

1: Richard II Study Guide from LitCharts | The creators of SparkNotes

Both Richard II and Henry V were powerful rulers, whose ruling was heavily dictated by their divine right to rule and their relationship with God. Through exploring the King's relationship to God in Shakespeare's tragedies Richard II, 1 Henry IV, 2 Henry IV, and Henry V, one can see that Henry V is the ideal Christian King.

He was the patriarch of this powerful political dynasty. Seven of these histories, including this one, cover descendents of John of Gaunt, the duke of Lancaster. Richard II has been king for twenty years, his father predeceasing his father, a matter that placed the young Richard first in line to be king. Bolingbroke and Mowbray are called before the king and John of Gaunt to defend themselves. Bolingbroke and Mowbray promptly engage each other in a serious verbal spar. The king decides that the two of them must settle their differences in a duel at Coventry. Later, at Coventry, just before the duel is to begin, the king decides to ban Mowbray from England for life and to exile Bolingbroke to France for six years. She soon leaves for her castle at Plashy, not to be heard from again. We soon learn she has died. He is comforted by his younger brother, the duke of York. Though their surname was Plantagenet, this powerful political family found itself for decades split primarily into two groups; the Lancastrians, descendents of John of Gaunt, and the so-called Yorkists, descendents of Edmund of Langley. It is also rumored about that Bolingbroke has plans to attempt to seize the crown from his cousin Richard II. Henry Bolingbroke and his entourage by now have arrived at Ravensburgh and have headed south for Bristow Castle. The monarchist York, now older and afflicted, confronts the young, virile and ambitious Bolingbroke, making a brave and heart-felt attempt to encourage Bolingbroke to support the king. With compassion and diplomacy, Bolingbroke holds firm, winning York over. Bolingbroke moves further inland. The king learns of his own deteriorating support among a number of key aides and their friends, many having defected to Bolingbroke, including the powerful Northumberland and his son, Harry Percy. Harry or Henry Percy is better known as Hotspur. He has a major role coming up. Salisbury is quickly followed by Stephen Scroop who offers even worse news. The king talks freely of death. He is taken to task and temporarily encouraged by the Bishop of Carlisle. Furthering his dismay, the king learns that his uncle York has joined Bolingbroke and his cause. The young Harry Percy Hotspur then informs Bolingbroke that the king and a few of his supporters have sought protection in Flint Castle. Bolingbroke dispatches Northumberland to talk with the king and to let him know that he only seeks to have his banishment repealed and to have his lands and other assets returned. The king soon buckles and is bloodlessly deposed, a discouraging moment for his supporters and a defining moment in English history. At about this time, the duke of York reports to Bolingbroke that Richard II is ready to publicly give up his crown. Richard II comes forward. Gently, Northumberland tells Richard II that he must sign certain papers acknowledging his crimes against the state. Northumberland proceeds to tell the queen that she has been banished to France and that Richard will be transferred to Pomfret Castle. Richard is relegated to Pomfret Castle to be its lone prisoner. Shakespeare has Richard reflect on his life and his own sense of being, and on what was and what might have been. A badly misguided but well intentioned friend of the new king kills Richard at Pomfret Castle, an act that will haunt kings and England for a century. He remains a close confidant to Richard II throughout, and is never close to Bolingbroke. Late in the play he is implicated in an earlier plot designed to take the life of Bolingbroke, who by then is Henry IV. The new king takes the accusation lightly and risking little, pardons his cousin. Henry Bolingbroke is the duke of Hereford, the son of John of Gaunt, and a future king. Early in the play he is exiled for six years to France; Richard II, his cousin and the king, fearing him as a competitor. While in France Bolingbroke gains political, military and financial strength as Richard II continues to exercise poor judgment. He is also the grandfather of Henry V and great-grandfather of Henry VI; known, understandably, as the father of kings. John of Gaunt was born in Gaunt, England, was the duke of Lancaster and the patriarch of the Lancastrians who ruled England for seven decades. John of Gaunt, a beloved figure in English history, dies early in Act two. In , the time of the play, King Richard II is thirty-two and married, but they have no children. What my tongue speaks, my right-drawn sword may prove. Meantime most falsely doth he lie. Mowbray picks up the gage. He is our subject, Mowbray, so art thou. Free speech and fearless I to thee

allow.

