

**AN ANALYSIS OF SHAKESPEARE'S USE OF RHETORIC IN THE KINGS'
SPEECHES IN *KING HENRY IV PART II* AND *HENRY V***

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT

OF

THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS IN ENGLISH STUDIES

OF

THE UNIVERSITY OF NAMIBIA

BY

BEVEN LISWANI KAMWI

(200035355)

February 2014

Main supervisor: Prof. J. Kangira

Abstract

This thesis is an analysis of Shakespeare's use of rhetoric in the kings' speeches in *King Henry IV Part II* and *Henry V*. The main aim of the study was to analyse Shakespeare's use of rhetorical devices and their purpose in selected kings' speeches appearing in *King Henry IV Part II* and *Henry V*. This study is based on selected extracts of speeches from the two plays. The speeches were analysed using the rhetorical analysis theory to unravel the use of rhetorical techniques and to explain the purpose of these techniques, as used by King Henry IV and Henry V with the intention to effectively communicate to their audience. The rhetorical analysis theory was used to interpret speeches; hence, it deals with the analysis of the structure of narrative texts to show how the linguistic mediation of a story determines its meaning and effect on the audience. The study revealed that the two speakers, King Henry IV and his son Henry V also known as Prince Hal, effectively employed two of Aristotle's mode of persuasion; namely ethos and pathos, to appeal to the audience and achieve approval of their arguments. King Henry IV used God's reference and credibility (ethos) and emotive language (pathos) to firstly convince his son, Prince Hal, to reform and secondly his subjects to support his efforts to quell the rebellion and maintain his troubled throne. On one hand, Henry V also used religious devotion (ethos) in his speeches to target his audience's hearts (pathos) to enable him to control them. The study also revealed the use of rhetorical techniques and other tools such as metaphors, rhetorical questions, puns/humour, alliteration, hyperbole, metonymy, simile, anaphora, personification, paradox, imagery and so on. It was also found by this study that King Henry IV and Henry V employed the mentioned

techniques for different purposes; namely, to impress, warn, intimidate, inspire, manipulate, invoke submission, order and command, praiseworthy, deliver ultimatums, and above all appeal to the audience. This study deduced that the kings' speeches were not just mere ordinary expressions but utterances that qualified an intention of the speaker.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor and lecturer, Prof. J. Kangira, for his tireless effort and guidance from the infancy to the final stage of this study. Equally, my sincere gratitude also goes to Ms Linda-Ann Bonny for her contributions.

Dedication

This study is dedicated to the following people: My late father, Moffat J. Kamwi, who did not live to see the fruition of this work he modelled me for; mother Theresia S. Liswani, and my daughter Lisa K. Kamwi who calmly endured my continuous absence from her side during the course of my studies.

Declarations

I, Beven L. Kamwi, declare hereby that this study is a true reflection of my own research, and that this work, or part thereof has not been submitted for a degree in any other institution of higher education. No part of this this thesis may be reproduced, stored in any retrieval system, or transmitted in any form, or by means (e.g. electronic, mechanical, recording or otherwise) without the prior permission of the author, or the University of Namibia in that behalf.

..... [Signature]

Date.....

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Orientation of the study.....	1
1.2 Statement of the problem.....	2
1.3 Research questions.....	3
1.4 Significance of the study.....	3
1.5 Limitation of the study.....	3
1.6 Research methodology.....	4
1.7 Conclusion.....	5

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction.....	6
2.2 Theoretical framework.....	8
2.2.1 The art of rhetoric.....	9
2.2.2 The proofs of rhetoric.....	13
2.2.3 The canons of rhetoric.....	16
2.2.4 Kinds of persuasive discourse.....	19
2.2.5 Parts of speech/discourse.....	20

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction.....	22
3.2 Research design.....	22
3.3 Population.....	23
3.4 Sample.....	23
3.5 Procedure.....	23
3.6 Data presentation and analysis.....	24
3.7 Research ethics.....	24

CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction.....	25
4.2 King Henry IV's moving speeches.....	26
4.3 Hal's emergence as King Henry V.....	38
4.4 Henry's conversation, in disguise, as a rhetorical mechanism.....	60
4.5 Rhetoric through prayer.....	65
4.6 Henry's diverse rhetorical techniques and purpose.....	69
4.7 The use of war imagery as a rhetorical mechanism.....	71
4.8 Conclusion.....	86

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

5.1 Introduction.....	87
5.2 Conclusion	87
REFERENCES.....	94
APPENDICES.....	97

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Orientation of the study

This study is an analysis of Shakespeare's use of rhetoric in the kings' speeches in *King Henry IV, Part II* and *Henry V*. Analysing the relationship between Shakespeare and rhetoric dates back many years. One scholar, Keller (2010, p. 398) states that "the potential of rhetoric as an analytical tool in Shakespearian studies emerged in the 1940s with the work of three American scholars such as T.W. Baldwin, M. Joseph and R. Tuve." At the present time, however, rhetoric has become a tool for studies in many disciplines apart from linguistics and literature. Although Shakespeare is well renowned in genres of poetry and drama, he was also a rhetorical connoisseur. Specifically, *King Henry IV Part II* and *Henry V* include Shakespeare's royal characters, namely King Henry IV and Henry V, which often use classical rhetoric through their outstanding persuasive speeches. For instance, in *Henry IV Part II* and *Henry V*, the royal characters frequently employs rhetoric in their speeches to convince, appeal or judge other characters or subjects. In particular, King Henry IV uses some emotionally charged speeches in an attempt to convince his son, the only heir to the throne, to change his street lifestyle and behave like a prince.

Prince Hal, who later becomes King Henry V, through his speeches, provides a picture of the powerful role of rhetoric. Henry V uses language as the means by

which he controls other characters (for instance, “Henry’s morale-rousing Saint Crispin’s day speech” and “the night before Southampton”). According to Bell, Dane and Dane (1993, p. 4) “the two plays (*King Henry IV Part II* and *Henry V*) can be seen as an essay on the education of a popular ruler. Before he became king, wild days were part of Henry V’s necessary experience of life among common people.” In these plays, Shakespeare portrays the growth of the prince who will eventually graduate from making princely utterances to great kingly speeches in *Henry V*. Shakespeare uses the power of rhetoric to transform Prince Hal (in *King Henry IV Part II*), a onetime fan of street life and lawlessness, into a young thoughtful King Henry V revered as a king-hero, conscious of a heavy burden of responsibility and the duties of kingship.

1.2. Statement of the problem

This study aims to analyse the rhetorical aspects of the kings’ speeches in Shakespeare’s *King Henry IV, Part II* and *Henry V*. The researcher noticed a gap in information about the rhetorical aspect appearing in Shakespeare’s plays, particularly *King Henry IV, Part II* and *Henry V*. The researcher’s personal observation from his previous studies of Shakespeare’s works is that not many studies have been pursued in this regard to expose the powerful role played by rhetoric in the kings’ speeches. Furthermore, from previous reading of Shakespeare’s political plays, the researcher observed that kings in Shakespeare’s works normally employ rhetoric in their speeches either to convince or judge other characters. According to Keller (2010, p. 398) “writers/speakers use metaphor and other rhetorical resources functionally, for

purposes of argument, praise and blame.” In this regard, for King Henry IV and Henry V to achieve the goal of persuading their audience, they also make use of rhetorical devices in their speeches. Moreover, the study seeks to reflect on how language is used by King Henry IV and Henry V to win support for their points of view and to justify themselves before their audience.

1.3. Research questions

This study attempted to answer the following questions:

- a) How do King Henry IV and Henry V make use of rhetorical devices?
- b) For what purposes is rhetoric employed in the kings’ speeches?

1.4. Significance of the study

This study contributes to a better understanding of Shakespeare’s brilliant use of rhetorical devices to achieve particular literary effects. The study also illustrates how Shakespeare’s literary works can be studied to unearth meanings behind his works. The study also adds to the broad knowledge of Shakespeare’s works.

1.5. Limitation of the study

This study is limited to the analysis of the use of rhetoric in the kings’ speeches which appear in two Shakespeare’s plays; specifically *King Henry IV, Part II* and

Henry V. However, for this study, the kings' speeches also extends to conversations and dialogues between Henry V and other characters (for instance, the account of the speech between Henry V and Exeter upon the death of York and Suffolk, the conversation between Henry V and Princess Catherine of France, as well as the chorus and prologue that gives a description of Henry V's conquests). This is the case because the kings' rhetorical eloquence is also displayed in these conversations. The study is restricted to content analysis of the said speeches in the two plays, which include studying the royal characters' texts and speeches. Moreover, only two plays are selected as it is considered sufficient to use these two plays to illustrate his use of rhetoric.

1.6. Research Methodology

This study is based on content analysis whereby the speeches of King Henry IV and V containing rhetorical devices are identified from the two plays. The identified speeches are presented in their original format in the discussion chapter as they appear in the plays. The rhetorical analysis is used to analyse these speeches through narrative descriptions to unravel the use of rhetorical devices, as well as interpret the reasons for the use of such devices. This is a desktop study whereby the identified speeches are closely read and analysed guided by the objectives of the study, and a conclusion is drawn thereon.

1.7. Conclusion

The rest of the chapters of this study includes: Chapter Two which deals with literature review and discusses the literature relevant to this study; Chapter Three describes the methodology used to collect, analyse, and interpret data; Chapter Four presents, analyses, and interprets data; and lastly, Chapter Five concludes the study.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

According to Kangira and Mungenga (2012, p.110), rhetoric is defined as “speech designed to persuade.” Another scholar, Burke (1996, p. 41) sees rhetoric as the use of words by human agents to form attitudes or induce actions in other agents. Moreover, Aristotle extended the definition of rhetoric, calling it the ability to identify the appropriate means of persuasion in a given situation (Rhys 2010). Tom and Eves (2012, p. 149) regard “rhetoric as a discipline of argumentation concerned not only with the message but with the determination of the most effective persuasive and frequently incorporates the use of rhetorical devices.” According to Corbett (as cited in Tom & Eves, 2012, p. 150) “a rhetorical device is an artful deviation and occurs when an expression deviates from expectation.” He adds that that the expression is not rejected as nonsensical or faulty, the deviation occurs at the level of form rather than content, and the deviation conforms to a template that is invariant across a variety of content and contexts.

Shakespeare, himself educated in classical rhetoric and renaissance schools of England, understands rhetoric in the same view as that of the renowned fathers of classical rhetoric such as Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian. These classical rhetoricians regard rhetoric as ability, in each particular case, to see the available means of persuasion. The rhetorical speeches under examination in this study are

those that use devices or tools of persuasion as described by Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian. Mann (2012, p. 2) states that “today, of course, it is commonplace to dwell on the rhetorical accomplishments of celebrated writers such as Shakespeare and Spenser when discussing the development of literature and the English language in the sixteenth century.” This acknowledges Shakespeare’s contributions to classical rhetoric.

Keller (2004, p. 1) states that “ in England, as in all nations during the renaissance, rhetoric was an integral part of the grammar school curriculum and anyone who had a basic education in the period 1550-1750 absorbed at least some of its techniques.” The same scholar adds that rhetoric is in fact central to many aspects of Shakespeare’s style, and has improved our knowledge of renaissance thinking about language and rhetoric. The orators are expected to employ stylistic devices that would make their speeches appealing or convincing for an audience or jury. In Shakespeare’s time, proper use of rhetoric was crucial especially by the leaders, as it was central to politics, education and literature. Thus, King Henry IV and Henry V face a challenging task of using the power of language effectively in order to convince their subjects or audience to submit to them and admit to their divine rights. Therefore, there is a growing need to analyse the use of rhetoric in literary speeches, particularly King Henry IV and Henry V, with the aim to unearth the role played by rhetoric in such speeches.

2.2. Theoretical framework

The most relevant approach to this narrative structure is that of rhetorical analysis. According to Rice and Waugh (1996, p. 27), “the rhetorical analysis approach means analysing the structure of narrative texts to show how the linguistic mediation of a story determines its meaning and effect. And the underlying aim of this form of criticism is to demonstrate that what look like redundant or random detail in realistic fiction is in fact the functional details, contributing to a pattern of motifs with expressive and thematic significance.”

Another scholar, Cronick (2002, p. 2), states that rhetorical analysis deals with how authors have structured their texts, employed style, used semantic and extra semantic meanings, and in general, presented their evidence and stories. For some analysts, rhetorical analysis is a stylistic enterprise dealing with a text’s aesthetic qualities. It can also refer to a pre-analysis some authors do in order to shape their writing for specific audiences (Cronick, 2002, p. 2). In view of this, this study uses the kings’ speeches to determine whether the use of rhetorical devices and their purposes apply to the theory put forth by these scholars. In addition, this study uses rhetorical analysis approach in which textual elements are identified; these include rhetorical devices such as figures of speech (metaphors, hyperbole and so forth) and strategies that in context can be associated with some rhetorical intention or attempt at persuasion.

2.2.1. The art of rhetoric and related analysis on the king's speech

Keller (2010, p. 399) states that in Elizabethan England, rhetoric became as much a set of tools for reading and literary analysis as an art of composition, and that writers in that age used metaphor and other rhetorical resources functionally, for the purposes of argument, praise and blame. This observation agrees with that of Kangira and Mungenga (2012, p. 110) who point out that “the use of rhetoric is to influence other people to follow their good or bad intentions.” In view of this, the main objective of rhetoric is persuasion of one's audience. Cicero (as cited in Keller, 2010, p. 399) argues that the poet is a very near kinsman of the orator. Renaissance rhetoricians thought of the playwright as working along parallel lines with the orator. And Hussey (1992, p. 66) emphasises that the word must be the cousin to the deed, meaning that different styles are suitable for different subject-matters.

Rebhorn (as cited in Bell, Dane & Dane, 1993, p. 5) states that “rhetorical displays of spectacular images and words may enable a ruler to terrorise his enemies and gain the allegiance of his subjects, but those displays are always finally connected to that ruler's possession of genuine forces.” This citation means that the rhetoric of kings must be backed up by ‘real’ power to enable them gain advantage, either by terrorising, judging or gaining allegiance of followers. A case in point, as Sweat (2011, p. 19) reveals, is King Henry IV, who addresses his son, Hal, when they first meet in the play. The king uses a religious tone by referring to God, to appeal to his wayward son: “I know not whether God will have it so.../ he'll breed revengement and scourge for me...” (III.ii.4-7). Here the King makes a strong appeal to his son

to realize that he is a disappointment to his father and that he is likely to be punished by God for his deeds.

Sweat (2011, p. 36) further mentions that the king's rhetoric is clearly the aspect of the play that spurs the action not only at the end of *Henry IV, Part I* but also throughout *Henry IV, Part II* and that it also shaped the character of *Henry V*. For instance, the deliberative argument that the king (King Henry IV) presents is responsible for Hal's decision to kill Hotspur and also sets in motion Hal's ultimate decision to accept the responsibility of good governance and eventually cast out Falstaff (Sweat, 2011, p. 36). Thus, King Henry IV uses rhetoric to lure his son to change his irresponsible behaviour and start to behave as a prince. Metaphor is one rhetorical device that the kings' speeches can use to appeal to the audience. Smit (2010, p. 95) observes that a substantial influence from metaphors can be expected in texts that are intended to persuade the audience, in this case Prince Hal. In relation to discourse, metaphor is important because of its functions of explaining, clarifying, describing, expressing, evaluating and entertaining and that people choose metaphor in order to communicate what they think or feel about something (Smit, 2010, p. 95). In view of this, the kings' speeches frequently use metaphorical language, King Henry V in particular, uses metaphor to refer to *war as a mighty force*: here war is described in terms of flood (1.2.149), thunder and earthquake (2.4.100-1), and melted snow (3.6.50). The objectives of this study require unravelling the effect of such rhetorical devices to achieve the desired persuasive goals.

Meanwhile another scholar, Rong-gen (2012, p. 1006) identifies several lexical and rhetoric features that speakers and writers alike normally employ to create vivid and emphatic effects and evoke profound persuasion. These are simile, metonymy, synecdoche, personification, paradox, allusion, hyperbole, understatement and irony. Ron-gen (2012, p. 1006) defines some of them as follows; firstly, simile is a figure of speech that directly compares two different things, usually by employing the words 'like' or 'as', for example, "spends money like water." Secondly, metonymy is a rhetorical device used in rhetoric in which a thing or concept is not called by its own name, but by the name of something intimately associated with that thing or concept. According to this scholar, types of metonymy include: replacing a person with a place related to him/her, an actor with the tool, one's works with the author, an abstract concept with a concrete matter; for example, "Rome was not built in one day" and "The pen is mightier than the sword."

Thirdly, personification is defined as a device in which inanimate objects or abstractions are endowed with human qualities or are represented as possessing human form, for instance, "Facts speak louder than words." Meanwhile, hyperbole is a figure of speech in which exaggeration is used for emphasis or effect. Rong-gen (2012, p.1008) says "it may be used to evoke strong feelings or to create a strong impression, but it is not to be taken literally." Some examples are, "A thousand years cannot repair a moment's loss of horror", "Love makes the world go around" and "Faith will move mountains." Although many studies reviewed here show the existence and use of rhetorical devices in many respects, this study tries to prove

whether these rhetorical techniques are used in the kings' speeches, how the kings' speeches employs such rhetorical devices and for what purposes are they used.

