

LABORATOIRE CULTURES ANGLO-SAXONNES (EA 801)  
DIPLOMATICA (RESEARCH PROGRAMME ON DIPLOMACY, LITERATURE AND HISTORY)

ONLINE  
CONFERENCE  
EN LIGNE

**Henry**  
Literary and Historical Territories at War  
Territoires d'histoire, territoires littéraires en guerre



11/12/2020  
13.45-18.00 (GMT +1)

Lien / Link : <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCaqOm58MoQTFimHWwh9zCTg/>

**Henry**

Literary and Historical  
Territories at War

Territoires d'histoire,  
territoires littéraires en guerre



**Contacts :**

Nathalie Rivere de Carles, nrivere@univ-tlse2.fr  
DiplomaticA, diplofab@gmail.com

13.45 Début de la connexion et accueil.

14.00  
15.20

## L'Histoire / histoire d'Henry V

Président de séance : Daniel Baloup  
(Université Toulouse - Jean Jaurès)

Valerie Toureille (CY Cergy Paris Université),  
"Henry V, chef de guerre".

L'ambition de cette communication est de faire une présentation historique d'Henry V, en le replaçant dans le contexte de la guerre de Cent Ans. Plusieurs questions formeront les étapes de cette présentation. Quels enjeux ont entouré son accession au pouvoir ? Dans quelle mesure cette figure a-t-elle changé le cours de la guerre de Cent Ans ? On pourra aussi s'interroger sur la manière dont il a conduit la guerre sur le sol du royaume de France, et comment sa diplomatie a favorisé l'émergence d'un modèle politique inédit, à savoir la double monarchie à la suite du Traité de Troyes (1420) et de son mariage avec Catherine de France.

Valérie Toureille est l'auteur de plusieurs ouvrages et articles sur la guerre de Cent Ans, la violence et les hommes de guerre. Elle poursuit ses recherches sur les femmes et la guerre, et vient de publier une nouvelle biographie sur Jeanne d'Arc, Perrin, Paris, 2020. Elle est commissaire de l'exposition sur l'anniversaire du traité de Troyes, Un Roi pour Deux Couronnes, Troyes 1420 : <https://www.aube.fr/1165-traite-de-troyes.htm> Catalogue de l'exposition disponible : <https://www.aube.fr/1181-catalogue-de-l-expo.htm>

Frédérique Fouassier (CESR Tours)  
« Remember, with advantages » : Henry V  
et la construction de la fiction historique

Henry V est traditionnellement vu comme l'exemple le plus représentatif de la pièce historique anglaise au service de l'exaltation des sentiments patriotiques, voire de la propagande pour l'unité nationale. Pourtant, son positionnement idéologique ne va pas de soi. La pièce ne se contente pas de refléter une conscience émergente de l'identité nationale : elle aide aussi à la construire et la soumet à un examen critique. En ce sens, *Henry V* ne constitue pas tant un reflet de l'histoire qu'une réflexion sur l'histoire. Si *Henry V* est souvent décrit comme le roi parfait de Shakespeare, la pièce n'offre pas pour autant une vision idéalisée de la nation, et encore moins une propagande au service de la dynastie régnante, comme l'a laissé entendre la vision providentialiste de l'œuvre. Shakespeare y fait au contraire une certaine lecture de l'histoire, à travers laquelle il livre une réflexion critique non seulement sur les failles de la construction du sentiment patriotique, mais aussi de manière plus large sur l'écriture de l'histoire en elle-même, notamment à travers l'insistance sur l'oubli, la reconstruction des souvenirs et les procédés à l'œuvre dans leur narration. Tout ceci donne à l'histoire une dimension nécessairement fictive, aspect renforcé par le médium du théâtre qui met en exergue l'idée de représentation et pose le monarque en double du dramaturge qui construit le récit historique.

Frédérique Fouassier est maître de conférences à l'université de Tours et membre du Centre d'Études Supérieures de la Renaissance. Ses recherches portent notamment sur les stratégies de représentation des personnages et leur perception dans le théâtre élisabéthain et jacobéen. Au fil de ses travaux, elle a été amenée à développer d'autres axes de recherche, comme l'histoire de la médecine. Depuis l'écriture de sa monographie sur Love's Labour's Lost de Shakespeare (2014), elle étudie de plus près les jeux de langage dans les textes dramatiques, textes qui constituent une réflexion sur le langage en général et sur les types de discours (essentiellement littéraires) qui circulent dans l'Angleterre de la première modernité.

