The "Marginal" and the making of Hal as a "National Hero" in *The First and Second Parts of King Henry IV*[1]

Takayuki Yamato

In the current criticism of Shakespeare's Histories, post-colonial studies have developed a range of readings of prodigious variety. Neill (1994), doubting the existence of definite borders of nationality, deals with language and optic power in early modern texts, assisted by the concept of Anderson's "imagined communities" (1991).[2] Hawkes (1998) radically focuses on the historical project of colonization, or Anglicization of the "Welsh" by the "British" in the discussion on the second tetralogy, with reference to Jacques Derrida's *Glas*. Both are most challenging in their breaking of frames barely established in the process of colonizing "others".

Gender studies and feminist criticism have extended the possibilities. Rackin (1990) creates a monumental analysis of the "Histories" from the feminist point of view, followed by Barker and Kamps (1995) and Howard and Rackin (1997). Their studies examine "Englishness" represented as masculinity, in the fantasic frames of Nationhood in early modern times, making clear the dynamic mechanism of the establishment of a subject-object relation produced by the differences in sex and gender.

The approaches of both groups are more or less affected by the idea of "transgression" in Stallybrass and White (1986). Under the influence of Bakhtin (1976), Stallybrass and White pay attention to contradictions brought forth in the formation of symbolic order. "Self" identity is established by placing "others" ideologically in a lower position. It is useful to

use this approach in the analysis of the two parts of *Henry IV*, as Greenblatt (1980) has done to clarify power politics. However, our approach is much closer to the strategy of cultural studies, post-colonial studies, gender studies and feminist criticism rather than that of new historicism which stresses the triumph of containment. The aim of the thesis is to shake the weak bases of the anxious "subject" that cannot attain its "self" identity without depending on the "marginal". We shall give regard to various kinds of boundaries, positions, locations and spaces, high and low, public and private, clean and dirty, silent and noisy, and to formations, exchanges, interchanges of things and men/women with their spirits/bodies, as key elements of the reading.

I

There are some differences in the two texts of *Henry IV: Part I*, whose title page in Q_1 reads "THE / HISTORY OF / HENRY THE / FOVRTH: / With the battell at Shrewsburie, / *between the King and Lord* / Henry Percy, surnamed / Henrie Hotspur of / the North. / *With the humorous conceits of Sir* / Iohn Falstalffe." and *Part II*, given the title in Qa, "The / Second part of Henrie / the fourth, continuing to his death, / *and coronation of Henrie* / the fift. / With the humours of sir Iohn Fal- / *staffe, and swaggering* / Pistoll". So it can be said that there are some problems in discussing both parts together or dealing with them simply as a single text. Before starting any discussion, we must at first confirm the similarities and differences between these two parts.

We shall divide the discussion into three categories: sources, construction and ideologies.

As for sources, the two plays use about one-fifth of Raphael Holinshed's *Chronicles* (2nd edition, 1587), mainly the materials concerned with

Percy's rebellion and its consequences.[3] One of the characteristics of Shakespeare's historical plays, categorized into the genre of "Histories" in the folio (1624), is to deal with a chain of the events centralizing the theme of England. If we arrange the two-part work and *Henry V* after *Richard II*, we can see how the latent anxiety of the sin of murdering Richard II haunts Henry IV and Henry V, and that it comes to be the most urgent requisite for both father and son to win domestic and foreign wars. We can regard the two parts of *Henry IV* as a sequence which attempts to redefine England's identity. The main purpose of the inclusion of the rebellion of Percy and its sequels is to enforce the male subject of England, represented by Hal.

