SHAHID BEHESHTI UNIVERSITY

FACULTY OF LETTERS AND HUMANITIES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

Machiavellianism, Power and Subversion in Shakespeare's *Henry IV* and *Henry V*

By

Ali Nakisa

Thesis

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

Master of Arts

In

English Literature

Thesis Supervisor**:** Dr. Shideh Ahmadzadeh

Thesis Reader: Dr**.** Jalal Sokhanvar

Tehran, Iran

June 2009

English Abstract

Shakespeare's *Henry IV, Part I* and *II* and *Henry V* are among the most controversial of all of his plays. They recount the youth and kingship of Henry V, one of the most successful of all Medieval English monarchs and represent his emergence as a Christian warrior and hero-king. Nevertheless Henry's heroism is besmirched by dark materials which are attributed to his application of Machiavellian realpolitik. This thesis focuses on the underlying preoccupation with this issue in the historicist critical tradition of these plays in order to examine the nature of Machiavellianism in them.

The first attempt at historicizing the aforementioned plays led to denial of the influence of Machiavelli on Shakespeare and therefore any manifestation of Machiavellianism in these plays. In spite of some unfavorable comments on several aspects, old historicism attests to the heroic and patriotic nature of the plays. New historicism and cultural materialism by radical revision of old historicist conception of the Elizabethan age and the role of literary works within the social fabric invert its heroic view of the plays. Their analyses of the operations of power and ideology demonstrate the application of Machiavellian strategies in seizing and wielding power by the princes in these plays. Generation and giving voice to its subversive other is the basic mode of the operation of power in *Henry IV* and *Henry V* which cultural historicists attempt to substantiate. Prince Hal then becomes a cold Machiavellian prince and the butt of criticism in

cultural historicist interpretations of these plays. The historicist critique of the plays after cultural historicism, after confirming the Machiavellianism of the plays, attempts to go beyond the Machiavelli-dominated and power-oriented approach of cultural historicism by emphasizing the aspects of these plays which counterpoint their Machiavellianism. Although this attempt highlights the subversive aspects of the plays, it restores to Prince Hal, the central character of the trilogy, the humanity he had lost in the cultural historicist readings of the plays. He becomes the quasi-tragic modern political man, facing an inevitable loss in performing his duties as a prince who has to submit to the necessities of the political realm. Indeed, as the ultimate turn in the historicist critical tradition of the plays shows, the central character of Shakespeare's Henry trilogy holds a fascination for the audience which offsets the subversive effects of his application of Machiavellian realpolitik.

Key words

1. Power   2. Subversion   3.Machiavellianism   4.Historicism

5. Containment   6. Carnival

Table of Contents

Chapter Four……………………………………………………………………………96

After Cultural Historicism

Chapter Five…………………………………………………...……………………124

Conclusion

Chapter One

Introduction

General Background

As a genre, Shakespearian history play is not easy to define, since any definition of this genre would exclude some plays which are generally considered as 'histories,' or include others which, by general consensus, are not 'histories.' The incorporation of the appellation 'tragedy' in the title of some of the history plays -e.g. *The Tragedy of King Richard the Second* (1595)- or 'history' in some others – *The Famous History of Troilus and Cresseid* (1602)- in earliest collected editions of Shakespeare's works reveals the degree of confusion involved in a determined generic classification. Furthermore, the principal source of tragedies such as *Macbeth* and *King Lear* is the same as Shakespeare's history plays; and all these contribute to the difficulty of exactly defining the boundaries of Shakespearian history plays (Hattaway 5-6).

For the sake of convenience, the term Shakespearian history play is generally used for ten plays which deal with the English history: *King John, Henry VIII,* and two series in groups of

four, known as First and Second Tetralogy. The First Tetralogy is composed of three parts of *Henry VI*, and *Richard III,* while the Second Tetralogy is made up of *Richard II*, two parts of *Henry IV* and *Henry V*. These plays cover the period of English history from the deposition of Richard II by Henry IV to Henry VII's murder of Richard III, which puts an end to 100 hundred years of civil war between the houses of Lancaster and York, known as the Wars of Roses.