According to Cronick (2002, p. 4) the speaker not only tries to convince his or her listener, but is also "thinking" out loud, so to speak. He adds that the speaker is elaborating his/her own political, philosophical and existential posture in a continuous and changing negotiation with his/her social environment. Cronick (2002, p. 5) further observes that "the use of rhetorical figures, interpretive distance and historical allusions in texts reveals a great deal about the intentions of the speaker." It is therefore an undeniable fact that the main objective of rhetoric is to have an influence on the audience, thus wishing to accomplish something. On the other hand, part of the listeners' role in interpreting the speaker's language is to judge why he/she is saying what he/she is uttering.

Kings in Shakespeare frequently engage in the rhetorical processes during their speeches or conversations, which is why this study targets the unravelling of the basic intentionality and motives underlying such speeches. Cronick (2002, p. 7) points out that the study of rhetoric is used to explore how people employ language to achieve certain things, that is, to convince others, establish power structures and make people do what they want. This observation coincides with the intentions of kings in Shakespeare's literary works, that of using the power of language to command allegiance by their subjects.

Hussey (1992, p. 65) says it is naturally important to persuade an audience of the justice of your case and the argument should not only be convincing but attractive. He adds that formality and eloquence invite the listener to accept what he is being told without submitting it to the more rigorous tests of logic and reason. In view of this, eloquence is one important ingredient and effective style in transmitting the message across to one's audience. Eloquence is to speak well, where the audience is left at the mercy of the speaker (Hussey, 1992, p. 69). As one Elizabethan rhetorician, Hoskins (as cited in Hussey 1992, p. 69) emphasizes that "to amplify and illustrate are two chief ornaments of eloquence. This means that the speech should be presented in a clear manner in order to reach out to the audience. Therefore, rhetoric is seen as the hallmark not only of the speaker himself but even of his subject-matter. The same scholar means that a disorganised and unplanned speech does not only discredit the person and reputation of the speaker in front of the audience but it can also discredit the opinion of his reason and judgement. Moreover, the truth of the message might also be distorted, let alone the force carried by the same message.

2.2.2. The proofs of rhetoric

The three Aristotle proofs formed part of classical rhetoric in which Shakespeare was writing within a specific historical understanding of the art of rhetoric, that of the 16th century. This study analyses the use of rhetoric in the Shakespearian era of the Elizabethan period. The renaissance rhetoricians such as Cicero and Quintilian have their own interpretations of Aristotle's three proofs. These classical rhetoricians believe that the speaker's intent upon persuading an audience had to be concerned

not only about the logical proofs, but also about affecting the appropriate emotional response in the audience, and about inducing the audience's confidence in his good sense, good will and virtue.

There three different rhetorical/artistic proofs are: ethos, pathos and logos (Aristotle, as cited in Corbett 1990). These persuasive strategies are normally used in arguments to support claims and respond to opposing arguments. Relating to these persuasive strategies of rhetoric, Shipale (2012, p. 36) elaborates on the three artistic proofs of rhetoric. He states that logos often depend on the use of inductive or deductive reasoning. Inductive reasoning takes a specific representative case or facts and then draws generalisations or conclusions. On the other hand, deductive reasoning begins with a generalisation and then applies it to a specific case.

Secondly, Shipale (2012, p. 8) adds to say "ethos or ethical appeal is based on the character, credibility or reliability of the speaker, addresser or writer." Adding to this, Kangira (2013, p.18) maintains that "...there is no proof as effective as that of ethos." The same scholar reflects upon several independence celebration speeches delivered between 2005-2012 by His Excellency President Pohamba, where the orator (Pohamba) frequently uses ethos through acknowledging the liberation role played by the Founding Father and retired President, Dr Sam Nujoma. Kangira (2013, p. 17) states that "at one occasion, President Pohamba said: 'we must endeavour to uphold the legacy of [former] President Nujoma by continuing to

maintain unity, peace, security, stability and prosperity.” Thus by using Nujoma’s ethos, President Pohamba is able to identify himself with the audience and then reach out to them through his message. In view of this, there are many ways to establish good character and credibility as a speaker or author, such as using only credible, reliable sources to build your argument and citing those sources properly. Once this is done, the speaker (king) will be able to establish a common ground with his/her audience making it possible to transmit the message successfully to them. And kings being the centre of power could easily use that to their advantage as a powerful persuasive tool of ethos. For instance, during Elizabethan times kings commanded much power over their subjects as they were seen as God’s symbols and representatives on earth, therefore God would rule his people on earth through them. This study bases its analysis on kings in Shakespeare’s works and not in real life or today’s kings that are mostly only figure-heads.

Pathos or emotional appeal is directed to an audience’s needs, values and emotional sensibilities (Shipale 2012, p. 8). For instance, King Henry IV’s rhetoric is shaped by an element of remorseful emotion. According to Humpreys (1966, p. xxxiv) “Henry IV is troubled by the thought that the crown, so dearly won and a source of his guilt, may be forfeited through Hal’s wildness. It is thus important that the pathos in the Kings’ speeches should be able to emotionally appeal to his audience to achieve the aim of convincing them. Mostly, the three artistic proofs are not usually used in equal proportion, rather determined by circumstances and situation. For instance, when a speaker is addressing a funeral audience comprised of mourners, obviously

pathos (emotions) will dominate the speech more than the other two persuasive strategies. By using the kings' speeches, this study examines how such rhetorical devices are employed by King Henry IV and V and for what purposes.

2.2.3. The canons of rhetoric

There are five important canons of classical rhetoric. These canons of rhetoric comprise; *inventio*, *dispositio*, *elocutio*, *memoria*, and *pronuntiatio* (Cicero as cited in Kangira & Mungenga 2012, p.110). Firstly, the same scholar adds by explaining that 'inventio' is synonymous to invention or discovery and is concerned with a system or method for finding arguments. This means finding what to say, whereby material from different sources may have to be assembled and consideration of the subject under several headings or topics must be considered.

Echoing the same is Aristotle (as cited in Corbett, 1990, p. 22) who points out that "there are two kinds of arguments or means of persuasion available to the speaker, namely, the non-artistic and non-technical means of persuasion." Additionally, the same scholar identifies five non-artistic proofs which are the opposites of artistic proofs, namely, laws, witness, contracts, torture and oaths. These non-artistic proofs do not have to be invented by the speaker, orator or author as they already exist and all what is required from the speaker is just to use them effectively to achieve his/her goals of communicating messages to the audience.

The second canon of rhetoric, *dispositio*, can be translated as ‘disposition’, ‘arrangement’ or ‘organisation’. This is the division of rhetoric concerned with the effective and orderly arrangement of the parts of a written or spoken discourse. Hussey (1992, p. 67) states that disposition deals with the general planning and ordering of the material. *Elocutio* is the third part of rhetoric which means ‘style’. Style as defined refers to the choice of words by the orator or speaker, for instance, their correctness, purity (choice of local words rather than foreign words), simplicity, clarity and appropriateness. Aristotle (1886) explains the fourth part of rhetoric, *memoria*, as being concerned with memorising speeches. This part of rhetoric deals with written discourse and concerns itself with tricks to improve the memory.

The fifth division of rhetoric is *pronuntiatio* or ‘delivery’ which concerns itself with effective delivery of speech in the persuasive process. This canon is equally important because a good speech alone on paper is not good enough unless effectively delivered, otherwise the message might get distorted during the transmission process. This part of rhetoric requires a speaker to be able to master certain skills, for instance, voice management and gestures to connect effectively with the audience. As explained, these skills imply adherence to modulation of the voice for the proper pitch, volume, orator’s training in gesturing, proper stance and posture of the body, and in the management of the eyes and facial expressions. Thus, delivery is important in effecting the end that one sets for oneself. Needless to say, many speeches and sermons, however well prepared and elegantly written, will always fall on deaf ears because of inept delivery. Therefore the only way in which

speakers can make up for this disadvantage is by the brilliance of their style and taking charge of their delivery.

Hussey (1992, p. 67) points out that during the Middle Ages, *memoria* (memorising) and *pronuntiatio* (delivery) were very important, where oral delivery was more common than silent reading. And as time went on, rhetoric became more concerned with elocution, the ornaments of style. These devices are particularly used for elaboration, illustration and amplification. Hussey (1992, p. 67) lists some of the more common devices which can be used in kings' speeches:

Adnominatio (paronomasia): repetition of the same word in a different form, e.g. similar words formed from the same root or the same word used in different senses.

Anaphora (repetition): repetition of the same word(s) at the beginning of successive clauses or lines of poetry.

Apostrophe (exclamation): highly-charged emotional comment, frequently shown in successive lines beginning with 'O' or 'Alas!'

Epistrophe: the same word ending successive clauses (the opposite of anaphora).

Gradatio (climax): the final word(s) of one clause repeated at the beginning of the following clause, thereby advancing the argument since the second use will usually add extra detail.

Isocolon: balance of two clauses of equal length.

Parison: balance of two clauses of corresponding syntactic structure.

Occupatio: mentioning something or somebody under cover of a pretended omission.

Effictio: description of outward appearance as opposed to moral worth.

Litotes: understatement, frequently by negatives, e.g. ‘He’s no fool’.

Ploce: repetition of the same word or phrase, sometimes after the intervention

Sychomythia: a form of dialogue in which single lines are uttered by alternative speakers (Hussey, 1992, p. 68).

These rhetorical figures provide speakers with a means to organise their speeches, especially utterances of some persuasion which needs to be distinguished from an ordinary talk. As Hussey (1992, p. 68) points out “talking and eloquence are not the same, to speak and to speak well are two things.” In this regard, for the speakers to be able to reach out to their audience their speeches should be organised through the use of the mentioned rhetorical devices. Shakespeare is known for the use of classical rhetoric in his historical and political plays, particularly King *Henry IV Part II* and *Henry V*. Hence, this study analyses how King Henry IV and Henry V deliberately and ostentatiously employ rhetorical styles and other figures and for what purposes.

2.2.4. Kinds of persuasive discourse of rhetoric

Ancient rhetoricians distinguish three types of persuasive discourse or orations. Corbett (1990, p. 28) mentions them as deliberative, forensic and epideictic rhetoric.

Corbett then explains them as follows: firstly, deliberative rhetoric also known as political or advisory, in which one deliberates about public affairs and anything that has to do with politics. Generally, deliberative discourse is that which seeks to persuade someone to do something or to accept a certain point of view. Forensic rhetoric also referred to as 'judicial'. This is the oratory of lawyers in the courtroom, but could be extended to cover any kind of discourse in which a person seeks to defend or condemn someone's actions (Corbett 1990, p. 28). Epideictic rhetoric is synonymous with 'ceremonial' or 'demonstrative'. Osborn and Osborn (1994) define epideictic as a speech of praise or blame, celebration or thanksgiving, condemnation or mourning. King Henry IV in Part II is known to have used several blame speeches, especially aimed at his son for being an irresponsible prince, as well as the group opposed to his throne. King Henry V is noted for his many praise and celebration speeches, especially to his army during the conquest of his several battles. Thus, a political speech, for instance, delivered by a king, is a ceremonial speech.

2.2.5. Parts of speech/discourse

Any discourse or speech can be divided in parts for a thorough analysis. There are five parts of discourse in which a speech can be divided. Corbett (1990) mentions the five parts of discourse as follow; the introduction (exordium), statement of fact (narration), confirmation, refutation and conclusion.

The most significant part of them all is the introduction or exordium as it begins or opens the speech. Kangira and Mungenga (2012, p. 112) state that “the exordium of a speech is the introduction of the speech in which the speaker states the purpose of his speech.” Shakespeare employs exordium in many of his history and political speeches, such as *King Henry IV, Part II* and *Henry V*. Therefore, one realises that the basic function of the introduction/exordium is to lead the audience or prepare the audience into the discourse or speech.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

This chapter describes the methodology used to collect, analyse and interpret data. First, the study makes use of content analysis, where the extracts of the kings' speeches are analysed using narrative descriptions to arrive at answers as guided by the objectives of the study. Second, this study also uses the theory of rhetorical analysis to interpret the identified Kings' speeches in an attempt to unravel the underlying rhetorical meanings and purposes embedded in these speeches. Extracts of the Kings' speeches are identified from the two plays based on their rhetorical characteristics. These items are then presented in their exact format as they appear in the plays, followed by narrative descriptions as guided by the following objectives: firstly, how do King Henry IV and V make use of rhetorical devices, and secondly, for what purposes is rhetoric employed in the kings' speeches.

3.2. Research design

This study uses a qualitative approach. This method is used because of it gives a clear description of the characteristics of items being studied. This study identifies speeches with rhetorical devices and those that show instances of these devices in the identified texts. This study also interprets the reasons or purpose for the use of such rhetorical devices. It is a desktop research in which the two selected plays of Shakespeare provide data for analysis to unravel the rhetorical devices in the chosen

literary works. Therefore, this study uses content analysis as a method of analysing data which will be from the two plays.

3.3. Population

The targeted population of this study is all Shakespeare's historical and political plays.

3.4. Sample

Shakespeare has several plays presenting kings' speeches; however, for the purpose of this study the focus will only be on two selected plays of Shakespeare from his wide range of plays. The two selected plays from Shakespeare's works are *King Henry IV, Part II* and *Henry V*.

3.5. Procedure

The Kings' speeches are identified in the two selected plays. The speeches are then closely studied and critically examined and then analysed using the rhetorical analysis approach in order to unravel the presence and purpose of rhetoric in such speeches. Moreover, the study identifies certain rhetorical mechanisms and figures used and interprets why they have been used this way or the speakers' reasons for using them. And then a conclusion is drawn from the analysis.

3.6. Data presentation and analysis

Due to the nature of this research as a literary study, the data analysis is in the form of content analysis, meaning the researcher uses narrative forms and rhetorical analysis to study texts under examination. Fragments of the kings' speeches are extracted from the plays and thoroughly interpreted through a rhetorical analysis process. Interpretation is a fundamental part of the rhetorical use of language, hence it deals with specific linguistic mechanisms used by a speaker or a writer to attain his or her purposes. The speech extracts from the two plays are presented in their original format, without altering the content. This study's interest is to study rhetorical devices employed by these speakers and to interpret their reasons/purposes for doing so.

3.7. Research ethics

All the works used in this study are acknowledged by the researcher to avoid plagiarism. The extracts from the plays will be presented in their original format without alterations. The researcher will remain neutral in his discussions and presentations of the data to avoid biasness.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS

4.1. Introduction

The focus of this chapter is solely based on two plays that are clearly connected and complementary to each other. Firstly, *King Henry IV Part II* dramatizes a king (King Henry IV) who is disappointed with his son, Hal, the supposed only heir to his troubled English crown. Shakespeare portrays the early life of Hal before he becomes king. The play depicts how Henry, Prince Hal, disliked his father's orderly governance and enjoyed the 'street life' owing himself to be labelled as a 'misspent youth' who frequents the Boar's Head Tavern, Eastcheap, with his cronies led by his alternative father-figure, Falstaff. But on becoming a king he rejects Falstaff in public after having reformed.

In addition, King Henry IV, besides having the son as his problem, faces rebellion in Scotland and Wales, especially those of his nobles who support the heir (Mortimer) to the deposed King Richard. At this point the king needs the help of his son to create a sense of stability, but Hal seems to be enjoying the excitement of street life and lawlessness. The king later contains the rebellion. Upon King Henry IV's demise, Prince Hal is crowned King Henry V and his reign presents him as a celebrated king-hero throughout the next Shakespeare's play, *King Henry V*. This play tells the conquests of Henry V in France and later his marriage to Katherine, the French princess. The two plays (*King Henry IV Part II* and *Henry V*) on which this study

focuses are seen as a summary on the education of a popular ruler in the person of King Henry V.

4.2. King Henry IV's moving speeches

In *King Henry IV, Part II* the king suffers from remorse, this is so because he explicitly forever yearns for an end to the political unrest threatening his kingdom and throne and admits and regret his unethical 'crook'd' ways he obtained the throne. Most certainly the king's anguish revolves around his son, Prince Hal, who refuses to change his wild ways and start behaving like a king-in-waiting, as his ill-discipline might result in the loss of the crown to his rivalry. During a meeting with two of his noblemen, the Earls of Surrey and Warwick, King Henry IV remarks:

Thou then, 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.70-74)

With these utterances the king makes it clear that he came to power unintentionally (line 1). Having instigated and plotted Richard's overthrow and finally murdering him, Henry IV bears heavy guilty and remorse. In line 2, the king tries to cover up his evil deeds by declaring that his action to overthrow Richard's government is because he owed it to the state "necessity so bow'd the state." King Henry IV uses a *synecdoche* device in line 3 "That I and greatness..." to justify his own actions of overthrowing King Richard. King Henry IV uses *synecdoche* device to cover his

deceitful and ambitious attributes that led him to overthrow the reigning king. Henry IV unwaveringly continues to rhetorically express his emotive feelings, especially towards his troubled crown. While bed-ridden as a result of a long ailment and ageing, Henry IV's last words are "How I came by the crown, O God forgive," (IV.v.218). The king employs an emotionally charged utterance to express regret, guilt and remorse for his past actions. It is undoubtedly true that the crown has always been 'troublesome' and a source of grief for Henry IV, especially the thought that the crown so dearly won may be lost through Prince Hal's wildness. The picture being painted by Henry IV through such speech is that of feeling insecure, weariness and mournful, as can be noted in the following line "And grants it may with thee in true peace live" (IV.v.219). Henry IV shows an element of remorseful emotion in the first reference, but he suddenly changes his attitude in the second reference where he tells his son, Hal, to preserve and safeguard the throne. Underlying the King IV's speeches are two serious points, namely, emotive feelings and unwavering desire and commitment to safeguard the crown.

