingbroke's six years' exile into a lifelong punishment so that he will not come back to England and represent people's hope for a more just and legal administration. As Richard is aware of his own illegal practices and the people's unrest, he fears that he will be replaced by a more efficient ruler. Bolingbroke's popularity among the English people shows that he constitutes a serious threat for Richard's kingship. In this sense, one may argue that Richard banishes Bolingbroke from England to remove the alternatives for the English throne. By declaring that his banishment will be perpetual, he, in fact, eliminates a powerful noble who has courted the people and gained their affection and, hence, poses a threat of succeeding Richard as the next monarch.

Richard's unjust confiscation of Bolingbroke's estates and title destroys the national unity, and as Myers has pointed out, "turn[s] the greatest magnate of the realm into his bitter foe" (33). In this respect, gathering of the forces who oppose Richard and declaration of the charges to dethrone him seem to be inevitable. York warns Richard severely that he will lose the support of the people if he endangers the idea of personal right by sequestering Bolingbroke's inheritance:

If you do wrongfully seize Herford's rights,
Call in the letters patents that he hath
By his attorneys-general to sue
His livery, and deny his off'red homage,
You pluck a thousand dangers on your head,
You lose a thousand well-disposed hearts,
And prick my tender patience to those thoughts

Which honour and allegiance cannot think. (II.i.201-208)

As indicated in these lines, York recognizes Richard's seizure of Bolingbroke's lands as lawless and alerts him about the negative responses he will have. Richard will not only lose many loyal supporters, but he will also waste York's faith. In this sense, Ornstein states that York's words "sound a dangerous warning because they intimate the breaking point of loyalty" (112). In other words, his loyalty to Richard is shaken as he realizes Richard's tyrannical attitude of appropriating Gaunt's estates. The Earl of Northumberland, who is Bolingbroke's cousin and supporter, further supports that Richard's sequestration of the Lancastrian estates cannot be excused on the grounds of military campaign as "[m]ore hath he spent in peace than they [his predecessors] in wars" (II.i.255) and calls him the "most degenerate king" (II.i.262). For Northumberland, Richard spends his finances recklessly at time of peace and does not note to take the necessary precautions for military matters, hence his claim to violate laws to finance the Irish wars presents his decadence as a king and indifference to his subjects' sufferings. In this respect, the convictions of the nobility display how far Richard's credit as a nation builder has fallen as he fails in providing good rule.

One can claim that, for Shakespeare and his contemporaries, the relation between the sovereign and the people is the fundamentally defining principle of nation building and maintaining the national unity. As Snider has pointed out, what matters "is not the attitude of the king toward foreign States, but his attitude toward his own subjects" (262). However, Richard fails in cultivating friendly relations with the English people and gaining their affection; instead, he breaks off the bond with the English nation. As Becker has pointed out, "there is a publicly discerned contrast between Richard's aloofness and his cousin's [Bolingbroke's] common touch" (22). While Richard disdains the people as mean subjects, Bolingbroke values them as his gentle countrymen. Richard reveals his arrogant attitude towards the English people when he describes Bolingbroke's departure for exile and the people's deep concern about his banishment:

Observ'd his courtship to the common people,
How he did seem to dive into their hearts
With humble and familiar courtesy;

What reverence he did throw away on slaves,
 Wooing poor craftsmen with the crafts of smiles (I.iv.24-28)

According to Richard, the people are no more than his vassals whom he oppresses by an authoritarian rule. He also displays his pride when he distances himself from the public as he calls them as destitute artisans while he is a mighty king. Richard's negative view of the English people is also emphasized by his supporters. Bagot, Bushy and Greene, the flatterers who are accused of misguiding Richard, claim that the poor common people take sides with rebellious Bolingbroke and betray Richard. For instance, Bagot demonstrates his dislike of the public as he says: "And that's the wavering commons, for their love / Lies in their purses, and whoso empties them, / By so much fills their hearts with deadly hate" (II.ii.128-130). They believe that the people do not consider love and loyalty but only material gain. So, they are changeable and not trustworthy as they take sides with the person who provides them funds and forget their oath of fidelity. Richard proves his disregard for the people as he decides to exact unparliamentary taxes on the common people and extort blank cheques from the rich people as he can fill them up himself to raise additional revenues for the Irish wars:

We will ourselves in person to this war;
 And, for our coffers, with too great a court
 And liberal largess, are grown somewhat light,
 We are enforc'd to farm our royal realm,
 The revenue whereof shall furnish us
 For our affairs in hand. If that come short,
 Our substitutes at home shall have blank charters;
 Whereeto, when they shall know what men are rich,
 They shall subscribe them for large sums of gold,
 And send them after to supply our wants;
 For we will make for Ireland presently. (I.iv.42-52)

It is strongly asserted in these lines that Richard has wasted the national treasury for pleasure and dissipated it to his flatterers at the court. As he is in need of financial support, he plans to raise money to afford the Irish campaign by robbing the people by illicit taxes. But, as Bevan has pointed out, "Richard's methods of raising money were entirely arbitrary, oppressive and consequently illegal" (136) as he imposes grievous burdens on his people. Hence, he cannot maintain the national unity and arouses uneasiness among the people. Lord Ross depicts how Richard has lost the love of the commoners and the nobles by forced taxes and blank cheques:

The commons hath he pill'd with grievous taxes,
 And quite lost their hearts. The nobles hath he fin'd
 For ancient quarrels and quite lost their hearts. (II.i.246-248)

As indicated in these lines, Richard loses the love and support of the whole nation as he exploits both the common men and the noblemen by unlawful means of raising money. His tyrannical attitude of collecting illegal taxes from his subjects displays that he completely disregards the welfare of his nation and rather than elevating them by good life conditions and wealth, he confiscates whatever they possess by grievous charges. So, he fails to earn the respect of the English people as an effective nation builder; instead, he turns to be a hated tyrant.

In this respect, the different attitudes of the English people to Richard and Bolingbroke, when "[...] our two cousins' coming into London" (V.ii.2), are important to display the choice of the English nation as a nation builder. While Richard is insulted as "[...] rude misgoverned hands from windows' tops / Threw dust and rubbish on King Richard's head" (V.ii.5-6), Bolingbroke is welcomed with respect and love. In this sense, one may argue that the people display their desire to end Richard's despotic rule and have a just and egalitarian administration by their greetings of the two men. York describes the parade as follows:

[...] the Duke, great Bolingbroke,
 Mounted upon a hot and fiery steed
 Which his aspiring rider seem'd to know,
 With slow but stately pace kept on his course,
 Whilst all tongues cried, "God save thee, Bolingbroke!"
 You would have thought the very windows spake,
 So many greedy looks of young and old
 Through casements darted their desiring eyes
 Upon his visage; and that all the walls
 With painted imagery had said at once,
 "Jesu preserve thee! Welcome, Bolingbroke!" (V.ii.7-17)

Therefore, it can be clearly seen that the whole nation, regardless of age and sex, acknowledges Bolingbroke as their new leader with great enthusiasm. They explicitly display that they attribute Bolingbroke kingly qualities as they call him as God's deputy and wants God to support him. The people's contrasting manners to the reigning weak

monarch and rebellious strong usurper demonstrate that they expect a powerful sovereign who does not abuse his power by unfair practices and sits in judgement. Hence, Bolingbroke, the potent and determined leader, is welcomed by the people as the new monarch and ensures public appreciation when he returns to England to claim his rightful inheritance. He endeavours for the restoration of his ancestral estates and the Lancastrian title which have been illegally confiscated. In this sense, as Pearlman has stated, “the banished Bolingbroke has returned from abroad to assert his claim to the lands and title of John of Gaunt” (77). Northumberland emphasizes Bolingbroke’s aim to rebel as he says: “The noble Duke hath sworn his coming is / But for his own; [...]” (II.iii.147-148). Bolingbroke purposes to prevent Richard from encroaching upon his rights and resolutely withstands his oppressive acts. He also depicts the Richard’s injustices which have led him to return from exile and rebel as follows:

I am denied to sue my livery here,
And yet my letters patents give me leave.
My father’s goods are all are distrain’d and sold,
And these, and all, are all amiss employ’d.
What would you have me do? [...] (II.iii.128-132)

These lines clearly display that Bolingbroke justifies his rightful resistance as he emphasizes that he is well aware of his lawful rights and Richard cannot take over Gaunt’s lands which should rightly pass to himself. By his rebellion, Bolingbroke shows his determination to cease Richard’s wilful rule and uphold justice and laws as an effective nation builder. He believes that Richard’s kingly power does not give him the right to act like a tyrant and to commit wrongs upon his subjects. That is why he also wants York to voice the Richard’s inequities as he says:

Will you permit that I shall stand condemn’d
A wandering vagabond, my rights and royalties
Pluck’d from my arms perforce, and given away
To upstart unthrifths? [...] (II.iii.118-121)

As stated in the quotation, Bolingbroke relies on York as a honest lord and wants him not to allow Richard to sequester his rights and inheritance. He aims to show York Richard’s failure as a moral and strong king and violation of laws. His determined efforts to prevail on York to see Richard’s unfair acts display that he wants York to

support his rightful struggle. However, York, in the first place, accuses Bolingbroke of being a traitor, who must be punished:

Were I but now the lord of such hot youth,
As when brave Gaunt, thy father, and myself,
Rescued the Blanck Prince, that young Mars of men,
From forth the ranks of many thousand French,
O then how quickly should this arm of mine,
Now prisoner to the palsy, chastise thee,
And minister correction to thy fault! (II.iii.98-104)

Hence, he considers Bolingbroke's rebellion as a wrongful act which should be controlled. He also compares Bolingbroke to his ancestors and emphasizes that he is a betrayer unlike his courageous forebears. Yet, as Ornstein has pointed out, "what York knows to be 'gross rebellion and detested treason,' Bolingbroke, with some justification, describes as a challenging of law" (116). He supports that he demands his legal rights which are denied him by Richard. He stresses the point that his claim rests upon the same basis as that of Richard to be the king of England, which Richard recklessly undermines: "If that my cousin king be King in England, / It must be granted I am Duke of Lancaster" (II.iii.122-123). As indicated in these lines, if the law of inheritance is applied to Richard, then it must also be valid for Bolingbroke; because, as a countryman of England, he has the right to seek his title and lands as much as the king of England claims the throne. In this respect, he believes that he has the prerogative to challenge law and defend his rights, "which is the right of the nation against the sovereign" (Snider 265). In a sense, Bolingbroke represents the whole nation by his bold and resolved fight for his legal rights and encourages them to oppose Richard's abuse of power as laws should be applied to all the people. As Bolingbroke cannot vindicate his claim by judicial process, which is obstructed by Richard, the only way which remains is the rebellion. So, Bolingbroke constitutes a challenge to the king's abuse of his absolute authority:

[...] I am a subject,
And I challenge law; attorneys are denied me,
And therefore personally I lay my claim
To my inheritance of free descent. (II. iii.132-135)

Therefore, it can be seen that as a subordinate who is prevented from seeking his legal rights by judicial means, Bolingbroke has no option but to start an individual resistance to claim his heritage. His obtaining of his rights is avoided by the king's illegal practices, and he is obliged to oppose the king's authority to exercise justice. In this respect, a significant cause of Bolingbroke's rebellion and Richard's final loss of the throne is the wrong done to the subject who places himself at the head of a national movement of seeking for constitutional rights. One may argue that his rebellion against the violation of laws by a despotic rule becomes a model for all the English people who are suppressed.

Indeed, though Bolingbroke emphasizes that he has returned from exile to claim his rightful inheritance, he also dwells upon a concern for England's national welfare by his righteous rebellion as an able nation builder. He explains, in *Henry IV 2*, that his rebellion results from the necessity to establish the national unity, which has collapsed during Richard's reign due to his failings and misdeeds, and maintain justice as he says:

[...] God knows, I had no such intent
But that necessity so bow'd the state
That I and greatness were compell'd to kiss. (III.i.73-75)

In a sense, it is obligatory for Bolingbroke to usurp the throne as a leader considering the decent use of power, exercise of justice and laws and the well-being of his countrymen. As indicated in these lines, Richard's illegal practices have thrown the country in a chaos, hence Bolingbroke's rebellion and deposition of Richard are urgent for the common interest of the English nation. He also displays his determination to save England from Richard's unjust practices and his supporters in his conversation with York as he says:

By Bushy, Bagot, and their complices,
The caterpillars of the commonwealth,
Which I have sworn to weed and pluck away. (III.iii.165-167)

With these lines, Bolingbroke implies that the way to bring England justice and order is to eliminate all the wrongdoers, and he has set his heart on removing the people ruining the country. He is determined to rid the nation of the corrupted rule as "he does not

hesitate to revenge himself on the hated sycophants, whom he accuses of misleading the King” (Ornstein 116). He condemns Richard’s flatterers to death without trial as they mislead Richard to a corrupt rule, break the close relationship between the king and the queen, take the possessions of the banished Bolingbroke as their own and cause the unjust punishments of Bolingbroke and Mowbray:

I will unfold some causes of your deaths:
 You have misled a prince, a royal king,
 A happy gentleman in blood and lineaments,
 By you unhappied and disfigured clean;
 You have in manner with your sinful hours,
 Made a divorce betwixt his queen and him,
 Broke the possession of a royal bed,
 And stain’d the beauty of a fair queen’s cheeks
 With tears, drawn from her eyes by your foul wrongs;
 Myself,- a prince by fortune of my birth,
 Near to the king in blood, and near in love,
 Have stoop’d my neck under your injuries,
 And sigh’d my English breath in foreign clouds,
 Eating the bitter bread of banishment (III.i.7-20)

As indicated in these lines, Bolingbroke explicitly pronounces that the flatterers have led Richard, who once has been a noble and decent king, to have an autocratic rule violating justice and laws. They have led him to deal with trivial issues and act as an ineffective ruler instead of presenting a powerful character as a nation builder. They have, first of all, violated the order within the court as they have alienated the king and the queen and made the queen suffer. In a sense, they have violated the order and harmony at the court. Then, they have slandered Bolingbroke, who is royal by blood and appreciated by Richard, to disgrace him and caused him too much pain in the exile. In this sense, Bolingbroke conducts the affair in a very decisive manner, and as Pearlman has also stated, “with a decisiveness totally devoid of sentiment, he revenges himself on the King’s counselors Bushy and Greene” (77) to end the corrupted rule in England.

Richard’s abuse of power by tyrannical attitudes to the people and failure to exercise justice take roots from his position as a divinely elected king. The idea of divine right to rule was an important political tradition in the Tudor dynasty. The king was elected by God and it was the subjects’ duty to serve the God’s deputy by passive obedience. From

the Tudor point of view, as the humanbeings were fallen creatures as heirs of Adam and Eve's original sin, they needed to be controlled by kings. Even if the divinely appointed king was weak or evil, the people were considered to be punished for their sins by a wicked ruler, which had to be suffered patiently. As the king would find retribution in heaven, any resistance to the royal authority was accepted as a crime (Dutton 83). The idea of kingship was immensely associated with divine power, that is, any violation of the king's crown was seen as the equivalent to a violation of the divine throne. Hence, an absolute submission to the divinely appointed king was expected from the subjects. In this sense, it may be argued that the Tudors adopted the theory of divine kingship to maintain a strong government and avoid any kind of disobedience to the monarch. John Neville Figgis describes the four main statements on the doctrine of divinely elected king in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries as follows:

(1) Monarchy is a divinely ordained institution. (2) Heredity right is indefeasible. The right acquired by birth to rule must not be forfeited through any acts of usurpation. (3) Kings are accountable to God alone. (4) Non-resistance and passive obedience are enjoined by God. (8)

Therefore, in the Tudor dynasty, the legitimate king, who succeeded the throne by the lineal right, had also divine sanction to rule the country. The king's inherited throne could not be seized by a disobedient subject as the king was the supreme authority in the country and responsible to merely God for his practices. However, the belief that the king can only be punished by God as he is the supreme authority on earth as the Lord's deputy inspires an arrogant confidence with the king. Such pride not only leads him to justify his injustices and arouse uneasiness among the people, but also to expect divine support to handle the chaotic situation in the country and support him to put down a rebellion, which makes him a weak king who cannot take action in the face of danger. In this sense, it may be argued that, in *Richard II*, Shakespeare makes an analogy with the theory of divine right to rule in his time and warns the monarch and the people about the severe consequences of excessive reliance on divine power. In the play, Richard disregards the consequences of his misgovernment and the worsening situation of England as he believes that he derives his absolute authority directly from God as the undeniably legitimate king of England:

[...] show us the hand of God
 That hath dismiss'd us from our stewardship;
 For well we know, no hand of blood and bone
 Can gripe the sacred handle of our sceptre,
 Unless he do profane, steal, or usurp. (III.iii.77-81)

As indicated in these lines, Richard strongly believes that only God can depose him as he is the Lord's surrogate. Aiming at usurping the throne, for mortals, is to oppose the divine will and brings merely sorrow. As Champion has maintained, Richard "touts himself as an embodiment of the religio-political principle of divine right, constantly invoking God and legal doctrine to validate his political power" (102). In other words, he has both hereditary and divinely constituted authority to rule and uses his power not for the welfare of his nation but to suppress his subjects. Richard calls himself "[...] the figure of God's majesty, / His captain, steward, deputy elect, / Anointed, crowned [...]" (IV.i.125-127); in Potter's words, he is "an almost sacred figure, deriving extraordinary power from his position as 'God's deputy'" (24). However, his reliance on divine power to rule is the basis of his maladministration of England. He wastes the advantages of the political tradition as a legitimate king and paves the way for his own downfall by excessively relying on God. He believes that his will is God's will and that none of his subjects can punish him due to his misgovernance as he is above the law of retribution. He believes that he has the ultimate power so that he neglects laws and administers the country according to his own will which represents the divine will. In this sense, as Snider has stated, "the justice of a thing, the moral quality of an act, do not concern the sovereign who rules over eternal right as over the meanest subject" (271). He sees the English people as insignificant before his excessive power which he derives from God. He associates his divine authority to the tyrannical rule under which he oppresses his subjects and justifies his unjust practices. His rights derived from God are everlasting and superior to all kinds of laws. In this regard, he explicitly expresses how he disregards any kind of objection to his kingship as he is above any of his subjects as the agent of God when he says to Bolingbroke:

We are amaz'd, and thus long have we stood
 To watch the fearful bending of thy knee,
 Because we thought ourself thy lawful king;
 And if we be, how dare thy joints forget
 To pay their awful duty to our presence? (III.iii.72-76)

Thus, Richard expects Bolingbroke to kneel in front of the mighty king in fear and plead for mercy; because, according to Richard, the task of a subject is a submissive compliance to the divinely elected king. As indicated in these lines, for Richard, the subjects should be bound by blind and passive obedience to him as God's surrogate. They do not have the right to rebel, and what they should do is to show dutiful loyalty to him in any circumstances. In this regard, Richard's deep faith in divinity gives him great confidence and blinds him to take the most crucial political precautions against Bolingbroke. He believes that it is impossible for a usurper to dethrone the divinely elected king of England:

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

Hence, as his blood is sacred and protected by God, he feels so assertive that even the violent powers of nature or the mortals cannot punish and dethrone him. As he is divinely sanctioned, he strongly and decisively asserts that he cannot be defeated by earthly powers. He represents the divine power on earth and is invincible just like God. In this respect, he calls "God's unarmed and non-human creations to assist him in thwarting Bolingbroke's rebellion" (Spiekerman 74) instead of armies of men. While Bolingbroke will struggle against Richard by the support of the weak mortals, he will display his ultimate power and unbeatable status to the whole country by the divine will on his side. In other words, he relies on divine support to put down Bolingbroke's rebellion instead of his followers' aid as he says:

Feed not thy sovereign's foe, my gentle earth,
Nor with thy sweets comfort his ravenous sense,
But let thy spiders that suck up thy venom
And heavy-gaited toads lie in their way,
Doing annoyance to the treacherous feet,
Which with usurping steps do trample thee;
Yield stinging nettles to mine enemies;
And when they from thy bosom pluck a flower,
Guard it, I pray thee, with a lurking adder,
Whose double tongue may with a mortal touch
Throw death upon thy sovereign's enemies. (III.ii.12-22)

As indicated in these lines, Richard wants the land to use all his powers, including the wild animals and plants, to defeat the opponents of the king. In other words, nature will prevent the usurper from deposing the rightful and divinely elected king of England instead of powerful and courageous soldiers. He sees the rebellious attitudes of his enemies towards the divinely sanctioned king as brutal senses and believes that earth will not allow the rebels to damage his celestial crown. Furthermore, apart from the forces of nature as agents of God, he depends on angels to defeat Bolingbroke. He sees the heavenly creatures as the soldiers of God and firmly believes that they will help him in his fight against Bolingbroke. He proclaims the divine protection on which he depends when he says:

God for his Richard hath in heavenly pay
A glorious angel: then, if angels fight,
Weak men must fall; for heaven still guards the right. (III.ii.60-62)

Hence, for Richard, God's appointment of the divine beings to support him displays that he is the rightful party in the villainous upheaval of the usurpers. As the powerless mortal fighters cannot stand out against the mighty guardians, Richard will certainly be the victor on God's will in his struggle with Bolingbroke. Accordingly, as Dowden has pointed out, "Richard has upon his side powers higher than natural flesh and blood" (251), and hence fails in taking the necessary political and military steps. Aumerle warns Richard and the courtiers not to leave the quarrel to merely God and take some measures before Bolingbroke gets stronger. He emphasizes the severe consequences of Richard's disregard of Bolingbroke's advance with powerful lords on his side as he says:

He means, my lord, that we are too remiss;
Whilst Bolingbroke, through our security,
Grows strong and great in substance and in power. (III.ii.33-35)

It is strongly asserted in these lines that as they have behaved so negligent, Bolingbroke has had an opportunity to gain supporters and grow stronger in financial terms. The Bishop of Carlisle agrees that God will preserve Richard's kingship despite all challenges as he is a king by divine right and in a mystical way, he stresses that Richard, as the legitimate monarch, is impregnable and protected by God: "Fear not, my lord. That Power that made you king / Hath power to keep you king in spite of all" (III.ii.27-

28). However, similar to Aumerle's cautious approach, he still urges Richard to take action as he can only defeat Bolingbroke if he uses the means that God has offered him. He wants Richard to rely on the divine support but also to benefit from the opportunities God supplies him for victory as he says:

The means that heaven yields must be embrac'd,
And not neglected; else, heaven would,
And we will not; heavens offer, we refuse
The proffered means of succour and redress. (III.ii.29-32)

By his emphasis on the facilities God provides, Aumerle, here, implicates the armies Richard can raise as the legitimate and divinely elected king, who has the ultimate power. He wants Richard to realize these means of assistance which will be more effective than the supernatural beings to put down the rebellion. In other words, the lords urge Richard to be more realistic and get prepared to outstand Bolingbroke's rebellion, which will depose him, as a pragmatic, strong and courageous nation builder. Yet, Richard still emphasizes his belief in the vulnerability of a divinely ordained king and instead of gathering soldiers to fight, as can be understood from his remarks to Northumberland, he challenges Bolingbroke by the power of God:

Yet know, my master, God omnipotent,
Is mustering in his clouds, on our behalf,
Armies of pestilence; and they shall strike
Your children yet unborn, and unbegot,
That lift your vassal hands against my head,
And threat the glory of my precious crown. (III.iii.85-90)

Therefore, it can be clearly seen that he relies on the power of the soldiers gathering in heaven rather than that of the soldiers at his court to punish the betrayers endangering his holy crown. He also emphasizes that God's armies will not destroy only the rebels themselves but also their coming generations so that their descent will never pose a threat for the English crown, which will pass to Richard's legitimate lineage. It is obvious from these remarks that, to put it in Spiekerman's words, "Richard lacks political savy. He hasn't a clue how to stay in power. [...] this too is directly related to his belief in his divine right to rule" (72). He deprives of the attributes of an ideal nation builder and a perfect monarch as he lacks power and determination to handle the crisis and produce useful solutions which will lead him to success. As he too much depends

on divine support to thwart the upcoming rebellion, he moves away from the practical means of politics and jeopardizes his own kingship.