2: Simplified Shakespeare: Richard II

*King Richard II and Macbeth [William Shakespeare] on www.enganchecubano.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers.*

Politics in the English history plays[edit] Shakespeare was living in the reign of Elizabeth I , the last monarch of the house of Tudor , and his history plays are often regarded as Tudor propaganda because they show the dangers of civil war and celebrate the founders of the Tudor dynasty. By nostalgically evoking the late Middle Ages, these plays described the political and social evolution that had led to the actual methods of Tudor rule, so that it is possible to consider the English history plays as a biased criticism of their own country. Thus the sentiments of the Lancaster myth are spoken by Lancastrians, the opposing myth is voiced by Yorkists, and the Tudor myth is embodied in Henry Tudor. Shakespeare "thereby allows each play to create its own ethos and mythos and to offer its own hypotheses concerning the springs of action". Warren , after J. Many of his changes in characterisation must be blamed upon the inconsistencies of the chroniclers before him. For this reason, the moral conflicts of each play must be taken in terms of that play, and not supplemented from the other plays. As for Lancastrian bias, York is presented as unrighteous and hypocritical in 2 Henry VI, [27] and while Part 2 ends with Yorkist victories and the capture of Henry, Henry still appears "the upholder of right in the play". In the later tetralogy Shakespeare clearly inclines towards the Lancaster myth. The omission of Mortimer from Henry V was again quite deliberate: Shakespearean history in the wider sense[edit] John F. He implies that rebellion against a legitimate and pious king is wrong, and that only a monster such as Richard of Gloucester would have attempted it. In these plays he adopts the official Tudor ideology, by which rebellion, even against a wrongful usurper, is never justifiable. Hotspur and Hal are joint heirs, one medieval, the other modern, of a split Faulconbridge. Danby argues, however, that when Hal rejects Falstaff he is not reforming, as is the common view, [36] but merely turning from one social level to another, from Appetite to Authority, both of which are equally part of the corrupt society of the time. Of the two, Danby argues, Falstaff is the preferable, being, in every sense, the bigger man. Hamlet, like Edgar in King Lear later, has to become a "machiavel of goodness". Macbeth is clearly aware of the great frame of Nature he is violating. By the time he reaches Edmund, Shakespeare no longer pretends that the Hal-type Machiavellian prince is admirable; and in Lear he condemns the society we think historically inevitable. Against this he holds up the ideal of a transcendent community and reminds us of the "true needs" of a humanity to which the operations of a Commodity-driven society perpetually do violence. This "new" thing that Shakespeare discovers is embodied in Cordelia. Cordelia, in the allegorical scheme, is threefold: Until that decent society is achieved, we are meant to take as role-model Edgar, the Machiavel of patience, of courage and of "ripeness". History theatrical genre Dates and themes[edit] Chronicle plays " history-plays based on the chronicles of Polydore Vergil , Edward Hall , Raphael Holinshed and others " enjoyed great popularity from the late s to c. By the early s they were more numerous and more popular than plays of any other kind. Plays about the deposing and killing of kings, or about civil dissension, met with much interest in the s, while plays dramatising supposedly factual episodes from the past, advertised as "true history" though the dramatist might know otherwise , drew larger audiences than plays with imagined plots. Playwrights were banned from touching "matters of divinity or state", [43] a ban that remained in force throughout the period, the Master of Revels acting as licenser. Ward pointed out that the elaborated, unhistorical and flattering role assigned to an earlier Earl of Oxford, the 11th , in The Famous Victories of Henry V c. Charlton gave some idea of their shortcomings when he spoke of "the wooden patriotism of The Famous Victories, the crude and vulgar Life and Death of Jack Straw , the flatness of The Troublesome Reign of King John , and the clumsy and libellous Edward I ". Such a drama could develop only when certain conditions had been fulfilled " when the people, nationalized, homogeneous, feeling and acting pretty much as one, had become capable of taking a deep and active interest in its own past; when it had become awakened to a sense of its own greatness; when there had come into being a dramatic form by which historical material could be presented in such a way as to reveal those aspects of which the public felt most deeply the inspiration This homogeneity did not arise out of identity of economic conditions,