Therefore, King IV's utterances are one of but many ways that depict the power of rhetoric delivered for a purpose. For instance, by saying "...thee in true peace live", Henry IV inspires Prince Hal, the only heir to the throne, to never forfeit the crown but safeguard it with all means. This moving speech on the part of Henry IV appealed to the emotions of Prince Hal. The king seems to have convinced the prince with his speech, as Hal's response is: "My gracious liege,/...you won it, wore it, gave it me;/ ... 'Gainst all the world will rightfully maintain" (IV.v.220-224).

Through his speech, King IV uses pathos, which is Aristotle's second tool of persuasion. Pathos or emotional appeal is directed to an audience's needs, values and emotional sensibilities (Shipale, 2012, p. 8). *King Henry IV Part I*, which is not part of this study, tells us how King IV was disappointed with Hal for not being an exemplary king-in-waiting; but in this second part of the play, King Henry IV's tone suddenly changes into being emotionally appealing "...thee in true peace live". This line appeals to Hal's sense of compassion in the sense that his father is now acknowledging and blessing him. Moreover, this qualifies as deliberative rhetoric, which is future-oriented and can be either encouraging or dissuasive. Through King IV outstanding oratory, he is in fact approving the crowning of the prince as a future king.

Deliberative rhetoric and emotive language are also employed in the crown-on-the-pillow incident, when Hal appears to be alone with his father in the Jerusalem Chamber of Westminster. Upon thinking that his father is dead, Hal takes the crown from his weary bed-ridden father and wears it and swiftly departs the chamber without the attendants and his brothers' knowledge. In carrying out this juvenile and irresponsible act, Hal assumes an entitlement defence by alleging that the crown legitimately belongs to him as the only heir apparent "My due from thee is this imperial crown, / Which, as immediate from thy place and blood, / Derives itself to me/ ... This from thee, / Will I to mine leave, as 'his left to me" (IV.v.40-6). King Henry IV later awakens and realizes his crown's disappearance. The king enquires

the whereabouts of his crown from Warwick and he is turn told that Prince Hal might have snatched it. These are Henry IV's indirect remarks on Hal, in his absence:

The prince has ta' it hence. Go seek him out.
 Is he hasty that he doth suppose
 My sleep my death?
 Find him, my Lord of Warwick, chide him hither.
 This part of his conjoins with my disease,
 And helps to end me. See, sons, what things you are,
 How quickly nature falls into revolt.... (IV.v.59-65)

King Henry IV castigates Prince Hal on his actions. In Hal's absence, the king is reproaching the prince for haste and grieving his misdeeds "Is he hasty that he doth suppose my sleep my death" (lines 2 and 3). Henry's words strike his son's emotions and make him feel guilty as if he is capable of strangling his father to fulfil his crown ambitions and fantasies. King Henry IV's haste reproach of his son could also mean his expression of guilt for previously deposing Richard II to ascend to the throne. At that point, the theme of remorse is also developed when Henry IV counsels his son (IV.v.92-116) both to strengthen his weak title by good rule and to distract restive energies with a crusade. In addition, in the same scene, Henry employs imagery as a rhetorical device, to paint a graphic picture of what his kingdom would look like under Prince Hal's reign upon taking over the thrown after the king's demise:

Pluck down my officers; break my decrees;
 For now a time is come to mock at form-
 Harry the fifth is crown'd! Up, vanity!
 ... Now, neighbour confines, purge you of your scum!

Have you a ruffian that will swear, drink, dance,
 Revel the night, rob, murder, and commit
 The oldest sins the newest kind of ways?... (IV.v.117-130)

Henry IV employs imagery as a rhetorical device, to depict images of a lawless, confused and anarchic state of affairs (line 1, 5, 6) as a likely situation to prevail with his son's tenure. Imagery serves a purpose of making a speech more explicit to understand and make meaning to become vivid and persuasive to the audience. Additionally, the same king's speech uses some hyperbole which Rong-gen refers to as a device in which exaggeration is used for emphasis or effect (2012, p.1008). Henry IV employs hyperboles (lines 1, 2, 5, 6) in his speech to evoke strong feelings and create strong impression. For instance "pluck down my Officers; break my decrees". This line means that the future king (Hal) would terminate the rule of law in favour of misrule or lawlessness that he had always enjoyed. In this case, Henry IV refers to disorderly governance that could supposedly be associated with Harry's future rule, but in essence, appears highly exaggerated. This reaction by Henry IV emanates from scenes in *King Henry IV Part I* which explain of how Prince Hal, commonly referred to as a 'misspent youth', in company of his cronies (Falstaff, Poins and Bardolph) would favour lawless activities and 'street life' and hated his father's courts and orderly governance. By invoking hyperbole, Henry IV indirectly appeals and shows his feelings and views to Price Hal, to realise that he is obliged to reform to be able to take over the throne. Through an exaggerated speech, Henry IV continues to criticise his son's un-princely conduct and in a way emphasize the need

for him to come to his senses and change his 'wild' ways. As a result of such criticisms from his father, Hal promises to change himself as his response is:

My gracious liege,
 You won it, wore it, kept it, gave it me;
 Then plain and right must my possession be,
 Which I with more than with a common pain
 'Gainst all the world will rightfully maintain. (V.iv.220-224)

Hal, in response to his father's criticism, first employs salutation (line 1). Kangira and Mungenga (2012, p.111) observe that salutation comes from the Latin word *salutare* which means 'to greet', and therefore refers to words and phrases that are used to open speeches. Thus Prince Hal uses salutation in his opening speech by addressing his father as "My gracious liege". By so doing, Hal accords respect and credence to the father, considering the throne he occupies. Through reverence of the king, Hal also tries to win over his attention and allegiance. Secondly, Prince Hal gives a self-assuring response promising (line 1) to maintain the throne that he is about to inherit from his ailing father. Therefore, with the use of *salutation* as a rhetorical device, Hal is able to appeal to the emotions (pathos) of Henry IV by assuring him that concerns for maintaining the crown shall be Hal's priority. Hal, in his response, uses *epistrophe* (repetition of the same word ending in successive clauses) "You won **it**, wore **it**, kept **it**, gave it me." In this line, the single word 'it' is repeated four times and used as pronoun to represent the 'crown'. The irony behind this 'deep' use of *epistrophe* is to show the full intensity of the subject under discussion. In this case, this form of repetition is used by Prince Hal to emphasise a

point with regard to the contentious crown and to symbolise its importance to him, as the father would wish. In a rhetorical sense, the prince's use of repetition is a persuasive skill which is emotionally appealing and convincing to the king, since he promises to safeguard the throne against rivalries. Hal also uses *epistrophe*, a device known for its emphatic effects, to calm King Henry IV's fears of whether Hal is the right heir. Thus, the intention of Hal's rhetoric is to appeal to King Henry IV's understanding of him being aware of the responsibility and duty that awaits him, as well as for the king to believe him.

A notable aspect of Henry IV's speeches is the presence of a variety of styles, notably the use of metaphors. Such language is highly metaphorical and produces rhetorical effect. Rong-gen (2012, p.1007) defines metaphor as a comparison that shows how two things that are not alike in most ways are similar in one important way. Whilst having a conversation with Prince Henry, the king's remarks are:

Stay but a little, for my cloud of dignity
 Is held from falling with so weak a wind
 That it will quickly drop; my day is dim. (IV.v.98-100)

Through this, Henry IV uses the image of a cloud to symbolise the decline of his supremacy, as opposed to glowing (line 1). The picture being painted here is that King Henry IV is in a state of helplessness, weariness and mourning. His eyesight, life and reign are together diminishing. Thus, metaphoric language is employed by Henry IV to describe a worrisome situation in which he finds himself at that point.

Metaphors are there to serve a purpose of expressing one's feelings and supporting an argument. Through the use of metaphorical language by the king, his speech becomes more vivid, moral, penetrating and persuasive to his audience, in this case his son, Prince Henry.

In his several narrations, Henry IV executes a rhetorical style known as *exclamatio* (expression of extreme emotions). This device is known to produce a highly-charged emotional comment. During his heated argument with Prince Hal after a brief disappearance of his crown from his bed, some of Henry IV's narrations are:

Before thy hour be ripe? O foolish youth! (IV.v.96.150)

O my poor kingdom, sick with civil blows. (IV.V.133.152)

O, thou wilt be a wilderness again. (IV.v.136)

The use of "O" to represent exclamation at the beginning of speeches, demonstrates disappointments and emotive feelings by the king. At one point in the play, King Henry IV summons the Earls of Surrey and of Warwick to his palace in Act III as threats to his throne continues. The king issues a summon order through a servant to demand immediate presence of the Earls to his palace:

Go call the Earls of Surrey and Warwick;

But ere they come, bid them o'er-read these letters

And well consider of them. Make good speed. (III.i.1-3)

With these utterances it is clear that the king uses his kingly stature to summon his subjects or subordinates. The demanding utterances in “Go call” and “make good speed” demonstrate forcefulness that goes along with his position. It shows that kings, unlike their subjects, speak in commands and demands because of the power they have.

When the king meets with his noblemen at Westminster, he employs a rhetorical style of inclusiveness in his speech. The king has this to say:

Now lords, if God doth give successful end
 To this debate that bleedeth at **our** doors,
We will **our** youth lead on to higher fields,
 And draw no swords but what are sanctified.
Our navy is address'd, **our** power collected,
Our substitutes in absence well invested,
 And everything lies level to **our** wish;
 Only **we** want a little personal strength,
 And pause **us** till these rebels now afoot. (IV.iv.1-9)

Here, Henry uses together words such as “**we**”, “**our**” and “**us**” as he addresses his noblemen in the private chamber of his palace, the Jerusalem chamber. Kangira and Mungenga observe that one of the purposes of ‘together-words’ is to show that the speaker and the audience share the same beliefs and values (2012, p.114). In the same vein, by incorporating such words in his speech, the king aims to draw his subjects and noblemen’s attention and create a sense of ownership of the political

decision-making process at hand. King Henry is very much aware of what is at stake in his kingdom, since a supposedly collective decision of how to deal with uprisings is needed. Therefore he is faced with a daunting task of convincing his audience on the legitimacy of his war plans. To achieve this, he persuades his noblemen to believe that his administration values their contribution and the emphasis is on collective and unified decision. Additionally, by using inclusive words, the king establishes a relationship with his audience so as to create a conception that the citizenry is indeed involved in the kingdom's affairs and rule. Establishing commonality with his audience also means that the king appeals to their emotions (pathos).

Henry IV's language and style seem to be influenced by the troubled throne he presides over and his irresponsible son, Prince Hal. Another noteworthy rhetorical style is that the king employs a number of religious devices throughout the play to achieve persuasive effects. He does this by connecting himself to God through referencing the Almighty from time to time in his speeches. Some of his narrations reveal the importance he attaches to God supposedly as the source of his power to rule over his subjects. Throughout Act III and IV, Henry mentions the word 'God' in so many ways: O God.../ God know.../ Holy land.../ Laud be to God.../ If God.... As a ruler, the king wants to establish himself as holy and make his audience believe that he is a representative of the rule of God on earth. This agrees well with an ideology in Elizabethan time, where it was believed that a crime against the king was a crime against God, and Kingship was held to be God's representation on earth.

With him showing gratitude to God in his speeches, Henry is in a way reinforcing the idea that he rules by God's will and guidance thereby winning over the hearts and minds of the his audience. This argument of the king's religious devotion successfully convinces the listeners, as they believe that God is a repository of kingship on earth. Furthermore, by connecting himself to God, Henry derives ethos from it, which is the person's character and credibility. Kangira states that "...there is no proof [as] effective as that of ethos" (2013, p. 18). By using God's character and credibility, Henry IV appeals to the senses of the audience and establishes connection and wins their trust.

Towards the end of *King Henry IV Part II*, the death-bed king assumes an advisory tone to counsel his son as King Henry IV approaches his demise. The king's advisory speech (IV.v.181-219) dwells much on the doctrines that Harry should emulate and live by:

O my son,
 God put it in my mind to take it hence,
 That though mightst win the more thy father's love
 Come hither, Harry, sit thou by my bed,
 And hear, I think, the very latest counsel
 That ever I shall breathe. God knows, my son,
 By what by-paths and indirect crook'd ways
 I met this crown, and I myself know well
 How troublesome it sat on my head.
 ...for all my reign hath been but as a scene

acting that argument. And now my death
 ... too near into my state. Therefore, my Harry,
 ... how I came by the crown, O God forgive me,
 And grant it may with thee in true peace live! (IV.v.181-219)

The king urges three themes in his long advisory speech directed at his heir, namely, strict maintenance of justice to all, attention to the subjects' welfare, and gratitude to God. Once again, the most striking rhetorical feature of this speech is the religious tone he addresses to Harry. This rhetorically striking counsel of the grieving father undoubtedly seems to have penetrated and persuaded Harry to change his manners and conform to good leadership principles as he assumes kingship. Signs of reformation in the new king are evident on three occasions; firstly, he responds to his father's advice through assurance that he will safeguard the crown against the world and undertakes to maintain it (IV.v.220-224). Secondly, as he addresses his brothers and the Lord Chief Justice, he vows to uphold the laws of the kingdom and to rule impartially. He also reconciles with the Chief Justice that he once termed enemy during his 'wildness' days. (V.ii.102-145). Thirdly, Prince Hal, who has now been crowned King Henry V, publicly denounces and rejects his once closest friend, Falstaff.

King Henry IV's rhetoric is responsible for evolving and transforming Hal from a once irresponsible prince excited about street life, to a responsible prince who later becomes a king-hero in *Henry V*. This transformation of Hal to Henry as a result of Henry's masterful speeches clearly shows the powerful role of rhetoric. It is also an

undeniable fact that the new king became who he is, a devout leader, because of the grooming by the old king through his rhetoric of reproach and criticism. In the next section, the study examines King Henry V's rhetoric.

4.3. Hal's emergence as King Henry V

Throughout *King Henry V* the focus is on Henry V. After having ascended to the throne at the end of *King Henry IV Part II*, the new king is associated with effective and competent military leadership, taking into consideration his many battle victories during his rule. One defining moment of his efficient rule is the effective use of speech to control those surrounding him. The new king proves to be charming and more of an elegant speaker in contrast to the late king's lame, grieving, repentant speeches. Upon Henry's coronation towards the end of *King Henry IV Part II*, in his first long speech addressed to his noblemen he for the first time sounds like a king. (V.ii.102-145). In his speech he demands royalty and he tries to achieve this by using religious imagery.

King Henry V brilliantly executes his speeches to his benefit. For instance, at one point in the play, Henry vehemently swears not knowing Falstaff and warns Falstaff not to think that he is still the person he was: "I know thee not, old man"/ "presume not that I am the thing I was". Meanwhile, an interesting thing to note in these utterances is the way they contradict each other. For instance, the king first claims he does not know Falstaff (line 1), but then later speaks in such a way as to mean that he

and Falstaff knew each other before, but Henry V is no longer the same person as before (line 10). The king's choice of harsh words such as "fool", "jester" and "a dream I despise" (line 2 and 4) really hurt Falstaff's feelings, pride and dream of ever becoming a right-hand man of the new king as in olden days. Meanwhile, the intention of this rejection speech is not meant to strip Falstaff of his pride but rather to impress and please the public. This instance also means that the evolution of Hal to Henry requires sacrifices such as phasing out his relationship with his historical corrupt cronies. Here is King Henry V's rejection speech of Falstaff:

I know thee not, old man. Fall to thy prayers.
 How well white hairs becomes a fool and jester!
 I have long dreamt of such a kind of man
 So surfeit-swell'd, so old, and so profane;
 But being awak'd I do despise my dream
 Make less thy body hence, and more thy grace;
 Leave gormandizing; know the grave doth gape
 For thee thrice wider than for other man.
 Reply not to me with a fool-born jest;
 Presume not that I am the thing I was;
 ... (V.v.47-72)

Moreover, in the same speech Hal not only rejects Falstaff but banishes him too ('Till then I banish thee, on pain of death', / 'As I have done the rest of my misleaders'. / 'Not to come near our person by ten mile', V.v.63-5). By rejecting and banishing his closest ally, Hal makes it symbolically clear that he separates himself from his own greed that tormented his life before his decision to reform. In this case,

reformation comes with a costly price which is to disown his cronies in daylight in the public eye. Hal defends himself by accusing his cronies, Falstaff included, as “Tutors and feeders of his riots” (line 62). However, his intention to divorce from his greed later proves to the contrary when he embarks on his ambitious plan to annex and dethrone France.

King Henry V’s denunciation speech of Falstaff targets the audience than just a mere personal attack on the person of Falstaff. Meaning the speech aims to demonstrate to the public and convince them how totally redeemed he is as per their wishes and that of his late father. Thus, the reason behind this speech is simply to achieve good publicity in the eyes of the subjects he presides over, and demonstrate to the public his seriousness to reform.