The idea that the monarch who is divinely appointed cannot be punished by his subjects is also illustrated by Gaunt in his speech with the Duchess of Gloucester, who is the widow of the Duke of Gloucester who has been murdered by Richard. Gaunt emphasizes that Richard represents divine will and can only be judged by divine power due to his sins and crimes. As the following discussion demonstrates, though Gaunt is convinced that Richard has killed Gloucester, he still respects him as the deputy of God and refuses to revenge him:

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

As indicated in these lines, Gaunt places the emphasis on Richard's divine right to rule and declares that it is God's responsibility to punish Richard if he commits any crimes. The subjects are not accountable to judge the divinely elected king and pass sentence on him for his offenses. Just as the mortals cannot question the deeds of God, they also do not have the right and power to try Richard for his acts. When the duchess asks Gaunt: "Where then, alas, may I complain myself?" (I.ii.42), he prefers to leave vengeance to the divine will despite his hatred for Richard's sin and says: "To God, the widow's champion and defence" (I.ii.43). Gaunt firmly condemns disobedience to Richard due to his divine right to the crown and emphasizes that only God has the judicial power to punish his deputy.

Apart from violating laws and customs, suppressing his subjects by illegal practices and abusing his royal power, Richard is also accused of relying too readily on the evil counsel of the self-interested young favourites, "completely inexperienced in weighty decisions" (Bevan 161). He fails to be an effective nation builder as he leaves the administration of the country to his flatterers. As Bushy, Bagot and Greene are not as wise as the old counsellors like Gaunt and York, they lead Richard to be interested in

fashionable but frivolous issues, which only give pleasure, rather than in politics and affairs of state as York says:

Report of fashions in proud Italy,
Whose manners still our tardy-apish nation
Limps after in base imitation.
Where doth the world thrust forth a vanity-
So it be new, there's no respect how vile-
That is not quickly buzz'd into his ears? (II.i.21-26)

As stated in the quotation, Richard is constantly informed about the current developments in Italy, which witnesses the Renaissance and revival in art, by his young courtiers and does not show concern for the events which occur in his own realm. As he is so much dazzled by the accounts of entertainments and joy even if they are ignoble practices, he gives up dealing with statecraft. Gaunt emphasizes the disability of the young favourites in politics as he criticizes Richard's dependence on them: "He hath no more must say is listened more / Than they whom youth and ease have taught to glose" (II.i.9-10). As indicated in these lines, Gaunt wants Richard to listen to him on his deathbed rather than the counsel of the young and indifferent favourites as his advice will be more didactic and instruct him for a better rule. Moreover, the Earl of Northumberland expresses how Richard abuses his power and makes unjust practices as he "has handed power to his favourites" (Devlin 69) when he says:

Now afore God 'tis shame such wrongs are borne
In him, a royal prince, and many mo
Of noble blood in this declining land;
The king is not himself, but basely led
By flatterers; and what they will inform,
Merely in hate, 'gainst any of us all,
That will the king severely prosecute
'Gainst us, our lives, our children, and our heirs. (II.i.238-245)

Hence, Richard does not manage the affairs of state according to his own decisions but to those of the flatterers who deceitfully advise him. He, himself, does not sit in judgement, but allows the evil courtiers to be involved in the management. The social unrest starts as these parasites lead the king to penalize the noble lords and their families harshly. In other words, Richard does not consider the welfare of the people; instead, he acts like a tyrant and punishes them severely and unjustly by the evil counsel of "a thousand flatterers" (II.i.99). Moreover, Richard not only abuses power as "his ear is

stopp'd with other flattering sounds" (II.i.17), but he also makes wrong decisions in military matters. He leaves England for the Irish wars at a very critical time while Bolingbroke wins the support of powerful lords to rebel in France. Northumberland expresses how the rebels have taken the opportunity of Richard's absence and waited Richard to leave for Ireland to return and start a revolt as follows:

With eight tall ships, three thousand men of war,
Are making hither with all due expedience,
And shortly mean to touch our northern shore.
Perhaps they had ere this, but that they stay
The first departing of the king for Ireland. (II.i.286-290)

These lines clearly demonstrate that Bolingbroke and his supporters wait for Richard's departure to return to England as they know that while the king is away with his forces, their advance will be easier. In a sense, they use Richard's leave to their own advantage as Bolingbroke gets strong and raises an army to oppose Richard while he is in Ireland. In this respect, as Bevan has stated, "at this moment so pregnant with danger, Richard would have been well advised to postpone his expedition to Ireland" (141). However, Greene assures Richard on the urgency of the Irish expedition and emphasizes that Bolingbroke can no longer endanger Richard's kingship during his absence as Bolingbroke has already left England:

Well, he is gone; and with him go these thoughts.
Now for the rebels which stand out in Ireland,
Expedient manage must be made, my liege,
Ere further leisure yield them further means
For their advantage and your Highness' loss. (I.iv.37-41)

As indicated in these lines, Richard is convinced that the fear of Bolingbroke's usurpation of the throne by the public consent disappears when Bolingbroke goes into exile. He ignores the possibility of Bolingbroke's coming back and seeking justice and his rights against his illegal practices ruining the title of Lancaster. So, Greene's words lead Richard to make a crucial mistake in his departure for Ireland as it deprives the country of strong monarchy at just the time when it is most needed. His going away from England in the face of such a serious rebellion leaves his kingship defenceless. While he is away in Ireland, Bolingbroke and other rebellious lords return to England.

York emphasizes the threat posed by Bolingbroke and his supporters and Richard's wrong decision to leave England as he says:

Should I do so, I should belie my thoughts;
 Comfort's in heaven, and we are on the earth,
 Where nothing lives but crosses, cares, and grief.
 Your husband, he is gone to save far off,
 Whilst others come to make him lose at home. (II.ii.77-81)

Richard's going to Ireland leaves England vulnerable to the attacks of the rebels and throws the country into the chaos of rebellion. Richard aims to secure distant places; however, meanwhile, he neglects the threat in his own kingdom. Hence, Richard's failure to foresee the threat posed by Bolingbroke and departure from England, ignoring the danger at home, pave the way for Bolingbroke's rebellion gathering wide support and hasten his own fall. He gives an opportunity to the rioters to get strong and return England without running into a solid resistance. The powerful lords, who have once supported Richard as the legitimate king of England, change sides and support Bolingbroke, who is right in his rebellion and embodies the attributes of an ideal nation builder as a strong, determined and respected leader. In this sense, Greene emphasizes that the former allies of Richard side with Bolingbroke and Richard loses his power as a nation builder as follows:

Ah, madam, 'tis too true; and that is worse,
 The Lord Northumberland, his son young Henry Percy,
 The Lord of Ross, Beaumont, and Willoughby,
 With all their powerful friends, are fled to him. (II.ii.53-56)

Therefore, it can be clearly seen that Richard not only has a strong enemy during his absence, but he also loses his military potential to suppress Bolingbroke when he returns to England as he loses all his powerful followers. In this absence, Bolingbroke, who is appreciated by the public, gains strength and support of the noblemen and appears as the hope of the English nation to end the corrupted rule, which has destroyed the country and made the people suffer.

In the light of these developments, the effects of Richard's follies on both his monarchy and the English nation are severe, and the downfall of his kingship is inevitable. Gaunt's speech at his deathbed is crucial to display the consequences of Richard's

misgovernance and abuse of his royal power. As Ronald Draper has suggested, “Richard is like a tragic protagonist whose conduct contributes to his own downfall, though at this point he is unaware of his culpability, and the function of Gaunt is to let him, and the audience, know his true condition” (87). Gaunt functions as the Chorus and informs both the spectators, who start to make a harsh response to Richard’s inequalities, and Richard himself, who is unconscious of his loss of power as a nation builder, on how England, the glorious country with an honourable nation, heads to disaster.

Gaunt criticizes Richard’s violation of monetary customs of England. As Pearlman has pointed out, Richard’s practice “is based not on traditional [...] customary procedures but on practical and perhaps impious legalistic and monetary rules” (76). He not only violates the feudal customs or law of inheritance, but also breaches the regular economic practices by illegal means of raising money from his subjects. Gaunt presents how England, “This land of such dear souls, this dear dear land, / [...] Is now leas’d out [...] / Like to a tenement or pelling farm” (II.i.57-60) as the king turns out to be an oppressive “[l]andlord of England” (II.i.113), and the sceptered isle, “[t]his other Eden” (II.i.42) becomes an ordinary tenement as if she were a piece of private property. In this respect, Gaunt makes reference to Richard’s selling of the royal revenues to private individuals as Northumberland says: “[...] basely yielded upon compromise / That which his ancestors achiev’d with blows” (II.i.253-255). Gaunt further depicts the basic change in the monetary conditions in England as follows:

England, bound in with the triumphant sea,
Whose rocky shore beats back the envious siege
Of wat’ry Neptune, is now bound in with shame,
With inky blots, and rotten parchment bonds (II.i.61-64)

Shakespeare, here, refers to the defeat of the Spanish Armada, which is a great naval victory and makes England a world power, as he exalts the sea surrounding England and protecting her from any foreign attacks as victorious. However, Gaunt expresses that England, which is a nation invincible by military means, is defeated and humiliated by debts. The beautiful, fertile and divinely favoured country of England has been rented out. Therefore, Gaunt explicitly states that Richard sees England as a type of property, a

means of income and himself as the owner. In this regard, he disregards the customary obligations and his duties to his subjects and fails to maintain unity.

While Gaunt comments on Richard's illegal practices, he also praises England as the part of the feudal and Christian world and evokes her military power and grandeur in patriotic terms. In other words, Gaunt's speech on the greatness of England is a stirring declaration of the English patriotism. As Campbell has stated, he makes "the most eloquent of the patriotic speeches in the history plays" (198):

This royal throne of kings, this scept' red isle,
This earth of majesty, this seat of Mars,
This other Eden, demi-paradise;
This fortress built by Nature for herself
Against infection and the hand of war,
This happy breed of men, this little world,
This precious stone set in the silver sea,
Which serves it in the office of a wall,
Or as a moat defensive to a house,
Against the envy of less happier lands;
This blessed plot, this earth, this realm, this England,
This nurse, this teeming womb of royal kings,
Fear'd by their breed, and famous by their birth,
Renowned for their deeds as far from home (II. i.40-55)

In Gaunt's great poetical oration, Shakespeare praises England and makes allusions to the upsurge of patriotism in England in the post-Armada period. The English defeated Spain, one of the major powers of Europe in the sixteenth century, with solidarity of the whole nation regardless of class differences and under the rule of their glorious queen, Elizabeth I, who aroused national and patriotic senses in the people. Hence, Gaunt functions as Shakespeare's spokesman in the play and emphasizes the distinctive character of England along with the harmony among the English people. He suggests an organic and natural unity in the country as he compares the nation to a fertile land. The ideal of kingship is also emphasized as it is based on an organic and integrated relationship between the king, the land and the people. Gaunt expresses that such an organic unity has been achieved by the previous kings, who have won glorious victories on foreign lands and been praised by their courage throughout the centuries. He also emphasizes that England cannot be easily invaded and is protected from any kinds of evil things, which may come from Europe, such as diseases, as she is surrounded by sea

and separated from the rest of the world. Hence, England is presented to be a safe country where all the English people, who have an inherited nobility regardless of their classes, live in peace and quiet. Thus, Shakespeare, in these lines, puts forth the cult of England in the most eloquent way and presents her as a great country with magnificence.

In this sense, Gaunt's words, "this scept'red isle", "[t]his earth of majesty" (II.i.40-41) and "[t]his fortress built by Nature" (II.i.43) glorify England and present the atmosphere of patriotism in the country after the defeat of the most powerful armada of the century though "in size and number of fighting units the two fleets were not very unevenly matched" (Neale 277). In other words, while the Spanish Armada was more powerful than the English navy in magnitude and weaponry, the English defeated Spain by the help of fierce weather conditions, that is divine help. In this sense, the divine sanction of the English victory over Spain was an important aspect which increased the patriotic senses. The idea of divine support to defeat the enemy, which is abused by Richard in his struggle with Bolingbroke, is effectively used by the English people to arouse Englishness and patriotic feelings during the defeat of the Spanish Armada. The English soldiers take pride in divine help and consider themselves as sacred people after they get ready for the war despite their poor conditions. Therefore, they do not rely on God for victory by blind devotion, but they derive benefit from the means God provides and uses the divine intervention to increase the sense of Englishness, so the power and courage to fight while they struggle against Spain by all the military opportunities they have. The English people believed that God favoured them and "in the shape of the winds, blew and the Spaniards were dispersed" (Neale 282). In other words, the providential support enabled the English fleet to establish mastery over the powerful Spanish Armada. J.E. Neale describes England's victory over Spain by the aid of divine will as follows:

As it was, with severe casualties, their ships badly injured by gunfire, and short of water and stores, they fled North before the wind and tried to make Spain by sailing round the North of Scotland and the west of Ireland. Many were wracked; most of the men who escaped drowning, slaughtered. Scarcely half of the great Armada ever got back to Spain. Not a cock-boat of the English had been taken. (278)

Therefore, most Spanish ships were damaged not by the arms of England, but by the help of blow which drifted them to other coasts. The crew of most of the ships died by drowning and the rest, who survived, were killed by the English soldiers as they lost their weapons when their ships sank. The English navy did not confront most of the Spanish vessels as they never reached England. In his speech, Gaunt emphasizes the idea that “this earth of majesty”, famous for its heroic ancestors, is protected by divine will in a severe war against Spain, although it is not expected to win the war. He points to the divine intervention when he expresses that the forces of nature guard England as the silver sea “serves it in the office of a wall / Or as a moat defensive to a house,” (II.i.47-48). The sea surrounding England does not allow the enemies to advance and attack the sacred country. Accordingly, in the play, Shakespeare uses Gaunt as the voice of reason, wisdom and especially patriotism.

Gaunt also displays how splendour has turned into corruption under Richard’s misgovernance as he “pictures the potential of England and its present decline” (Page 42) in his patriotic rhetoric. Shakespeare makes an analogy with his time and presents England as a supreme country which achieves to defeat the most powerful nations of the century in Gaunt’s speech; however, he also demonstrates how she weakens under the corrupted rule of a bad ruler. In this sense, as Diana Devlin has also pointed out, while praising England with patriotic feelings,

John of Gaunt is here lamenting its downfall under Richard. He paints a glorious picture only to tell his listeners how besmirched it is. The appropriate response is a contradictory one, pride and shame being equally mixed. (65)

With these lines, Gaunt mourns for England’s ruin by Richard’s unjust acts such as the violation of feudal traditions, sequestration of Bolingbroke’s estates and suppression of the subjects by illegal monetary practices. As a consequence, the national unity collapses and the noble lords along with the subjects side with Bolingbroke, who rebels to cease the ongoing corruption in the country. So, Gaunt is both proud of his glorious nation and ashamed of England’s current fall. The sea is no longer ‘silver’, the plot is not ‘blessed’ and the ‘happy breed of men’ does not exist anymore. Instead, “[t]hat England, that was wont to conquer others, / Hath made a shameful conquest of itself” (II.i.65-66) under Richard’s misgovernance. In other words, the idealized and fertile

England, “other Eden, demi-paradise” (II.i.42) is already in the past, and as Graham Holderness has stated, “its violence now turned self-destructively inwards” (186). England, as Shakespeare glorifies by patriotic feelings, is the land of heroic kings, fights on foreign lands and defeats the major power of Europe; however, she is ruined by an unjust administration of a weak king. In this respect, as an old statesman with impeccable wisdom, Gaunt presents how Richard has been unsuccessful in nation building and with an inspired prophetic vision, he predicts his downfall and pronounces that the corruption the legitimate king has caused in England will not last long as follows:

Methinks I am a prophet new-inspir'd,
And thus, expiring, do foretell of him:
His rash fierce blaze of riot cannot last.
For violent fires soon burn out themselves;
Small showers last long, but sudden storms are short;
He tires betimes that spurs too fast betimes;
With eager feeding food doth choke the feeder;
Light vanity, insatiate cormorant,
Consuming means, soon preys upon itself. (II.i.31-39)

These lines clearly demonstrate that when he envisages Richard's deposition, he also declares that he still has hope for reform and implicates Bolingbroke's rise as a more effective nation builder. For Gaunt, the disorder Richard has created in England will not remain long as his ruthless acts will result in his own destruction and Bolingbroke, who gets ready patiently and resolutely in exile to return to England and seek his rights, will maintain national unity and justice.

One might argue that Richard's political inefficiency and violation of the established norms of monarchy ruin his own life and the peace of the country. With him, the hereditary monarchy is subverted. As Spiekerman has queried, “If hereditary monarchy cannot produce either good government or stable government, then, Shakespeare seems to ask in this play, why hereditary monarchy?” (89). Shakespeare himself answers the question by presenting the rise of Bolingbroke as a new, powerful and determined monarch, as an efficient nation builder, superior to the legitimate but weak king Richard II. His usurpation of power hardly complies with the law, yet the illegitimacy of his act of usurpation no longer needs to be questioned. In other words, an illegitimate but

efficient king is preferred to a legitimate but weak monarch. Despite his legitimacy, Richard makes the nation suffer; whereas, the usurper Bolingbroke ends the unjust practices. In this sense, though illegitimate, Bolingbroke rises as the monarch who is expected to accomplish “the restoration of things as they were and should be” (Jones, *These* 72). In other words, as opposed to Richard, Bolingbroke will follow the feudal traditions and regard the laws of England. The point is stressed metaphorically by Northumberland: “[...] even through the hollow eyes of death / I spy life peering [...]” (II.i.270-271). Despite all the sufferings of grievances under Richard’s rule, Bolingbroke represents the glimmer of hope for the English people for a more righteous administer where the laws are executed and the subjects are not suppressed by tyrannical attitudes.

But, though Bolingbroke becomes the representative of the new political order as an illegitimate king, he never abuses and violates the traditional ideals of monarchy and feudalism such as the hereditary succession and divine right to rule, which constitute the basis of the English nation building. Though he succeeds to the throne through an armed revolt, he emphasizes the significance of the hereditary monarch as he leaves the throne to his son, Prince Hal in *Henry IV 2*: “[...] for what in me was purchas’d, / Falls upon thee in a more fairer sort; / So thou the garland wear’st successively” (IV.v.199-201). Prince Hal, who becomes King Henry V, takes the throne by succession as the legitimate heir after Bolingbroke dies. For Bolingbroke, the tradition of the monarch’s divine right is also essential: “In God’s name, I’ll ascend the regal throne” (IV.i.113). Bolingbroke expresses that he accedes to the throne as God’s deputy and, during his reign, accepts to use the power derived from God. York further emphasizes that Bolingbroke has the favour of Providence as he says: “But heaven hath a hand in these events, / To whose high will we bound our calm contents” (V.ii.37-38). As it is implicated in these lines, Bolingbroke is elected by God as a more able nation builder than Richard to sustain the national unity and correct all the wrongful practices such as violation of laws and justice by Richard, an arrogant king who abuses his absolute power and divine right to rule in order to establish an autocratic rule. Hence, Bolingbroke is presented, contrary to Richard’s absolutist authority, as the embodiment of traditional feudal principles and as an ideal nation builder. In this respect, Pearlman

points out that Shakespeare develops the action by “making the legitimate king [Richard II] the exemplar of a changed and corrupted world, while at the same time allowing the potential usurper, Bolingbroke, to embody traditional feudal principles” (76). Though Bolingbroke is strongly opposed to Richard’s lawlessness, as Richard’s vassal, he still maintains the traditional customs and shows his loyalty to Richard. In other words, as Bevan has pointed out, “in all fairness to Henry of Lancaster, he show[s] Richard all possible respect” (156). He presents the ritual ceremonies of respect and shows his loyalty by kneeling down and kissing his hand as he says:

Henry Bolingbroke
On both his knees doth kiss King Richard’s hand,
And sends allegiance and true faith of heart
To his most royal person [...]. (III.iii.35-38)

In these lines, he emphasizes Richard’s kingly character and implies that he deserves regard as he represents the institution of royalty despite his despotic rule during his reign. He wants all the courtiers to pay tribute to Richard: “Stand all apart, / And show fair loyalty to his Majesty” (III.iii.186-187). In this sense, for Bolingbroke, Richard’s grandeur as the legitimate king of England should be esteemed by all the lords. Bolingbroke also upholds the law of inheritance, contrary to Richard, as he does not aim to confiscate the banished Mowbary’s possessions when he returns from the exile. He displays that he does not see Aumerle as a threat for his kingship and he is very confident of his just and egalitarian rule as the king of England as he says: “And, though mine enemy, restor’d again / To all his lands and signories: when he is return’d” (IV.i.88-90). Though Mowbray is Bolingbroke’s adversary, he treats him fair by planning to return his estates and title when he comes back to England and displays his regards for the law of inheritance.