As A. J. Hoenselaars observes, "[t]he English history play as practiced by Shakespeare had distinct roots in the morality tradition" (25). Norton and Sackville's *Gorboduc* (1561) and Preston's *Cambises* are the instances which mark the transition from morality to history play; and Christopher Marlowe's *Edward II* (1593) is the most accomplished history play before Shakespeare's contribution to the genre (Cuddon 120). Shakespeare's First Tetralogy are his earliest plays; they are written in the first half of 1590s. The Second Tetralogy were, however, written in the second half of 1590s, before his major tragedies and about the period in which Shakespeare composed some of his fanciful and poetic plays such as *Romeo and Juliet* (1597) and *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* (1600). Shakespeare's Second Tetralogy are undoubtedly the best of the genre and the rare ones which have been revived and managed to draw attention to themselves; *Henry IV, Part I* and *II* and *Henry V* have proved exceptionally popular in this respect.

Raphael Holinshed's *Chronicles* (1587) and Edward Hall's *The Union of the Noble and Illustre Families of Lancaster and York* (1542) are, by general consensus, Shakespeare's sources in writing his history plays. Yet, it is a matter of taste and conjecture which one of these chroniclers affected Shakespeare most: Hall's orthodox Tudor historiography, as Tillyard asserts, or what Annabel Patterson refers to as Holinshed's 'multivocality' (cited in Kamps 5). Furthermore, Shakespeare's treatment of the materials could well have been influenced by the

social and political atmosphere of his age and contemporary attitudes toward history and historiography. Publication of Sir Henry Savile's translation of Lucan's *Pharsalia* and Christopher Marlowe's translation of Tacitus' *Histories* would have made access to these books quite easy for Shakespeare. Tacitus and Lucan's enquiring and secular view of their subject - which was Roman history-, has led many critics to question the belief that Shakespeare's plays, especially his histories simply reflect the orthodox Tudor ideology (Hattaway 18).

Among "the three main 'schools' of Renaissance historical thought: the providential, the humanist and the antiquarian," which Ivo Kamps explicates, the impact of the providential and the humanist schools on Shakespeare and his contemporaries have had more staunch supporters than the antiquarian one ("Writing of History" 6). The reason is that adherents of antiquarian historiography, as in Shakespeare's own time, are concerned with history as an end in itself, rather than its uses and relation to the present (Kamps 18). The providential school of history, which was an essentially medieval legacy, upheld the belief in God's absolute command of human destiny which leads him to the last judgment and eternal life. At the same time, it also kept the cyclical conception of history. The cluster of ideas formed around this providential conception of history were brought into the service of the Tudor dynasty, and Shakespeare's belief in and application of it would have significant implications.

The humanist school of history with "its interest in secondary causes and human psychology, in matters of politics, and in its careful attention to rhetorical/literary style" marked a break with the providential tradition (Kamps 13). In addition to the providential conception of history, which circulated freely in Elizabethan England, the Italian humanist influence of Machiavelli, Guicciardini and Tacitus could have influenced Shakespeare, just as it did "English

historians such as William Camden, Samuel Daniel, Francis Bacon and John Hayward" (Kamps 13). Among the Italian humanists Machiavelli's influence was far more extensive than others.

Nicolo Machiavelli was born in 1469 in Florence, one of the five major city-states of Renaissance Italy. All these city-states, Naples, Milan, Florence, Venice and Papal state, were equally powerful and constantly in war or political struggle with each other (Foster 266-7). Therefore, unlike England, France, and Spain which were united by their national monarchs, Italy was plagued by internal conflicts. These conflicts were, in turn, exacerbated by the intrusions of foreign armies which were called in by the political divisions of the country to support them against their rivals (Harmon 154-5).