This Henry - Falstaff denunciation speech is one of many cases where Henry V proves to be a gifted speaker and very well utilises this gift in many aspects of the play to his own benefit. The preceding play, *King Henry IV Part I*, which is not part of this study, informs us of how Henry and Falstaff enjoyed each other’s company in doing irresponsible acts in the streets of London. Therefore, for him to at a later stage deny any prior association or knowledge of ever knowing Falstaff is a discrepancy of the highest order that an audience could not agree to. However, the power of speech proves to the contrary as Henry is seen executing his speech in such a way that any listeners present at such an occasion would have then been lured to believe in his line

of argument. As a result, the audience is left to believe as if Falstaff is not in his right mind to claim knowledge of Henry.

King Henry V opens with a prologue chorus filled with contrasting images portraying war between England and France (1-34). This study analyses this prologue as part of the kings' speech because it describes Henry V's triumph and conquests. This prologue is indeed contrasting because it paints pictures from different angles; for instance, one depicts a kingdom in glory, whilst on the other hand, it is that of ruin and anarchy. A noteworthy rhetorical device is firstly, the use of simile (directly compares two different things by using 'like' and 'as') that compares Harry to war and mars: "Then should the warlike Harry, like himself, Assume the port of Mars," (line 5 and 6). This line means that Harry is compared to war, to depict his intention to regain control of the territory of France and take over the French throne. It also presents Harry appearing like mars: "assume the port of mars". This line represents the power, patriotism and authority of Henry V. The second rhetorical device used in this prologue is *personification* (where things are accorded human attributes). Words such as "famine", "sword" and "fire", are used to symbolise living things in line 7: "Leashed in, like hounds should famine, sword and fire crouch for employment." Here, famine, sword and fire are portrayed as animate entities capable of seeking employment as human beings do. The effect of *personification* is to create a vivid picture of an expression, as a result making it clear and persuasive to the audience. The idolising of King Henry V as a military leader sets the plot of the whole play where battles of annexation of France take centre stage during Harry' reign.

While having a meeting with the Archbishop of Canterbury in the Council Chambers of his palace and in the presence of his nobility, Henry V speaks humbly and respectfully as he converses on the issue of Salic law. In Act 1 Scene 2, line 1-9, Henry V says:

Where is my gracious lord of Canterbury? (I.ii.1)

Send for him, good Uncle. (I.ii.3)

Not yet, my cousin. (I.ii.5)

My learned lord, we pray you to proceed. (I.ii.9)

Harry addresses Canterbury as “my gracious lord of Canterbury” (line 1) and “my learned lord” (line 4), Exeter as “good uncle” (line 2), and Westmorland as “cousin” (line 3). With such utterances the King Henry V shows a sense of recognition of their roles and thus cherishes their presence in the affairs of the kingdom, hence the respect accorded to them. In the same vein, the Archbishop and nobility feel valued by Harry. Additionally, while being mindful of his choice of words, Henry V asks Canterbury to be truthful in his explanation of the Salic law:

And God forbid, my dear and faithful lord,

That you should fashion, wrest, or bow your reading,

Or nicely charge your understanding soul

With opening titles miscreate, whose right

Suits not in native colours with the truth.

For God doth know how in health

Shall drop their blood in approbation

Of what your reverence shall incite us to.

Therefore take heed how you impawn our person,

How you awake our sleeping sword of war.

We charge you in the name of God take heed. (I.ii.13-23)

Henry V uses God's reference in his speech "and God forbid..." (line 1) "For God doth know..." (line 6)/ "we charge you in the name of God take heed" (line 11). His intention is to persuade Canterbury to advise him well on his claim of France territory in accordance with the Salic law. Knowing Canterbury as a spiritual leader and having fear for God, Henry V deliberately creates a 'confession-like environment' by quoting God in his speech, in order to influence and compel Canterbury to be truthful. Henry further argues that any misinterpretation of the Salic law by Canterbury will result in major bloodshed and for that he will bear such responsibility and be answerable to God (lines 6 and 7). Once again, Henry V employ religious device to persuade Canterbury to interpret the Salic law's claim over French territory. Thus 'God's power' and 'bloodshed' are skilfully being exploited through Henry V's speech in order to extract the truth from the archbishop. In this case, King Henry IV's language intends to warn and intimidate his audience, in the person of Canterbury.

While discussing the threat of a possible attack from Scots while England is away invading France, King Henry V uses several images to create vivid pictures of the events that might unfold in an attempt to appeal to his listeners to concur with his complaint:

We do not mean the coursing snatchers only

But fear the main intendment of the Scot,
 Who hath been still a giddy neighbour to us.
 For you shall read that my great-grandfather
 Never went with his forces into France
 But that the Scot on his unfurnished kingdom
 Came pouring like the tide into a breach
 With ample and brim fullness of his force,
 Galling the gleaned land with hot assays,
 Girding with grievous siege castles and towns,
 That England, being empty of defence,
 Hath shook and trembled at th'ill neighbourhood. (I.ii.143-54)

King Henry V employs these images to picture the Scots's attack on England. Such images are meant to convince Henry's audience on the destruction that Scots are to unleash on their kingdom. For instance, in line 1 "coursing snatchers" refers to the swift-riding raiders of the Scottish army that might prove to be tough enemies for England. In Elizabethan era, people could very well understand this image of 'swift-riders' of the army, unlike modern readers where this could rather be an obscure image. Whilst in line 6 "unfurnished kingdom" is an image that literally means a room/place without furniture' as the word furniture relates to a room. However, this image is used to paint a picture of England without an army to defend it. King Henry V's use of this image is effective in a sense that he paints vivid pictures [to his noblemen] of England's vulnerability to Scots, there by appealing to them. Line 7 "came pouring like the tide into a beach", is a symbolic connotation of a 'tide'. This image depicts a picture of how the Scot will overwhelmingly invade and overpower

England. Henry V uses these images with an intention of intimidating his noblemen in order to convince them to support his argument of declaring Scotland as a threat. To avoid catastrophe, Henry V has vividly put the issue across to them through his eloquent use of imagery; thus leaving the audience with no choice but to concur. The same lines also make use of *alliteration* as a rhetorical device for persuasion. By using this device in line 9 ‘galling’ and 10 ‘girding’ for instance, it adds an emphatic appeal for the listeners. The king is faced with a challenge of convincing his people about the seriousness of the Scots; therefore he is determined to use all the available rhetorical devices to achieve this.

Still in Act I Scene 2 (221-36; 241-44) King Henry reverts to employing the royal “we” and other inclusiveness devices such as “our”, “ours” and “us”; during the visit of the French Ambassador. The royal “we” fosters unity and common understanding between him and the audience. This also means a collective undertaking between Henry V and the audience, to take over the reins of France. In addition, by speaking in the first person plural “we”, Henry V assimilates himself with the emotions of the audience. Quintilian (as cited in Wilson, 2012, P. 38) says that “none of the instructions of the rhetor will be effective if the speaker does not feel the very emotions he is trying to evoke in others.” He adds that such sincerity speaks to the ethos of the rhetor. This means that the rhetor must know the audience’s emotions and imagine and feel the emotions himself. Therefore, by using the royal ‘we’, Henry V does not only acknowledge the emotional toil of his audience and stir those very

emotions to accomplish the goals of his speech, but he is able to do so effectively by showing that he, too, feels these emotions.

Henry V exploits these unison devices to his advantage by assuming the position of a people's person, whose interests are that of the English people. His "all-inclusive approach" also creates a sense of unity. Henry V speaks of "France being **ours**, we will bend it to **our** ewe" (I.ii.224). Through this, the king creates a sense of ownership of affairs by the citizenry and establishes shared beliefs to easily appeal to them. However, inclusive as Henry V's speech maybe, the tone throughout his speech seems to be contradictory as it sounds like an autocratic ultimatum. For instance, King Henry V declares his resolution that 'when France is his, he will bend it to his ewe, or break it all to pieces'- a resolution worthy of a conqueror, able to destroy that entire he cannot enslave. Interestingly, what adds to the *pun*, is that King Henry V lays all the blame of the consequences of his ambition on those who will not submit tamely to his tyranny. This is so because he talks of forcing people to accept his kingship or break France into pieces.

Another frequently employed rhetorical device by Henry is the use of '**I**' to refer to himself. This emphasizes his personal and private capacity than the public he supposed to take as priority. For instance, in Act 4 Scene 1, he speaks of "**I** and my bosom must debate"/ "And then **I** would no other company"/ "**I** am a gentlemen of a company"/ "No, **I** am a Welshman". This personal tone symbolises power and adds

more authority to his speech to influence the subjects he presides over or the audience he speaks to. This agrees with the notion that rulers must speak with authority in order to command respect and submission from their subjects. Moreover, the frequent use of ‘I’ has the power to intimidate and strike fear in the audience. The royal “we” on the other hand, sounds more polite which can enable Henry V to reach out to the audience through emotional appeal. The switching of Henry V’s speech between ‘I’ and ‘we’ emanates from the fact that Henry, first and foremost, speaks as king and secondly as a man, and this influences his speech. Thus, in the end it works to the advantage of the speaker by reaching out to whichever audience is addressed. Realising how autocratic the personal tone ‘I’ sounds, Henry at times switches between ‘I’ and ‘we’ for the purpose of sounding polite and identifying with his audience. This could be observed mostly in Act I Scene 2, lines 259-97, during Henry’s response to the French Ambassador.

In his reaction speech after the discovery of the betrayal plot by Scroop, Cambridge and Gray, Henry V employs different rhetorical devices to express his feelings. Henry V felt betrayed because Lord Scroop of Masham was Henry’s closest friend whom Henry confided in and honoured by making him the treasurer of England, a member of the Garter and French Ambassador. This betrayal speech appears in Act 2 Scene 2, lines 76-141. In this speech, Henry V uses several rhetorical devices. First, the denunciation of Scroop’s fall from friendship to treason is four-times repeated ‘Why, so didst thou’. This over-indulgence of *anaphora* by Henry expresses the gravity of the offence committed by Scroop. King Henry also uses rhetorical

questions, which is a device in the form of a question posed without expecting a reply. A case in point is lines 92, 96, 124-9: “Ingrateful, savage and inhuman creature? / Woudst thou have practised on me for thy use? / The sweetness of affiance? Show men dutiful? /Why, so didst thou. Seem they grave and learned? /Why, So didst thou. Come they of noble family? /Why, so didst thou. Seem they religious? /Why, so didst thou. Or are they spare in diet.” By using rhetorical questions as part of his speech, Henry V makes his speech appear more emphatic and impressive to the audience. For Henry to pose such questions without the expectation of a reply allows him to attract the people’s attention and keep them in suspense, thereby, leaving them glued to the conversation. This allows him to be and remain in control of the situation as it accords him an opportunity to manipulate the conversation to benefit himself, leaving the audience to his mercy. Furthermore, by keeping the conversation to himself, allows him to impose authority over the audience. Additionally, some other rhetorical devices that Henry resorts to in his speech are personification, adjectives, religious references and puns.

In the same speech, Henry V publicly discloses the treachery of three friends and elaborates on their evil hearts under their apparent goodness:

... thy fall hath left a kind of a blot

To mark the full-fraught man and best endued

With some suspicion. (II.ii.138-40)

With this speech, Henry V makes the audience aware that he is also emotionally touched by the friends' treacherous acts just like them. Using such speech, enables Henry to appeal to the emotions of the audience.

With regard to religious references, Henry V once again establishes God's ethos, whereby he uses God's holy character to appeal to the public. For instance, at one point in his speech he elegantly states "And God acquit them of their practices" (line 141). This line means that it is not up to Henry to judge them but that task and responsibility lies with God. Once more reinforcing the Elizabethan belief, this entails that kings were God's representatives on earth and mandated them to rule over the masses. This religious link, as fostered by Henry from time to time, demands that he be accorded the recognition similar to that which God is acclaimed for among the public. Henry's devotion to God happens in so many parts of the play that sometimes one wonders if he is really a religious devotee or just claiming to be. Apart from the usual religious references he employs from time to time, a more striking one is that which takes place at Agincourt. At that point, Henry V uses rhetoric to place the responsibility for the victory at Agincourt firmly in God's hands. For instance, in Act 4 Scene 7, line 77, he remarks "Praised be God, and not our strength, for it." Once again in Act 4 Scene 8, line 105-8, Henry acclaims the following:

Come, go we in procession to the village,
And be it death proclaimed through our host
To boast of this, or take that praise from God,

Which is His only. (IV.viii.105-8)

At particular moments in the play, Henry even commends himself and his actions to God. These acknowledgements and references to God have several effects, one is that he uses religious association to manipulate others and assumes the role of a cynic who uses the church to justify his actions. His deeply religious acumen masks a reckless and ruthless leader who gambles with the lives of his men. Therefore, to advance his self-interest, he in turn exploits the religious link. In light of this, Bell, Dane and Jane (1993, p. 226) observe that most English people in King Henry V's time (and in Shakespeare's) had an acute sense of sin and salvation. Every man and woman hoped to die with Christ's words on their lips. Moreover, the church encouraged people to believe that rebelling against the king was a very grave sin against God. Thus, religion is used as a medium to intimidate the public, since the public is very much aware of the consequences that are likely to befall them upon committing crime. Considering this, it was very easy for Henry V to take advantage of the religious link to God.

Pun is another effective rhetorical device that Henry very well exploits in the same speech. Henry V uses pun as a weapon to evoke a sense of humour or laughter on the part of the listeners. He makes a joke by alleging that the demon must have persuaded the traitors to betray him (line 118). By cracking a humorous utterance, Henry arouses their attention to the matter at hand and eases the tension on a seemingly serious issue of high treason. By mixing humour with serious rhetorical

expressions, the king aims to establish a connection with the audience to achieve successful communication. Good speakers usually crack jokes during their speeches in order to keep their audience attentive.

King Henry V also uses *anaphora* to emphasize the extent of his deeply felt emotions towards the traitors. Hussey (1992, p. 68) states that *anaphora* is a repetition of the same word(s) at the beginning of successive clauses. By repeating “Why, so didst thou” and “they” four times in line 125-8, Henry reiterates the gravity of the traitors’ acts and wants them to realise and accept their treacherous actions. As a result of the king’s rhetoric, the traitors admit guilt and try to repent and ask for forgiveness. King Henry V pronounces the death penalty for their offence against the kingdom, and they are ruthlessly condemned.

Harfleur in France proved to be one of the most challenging battle field for Henry. The situation required not only a celebrated military leader but one with the rhetorical eloquence to be able to appeal and reach out to the thousands of troops. This is the case, because the troops are weary and have low morale. Once again Henry relies on his language skills to influence his men to attack Harfleur to achieve his ambition. In an effort to inspire his army into action, Henry had this to say:

Once more unto the breach, dear friends, once more,
Or close the wall up with our English dead!
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-favoured rage.
 Then lend the eye a terrible aspect,
 Let it pry through the portage of the head,
 Like the brass cannon. Let the brow o'erwhelm it
 As fearfully as doth a galled rock
 O'erhang and jutty his confounded base,
 Swilled with the wild and wasteful ocean.
 Now set the teeth and stretch the nostril wide,
 Hold hard the breath, and bend up every spirit
 To this full height. On, on, you noble English,
 Whose blood is fet from fathers of war-proof,
 Fathers that like so many Alexanders (III.i.1-19)

By blending several rhetorical devices in his speech, Henry V is out to convince his men to go over the wall which defended Harfleur against invaders. Faced with this hurdle, the king mobilises the soldiers through his calculated speech that proves successful in the end. For instance, Henry sets off his speech with a calm and friendly tone (lines 1 and 4) and moves on to a serious and vigorous tone in the middle of the speech, full of commands and orders. In this speech, Henry pushes his men to victory against all odds as the battle wages on. For example, in line 2, he sounds like a military commander than a caring leader as he remarks that it is ideal for them to close the wall with their dead bodies for England's sake. In this line, he

chooses to employ the device of *metonymy*, which implies describing something by naming its attribute; in this case this symbol brings to mind a huge pile of English dead soldiers emanating from the battle. This in itself intimidates the opponents to realise the seriousness and to what extent Henry is willing to sacrifice his men to win the war. Meanwhile in line 3 and 4, he persuades them that the only way for them to win the war is to replace peaceful thoughts with that of destruction so as to become heroic and noble Englishmen. Through this speech, Henry develops fearless characters of his men capable of anything; as this can be seen in line 6 and 7 where they are called upon “to imitate the action of the tiger/ stiffen the sinews and conjure up the blood”. By comparing his supposed men’s actions to that of a tiger suggests to what extent is Henry V wishing to bring a beast out of his soldiers, capable of total destruction. King Henry V seeks to elaborate and illustrate his expectations from his men. Moreover, such utterances also enhance bravery among the fighters and arouse their fighting strength and enable them to continue with the battle. Therefore, the overall aim of Henry’s speech at Harfleur was simply to convince his men to commit themselves to the battle at hand and emerge victorious as per his personal wish.