of political belief, or of religious creed, but was the product of the common participation, individually and various as it might be, in those large and generous emotions. These, for a brief glorious moment, were shared by Catholic and Puritan, courtier and citizen, master and man. And so we can speak of a national unanimity of thought and action, and of a national historical drama. He also brought noble poetry to the genre and a deep knowledge of human character. Some critics believe that Shakespeare has a fair claim to have been the innovator. Courthope, [72] E. Decline[edit] Several causes led to the decline of the chronicle play in the early 17th century: English chronicle plays, by reign dramatized Reign.

3: PSF King Richard II

Pennsylvania Shakespeare Festival announces the principal actors cast in its productions of Shakespeare in Love and King Richard II, which will play in repertory July 11 through August 5 on the Main Stage at the Labuda Center for the Performing Arts on the campus of DeSales University.

In constructing his history plays, Shakespeare most likely relied upon the Chronicles of Froissart, and, primarily, Holinshed, but he altered and embellished the material found in these sources. The plays make the statement that the best possible ruler must be both anointed and politically shrewd. This philosophy seems to be a combination of Tudor and Machiavellian theories on the nature of kingship and power. Moreover, it is possible that this didactic message linking all four history plays in the second tetralogy was constructed as a reaction to the succession problem and the potentiality that Elizabeth and her council might choose an heir lacking in one or both of these areas. Thus, the plays, to a large extent, can be read as a collective guide to help Elizabeth select the next ruler of England. In order to assess the credibility of the argument that the plays contain the didactic message that a ruler needs the combination of divine right and leadership qualities, we must examine the three main characters, Richard II, Henry IV, and Henry V, as found in the chronicles and in the plays. However, it is the small and subtle changes to the chronicles that so effectively reshape the focus of the play from a simple report on history, to a dramatic lesson on the responsibilities of monarchs. The first and most striking example is the way the character of Gaunt changes. In the Chronicles, Gaunt is a disorderly and rapacious magnate. However, in Richard II, Gaunt is the voice of reason, wisdom, and, above all, patriotism. It is likely that Shakespeare relied on the Chronicle of Froissart for his characterization of Gaunt. The duke of Lancastre was sore displeased in his mind to see the kyng his nephewe mysse use himselfe in dyvers thynges as he dyd. He consyded the tyme to come lyke a sage prince, and somtyme sayd to suche as he trusted best: Our nephue the kyng of Englande wyll shame all or he cease: The Frenchman are right subtile; for one myschiefe that falleth amonge us, they wolde it were ten, for otherwise they canne nat recover their dommages, nor come to their ententes, but by our owne means and dyscorde betwene ourselfe. And we se dayly that all realmes devyded are destroyed;. John Froissart, Chronicles [London: In many of his speeches in the play, Gaunt emphatically expounds the importance of the Divine Right of Kings. To stir against the butchers of his life! But since correction lieth in those hands Which made the fault that we cannot correct, Put we our quarrel to the will of heaven. The Tudors adopted the theory of the Divine Right of Kings in the attempt to maintain a strong government, and to counter the Papal authority as the state attempted to break away from the church. The theory became the foremost doctrine of the time regarding the nature of kingship, and rests on four main statements: The vehicles for the expression of Tudor propaganda were usually homilies and sermons. It declares the following: As quoted in B. God hath sent us a noble king in this his visitation; let us not provoke against him. Let us beware; let us not displease him; let us receive with all obedience and prayer the word of God. I hear say ye walk inordinately, ye talk unseemly, otherwise it becometh Christian subjects: I will not make the king a pope; for the pope will have all things that he doth taken for an article of our faith. I will not say but the king and his council may err; I pray daily that they may not err. It becometh us, whatsoever they decree, to stand unto it, and receive it obediently. Hugh Latimer, Sermons [Cambridge: Bolingbroke will make countless other English men and women feel the repercussions of his act of deposing the rightful King Richard. However, there are other additions in the drama that also work to this end. York then "came foorth into the church that stood without the castell, and there communed with the duke of Lancaster" Holinshed, Chronicles [New York: He clearly obeys his orders and tries to fight Bolingbroke, but he seems to change sides and join Bolingbroke without compunction or hostility. Grace me no grace, nor uncle me no uncle! York, in the play, is outraged that Bolingbroke would consider rebelling against Richard. Having no choice, York goes along with Bolingbroke, but he is bitter: Not all the water in the rough rude sea Can wash the balm off from an anointed king. But the additions also illustrate the importance of legitimacy itself. Richard has gained the throne by the law of primogeniture, and has license to control England because he is a divinely-ordained king. Although Richard, as we will see, is grossly incompetent at managing the