When the twenty-five-year-old Machiavelli began his political career, Florence was a republic, after the fall of the Medici. Machiavelli served as a diplomat in the courts of Louis XII of France, Maximilian of Germany and Cesar Borgia in Romagna. In spite of his initial resentment, he was gradually attracted to and admired Cesar Borgia's cold-blooded machinations and political maneuverings to the extent that he became the alleged model of his most well-known book *The Prince* (Harmon 156). With all factional conflicts and degeneracy of people, Machiavelli believed, only a ruler like Cesar Borgia could unite Italy.

In 1512 the Medici overthrew the Florentine republic, and consequently Machiavelli lost his position. He was exiled from Florence and was later on imprisoned and tortured for his alleged involvement in a conspiracy against the Medici. Finally released, Machiavelli retired to a farm house in the country and spent the rest of his life there, writing books which made him one of the most prominent thinkers in the history political thought (Foster 267).

Although Machiavelli began his writing with *Discourses on the First Ten Books of Titus Livius* (1517), he abandoned it temporarily in favor of his more well-known *The Prince* which

was completed in 1513. Despite their essential difference, these two books express the same views on fundamental issues of political thought. Machiavelli wrote also *The Art of War* (1520) and a book on the history of Florence, along with some translations and literary works the best-known of which are his comedy *Mandragola* (1515) and satirical novel *Belfagor* (1527) (Harmon 157).

In *Discourses* and *The Prince* Machiavelli radically departs from classical and Christian political philosophy and he is generally acclaimed as the founder of modern political science. Machiavelli's unadorned language and his simple, plain style are characteristic of his realistic and scientific approach to politics. His method in politics is drawing rules, or maxims as they are commonly called, from "historical works available to him, from what others, prominent in the politics of his own day, have told him, and from what he himself observed during his own active political career" (Burnham 47). Therefore, in Machiavelli all utopian and idealist concerns of the classical political philosophy are dismissed in favor of an exclusive concern with reality.

Machiavelli's denial of Divine and Natural Law is the most significant of all his contributions to modern political thought. He firmly rejects the Christian separation of temporal and spiritual life and the subordination of the former to the latter. Therefore, man's supreme goal is not salvation in the other world, but achievement of power and glory in this world. Nevertheless, Machiavelli does not reject religion; he regards religious institutions essential to instilling obedience to civil laws in the citizens. What he despises is Christianity, which he regards responsible for the degeneracy and moral decay of the Italian citizens.

Far from conventional perceptions of morality and virtue, Machiavelli's moral criterion for his superior citizen, *virtu* is directed toward attaining worldly fame and power. Since circumstances change, achievement of these goals necessitates changes in conduct and the ability

to act beyond good and evil. Thus, Machiavelli's *virtu* undermines Natural Law which "implies that there are certain eternal canons of right conduct, to which the good man must conform" (Foster 272). Furthermore, Machiavelli's belief that people are essentially selfish, driven by their immediate interests allows Machiavelli to endorse entering into the bad if it is necessary for maintaining one's power. Nonetheless, it should be mentioned that the supreme aim for Machiavelli is generally public good and specifically, as in case of *The Prince*, national unification of Italy.

How much Shakespeare might have been familiar with Machiavelli's doctrines and how much it had influenced him is a matter of conjecture. Yet, what seems evident is that in his Second Tetralogy he is far from unqualified acceptance of providential Tudor view of history and kingship. Bolingbroke's deposition and murder of Richard II, his success in suppressing the rebellions, and his son's achievements as Henry V savor of the emergent Machiavellian view of kingship and history.

The Argument

Henry IV, Part I and II, and *Henry V*, Shakespeare's crowning achievements in the genre of 'history' have been among the most controversial of his plays. They have elicited a wide range of responses from their audience and critics, some of them noticeably contradictory. Although Shakespeare's well-known characters such as Iago and Richard II have been regarded as Machiavellian, their roles, the contexts in which they play their roles and their fates correspond to the negative view of Machiavellian realpolitik. Yet, in *Henry IV* and *Henry V* Shakespeare presents in Prince Hal a character who, despite application of Machiavellian realpolitik, manages

to elicit positive responses from the audience. This has caused a controversy over Prince Hal, who keeps occupying the center-stage of the whole trilogy.