In this respect, Bolingbroke, contrary to Richard, achieves to exercise justice among his subjects. He acts as God’s deputy and adjudicates the quarrel between Aumerle and Bagot on the murder of Gloucester. The two lords accuse each other of taking part in the murder of Gloucester and Bolingbroke, just like Richard in the beginning of the play, stands as the judicial power to find out the rightful party. In this respect, as Campbell has pointed out, this scene “clearly intended to act as a foil to the first scene of the play,

in which Richard presides over the quarrel between Bolingbroke and Mowbray” (205) and fails to provide justice. However, Bolingbroke first maintains justice as he permits all the lords to declare their accusations. He allows Bagot to raise the charges against Aumerle when he says:

Now, Bagot, freely speak thy mind-
What thou dost know of noble Gloucester's death,
Who wrought it with the king, and who perform'd
The bloody office of his timeless end. (IV.i.2-5)

As indicated in these lines, Bolingbroke wants Bagot to reveal everything he knows about Gloucester's death so that he can listen to the two sides equally and maintain justice by deciding on the just side. But, as Mowbray, one of the parties of the accusations, is not present at the time of the quarrel, Bolingbroke postpones his decision to be objective and making a fair decision as he says: “These differences shall all rest under gage / Till Norfolk be repeal'd [...]” (IV.i.86-87). Hence, Bolingbroke wants to exercise justice after he hears how Mowbray will defend himself against the accusations, and he does not try to reconcile the resentful lords or let them solve the problem by force, but he wants to hear the charges of the two sides to decide on the righteous.

While Bolingbroke becomes the representative of the English feudal codes, he also represents the politically powerful English state. As Spiekerman has pointed out, “Bolingbroke shows himself superior to the inept and tyrannical Richard” (89) as a nation builder with his political talent. Power, determination and popularity among the people are the political virtues which Richard lacks as a nation-builder, but Bolingbroke embodies all these qualities. Robert Ornstein has asserted that “there is no doubt of Henry's political qualities- he is strong, determined, shrewd, and ruthless, not particularly attractive but eminently capable” (122). He is portrayed not only as a honourable warrior, who has the potential to lead his nation to great victories, but also as a perfect politician, who is supported by the public due to his power and perseverance. His political attitude does not suppress the English people, but elevates them by good practices. In this respect, Northumberland supports the idea that Henry “is [...] the true king” (Ornstein 124) when he calls the nobles to meet Bolingbroke, the saviour of the nation, in Ravenspurgh:

If then we shall shake off our slavish yoke,
 Imp out our drooping country's broken wing,
 Reedem from broking pawn the blemish'd crown,
 Wipe off the dust that hides our sceptre's gilt,
 And make high majesty look like itself,
 Away with me in post to Ravenspurgh; (II.i.291-296)

It is strongly asserted in these lines that Bolingbroke is seen as the leader who will end the captivity of the subjects under the despotic practices and execute laws and customs by a just rule. Northumberland portrays Richard as a moneymonger who exploits people by collecting unconstitutional taxes and indebts England as he spends the national wealth for pleasure and distributes the estates of the noble lords, which he forcefully confiscates, to his flatterers. However, it is asserted that, by his decent administration, Bolingbroke will earn the crown the glory it has lost under Richard's misgovernance.

Bolingbroke displays his power and determination in judgement in his challenge to Mowbray in the first scene of the play. The two lords confront each other to defend their honour against accusations as has been discussed in the beginning of this chapter in details. He struggles and does not give up his rightful cause against all the charges brought by Mowbray. Mowbray insults Bolingbroke and calls him "a slanderous coward, and a villain" (I.i.61). He accuses him of being unfaithful to God and to the king as the Second Herald proclaims his accusations:

Here standeth Thomas Mowbray, Duke of Norfolk,
 On pain to be found false and recreant,
 Both to defend himself, and to prove
 Henry of Hereford, Lancaster, and Derby,
 To God, his sovereign, and to him disloyal,
 Courageously, and with a free desire,
 Attending but the signal to begin. (I.iii.110-116)

Yet, depending on the validity of his claims, Bolingbroke feels enormously self-confident and challenges Mowbray as he says: "As confident as is the falcon's flight / Against a bird, do I with Mowbray fight" (I.iii.61-62). Bolingbroke expresses that he is more powerful than Mowbray, which gives him a great self-confidence in the quarrel set to find out the rightful party. He is also so determined and valiant that he even dares to

die in a single combat to defend his honour and prove the validity of his accusations of treason to Mowbray. In other words, he displays his power and courage to defeat his opponent as a heroic leader and fight for his righteousness case.

Bolingbroke is also strong in character and is in firm control of the situation. Instead of making long sentences loaded with artistic expressions and rich in emotions like Richard, he speaks in brief, direct and decisive sentences. As Dowden has stated, Bolingbroke does not “ever unpack his heart with words [...] his words are right and efficient without aiming” (254). In other words, Bolingbroke is a man of action, a politician with clear objectives, and a statesman for strategies. In the deposition scene, while Richard expresses his grief on the loss of his crown with elaborate expressions as: “My crown I am, but still my griefs are mine: / You may my glories and my state depose, / But not my griefs; still am I king of those” (IV.i.191-193), Bolingbroke’s calm and firm attitude represents his resolution and pragmatism: “I thought you had been willing to resign” (IV.i.190). Richard decorates his words with a mournful sentimentality and associates his kingship to his sorrows and implies that even if his throne is taken, the kingship of his woes will last. However, as he is too much indulged in senses and decorated statements, he falls short of reality and does not take action in political affairs as an effective nation builder. On the other hand, Bolingbroke does not waste time in expressing his emotions in a highly ornate tone, but as a sensible nation builder, he focuses on his political aims such as ascending to the throne with determinism or establishing a just and good administration. Hence, it may be argued that, as nation builders, Richard and Bolingbroke belong to different orders. While Richard belongs to the old order “where the means, the style, the embroidery matter more than what they further or express”, Bolingbroke “belongs to a new order, where action is quick and leads somewhere” (Tillyard 263). Richard deals with only the ostentation of the words but not the action the words lead him to take, so he fails to protect his throne, and abdicates it to Bolingbroke willingly. Oppositely, Bolingbroke attends to the political situation itself rather than the way of expressing it and takes the necessary steps to achieve his aim in time such as returning to England during Richard’s absence in Ireland and deposing Richard by gaining affection of the public and support of the powerful lords.

The scene of the gardeners is one of the most significant and symbolic scenes in order to emphasize the greatness of England and “ideas of the proper management of a realm” (Moseley 100) in *Richard II*. The gardeners criticize Richard’s careless administration of his kingdom and describes the consequences of his failure in being an efficient nation builder. Diana Devin argues that “this scene is one of the most extended, graphic similes in all Shakespeare’s works, and since it too is about the image of England and of earth, it bears comparison with Gaunt’s speech” (67). In this extended metaphor of England, the country is identified with soil, which the gardeners cultivate, and the principles of an effectual rule of a country are discussed in terms of managing a garden. As in Gaunt’s speech, the sense of shame out of the recent deterioration of England under Richard’s administration is also presented in the conversation between the two gardeners. Though the gardeners are lower class people, they are not portrayed as ordinary gardeners. As Pearlman has pointed out, “they do not jibe or jest, they do not quibble, and they do not give way to foolery... the gardeners speak like no gardeners who have ever dwelt on the face of the earth; they discuss the political situation in England” (81). They handle the political chaos in the country and the violation of the national unity by Richard’s absolute rule and unjust practices with a highly serious tone. They argue the desperate political situation in England not as fools, joking and satirizing, but sensible subjects who are aware of the corruption in the country and the ways to improve it. The two gardeners compare their roles to that of a ruler in the sense that they should support and trim the growing plants and uproot the weeds which harm the other plants in the garden as the king should be legal, just and avoid the flatterers in his country:

Give some supportance to the bending twigs.
Go thou, and like an executioner
Cut off the heads of too-fast-growing sprays,
That look too lofty in our commonwealth:
All must be even in our government.
You thus employed, I will go root away
The noisome weeds, that without profit suck
The soil’s fertility from wholesome flowers. (III.iv.32-39)

With these lines, the gardeners emphasize the importance of the king’s exercise of justice when they state that all the branches in the garden should be equal. In other

words, the king should not suppress the noble lords by unwarranted charges and empower the flatterers to make them closely involved in the management. An effective nation builder promotes the noble lords instead of punishing them unjustly while eliminating the flatterers, who lead the king to evil acts and the nation to corruption, from the court. Hence, the gardeners describe the qualities of an ideal monarch and an effective nation builder in their conversation. They emphasize the means of a proper government which maintains the national unity and justice. In this sense, they establish their garden as a similitude of the contemporary English kingdom and comment on Richard's misgovernance. They liken Richard to a bad gardener whose kingdom

[i]s full of weeds; her fairest flowers chok'd up,
 Her fruit-trees all unprun'd, her hedges ruin'd,
 Her knots disordered, and her wholesome herbs
 Swarming with caterpillars? (III.iv.44-47)

In these lines, the gardeners present the current disorder in England out of Richard's indifference to laws and customs when they point to the destruction in the garden out of lack of good care. Richard neglects his commonwealth and lets it go to ruin. Due to the lack of an effective nation builder, the country is left to the hands of the flatterers whose only concern is to rise to wealth by illegal seizures of the subjects' estates. In this sense, the gardeners clearly emphasize that Richard has "showed no sense of good management. He has not been a good gardener" (Potter 27). As indicated in these lines, Richard has proved to be an ineffectual nation builder as he has lost the love and respect of his subjects by his autocratic rule. He has led his nation to corruption rather than illustrious victories over powerful foreign enemies. In a sense, he himself becomes the foe of England and destroys her not by potent arms but by his disregard of his subjects and laws of the country. They also stress that Richard's unjust practices have urged Bolingbroke to rise as a more able nation builder. The Gardener describes Richard's follies, which have led him to fall, and Bolingbroke's rightful rebellion as follows:

They are; and Bolingbroke
 Hath seiz'd the wasteful king.-O, what pity is it
 That he had not so trimm'd and dress'd his land
 As we in this garden! We at time of year
 Do wound the bark, the skin of our fruit-trees,
 Lest, being over-proud in sap and blood,

With too much riches it confound itself;
 Had he done so to great and growing men,
 They may have liv'd to bear, and he to taste
 Their fruits of duty. Superfluous branches
 We lop away, that bearing boughs may live;
 Had he done so, himself had borne the crown,
 Which waste of idle hours hath quite thrown down. (III.iv.54-66)

These lines clearly demonstrate that Richard fails to support the noble lords such as Bolingbroke, Northumberland, Ross and Willoughby as he persecutes them by heavy taxes, unfair punishments and threatening their families. Consequently, he loses their loyalty, which leaves him powerless and brings forth his deposition. The gardeners emphasize that Richard's main fault is to overvalue the ill advice of the flatterers who are both inexperienced in state affairs and act as evil fortune hunters. As they easily influence Richard, they play a major role in the banishment of the noble lords, violation of justice and laws. Hence, the gardeners criticize Richard as a nation builder, because he leaves the country to the plunder of the base courtiers and fails to care about England. They pronounce that England, just as a garden, must be tended by the king to assure that it functions properly. As Spiekerman has pointed out, Richard falls "to a simple [...] ignorance of political science" (85) and neglects laws and exercise of justice as he abuses his power by an excessive arrogance as he believes that he derives his supreme authority from his legitimate title and divine right to rule. Thus, this political allegory of England as a cultivated garden refers that "had Richard attended to affairs and lopped away overproud and superfluous branches, the kingdom of England would not be endangered and the king would not find himself in the 'mighty hold of Bolingbroke'" (Pearlman 82). This scene presents the main idea of the play, that is, Richard is deposed as he fails to exercise justice and maintain the national unity as a strong and determined king and leads a corrupted rule. It also demonstrates the grief of the subjects on the deterioration of England due to Richard's unfair practices and negligence of the country.

The gardeners end their symbolic speech by weighting the fortunes of Richard and Bolingbroke as nation builders. By this comparison, they not only display the suitability of both leaders to be an effective nation builder, but they also conclude that Bolingbroke deserves the English throne more than Richard by his powerful, decisive and

courageous character despite his illegitimate title. In this sense, they compare both rulers and express how Bolingbroke gets stronger by the support of the whole English nation while Richard falls due to his follies:

[...] Their fortunes both are weigh'd:
 In your lord's scale is nothing but himself,
 And some few vanities that make him light.
 But in the balance of great Bolingbroke,
 Besides himself, are all the English peers,
 And with that odds he weighs King Richard down. (III.iv.84-89)

As indicated in these lines, when Richard and Bolingbroke are compared at the end of the play, it is seen that Richard is completely alone without any loyal supporters and destined to a tragic fall due to his errors; whereas, Bolingbroke rises as an ideal nation builder by the love and respect of the whole nation. It is asserted that Richard has wasted his legitimate and divinely sanctioned right to rule by his tyrannical administration, but Bolingbroke takes the advantage of Richard's follies and takes the throne as the new monarch by his power, determination and admiration of the English people.

In conclusion, one may argue that Shakespeare's *Richard II* displays in the person of Bolingbroke the characteristics of an ideal monarch and effective nation builder. Richard, the former king, and Bolingbroke, the succeeding sovereign, are compared and the principles of nation building and the attributes of a perfect nation builder are demonstrated. Richard loses his throne as he fails to sit in judgement as a strong king and exercise justice. His weakness leads him to make errors of judgement and he establishes a tyrannical rule where he abuses his royal power and oppresses his subjects by his unjust and despotic practices. In this regard, he places his own will over the will of law. He is more interested in the fashions of the world rather than the politics of his country. His grievous and unconstitutional taxation of the people arouses unrest among the noblemen and the common men. His mortgage of England by debts degrades the national honour of the country. As a consequence, the most loyal lords such as John of Gaunt and Duke of York put aside Richard's legitimate and divine right to rule and begin to question his practices, which eventually drive them to Bolingbroke's side. In a sense, Richard wastes his rightful authority to rule and cannot fulfil his duties to his

subjects as a weak and self-absorbed king. The common men, just like the noblemen, oppose Richard's inequalities and present their choice of the ideal nation builder as they treat Bolingbroke with esteem and love while they offend Richard. Their admiration for Bolingbroke shows that they see him as the national saviour and the power to end Richard's despotic rule, which fears Richard and leads him to send Bolingbroke to a perpetual exile. In the play, the theory of divine right to rule is presented as a major cause of Richard's follies. As he is so devotedly believes that he is a divinely sanctioned king and represents God's will on earth, he considers any attempt of disobedience to his rule as a sin. His excessive reliance on God also enables him to legalize his tyrannical and unjust practices.

On the other hand, Bolingbroke is presented as an excellent nation builder who regards laws, exercises justice as a strong and determined king and maintains the national unity as he attracts the respect and affection of the whole nation. He is supported by both the common men and the powerful lords in his righteous rebellion. He asserts that he has returned to England from exile to claim his inheritance which is unfairly confiscated by Richard, but he also aims to end the corrupted rule, which has ruined the country. Bolingbroke achieves to sit in judgement as he is a pragmatic politician and a man of action; that is why, he acts by his reason and avoids any wrong judgements. While he upholds the divine right theory, he does not blindly depend on merely God during his administration. He both respects the traditional ideas of rule such as the legitimacy and divinity and presents the characteristics of a determined and powerful king who establishes a politically powerful kingdom. In this sense, Shakespeare asks in this play political questions such as whether a king might be deposed for any reason and what a virtuous nation should do when confronts a tyrannical ruler who abuses his royal power and violates laws. What he presents by the end of the play is that a weak monarch should be replaced by a strong nation builder to maintain the national welfare as Bolingbroke deposes Richard and ascends to the throne as king Henry IV. The use of power and exercise of justice are extensively discussed and the necessity of a strong nation builder for an efficient administration is emphasized in the play. In this respect, Shakespeare also makes allusions to his time in the play and refers to Elizabeth's application of authority to establish a strong rule during her reign. He glorifies England

and makes references to the defeat of the Spanish Armada through John of Gaunt's speeches and displays what happens when such a great country is misgoverned and ruined under unfair practices. He also warns the audience and the monarch of his time of the dangers arising from the king's abuse of power due to weakness or wish to have authoritarian rule and blind dependence on divine right to rule.

CHAPTER II

HENRY V: THE HEROIC SELF AND THE PATRIOTIC RHETORIC

Shakespeare's *Henry V* deals with the period of the Hundred Years' War which encompasses King Henry V's reign between 1387 and 1422. The period begins with the landing of English troops in 1415 near Harfleur and ends with the English victory at Agincourt and the Treaty of Troyes in 1420. In the play, Henry's declaration of war on France by a just claim to the French throne and his leading the English nation to the glorious victories of Harfleur and Agincourt as a model hero king are presented. Indeed, as Theodor Meron has emphasized, "*The Life of Henry*, written in 1599, one of Shakespeare's histories, is a patriotic, epic portrayal of a phase in the bloody Hundred Years' War between England and France. It describes a medieval campaign led by a chivalrous and virtuous king" (1). The play depicts the valiant struggle of the English nation against France in the Hundred Years' War, which was fought between 1337 and 1453, under the leadership of a honourable and efficient monarch based on the chronicles by Raphael Holinshed and Edward Hall.

In the play, King Henry V, Henry IV's son, is presented as an ideal and heroic king, and the unity of a nation regardless of class differences is displayed. Henry goes through a miraculous transformation at the end of Shakespeare's *Henry IV* and turns into a courageous and powerful ruler from a rascal wasting his time at Eastcheap with his wanton friends. He achieves to maintain the national unity by his heroic self and personally leads the English nation to great victories. He encourages his soldiers, who are weak and outnumbered when compared to the French soldiers, by his patriotic rhetorics at the Battles of Harfleur and Agincourt. The historical accounts of Henry's achievements as a powerful monarch not only served as a mirror to Henry VIII, but also provided the Elizabethans with a perfect model of ideal monarch. So, in his portrayal of Henry V, Shakespeare must have made a historical analogy for Elizabeth and, thus, re-emphasized the tradition of ideal monarch (Campbell 262). Henry V is a strong king, who is adored by his followers just like Queen Elizabeth and leads the whole nation in unity to a savage war by his individual charisma. He also rules the battles personally as

Elizabeth did at Tilbury in 1588, and, hence, maintains the national unity not only by integrating the different social classes in the society, but also by effacing the distinction between the monarch and the subjects. In this respect, as Robert Pierce has pointed out, “in *Henry V* Shakespeare undertakes to set forth an orderly state under an ideal king and to show that state conquering a mighty rival by the sheer impact of its virtue” (254). In the play, it is demonstrated that Henry, as a perfect sovereign, brings harmony to England, and the English people defeat the puissant French not by potent arms, but by their inner strength and faith to defend their nation against a foreign enemy. So, the historical and political point emphasized in *Henry V* is that England united under the leadership of a heroic and patriotic monarch can never be defeated by his enemies.

It is for sure that the implied reference in the play is to Elizabeth’s England that, nationally united and defended, defeated Spain and emerged as a significant power in the European politics. Thus, the major aim of this chapter is to show how Henry V, the prodigal Prince Hal in *Henry IV*, turns out to be an ideal and mature ruler as the legitimate and divinely sanctioned king of England after his father’s death and leads the English nation to great triumphs by his heroic self. The national unity is sustained in the play as the whole nation, both the commoners and the nobility, fight together without any class divisions under Henry’s heroic leadership. Henry’s egalitarian leadership eliminates the distance between the monarchy and the nation as he achieves to earn the English people’s respect and devotion by his humility. It is displayed that not only Henry, but also his soldiers embody a heroic and courageous self in a righteous war against France. The noble and the common soldiers’ gallant struggle against the foreign enemy in the unity of purpose displays their valiant self. It is also presented that the sense of Englishness is aroused in the play through the patriotic rhetorics of Henry V and the Chorus. Henry encourages his soldiers, who are weaker than the French, to imitate their ancestors and expose their inherited prowess to defeat France. Shakespeare uses the Chorus as his spokesman and makes the Elizabethan audience part of the ongoing war on the stage and rises the national and patriotic senses as he visualizes the great battles in their minds by the patriotic rhetoric of the Chorus. In this chapter, the contrasting orations of the English and French kings and the Constable of France will

also be demonstrated to put forth the different attitudes of Henry V and the French king along with the French nobility towards their soldiers.