affairs of the realm, he is legitimate; he has right on his side, and, therefore, he has one of the qualifications that make a successful ruler. What Richard is lacking is the ability to make shrewd political decisions. He is ordained and has the rightful authority and obligation to lead his subjects, but, being weak and self-absorbed, he cannot fulfill his duty. His ineffectiveness is shown in the *Chronicles of Holinshed*, but to a far lesser extent than in the play. Subsequently, the additions illustrate that Richard is not the best possible ruler because he does not have the combination of legitimacy and political savvy. It seems a necessary decision in the *Chronicles* "Richard desires to end the argument, and no other motive of Richard is implied. But in the play, Richard makes the following speech after Bolingbroke is banished that impugns his motives behind the removal of Bolingbroke: Although severely punishing a man so beloved by the people for a minor offense is political folly, Richard does not seem to take this into consideration. He shows his weakness as a ruler by allowing his emotions to shape his decisions. This passage also illustrates that Richard has not been able to interact effectively with the English people; he has done nothing to gain their support. This estrangement from the common people is politically disastrous. In both the play and *The Prince* we see that the ability to influence public opinion is the key to political success, a concept that Richard cannot grasp. *Holinshed* does not say for what purpose Richard used the money. Shakespeare, however, adds the following passage: We will ourself in person to this war; And, for our coffers, with too great a court,. If that come short, Our substitutes at home shall have blank charters. I, iv, To take the money of his already poverty-stricken subjects and use it to finance the war in Ireland is a politically-disastrous decision. Thy deathbed is no lesser than thy land, Wherein thou liest in reputation sick;. A thousand flatterers sit within thy crown, Whose compass is no bigger then thy head. These passages echo the words of Machiavelli: What will make [the ruler] despised is being considered inconstant, frivolous, effeminate, pusillanimous, and irresolute: He should contrive that his actions should display grandeur, courage, seriousness and strength. A ruler who succeeds in creating such an image of himself will enjoy a fine reputation; and it will be difficult to plot against him or to attack him. A ruler will effectively protect himself from this danger if he avoids incurring hatred and contempt, and keeps the people satisfied with him. It is essential to do this. Richard believes that his status as anointed king is the only attribute he needs to govern successfully, and so he makes no effort to display those traits that both the Prince and the play deem vital. According to Machiavelli, above all else, the confiscation of property is the worst action a ruler can take. Richard, playing perfectly the role of an incompetent ruler, does not even give it a second thought 3. Bolingbroke Hath seized the wasteful king. We at time of year Do wound the bark, the skin of our fruit trees, Lest, being overproud in sap and blood, With too much riches it confound itself. Richard has only one of the facets that makes a successful ruler. Henry has all the characteristics of a great Machiavellian despot and, were this enough, he would be the consummate ruler and have a peaceful reign. But, unfortunately, Henry IV comes to the throne as a usurper and an illegitimate monarch. A wonder it was to see what number of people ran after him in euerie towne and street where he came, before he took the sea; lamenting and bewailing his departure, as who would saie, that when he departed, the only shield, defense, and comfort of the commonwealth was vaded and gone *Chronicles*, p. In the play, however, Shakespeare creates a speech for Richard that reveals not only the tremendous affection the people have for Bolingbroke, but, more significantly, it reveals how he has gained their favor: Off goes his bonnet to an oyster-wench; A brace of draymen bid God speed him well And had the tribute of his supple knee. He is already living up to the ideal Machiavellian statesman whose primary goal is "to seem merciful, trustworthy, humane, upright and devout" Machiavelli, p. But, in *Richard II*, unlike in the *Chronicles*, the historical event is manipulated so that it resembles the confrontation between Bolingbroke and Mowbray earlier in the play. Its position right before the deposition scene has great significance. Bolingbroke, however, is complete master of the situation. But *Holinshed* reports that Henry went on a crusade only during the final year of his reign, and there is no mention of why Henry decides to leave, other than to destroy the infidels. While it is obvious that Henry feels remorse for his actions, it is not likely that this is the sole motivation for his sojourn abroad. Did lately meet in the intestine shock And furious close of civil butchery, Shall now in mutual well-beseeming ranks March all one way. In this instance, the connection to Machiavelli is striking: Nothing enables a ruler to gain more prestige than undertaking great campaigns. In our own times Ferdinand of Aragon, the present King of Spain is a