Henry IV, Part I and II abounds with memorable characters more than any of Shakespeare plays, but if we have to pick three, they must be Prince Hal, Hotspur and Falstaff. Prince Hal's character has always been judged in relation to these two characters, especially Falstaff. His final rejection of Falstaff is the issue which has provoked criticism, because of the betrayal of the friendship to which the plays owe their vitality. In *Henry V* Prince Hal also seems to become even less amiable and more akin to his cold Machiavellian father. With the overall movement of the trilogy Prince Hal's character seems to undergo a transformation which is related to his duty as the heir apparent and the future King of England. He bears resemblance to the prince whose portrait is drawn in Machiavelli's *The Prince*. Transformation of Hal's character is, however, concomitant with amazing and unexpected accomplishments, especially in wars which pose major threats to the national unity of the Island. This creates a heroic and patriotic image of him that seems to be at odds with his Machiavellianism.

Underlying the historicist critical tradition of *Henry IV* and *Henry V,* there is a concern with this alleged Machiavellianism of the Henry trilogy. Because of Shakespeare's reputation as the national laureate and Machiavelli's notoriety in his own time and subsequent periods, forging a link between Shakespeare and Machiavelli is potentially controversial and disconcerting. Three distinct phases of historicist critical tradition of the plays reveal the implications and ramifications of forging such a link between Shakespeare and Machiavelli.

Henry IV and *Henry V* have proved exceptionally amenable to historicist literary analysis and the most significant and innovative critiques by the major practitioners of the movement are written on these plays. Tillyard and Campbell's readings of these plays represent most vividly

the pros and cons of old historicism and Greenblatt's "Invisible Bullets" and Dollimore and Sinfield's reading of *Henry V* are the most anthologized and influential pieces of cultural historicist literary criticism. Old historicist readings of these plays are supported by sketching the supposed socio-political atmosphere in which they were produced and circulated; what is for old historicists predominantly Medieval. With the revision of the relation of literary work to its socio-political background and the change in the conception of history and historiography in cultural historicism, the old historicist view of the aforementioned plays is inverted. Consequently, the stance toward Machiavellianism of the plays is negated too. The re-orientation in the historicist critical tradition of *Henry IV* and *Henry V* after cultural historicism provides a critical vantage point to settle the controversy over the Machiavellianism of these plays.

The three body chapters of this thesis attempt to answer the following questions. The answers to these questions unveil as much as about Machiavellianism in the plays as about the evolution of historicism:

- What are the basic tenets of old historicism?

- What is the old historicist conception of the Elizabethan age?

- How Shakespeare and Machiavelli are placed in the putative 'Elizabethan world picture' and is there any relation between them?

- How does old historicist critics' conception of the cultural climate of the Elizabethan age affect their interpretations of the Henry trilogy?

- Is there any concern with the alleged Machiavellianism of the Henry trilogy in the old historicist readings of the plays and what does it reveal, if there is any concern at all?

- What are the problems of the old historicist "Elizabethan world picture" and what do these problems refer to?

- What are the major influences on new historicism?

- How does the critical framework of new historicism affect the readings of the Henry trilogy?

- What are the major principles of cultural materialism?

- What are the similarities and differences between the critical frameworks of new historicism and cultural materialism and their readings of the Henry trilogy?

- What are the reactions of new historicist and cultural materialist critics' to the old historicist conception of the Elizabethan age?

- What are the implications of the cultural historicist interpretations of the Henry trilogy?

- Does Shakespeare's Henry trilogy resemble Machiavelli's *The Prince*? If so in what ways?

- What are the underlying paradoxes of the Machiavellianism in *The Prince* and how this paradox resembles the paradoxes of the Henry trilogy?

- What is the ultimate reaction of to the Machiavellianism of the Henry trilogy?

- What does this ultimate reaction reveal about the nature of Machiavellianism and its manifestation in Shakespeare's Henry trilogy?

- How do the shifts in methods and priorities affect the attitudes toward Prince Hal in the historicist critical tradition of the aforementioned plays?