Shakespeare creates vivid portraits of Glendower, Hotspur and Hal unlike the flat descriptions in Holinshed. These three are important characters who display male power in *Part I*. Glendower, a savage robber at the frontier in both Holinshed and *A Myrroure for Magistrates* (1559), becomes a civilized Welsh male head with magical power (see Act III, Scene i).[4] Hotspur is a misogynist warrier, whose meadieval heroic tension longs for honour and renown on the battle field as well as in the home, with a rebuke for "a popinjay" lord who "With many holiday and lady terms" questioned him (see I. iii. 32-63), an explanatory speech for the fierce battle of "Revolted Mortimer" and "great Glendower" (see 92-111), and a comical exchange of words with his wife Kate in which he emphases his masculinity (see II. iii. 74-119). Hal, the boisterous Prince of Wales, indulging in a disgraceful life with the effeminate and devilish Falstaff and his company in the low order district, only shows his virtuous masculinity before the King; in evincing his secret plan that when the time comes Hal "shall make this northern youth exchange / His glorious deeds for my indignities", to "[b]e more myself" (III. ii. 93), making Hotspur his

"factor" "To engross up glorious deeds on my behalf" (147-48); helping his father Henry IV in a lethal situation and subjugating his double, another Harry, with his valour, as is shown in the last scene in *Part I*. In this way, three high ranking leaders, largely devised by Shakespeare, are more clearly delineated as male rivals competing for supremacy.

Part II uses Holinshed five times as much as *Part I*, but mostly in a fragmentary way. In such a hybrid history, the invisible Hal stays in the margins, repeating entrances and exits in a hurried manner. Shakespeare mentions the enemies against which England has to make war: the Scots and Welsh at home, and the French abroad. This is seen in the lines of Lord Hastings, "one power against the French; And one against Glendower; perforce a third / Must take up us" (I. iii. 71-73). Thus, Hal goes to Wales accompanying the King offstage. This gives the impression that the father and the son were closely linked in their military action, though Holinshed left no description of the Prince of Wales' participation in a Welsh campaign. In *Part II*, Hal seems to have hidden himself mostly in remote places, as shown by the fact that he first appears on stage at length in Act II, Scene ii: he is no longer an impressive character but an heir waiting to succeed to the throne, just turning up at the private scenes in the vulgar, noisy tavern and at the noble court of tranquil air where the dying King is waiting for both Hal and his own doomsday to come.

Samuel Daniel's poem, *The First Fowre Bookes of the Ciuile Wars Between the Two Houses of Lancaster and Yorke* (1595) is another important source by which Shakespeare creates the King, Hotspur and Hal. The poem makes clear father-son relationships among the four Henries, who try to survive in history in their own way. At the battle of Shrewsbury in 1403, Henry IV was only thirty-six, Hotspur was Henry's senior around thirty-nine, and Hal only sixteen. Besides the age scheme, the rivalry of

Hotspur and Hal in opposite positions is stressed both in the King's speech, "O that it could be prov'd / That some night-tripping fairy had exchang'd / In cradle-clothes our children where they lay, / And call'd mine Percy, his Plantagenet! / Then would I have his Harry, and he mine" at the opening scene (I. i. 85-89) and in the final match at Shrewsbury. Hal rescues his father from Douglas, while forlorn Hotspur abandoned by his father was defeated by Hal. On the other hand, *Part II* owes its tone in the scene of the King's death-bed to Daniel's post-Shrewsbury stanzas. The theme of nemesis for Henry's usurpation is gravely retold by the King himself. The private scene between man-father and man-son is to prepare for the dramatising of the reconciliation of the King and the reformed(?) Prince of "Wales". Magestic "England" is born from this male community at the "centre" of the dramatic world.

There are many stories about the wild prince Hal, in chronicles such as Thomas Washingam's record (1418), Tito Livio's official *Vita Henrici Quinti* in Latin (c. 1437), and the Lambeth MS 84 (c. 1479) of *Brut*. However, John Stow's *The Chronicle of England* (1580), and *The Annales of England* (1592), which, like Holinshed, do not include the episode of the highway robberies, and the original play of *The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth* (1594?-98) entered on Stationer's Register by Thomas Creede on 14 May 1594, are thought to be direct sources for Hal. Utilising these, Shakespeare changes the image of Hal. The soliloquy in *Part I* (I. ii. 190-212) gives the impression of Hal as a Machiavellian. The ideas of metamorphosis, transportation and reformation are significant to understand the violence of Hal's skill. This corresponds to the device in the robbery scene in which, unlike in the anonymous play, *The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth*, Hal robs the "money of the King's coming down the hill" (II. ii. 51) of Falstaff who robs it from the travellers who took it from "the