Shakespeare interprets the issues of his time by referring to the heroic deeds of a fifteenth century monarch, Henry V, in the play. The idea of war and the ideal ruler, who unites the whole nation under his inspiring leadership, in the Elizabethan England are presented as Henry's courage and chivalry in the glorious Battles of Harfleur and Agincourt are demonstrated. Shakespeare's *Henry V* is not only a historical play, but also has political connotations on the philosophy of war and the concept of perfect monarch.

The Elizabethan period was mostly a time of peace as there were no wars fought in England with the other countries. However, the English fought on foreign lands such as Ireland, France and Scotland. Yet, the possibility of invasion by a foreign enemy was a longstanding fear which troubled the English nation, so Elizabeth raised both an army and a navy to confront a possible Spanish attack. The expenditures on war and the raising of the forces to fight on land and at sea demonstrate that the idea of war was a major part of the English politics throughout Elizabeth's reign (Campbell 257). Shakespeare makes a reference to the triumphal defeat of the Spanish Armada in Elizabeth's time by the presentation of Henry V's glorious victories at Harfleur and Agincourt. As Arthur F. Kinney has pointed out, "the Elizabethan Age is best remembered for the Spanish Armada and its defeat by the English off their coasts in the summer of 1588" (237). The English troops fought courageously against Spain under the valiant leadership of Elizabeth despite the weakness of their navy and defeated the most powerful armada of the Europe. The victory was so celebrated that it became the manifest of Englishness and showed the power of the English nation to the whole world. In this war, Elizabeth appeared as an excellent sovereign, who led her nation to a glorious victory by her heroic self as Henry does at the Battles of Harfleur and Agincourt. She personally commanded the English troops and spirited her soldiers by her patriotic rhetoric at Tilbury Camp on August 9, 1588 on the eve of the Spanish Armada just like Henry's nationalistic orations before Harfleur and Agincourt. As Carole Levin has stated, "[w]hen she went to Tilbury to rouse the troops, she is

described as dressed in breast plate, mounted on a charger, with Leicester on one side and the Earl of Ormond, carrying the sword of state, on the other” (143). In her speech, she pronounced that the English nation had the power and courage to defeat the most powerful countries of Europe under her heroic leadership:

I know I have the body but of a weak and feeble woman; but I have the heart and stomach of a king, and of a king of England too- and take foul scorn that Parma or any prince of Europe should dare to invade the borders of my realm. To the which rather than any dishonour shall grow by me, I myself will venter my royal blood, I myself will be your general, judge, and rewarder of any virtue in the field. I know that already for your forwardness you have deserved rewards and crowns and I assure you in the word of a prince you shall not fail of them. In the meantime, my lieutenant general shall be in my stead, than whom never prince commanded a more noble or worthy subject. Not doubting but by your concord in the camp and valour in the field and your obedience to myself and my general, we shall shortly have a famous victory over these enemies of my God and of my kingdom. (Marcus, Mueller and Rose 326)

With these lines, Elizabeth emphasized the principles of ideal kingship and stated that despite the frailties of her sex, she embodied the strength and fortitude of a king as she represented England. Her leading the army in person aroused patriotic feelings among the soldiers as the whole nation fought in harmony and unity of purpose against a foreign foe. Elizabeth also praised the English soldiers as virtuous and valuable people as they were not simple soldiers, but heroic warriors defending the national honour of England. Shakespeare also refers to the Tudor philosophy of war in Henry’s attempts to justify the war against France. According to the Tudor idea of war, justifying a particular war has utmost importance as the Tudor kings do not want to make their people suffer for unjust causes. The questions whether a Christian state might declare war on another Christian country, what should be the good cause of a bloody war and who is responsible from the consequences of a savage war are raised by the Tudor monarchs. And, as Campbell has also stated, it is concluded that if a Tudor king decides to start a war, then “the causes of war must be just, for the evils of war are great” (265). In this sense, the national interests along with the execution of justice are considered by the Tudor rulers while declaring a war upon a country.

When analyzed within this historical and political context, Shakespeare's *Henry V* presents how a heroic monarch as an accomplished orator and a courageous military leader evokes the unity of purpose and inspires his soldiers from different social classes, even from varied ethnic origins, for great victories. As Derek Traversi has pointed out, "the national unity aimed by Henry IV is finally achieved, [...], by his son" (166). The maintenance of the domestic integrity was the major interest of Henry IV, the strong nation builder Bolingbroke in *Richard II*, who usurped the throne from the legitimate King Richard II, during his regency. However, his reign was spoiled by internal and external disorders and the crisis, which started in Edward III's reign by the scandals and military defeats, the great uprising of 1381 and the spread of Lollardy, deepened. The Battle of Shrewsbury became the beginning assault of civil war as the powerful families of Percy and Mortimer revolted between 1402 and 1408. In Wales, Owen Glendower started a national uprising and the fear of French invasion reappeared, "while internally Henry IV's government looked like collapsing into insolvency and disorder" (Harriss, *Henry V* 2). Thus, it may be argued that the problem of rebellion became the chief concern of Henry IV's sovereignty. As Bolingbroke himself started a rebellion against Richard II, who was an anointed king, and did not have moral and legal right to rule, his reign as King Henry IV became the period of disquiet. But, Henry V ascended to the throne with the unification of his father's political wisdom as an ideal nation builder and Richard's legitimacy and divine power, and became the most perfect monarch ruling over England and eliminating all the domestic conflicts. His reign was a new stage in the English history and the troubles of his father's time would be forgotten.

Shakespeare's play reflects this triumphant reign of a perfect monarch, who leads his nation to glorious victories over France. In this respect, for Traversi, Henry V privileges the establishment of an order based on a devoted moral and political authority and a successful action against France (169). The people are truly committed to their strong king and unite to have a triumphant victory against the French troops. Henry uses his absolute power as an ideal king and wins the support of the English people. He emphasizes two aspects of his character while achieving his aim and shaping his heroic self; his responsibilities as a valiant king of England and his place among the commoners as an ordinary man. As Wolfgang Iser has suggested, Henry V is "the

triumphant ruler” who “embodies humanity’s potential ability to produce its own reality” (168). He not only appears as a perfect monarch who leads the whole nation to victorious wars, but he also displays that he is a strong, courageous and determined person who has the capacity to achieve his purposes. Hence, Henry’s rule is based on an active patriotic affirmation of the fact that “both aspects, the personal and the political, need to be held in a continual balance” (Traversi 171). Henry integrates his personal qualities of power, fortitude and stability with his kingship attributes and becomes the legendary monarch of England. The heroic atmosphere of the play is created by the formation of his heroic self as he rises from the vanity of his lavish youth to the political authority as a powerful king. In this respect, the first scene of the play gives us the necessary clue that the play will develop in a valiant framework by the “theme of Henry’s miraculous transformation from a dissolute prince to an accomplished monarch” (Traversi 167). Prince Hal goes through an astounding change at the end of *Henry IV*, leaves his frailties behind and develops into an effectual king. His resolute attitude to change is revealed in his challenge to Henry Hotspur Percy, who is the Earl of Northumberland’s son and rebelled against Henry IV, at the Battle of Shrewsbury. In other words, Henry first proves himself to be an excellent soldier and a ruler on the field of Shrewsbury. Though Hotspur expects to see the “nimble-footed madcap Prince of Wales” (*Henry IV 1*, IV.i.95), Henry appears as a heroic warrior ready to fight in his magnificent armour. Hotspur asks where Prince Hal and his soldiers are in a humiliating tone as follows:

[...] where is his [Henry IV’s] son,
 [.....]
 And his comrades that daft the world aside,
 And bid it pass? (IV.i.94, 96-97)

As indicated in the lines above, Hotspur underestimates the power of the English men, with whom his soldiers will confront at Shrewsbury, as they are under the leadership of an idle prince, who does not have knowledge about the art of war and statecraft. However, Hal’s heroic presence at the battlefield is admired and praised by the nobility after he challenges Hotspur to a duel. The nobility begin to consider the rascal prince as a strong and gallant future king of England. Sir Richard Vernon, who is a rebel and

supporter of Hotspur, describes the chivalrious appearance of Henry and his soldiers under his command at the battlefield when he says:

All furnish'd, all in arms;
 All plum'd like estridges that with the wind,
 Baited, like eagles having lately bath'd,
 Glittering in golden coats like images,
 As full of spirit as the month of May,
 And gorgeous as the sun at midsummer;
 Wanton as youthful goats, wild as young bulls.
 I saw young Harry with his beaver on,
 His cushes on his thighs, gallantly arm'd,
 Rise from the ground like feather'd Mercury,
 And vaulted with such ease into his seat,
 As if an angel dropp'd down from the clouds,
 To turn and wind a fiery Pegasus,
 And witch the world with noble horsemanship. (IV.i.98-110)

Hence, Henry and his fellows are considered not as frivolous people drinking and stealing at the taverns anymore, but as courageous knights in full gear determined to fight the rebellions. They are presented as valiant warriors strong enough to defeat the opponents. In Vernon's speech, Henry's heroic self in his shield mounting his horse daringly and inspiring those who follow him is emphasized. By the defeat of Hotspur in *Henry IV*, the young prince's promise to his father to be an ideal ruler and a valiant commander of the English troops is fulfilled. He also displays that he is ready to succeed him as a deserving heir. Therefore, the reformation of the young prince starts in *Henry IV* and as Dover Wilson has also stated, Shakespeare accustoms the audience to the conversion by "giving an impression of gradual development of character, the development of a kind normal in the passage from adolescence to manhood" (150). Henry presents a progressive growth from youth to adulthood in *Henry IV* and reveals the excellent image of a heroic king when he ascends to the throne in *Henry V*.

One may argue that Henry's transformation into a heroic self can be observed at the end of *Henry IV 1* and Shakespeare does not portray Henry V merely as an epic figure. He is presented also as an individual who has shortcomings and whose human side is emphasized. However, it is also demonstrated that Henry owes a great deal to the time he has spent at Eastcheap stealing and drinking as his heroic self and perfect kingship

are based on his youthful years associating with the commoners. His early experiences as Prince Hal in *Henry IV 2* at London's taverns with ordinary people enable him the quality to know the commoners, and, hence, his nation. Henry's remarkable transformation into a model king who is admired by all the English people is described by the Bishop of Ely as follows:

The strawberry grows underneath the nettle,
And wholesome berries thrive and ripen best
Neighbour'd by fruit of baser quality:
And so the prince obscur'd his contemplation
Under the veil of wildness; which, no doubt,
Grew like the summer grass, fastest by night,
Unseen, yet crescive in his faculty. (*Henry V*, I.i.60-66)

As it is stressed in these lines, the Bishop pronounces that Henry's character matures in his coarse age of youthfulness. He not only enjoys himself in the years of frivolity, but he is also politically motivated. He has developed his intellectual mentality, ability in ruling and warfare in the wild and slothful years spent at the taverns by the company of beggars, drunkards and worthless men like Falstaff. In these lines, it is also asserted that Henry's transformation is not a sudden occasion as it seems to be, but his spirit has matured by his early experiences with the commoners. In other words, his association with Falstaff and the others brings him closer with the common people. He has the opportunity to familiarize with both the nobles he encounters at the court and the lower layers of the society whom he accompanies at the taverns. So, as a king, he understands the feelings of his common soldiers and the lords, and knows how to address them. The Constable of France in his conversation with the Dauphin, the arrogant heir of the French throne, also declares that he sees Henry's early years as the fertile soil which has cultivated him for his triumphant reign and created his heroic self. He warns the arrogant Dauphin not to underestimate Henry's power as his youth has enhanced his abilities as a perfect monarch when he says:

Covering discretion with a coat of folly;
As gardeners do with ordure hide those roots
That shall first spring and be most delicate. (*II.iv.38-40*)

Hence, the Constable of France indicates that Henry's wild years function simply as a disguise for his flourishing wisdom and greatness. Just as the most elegant flowers

blossom after they have been manured, Henry's perfect monarchy will arise after he leaves his early sinful life behind. According to the Constable, Henry's heroic self is formed and matured during his frivolous youthful years. In this sense, it may be argued that Henry's youth has been a kind of school educating him on statecraft, military service and the attributes of a perfect monarch.

Henry's moral and personal metamorphosis from juvenile delinquency as Prince Hal, to powerful and heroic kingship is fully illustrated in the play. Prince Hal, who becomes Henry V on the death of his father at the end of *Henry IV 2* undergoes a significant change before he appears as a heroic figure and legendary hero of Agincourt in *Henry V*. In a sense, Shakespeare aims to portray an ideal king as the perfect man of action and the pattern of all the virtues in the heroic character of Henry V. King Henry is no longer the frivolous youth, Prince Hal, but he is a king full of grace and fair regard as a heroic exemplar and about to set out on a military venture in France. On the death of his father, Henry IV in 1413, Henry ascends the English throne and impresses the English people by his sense of justice, as he insistently wants to justify the war, and spirit of heroic deeds in the glorious Battles of Harfleur and Agincourt. He turns into another man as soon as he comes to the throne at the end of *Henry IV 2* and this remarkable transition from an irresponsible youth to a serious monarch affects the fate of England and the English people as well. E.M.W. Tillyard argues that "the legend of his conversion was powerful and of long standing" (305). Henry is portrayed as an ideal and heroic king who, exploiting national unity, leads his nation to great political and military victories. He is appreciated and respected by the whole nation and glorified as a legendary king. This is clear in the Chorus's speech which presents Henry as the perfect national hero:

Now thrive the armourers, and honour's thought
Reigns solely in the breast of every man.
They sell the pasture now to buy the horse,
Following the mirror of all Christian kings,
With winged heels, as English Mercuries. (II.Chorus.3-7)

As stated in the quotation, the Chorus wants each patriotic Englishman to awake the martial spirit of a virtuous soldier. It is strongly asserted that the English people are committed to Henry by deep loyalty and ready to pursue him at the battles without any

hesitation. They are portrayed as courageous and devoted soldiers eager to sacrifice their possessions to prepare a war under the leadership of their valiant king. Therefore, as Moody E. Prior argues, “the reference in the chorus to ‘the mirror of all Christian kings’ points to the ideal qualities with which the monarch was to be endowed as a model king and warrior” (325). It is asserted that, with his power, Henry represents all the heroic kings of the past who have won glorious victories in great battles. The first lines of the Prologue, “O, for a Muse of fire, that would ascend / The brightest heaven of invention” (I.Chorus.1-2), also have the invocation to an epic. The gallant king of England fights in unity with his nation in a fabulous war which ends by the English triumph and arouses patriotic and national feelings. It is an epic not only because it is about war and heroic conduct, but it also depicts a nation displaying its virtues under the inspired leadership of a heroic king. So, the theme announced in the prologue is epic in character and the warrior king, whose name has turned into a legend, is ready to lead his country to illustrious victories.

Moreover, Shakespeare’s new political hero achieves to create a common bond between the monarch and the nation as he establishes an intimate relation with the English people. He does not act as an aloof and arrogant king; instead, he gets into the band of his soldiers and behave as a man who has the same concerns and interests with those commoners. He wanders among the soldiers in disguise before the Battle of Agincourt and tries to persuade them that although the king has royal power with responsibilities to his people, he is still an ordinary man like them:

For, though I speak it to you, I think the king is but a man, as I am: the violent smells to him as it doth to me; the element shows to him as it doth to me; all his senses have but human conditions: his ceremonies laid by, in his nakedness he appears but a man; and though his affections are higher mounted than ours, yet, when they stoop, they stoop with the like wing. Therefore when he sees reason of fears, as we do, his fears, out of doubt, be of the same relish as ours are: yet, in reason, no man should possess him with any appearance of fear, lest he, by showing it, should dishearten his army. (IV.i.100-113)

According to Henry, there is not any difference between the soldiers fighting at the battlefield and the king ruling the country with absolute authority. He speaks to his soldiers as equals and shares their common fears and hopes. He clearly announces that

he has the same concerns about the consequences of war as those of the English people and if England is defeated, the king will suffer as much as the public. In this respect, Henry, in his above speech, emphasizes that the soldiers should rely on their king as the victory over France will be attributed to the whole English nation without any distinction between the sovereignty and the people. Thus, he gives them a sense of national unity and Englishness and convinces them that they have to fight altogether against a foreign threat in the unity of purpose. Pierce explains Henry's flexible character as follows: "We see a Henry V who relaxes as a man among men, but when he takes on his regal authority, it is as though in gathering his robes about him he becomes a different person" (226). Henry achieves to be an ordinary and humble man when he is among the commoners and knows how to address them; however, when he has to play the role of a heroic king, he exercises his authority and leads his nation with devotion.

Henry's admirable conversion from delinquency to maturity is first emphasized by the Archbishop of Canterbury in the first act. He mentions his wonder and satisfaction on the transformation of the young prince. It is obvious that he is pleased with Prince Hal's reformation and his newly acquired heroic self. He observes Henry's change from a prodigal son into an ideal and a heroic leader as he says:

The breath no sooner left his father's body,
But that his wildness, mortified in him,
Seem'd to die too; yea, at that very moment,
Consideration like an angel came,
And whipp'd th' offending Adam out of him,
Leaving his body as a Paradise,
T'envelop and contain celestial spirits. (I.i.25-31)

In these lines, the Archbishop pronounces that as soon as his father dies, Henry abandons his recklessness, which has been a major characteristic of his youth, and turns into a responsible leader. The prelate associates Henry's gaining respect with the salvation of a sinful man when he resembles the conscious, which changes Henry into an efficient ruler, to an angel which relieves him of his vices. In a sense, he is purified from the evils corrupting his character and leading him to have a worthless life. It is also indicated in these lines that his kingship, just like his flawless character, becomes the embodiment of integrity and excellence. In fact, Henry, himself, gives a hint of his

flourishing heroic self at the end of *Henry IV 2* and indicates that he is no longer the prodigal prince and he will be both a good ruler and a military commander who makes his nation strong among other nations:

And, Princes all, believe me, I beseech you;
 My father is gone wild into his grave,
 For in his tomb lie my affections;
 And with his spirits sadly I survive,
 To mock the expectation of the world,
 To frustrate prophecies, and to raze out
 Rotten opinion, who hath writ me down
 After my seeming. The tide of blood in me
 Hath proudly flow'd in vanity till now.
 Now doth it turn, and ebb back to the sea,
 Where it shall mingle with the state of floods,
 And flow henceforth in formal majesty. (V.ii.122-133)

With these lines, it is pronounced that all of Henry's mischievous behaviours have vanished after his father's death. He, now, embodies the strong and gallant spirit of Henry IV, a strong nation builder, and aims to let down the assumptions of the people who do not believe that he will be a perfect sovereign. He regrets his former arrogance and declares that, hereafter, he will use his authority not for vain pleasure, but to promote England as an effective king. As J.H.Walter has suggested, "the soliloquy on the cares of kingship shows the Prince beginning to realize his responsibilities; his profound grief (mentioned twice it should be noted), his reconciliation with his father" (158). In Henry's speech on the concerns of the monarch, it is evidently demonstrated that he comprehends his duties as the king of England. The strife with his dying father, which he has had from the beginning of the play, is finally ended, and he decides not to lead an idle life anymore. Thus, the comments of Canterbury above stress the fact that physically, intellectually, spiritually and politically, Henry has attained perfection and created his heroic self. As can be understood from the statements of the Archbishop, Henry not only repents his sins and gives up his past habits, but he also "suddenly emerge[s] as a reborn being free of taint, prelarian, a marvel of theological purity translated whole and entire from the first paradise to the English throne" (Pearlman 145). After his transformation from a rascal youth into an ideal king, he becomes as innocent as a newborn child and a symbol of sanctitude free from all kinds of corruption. His metamorphosis not only brings excellency to his own character, but also

to the English crown. Canterbury further describes Henry's spiritual virtues in his praise of him:

Never such a sudden scholar made;
 Never came reformation in a flood,
 With such a heady currance, scouring faults;
 Nor never Hydra-headed wilfulness
 So soon did lose his seat, and all at once
 As in this king. (I.i.32-37)

It is strongly asserted in these lines that Henry has had a remarkable transformation getting rid of all his flaws and turned into an intellectual man and an effectual monarch. Hence, in all of these speeches, one may conclude that the asset of maturity is considered, even from the first scene, as a necessary feature of Henry's heroic self which will affect the national destiny of England. The common soldiers also praise Henry V's transformation and his heroic qualities. As Iser has stated, "the speeches describing his transformation are attempts by those around him to set forth an ideal in their contemporary terms" (170). The commoners glorify Henry's qualities which make them admire him and commit themselves to their inspired leader with devotion. They clearly put forth the reason why they see Henry as an ideal ruler and a military leader and follow him with loyalty. Nym, a common soldier and a rascal companion of Henry at Eastcheap, says of him: "The King is a good King" (II.i.125). According to Nym, Henry knows how to administer well and does not make his subjects suffer. One may argue that Nym's reference to Henry's good kingship implies the attributes such as the exercise of justice, love of the subjects and respect to laws, which have been shown as lacking in King Richard II's character in Shakespeare's *Richard II* and led to his deposition. Similarly, Pistol exalts Henry as he says: "The king's a bawcock, and a heart of gold, / A lad of life, an imp of fame; / Of parents good, of first most valiant" (IV.i.44-46). With these lines, Henry's gentle ancestry along with his courage and compassion are displayed. For Pistol, there are two episodes in Henry's life; the part he has lived as an irresponsible young man and the part he is leading as a respectable and honourable king. Apart from the commoners, to the Chorus he is "the mirror of all Christian kings" (II.Chorus.6), "this grace of kings" (II.Chorus.28), "a conqu'ring Caesar" (V.Chorus.28) and "This star of England" (Epil.6). As indicated in these lines, he embodies the

courage which all the Christian kings have acquired and he is a heroic warrior king who occupies lands. So, as Iser has further pointed out, “the friends [...] proclaim the King’s greatness, while the audience is enabled to imagine for itself the greatest event in the monarch’s life” (181). The Elizabethan people or the contemporary spectators and the readers witness Henry’s miraculous transformation and the formation of his heroic self, which is a milestone in his life, and are informed on his newly acquired strong and courageous character by the glorifying comments of his supporters.