Thesis Outline

This thesis having the issue of Machiavellianism in Shakespeare's *Henry IV* and *Henry V* as its immediate subject is divided into three major parts. In the first chapter, after a short introduction of Shakespeare's history plays and the theories of historiography in his age, Machiavelli's

doctrines and works are briefly introduced. In three separate chapters, then, the controversy over Machiavellian aspects of these plays is mapped out through the stages in the evolution of historicism in Renaissance literary studies.

In chapter two old historicism is, at first, defined by the background against which it emerged and its conception of the cultural climate of the Elizabethan age. Shakespeare's and other Elizabethan authors' relation to the old historicist conception of the cultural climate of the Elizabethan age is also discussed in this section. The way old historicist critics conceive of the Elizabethan age and their opinion regarding the influence of Machiavelli on the Elizabethans and Shakespeare is investigated in the second section of this chapter. Sample readings of *Henry IV* and *Henry V* by Tillyard and Campbell are also reviewed in detail to reveal the way they treat the supposedly Machiavellian aspects of these plays. The final section of this chapter examines Tillyard and Campbell's motives in rejecting the influence of Machiavelli on Shakespeare and the efficacy of their criticism in accomplishing this task.

In third chapter, after probing the critical agendas of new historicism and cultural materialism, sample readings of the prominent critics of the movements, such as Greenblatt, Tennenhouse, Dollimore and Sinfield are examined in detail. The emphasis in these sections is put on the way these movements, with minor differences, accentuate the Machiavellian nature of the political strategies in these plays. The final section of this chapter is allotted to revealing the general stance of cultural historicism toward Machiavelli and the emphasis on the overarching presence of his doctrines in the public life in the early modern Europe.

The fourth chapter of this thesis begins by expounding the way *Henry IV* and *Henry V* resemble Machiavelli's *The Prince*, and the way they endorse Machiavellian conception of princely power. The similarity between the nature of princely power in these plays and *The*

Prince is also analyzed and substantiated in the second section of this chapter. In the final section of this chapter the latest historicist critique of the plays is discussed in order to reveal the essence of Machiavellianism and the alternative to Machiavellian view of the plays.

Approach and Methodology

Critical responses to Shakespeare's *Henry IV* and *Henry V*, though diverse, show bifurcations with regard to the major issues which have preoccupied critics. Primarily, due to the diversity of the responses and the issues discussed, this thesis has concentrated on those responses which show an explicit or implicit preoccupation with Machiavellianism and at the same time reveal this bifurcation. Furthermore, the political and historical nature of the plays requires attention to those responses which express more than mere personal attitudes and sentiments of the critic. Therefore, those critics whose responses were based on and supported by historical research and critical system-building were selected and grouped due to their general orientation toward the issue.

The aforementioned critical system-building begins as a self-conscious and unanimous movement in Renaissance literary studies during World War II and its aftermath. Generally called old historicism, this movement undertook a radical departure from the contemporary trends in literary studies. Instead of focusing exclusively on the formal properties of literary texts, which was strictly prescribed by formalist critics of the first half of the twentieth century, old historicist literary critics underscored the use of historical background in interpreting literary texts.

In Shakespeare criticism, old historicism was also working against the aesthetic tradition which viewed Shakespeare as a universal genius whose works expressed universal human traits.

Old historicism regards Shakespeare's works as the products of the social and historical circumstances of the Elizabethan age. Consequently, Shakespeare is also constrained by the limitations imposed on him by the cultural climate of his age. One important factor that is taken into consideration in this thesis is the way that various phases of historicism construct the cultural climate of the Elizabethan age and determine Shakespeare and Machiavelli's relation to it. It is here that personal sentiments and underlying motives of the historicist critics also come to foreground.