Henry was a man who tried by all means to control the people around him with his rhetorical skills which he used in various forms. Through his speeches, Henry resembles a great statesman and a heroic leader who is devoted and patriotic to his nation, while on one hand he depicts a ruthless and manipulative leader. One of Henry V’s best speeches, which symbolises the power of rhetoric, is his morale-rousing Saint Crispin’s Day speech. Despite his English army being outnumbered,

weary and exhausted with diminished hope and power on the battlefield against the French troops, Henry is known to have used the power of language to re-energise and arouse morale among his troops to fight on. On this day, Henry's calculated speech includes a proclamation to his entire army that any soldier willing to leave should do so before the battle and that he will only share fame and brotherhood with those who fight with him on that Saint Crispin's Day. Henry's speech has several effects, namely to intimidate his soldiers and at the same time inspire them.

Henry V deliberately starts his speech with a declamatory gesture which forces the soldiers to choose between fighting and quitting: "...he which has no stomach to this fight /Let him depart/ His passport shall be made/ And crowns for convoy put in his purse" (IV.iii.35-7). These four lines give ultimatum to members of his army who thought of giving up fighting. He also questions their patriotism to their nation. The rhythm of this speech sounds serious, rigorous and commanding as it leaves the addressees with no choice but to adhere to Henry's call.. As the speech continues, Henry tries to inspire his army:

This day is called the feast of Crispin.
 He that outlives this day and comes safe home
 Will stand a-tiptoe when this day is named,
 And rouse him at the name of Crispin.
 He that shall see this day and live old age
 Will yearly on the vigil feast his neighbours,
 And say 'Tomorrow is Saint Crispin.'
 ... We few, we happy few, we band of brothers-

For he today that sheds his blood with me
 Shall be my brother; be he ne'er so vile. (IV.iii.40-67)

In this rallying speech, Henry V is telling men to sharpen their fighting spirits and adopt a positive approach to the battle at hand and he does this by encouraging them to be brave (lines 2, 3, and 5 above). Henry is also seen assuming a role of an inspirational military leader with the help of his rhetoric to appeal to the hearts of his army. Through this speech, Henry changes the status quo from a hopeless army to one with high morale. He tells them how heroic they will be if they happen to outlive the war (lines 1 and 2). Through such utterances, Henry V establishes a common understanding with them of how important it is to fight for one's country. This speech also reminds the army of the advantages and benefits of being victorious. Thus, knowing how vulnerable his army is at that moment, Henry uses this opportunity to his own advantage and this shows how manipulative he can be.

In this same speech and even some other parts of the play, Henry V uses the word 'brother' time and again in order to appeal to the audience. The literal meaning of 'brother' is blood relations, but in this case the term is used by King Henry V to refer to non-blood relations (people he is not related to by blood). The king uses the word 'brother' when it best suits him; for instance at one point in his Saint Crispin Day speech, he explicitly declares "For he today that sheds his blood with me/ shall be my brother" (lines 9 and 10). This line explains that only the members of his army that are willing to sacrifice themselves and fight with him in the war become his

brother, denoting a blood relative. In the same lines, Henry tries to persuade his men that loss of their own lives is heroic and in the national interest. Moreover, Henry passes himself as a credible character and therefore uses his own ethos to appeal to his men. By passing himself as a trustworthy character that his soldiers should emulate “for he today that shed his blood with me, shall be my brother”, Henry V advances his interests. Henry V as both a king and commander of his army is able to establish credibility and good characteristics worthy of trust and admiration by his men. This is so because kingship leads by example and sets a vision for the subjects. Being a commander of an army also requires extraordinary skills such as protecting your men and giving them assurance at all times, including dire times. This is exactly the character that Henry V tries to model for himself before his people, thus knowing how much power and influence at his disposal he uses it to convince his followers. Additionally, ‘brother’ spurs confidence and raises his men’s hopes to face the battle.

Moreover, Henry V addresses his men as ‘dear friends/ my friends/ band of friends’ in this speech to show that he regards his men as valued comrades rather than ordinary soldiers and subjects. The Saint Crispin Day speech vividly shows Henry’s character as an inspiring leader by assuming both the position of an intimidating and caring leader. At that point, Henry V also remembers the two noble brothers, Crispin and Crispian, who during the Roman persecution served as shoemakers yet were still martyred for their obvious Christianity; and they become an image for his men in battle (lines 8-11). In lines 8-11, Henry V covets honour in his heart and wants his soldiers do so with him; and that is his battle cry. Through his speech, Henry shows

that he is valiant, hardened, angry, ruthless and efficient, ready to kill his prisoners. The subject matter of this speech revolves around war and kingship. However, Henry V's language reveals two contrasting views; firstly that of firm, humble and heroic leader; and the other is the character of a king whose devotion and obsession is victory, regardless of human cost. This is so because Henry V seems to a large extent ignorant of the hardships and feelings faced by his men and instead his intent is on what he wants them to do to fulfil his own ambitions.

Another rhetorical incident where Henry V tries to use his influence as a person of authority and passes himself as a credible character (ethos), is in chorus 4 of *King Henry V*. Ethos is regarded to be the most important pillar of any given speech, even before any words are spoken by the speaker. Moreover, ethos advances the notion of credibility of the speaker or personal character. Ethos emphasizes what the public thinks of the speaker, as it determines the audience's response to the speech. This chorus gives a version of Henry, on the night before the battle of Agincourt. At this point, Henry visits his army to cheer them up using ethos as his greatest asset and other rhetorical devices; specifically lines 29-42:

The royal captain of this ruined band
 Walking from watch to watch, from tent to tent?
 Let him cry 'Praise and glory on his head!'
 For forth he goes and visits all his host,
 Bids them good morrow with a modest smile,
 And calls them brothers, friends and countrymen.
 Upon his royal face there is no note

How dread an army hath enrouned him,
 Nor doth he dedicate one jot of colour
 Unto the weary and all-watched night,
 But freshly looks and overbears attaint
 With cheerful semblance and sweet majesty,
 That every wretch, pining and pale before,
 Beholding him, plucks comfort from his looks.

Chorus 4 presents the eminent confrontation between two armies, the English and the French, on the long night before Agincourt. The status quo is that Henry's weary troops are up against the over-confident French who are impatient for action. Due to this, Henry decides to make the rounds of his troops with the intention of encouraging and ready them for the battle at hand. This chorus reveals that Henry's appearance among his men, showing no sign of weariness or worry ('But freshly looks and overbears attaint', line 11) is able to raise the morale of his army. This means that the presence of Henry himself, walking through the camp ('walking from watch to watch, from tent to tent, line 2), transforms his troops from a hopeless and weary to a cheerful and energetic army. By looking energetic as he moves among his men, Henry motivates them to overcome tiredness ('nor doth he dedicate...night', lines 9 and 10). He speaks to his men in a brotherly way ('He calls them brothers, friends and countrymen', line 6). Therefore, the chorus reports two points; firstly is that the presence of Henry alone as their leader ignites his men and instils hope in them (ethos), and secondly, by showing them a brotherly love and gesture, establishes commonality between him and his men. Here he seems to insist on the appeal for the cooperation of the audience. The two strategies appear to be the

rhetorical weapons that Henry mercilessly uses to appeal to his audience, in this case his army.

In the same vein, Henry continues to exhaust possible rhetorical devices to his disposal in order to have total control of his army. This is so because he does not only limit himself to showing his cheerful face, making rounds of his men, but goes to address the leaders/noblemen of his army's various command sections, which includes his brothers. Speaking to his nobles privately at his tent, Henry emphasizes to them the importance of a leader's example to his men. In this episode which appears in lines 1-34, in Act 4 Scene 1, Henry V is being open and frank with his nobles about the dangers they face. The most striking rhetorical device in use at this point is that he tries to make light of the dangers they face in order to boost morale. In this way he is sure to make use of his section commanders to help him appeal to his entire army to re-commit and re-dedicate themselves to the 'so called' continuous just cause for the war, all in the name of the English nation. Henry's right choice of words makes it possible to turn a possible dangerous situation at hand into a just position. As he addresses his brothers and nobles, Henry says:

Gloucester, 'tis true that we are in great danger.

The greater therefore should our courage be.

Good morrow, brother Bedford. God almighty,

There is some soul of goodness in things evil

Would men observingly distil it out.

... And make morals of the devil himself. (IV.i.1-12)

He continues in the same scene;

‘Tis good for men to love their present pains.

Upon example so the spirit is eased,

And when the mind is quickened, out of doubt

... Break up their drowsy grave and newly move (IV.i.18-22).

Henry’s rhetoric appears in two ways, the first being his earlier tour among his men looking cheerful, whilst the second, is when he tries to appeal to his nobles to convince his army through his section commanders. By recognising that his audience is hopeless and almost giving up on the battle, Henry V’s speech has to produce not only persuasion, but also inspiration. Henry consolidated his ethos among his audience through positioning himself as the caring leader who could easily identify with the ordinary masses by being in their midst to share their pain and suffering. By doing this he also reinforces the spirit of unity and togetherness to achieve his intentions. As a result of his rhetorical tactics, the response from his army in terms of cooperation is overwhelming as manifested in the army’s attack on French troops.

4.4. The conversation of Henry V, in disguise, as a rhetorical device

The night before the battle of Agincourt, victory seems to have been far distant and looks uncertain in Henry V’s camp. The king’s rhetorical acumen emerges in his decision to go around the English camp in darkness, in disguise, with the intention to comfort his men and be informed of what they really perceive of him. After having toured the camp in disguise he contemplates the burden of being a king. During

Henry's tour of the camp, in disguised, he comes in contact with Pistol. Pistol fondly praises the King Henry V without the knowledge that he is actually addressing the king himself. Poised to determine how his men feel about him, the disguised Henry V as Leroy a Welshman converses with Pistol, who does not recognise him. As their conversation takes place (Act IV. I, lines 35- 43) Pistol, first enquires about the identity of the passer-by (disguised Henry), not in his usual English mother tongue but sub-standard French language (to show social class) '*quivouslà?*' as to literally mean 'Who you there?' supposedly to correctly mean 'Who goes there.' The king identifies himself as a friend and when asked about his military rank he responds by saying 'I am a gentleman of a company.' This time Pistol again queries the king if he is an infantryman to mean a soldier without a rank to which Henry V reluctantly admits and in turn asks Pistol what he is. To which Pistol responds 'As good a gentleman as the emperor' which denotes somebody occupying high military rank and social class. Here, Pistol attempts to consolidate his superiority unsuccessfully, given the poor French as well as the military rank he attaches on to himself. To the contrary, the king assumes a position of a no-body with the intention of getting as much information from Pistol through his cunning and manipulative ways. As their verbal exchange continues, Henry asks Pistol if he thinks he is better than the king, after having endorsed himself 'emperor.' Pistol declines and instead shows reverence to King Henry V in his response. These are Pistol's praiseworthy words for Henry V:

The king's a bawcock and a heart of gold, a lad of life, an imp of fame, of parents good, of fist most valiant. I kiss his dirty shoe, and from heartstring I love the lovely bully. (IV.i.44-46)

Herein, it is obvious that Pistol does not yet recognise the disguised Henry, even though they were close associates during the time they frequented the Boar's Tavern in Eastcheap, part of London. Pistol admits and confesses his love, respect and admiration for King Henry V through a mixture of metaphor and adjectival descriptions. Pistol employs praiseworthy words and phrases with positive connotation to describe the person of Henry; such as 'a heart of gold' to mean his sincerity, 'a lad of life' to refer to his humility, 'an imp of fame' to refer to Henry as a child revered for good deeds or cause among his people, 'parents good' to mean a leader of all, and 'of fist most valiant' describes Henry's firm heroic character and exemplary ruler. Pistol continues to show affection for Henry V by using exaggeration but yet purposeful metaphorical expression 'I kiss his dirty shoe'/and from the heartstring I love the lovely bully'. Pistol's declarations to this stranger, who is in actual fact King Henry V, and Henry's other discussions with other soldiers in disguise, gave Henry a clear testimony of his people's perception of him. Henry learns for the first time what different people honestly think of him and his leadership. This whole scenario in turn tests Henry's conscience to an extent that it stirs his emotions (pathos). Bell, Dane and Dane (1992, p. 126) state that at this point in time Henry is forced to face complex moral questions about his responsibility for his soldiers and the rightness of his cause. The same scholars add that here too the audience comes closest to knowing Henry's innermost thoughts.

As the episode of King Henry V's disguise continues around the English camp, Henry yet again showcases another antagonising rhetorical gesture as he meets three

of his soldiers, namely, Court, Bates and Williams. At this juncture, the king passes himself off as a fellow soldier who serves under the command of Sir Thomas Erpingham, whom the three companion soldiers acknowledge as ‘a good old commander and a most kind gentleman.’ King Henry V stops to listen to the three soldiers’ war conversation, and two of these soldiers, Williams and Bates, squarely blame and place the responsibility of the war and the salvation of those who will die in the battle of Agincourt firmly upon King Henry V. In reaction, the disguised King Henry says:

No. It is not meet he should. For though I speak it to you, I think the king is but a man as I am. The violet 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 light 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 be showing it should dishearten his army. (IV.i.96-106)

This shows the defensive response of the disguised King Henry V in a conversation with some of his soldiers. He vehemently denies responsibility for the war and related deaths, and strongly argues that the king is not responsible for his subjects’ souls that might perish in the battle as per their claim. Henry defends the king by assuming that (‘I think the king is but a man as I am’, line 1 and 2). With these utterances, Henry V seeks to convince the three soldiers to reason that the king is just

like any other ordinary human being, therefore should not be blamed for either the war or loss of lives. Moreover, Henry V tactfully positions his speech in the third person pronoun and speaks as a distant observer, as is evident in the use of words 'he', 'the king', 'him', 'his' as opposed to first person pronouns 'I' and 'me'. This choice of style serves many rhetorical purposes, amongst others, is to know the three soldiers' perceptions of him as well as appeal to them to believe in what he says of the king. Additionally, the king's disguise also enables him to defend his unpopular decision of going to war with the French on that fateful night before the dangerous battle of Agincourt.

The disguised King Henry V dwells much on metaphorical expressions in his speech in order to defend the king's position and for the audience to change their condemnation of the king. In an attempt to shy away from the burden of kingship and responsibility, Henry V asserts the following comparisons at some point in his speech: 'The violet smells to him doth to me' / 'The element shows to him as it doth to me' / 'All his senses have but human conditions' / ..., his fears, out of doubt, be of the same relish as ours are'. These devices as employed by Henry simply consolidate his position of 'The king is but a man', therefore, he should not be persecuted and held responsible for any of his men's demise or salvation as a result of war; but rather every soldier's soul is his own responsibility. As in Act 4, Scene 1, lines 159-62, Henry argues that "Every subject's duty is the king's, but every subject's soul is his own, / Therefore should every soldier in the wars do as every sick

man in his bed, wash every mote out of his conscience”. King Henry V tries to use these defensive arguments to convince Williams and Bates.

In the same vein, another noteworthy rhetorical mechanism during Henry’s speech with Williams and Bates is the use of *antitheses*. This rhetorical device entails balancing of opposite ideas to achieve emphatic effect on listeners. Some notable *antitheses* features that Henry makes use of, specifically in Act IV, Scene I, lines 153-6, are: ‘before-breach’ against ‘punishment’, ‘death’ oppositely balances with ‘borne/ life’, and ‘safe’ against ‘perish’. Henry relies on this feature to make his argument clear to his audience.

4.5. Rhetoric through prayer

Henry was indeed a man of persuasive character, considering the various rhetorical avenues that he attempted at various intervals on the night before the battle of Agincourt. As if his disguise was not enough, Henry attempts to raise the morale of his outnumbered, weary soldiers with a prayer. This is yet another clever move on the part of Henry to encourage his troops, by once again resorting to God to advance his intentions. In this exhilarating moving speech, Henry equivocally stresses the importance of having God on his side and prays for courage for his outnumbered army:

O God of battles, steel my soldiers’ hearts.

Possess them not with fear. Take from them now

The sense of reckoning ere th' opposed numbers
 Pluck their hearts from them. Not today, O Lord,
 Oh, not today, think not upon the fault
 My father made in compassing the crown.
 I Richard's body have interred new,
 And on it have bestowed more contrite tears
 Than from it issued forced drops of blood.
 Five hundred poor I have in yearly pay
 Who twice a day their withered hands hold up
 Toward heaven to pardon blood. And I have built
 Two chantries where the sad and solemn priests
 Sing still for Richard's soul. More will I do,
 Though all that I can do is nothing worth
 Since that my patience comes after all,
 Imploring pardon. (IV.i.263-279)

At this point, first Henry V falls on his knees and prays. In his prayer, Henry first pleads to God "O God of battles, steel my soldiers' hearts" (lines 1). Henry knows his men's weaknesses, therefore calls on his men to become fearless and brave (lines 2-4). He further begs God not to punish him with the crime his father committed to gain the crown (lines 5 and 6), in reference to his father's act of deposing and murdering of Richard II, narrated in *King Henry IV Part I*. Henry expresses fear that he might lose God's favour at the battle field, because of his father's misdeeds. As he mentions this fear, Henry speaks of himself, urgently, repetitively and impulsively.