15.25  
16.40

## The Law of Land, the Language of the Land

Présidente de séance : Nathalie Rivere de Carles  
(Université Toulouse Jean Jaurès)

Stuart Elden (University of Warwick)  
The Legal Geographies of Henry V

This talk focuses on the play's first two scenes, the first of which is only found in the Folio text. In that first scene the Bishop of Ely and the Archbishop of Canterbury discuss the political situation of the time, and the position of the Church in relation to the Kingdom. The bishop and archbishop discuss the threat to their "temporal lands", those the church owns directly as landlords, not by nature of their spiritual possession, but because of their earthly wealth. The struggle between church and king over such lands recurs through European history of this period. In *Henry V* the discussion is occasioned by a bill passing through parliament that will tax the church's temporal lands, with the idea being that the revenue raised from them can go direct to the crown, in part to support its wars and arm and feed the necessary armies; as well as to provide alms to sick and diseased persons and those too old to be able to work and support themselves. The key legal struggle of the bulk of the play, however, is not between the church and crown, but between the Kingdom of England and the Kingdom of France. In these opening scenes we discover that Canterbury is trying to divert the King from taking lands from the church by suggesting the conquest of France. The bishops therefore offer a tortuous explanation of the Salic law, providing a legal basis for the claim to the French territories. This talk therefore explores the play's legal geographies, as well as its tripartite divide between those who pray, fight and labour.

Stuart Elden is Professor of Political Theory and Geography at the University of Warwick, UK. He is the author of books including *The Birth of Territory* (University of Chicago Press, 2013) and *Shakespearean Territories* (University of Chicago Press, 2018). His most recent book is *Canguilhem* (Polity, 2019), and *The Early Foucault is forthcoming in 2021*. He has been involved in editing several collections of Henri Lefebvre's writings, and has edited or co-edited books on Kant, Foucault and Sloterdijk. He runs a blog at [www.progressivegeographies.com](http://www.progressivegeographies.com)

Jean-Christophe Mayer (IRCL Paul Valéry  
Montpellier 3)

"I cannot tell wat is dat": Linguistic Conflict  
in Shakespeare's King Henry V

Shakespeare's *King Henry V* is often portrayed and staged as a play not only about the glory, but also about the tragedy of war. That such conflicting interpretations came to be so repeatedly attached to the story of how the second English monarch of the House of Lancaster invaded France and won the battle of Agincourt during the Hundred Years' War in 1415 can be explained especially in the light of the play's textual and linguistic make-up. Indeed, and as I shall argue, Shakespeare's history play is unique in the way that it is a linguistically troubled and conflicted piece of writing. As one of its most recent editors put it, "No play of Shakespeare's makes so much use of differences in language and has more language barriers". As I aim to demonstrate, the play is much more than an Anglo-French confrontation seen from an English angle. It anatomises the concept of nationhood: it is slippery, ambivalent, and fluid on the one hand and jingoistic and rigid on the other. *Henry V* is ideal when it comes to studying scenes in the other's language, as well as

otherness and alterity. The two scenes I shall mainly focus on in my talk—the scene almost entirely in French (3.5), during which Princess Katherine of France tries to learn a few rudiments of English from her servant Alice, and the wooing scene between Henry V and the Princess where Alice acts partly as an interpreter between the two (5.2)—exploit and expose linguistic and cultural faultlines. Both scenes encapsulate many of the issues of the play at large. Moreover, while questioning the idea of foreignness through specific linguistic interplay, they challenge the very notion of Shakespearean scenic division in theatrically productive ways.