notable example. This man attacked Granada at the beginning of his reign, and this campaign laid the foundations of his state. First of all, he began the campaign. Moreover, he continued to make use of religion, resorting to a cruel and apparently pious policy of. The basis of this scene comes from Holinshed. He writes that the tales Henry had heard about Hal "brought no small suspicion into the kings head, least his son would presume to vsurpe the crowne. It is then reported that they reconcile. Shakespeare, building upon this historical reconciliation, includes a speech by Henry who describes how he achieved power: Opinion, that did help me to the crown, Had still kept loyal to possession, And left me in reputeless banishment, A fellow of no mark nor likelihood. So when he had occasion to be seen. Henry, because of his desire to keep the favor of the common people, will perform any action, and assume any persona. It does not matter if he is insincere, as long as he conveys the right sentiment to the people , as long as he appears "merciful, trustworthy, upright, humane, and devout" Machiavelli, p.

4: Richard II (TV Movie) - IMDb

*King Richard II; MacBeth. Glossary. Critical Comments and Method of Study. The University Society Booklovers Edition [William Shakespeare] on www.enganchecubano.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers.*

It is an interesting question to pose to Shakespeare, for of all the writers we know of, he seems to portray the widest variety of human types, as well as to see most deeply into the human soul. Aristotle had a more positive view of the potential effect of wielding power, for he saw it as necessary to the rounding off and completion of practical virtue. Aristotle would, on the whole but not universally see his treatment of the ancient monarchy, agree with Acton that absolute power is a problem, thus his favoring of the aristocratic republic or the polity as the best regimes in most circumstances. But he would take a more nuanced position on the inherent tendency of power to corrupt. It can ennoble as well, and the actual effects of power-holding are apparently more circumstantial than Acton allows. At almost the opposite extreme lies the other Shakespeare predecessor of interest here—Machiavelli. Human beings are by nature corrupt, if by corrupt we mean indisposed to play nicely with one another on their own. As Machiavelli says in one place: Indeed, his very last words are these: He finds Macbeth a poor test because Macbeth, not following Machiavelli enough, never achieves absolute power to provide a good test. Antony and Cleopatra are also inconclusive because we cannot find a proper standard to gauge their corruption just as we cannot judge the degree of power they hold. Richard II is also inconclusive, for he believes himself absolute by virtue of his constitutional and divinely ordained power, but is in fact anything but because of his dependence on the barons and his personal weakness and poor judgment. They became wiser, more moderate, more loyal to others. Shakespeare partakes of both the perspectives of Aristotle and of Machiavelli on the issue, but, I would say, he is ultimately more Aristotelian. To be more concrete, let us begin where Alvis does, with Macbeth. Ambition has an object—honor. Shakespeare may not agree with Macbeth about military prowess as the highest claim of worth, but he no doubt does agree that honor is a respectable and valid aim of rule. Aristotle surely does agree. Honor can be a good and incorrupt aim, for it may lead a ruler to attempt to rule in such a way as to deserve honor, that is to say, to rule in a way that benefits his subjects and thus earns their esteem. Ambition is not corrupt in itself and it does not seem that Shakespeare means to show that honor achieved through attaining power is necessarily corrupting. A clearer case of one who is corrupt before attaining power is Richard III. It is difficult to say that possessing absolute or near absolute power made him worse; it merely gave him the opportunity to do more mischief. The elevation of Malcolm makes him realize there is no noncriminal path for him to take to his destination. Once he faces that necessity he develops qualms, but not over the injustice of the deed. In a word he fears he will be caught and punished. In attaining power, then, Macbeth is not corrupted but more nearly reveals what he has inwardly been. Macbeth is not one who is corrupted by power but one who reveals what he already is—an unjust man. Although Macbeth is but one case, it is not clear that Shakespeare shows any individual who became corrupted through possession of power. Does he show any who are made better through holding power? There is of course the difficult and complex case of Prospero. But on balance he seems to have become better not through wielding power but through losing power. When Duke of Milan, he spent his time and attention on his studies to the neglect of his dukedom and his duties. It is only when supplanted and exiled that he comes to take seriously his responsibility for the welfare of those over whom he rules. On his island and with his small polity he becomes less corrupt in the sense of more responsible. But as Alvis rightly says, Prospero remains an enigma. At the beginning he is a tyrant in both his domestic and political actions. He approaches his marriage to Hippolyta as the reward due to one who has triumphed in war. He acts to impose severe penalties on various of his subjects when they seek to act freely in choosing their marriage mates. By the end of the play he is quite transformed. He no longer treats Hippolyta as a mere spoil of war but as a loved and loving companion. The exercise of power has made him better. Just how is a complex story that cannot be recounted in the space available here. Even this brief sketch shows that Shakespeare is closer to Aristotle than to either Lord Acton or Machiavelli. Much of what he shows about men in power is Creonic. Often he may remind one of Machiavelli, but the examples of at least two—Prospero and Theseus—strongly suggest