The aforementioned bifurcations in the responses to *Henry IV* and *Henry V* reflect the contradictory responses to those elements in these plays which are considered to be Machiavellian in essence. The unusual juxtaposition of the Machiavellian and heroic/patriotic materials in these plays divides the critics of these plays in two opposing camps: those stressing their Christian heroism and patriotism and those regarding them as essentially Machiavellian. Two phases of historicism in the twentieth century reproduce the same contradictory responses to the plays. Therefore, in two separate chapters these two phases are explicated in detail to examine the way they justify their readings and their stance on the putative Machiavellianism of the plays.

Old historicist critics' construction of the cultural atmosphere of the Elizabethan age and its impacts on the interpretation of *Henry IV* and *Henry V* is the task undertaken in the second chapter. To determine the way Shakespeare and Machiavelli are situated within the old historicist conception of the Elizabethan literary culture, E. M. W. Tillyard's well-known *Elizabethan World Picture* (1943)*,* the manifesto of the movement, is reviewed. After expounding Shakespeare and Machiavelli's relation to "the Elizabethan world picture," the possibility of any link between them is discussed. How old historicism approaches the Machiavellianism of the

Henry trilogy and its motivation in rejecting it and foregrounding heroism and patriotism are the issues which are deduced from the selective readings of the plays by Tillyard and Lily B. Campbell, two major practitioners of the movement, and the discussion of their implicit and explicit responses to former attacks on Machiavelli and Machiavellianism of the Henry trilogy.

Radical redefinition of historicism by new historicists and cultural materialists and its ramifications are the central issues of the second chapter. Theoretical frameworks of these closely allied movements are used in this chapter to delineate the process by which Machiavellianism comes to foreground in their readings of the plays. The ways Stephen Greenblatt and Jonathan Dollimore, major practitioners of cultural historicism, construct the intellectual atmosphere of the Elizabethan age are derived also from their works to support or assess their stance toward the link between Shakespeare and Machiavelli and manifestations of Machiavellianism in *Henry IV* and *Henry V*.

Despite their opposing responses to *Henry IV* and *Henry V*, old historicism and cultural historicism substantiate in different ways the operation of Machiavellianism in these plays. The fourth chapter of this study examines the way aforementioned plays reflect or resemble the attitudes that Machiavelli expresses about kingship and politics in *The Prince*. The latest movement in the historicist critical tradition of the plays is presented also in this chapter as the confirmation of their Machiavellian essence, yet what is significant in this final step is the attempt to open a new way out of the Machiavelli-oriented criticism of these plays; What, indeed, helps to shed light on the nature of Machiavellianism in general and its manifestation in Shakespeare's Henry trilogy.

Chapter Two

Old Historicism

What is now referred to as old historicism denotes the application of historical background in literary criticism, especially in Renaissance literary criticism. Tillyard and his fellow critics applied this method in their literary analyses when formalism was the dominant trend in literary criticism. In this chapter after a relatively brief overview of the basic tenets of old historicism, its stance toward Machiavelli's influence on the Elizabethan authors and especially Shakespeare is discussed. The views of two major critics of the movement, Tillyard and Campbell, are therefore, examined in relation to other critics who expressed similar views on the issue earlier and in the same span of time. In the last two sections of this chapter, at first, Tillyard and Campbell's readings of Shakespeare's Henry trilogy are reviewed with regard to their stance toward the alleged Machiavellian elements of these plays, and then their old historicist interpretations are put in the larger critical background to which they reacted and against which they built their critical framework.

Basic Tenets of Old Historicism

The Tillyard-Campbell school of criticism of Shakespeare's plays, generally called old Historicism, has some basic assumptions regarding the literary analyses of these plays. In addition to the expository part of his seminal work on Shakespeare's history plays, Tillyard allots a separate book, *The Elizabethan World Picture*, to explicate the background to these plays, and to make known to his audience the criteria by which he assesses their literary merit of them. Campbell, however, deems it sufficient to allocate one third of her book on Shakespeare's history plays to their literary and non-literary background. It is interesting to note that among these three works and a host of other works on the same subject Tillyard's *The Elizabethan World Picture*, a fairly short book which he intended for ordinary readers and not for specialists, turned into the manifesto of the school, and was hailed, interrogated and referred to as the cornerstone of old historicism.