King's exchequer" (53). Hal keeps the money for some time and returns it to the owner later. By this manipulation, Hal's honour is retained since he is not a thief but a carrier. In *Part II*, while using similar materials such as his entering the tavern in Eastcheap and his praising of the hostess, Shakespeare reduces the scenes of Hal's escapades, separating him from Falstaff, and preparing for the time of the Prince of Wales' reformation to come. Hal, already conscious of his laziness and the necessity to return to his father and leave the effeminate world of the lower orders quickly, speaks to his intimate friend, "By heaven, Poins, I feel me much to blame,/ So idly to profane the precious time" (II. iv. 358-59) within a break between scenes after his first appearance.

Now let us shift the discussion to the construction of the *Henry IV* plays.

Both works have, as shown in their titles, an important character, Falstaff, in the centre of the mixed structure of the two-part play. This humorous knight is a key person to link and harmonise the whole cast with his "womanish" wit. Though he belongs to a higher class, Falstaff, living a dissipated life, frequents the highway at Gat's Hill and the Boar's Head in Eastcheap as well as the King's court. Besides, he has a mock father-son relationship with Prince of Wales and in a world full of festive atmosphere accommodates himself to patriarchy to take advantage of it or repels it to expose its artifice. He shows another strategy to survive the world making the most use of comical nonsense. By centralizing such a colonizer and womanizer as Falstaff, Shakespeare creates a continuity and similarity between the two texts. Each records the conditions of conscription, Falstaff's way of recruiting soldiers and the quality of his men. Moreover, in *Part I*, his abuse upon Hotspur's dead corpse with the stabbing at the end reminds us of the devilish and canibalistic behaviour of

Welshwomen at the opening. He also has a demonic image in common with the Welsh head, Glendower.[5]

Part II has a particular feature in its construction beginning with the prologue of the "Rumour", which functions as a chorus, and concluding with the epilogue of the dancer. *Part II*, Act I, Scene i, immediately after the disappearance of the "Rumour", which describes how the Earl of Northumberland, Henry Percy, worries about the war situation and the safety of his son, makes a clear contrast with *Part I*, Act I, Scene i, which presents the reactions of the King, receiving the reports of the situation on the battle field. Each, playing the part of prologue and epilogue has the function of forcing the audience to watch the play with consciousness of its falsity. *Part II* has narrators, as seen in "Interrudes", to make us conscious of the frame of the work, whose contents are of a different space and time. On the other hand, *Part I* has another way to make us conscious of the very "dramatic" moments through performance: Prince Hal's one-man stage play mocking the imaginative conversation between Hotspur and his wife Kate, and an improvised play between Hal and Falstaff as a rehearsal for Hal's visit to the King at court next day.

Furthermore, *Part II* has many scenes in a strong allegorical vein with a number of characters with symbolic names, newly introduced on a large scale. In *Part I*, no name but the nickname "Hotspur" for Henry Percy is allegorical, whereas, in *Part II*, many names are indicative of what the characters are: Doll Tearsheet, Shallow, Silence, Mouldy, Shadow, Wart, Feeble, Bullcalf, etc. They are all given allegorical names, though it is not clear whether each shows the character's real quality. Though neither a name nor a nickname, the Lord Chief Justice, who plays an important role in *Part II*, can be understood as the embodiment of "justice" in law. A large number of tongues drawn on the cloth of "Rumour" are also

allegorical.

In *Part II*, there is an impressive scene in Gloucestershire where Falstaff meets again and talks with his friends Justice Shallow and Justice Silence remembering their young days. This stirs the most nostalgia. *Part II* is full of words which remind us that "death" is approaching, maybe partly because the death of Henry IV is waiting near at hand. In the conversation, Shallow and Silence mention how lively their "dead" friends were in their youth. The scene brings out an uncertainty about the "past" in memory as encapusulated earlier in the speeches of "Rumour". Falstaff's comment on the young days of Shallow exposes the falsity of the Justice who makes up a boastful "past" for his convenience, though the lines also ironically reflect upon Falstaff's habit of telling lies.