In the first act of the play, the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Ely elevate the king due to his reformation and new attributes. They pronounce that the development of Henry’s heroic self does not merely depend on his progression as a powerful and valiant soldier, but also on his improvement as a statesman capable in politics and divinity. As Lily Campbell has stated, “they praise him because he is able to reason in divinity like a prelate, to debate the commonwealth affairs as though they were his chief study, and to discourse so admirably of war” (260). Henry not only appears as a heroic warrior king, but he is an ideal ruler also able in religious issues and state affairs. The bishops exalt him as he is knowledgeable in ecclesiastical matters as if he were a cleric and can discuss the national events by the wisdom of a great politician. In this sense, the Archbishop of Canterbury depicts Henry, the new king, as a learned, wise, and perfect monarch:

Hear him but reason in divinity,
 And, all-admiring, with an inward wish
 You would desire the king were made a prelate:
 Hear him debate of commonwealth affairs,
 You would say it hath been all in all his study:
 List his discourse of war, and you shall hear
 A fearful battle render’d you in music:
 Turn him to any cause of policy,
 The Gordian knot of it he will unloose,
 Familiar as his garter; that, when he speaks,
 The air, a charter’d libertine, is still,
 And the mute wonder lurketh in men’s ears,
 To steal his sweet and honey’d sentences;
 So that the art and practic part of life
 Must be the mistress of this rhetoric: (I.i.38-52)

Therefore, it can be clearly seen that Henry gains strength by his reformation from an ineffective young prince to an intellectual mature king as he displays all the traits of an

excellent sovereign. Shakespeare does not present Henry as only a heroic king, who wins great victories in legendary battles, but also as a man, who masters the religious and state affairs successfully. Henry's ability in rhetoric, which has a great influence on both his soldiers and enemies, is also emphasized by the Archbishop. As indicated in the lines above, the dreadful wars lose their brutality by his encouraging and heroic eloquence, and when he speaks, all the soldiers become quiet to hear his harmonious phrases, which are both very instructive and artistic.

Henry's treatment to Falstaff, his early tutor and companion at the taverns spoiling him in *Henry IV*, is fundamental to present Henry's moral reformation and attainment of heroic self in *Henry V*. The young prince displays his wish to get rid of the follies of the past and to start a new life as he sees the corpse of Falstaff expecting that he has died at Shrewsbury. In this sense, as Wilson has pointed out, "after Shrewsbury Falstaff is never on the same terms with his patron" (148). Henry's transition into a heroic monarch, aware of the responsibilities of being a king and considering the welfare of his nation, leads him to end his relationship with Falstaff whose concern is seeking pleasure by drinking and stealing and different than that of Henry. Henry has to make a choice between his former life as a prodigal son wasting all his money and property on pleasure and his new life devoted to his nation as soon as his father dies. In Wilson's words, Henry chooses between "Vanity and Government" (133). On one side, there is an irresponsible self as a wanton; on the other side, there is a heroic self as a perfect leader of a glorious nation. In this respect, Henry ends the reign of the corrupted tutor, Falstaff, as he represents vanity in every sense of word. As he retreats from his previous life into a heroic self by his victory at Shrewsbury, he wants to get rid of the degenerated memory of his past:

What, old acquaintance, could not all this flesh
Keep in a little life? Poor Jack, farewell!
I could have better spar'd a better man:
O, I should have a heavy miss of thee,
If I were much in love with vanity: (*1Henry IV*, V.iv.101-105)

In these lines, Henry uses Falstaff's fatness as a symbol to display the despicable life he has led. He, explicitly, implies that he does not want Falstaff even to live as he represents a life in vanity, he is the source of crime and sin and does not deserve to be a

companion of the heroic King Henry V. His attitude displays that he is determined to forget Falstaff to leave out “the course of his youth” and act as the valiant leader of England. Falstaff’s life as a braggart and a coward, who leads a degenerate life, and his guidance of Prince Hal to live a similiar life creates a negative image for Prince Hal. As Falstaff is Henry’s closest companion in his youth, he represents his idle life which he has wasted at the taverns in negligence as a rascal. Yet, King Henry V has to embody a new image of a heroic king who is talented in politics and warfare. In this sense, he banishes Falstaff, “[t]he tudor and the feeder of my riots” (V.v.62) in *Henry IV* at the end of *Part II* and speaks of his companionship with him as a dream, which “being awak’d” (V.v.51). In other words, he sees his companionship with Falstaff as a temporary experience which should be finalized as his kingship necessiates a heroic self which can be formed by giving up living as a prowess. The young king dismisses his tutor corrupting him and cultivates his kingdom in “law and form and proportion” as a great monarch as follows:

The tide of blood in me
Hath proudly flow’d in vanity till now.
Now doth it turn and ebb back to the sea,
Where it shall mingle with the state of floods,
And flow henceforth in formal majesty. (2*Henry IV*, V.ii.129-133)

These lines clearly show that Henry has wasted his noble character as the heir of the English throne in idleness; however, he is decisive to behave as a responsible king exercising justice, caring about his subjects and firmly managing the affairs of state as soon as he assumes the crown. He wants to deserve the love and respect of the English people and maintain the heroic image of an ideal nation builder and a good king which he inherits from his father. In this sense, Henry’s new character will represent a regal dignity rather than a vicious self. He feels himself obliged to disclaim Falstaff in order to complete his reformation and fulfill his duties as an ideal king. In other words, he is determined to turn away Falstaff and everything that he represents in the public view to come out as the heroic king of England. As Raymond Dorius has stated, “the rejection of Falstaff marks the new king’s turning from the negligence and excess that had nearly destroyed England since the reign of Richard II” (130). Prince Hal in *Henry IV*, has led an exaggerated life in vanity and disregarded the state and his subjects as Richard II has

done during his reign. But, Henry's decision not to carry on his former follies when he ascends to the throne demonstrates that he has turned out to be the most perfect king of England.

Shakespeare also reawakens Henry's legendary ancestry to support his transformation from a rascal youth into a heroic king and presents how such reformation provokes the rise of the sense of English nationalism. The illustrious English history is awakened by Henry's heroic self and the glorious victories of the former kings are emphasized. As Robert C. Jones has emphasized, "the living Henry awakens remembrance of those valiant dead who preceded him and renews their feasts with his puissant arm" (*These* 144). Henry mirrors his legendary forebears who have conquered lands and been presented in history as chivalrous warriors. His triumphs at the Battles of Harfleur and Agincourt also remind the illustrious triumphs of the English predecessors and display that Henry is descendant of a gallant origin. The Bishop of Ely praises Henry's valiant ancestry as follows:

Awake remembrance of these valiant dead,
And with your puissant arm renew their feast:
You are their heir, you sit upon their throne,
The blood and courage that renowed them
Runs in your veins; (I.ii.115-119)

These lines place Henry in the great context of the English history and refer to his glorious inheritance. Henry descends from noble warriors who have come to the fore by their heroic deeds. The Bishop urges Henry to imitate the heroic actions of his predecessors and encourages him to find the necessary courage in his own character which he has inherited from his forefathers. The Bishop's words also make the audience forget Henry's previous character as Prince Hal and focus on his great heroic self as the strong and courageous king of England. The Duke of Exeter, Henry's uncle, specifies his place among the English monarchs as follows:

Your brother kings and monarchs of the earth
Do all expect that you should rouse yourself,
As did the former lions of your blood. (I.ii.122-124)

It is strongly asserted in these lines that Henry has responsibility to act as a powerful and brave king as he should be worthy of his past which is full of illustrious victories. Hence, these nobles, who provoke Henry for great deeds in France, touch upon both his revolutionary transformation and his glorious heritage. In this respect, as Pearlman has emphasized, “Harry is never represented as the son of his usurping father but is often described as a descendant of his great-grandfather Edward” (152). Henry’s kingship is not dishonoured by the memories of his father’s usurpation of the throne from the legitimate king of England, Richard II. He is never called as the son of an illegitimate king, who has deposed the rightful king, and his right to rule is not questioned; on the contrary, his regality has always been accepted as legal and divinely sanctioned. The public’s admiration for Henry also displays his powerful position in England. His rule is glorified as the valid heir of his heroic ancestors like Edward III. The Archbishop of Canterbury emphasizes his legitimacy as he says:

From whom you claim; invoke his war-like spirit,
And your great-uncle’s, Edward the Black Prince,
Who on the French ground play’d a tragedy, (I.ii.104-106)

These lines clearly demonstrate that Henry is the descendant of the legendary English king who has caused great damage to France during the Hundred Years’ War and his right to the English throne can be justified by referring to his glorious ancestry. It is also implicated that Henry has the potential to revive the power of his heroic predecessors and defeat the French by a glorious victory.

Through his moral reformation and military success, Henry becomes a legendary king, and his heroic self symbolizes patriotism and the sense of English nationalism in the play. Henry’s moral reformation enables him to become the embodiment of nationalism and gives momentum to the evolution of the dramatic action. As Campbell has stated, “the progress of the warrior king is the progress of the play” (255). Henry is the primary cause which encourages the hopeless English people to fight and defeat the more powerful French, that is, the English people find the fortitude and faith they need in Henry V’s heroic self. In a sense, the more Henry transforms into a powerful, bold and heroic king from a tramp, the more the English nation becomes patriotic and willing to fight. In this sense, it is possible to argue that just as he develops as the strong and

valiant king of England, who embodies leadership qualities, so the sense of nationalism and the idea to unite against a common foreign threat develop. Hence, for Shakespeare, Henry comes to embody the greatness of England and her national spirit.

Henry displays that he is an ideal king when he acts as a responsible monarch, who does not want to lead his nation to the devastation of an unjust war. He wants to display his heroic self in a war which is fought for rightful causes. As Prior has pointed out, Henry is “the just king who wants to be sure his procedure is lawful, and the patriot king who upholds the honour of his country against foreign insult” (328). Henry wants to maintain that his cause is just and quarrel is acclaimed. In this sense, he earnestly asks the Archbishop of Canterbury whether the declaration of war and his claim to the French throne is rightful as follows: “May I with right conscience make this claim” (I.i.96). He seeks the Archbishop’s solemn advice to declare war on France. The reason why Henry aims to justify the war is that he does not want to go to war “without the assurance of justice on his side, for the horrors of the war are too terrible to be risked in an unworthy cause” (Campbell 260). He does not want his nation to suffer for an unjust war whose consequences will be bloody as so many innocent people will die and the families will break up. Hence, it may be argued that Henry’s priority is not starting a war regardless of its outcomes, but the welfare of his nation. Michael Bates, a common soldier, with whom Henry meets before the Battle of Agincourt and agrees to have a duel after he discusses on the responsibilities of a king, describes the severe effects of the war on the people as follows:

[...] some swearing; some crying for a surgeon, some upon their wives left poor behind them, some upon the debts they owe, some upon their children rawly left.
(IV.i.140-143)

His words become a reminder of the cost of war in terms of human lives and relationships. It is quite obvious from these lines that war has serious repercussions as the national unity will be totally destroyed and, therefore, the king should act responsible before he decides to start a war. However, Henry V’s cause is worthy enough to lead a nation to a foreign war, because what is in question is to possess the French throne, which should rightly belong to Henry by inheritance. So, he has a

righteous claim to the French crown as he inherits it from his great-grandfather Edward III. In this sense, the Archbishop of Canterbury supports the just cause as follows:

Gracious lord,
Stand for your own, unwind your bloody flag,
Look back into your mighty ancestors.
Go, my dread lord, to your great-grandsire's tomb, (I.ii.100-104)

As indicated in these lines, he spirits Henry to challenge the French king to defend the right of England. Henry will follow the steps of his forebears and awaken their martial drives to vindicate what is rightly and historically belongs to the English nation. As Barbara Hodgdon has pointed out, “through bloodshed, it ratifies Henry V’s dynastic line and proves his descent from his lion-hearted ancestor, Edward, the Black Prince; through French conquest, Henry achieves his father’s dream of a Christian crusade, [...] unifies his kingdom” (188). Henry’s revival of an old claim to the French throne not only upholds the right of England, but it also affirms Henry’s rightful accession to the English throne; because, if he successfully takes over the French throne and proves the validity of his claim, he will be seen not as the son of a usurper but the descendant of a legendary English king, Edward III. He also fulfills his father’s, Henry IV’s, purpose of invading foreign lands as he declares war on France and strengthens his commonwealth. As Graham Holderness has pointed, “the sleepy ghosts of the past are disturbed” (140) by the speech of the Archbishop of Canterbury, which not only confirms the legitimacy of war against France by its reference to the historical authority, but also provides Henry V the necessary encouragement and support, that is, his great ancestors, to unite the English nation under his heroic leadership. The French king is also fully aware of Henry’s power and rightful inheritance. As Pierce has stated, the French “have to admit the inbred strength and courage of the English” (230). They fearfully know that Henry V descends from Edward III, the Black Prince of Wales, who caused great damage to France at Crecy during the Hundred Years’ War in 1346. In this respect, the glorious English history that the Archbishop aims to invoke to encourage Henry’s heroic aspirations appears to the French as unforgettable and appalling. The French king displays his concern about Henry’s ancestral strength as he says:

Think we King Harry strong;

[...] he is bred out of that bloody strain
 That haunted us in our familiar paths;
 Witness our too much memorable shame
 When Cressy battle fatally was struck,
 And all our princes captiv'd by the hand
 Of that black name, Edward, Black Prince of Wales;
 Whiles that his mountain sire, on mountain standing,
 Up in the air, crown'd with the golden sun,
 Saw his heroical seed, and smil'd to see him, (II.iv.48-59)

In these lines, the French king expresses his fear of Henry's valiant predecessors and heroic self inherited from his mighty forefathers. As he remembers the early victories of the legendary English kings such as Edward III against France, he feels that Henry embodies the same heroic spirit and his power is rooted in his nature. Hence, the validity of Henry's claim on the French throne is not even questioned by the French; on the contrary, the French king accepts that Henry has the right to claim the French throne by his chivalrous lineage.

To protect the national honour is displayed as another major reason and justification of the war against France. After the imperial esteem of England is insulted by the message of the Dauphin, who is the heir of the French throne, Henry puts forth a determined and valiant character to wage an assault on France. The Dauphin's present of the tennis balls reminds Henry his former life as a tramp at the taverns of London and implies that he is not able to rule a country, but to lead the life of a vagabond. In this respect, the justification of war is completely established, and Henry declares that he will show his heroic self by his response: "[...] to put forth / My rightful hand in a well-hallow'd cause" (I.ii.-292-293). The Dauphin gives Henry the motive he needs to start a war as his affront by the tun of tennis balls not only detracts Henry but also the English people. In other words, his making a mock of the English King is accepted as an offense to the English nation as well. Thus, the contemptuous gift of tennis balls leads Henry to make a choice between humiliation, that is accepting the Dauphin's pejorative act, and declaring a war upon France to defend the national interests. He acts as an ideal king considering the national dignity and bases the war against France on a rightful cause; because, a contempt to the national honour cannot be accepted by the patriotic Englishmen and he, as the king of England, should present a bold front to such a dishonourable attitude of France.

One may argue that when the national honour and the rights of his nation are concerned, Henry becomes extremely resolute and reveals his heroic self. This is clear from his determined stand when he says: “France being ours, we’ll bend it to our awe, / Or break it all to pieces” (I.ii.224-225). For Henry, there is no way for the French nation but to yield to the English defiance as he decisively pronounces that he will never give up the rightful cause of the English nation. He encourages his troops with a martial rhetoric before the Battle of Harfleur and uses “the same rhetorical skill to threaten the city with all the brutal savagery and awful horrors of total war if it does not surrender peacefully” (Prior 328). He explicitly puts forth the barbarous ferocity and dreadful evils of an English attack to the city of Harfleur as follows:

In liberty of bloody hand shall range
 With conscience wide as hell, mowing like grass
 Your fresh-fair virgins and your flow’ring infants.
 What is then to me, if impious war,
 Array’d in flames, like to the prince of fiends,
 Do, with his smirch’d complexion, all fell feats
 Enlink’d to waste and desolation? (III.iii.12-18)

It is strongly asserted in these lines that the English soldiers are firmly eager to destroy the whole city of Harfleur and kill the citizens for their righteous national cause. It is implied that the English will turn the city into a hell and the resistance of the French people will only bring calamity to the town. Henry makes such an elaborate oration that the French people are persuaded to submit to the English soldiers:

[...] Therefore, great king,
 We yield our town and lives to thy soft mercy.
 Enter our Gates; dispose of us and ours;
 For we no longer are defensible. (III.iii.47-50)

Henry’s effective rhetoric leaves the French people no other choice but to yield and arouses patriotic and nationalistic senses in the English soldiers. While it displays the strength of the English, it clearly puts forth the weakness of the French. As indicated in these lines, the French people are so powerless and in such a desperate situation that the only thing they can do is to beg for mercy of the English king.

In the play, the conquest of France is presented to be an important event for the formation of Henry's heroic self and the presentation of the patriotic rhetoric. Henry proves his prowess as a leader and conquerer in this expedition. He displays his strength and courage as a monarch and a military commander when he says: "No king of England, if not king of France" (II.ii.193). As indicated in these lines, he will either defeat France and will be remembered as a gallant soldier or he will die as a prodigal prince who has wasted time with his disreputable companions at the taverns with petty quarrels and greedy purposes without any celebrated deeds. Hence, war enables Henry to show his heroic self with his determined stand to ascend to the French throne, which is the inherited right of the English nation and an affair of honour, along with his patriotic rhetoric, which cheers the English soldiers to defeat the French. War is also presented to be an exciting occasion in which confidence in victory is supreme and "the preparations for battle seem a cheerful, productive enterprise" (Ornstein 180). The English soldiers, despite being terribly weary, are not demoralized and even if they die, they are voluntary to fight the French. The Archbishop of Canterbury describes the readiness of the patriotic Englishmen for a righteous war in spite of all impossibilities as follows:

Where some like magistrates, correct at home,
Others like merchants, venture trade abroad,
Others, like soldiers, armed in their stings,
Make boot upon the summer's velvet buds;
Which pillage they with merry march bring home
To the tent-royal of their emperor. (I.ii.191-196)

Therefore, it can be clearly seen that all the English people are in a devoted campaign. The social harmony is maintained in the country as the judges administer justice, the traders endeavour to merchandise in abroad and the soldiers prepare to fight at the battlefield. As indicated in these lines, all the English people work in unity and with devotion in such a critical situation when England is on the verge of a bloody war against a powerful foreign foe. Moreover, the references made to the historical battles function as a means to arouse the sense of nationalism and patriotic feelings among the English soldiers and unite them under a common purpose of beating a foreign enemy which threatens the national unity of England and humiliates the national honour.

Before the Battle of Agincourt, the Duke of Exeter refers to the past victories in his conversation with Henry, which should be the necessary examples for their cause:

Your brother kings and monarchs of the earth
Do all expect that you should rouse yourself,
As did the former lions of your blood. (I.ii.122-124)

As it is stated in this quotation, the grand English history, which is full of outstanding victories of heroic English kings, should be the sole model for Henry's actions. Henry V has proved his princeliness and power at Shrewsbury in *Henry IV 1* and now he will prove his imperial title at Harfleur and Agincourt in *Henry V*. He wins the support of the whole nation when he declares war on France to defend the national dignity of England and claim his rightful inheritance. The fact that Henry does not attribute the victory to only himself, but to the whole English nation is reflected in his patriotic statements which stress that the ones who shed their blood with him will also gain respect and will be remembered:

This story shall the good man teach his son;
And Crispin Crispian shall ne'er go by,
From this day to the ending of the world,
But we in it shall be remembered; (IV.iii.56-59)

It is strongly asserted in these lines that the victory at Agincourt will turn into a legend and will be told to the next generations as a model of courage and strength. It will be also celebrated as a substantial exemplar of determination of a valiant nation to defeat a foreign foe under the leadership of a heroic king. The hard struggle of the brave soldiers fighting at the battlefield in unity to protect the national honour against a foreign enemy will eternally be commemorated by respect. The patriotic heroes of Agincourt will tell their children how they have triumphed over France by a bloody war fought under heavy circumstances. In this respect, the coming generations will follow the victory of the valiant soldiers at Agincourt by deep regard as how Henry and his men have imitated the conquests of their chivalrous forebearers.

Especially, the victory at Agincourt is very significant to reflect Henry's heroic self and how he provokes the rise of Englishness by his patriotic rhetoric. The devotion and enthusiasm he creates among his soldiers begin earlier than he sets foot in France.

Walter points out that “his personality has united England as never before, and already “the youth of England are on fire” eager to follow the “mirror of all Christian kings”” (164). Shakespeare’s depiction of the unity among the English people including both the commons and the nobles, the Welsh, the Scots and the Irish is one of the main reasons to defeat France though the French are superior to the English in numbers. The position of the English soldiers is very desperate militarily. The soldiers are heavily outnumbered, tired and weakened by the disease and lack of food. However, the heavy losses before Harfleur and the size of the French army do not dishearten the English; on the contrary, unite them under the shelter of a righteous cause and the leadership of a heroic king. Henry’s noble character plays a vital role to win a victory against France; because, as Walter has further stated, Henry “does not unpack his heart and curse like a drab, nor flutter Volscian dovescots, nor unseam his enemies from the nave to the chaps, he is no tragic warrior hero, he is the epic leader strong and serene, the architect of victory” (164). He never loses his faith in the English soldiers and the just cause of the war. He does not underestimate the power of his enemy and encourages his soldiers by leading them personally.