Moreover, the expression of purpose “to pardon blood” (line 12), is emphasized to give urgency and weight to the issue. The mood of this prayer is strenuous and cold, as Henry laments about the poor whom he supports and the chantry-chapel he has found in Richard’s memory (lines 10-14). The prayer also shows the king’s desperation as he reveals that he has tried to make amends (lines 12-17). Henry’s prayer is appealing, in the sense that he deliberately chooses to disown the exigency and pass on everything to God’s hands. He also wisely blames his late father’s overthrow and killing of Richard to be the principal reason why he faces misfortunes in his war battles. Henry V once again, through his speech, proves deceitful and cunning leader who runs away from his responsibility and instead blames others. By using God and his father as scapegoat, he intends to win the hearts and souls of his men. The king uses the speech to completely set himself free from the situation at hand and divert the audience’s attention from him to other mentioned parties. In addition, the king exploits his camp’s devotion to God to arouse their hopes and make them believe in salvation by God. Therefore the persuasion skills that he envisions and tries to accomplish here are that of purity from any wrongdoing and emotional appeal.

In the same prayer, Henry’s other preferred techniques of persuasion are *anaphora/ repetiton* and *paralipsis*. As for the repetition technique, the speaker employs it to make a lasting impact in the audience. By using this mechanism, he intends to create an impressive tone/rhythm and emphasis of a point that he wants the listeners to absorb. This evidence of repetition of word(s) appears in lines 1 and 4 ‘O’

(exclamation), as to signify a great emotional devotion; lines 4 and 5 ‘Not today’, and lines 9 and 12 ‘blood’, to stress a point. Coming to the second technique, *paralipsis*, Henry V brilliantly executes it by playing the blame game of solely placing all the faults on the curse that God might have placed on his father for executing Richard II (see lines 5 and 6). Keller (2010, p. 403) states that “*paralipsis* as a rhetorical device entails pretending to pass over a matter in order to give it more emphasis”. Meanwhile, Peacham (as cited in Keller, 2010, p. 403) adds that this device “is most fit to accuse and reprehend, and most usually in a negative form”. This device is most abused by malice, as when it is applied in false accusation, or in malicious detraction and sometime also by subtlety in a counterfeit praise, or figured flattery (Keller, 2010, p. 403). Thus, by denying the responsibility of his own faults and mistakes, Henry wants the audience to believe in his innocence and instead blame his father. Therefore, the king points at his father to bear the brunt of his weaknesses, mishaps and losses in the battle. This prayer is another calculated manoeuvre to convince the audience.

Towards the end of the prayer, Gloucester enters and Henry V is once more the leader, assured and ready:

Gloucester: My liege!

King: My brother Gloucester’s voice? Ay.

I know thy errand; I will go with thee.

The day, my friends, and all things stay for me.

This speech sequence starting with the prayer, shows Henry V as a king, son and man, conscious of his responsibility and that of other men in war as in peace, and acknowledging fear within himself, an awareness that, though he may outstrip the judgement of men, he has ‘no wings to fly from God.’ For instance, as he prepares for battle, a short moment of intense focus reveals his inmost secrets, and his knowledge that no human help can redress the past.

4.6. Henry’s diverse rhetorical techniques and purpose

In the end, Henry’s methods of persuasion, from paying visits of his soldiers in their tents, to conversing with them in a brotherly way, to a disguised soldier, as well as his rallying speeches, finally pay off. This is so because the once paler and weakened English army now beams with renewed hope and vigour to take on the French army. As a result of his brilliant rhetoric, Henry V manages to instil courage in his soldiers and they put up a brave and victorious battle; this is evident in the French’s withdrawal and defeat. At one point, just before the battle ensues at the end of Act 4, Scene 3, the king refuses the final offer of ransom by the French troops, and commands his inspired soldiers to advance:

Take it, brave York. Now, soldiers, march away,
And how Thou pleases, God, dispose the day. (IV.iii.131-2)

In this marching order, the king uses a combination of praises (brave York) and commands (Now, soldiers, march away). He refers to York, a commander in the English camp, as ‘brave York’ to praise him for his unwavering devotion to the just

cause of the war. By praising York, Henry appeals to his emotions (pathos). On the other hand, forceful language such as that of the military compels the soldiers to do what King Henry wants. This is so because a speech in form of an order carries weight in terms of what is to be conveyed and has the ability to intimidate the audience.

Furthermore, a closer glance at this same episode reveals a rhetorical war situation. Realising the seriousness of the rhetorical situation before him, Henry V is faced with a mammoth task to attain his persuasion objectives. Most importantly, at this point, Henry takes cognisance of the *kairos* device, this can be observed in his sense of timing. *Kairos* entails the right time or opportune moment to say/act or do something in order to respond to an issue that demands immediate action. Henry uses *kairos* to the best of his advantage, and this is so because his speech and presence before his men comes at the right moment to spark motivation in his helpless and weary army. With a clearly positioned speech and his presence among his men, Henry fulfils *kairos* as a rhetorical device, and this benefits him immensely. Moreover, Henry V seems to be well vested with diverse rhetorical approaches, as he is seen combining sincerity with the ability to use force and deceit just to achieve his intentions.

Meanwhile, the noble intentions of this chorus and of Henry's speech are put in jeopardy and become seriously undermined, especially by Pistol and his friends.

Specifically, Pistol chooses to speak in a rather contrary tone to that of Henry, by exposing Henry's actions, thus putting his leadership into disrepute. This suggests that King Henry V's rhetoric was not that effective to appeal to the audience being addressed.

4.7. The use of war imagery as a rhetorical Device

King Henry V dramatizes war. As a result much of its action and plot centres on figures of speech that depict vivid pictures of war. The most employed rhetorical device is imagery, and Henry seems to be the culprit who enjoys exploiting such a rhetorical device, especially during his several battles to persuade his audience. The choice of imagery that a speaker uses produces different effects for such expressions to the listener or audience. Imagery is a device known to intensify deep understanding of the subject-matter at hand through the creative use of words, usually by the speaker. Tom and Eves (2012, p. 150) says that "the theory of visual rhetoric states that pictures are not merely analogues to visual perceptions, but symbolic artifacts constructed from the conventions of a particular culture." They add that, a theory of visual rhetoric recognises that pictures are a symbol system employed for the purpose of persuasion.

In *Henry V*, several war images are shown and one of the common imagery is the depiction of war as a mighty force. This description is evident in some parts of the play; for instance, in (I.ii.149) war is described by Henry in the sense of flood "came

pouring like the tide into a breach.” This line paints a picture of how the Scots will attack England mercilessly if England does not recognise the threats they pose and put defence measures in place. Literally, floods are known to be destructive forces that will destroy everything in their way. Thus, such a destructive ‘mirror’ is used to show what Henry terms as serious threats posed by their rivalries. Meanwhile, this serves the rhetorical purpose of convincing the addressees to agree with the rhetor, in this case King Henry V. Likewise, Exeter adds to the list of imagery of war as he refers to war as a reflection of ‘thunder and earthquake’ and talks of its ‘vasty jaws’. These images are spoken of at the point when the French king enquires what will happen if he refuses Henry’s demands to surrender the crown. In reaction to this, Exeter threatens the king of France with the most destructive war with the following remarks: “in thunder and in earthquake, like a jove” (II.iv.101) and “on the poor souls for whom this hungry war/ opens his vasty jaws, and on your head” (II.iv.105-6). These two pictures, as emphasised by Exeter, merely portray the ‘bloodshed’ image that the French might suffer. In this case, the nouns and noun phrase, ‘Thunder and earthquake’ and ‘vasty jaws’ resembles nothing but pictures of complete destruction.

Moreover, Henry V yet again uses another war image at Harfleur as part of his inspirational speech addressed to his men in Act 3 Scene 1, line 6-17. In this part of the speech, he commands his army to turn themselves into ‘an animal-cum-war machine’. Here, the king paints a vivid picture of men turning themselves into something like ruthless, savage animals bent only on destruction. Using this type of

imagery, Henry wants to spur and convince his men to take on Harfleur without hesitation. His deliberate choice of this sort of image is based on the fact that war machines are merciless and brave, inhumane and very destructive. In reaction to Henry's commands through imagery, the troops indeed shows an urge to take on Harfleur with great vigour and honour.

Henry continues to employ imagery to gain the approval of his listeners or audience, for instance still at Harfleur, he again describes war as 'butchery'. The term 'butchery' refers to acts of killing carried by the English army on the French troops. By using such a term in line with a war situation, it produces a brutal effect on the enemy. To describe this brutal picture that Harfleur is likely to suffer if it does not give in, Henry V uses the following word symbols in Act 3 Scene 4, line 37-41:

And their most revered heads dashed to the walls,
 Your naked infants spitted upon pikes
 Whiles the mad mothers with their howls confused
 Do break the clouds, as did the wives of Jewry
 At Herod's bloody-hunting slaughtermen. (III.iv.37-41)

Here Henry wants the opponents to imagine horrible pictures of their fathers' heads crushed to the walls (line 1), naked dead children hanging onto their weapons (line 2) whilst their mothers runs around with scars of their dead infants (line 3). After having described such carnage to the Governor of Harfleur, Henry's speech proves effective as he achieves his objective without a fight as the opponent yields as a result of fear. Interestingly, in the last part of the same speech Henry uses a figure of

speech known as *anthyphora*, whereby he begins with a question and proceeds immediately to the answer in the same line: what say you? Will you yield, and this avoid? /or guilty in defence be thus destroyed? Henry asks them a question on their position to his threats and at the same time gives them the answer by providing them with an alternative of giving in as per his wish. This device serves the purpose of involving his audience in the discussions and at the same time indirectly solicits their approval of the matter.

Moreover, the incident at the English camp near Agincourt shows imagery from a different perspective. At this point, Williams who is one of Henry's soldiers tries to capture a symbol of the destruction and sorrow caused by war, using words and images. During his conversation with his fellow soldier, Bates and Henry, he says:

... when all those legs and arms and heads chopped off in a battle shall join together at the latter day and cry all 'We died at such a place', 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.124-9)

William's speech simply draws a picture, depicting a dire situation of the consequences of war as he deliberately enumerates such incidents in his speech. He continues to announce that all these brutal things caused by war are squarely on the king's head. Thus this once again reiterates and adds to the earlier figurative description of war as 'butchery' by Henry. What William intends is to remind Henry

of the destruction of their several wars and convince him to desist from waging further attacks to save the souls of his men and that of the rivalry. As described by William, these scary images have the ability to penetrate the mind of reasonable listeners and then reconsider their actions; in this case he targets the king's sense of conscience. Additionally, these images can appeal to the emotions (pathos) of the audience and convince them to change course.

Meanwhile, besides the domineering insinuations of war as monstrous in many parts of the play; images are also used by Henry V and other characters to glorify war and make it look good. The majority of the speeches throughout portray a picture of war as a glorious enterprise. Apart from these, characters themselves in the play do glorify and credit war in the various speeches. Henry V, for instance in his Saint Crispin Day speech (IV.iii.41-67), describes war as an entity that separates cowardice from heroic stature and something larger than anything else if you outlive it. He paints a picture of war as the best prize a man could ever ask for through sacrifice and become a celebrated hero of the kingdom. In the same vein, Ely (King Henry's Uncle) when glorifying war depicts it as a "mighty enterprise" (III.ii.121), referring to it as a very powerful tool. Meanwhile, Exeter also glorifies war in his speech in Act 4 Scene 6, lines 16-19 as he brings the king news of the noble deaths of the Duke of York and the Earl of Suffolk. In his reaction speech, Henry V gives a highly emotive description of war through images. He showers the death of the duke with praises to resemble death for a good cause. Therefore, the glorifying of war by Henry is to persuade and convince people around him. Considering that this takes

place in the middle of the battle, with this image he aims to appeal to his fellow men to perceive death in war as sweet, harmless and a heroic deed. These are his cheering words to his soldiers:

... he cries aloud 'Tarry, my cousin Suffolk.
 My soul shall thine keep company to heaven.
 Tarry, sweet soul, for mine, then fly abreast,
 As in this glorious and well-foughten field
 We kept together in our chivalry. (IV.vi.15-19)

Using these words, Henry is able to carefully create an attractive image of dying in war. In his speech, he points out that upon death, the souls of the dead ascend to heaven signifying God's acceptance (line 2 and 3). Another message that Henry puts across in his imagery language is that it is a noble thing for one to be willing to give your life for your country as Suffolk did. Thus, the king uses the divine beauty of death to try and reach out to his men in an attempt to lure them into believing in the argument of war as a noble act. Henry V deliberately chooses words with a positive connotation to paint a good picture of war and death, such as 'sweet soul, heaven, together, and glorious'. Such positively used words ensure that death and war, that are literally destructive, are given a good image and celebrated enterprise. This in turn captures the attention of the audience and encourages them to develop a positive attitude towards war and death. A *paradoxical* device is also employed in the sense that the speaker, although fully aware of the effects of war, ignorantly chooses to substitute the negative picture of war with the perceived glories of war which are

virtually non-existent in the real world. Therefore, the speaker uses imagery as a rhetorical device to attempt to gain collaboration from his listeners.

After the long battle of Agincourt where the French are finally subdued and the English emerge victors, Henry V once again proves to be a charming man as he presents his victory speech to his audience (army). This speech comes after the war statistics reflects a heavy loss of men in the French's camp compared to the English military. The French lost ten thousand men, including one hundred and twenty six nobles/lords, compared to the English who lost only four nobles and twenty five other men. At this point, Henry V gives a victory speech:

This note doth tell me of ten thousand French
 That in the lie slain. Of princes in this number
 And nobles bearing banners, there lie dead
 Of knights, esquires and gallant gentlemen,
 Eight thousand and four hundred, of the which
 Five hundred were but yesterday dubbed knights.
 So that in these ten thousand they have lost
 There are but sixteen hundred mercenaries.
 The rest are princes, barons, lords, knights, squires,
 And gentlemen of blood and quality.
 The names of those their nobles that lie dead:
 Charles Delabret, High Constable of France;
 Jacques of Chatillon, Admiral of France;
 The Master of the Crossbows, Lord Rambures;
 Great Master of France, the brave Sir Guiscard Dauphin,

John, Duke of Alencon; Anthony, Duke of Burgundy;
 And Edward, Duke of Bar. Of lusty earls:
 Grandpre and Roussi, Fauconbridge and Foix,
 Beaumont and Marle, Vaudemont and Lestrelles.
 Here was a royal fellowship of death
 Where is the number of our English dead?

King Henry V purposefully reads the long list of dead French soldiers first, before he continues to enumerate the short list of his own soldiers that succumbed to death:

Edward, the Duke of York, the Earl of Suffolk,
 Sir Richard Keighley, Davy Gam, esquire.
 None else of name, and of all other men
 But five and twenty. O God, thy arm was here!
 And not to us, but to Thy arm alone
 Ascribe we all. When, without stratagem,
 But in plain shock and even play of battle,
 Was ever known so great and little loss
 On one part and on th'other? Take it, God,
 For it is none but Thine. (IV.viii.72-104)

This celebratory speech by Henry V includes several rhetorical mechanisms and features to attempt to reach out to the audience. In this speech, the behaviour of the king, in the difficult and doubtful circumstances in which he is placed, is as patient and modest as it reflects in his speech. Moreover, the speech is meant to evoke feelings of pleasure, triumph and celebration in Henry's men. By comparing the number of the dead between the French and his army (see lines 1-2 and 95-98), he

actually seeks to make his men feel powerful over their defeated French rivals. By giving all the details of the number of military leaders that have succumbed to death, the French being far more, he surely aims at inciting a sense of pride among his men, considering that they were outnumbered prior to the battle. In this speech, Henry mentions the names of the lords as to provide accurate data of what transpired in the battle. But this serves a purpose to Henry, particularly under the notion that the high number of slain leaders/lords ultimately signals absolute and total defeat of the French and victory for the English. Therefore, for the king, to emphasize on such a high figure also speaks volumes in terms of praising his men. From a military point of view, it means that what really determines the strength and success of the battalion lies in its captain, leader or commander.

Another striking rhetorical mechanism is the king's dwelling on 'inclusivity' in his victory speech. To prove this, he reverts to the use of the words 'us', 'we' and 'our', specifically lines 29 "Where is the number of **our** English dead?" and 34 "And not to **us**, but to Thy arm was here!" as well as 35 "Ascribe **we** all". The three words of inclusivity as employed by the king serve two functions, first, to emphasise a sense of ownership of victory and pride by all members of the English army, and second is to signify a collective understanding by all, in unison that they owe their victory to God.

Moreover, there is also *deliberate hyperbole* in use. This is so because the number of the dead leaders/nobles seems to be more than that of the ordinary soldiers which is very much unlikely, considering the ratio of the two. This type of a rhetorical device is simply employed to appeal to the audience. Additionally, an understatement in the form of *meiosis* is also employed in Henry's victory speech. Rong-gen (2012, p.1009) mentions that "*meiosis* is a euphemistic device that intentionally underscores something or implies that it is lesser in significance or size than it really is." Henry herein deliberately lowers the figure of the English dead to only 25 ordinary soldiers and four nobles (line 98). Meanwhile, commenting on these same statistics, Bell, Dane and Dane (1993, p. 174) argue that most modern historians and writers estimate the English loss at between 400 and 500, while the French suffered loss of an estimated 7000 soldiers. Thus, Henry's intention is to make his men to believe in their victory which came with few losses.