otherwise. These are rulers who do not live down to Machiavelli cynical theory. On that occasion there was much discussion as to which was the most ambitious, he who wished to preserve power or he who wished to acquire it; as both the one and the other of these motives may be the cause of great troubles. It seems, however, that they are most frequently occasioned by those who possess; for the fear to lose stirs the same passions in men as the desire to gain, as men do not believe themselves sure of what they already possess except by acquiring still more; and, moreover, these new acquisitions are so many means of strength and power for abuses. Osgood and company, Alvis, "Power, Character, and Disorder" [Posted: First, as Zuckert points out for good or for ill, the exercise of power is necessary to reveal character. In accord with that principle Theseus, most clearly, and Prospero less clearly, improve in their exercise of power. He knew the tendency could be counteracted, as have I suppose all who inveigh against power unchecked. Besides God, perhaps, as Aristotle says, the best mode of rule would be that of a good and wise man without any hindrance whatsoever. I, or whether this is just another demonstration he thinks needed to further the education of Ferdinand. Anyway, the problem here is not his counter-example of becoming better by gaining? The mystery lies in determining whether with renunciation of magical power he becomes better or worse. Actually Prospero gains political power restored Dukedom but becomes thereby not less but more dependent upon the will of others. To use Shakespeare to refute me, I maintain, you would be obliged, first, to show a full-blooded pupil of mine, not the Macbeth of half-measures and effeminate conscience, nor the Richard Crookback who begins to lose his self-command the moment he ascends the throne. But you should take care not to allow your mastery to corrupt, self-mastery as well as command over others. A man need worry only that he may lack power sufficient to achieve and keep whatever he desires. Wisdom is prudence, and prudence consists in modifying principle to suit circumstances. Skwire is right to point out that Shakespeare shows not so much that self-corruption suffered by rulers is the consequence of their acquiring power, but rather that the more baneful result is harm dealt the relatively innocent. Does this not teach us that we should do whatever is possible to make power not less potent but more responsible? But have I just made a distinction without a difference? Power made responsible is power diminished. So the question becomes how to confer such power as rulers need to make citizens restrain their desire to have power without responsibility, yet confer it in such manner that those who govern others govern themselves as well. We may wonder why he does not. And the pertinent question for Acton would be whether Shakespeare indicates this legislative body has any authorityâ€”or does Shakespeare imagine it to be merely advisory. This provokes the question of whether Shakespeare has made us mindful of any