In the preface to *The Elizabethan World Picture,* Tillyard claims that his purpose in writing this book is "to help the ordinary reader to understand and to enjoy the great writers of the age" (8). Since the issues Tillyard discusses in this book are commonplaces known to the ordinary Elizabethans, the original audiences of Shakespeare's Plays, we can conclude that for Tillyard the background knowledge of these plays is quite essential to their understanding. Indeed, the reproduction of the cultural and historical context in which the work is produced is an essential prerequisite for the type of criticism which Tillyard engages in.

A cursory glance at the table of contents of *The Elizabethan World Picture* shows that the issues discussed in this book such as order, sin, the chain of being, the corresponding planes, the correspondences, and cosmic dance are taken from medieval Christian lore. In contrast to the general conception of the Elizabethan age as a secular age, the world picture which Tillyard attributes to this age is an essentially religious one. One clear reason is that Shakespeare drew the

Henry V study guide contains a biography of William Shakespeare, literature essays, a complete e-text, quiz questions, major themes, characters, and a full summary and analysis. Â They refer back to his wild days as a youth (portrayed by Shakespeare in Henry IV, Part I and to his seeming lack of interest in the crown. They comment on the fact that since assuming power, Henry V has become Machiavellian in his approach to affairs of state, showing that he is a great politician, great military strategist, and also a familiar with religious affairs. Act One, Scene Two. King Henry calls Ely and Canterbury into his royal court and asks them if he has a legal right to claim France. He needs them, as representatives of the church, to legitimate his claim before he can attack Fr Henry IV, Part 1, more commonly referred to as 1 Henry IV, is one of Shakespeareâ€™s history plays. It forms the second part of a tetralogy, or four-part series, that deals with the historical rise of the English royal House of Lancaster. (The tetralogy proceeds in the following order: Richard II, 1 Henry IV, 2 Henry IVâ€"that is, Henry IV, Part 2â€"and Henry V.) Henry IV takes place nearly two centuries before Shakespeareâ€™s own time. In general, it follows real events and uses historical figures, although Shakespeare significantly alters or invents history where it suits him. For instance, the hist KING HENRY V. Where is my gracious Lord of Canterbury? EXETER. Not here in presence. KING HENRY V. Send for him, good uncle. WESTMORELAND. Shall we call in the ambassador, my liege? KING HENRY V. Not yet, my cousin: we would be resolved, Before we hear him, of some things of weight That task our thoughts, concerning us and France. Enter the ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, and the BISHOP of ELY. CANTERBURY. God and his angels guard your sacred throne And make you long become it! KING HENRY V. Sure, we thank you. Shakespeare's Gloucester, later Richard III, refers to Machiavelli in Henry VI, Part III, for instance: I can add colours to the chameleon, Change shapes with Proteus for advantages, And set the murderous Machiavel to school. Â Machiavellianism in the workplace is the employment of cunning and duplicity in a business setting. It is an increasingly studied phenomenon. The root of the concept of Machiavellianism is the book The Prince by Machiavelli which lays out advice to rulers how to govern their subjects. Â Bypassing empathy: mapping a Machiavellian theory of mind and sneaky power. In Individual Differences In Theory Of Mind, eds. B. Repacholi and V. Slaughter. Macquarie Monographs in Cognitive Science. NY: Psychology Press. 39-68. Henry V follows the events of Henry IV Part 2, after Prince Hal is crowned. A Chorus introduces the play and celebrates the life of England's King Henry V. Henry himself seeks for evidence of his right to rule over France. The Archbishop explains land laws to the King and his court. Then an ambassador arrives from the French King's son, the Dauphin, with a gift of tennis balls to humiliate Henry. Â Three of these former friends are caught plotting his death, and Henry condemns the conspirators to their own deaths in return. Meanwhile, Pistol, Nim, and Bardolph, three of Henry's former rambunctious comrades who appeared in Henry IV Parts 1 and 2, decide to join the army. They set off for the war after hearing of the death of their leader, Sir John Falstaff.