In addition, Henry V once again turns to the use of religious symbols, particularly by acknowledging God for his victory. He masterfully employs religious inferences to once again deny his duties and responsibilities through ascribing the victory to God (as can be observed in lines 98-104). Henry uses God as a scapegoat to hide from his atrocities by shifting responsibility to God. This is to mean that although he is the brainchild behind the battles, he in the end points to God for the victory. Such techniques enable Henry to blind fold his men not to accuse him of any responsibility of whatever losses that might incur in the war. In the end what dominates much of his men's talk is victory by God favour, instead of their leader's war mongering

tendency and ambition to go to any extent to fulfil his personal agenda to annex and dethrone France.

By acknowledging God in this speech, it means to show that God fought the battle and won it, that is why all praises are due to God “To boast of this, or take that praise from God”/ “Which is His Holy.” (IV.viii.107-8). In the same vein, Henry seriously shows his deep-rooted religious devotion by reference to a Latin quote appearing in a religious book (Psalm 115), as well as the first words of a Latin hymn: “Let there be sung *Non nobis* (Not unto us, O Lord, but unto thy Name give the praise) and *Te Deum* (We praise thee, O God, we acknowledge thee to be the Lord).” This once more authenticates Henry’s use of God as ethos to appeal to his audience to believe his arguments. Using Latin in his speech, Henry provides his knowledge of religion to his men. Henry’s exploitation of religion from time to time intends to convince his audience, which by its nature has respect and fear for God. Henry’s effective way to connect with the audience is to recognise its weaknesses, in this case the religious belief of his people. In Elizabethan times, Henry’s people perceived him or any king as secondly to God and a direct authority link of God on earth.

With Henry’s entrance into France after having conquered the French at the battlefield of Agincourt, he tries to propose Catherine, the French princess. During the time that Henry attempts to convince the princess, he displays exceptional rhetorical techniques. This conversation between the two turns out to be one filled

with humorous gestures that the king attempts by all means to work in his best interest. One thing that provides humour is the fact that none of the two seem to have knowledge of either's language, thus resulting in so many mistakes in their utterances as they continue to interact. In Act V Scene 2, stretching from line 101 to 253 explicitly shows their repeated speech mistakes in their two different languages. This is a courtship by Catherine declaring that she is unable to speak King Henry's language: "Your majesty shall mock me. I cannot speak your England" (V.ii.102-3). This line shows the deficiency of Princess Catherine's English language command. For instance, she refers to 'not speaking England', a country for that matter, instead of the correct word 'English' to refer to the language. These mistakes that the two commit in French and English respectively, serve a rhetorical function, especially for Henry V. He uses this humour to woo and entice Catherine to declare her love for him, which is his ultimate goal.

Henry, for that matter, in an effort to get the message through to his audience (Catherine), combines techniques such as translation of his English speech into clumsy French. For instance, his mother-tongue speech in lines 162-3 "when France is mine and I am yours, then yours is France, and you are mine" is translated into 'broken' French in lines 167-70, which evokes a humorous effect. In addition to this, Henry V also uses gestures to try to stress his ideas in his speech as is the case in instances where one communicates with someone with no command of such a language. All such techniques are employed by Henry to achieve an objective of communicating his message effectively and ultimately convincing the princess.

Furthermore, Henry V's wooing of Princess Catherine to become his wife is another rhetorical situation that compels Henry to employ devices to enable him to convince her. Considering this, Henry resorts to several rhetorical devices; for instance, in lines 210-12 he uses a repetition to elaborate the rhythm of words and phrases "Thou hast me, if thou hast me/... at thou shalt wear me, if thou wear me/ better and better". (V.ii.210-12). This technique makes the speech more emphatic, both in form and meaning, in order to easily appeal to the princess. He also chooses to use the rhetorical device of *self-denigration* and which he uses best to his advantage. Henry V uses this technique by presenting himself as a plain soldier who is not gifted in convincing a lady. Therefore, he deliberately puts aside his nobleman stature and pretends to be a plain person. The king also willingly avails himself to laughs and made fun of during this courtship scene. Evidently, at one point in their interactions, Henry claims that he cannot act as a love-sick king ('mince it in love', line 129); and that he cannot manage the words or rhythm of poetry ('measure', line 129). In the vein, the king also strikes an obvious exaggeration that is plainly untruthful to any audience of King Henry's reign. Henry V offers himself as a simple man, but he does so with great wit and eloquence to show that he is indeed a suitor to the princess. Henry speaks with confidence of a conqueror but with a good heart to woo the princess:

A good leg will fall, a straight back will stop, a black beard will turn white, a curled pate will grow bald, a fair face will wither, a full eye will wax hollow: but a good heart, Kate, is the sun and the moon, or rather, the sun, and not the

moon, for it shines bright and never changes, but keeps his course truly
(V.ii.163-70).

Princess Kate questions “Is it possible dat I should love de ennemie of France?”

Henry answers in a riddle made of hyperbole:

No, it is not possible you should love the enemy of France,
Kate, But in loving me you should love the friend of France,
For I love France so well that I will not part with a village of it. I
Will have it all mine; and, Kate, when France is mine and I am
Yours, then yours is France, and you are mine. (V.ii.159-163)

In this highly exaggerated speech, Henry dismisses the claim by Kate that he is an ‘enemy of France’ (line 159) rather declaring himself to be the ‘friend of France’ (line 160). The fact of the matter here is that even the most naïve personality would not concur with this statement, considering the just destructive war that Henry unleashed on France, because of for its land and the throne. For Henry to also claim that he loves France so much, is an exaggeration of the highest order, in a sense that it is not France that he dearly long for but his love for power and control, and self-fulfilling ambitions. In the end, the use of hyperbole helps Henry to strengthen his point and create good impression to his audience, Princess Catherine.

Towards the closure of *King Henry V* in Act V, there is once again the use of an imaginary speech that celebrates the triumphant persona of Henry V. This speech

celebrates King Henry's political onslaught and final victory after political negotiations with France. The protracted attack that Henry waged on France did not only include military force but the use of other mechanisms such as political negotiations which involve speech, to achieve victory in the end. The conquering of France was highly welcomed by the English; as a result Henry was accorded an outstanding ovation upon his return to London, England. Once again, the power of rhetoric is reflected in this speech. For instance, this speech describes Henry's spectacular welcome to England and thus elevates him to a status befitting a war-warrior. Surprisingly, none of his army's role is mentioned in the entire speech except Henry's. The words used in this imaginary speech are highly persuasive to the audience. This is the case because the speech embodies numerous rhetorical devices such as *metaphors*, *hyperbole* and *rhythms*.

Additionally, this speech, through its precision, produces a celebrated hero in the person of Henry worth of worshipping by his subjects. To achieve this, it takes a rhetor of great rhetorical acumen. In this speech for instance, the rhetor talks of men with their wives, and boys readying themselves to receive their hero by turning themselves into a sort of a fence around the sea: "Pales-in the flood with men, with wives, and boys, /Whose shouts and claps out-voice the deep-mouthed sea" (lines 10 and 11). In the same vein, Henry V is also metaphorically compared to Caesar due to his bravery "Go forth and fetch their Caesar..." (line 28). Caesar was a Roman warrior/Emperor renowned for his bravery and military flamboyance. The use of

multiple rhetorical devices herein is simply to entice the audience into believing in the power possessed by Henry and that he is no ordinary being but extraordinary.

4.8. Conclusion

This chapter dealt with the presentation, interpretation and analysis of data. This study revealed that several rhetorical devices, such as metaphor, hyperbole, metonymy, anaphora and many others mentioned in the conclusion chapter were used in the kings' speeches. According to this study, the use of such rhetorical devices was aimed at convincing the audience. The next chapter concludes this study.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

5.1. Introduction

This chapter concludes this study by summarising the findings of the study. The study aimed to analyse the use of rhetoric in the kings' speeches in Shakespeare's *King Henry IV Part II* and *Henry V*. Using the two plays as sources of data, the study investigated the following research questions, first, how do King Henry IV and Henry V make use of rhetorical devices, and second, for what purposes was rhetoric employed in the Kings' speeches. This chapter also presents the conclusions drawn from the analysis at hand. In this case, the conclusion to be drawn relates to the choice of rhetorical devices used in these speeches and their effectiveness and purpose in terms of achieving successful communication between the rhetor and the audience.

5.2. Conclusion

It is evident from the analysis of this research that there are more intentions to speeches than just mere talk or ordinary utterances. This analysis unravelled that various rhetorical devices and other figures of speech are employed by King Henry IV and Henry V to create vivid, emphatic effects to the audience. These rhetorical devices serve the purpose of enabling the rhetorician to appeal and convince his/her listeners which is the sole objective of rhetoric.

Rhetoricians target and take cognisance of the three most important proofs of rhetoric as mentioned by Aristotle (1886), namely; ethos, pathos and logos. This analysis revealed numerous instances in the two plays (*King Henry IV Part II* and *Henry V*) under discussion, in which both the father and the son (Henry IV and V) wisely put ethos and pathos to good use in their processes of convincing their audiences. Sweat (2011, p. 32) echoes this by observing that “three things (ethos, pathos and logos) alone have the ability to carry conviction, win over, instruct and stir men’s minds.” King Henry IV, for example, combines ethos and pathos frequently, through the use of religious references and targets to stir the emotions of his audience to achieve approval; and in addition much of his rhetorical arguments that are meant for either his son or subjects include these features. In the same vein, his son Hal later crowned Henry V abuses God’s character (ethos) and focuses on the heart of his listeners to persuade them. Prince Hal’s seemingly religious devotion seems to be a powerful tool of persuasion in his many speeches, as at one point in *King Henry IV Part II*, Hal, now the new king remarks:

And, God consigning to my good intents,
 No prince nor peer shall have just cause to say,
 God shorten Harry’s happy life one day! (V.ii.143-5)

With this speech, the new king declares by praying that his accession to the throne shall be conditional to God, and that he may die rather than reign if God does not approve of him. Thus Hal timely sets off his intentions by putting God first, as a credible character, before himself to give assurances and seek approval of the nation for his leadership.

Most importantly, the two rhetoricians seem to be very much aware of the benefits they can reap from the careful use of these three persuasive strategies. Moreover, this analysis points out the power of rhetoric embedded in the rhetoricians' speeches with the aim of persuading their target populace. This agrees with Sweat (2011, p. 32) who argues that "the rhetorician's job is to teach, to delight and to persuade." Considering this, King Henry IV's power of rhetoric, according to this study, is responsible for the transformation of an irresponsible prince (Hal) to a hero-king with many war accolades to his name, won from the fields of France during his tenure. As a result of the King IV's rhetoric, Hal promises to do away with his bad, unprincely behaviours and undergo reformation.

In *King Henry IV Part II*, Shakespeare particularly presents a charming young prince, Hal, who is also a bona-fide member of England's underworld, particularly the Boar's Tavern in Eastcheap. Prince Hal uses his charm to defend and cover his deficiency as pointed out by the father. On the other hand, his father Henry IV speeches depicts and describes a troubled and repentant king whose most speeches are highly-emotionally charged.

The other finding of the analysis is that King Henry IV and Henry V resort to the use of diverse rhetoric devices and other figures such as metaphor, emotive language, rhetorical questions, puns (humour), alliteration, exaggeration (hyperbole), metonymy, simile, repetition (anaphora), personification, paradox, and most

dominantly, imagery (see the images of Henry assuming the *port of mars* with famine, sword and fire *crouching* at his feet in the beginning of *Henry V*, pages 12-13), and so on. These techniques, as the findings reveal, are usually not used in equal proportion as some devices are given much preference than the others by the two kings; a good example in this case is the dominant use of images.

In addition, speakers employ these devices for different purposes; amongst others, to impress (appeal), warn, intimidate, inspire, manipulate, submission, order and command, praiseworthy and mainly persuasion of the audience. Bell, Dane and Dane (1993, p. 225) state, “much of the plays deal with formalities of political negotiation: embassies, demands and ultimatums. At these times the language is often public and declamatory.” Both the two main speakers, Henry IV and V, clearly and capably exploit these techniques to advance their intentions in several parts of the plays; for example, Sweat (2011, P. IV) regards Hal, later Henry V, as a great manipulator in his surrounding capable of emotionally controlling people with his speech while Henry IV gives a passionate rhetorical plea to his son in order to incite change and reaction to his unstable reign. Sweat adds that these outstanding rhetoric qualities of these two kings are a testament to the power of what Cicero calls “good man skilled in speaking” (2011, p. IV). This also testifies that the two characters possess eloquence.

According to this study, it is clear that speeches are expressed to qualify an intention, mainly that of the speaker, with the aim of affecting other characters' attitudes and feelings. Moreover, the effects of rhetorical devices depend on the intentions of their users and on the context in which they employ them. Additionally, it can be deduced from this study that the kings' speeches are not merely absurd utterances but an effective rhetorical strategy by the two kings to achieve persuasion goals.

This study also proves that kings' speeches are a powerful tool that King Henry IV and Henry V use to their best advantage to command submission and loyalty from their subjects and followers alike. The findings reveal that the two kings were able to entice and allure their audiences toward their intentions. Meanwhile, it can be read from this analysis that although Henry V was regarded to be a good person in some parts of the play, he was also an unscrupulous user of rhetoric. For instance, this study unravelled Henry V as a great manipulator and cynical, capable of using absurd rhetorical means to advance own agenda. Thus, according to this study, Henry V is a true reflection of what Keller remarks that "if we bestow fluency of speech on persons devoid of virtues of integrity and supreme wisdom, we shall not have made orators of them but shall have put weapons into the hands of madman" (2010, p. 404). The analysis points out how Henry V ruthlessly abuses the persuasive media at his disposal to fulfil his objectives regardless of the fatalities in the process. Meaning Henry V was ready to achieve his persuasive goals for the pleasure of destroying thousands of lives.

This study further shows that the two characters under discussion, Henry IV and V, emerge as rhetorical experts in their own right as the rhetorical context in which they operate seem to have favoured them exclusively, compared to other characters in the plays. King Henry V manages to achieve his long goal of finally convincing his son, Prince Hal, to change into an exemplary king-in-waiting to be later coroneted Henry V; as well as contain a rebellion to his throne. Prince Hal on the other hand, with his rhetorical gift makes it possible to appeal to his father to accept him as the rightful heir to the crown. Upon his accession to the throne, Henry V manages to command approval of his intentions from the audience. Moreover, with the help of his extraordinary rhetorical style, Henry V uses it to demonstrate outstanding military flamboyance and exceptional heroism.

Moreover, Henry V's charm places him well in a position to be exhibited as a warrior-king with great ethos to appeal to the audience. However, some authors have different views of him; for instance one scholar, Hussey (1992, p. 204) describes Henry "as a hero who seems to veer between triumphalism rhetoric and an undercurrent of cynicism." Meanwhile, Hammond (cited in Hussey (1992, p. 204) points out that "the only intelligible conclusion is that the duality is built into the play: Henry is a great hero, and a cold, conniving bastard." These descriptive characteristics seem to be reflected in Henry V's rhetorical speeches. This study draws conclusion that, despite the differences of rhetoricians and their rhetorical approaches, they are focused on convincing the audience which is also the ultimatum goal of rhetoric. Shakespeare's use of rhetorical devices in the two plays under

discussion shows mastery of literary expressions which is unique to both classical and modern rhetoric. By using King Henry IV and Henry V, Shakespeare demonstrates how rhetorical devices can be embedded in speeches to convincing or persuading the audience.

REFERENCES

- Aristotle. (1886). *The rhetoric of Aristotle*. Translated by Weldon, J.F.C. New York, NY: Macmillan and co.
- Bell, M., Dane, E., & Dane, J. (Eds.). (1993). *King Henry V*. Cambridge, Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- Burke, K. (1996). *A rhetoric of motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cicero. (1942). *De Oratore (On the Orator)*. Translated by Sulton, E.W. & Rackham, H. Cambridge, Ham: Harvard University Press.
- Corbett, E.P. (1990). *Classical rhetoric for the modern student*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Cronick, K. (2002). The discourse of President George W. Bush and Osama Bin Laden: A rhetorical analysis and hermeneutic interpretation. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 3(3), 1-23.
- Humphreys, A.R. (Ed.). (1996). *King Henry IV Part II*. London, Great Britain: Mathuen & Co. Ltd.
- Hussey, S.S. (Ed.). (1992). *The literary language of Shakespeare* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Kangira, J. (2013, March/April). An insight into President Hifikepunye Pohamba's selected independence celebration speeches delivered in the 2005-2012 period. *Focus*, (5), 15-18.

- Kangira, J., & Mungenga, J.N. (2012). Praiseworthy values in President Hifikepunye Pohamba's epideictic speech marking Namibia's 20th anniversary of independence. *Journal for Studies in Humanities and Social Sciences*, 1(1), 109-116.
- Keller, S.D. (2010). Combining rhetoric and pragmatics to read Othello. *Journal For English Studies*. 91(4), 398-411. DOI:10.1080/00138381003647574.
- Keller, S.D. (2004). *The Development of Shakespeare's Rhetoric: A Study of Nine Plays*(Doctoral thesis, University of Zurich). Retrieved from <http://www.franke.de>.
- Mann, J.C.(2012).*Outlaw Rhetoric: Figuring Vernacular Eloquence in Shakespeare's England*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Osborn, M., & Osborn, S. (1994). *Public speaking*. Harcourt: Houghton Mifflin.
- Quintilian. (2001). *The orator's education*. Translated by Russell, D.A. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Rice, P., & Waugh, P. (Eds.)(1996).*Modern literary theory*. London, England: Arnold.
- Rong-gen, Z. (2012). Rhetorical analysis of English proverbs. *US-China Foreign Language*, 10(3), 1005-9.
- Rhys, W. (Ed.). (2012). *Rhetoric*. London, England: Oxford University Press.