institution that can make the king accountable? This insufficiency of power is most obvious in Richard II where, faced with one rebellion in Ireland and another at home, the king finds himself reduced to begging armed assistance from one of his nobles in order to confront another. Is it then the case that on the basis of our reading of the plays we should attribute to diminishment of central power all the civil disorders the playwright has depicted? Must we therefore almost reverse Acton and conclude that diminishing power corrupts the state and that diminishment approaching an absolute degree corrupts so thoroughly that civil society disintegrates? Yet, so to conclude may go too far, since I should not suppose Acton fails to realize that too little power causes difficulties comparable to an excess thereof. David Urban notes the morally salutary effects of losing power in the case of Richard II and of voluntarily renouncing power in the case of Prospero. He stresses the connection between regeneration and Christian piety he thinks displayed by several characters in *The Tempest*, the repentant political enemies of Prospero, Caliban, and Prospero himself. Two problems occur to me. Second, if he professes Christian belief Prospero seems ambiguous in his practice. He does not pray. And he is a mortalist: *The Tempest*, Epilogue, There are many indications throughout the plays that Shakespeare is aware he writes for Christians. In our discussion we can profitably pursue the issue of Shakespeare and Christian doctrine since that matter bears upon our inquiry into what may be the limits upon absolute power. Urban has pertinent comments on Henry V that we might take up in an approach to the question just mentioned. Would it be worthwhile to consider what would be required of such a king and to examine the thought and policies of Henry V with a view to discovering whether Shakespeare himself shares the enthusiasm of his Chorus? How would one go about considering the claim that Shakespeare can best be understood from an Aristotelian perspective? Then we have not spoken of Hobbes. I

mean a condition in which every man is at war with every other man. But now at issue is what theological-moral-political precepts afford guidance in seeking to make power responsible? Oxford, Clarendon Press, Be patient, gentle Earl of Westmoreland. Patience is for poltroons, such as he: My gracious lord, here in the parliament Let us assail the family of York. Well hast thou spoken, cousin: Cousin of Exeter, frowns, words, and threats, Shall be the war that Henry means to use. Urban, "Reason and Grace" [Posted: The scene to which Alvis refers takes place within this exchange between Prospero and his spirit servant, Ariel: In the same fashion as you gave in charge, Just as you left them: Dost thou think so, spirit?

V. 9 KING RICHARD II. MACBETH. pdf

5: Shakespeare's tragedy of King Richard II - ECU Libraries Catalog

KING RICHARD II. Bushy, go straight to the Earl of Wiltshire and tell him to come to Ely House to help us. Tomorrow morning we'll go to Ireland. I believe it's time.