In the beginning of the fourth act, the Chorus depicts the situation at the English camp at night before Agincourt by an epic rhetoric. The mood of the soldiers, who wait for the coming war and their readiness to confront and defeat their enemy are vividly demonstrated. The tense stillness of the long night is presented with a poetic language to describe the moment of inactivity:

The secret whispers of each other’s watch:
 Fire answers fire; and through their paly flames
 Each battle sees the other’s number’d face;
 Steed threatens steed, in high and boastful neighs
 Piercing the night’s dull ear; and from the tents
 The armourers, accomplishing the knights,
 With busy hammers of closing rivets up,
 Give dreadful note of preparation: (IV.Chorus.7- 16)

As indicated in these lines, the English soldiers wait for the coming war in silence. The only action which breaks the peace of the night is the sound of the preparations for war. The Chorus, hence, distinguishes the patriotic tradition between the “confident and over-lusty French” (IV.Chorus.18) and the “low-rated English” (IV.Chorus.19) who

wait in melancholy being sure of an inevitable defeat on the next day. At this very despairing moment, Henry appears as a strong and courageous leader who awakens the heroic spirit in every English soldier, including both the commons and the nobility, no matter how hopeless the condition is for the English army. As Holderness has stated, “Henry abundantly displays the expected heroic virtues of courage in the face of desperate odds, the gaiety and insouciance of a truly brave leader” (151). He does not abandon himself to despair and accept the defeat; on the contrary, he cheers his soldiers by his patriotic orations and make them believe that they have the potential to overcome the French by their courage and power. Henry emphasizes the immortality of their achievement when he says:

This day is call'd the feast of Crispian:
 He that outlives this day, and comes safe home,
 Will stand a tip-toe when this day is nam'd,
 And rouse him at the name of Crispian.
 He that shall see this day, and live old age,
 Will yearly on the vigil feast his neighbours,
 And say, “To-morrow is Saint Crispian”:
 Then will he strip his sleeve and show his scars,
 And say, “These wounds I had on Crispian’s day”.
 Old men forget; yet all shall be forgot,
 But he’ll remember with advantages
 What feats he did that day. Then shall our names,
 Familiar in his mounth as household words, (IV.iii.40-52)

In these lines, Henry makes a passionate and uplifting speech which appeals to his soldiers’ emotions and inspires them to join him in a fellowship of heroic deeds. The Crispin Crispian Speech before the battle is spoken in great confidence, and not only the sense of brotherhood with the lords and the commoners but also the permanency of their success is asserted. Henry firmly emphasizes that their honourable and rightful fight against France is a collective enterprise and the ones who participate in this war will earn an everlasting fame and will be legendary historical characters. These lines clearly demonstrate that Henry believes in the immortality of the legend of Agincourt and emphasizes that their story at Agincourt will be celebrated by the future generations as a heroic deed. Henry’s speech to the camp at Agincourt is more different than the one he has made before Harfleur. Here, he does not talk about imitating the action of the tiger or. The confidence expressed in this speech comes from the knowledge that this small

and poor army is united in waiting to face a common danger with courage. Hence, as Lord John Hall has pointed out, “the Crispin’s Day speech is the ultimate proof of Henry’s strength as a leader” (90). He clearly displays that he is no longer a pleasure-seeking prince, but a powerful king and a gallant commander with a heroic self. Shakespeare also shows the strength of Henry’s rhetoric skill in this speech as he inspires his soldiers to take a patriotic action against a foreign enemy. Hence, it may be argued that Henry uses his orations as an effective weaponry; he intimidates his enemy before Harfleur and makes them to submit and, before Agincourt, he persuades his soldiers to be courageous and strong to challenge the French. He makes two different orations at two different battles, but the common point is that in both wars, his rhetorics become an important cause which brings victory to England.

The English soldiers represented in the play also become perfect embodiments of the heroic self and Englishness. Holderness argues that “the key persona through which the play connects the demotic, the sovereign and the divine is that of the soldier” (146). The soldier personifies not only the commonwealth, but also the monarch and the divine will. The English troops are composed of both the commoners and the nobility and represent the whole English nation in unity and equality. The class distinctions are eliminated as both the commons and the nobles fight together at a war and defend the national honour of England side by side. The brotherhood of all the English soldiers is emphasized regardless of class divisions. As the king personally leads the army as an ordinary soldier, the monarch is identified with the military power of England. The English soldiers are divinely supported and fight on the will of God and they represent the divine authority. Henry emphasizes the soldier’s uniting power of the public body, king and heavenly power in his heroic self before Harfleur as follows:

[...] The game’s afoot:
Follow your spirit; and upon this charge
Cry, “God for Harry, England, and Saint George!” (III.i.32-34)

Therefore, it can be clearly seen that the war is about to start and the soldiers are not simple men, but symbolize Henry V, the heroic king of England, the national will and the divine justice. The soldier turns to be a historical character who has a crucial role in the national destiny, and is profoundly praised by Henry’s patriotic address to his troops

at Harfleur as “Once more unto the breach, dear friends, once more” (III.i.1). Henry does not consider the soldiers as only warriors trained to fight or his subjects obliged to show their loyalty to him and fight at the battlefield, but also as his fellows with whom he shares a common goal of defending the nation. He inspires his soldiers to advance without fear by his patriotic address at the Battle of Harfleur and believes that victory can only be won by the company of these brave soldiers as he says:

For there is none of you so mean and base
That hath not noble lustre in your eyes.
I see you stand like greyhounds in the slips,
Straining upon the start. (III.i.29-32)

In these lines, the idea of the soldiers’ heroic self is strongly emphasized. Henry asserts that all the soldiers have the sparkle of courage and power as they are honourable men without any vulgar and vicious attributes. They are prepared for a glorious triumph over France and ready to fight under the leadership of their heroic king. One may argue that the soldiers derive their power and courage from their Englishness and the heroic self of their valiant king, who is not only a good politician but also a gallant warrior. The soldiers with their prowess and loyalty also display a perfect image of Englishness as they are eager to defend the national honour of England against a foreign threat. In this sense, by an encouraging speech, Henry urges them to

[...] imitate the action of the tiger;
Stiffen the sinews, conjure up the blood,
[.....]
Now set the teeth, and stretch the nostril wide,
Hold hard the breath, and bend up every spirit
To his full height! (III.i.6-7, 15-17)

It is strongly asserted in these lines that the sense of Englishness is aroused as the power of the English soldiers is resembled to that of an aggressive tiger which is invincible. They hold the agility of a tiger and have the ability to fear their enemy by their wild and aggressive appearance. These men are also descendants of the heroic English warriors such as Edward III, and, hence Henry wants them to display their inherited courage to their enemies by their heroic struggle. Though the common soldiers are not highborn as the nobility, they have an important place in the English military force as they reveal their heroic self by their power, courage and knowledge in the art of war. The common

soldiers constitute a highly important part of the English army and shape the course of the war by their ability and experience in warfare. Holderness refers to the existence of the commoners in the English troops by arguing that

[a] fifteenth-century war is not fought in the chivalric poetry of the Accession Day tilt, or in the glamour of single combat between noble heroes. War also needs professional soldiers who have no such illustrious ancestry from which to claim their derivation. (148)

As it is illustrated in these lines, commoners had a significant role in the English army in the fifteenth century. War against a foreign country was more than a duel between two noble lords within the chivalric codes and necessitated the commoners, who were experienced in warfare and achieved nobility by their courage and might, for victory. The commoners were knowledgeable in the articles of war and fought with devotion against a foreign enemy. Hence, they constituted a major part of the English armed force. In the play, these commoners are eager to win the war in any circumstances, and though they become weak after Harfleur, they still fight as powerful soldiers at Agincourt to protect their national honour and just cause. Henry pronounces the determination of the soldiers to fight by a patriotic speech when Montjoy comes for a second time to ask for Henry's ransom:

Let me speak proudly: tell the constable
We are but warriors for the working-day;
Our gayness and our gilt are all besmirch'd
With rainy marching in the painful field;
There is not a piece of feather in our host-
Good argument, I hope, we will not fly-
And time hath worn us into slovenry:
But, by the mass, our hearts are in the trim;
And my poor soldiers tell me, yet ere night
They'll be in fresher robes, or they will pluck
The gay new coats o'er the French soldiers' heads,
And turn them out of service. (IV.iii.108-119)

In these lines, Henry, decisively, expresses that the common soldiers will definitely not yield to the French. By their power, courage and fortitude, they will struggle until they win victory over France. Though they are not as confident and powerful as the French soldiers since they get weaker at Harfleur, he, proudly and firmly, emphasizes that the English soldiers will cause heavy losses to the French. As indicated in these lines, there

are various reasons which give weight to the commoners for triumph. They get such faith of victory from their heroic ancestors and the magnificent English history which has always been supported by the divine will. As Ornstein has observed,

all share the imperial impulse, all are inspired by memories of a glorious past and hopes of crowns and coronets to come; all believe that God and history are on the side of English and mean to prove their manhood. (180)

Therefore, the national interests and continuity of the English throne are the mere concerns of the commoners. They find the necessary confidence to fight and defeat the most powerful countries in the illustrious victories of the English history and the divine support. As they do not have an inborn nobility, they fight with all their might to display that they are as dignified as the nobility not by their blood but their fighting skills. In this respect, Traversi states that “for the first time in this series of plays [i.e. in the history plays], a king and his subjects are embarking upon action in full unity of purpose. The distant crusading aspirations of the father [i.e. Henry IV in *Henry IV*] are about to bear fruit in the son’s decisive, if more limited, project of national affirmation” (170). In other words, the English soldiers, under Henry’s leadership, are ready to fight even in far foreign lands as they are strong and courageous men, who are united in purpose of elevating the English nation.

The idea of soldiers’ heroic self is demonstrated by the valiant representations of the professional soldiers, Fluellen, Gower, Captain Jamy and Macmorris. Their knowledge on the art of war is the basis of the formation of their heroic self as they are presented as men who know the principles of a honourable war and fight courageously for the victory. Throughout the play, they discuss the principles of war; how a good king should behave during the war and whether the prisoners should be killed or not. By their intellectual discussion on the articles of war displays that they are not only soldiers but also military strategists. Fluellen displays his intelligence in warfare in his conversation with Captain Macmorris:

Captain Macmorris, 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. (III.ii.140- 143)

Therefore, he, explicitly and daringly, asserts that he is a qualified soldier and will fight in accordance with the articles of war to defeat the enemy. They not only know how to use weaponry, but they are also highly knowledgeable in the tactics of war. In this sense, as Ornstein has pointed out, “they are professional soldiers, men of good discipline and good cheer, proud of their ancient calling, well versed in its decorums, and scholarly in their knowledge of the campaigns of Caesar and Pompey” (179). As indicated in these lines, they are spirited soldiers, well trained in the technique of war, hence they know how to fight against the enemy heroically on the battlefield. They are also learned men on the glorious victories of the great commanders both in the English past and the universal history. Fluellen compares the situation and the treatment of the principles of war at the English and French camps on the eve of the Battle of Agincourt to that of Pompey’s camp, and presents the ideals of a legendary war by the exemplarity of the ancient wars and heroic warriors as he says:

[...] if you would take the pains but to examine the wars of Pompey the Great, you shall find, I warrant you, that there is no tiddle-taddle nor pibble-pabble in Pompey’s camp; I warrant you, you shall find the ceremonies of the wars, and the cares of it, and the forms of it, and the sobriety of it, and the modesty of it, to be otherwise. (IV.i.68-75)

According to Fluellen, the continence and humility are the main regulations of a honourable and glorious war and a heroic self. In this sense, he pronounces that the French soldiers, who make rapturous celebrations although the war has not even started, violate the ideal principles of war and display their inferiority as warriors while the English wait for the coming war in serenity as proud men. He also makes references to the ancient battles along with the Roman wars when he exalts the Duke of Exeter due to his heroic deeds at Harfleur and says:

The Duke of Exeter is as magnanimous as Agamemnon; and a man that I love and honour with my soul, and my heart, and my duty, and my life, and my living, and my uttermost power: he is not,- God be praised and blessed!- any hurt in the world, but keeps the bridge most valiantly, with excellent discipline. There is an aunchient lieutenant there at the pridge; I think in my very conscience he is as valiant a man as Mark Antony; and he is a man of no estimation in the world; but I did see him do as gallant service. (III.vi.6-16)

It is obvious from these lines that Fluellen is highly knowledgeable about the previous wars which have shaped the history. He also presents his wisdom and knowledge in the legendary commanders as he resembles Exeter's greatness to Agamemnon and mettle to Mark Antony. In this sense, Henry displays his positive assessment of Fluellen when he says: "Though it appear a little out of fashion, / There is much care and valor in this Welshman" (IV.i.83-84). He expresses that Fluellen is devoted to the English nation and has fortitude and experience to fight for the defence of the national honour and inheritance. As also indicated in these lines, Henry is impressed by Fluellen's experience and intelligence in the art of war. Similarly, Fluellen elevates Captain Jamy's military attributes as he says:

Captain Jamy is a marvellous falorous gentleman, that is certain; and of great expedition and knowledge in th' aunchiant wars, upon my particular knowledge of his directions: [...] (III.ii.80-83)

In Fluellen's words, Shakespeare presents Jamy as a heroic warrior able to conquer lands, and who has acquirements in the disciplines of war. In this regard, by the unity of the nobles, yeomen and the professional common soldiers, Henry's army of the Welsh, English, Scottish and Irish troops fight as a single force against France. Hence, by the presentation of these gallant professional soldiers in the play, it is also shown that the traditional rivalries within the British Isles are resolved as the Scotsmen, Irishmen and the Welshmen are united in their common commitment to the heroic king and the national cause of England.

The noble lords such as the Earl of Cambridge, the Duke of Exeter and the Duke of Bedford are strong and courageous soldiers who display their heroic self at throughout the play and depend on Henry by high fidelity. They are eager to defend the national honour of England against a foreign enemy and defeat France like the commoners, with whom they fight side by side at the battlefield. The Earl of Cambridge asserts the deep sense of admiration and respect he has for Henry as he says:

Never was monarch better fear'd and lov'd
Than is your majesty: there's not, I think, a subject
That sits in heart-grief and uneasiness
Under the sweet shade of your government. (II.ii.25-28)

As indicated in these lines, by his perfect rule of England, Henry is appreciated by the English people and feared by the French due to his heroic self, which will bring great victory to England, but a thrashing defeat to France. In other words, in these lines, Henry is depicted as the most perfect monarch who has ever administered England. It is also pronounced that all the English people are pleased by Henry's just and egalitarian rule. They are not sufferers and suppressed subjects by unfair acts, but respected countrymen under Henry's leadership. The Duke of Bedford's praising words for Henry also display that Henry is seen as both a perfect monarch, who inspires the English people by his heroic leadership, and a humanitarian man, who regards his subjects and behaves as one of them without any arrogant attitudes: "He is full of valour as of kindness; / Princely in both" (IV.iii.15-16). These lines clearly demonstrate that Henry achieves to combine all virtuous attributes in his kingship and appears as a strong, valiant and heroic king of England.

The Duke of Exeter displays that he is a powerful and valiant soldier when he delivers Henry's message to the French King at the French Court. He not only speaks as an ordinary messenger, but he also challenges the French King as a honourable and fearless warrior who is determined to defeat the French like all other English people. In other words, he represents the heroic self of the whole English nation and the king at the French Court, and by his valiant confrontation, he demonstrates the power and greatness of England:

Bloody constraints; for if you hide the crown
 Even in your hearts, there will he rake for it:
 Therefore in fierce tempest is he coming,
 In thunder and in earthquakelike a Jove,
 That, if requiring fail, he will compel;
 And bids you in the bowels of the Lord,
 Deliver up the crown, and to take mercy
 On the poor souls fro whom this hungry war
 Open his vasty jaws; and on your head
 Turning the windows' tears, the orphans' cries,
 The dead men's blood, the prived maidens' groans,
 For husbands, fathers, and betrothed lovers,
 That shall be shallow'd in this controversy.
 This is his claim, his threat'ning, and my messege;
 Unless the Dauphin be in presence here,
 To whom expressly I bring greeting too. (II.iv.97-111)

It is strongly asserted in these lines that the English soldiers are firmly decisive to defeat the French and defend the national honour of England, which has been humiliated by the Dauphin's insulting gift of the tennis balls, and take over the French crown, which should be rightly pass to Henry as inheritance. The Duke of Exeter vividly describes the chaotic situation which will arise if the French resist the English attacks. As indicated in these lines, the war will be bloody and the innocent French people will suffer as the English soldiers are heroic men eager to win a victory. Thus, he demands the French King to withdraw from the battle and give Henry the French throne, which is his rightful heritage. The Duke of Exeter's last attempt to give Henry's compliments to the Dauphin also demonstrates that the English King has not forgotten the Dauphin's affront to both the English monarch and the nation. Hence, the French were threatened and it was clearly shown that they should not underestimate the power of the English people as they will fight against the French with all their strength.

Shakespeare presents Henry V in two different but complementing images in the play; he is a king, but at the same time he can assume the identity of a common soldier and mingles with his troops. His humility and closeness with his soldiers show that he does not have the vain ambitions of an arrogant king; instead, he aims to rule England by the support of his subjects. In this sense, he develops his heroic self by fighting among his men as an ordinary soldier. As a king, he has the responsibility of protecting the national honour and sustaining the welfare of England, but he also prefers to be one of the soldiers with whom he fights for a just cause against a common foe. In the play, Henry emphasizes that he is not only the king of England but also a soldier who fights for England with other common soldiers. While addressing the governor of Harfleur, he speaks of himself as a soldier and says:

[...] for, as I am a soldier,
 A name that in my thoughts becomes me best,
 If I begin the batt'ry once again,
 I will not leave the half-achiev'd Harfleur
 Till in her ashes she lie buried. (III.iii.4-9)

These lines clearly demonstrate that Henry places his military character fighting heroically at the battlefield with other soldiers on his royalty. He uses a martial rhetoric

and firmly emphasizes that he will not give up his fight until he totally captures the city as a mighty and audacious soldier. When Henry woos Katharine, daughter of the French king, to whom he wants to get married after the victory at Agincourt, he brings his warlike spirit in the foreground as he wants the Princess to enlighten a rough soldier on how to court an elegant lady:

Fair Katharine, and most fair,
Will you vouchsafe to teach a soldier terms
Such as will enter at a lady's ear
And plead his love-suit to her gentle heart? (V.ii.98-101)

Henry, in these lines, highlights the wild nature of a soldier, who should endure the brutal circumstances of the battles. He presents himself as a plain soldier who needs to be educated on gentle attitudes. In other words, he does not portray himself as a gentleman but a coarse soldier who needs affection. Moreover, by identifying himself with a common soldier, Henry eliminates the barriers between the monarch and the soldiers and creates a more united nation. In the prologue to Act IV, the close relation between Henry and his soldiers is stated as follows:

For forth he goes and visits all his hosts,
Bids them good-morrow with a modest smile,
And calls them brothers, friends and countrymen. (IV.Chorus.32)

It is strongly asserted in these lines that Henry does not act as an aloof king distancing himself from his people and soldiers, but he mingles with them as he goes to the English camp before the Battle of Agincourt. He treats the soldiers with humility and, as Bolingbroke does in *Richard II*, he calls them his relatives, companions and citizens. Hence, as a king, he devotes himself to his nation with his two identities; both as a heroic king and a common soldier. Hodgdon describes Henry's double identity as "blood-brotherhood with his soldier-subjects" and "the responsibilities of monarch and subjects" (189). Henry is both an ideal monarch, who fulfils his duties to his people, and an ordinary soldier, who shares the honour of fighting side by side with his soldiers at the battlefield.

One of the sharp differences between England and France put forth by Shakespeare is the attitude of the two nations towards their common soldiers, which is revealed in the

different rhetorics of both nations. One may argue that Henry's egalitarianism represents a direct challenge to the French feudalism, which is reflected through the war. The French only think about the honour of the nobility and regard their common soldiers as "superfluous lackeys" (IV.ii.26); however, Henry unites his nation by his regard of the nobility and the common soldiers in the same context. In this respect, as Campbell has pointed out, "this picture of the soldier king is the more impressive by contrast with the picture of the leader of the French armies" (291). In the following words which Henry utters in his Crispin Crispian Speech, he emphasizes the essence of the English national unity by a highly patriotic tone:

We few, we happy few, we band of brothers;
For he to-day that sheds his blood with me
Shall be my brother; be he ne'er so vile,
This day shall gentle his condition. (IV.iii. 60-63)

In these lines, the solidarity of the English soldiers is emphasized. The ones who courageously dare to die for their nation in this bloody war will be called as brothers, and this honourable unity will be not only respected by the contemporary English nation, but will also be remembered by the next generations in esteem. On the other hand, the Constable of France hates his common soldiers and addresses them by a very ordinary speech lack of patriotic spirit before Agincourt as follows:

‘This positive ‘gainst all exceptions, lords,
That our superfluous lackeys and our peasants,
Who in unnecessary action swarm
About our squares of battle, were enow
To purge this field of such a hilding foe, (IV.ii.25-29)

With these lines, the Constable expresses that there is not a permanent unity among the French soldiers. They do not fight as they believe in the righteousness of their national cause, but just as they are ordered to fight. While Henry praises his soldiers as honourable men, strong and courageous, and wants them to fight to defend the national interests in unity, the Constable sees the French soldiers as mean subjects, who do not consider their nation. As opposed to Henry, the Constable displays his arrogance and indifference to the French soldiers when he calls them as his servants who are bound to the king not by love and respect, but by obedience. Hence, it can be argued that there is

a complete unity in the English army as the king and the soldiers unite by a national goal and the patriotic spirit is awakened by Henry's great orations; whereas, the French army is divided as there is not a unity of purpose between the king and the soldiers.