Next, we shall deal with the topic of ideology bringing forth the power to convey historical ideas.

We can see a manipulation in order to make the "noble" history of "England" where "men" are "superior", at least on the surface, compared with "others" of any difference in sex, gender, class, culture, language and nationality.

The first example is in the arrangement of "domestic" scenes outside the court of King Henry IV. In such scenes, "female" characters appear with the immanent power of transcending borders. This power is a projection of the anxiety of the patriarchy cunningly concealed in the privileged men's space in England.[6] No women appear in the scene of the King's court, but "lower" Englishwomen do appear outside the court, and upper-class women appear in *Part I* both at Warkworth Castle in Northumberland, the principal seat of the Percies, and at the Archdeacon's House, Bangor, in Wales, and in *Part II* at Warkworth Castle in Northumberland. Women in opposing positions cannot exchange words, because they have definite

differences in rank and in race. Thus these texts manipulate female characters geographically at distant places preventing any sense of "solidarity" between them.

The second is in the representation of heterogeneity in a marginal district. It is expressed in couples, families of men/women, followed by cultural differences. They are a basic model for showing the crisis of dividing or breaking down because of the intervention of hybrid elements. In *Part I,* there are some family scenes of the rebel side in which husbands and wives appear on stage: Hotspur and Kate, Mortimer and the daughter of Owen Glendower. They make a clear difference from the single lives of Henry IV and Prince Hal. In addition to the complexity due to personal situations in marriage, the Welsh scene is full of cross-cultural elements, a quarrel in the way of dividing the land after the war into three domains and the emergence of colonial themes, with a great "foreign" air. On the other hand, in *Part II*, the features change: a husband-wife relationship is seen only in the couple of the Earl of Northumberland and his Lady in the brief scene of the domestic atmosphere at Warkworth Castle, where the Lady and Kate politically cooperate to make the Earl flee to Scotland.

In *Part I*, the roles of the male military characters on the rebel's side are emphasised, whereas in *Part II*, those of the Archbishop of York, Richard Scroop, the new chief leader of the rebels, and the Lord Chief Justice on the King's side emerge into the foreground. This tendency has a close connection with the representation that "superiority" is only placed on the King's side: nearly at the climax scene, in *Part I,* Act V, Scene iv, of the historical battle of Shrewsbury, the man to man fight of Prince Hal and Hotspur seems to be described as if it decided the war, by emphasising the defeat of "medieval" knightship embodied by Hotspur; *Part II* gives much focus on religious, legal power and accentuates the "superiority" of Prince

John of Lancaster's Machiavellian strategy on England's side. These can be interpreted on the whole as seemingly the victory of "modern" institutions and as a "modern" way of action.

This power struggle in the public male world has a connection with a series of relevant themes in both parts expressed in such concept words as "conceal", "deceive" and "appropriate". There are many characters who conceal their true minds or true selves to get an advantage over "others". Prince Hal the best politician makes a very famous speech about his "skill". Hal disguises himself, and with his companion Poins, spies on the behaviour of Falstaff. In *Part I*, Hal and Poins in disguise attack Falstaff and his company, who have robbed money from ignorant travellers. They remember how Falstaff and his friends were bewildered by their mischief, and later on enjoy making fun of Falstaff pointing his falsities out. In *Part II*, the pair disguise as drawers at the Boar's Head in Eastcheap to check the speeches and behaviour of Falstaff. In disguise, the doubles of the King, in *Part I*, Act V, Scene iii, have the same function. Further, so does the spy with a political mission suggested in Hotspur's explanatory speech, "Disgrace'd me in my happy victories, / Sought to entrap me by intelligence" (*Part I*, IV. iii. 97-98). Thus, the King and Prince Hal institute widespread search plots taking advantage of "disguise". *Part II* has the "Rumour" who rather obviously announces the text's imperial order, "Don't be deceived", from outside the "history", which also supports the importance of the theme throughout the two-part play.