The Royal Academy of Dramatic Art. Benford is thrilled to be making her PSF debut. Thanks to Liz, Patrick and Gina. Exit Strategy Primary Stages ; Regional: BFA University of the Arts. A PA native and current Chicago resident, some credits include: His wife is the Rev. Harper Turney; they have three beautiful grandchildren, pictures available. Recent credits include the musicals: John Adams, , Dr. She thanks Stephen Casey for being such an amazing mentor and friend, her parents and brothers for all their amazing love and support, and Johnny for putting up with her. Over the Tavern at the Montgomery Theater. He thanks his family, both in blood and bond who never cease loving fiercely. DeSales University class of , P. Andrew would like to thank his family and friends for their constant support. Pipeline Theatre Company ensemble member. Thanks to Mom and Dad for everything important. As a professional director, actor, and fight director, credits include Broadway, Off-Broadway, regional theatre, television and radio. Razze would like to thank Patrick Mulcahy for his support and allowing him to direct this amazing musical, Ragtime! Over the years he was the assistant house manager, box office manager, company manager, assistant producer, and director of development. Since , in his role as general manager and later managing director, he has served as the administrative leader of the Festival working very closely with the box office, business, development, marketing and production departments. During this time, PSF subscriptions have more than doubled, income from the annual Luminosity Gala fundraiser has more than quadrupled, and the summer seasonal staff has grown to over Thaisa in Pericles and Miranda in The Tempest. Nominated for Washington, D. USA local www. His theatrical lighting has been seen Off-Broadway and in regional theatres across the country. Special thanks to Susan, Alexandra, and Connor for your support. As always, for CW and AS. This summer is for Rachel Rockwell. Some favorite PSF credits include: Love to God, family, Andrew, Ali, and Maggie!

6: WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE WORKS Edition De Luxe King Richard II Macbeth plus - \$ | PicClick

The Humility of Kings in Richard II through Henry V Though Shakespeare was a conservative, he believed in the humility of Kings. The plays Richard II through Henry V assert Shakespeare's idea that a King must understand the common man to be a good ruler.

7: Richard II | Folger Shakespeare Library

From 'The Life and Death of Richard the Second - Act 3, Scene 2': King Richard II . Let's talk of graves, of worms, and epitaphs; Make dust our paper and with rainy eyes Write sorrow on the.

8: Richard II and Macbeth | The Arts in NYC

A synopsis of Shakespeare's Richard II NOTE: Several people have correctly pointed out that in Shakespeare's play it is not Aumerle but Exton who kills Richard. What I have portrayed is a common.

9: Kingship and Power in Shakespeare's Richard II, Henry IV and Henry V

II 1 The court of Macbeth's castle. 72 II 2 London. King Richard's palace. I 2 The Duke of Lancaster's palace. 74 I 3 The lists at Coventry.

V. 9 KING RICHARD II. MACBETH. pdf

Painful obsessions Graphics under c Social engineering the art of human hacking ebook The Bedazzling Bowl Roland fp 90 manual A Bill Respecting Field Officers of the Militia and Officers of the Staff Ducati 696 service manual Morphological dermatology V. 1. Barnaby Rudge. Hard times. At a General Assembly of the governor and Company of the state of Connecticut Zanesville (OH (Images of America) Discovery of America other myths Quantitative view of future world economic development Writing Masculinity in the Later Middle Ages Remarkable geography Mechanical engineering mini projects in design and fabrication NOW for Anderson/Sweeney/Williams Essentials of Statistics for Business and Economics, 4th Through the stage door Flight performance of aircraft Exploring psychology 9th edition chapter 1 Could Dracula live in Woodford? Changing styles of patronage : tourism and commoditization Practical competitive binding assay methods The case of the planetarium puzzle Knotted sash ch. 14. Manual de evangelismo personal GROUND FREEZING 97 Benign changes of the female genital tract Must evidence underdetermine theory? John D. Norton Investigation Into Freezing and Bursting Water Pipes in Residential Construction Russian European; Paul Miliukov in Russian politics. New hope for the dead 2.2 The Lady Tasting Tea Telegraphy, culture, and policymaking Leed v4 study guide Feluda books in bengali The degree of progressivism among Arkansas public school superintendents Geometry resource book chapter 5 Every Day in Every Way Intensive care anesthesia analgesia Tai-Shion Lee Biing-Jaw Chen