Henry's band of few brothers includes every common soldier who fights willingly for the unity and defence of England. In other words, Henry does not marginalize his soldiers but embraces them patriotically within the unity of nation and inspires in them the idea of nationhood and patriotism. So, Henry's identification with the commoners and his references to the brotherhood of all the English soldiers including himself during the war can be regarded as a subversion of the feudal hierarchy and reiterates some sense of social solidarity. Hodgdon points out that "Henry V seems to oppose a French feudal aristocracy to Henry's homosocial ideal, which flirts with imagining England as a proto-democratic or, more accurately, a fraternal state" (190). There is not a hierarchical relation based on obedience between Henry and his soldiers, but an intimate affiliation which is based on equality. This is most strikingly represented by the solidarity of the English army in the battlefield at Agincourt. Henry's disguise among the soldiers before Agincourt confirms the distinctiveness of the English nationhood, informed by loyalty, national solidarity, self identity, and patriotism. In this sense, Holderness points out that "in appearing as a common man and disguised the king, Henry is able to put into practice the idea of egalitarian majesty that is at the heart of the myth of Agincourt" (152). The king and the soldiers are equal at the battlefield and fight as brothers not as the monarch and his obedient subjects. In this sense, Henry eliminates the difference between the king and the soldiers and maintains unity as he brings his military character in the foreground and fights as one of the soldiers among them not as their commander giving orders from the court.

The Chorus, represented in the play by an actor, has a significant role in reiterating the sense of English nationalism and displaying the great exemplar of patriotic rhetoric in *Henry V*. English patriotism, Englishness, national unity and solidarity are strongly expressed through the Chorus, which in fact sums up the heroic and patriotic nature of the play:

O England! Model to thy inward greatness,
 Like little body with a mighty heart,
 What might'st thou do, that honor would thee do,
 Were all thy children kind and natural! (II.Chorus.16-19)

In these lines, Shakespeare, through the Chorus, arouses patriotic feelings as he states that England's power as a nation depends on the strength and fortitude of the English people. He resembles England to a small constitution and the English people to her essence, which keeps her alive. In a sense, it is the responsibility of the English people to defend their nation against any foreign attacks and glorify her by heroic deeds. The Chorus's emphasis on patriotism is extended to the idea of national unity and the glorification of England as the homeland shared by all the English people. It addresses to the English people to be prepared for the upcoming war as it says: "Grapple your minds to sternage of this navy, / And leave your England" (III.Chorus.18-19). Hence, as indicated in these lines, England is the fatherland of all the English people who are eager to fight for their country. As Ornstein has stated, the Chorus's words create "such memorable word pictures of epic activity and movement" (176). The Chorus glorifies England as a great country having a honourable past, praises the English people as bold and powerful people and implies that the national unity will be always maintained against any kind of foreign assault no matter how serious it is. In other words, the Chorus "exalts English patriotism and commitment" (Pearlman 149). Indeed, as Ornstein has further emphasized:

the Chorus is an interesting figure because in one aspect he is your average patriotic Elizabethan whose eyes moisten at the thought of his nation's triumphs, and in other aspect, he is the author's surrogate, a means by which Shakespeare reflects on his art as well as on England's history. (186)

These lines clearly demonstrate that through the Chorus, Shakespeare arouses his own audience's patriotic feelings and appeals to their imagination. The narrow stage conditions make it difficult to stage the epic theme literally. It is difficult to present the preparations for war, of the gathering and movement of the ships and armies before Harfleur and Agincourt and of the sound of the fury battle. The Chorus urges the audience to imagine the battlefield and the display of the forces: "And let us, ciphers to this great accompt, / On your imaginary forces work" (I.Chorus.17-18). The patriotic tension of the play rises as the audience visualize the battle on the stage. The

significance of the victory for the audience increases when they see the armies confronting in a great battle and the English soldiers fighting courageously although they are weaker than the French. In this regard, the intended effect in such a description is to move the audience to the battle scene in both thought and sense:

Play with your fancies, and in them behold
 Upon the hempen tackle ship-boys climbing;
 Hear the shrill whistle which doth order give
 To sounds confus'd; behold the threaden sails,
 Borne with th' invisible and creeping wind,
 Draw the huge bottoms through the furrow'd sea,
 Breasting the lofty surge. O, do but think
 You stand upon the rivage and behold
 A city on th' inconstant billows dancing;
 For so appears this fleet majestical,
 Holding due course to Harfleur. Follow, follow! (III.Chorus.7-17)

In these lines, the atmosphere of the battle is explicitly presented by the references to the harsh wind, the rough sea and the navy leading to its foe decisively despite its insufficiency in equipment and the tough weather conditions. In this sense, the senses of nationalism and patriotism are aroused as the solidity and courage of the English soldiers is demonstrated. So, through the Chorus, Shakespeare enables the audience to imagine that what is being performed on the stage is naturally a heroic endeavour. Dramatically, the present has been replaced by the past by the imagination of the great moments of the war, and Shakespeare's use of the Chorus for bridging the gap between the present and the past is certainly very effective. As Jones has pointed out, "instead of sharing our retrospect, as he does when he speaks of the performance, he [the Chorus] takes us with him to the moment of the action itself" (147). Though it is a historical event, by the help of the Chorus, the audience have the chance to feel themselves at the time of the incident and live the war as if they are actively involved as one of the English soldiers fighting at the battlefield. Thus, by presenting a dramatically moving picture of the Battle of Agincourt, Shakespeare plays on the patriotism of the audience and, in a sense, reminds them of the sacrifices that the English people have made in the past for their country:

The country cocks do crow, the clocks do toll,
 And the third hour of drowsy morning name.

Proud of their numbers, and secure in soul,
 The confident and over-lusty French
 Do the low-rated English play at dice;
 [.....]
 The poor condemned English,
 Like sacrifices, by their watchful fires
 Sit patiently, and inly ruminate
 The morning's danger and; their gesture sad. (IV.Chorus.15-19,22-25)

The English soldiers are powerless in number and military armament, hence the French are self-assured that they will easily defeat the English. The English soldiers, desperately, wait for the war at their camp while the French boastfully regard the English as inferior. So, the presentation of the gloomy atmosphere of the English camp by the Chorus, as opposed to the assertive mood of the French side, displays the greatness of the English victory as it has been won under very heavy circumstances.

The dramatic effect of the Chorus's rhetoric is maintained in the play by Henry's own patriotic rhetoric on the righteousness of the English cause and the courage of the English soldiers. His aim is, to put it in Campbell's words, "to rouse men to prowess" (289). He wants to hearten his weary men to gather their inherited strength and challenge the French. In this sense, the courage and the strength of the English soldiers are put in the forefront in Henry's patriotic rhetoric to both the noble lords and the common soldiers. His speech in front of the walls of Harfleur revolves around the sense of English nationalism. He encourages his men to show the ability of true soldiership and leads them for greater efforts. In his address to the nobility, he stresses their hereditary valour and virtue:

Dishonour not your mothers; now attest
 That those whom you call'd fathers did beget you.
 Be copy now to men of grosser blood,
 And teach them how to war. (III.i.22-25)

Therefore, it can be clearly seen that Henry wants the nobility to inflate their gentle families by their bravery. He also encourages his noble soldiers as he expresses that they will definitely defeat the enemy as they have the necessary knowledge and capacity to fight in a bloody war. It is indicated that the nobles should imitate their heroic ancestors, who are both highborn and courageous warriors, to defeat the enemy. While

Henry wants the nobles to deserve their ancestors, in his address to the yeomen, he emphasizes their Englishness and national traits:

[...] And you, good yeomen,
Whose limbs were made in England, show us here
The mettle of your pasture; let us swear
That you are worth your breeding; which I doubt not; (III.i.25-28)

With these lines, Henry affirms that though the yeomen are of no noble origin, they are born in England and embody her greatness as proud Englishmen. The common infantry men stand as the representatives of the unhistorical; but, here, they enter the history by the virtue of successful military action. They are presented as valiant and powerful warriors who fight the enemy with dedication. As indicated in these lines, they are expected to repay in loyal service and devotion to England the investment of their breeding as they are bred like cattle in the meadows of England. These men are considered to be the honourable part of the English nation. In this sense, he urges them to be worthy of their honourable country and arouses patriotic senses in the yeomen to defend the righteous cause of England against a foreign enemy. Henry also reiterates the idea of prowess and Englishness when he speaks to his cousin, Earl of Westmoreland, just before the battle:

[...] proclaim it, Westmoreland, through my host,
That he which hath no stomach to this fight,
Let him depart; his passport shall be made,
And crowns for convoy put into his purse:
We would not die in that man's company
That fears his fellowship to die with us. (IV.iii.34-39)

It is strongly asserted in these lines that the war will be murderous and the men who are not powerful and courageous enough should not participate in the war and fight with the soldiers who defend the national cause by faith. He wants them to leave the battlefield and not to be called as one of the brave English soldiers, who has dared to die in a bloody war to protect his nation. Henry's main aim in this address to his noble and common soldiers is to strengthen unity, awaken patriotic feelings and discourage cowardice among the English soldiers. For him, any class differences and social barriers

have no significance in the battlefield where the whole army becomes a living image of full brotherhood:

We few, we happy few, we band of brothers;
For he to-day that sheds his blood with me
Shall be my brother; be he ne'er so vile (IV.iii.60-62)

The soldiers leave their social statues back when they are on the battlefield as they gather around a common purpose at war, which is to defend their nation. Hence, the important point during a battle is not to come from a noble family or be wealthy, but to know how to fight heroically and have the necessary personal skills of courage and power. The soldiers, regardless of their social classes, have a unity of purpose which eliminates the hierarchy and makes them equal as brothers who fight side by side. The most encouraging and heroic point in Henry's rhetoric is that he does not differentiate himself from his soldiers fighting at the battlefield. Shakespeare, here, points to the integrity between the king and his nation as both regard the national unity and fight altogether as a single body. As Pearlman has observed, Henry "speaks as a man who has been willing to grunt and sweat under the same weary load as his soldiers" (164). He desires to confront all the challenges that his soldiers handle at the battlefield. Moreover, through Henry's patriotic rhetoric to the nobles and yeomen, Shakespeare indicates that valour and nobility are inborn qualities that are possessed individually, not by inheritance from the family. Also, as a dramatic illustration of this point, he inserts a scene in the play, where the ignoble and despicable types such as Nym, Pistol and Bardolph turn out to be soldiers of perfect valour and inward nobility. These men are Henry's tavern companions at Eastcheap; however, when the action is moved to the battlefield, they are absorbed into the fierce atmosphere of the camp and the battle. They decide to leave the Boar's-Head Tavern at Eastcheap to participate in the war. Pistol's speech, despite its cynical tone, resembles Henry's patriotic rhetoric at the Battles of Harfleur and Agincourt:

[...] Yoke-fellows in arms,
Let us go to France; like horse-leeches, my boys,
To suck, to suck, the very blood to suck! (II.iii.55-57)

In these lines, he calls Nym and Bardolph as his companions with whom he will fight against a common foe for the national interests as Henry addresses his soldiers as his friends and countrymen before Harfleur and Agincourt. Despite their dissolute characters, the three vagabonds behave like virtuous soldiers and decisively go to France and assault the enemy to defend their nation. Bardolph's character as "a soldier, firm and sound of heart, / And of buxom valour," (III.vi.25-26) is also presented in the quarrel between Nym and Pistol. He resolutely declares that he will punish both men severely if they do not cease to dispute as he says:

Hear me, hear me what I say: he that strikes the first stroke, I'll run him up to the hilts, as I am a soldier. (II.i.63-65)

As indicated in these lines, Bardolph completely gives up his depraved character and also wants Nym and Pistol to behave like honourable soldiers. He also tells the two men to end the strife as they should not "keep knives to cut one another's throats" (II.i.92), but, act together in harmony to defeat the foreign enemy threatening the national unity and besmirching the national honour.

The divine support for the righteous cause of England is one of the most fundamental elements to arouse the sense of Englishness and the heroic self in the play. It is clearly indicated that God favours England in the war and helps her defeat France by a glorious victory. Henry's commitment to the divine support is presented in the first act, in the speech between the Archbishop of Canterbury and Ely:

Canterbury: The King is full of grace and fair regard.
Ely: And a true lover of the holy Church. (I.i.22-23)

These lines clearly demonstrate that he depends on the divine power to exercise his authority in statecraft and military affairs as a faithful follower of the Church; because, he sees the ecclesiastical structure as an integral part of the national constitution. Henry also states that the course of the war is controlled by a higher power when he receives the insulting gift of the tennis balls sent by the Dauphin: "this lies all within the will of God / To whom I do appeal" (I.iii.289-290). In these lines, he explicitly pronounces that the offensive message of the Dauphin is a sign of God's consent in Henry's declaration

of war. Right after he is persuaded that his claim to the French throne is rightful, the gift of tennis balls arrives and Henry is given a good cause to declare war on France. In this sense, he depends this good timing of the message on God's will and favour of England. The idea of divine support does not encourage only Henry to go to war with France, but also the whole English nation. The idea that the English people are divinely chosen convinces them that England is divinely sanctioned as a nation and promotes the national unity. In this sense, the Earl of Salisbury, a courageous lord in Henry's army, cheers the other lords and the soldiers by ensuring that the divine power will be on the side of England before they go to war as he says:

God's arm strike with us! 'tis a fearful odds.
 God bye you, princes all; I'll to my charge:
 If we no more meet till we meet in heaven,
 Then, joyfully, my noble lord of Bedford,
 My dear Lord Gloucester, and my good Lord Exeter,
 And my kind kinsman, warriors all, adieu! (IV.iii.5-9)

It is strongly asserted in these lines that the English soldiers will fight against French by the assurance of divine support. It is indicated that even if they die, they will fight for a righteous cause on the will of God. At Agincourt Henry also emphasizes the significance of divine will as he orders his troops to trust in the divine support: "Now soldiers, march away; / And how thou pleasest, God, dispose the day" (IV.iii.131-32). He cheers his soldiers to advance without fear as the divine power will protect the English people to defend their righteous cause.

One may argue that Henry V's heroic character is not only promoted by his legendary ancestors, but by the divine will as well. Henry intends to rise as the saviour of the nation and enters his kingdom in full glory after the victory of Agincourt. He declares himself as godlike and states that his kingly power is derived from divine will in his conversation with the Archbishop of Canterbury:

For God doth known how many, now in health
 Shall drop their blood in approbation
 Of what your reverence shall incite us to.
 Therefore take heed how you inpawn our person,
 How you awake the sleeping sword of war:
 We charge you, in the name of God, take heed (I.ii.18-23)

With these lines, Henry warrants the Archbishop of Canterbury to justify the war through the medium of God. He acts as a celestial judge when he urges the prelate to be true whether Henry justly deserves the French throne as the consequences of an unjust war will be severe and Henry, as a good king, does not want to lead his nation to such a devastation for an unfair claim. Hence, as Holderness has stated, “the cause being thus hallow’d, God and king are inseparably fused: or rather the King’s divinely inspired will is reconciled with the will of God” (145). He calls the Archbishop as the agent of God and clearly expresses that a just war is not only his will, but it is also the demand of divine power. The king is accepted as God’s deputy on earth and represents the divine authority. Hence, the divine will becomes alive in Henry’s heroic and just character and the English people trust him as their divinely appointed leader, who will lead them to victory. Henry, himself, inspires his soldiers to rely on his royal and divine authority as he says: “Upon the king! let us our lives, our souls, / Our debts, our careful wives, / Our children, and our sins lay on the king!” (IV.i.236-238). He wants his people to entrust not only their lives, but also their families and even their crimes, that is, whatever they possess to the power of divinely sanctioned legitimate king of England. Thus, Henry goes through a moral reformation and reaches maturity as the heroic king of a virtuous nation, who is aware of his responsibilities and powerful enough to resist any foreign attack when he is divinely encouraged and supported by the whole nation.

Shakespeare praises and elevates England and Englishness in the play as he compares the country to France. The idea of heroic self is also raised in the different presentations of Henry V and the Dauphin along with the English and French soldiers. The differences between the two nations are presented, and while England is praised, France is depicted as an inferior nation. Henry displays the excellence of the English soldiers over the French as he says: “upon one pair of English legs / Did march three Frenchmen” (III.vi.154-155). He emphasizes that the English soldiers are more powerful than the French and even if they are outnumbered, their strength will substitute the deficient means on the side of the English soldiers. They will defeat the French soldiers by their courage and power. Henry’s great reformation into a hero king is contrasted to the levity of the Dauphin. Henry constantly talks about the bravery of his soldiers, his legendary ancestors and the glorious English history; however, the

Dauphin totally neglects his nation and soldiers and boasts about his horse and armour before the Battle of Agincourt as he says:

And of the heat of the ginger. It is a beast for Perseus: he is pure air and fire; and the dull elements of earth and water never appear in him, but only in patient stillness while his rider mounts him: he is indeed a horse: and all other jades you may call beasts. (III.vii.20-25)

It is quite obvious from these lines that the Dauphin is an irresponsible leader dealing only with his own image and boasting about trivial issues such as his horse. While Henry gets into a complete maturity as the heir of the English throne and transforms into an ideal ruler aware of his duties towards his subjects, the Dauphin fails to turn into a perfect monarch as he is too arrogant and indifferent to his nation. The French aristocracy is also presented to be vain and overconfident. Instead of focusing on the means to defeat the enemy, the French nobles haughtily despise the English people as the Constable of France says:

[...] where have they this mettle?
Is not their climate foggy, raw and dull,
On whom, as in despite, the sun looks pale,
Killing their fruit with frowns? Can sodden water,
A drench for sur-rein'd jades, their barley-broth,
Decoct their cold blood to such valiant heat?
And shall our quick blood, spirited with wine,
Seem frosty? (III.v.15-22)

As indicated in these lines, the Constable not only humiliates the English people, but he also depicts England as a barren land with an uncongenial climate and natural resources. He does not understand the reason why the English people are so courageous and strong as their native land does not promise any hope to spirit them.

This differentiation between the English and the French continues to reveal itself on the eve of Agincourt and during the war. Before the battle, the French are overconfident and sure that they will defeat the weak English soldiers. The Dauphin haughtily yearns for the coming day as he is so certain to upset the English soldiers as he says:

Would I were able to load him with his desert! Will it never be day?- I will trot tomorrow a mile, and my way shall be paved with English faces. (III.vii.81-84)

These lines clearly demonstrate that the French are firmly sure of the triumph against the English. The Dauphin pronounces that he will easily kill the English soldiers and ride his horse proudly without any obstacles on his way to victory. Furthermore, the Constable emphasizes England's weakness and humiliates the English soldiers instead of speaking of the power of France as he calls the English a "poor and starved band" (IV.ii.16) who are only the "shales and husks of men" (IV.ii.18). For the French king, the English soldiers are a group of weak and ignoble men, so England is an easy prey for the self-assured and powerful France. He never considers the English soldiers as courageous and strong warriors and makes a judgement of error by neglecting the power of his enemy. Though Henry V is not as confident as the French king due to the weakness of the English troops, he is aware of the fact that he has to put aside all his doubts and lead his soldiers for victory. As Pearlman has stated, he "knows that his army is tired and overmatched; instead of addressing himself to the condition of things as they are, he turns away from the present and inspires his army by speaking of what may be" (162). Though Henry is aware of the desperate situation of his soldiers, he never lets himself indulge in despair. Instead of stressing the weakness of the English and the supremacy of the French, he encourages his soldiers to realize their inner potential of powerful and brave warriors and reveal their strength at the battle. In this sense, he aims to unite his soldiers at the eve of Agincourt as he visits the English camp and dissolves the "cold fear" of both the commoners and the nobility. He displays that the English soldiers are not alone and their king will support them at the battle by both his royal authority and divine power. Therefore, as the Chorus states, all of his soldiers equally share "a little touch of Harry in the night" (IV.Chorus.47) They are blessed by Henry before the battle and encouraged to defeat the arrogant French despite all physical obstacles.

The difference between England and France is also presented in the battle scenes where the kings of the two nations make their last orations to encourage their soldiers. Before the Battle of Harfleur, Henry V emphasizes the significance of his soldiers' fight against the French and arouses patriotic feelings as follows:

In peace there's nothing so becomes a man

As modest stillness and humility:
 But when the blast of war blows in our ears,
 Then imitate the action of the tiger;
 Stiffen the sinews, conjure up the blood,
 Disguise fair nature with hard- favour'd rage:
 Then lend the eye a terrible aspect; (III.i.3-9)

Therefore, it can be clearly seen that war is presented by the English as a thrilling occasion, which every participating soldier should share the enthusiasm of being on the battlefield. On the contrary, the French king, before the Battle of Agincourt presents “the picture of the weakness and the effeminacy” (Campbell 284) and does not give his soldiers a patriotic and encouraging oration on the glorious consequences of the French victory over England or the equality of the ones who fight together. He only disdains the power of the English soldiers and expresses that England is of no importance as an enemy and it will not be hard for the French soldiers to defeat the weak English. In this regard, as Campbell has pointed out, the French king “despises the enemy and belittles the task before his troops. There is nothing in what he says to make them lions” (289). He only expresses how much he hates the English, but he does not celebrate the power of his own soldiers. His speech is full of humiliating images for the English nation:

To horse, you gallant princes! straight to horse!
 Do but behold yond poor and starved band,
 And your fair show shall suck away their souls,
 Leaving them but the shales and husks of men.
 There is not work enough for all our hands;
 Scarce blood enough in all their sickly veins
 To give each naked curtle-axe a stain, (IV.ii.15-21)

As indicated in these lines, as opposed to Henry, the Constable does not fight with his soldiers, but he gives them orders to fight the gang of the English soldiers savagely. He only cares about defeating England in brutal means, but he does not have concerns about glorifying his nation. He also emphasizes that the French are superior in numbers and the English soldiers do not have any chance to defeat the French.