Shipale, P.T. (2012, August 24). Rhetorical analysis and logical fallacies. *The New Era*, p.8.

Smit, T.C. (2012). Conventional and novel/creative metaphors: Do different cultural environments affect parsing in a second language. *Journal for Studies in Humanities and Social Sciences*, 1(1), 93-108.

Sweat, C. (2011). *The King's speech: A rhetorical analysis of Shakespeare's Henry IV, Part I* (Master's thesis, University of New Orleans). Retrieved from

<http://Scholarworks.uno.edu/td/345>

Tom, G., & Eves, A. (2012). *The use of rhetorical devices in advertising*. New York, NY: Longman.

Wilson, C.T. (2012). The master's tools: Carmichael's use of Aristotle's and Quintilian's rhetorical theories of emotional appeal to promote black consciousness. *The Researcher: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 25 (1), 1-138.

Appendices

Texts used for Analysis

King Henry IV's moving speeches in *King Henry IV Part II*.

Though then, 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.70-75)

How I came by the crown, O God forgive,

And grant it may with thee in true peace live! (IV.v.218-219)

My gracious liege,

You won it, wore it, kept it, gave it me;

Then plain and right must my possession be,

Which I with more than with a common pain

'Gainst all the world will rightfully maintain. (IV.v.220-224)

My due from thee is this imperial crown,

Which, as immediate from thy place and blood,

Derives itself to me...

Which God shall guard; and put the world's whole strength

This lineal honour from me. This from thee

Will I to mine leave, as 'tis left to me. (IV.v.40-6)

The Prince hath ta'en it hence. Go seek him out.

Is he so hasty that he doth suppose

My sleep my death?

Find him, my Lord of Warwick, chide him heather.

This part of his conjoins with my disease,

And helps to end me. See, sons, what things you are,

How quickly nature falls into revolt. (IV.v.59-65)

Thy wish was father, Harry to the thought;

I stay too long by thee, I weary thee.

Dost thou wilt needs invest thee with mine empty chair

That thou wilt needs invest thee with my honours

Before thy hour be ripe? O foolish youth!

Thou seek'st the greatness that will overwhelm thee.

Stay but a little, for my cloud of dignity

Is held from falling with so weak a wind

That it will quickly drop; my days dim.

Thou hast stol'n that which after some few hours

Were thine without offence, and at my death

Thou hast seal'd up my expectation.

Thy life did manifest thou lov'dst me not,

And thou wilt have die assur'd of it.

Thou hid'st a thousand daggers in thy thoughts,

Which thou hast whetted on my stony heart,

To stab a half an hour of my life.

What, canst thou not forbear me half an hour?

Then get thee gone, and dig my grave thyself,

And bid the merry bells ring to thine ear

That thou art crowned, not that I am dead.

Let all the tears that should bedew my hearse

Be drops of balm to sanctify thy head,

Only compound me with forgotten dust.

Give that which gave thee life unto the worms. (IV.v.92-116)

Pluck down my officers; break my decrees;

For now a time is come to mock at form-

Harry the fifth is crown'd! Up vanity!

Down ,royal state! All you sage counsellors, hence!

And to the English court assemble now

From every region, apes of idleness!

Now neighbour confines, purge you of your scum!

Have you a ruffian that will swear, drink, dance,

Revel the night, rob. murder, and commit

The oldest sins the newest kind of ways?

Be happy he will trouble you no more.

England shall double gild his treble guilt,

England shall give him office, honour, might:

For the fifth Harry from curb'd licence plucks. (IV.v.117-130)

Stay but a little, for my cloud of dignity

I held from falling with so weak a wind

That it will quickly drop; my day is dim. (IV.v.98-100)

Before thy hour be ripe? O foolish youth! (IV.v.96)

O my poor kingdom, sick with civil blows. (IV.v.133)

O, thou wilt be a wideness again. (IV.v.136)

Go call the Earls of Surrey and of Warwick;

But ere they come, bid them o'er-read these letters

And well consider of them. Make good speed. (III.i.1-3)

Now, lords, if God doth give successful end

To this debate that bleedth at our doors,

We will our youth lead on to higher fields,

And draw no swords but what are sanctified.

Our navy is address'd, our power collected,

Our substitutes in a absence well invested,

And every thing lies level to our wish;
Only we want a little personal strength,
And pause us till these rebels now afoot. (IV.iv.1-9)

O my son,
God put in my mind to take it hence,
That thou mightst win the more thy father's love,
Come hither, Harry, sit thou by my bed,
And hear, I think, the very latest counsel
That ever I shall breathe. God knows, my son,
By what by-paths and indirect crook'd ways
I met this crown, and I myself know well
How troublesome it sat on my head.

... For all my reign hath been but as a scene

Acting that argument. And now my death

... Too near into my state. Therefore, my Harry,

... How I came by the crown, O God forgive me,

And grant it may with thee in true peace live! (IV.v.181-219)

You are right, justice, and you weigh this well.

Therefore still bear the balance and the sword;

And I do wish your honours may increase

Till you do live to see a son of mine

Offend you and obey you, as I did.

So shall I live to speak my father's words:

'Happy am I, that have a man so bold

That dares do justice on my proper son;

And not less happy, having such a son

That would deliver up his greatness so

Into the hands of justice.' You did commit me:

For which I do commit into your hand

Th'unstained sword that you have us'd to bear,

With this remembrance-that you use the same

With the like bold, just, and impartial spirit

As you have done 'gainst me. There is my hand,

You shall be as a father to my youth,

My voice shall sound as you do prompt mine ear... (V.ii.102-145)

I know thee not, old man. Fall to thy prayers.

How will white hairs becomes a fool and jester!

I have long dreamt of such a kind of man,

So surfeit-swell'd, so old, and so profane;

But being awak'd I do despise my dream.

Make less thy body hence, and more thy grace;

Leave gormandizing; know the grave doth gape

For thee thrice wider than for other men.

Reply not to me with a fool-born jest;

Presume not that I am the thing I was;

For God doth know, so shall the world perceive,

That I have turn'd away my former self;

So will I those that kept me company.

... The tutor and the feeder of my riots

Till then I banish thee, on pain of death,

As I have done the rest of my misleaders... (V.v.47-72)

Texts analysed from *King Henry V*

O for a muse of fire, that would ascend

The brightest heaven of invention,

A kingdom for a stage, princes to act,

And monarchs to behold the swelling scene.

Then should the warlike Harry, like himself,

Assume the port of Mars, and at his heels

(Leashed in, like hounds) should famine, sword and fire

Crouch for employment. But pardon, gentles all... (Prologue 1-34)

Where is my gracious lord of Canterbury? (I.ii.1)

My learned lord, we pray you to proceed. (I.ii.9)

And God forbid, my dear and faithful lord,

That you should fashion, wrest, or bow your reading,

Or nicely charge your understanding soul

With opening titles miscreate, whose right

Suits not in native colours with the truth,

For God doth know how in health
Shall drop their blood in approbation
Of what your reverence shall incite us to.
Therefore take heed how you impawn our person,
How you awake our sleeping sword of war
We charge you in the name of God take heed. (I.ii.13-23)

We do not mean the coursing snatchers only
But fear the main intendment of the Scot,
Who hath been still a giddy neighbour to us.
For you shall read that my great-grandfather
Never went with his forces into France
But that the Scot on his unfurnished kingdom
Came pouring like the tide into a beach
With ample and brim fullness of his force,
Galling the gleaned land with hot assays,
Girding with grievous siege castles and towns,
That England, being empty of defence,

Hath shook and trembled at th'ill neighbourhood. (I.ii.143-54)

Call in the messengers sent from the Dauphin.

Now we are well resolved, and by God's help

And yours, the noble sinews of our power,

France being ours, we'll bend it to our awe,

Or break it all to pieces, Or there we'll sit,

Ruling in large and ample empery

O'er France and all her almost kingly dukedoms,

... Either our history shall with full mouth

Speak freely of our acts, or else our grave

... Now are we well prepared to know the pleasure

Of our fair cousin Dauphin; for we hear

Your greeting is from him, not from the king. (I.ii.221-36)

We are no tyrant, but a Christian king,

Unto whose grace our passion is as subject

As are our wretches fettered in our prisons.

... Tell us the Dauphin's mind. (I.ii.241-44)

We are glad the dauphin is so pleasant with us.

His present and your pains we thank you for.

When we have matched our rackets to these balls

We will in France, by God's grace, play a set

... But tell the Dauphin I will keep my state,

Be like a king, and show my sail of greatness

When I do rouse me in my throne of France,

For that I have laid by my majesty

... But I will rise there with so full a glory

That I will dazzle all the eyes of France,

... To whom I do appeal, and in whose name

Tell you the Dauphin I am coming on

To venge me as I may, and to put forth

My rightful hand in a well-hallowed cause... (I.ii.259-97)

The mercy that was quick in us but late

By your own counsel is suppressed and killed.

For your own reasons turn into your bossoms,

As dogs upon their masters, worrying you.

... These English monsters. My lord of Cambridge here,

... Ingrateful, savage and inhuman creature?

... Woudst thou have pracyised on me for my use?

... The sweetness of affiance? Show men dutiful?

Why, so didst thou. Seem they grave and learned?

Why, so didst thou. Come they of noble family?

Why, so didst thou. Seem they religious?

Why, so didst thou. Or are they spare in diet,

Free from gross passion, or of mirth or anger...

... And God acquit them of their practices. (76-141)

Praised be God, and not our strength, for it. (IV.vii.77)

Come, go we in procession to the village,

And be it death proclaimed through our host

To boast of this, or take that praise from God.

Which is His only. (IV.viii.105-8)

Once more unto the breach, dear friends, once more,

Or close the wall up with our English dead!

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-favoured rage.

Then lend the eye a terrible aspect,

Let it pry through the portage of the head,

Like the brass cannon. Let the brow o'erwhelm it

As fearfully as doth a galled rock

O'erhang and jutty his confounded base,

Swilled with the wild and wasteful ocean.

Now set the teeth and stretch the nostril wide,

Hold hard the breath, and bend up every spirit

To this full height. On, on, you noble English,

Whose blood is fet from fathers of war-proof,

Fathers that like so many Alexanders. (III.i.1-19)

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. (IV.iii.35-37)

This day is called the feast of Crispin.

He that outlives this day and comes safe home

Will stand a-tiptoe when this day is named,

And rouse him at the name of Crispin.

He that shall see this day and live old age

Will yearly on the vigil feast his neighbours,

And say 'Tomorrow is Saint Crispin'.

... We few, we happy few, we band of brothers-

For he today that sheds his blood with me

Shall be my brother, be he ne'er so vile... (IV.iii.40-67)

The royal captain of this ruined band

Walking from watch to watch, from tent to tent?

Let him cry 'Praise and glory on his head!'

For forth he goes and visits all his host,

Bids them good morrow with a modest smile,

And calls them brothers, friends and countrymen.

Upon his royal face there is no note

How dread an army hath enrounded him,

Nor doth he dedicate one jot of colour

Unto the weary and all-watched night,

But freshly looks and overbears attaint

With cheerful semblance and sweet majesty,

That every wretch, pining and pale before,

Beholding him, plucks comfort from his looks. (Chorus 429-42)

Gloucester, 'tis true that we are in greater danger.

The greater therefore should our courage be.

Good morrow, brother Bedford. God almighty,

There is some soul of goodness in things evil

Would men observingly distil it out.

... And make morals of the devil himself. (IV.i.1-12)

'Tis good for men to love their present pains.

Upon example so the spirit is eased,

And when the mind is quickened, out of doubt

... But up their drowsy grave and newly move. (IV.i.18-22)

PISTOL: *Quivousla?*

KING: A friend

PISTOL: Discuss unto me, art thou officer, or art thou base, common and popular?

KING: I am a gentleman of a company.

PISTOL: Trail'st thou the puissant pike?

KING: Even so. What are you?

PISTOL: As good a gentleman as the emperor.

KING: Then you are a better than the king.

PISTOL: The king's bawcock and a heart of gold, a lad of life, an imp of fame, of parents good, of fist most valiant. I kiss his dirty shoe, and from heartstring I love the lovely bully. (IV.i.44-46)

KING: No. Nor it is not meet he should. For though I speak it to you, I think the king is but a man as I am. The violet 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.96-106)

Every subject's duty is the king's, but every subject's soul is his own. Therefore should every soldier in the wars do as every sick man in his bed, wash every mote out of his conscience. And dying so, death is to him advantage; or, not dying, the time was blessedly lost wherein such preparation was gained. And in him that escapes I were not sin to think that, making God so free an offer, He let him outlive that day to see His greatness, and to teach others how they should prepare. (IV.i.153-6)

O God of battles, steel my soldiers' hearts.

Possess them not with fear. Take from them now

The sense of reckoning ere th'opposed numbers

Pluck their hearts from them. Not today, O Lord,

Oh, not today, think not upon the fault

My father made in compassing the crown.

I Richard's body have interred new,

And on it have bestowed more contrite tears

Than from it issued forced drops of blood.

Five hundred poor I have in yearly pay

Who twice a day their withered hands hold up

Toward heaven to pardon blood. And I have built

Two chantries where the sad and solemn priests

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

Though all that I can do is nothing worth

Since that my penitence comes after all,

Imploring pardon.(IV .ii.263-279)

Take it, brave York. Now soldiers, march away,

And how Thou pleasant, God, dispose the day. (III.131-132)

Came pouring like the tide into the breach. (I.ii.149)

In thunder and in earthquake, like Jove. (II.iv.101)

On the poor souls for whom this hungry war

Opens his vasty jaws, and on your head. (II.iv.105-6)

Then imitate the action of the tiger:

Stiffen the sinews, conjure up the blood,

Disguise fair nature with hard-favoured rage.

Then lend the eye a terrible aspect,

Let it pry through the portage of the head,

Like the brass cannon. Let the brow o'erwhelm it

As fearfully as doth a galled rock

O'erhang and jutty his confounded base,

Swilled with the wild and wasteful ocean... (III.i.6-17)

And their most reverend heads dashed to the walls,

Your naked infants spitted upon pikes

Whiles the mad mothers with their howls confused

Do break the clouds, as did the wives of Jewry

At Herod's bloody-hunting slaughtermen. (III.iv.37-41)

When all those legs and arms and heads chopped off in a battle in a battle shall join together at the latter day and cry all 'We died at such a place,' 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. I am afeard there are few die well in a battle. (III.i.124-9)

He cries aloud 'Tarry, my cousin Suffolk.

My soul shall thine keep company to heaven.

Tarry, sweet soul, for mine, then flyabrest,

As in this glorious and well-fourten field

We kept together in our chilvary.' (IV.vi.15-19)

This note doth tell me of ten thousand French

That in the field lie slain. Of princes in this number

And nobles bearing banners, there lie dead

One hundred and twenty-six. Added to these,

Of knights, esquires and gallant gentlemen,

Eight thousand and four hundred, of the which

Five hundred were but yesterday dubbed knights.

So that in these ten thousand they have lost

There are but sixteen hundred mercenaries.

The rest are princess, barons, lords, knights, squires,

And gentlemen of blood and quality.

The names of those their nobles that lie dead:

... Here was a royal fellowship of death.

Where is the number of our English dead?

... None else of name, and of all other men... (IV.viii.73-104)

To boast of this, or take that praise from God,

Which is His Holy. (IV.viii.107-8)

Let there be sung *Nonnobis* and *TeDeun*, (IV.viii.115)

... Now we bear the king.

Toward Calais. Grant him there. There seen,

Heave him away upon your winged thoughts

Athwart the sea. Behold the English beach

Pales-in the flood with men, with wives, and boys,

Whose shouts and claps out-voice the deep-mouthed sea,

Which, like a mighty whiffler 'fore the king,

Seems to prepare his way. So let him land,

And solemnly see him set on to London.

So swift a pace hath thought that even now

You may imagine him upon Blackheath,

Where that his lords desire him to have borne

His bruised helmet and his bended sword

Before him through the city. He forbids it,

Being free from vainness and self-glorious pride,

Giving full trophy, signal and ostent

Quite from himself to God. But now behold

In the quick forge and working-house of thought,

How London doth pour out her citizens,
The mayor and all his brethren in best sort,
Like to the senators of th'antique Rome,
With the plebeians swarming at their heels,
Go forth and fetch their conquering Caesar in-
As, by a lower but by loving likelihood
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? Much more, and much more cause,
Did they this Harry. Now in London place him-
As yet the lamentation of the French
Invites the king of England's stay at home,
The emperor's coming in behalf of France.
To order peace between them- and omit
All the occurrences, whatever chanced,
Till Harry's back return again to France.

There must we bring him, and myself have played

The interim, by remembering you 'tis past.

Then brook abridgement, and your eyes advance

After your thoughts, straight back again to France. (Act 5, Chorus, lines 6-45)