Jean-Christophe Mayer est Directeur de Recherche au CNRS, rattaché à l'Institut de Recherche sur la Renaissance, l'âge Classique et les Lumières (IRCL-UMR 5186 du CNRS), à l'Université Paul Valéry-Montpellier 3. Spécialiste de Shakespeare et de ses pièces historiques, il est l'auteur de trois ouvrages : *Shakespeare's Hybrid Faith: History, Religion and the Stage* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), *Shakespeare and the postmodernity: essais sur l'Auteur, le Religieux, l'Histoire et le Lecteur* (Peter Lang, 2012), et, plus récemment, *Shakespeare's Early Readers: A Cultural History from 1590 to 1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018).  
<https://cnrs.academia.edu/JeanChristopheMayer>

16.45  
18.00

## Playing with Honor, Playing Honorably

Présidente de séance : Jeanne Mathieu  
(Université Toulouse - Jean Jaurès)

Louise Fang (Université Sorbonne Paris Nord)  
Playing Dice at Agincourt: games of hazard and  
providence in Shakespeare's Henry V

Shakespeare's *Henry V* contains many references to games. Critical attention has focused more closely on two ludic practices: tennis, which figures prominently in the play as the Dauphin's gift of tennis balls in act 1 scene 2 gives rise to an extended metaphor for war which reappears in subsequent scenes; and archery, whose absence has been deemed particularly conspicuous considering the famously instrumental role played by the longbows in the English victory at Agincourt. In this paper, I wish to explore games of hazard which are equally present throughout the play. Although these references may seem anecdotal at first, the debates and controversies that surrounded these games in the early modern period make them much more meaningful. Through games of hazard players experience risk and "luck" or "fortune" which were then often conflated with one of the possible manifestations of providence. In this perspective, references to games of hazard shed light on the historical narrative of Agincourt and its construction. On several occasions, wagers and allusions to dice-playing seem to assert a providentialist view of the battle. The ludic elements in Henry's rhetoric in particular emphasize the risks he is taking in a way that ultimately shores up his charismatic authority.

Louise Fang is a lecturer in Elizabethan and Jacobean drama at the Université Sorbonne Paris Nord (ex- Université Paris XIII). She completed her PhD on "Theatre and Games in William Shakespeare's Plays" at Sorbonne Université in October 2019.



Patrick Gray (Durham University),  
Megalothymia and the Last Man: Henry V,  
Hamlet, and the Problem of Honor'

The most influential contribution to political philosophy since John Rawls' *Theory of Justice* (1971), as well as the most controversial, is Francis Fukuyama's argument in *The End of History and the Last Man* (1991) that "Western liberal democracy" is "the end-point of mankind's ideological evolution" and "the final form of human government". In closing, however, Fukuyama grants that the stubborn streak of human nature ancient philosophers call *thymos* may yet pose a problem. Some individuals and indeed some societies may not be content with being treated equally, a condition Fukuyama calls *isothymia*, but instead will crave to be recognized as superior, a condition he dubs *megalothymia*. How should we collectively respond to this refractory impulse? Should we try to root it out, so that we become, as Nietzsche says, "men without chests"? Or can we channel it somehow towards the common good? Many of the plot points in Shakespeare's play, *Henry V*, which audiences in Western liberal democracies today tend to find most upsetting can be better understood if we consider them in light of Shakespeare's lifelong interest in this pressing political problem. Shakespeare recognizes that Henry V's pursuit of martial glory is not only at odds with our progressive hopes today for what Kant calls "perpetual peace", but also with the ethical precepts of Christianity. As Henry V himself admits, "if it be a sin to covet honor / I am the most offending soul alive". Yet the pacifism of his feckless heir, Henry VI, proves disastrous in practice, as do the moral scruples of that weaker king's pious analogue, Hamlet. Many productions and interpretations of *Henry V* in recent decades appropriate the play in somewhat Procrustean fashion as an opportunity to protest military action abroad. Shakespeare's own assessment of Henry V, however, is more complex and more sympathetic.

Patrick Gray is Associate Professor of English Studies and Director of Liberal Arts at Durham University. He is the author of *Shakespeare and the Fall of the Roman Republic* (Edinburgh, 2019), editor of *Shakespeare and the Ethics of War* (Berghahn, 2019), and co-editor of *Shakespeare and Montaigne* (Edinburgh, 2021) and *Shakespeare and Renaissance Ethics* (Cambridge, 2014). His essays have appeared in *Shakespeare Survey*, *Comparative Drama*, *JMEMS*, *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, and *Shakespeare en devenir*, as well as collections such as *Shakespeare and the Soliloquy in Early Modern English Drama* (Cambridge, 2018) and *Shakespeare au risque de la philosophie* (Éditions Hermann, 2017).