Shakespeare makes an analogy to his time in Henry V and draws a parallel between the victorious return of Henry V to London after Agincourt and the early stages of the Irish expedition. In other words, he associates the present and the past and interprets the contemporary politics by referring to the English history. Hence, it may be argued that

Shakespeare considers contemporary situations while writing his plays. In *Henry V*, apart from the Elizabethan idea of war and ideal ruler, there is also a tendency to associate the play to the Irish Expedition led by the Earl of Essex. Shakespeare presents Henry as the prototype of the Earl of Essex, who made an expedition to Ireland to put down the rebellion started by the Irish dissidents in 1599. As Campbell has pointed out, the play “must have been written after that date and before September of that year, when the harried earl made his very unvictorious appearance in England” (258). The Chorus introducing the fifth act makes a reference to the expected successful return of Essex’s from Ireland as follows:

Were now the General of our gracious empress,
As in good time he may, from Ireland coming,
Bringing rebellion broached on his sword,
How many would the peaceful city quit
To welcome him! (V.Chorus.30-34)

In these lines, Shakespeare compares the greeting which would be given to Essex if he had returned from Ireland, putting down the rebellion successfully, to the greeting which Henry received from the English people when he returned victorious from France. Henry is welcomed by respect and affection by the English nation as he has had a great victory against France and it is implied that if Essex returns from Ireland with such success, he will be treated by regard. Hence, the play “represents the fantasy of a successful Irish campaign” (Dollimore and Sinfield 196). There are also other similarities between the two commanders which lead Shakespeare to associate the two men. The Earl of Essex leaves England to repress a rebellion, which is a threat for the English nation, on a foreign land and, correspondingly, Henry goes to France to fight a foreign enemy for a righteous national cause. Both men lead the expedition personally as they do not stand aloof from their soldiers. In this respect, in Pearlman’s words, Shakespeare “has already implicitly celebrated a fifteenth century king as a similitude of contemporary English virtue” (167). He glorifies Henry, a medieval king, as a courageous and strong leader by relating him to the Earl of Essex, a powerful Elizabethan courtier.

In conclusion, one may argue that *Henry V* illustrates Henry's embodiment of heroic self through his miraculous transformation from a rascal youth indulging in adventurous and illegal exploits at Eastcheap with his idle companions into an ideal king. The unity of the English nation under his valiant leadership in a war fought against France for the righteous English claim to the French throne and defence of the national honour of England, which is humiliated by the Dauphin, is displayed. In other words, national unity is obtained, and England rises as a courageous nation by fighting for a righteous cause at patriotic wars, Harfleur and Agincourt. The nobility and the commoners fight together against a foreign enemy in the unity of purpose and maintain the domestic integrity. Henry's intimate relationship with the English people and presentation of himself as a regular soldier also eliminates the barriers between the monarch and the people and brings harmony to the English nation. In *Henry V*, Shakespeare writes the epic of England in a nationalist and patriotic framework with characters who are heroic in deeds and in nature. The madcap Prince Hal in *Henry IV* appears as an efficient ruler, who is skillful in politics and rhetoric, and a brave warrior king, whom the English people are committed by fidelity, in *Henry V*. Not only Henry V, but also the English soldiers are demonstrated as heroic characters who are courageous and powerful to defeat France.

In the play, it is also presented that Henry's patriotic rhetoric before the Battles of Harfleur and Agincourt to both the nobility and the commons encourages the soldiers and gives them the necessary bravery and power to challenge and defeat the powerful French soldiers. The effective orations of the Chorus urging the audience to imagine the great wars are also important to arouse the patriotic feelings and Englishness. As the stage conditions are narrow to display the glorious wars fought with great armies in nationalist senses, Shakespeare uses the Chorus to present these illustrious wars and evokes patriotic feelings in the audience as they are taken to the time of the war and the past and the present are mingled. Shakespeare also makes references to his time by presenting Henry's outstanding victories at Harfleur and Agincourt and his heroic self which attracts admiration and respect. He refers to the defeat of the Spanish Armada in Elizabethan's era and how Queen Elizabeth achieved to unite the English soldiers by her heroic self and encourage them by her patriotic rhetoric at Tilbury just like Henry's

inspiring orations at Harfleur and Agincourt. Hence, in *Henry V*, Shakespeare draws a brilliant picture of the English victories in France during Henry's reign and presents his transition into an ideal king and a honourable soldier maintaining the national unity.

CONCLUSION

In this thesis, Shakespeare's *Richard II* and *Henry V* are studied with reference to the development of the sense of nationalism, Englishness and nation building within the context of the major political and social developments in Elizabethan England. The main aim of this study has been to demonstrate the rise of nationalism in England from the Anglo-Saxon period to the Elizabethan Age and how, in his Histories, *Richard II* and *Henry V*, Shakespeare presents the rise of nationalism, patriotism and Englishness. His use of the historical context as a vehicle for his own allusions to political and social events of his time is also discussed extensively.

The Introduction of the thesis is mainly concerned with the emergence of the sense of Englishness and gives a historical and cultural account of the evolution of the sense of English nationalism from its Anglo-Saxon beginnings. As has already been demonstrated, the sense of Englishness and the idea of nation building can be traced back to the Anglo-Saxon period through the ecclesiastical unity of the Anglo-Saxons and also through the use of the English language, which gave rise to a vernacular literature. Moreover, through the changes and developments in administration, legislation, the economy and warfare, the sense of national unity was consolidated. Throughout the Middle Ages, the sense of a national identity of Englishness was maintained, and, despite the negative effects of the Norman Conquest, this sense of Englishness never declined but was constantly reiterated through literary writings, chronicles, and institutions. It was indeed during the Tudor period (1485-1603) that Englishness became the core of the national identity. The sense of nationalism increased and the national unity is maintained under the rule of the Tudor monarchs. Henry VIII's religious reforms and establishment of the Church of England increased the sense of Englishness as England became a sovereign nation in religious issues and completely freed itself from the papal hegemony of Rome. Queen Elizabeth I's heroic character united the whole nation, both the commoners and the nobility, without any class distinctions and led to a great victory over Spain in 1588. The defeat of the Spanish Armada aroused the sense of Englishness and patriotism in England. England's victory over Spain despite the weak conditions strengthened the idea that the English people

were divinely chosen people and God helped them defeat Spain. Hence, after the defeat of the Spanish Armada, it was proved that England was a powerful country, which was impossible to invade, had strong and courageous soldiers, and was divinely supported.

Chapter I, in which *Richard II* is studied, demonstrates the use and abuse of power, the absence of justice and the personal weakness of the monarch which leads to a political chaos and undermines the national unity. This is illustrated through Richard II's weak monarchy and Bolingbroke's determined and unyielding political stand. It is displayed that Richard makes the nation suffer by his unfair practices and suppressing of both the commoners and the nobility while Bolingbroke elevates them by his just acts and respecting them as his countrymen. The play is not only a historical play depicting the end of Richard II's reign, his deposition and Bolingbroke's rise to absolute power, but it is also highly political as it presents the principles of how a realm is ruled perfectly. In the play, the kingship and its requirements embodied in the idea of nation building are chiefly discussed. An ideal nation builder is depicted as a strong, courageous and determined person who achieves to maintain the national unity. Shakespeare conveys the idea that a weak monarch, who abuses his power, obstructs the exercise of justice, and violates laws and customs by his illegal practices, should be replaced by a more efficient nation builder. In this case, it is also demonstrated that the legitimacy of the monarch loses its significance as an illegitimate but powerful monarch is better than a legitimate but weak ruler. Hence, Bolingbroke's deposition of the legitimate monarch, Richard II, is supported by the public and the powerful lords, who are suppressed by Richard's unjust practices. The attributes of an effective nation builder are presented in Bolingbroke's personality, who is strong, determined and maintains the national unity as he wins the love and respect of both the commoners and the nobility. Hence, the question of what people should do when ruled by a weak monarch, who frustrates his nation by a tyrannical rule, is particularly presented throughout the play. The proper relationship between the king and the nation, the idea of good administration and the agony of a nation which is weakly and unjustly governed are depicted.

It is also presented in this chapter that Richard's abuse of power, violation of laws, failure to exercise justice and disregard of his subjects mostly emanate from his

excessive reliance on his divine right to rule. Hence, the idea of divine kingship is one of the major themes of the play. Shakespeare shows that the idea of the divine right to rule, which was an important political tradition in the Tudor dynasty and was used to strengthen the monarch's rule and encourage the people for victory during a war, leads to the fall of a monarch if it is abused. If a monarch disregards the consequences of his misgovernance and oppresses his subjects by unjust practices since he believes that he derives his power directly from God and he is above the law, then he turns out to be a despotic monarch and loses the public support. Hence, his great confidence in his divinity prevents him from being an ideal nation builder. It is also shown in the play that a perfect monarch should primarily depend on his own power along with that of his soldiers to put down a rebellion and take all the necessary measures to challenge his opponents. Shakespeare displays that if the monarch blindly waits for divine support to defeat the rebels, he will get weaker and lose his throne due to his inability to act.

Chapter II, in which *Henry V* is studied, discusses the attributes of a perfect monarch. In this chapter, Shakespeare shows that the strong and courageous King Henry V unites the whole nation, both the commoners and the nobility, regardless of class differences, by his heroic self and patriotic rhetoric and leads his country to great victories at Harfleur and Agincourt against France. He encourages the nobility by emphasizing their noble heritage and the common people by reminding them that they have been born in England, and, hence have the greatness of the country. Hence, for Shakespeare, a perfect monarch should be both a just ruler regarding his subjects and a powerful and valiant warrior personally leading his soldiers at war and encouraging them by his inspiring orations. In this chapter, it is also displayed that Henry's prodigal youth as Prince Hal of *Henry IV 1&2*, who wastes his time with his worthless and decadent companions like Sir John Falstaff and his thugs at Eastcheap, has a positive impact on his perfect kingship when he ascends to the throne after his father Henry IV's death. His delinquent character has matured into a heroic self, and he turns out to be a wise and admirable leader. He not only knows the nobility at the court, but he is also familiar with the lower class of the society he meets at the taverns and knows how to address and impress both of them. Hence, it is shown that his frivolous youth has a significant role in his metamorphosis into a perfect monarch. His strength and courage as a great

warrior and humility as an ordinary man among his soldiers are the main features of his heroic self. He eliminates all the barriers between himself and his soldiers and displays his warfare skills as he fights among them. It is also shown that not only a heroic monarch but also heroic soldiers are necessary to defeat the powerful foreign enemy. Therefore, the heroic self of the soldiers is emphasized and their significance in the victory over France is displayed in the presentation of their valiant struggle and Henry's praise of the common soldiers such as the Welsh soldier Captain Fluellen and the noble lords.

In this study, it is also demonstrated that in his Histories, Shakespeare draws a parallel between his own time and medieval English history. In other words, he interprets the political developments of his time by historicism as a cover. Shakespeare refers to Elizabeth's use of power to maintain a strong administration as he presents Richard's abuse of power and the necessity to use power effectively for the national welfare. Hence, he depicts the problems of misgovernment and the duties of an ideal monarch towards his subjects through *Richard II*. He also presents a perfect model of the ideal monarch by the portrayal of Henry's heroic self in *Henry V*. He draws a parallel between Elizabeth's strong and courageous character, which unites the whole nation against Spain in 1588, and Henry's heroic self and perfect monarchy, which increases the sense of Englishness. He refers to the upsurge of patriotism in the post-Armada period through the depiction of Henry V's great victories at the battles of Harfleur and Agincourt. It is demonstrated that the English people are powerful and valiant so that they win a victory over France through Henry's heroic leadership and inspiring orations. Henry's patriotic rhetorics at Harfleur and Agincourt also mirror Elizabeth's patriotic speech at the Battle of Tilbury. Elizabeth here emphasizes the brotherhood of all the English soldiers and maintains the national unity just as Henry did by his encouraging addresses to both the commoners and the nobility.

WORKS CITED

1. Texts and Primary Sources

Bede, Venerabilis. *Bed's Ecclesiastical Hisyory of the English Nation*. London: Dent, 1965.

Shakespeare, William. *King Richard II*. Ed. Peter Ure. The Arden Edition. Eds. Richard Proudfoot et al. London: Methuen, 1956.

---. *King Henry IV, Part I*. Ed. A.R.Humphreys. The Arden Edition. Eds. Richard Proudfoot et al. London: Methuen, 1960.

---. *King Henry IV, Part II*. Ed. A.R.Humphreys. The Arden Edition. Eds. Richard Proudfoot et al. London: Methuen, 1966.

---. *King Henry V*. Ed. J.H. Walter. The Arden Edition. Eds. Richard Proudfoot et al. London: Methuen, 1985.

The Parker Chronicle. (A) 882 [881]

2. Secondary Sources

Allmand, Christopher. *The Hundred Years War: England and France at War*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989.

---. *Henry V*. London: Methuen, 1992.

Barber, Charles. *Richard II by Williams Shakespeare*. Houndmills: Macmillan, 1987.

Becker, George J. *Shakespeare's History Plays*. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1977.

Bevan, Bryan. *King Richard II*. London: Rubicon, 1996.

Brooke, Christopher. *The Saxon and Norman Kings*. London: B.T. Batsford, 1963.

Campbell, Lily B. *Shakespeare's Histories: Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy*. London: Methuen, 1964.

Chambers, E.K. *William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1988.

Champion, Larry S. *The Noise of Threatening Drum: Dramatic Strategy and Ideology in Shakespeare and the English Chronicle Plays*. Newark: Delaware UP, 1990.

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. "On *Richard II* and History Play." *Shakespeare the Critical Tradition: Richard II*. Ed. Charles R. Forker. London: Athlone, 1998. 95-102.

Cubeta, Paul M. *Twentieth Century Interpretations of Richard II*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Devlin, Diana. "'This Earth, This Realm, This England.'" *Critical Essays on Richard II: William Shakespeare*. Eds. Linda Cookson and Bryan Loughrey. Harlow: Longman, 1989. 65-79.

Dollimore, Jonathan and Alan Sinfield. "History and Ideology: *Henry V*." *Shakespeare's History Plays: Richard II to Henry V*. Ed. Graham Holderness. London: Macmillan, 1992. 183-199.

Doran, Susan. *England and Europe in the Sixteenth Century*. London: Macmillan, 1999.
---. *Elizabeth I and Foreign Policy, 1558-1603*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Dorius, Raymond J. "A Little More Than a Little." *Shakespeare The Histories: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Eugene M. Waith. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965. 113-132.

Dowden, Edward. "The Immaturity of *Richard II* and the Realism of Bolingbroke." *Shakespeare the Critical Tradition: Richard II*. Ed. Charles R. Forker. London:

Athlone, 1998. 247-255.

Draper, Ronald. "‘I Wasted Time, and Now Doth Time Waste Me’." *Critical Essays on Richard II: William Shakespeare*. Eds. Linda Cookson and Bryan Loughrey. Harlow: Longman, 1989. 79-94.

Dutton, Richard. *William Shakespeare: A Literary Life*. London: Macmillan, 1996.

Elton, G.R. "Henry VIII." *The Tudors*. Ed. Joel Hurstfield. London: Sidgwick, Jackson, 1973. 46-70.

---. *The English*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.

Figgis, John Neville. *The Divine Right of Kings*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1914.

Fisher, D.J.V. *The Anglo-Saxon Age*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1973.

Garmonsway, G.N. Introduction. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. Introduction. London: J.M.Dent&Sons, 1990.

Greenfeld, Liah. *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*. Cambridge M.A.: Harvard UP, 1992.

Hadfield, Andrew. *Literature, Politics and National Identity: Reformation to Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.

Hall, Lord Joan. *Henry V: A Guide to the Play*. London: Greenwood, 1997.

Harriss, G.L. *Henry V: The Practice of Kingship*. Stroud, Eng.: Alan Sutton, 1993.

---. *Shaping the Nation: England, 1360-1461*. Oxford: Clarendon, 2005.

Hastings, Adrian. *The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006.

- Helgerson, Richard. "Writing Empire and Nation." *The Cambridge Companion to English Literature, 1500-1600*. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.
- Hodgdon, Barbara. *The End Crowns All: Closure and Contradiction in Shakespeare's History*. Princeton N.J.: Princeton UP, 1991.
- Holderness, Graham. *Shakespeare: The Histories*. Houndmills: Macmillan, 2000.
- Holinshed, Raphael. *Holinshed's Chronicle as Used in Shakespeare's Plays*. Eds. Allardyce Nicoll and Josephine Calina. Introduction. London: M. Dent and Sons, 1965.
- Hurstfield, Joel. "The Close of the Tudor Age." *The Tudors*. London: Sidgwick, Jackson, 1973. 205-219.
- Ignatieff, Michael. *Blood and Belonging: Journeys into the New Nationalism*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1994.
- Iser, Wolfgang. *Staging Politics: The Lasting Impact of Shakespeare's Histories*. New York: Columbia UP, 1993.
- Jones, Norman L. *The Birth of the Elizabethan Age: England in the 1560s*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.
- Jones, Robert C. *These Valiant Dead*. Iowa: Iowa UP, 1991.
- Kantorowicz, Ernst Hartwig. "From *The King's Two Bodies*." *Shakespeare: Richard II: A Casebook*. Ed. Nicholas Brooke. London: Macmillan, 1973.
- Keeton, George W. *Shakespeare's Legal and Political Background*. London: Pitman, 1967.
- Kinney, Arthur F. *Elizabethan Backgrounds: Historical Documents of the Age of Elizabeth*. Hamden: Archon, 1975.

Kohn, Hans. "The Genesis and Character of English Nationalism." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 1.1 (1940): 69-94. JSTOR. 12 April 2008

<<http://www.jstor.org/>>.

Laing, Lloy and Jennifer. *Anglo-Saxon England*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979.

Levin, Carole. *The Heart and Stomach of a King: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power*. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania UP, 1994.

Loades, David. *Power in Tudor England*. London: Macmillan, 1997.

MacCaffrey, Wallace T. *Elizabeth I*. London: Edward Arnold, 1993.

Mackie, J.D. *The Earlier Tudors, 1485- 1558*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991.

Marcus, Leah S., Janel Mueller and Mary Beth Rose. Eds. *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 2000.

McEachern, Claire Elizabeth. *The Poetics English Nationhood, 1590-1612*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.

McKisack, May. *Medieval History in the Tudor Age*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971.

Meron, Theodor. "Shakespeare's Henry the Fifth and the Law of War." *The American Journal of International Law*. 86.1. (1992): 1-45.

Moseley, "'This Blessed Plot': The Garden Scene in *Richard II*." *Critical Essays on Richard II: William Shakespeare*. Eds. Linda Cookson and Bryan Loughrey. Harlow: Longman, 1989. 94-102.

Myers, A.R. *England in Late Middle Ages*. London: Penguin, 1991.

Neale, J.E. *Queen Elizabeth*. London: The Reprint Society, 1942.

- Ornstein, Robert. *A Kingdom for a Stage: The Achievement of Shakespeare's History Plays*. Cambridge M.A.: Harvard UP, 1972.
- Page, Malcolm. *Richard II*. Houndmills: Macmillan, 1987.
- Palmer, M.D. *Henry VIII*. London: Longman, 1983.
- Pearlman, E. *William Shakespeare: The History Plays*. New York: Twayne, 1992.
- Pierce, Robert B. *Shakespeare's History Plays: The Family and the State*. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1971.
- Pool, Austin Lane. *Medieval England*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1958.
- Porter, Roy and Mikulas Teich. Eds. *The Renaissance In National Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.
- Potter, Niholas. "'This Sceptred Isle': The Idea of England in *Richard II*." *Critical Essays on Richard II: William Shakespeare*. Eds. Linda Cookson and Bryan Loughrey. Harlow: Longman, 1989. 21-30.
- Prior, Moody E. *The Drama of Power: Studies in Shakespeare's History Plays*. Evanston Ill: Northwestern UP, 1973.
- Randell, Keith. *Henry VIII and the Reformation in England*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1993.
- Reese, M.M. *Shakespeare, The Cease of Majesty: A Study of Shakespeare's History Plays*. New York: St. Martin's, 1961.
- Rex, Richard. *Henry VIII and the English Reformation*. New York: St. Martin's, 1993.
- Routh, C.R.N. *Who's Who in Tudor England*. London: Shephard-Walwyn, 1990.
- Sharpe, J.A. *Early Modern England: A Social History 1550-1760*. London: Edward Arnold, 1987.

Snider, Denton J. "Richard II and the Right of Revolution." *Shakespeare the Critical Tradition: Richard II*. Ed. Charles R. Forker. London: Athlone, 1998. 261-276.

Spiekerman, Tim. *Shakespeare's Political Realism: The English History Plays*. New York: New York UP, 2001.

Starkey, David. "England." *The Renaissance In National Context*. Eds. Roy Porter and Mikulas Teich. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992. 146-164.

Thompson, A.F. John. *The Transformation of Medieval England: 1370-1529*. New York: Longman, 1983.

Tillyard, E.M.W. *Shakespeare's History Plays*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1959.

Traversi, Derek Antona. *An Approach to Shakespeare*. Garden City, N.Y: Doubleday Anchor, 1956.

Turville-Petre, Thorlac. *England the Nation: Language, Literature, and National Identity, 1290-1340*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.

Trinkaus, Charles. *The Scope of Renaissance Humanism*. Ann Arbor: Michigan UP, 1983.

Walter, J.H. "Introduction to Henry V." *Shakespeare The Histories: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Eugene M. Waith. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall 1965. 152-168.

Weir, Alison. *Elizabeth the Queen*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1998.

Whitelock, Dorothy. *The Beginnings of English Society*. London: Penguin, 1972.

Wilson, John Dover. "Falstaff and the Prince." *Shakespeare The Histories: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Eugene M. Waith. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965. 132-152.

Young, Robert J.C. *The Idea of English Ethnicity*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2008.