It will be possible to analyse the continuity, breaks and gaps in the plural levels in the two-part play which has similarities and differences shown above by taking them as two different texts and comparing one with the other. By changing the viewpoint, men and things in the governing position alter. In the text, there are many alternative elements linked

to Hal. However, it can be said that this play, depicting the way to the "future" coronation of Henry V had tacit representations to give an impression that Hal achives a final victory merely on the surface.

II

The marginalized people suppressed in the work represent an alternative connected with the terror of a frontier area, "foreigners", low life characters unwelcome to the establishment, Falstaff, who moves through classes freely, women, whores. These are the existences to be excluded or contained until Hal succeeds to the kingship after his father. Hal, being in the centre of these marginalized people, observes them, decides what shall be done for them, and later, rises as a new king with a "superior" political capability.

In this section, we will see the strategy of Hal, who places himself as a central person, and the way in which marginalized people are represented. Focussing on "others" excluded or contained in the stages where Hal a "male" "English" subject has become a "central" "national hero", we shall verify the mythology of "Englishness", the violence hidden in "men's" mythology, the immanent tendencies of violence and suppression in the dynamism of exclusion and containment.

Wales is represented as a geographical "other" parallel to England. Welsh culture is one of the objects England utilizes in order to establish its "superiority". The representation of "Welshness" serves the image of its bewitching atmosphere of magic and exoticism, a stereotype accompanying all matters Celtic, to be differentiated from "Englishness". Once differentiation is completed, the gap produces an ambivalent combination of terror and pleasure and attractiveness. There is, in fact, no inferior culture. It is important to have an awareness of the issues to question the

existence of the frame itself. Such arbitrary creation of "superior" or "inferior" culture is connected with the formation of the frame of the "nation state".

OED reads "Welsh" as a word whose original meaning was "foreign".[7] It is interesting to consider some features of "Welshness" as "other". Historically, Wales joined England much earlier than Scotland and Ireland.[8] The expedition by Edward I from 1276 to 1283 advanced the annexation. England, the conqueror, domesticated Wales, the conquered, through a "national marriage" which maintained patriarchy. This can be called the domestication of the "other". The custom that the successive princes of England are given the name of "Prince of Wales", in spite of the place where they were born, is considered to be a conciliatory measure. Though having the title of "Prince of Wales", Hal is in a hostile position to Wales. There can be seen here a key gap; a sense of colonial incongruity.

Glendower, the male head who rules the "frontier" area, is a man of magic, who decides to take action by lot. However, this is an arbitrary view from England's side that represents the military, politically skillful capacity of the last and greatest hero in Wales before it is annexed with England, as mysterious and magical, and full of wonder.[9] In fact, the lines of Mortimer, "In faith, he is a worthy gentleman, / Exceedingly well read, and profited / In strange concealments, valiant as a lion, / and wondrous affable, and as bountiful / As mines of India" (*Part I*, III. i.159-63) show that Glendower is a "fine" male leader with a great number of virtues who acts freely in the frames of "Englishness" and "Welshness". He is a hybrid character as shown in his self-representation:

> I can speak English, lord, as well as you,
> For I was train'd up in the English court,

> Where being but young I framed to the harp
> Many an English ditty lovely well,
> And gave the tongue a helpful ornament—
> A virtue that was never seen in you. (*Part I*, III. i. 116-21)

In Glendower, the elements which identify the superior-inferior relation are twisted and make the "superiority" of the Englishness unstable and unclear. Glendower can take his subjective action from a wider area of choice, taking advantage of his hybridity. One of his sources of authority is his ability to command two different languages, which he acquired from education. This may be what leads to his equivocation in breaking the alliance and not appearing at the battle-field later. It is remarkable that Glendower thus takes an "advantageous" position able to understand the meanings of the negotiation exchanged in the *Part I*, Act III, Scene i.

The information given at the beginning that a lot of barbarous Welshwomen had done "shameful" abuse on the corpses at the frontier area where plunder and robbery occur, imprints the threats of a strange land and makes them "others" to England on a class level as well as a gender level.

> But yesternight, when all athwart there came
> A post from Wales, loaden with heavy news,
> Whose worst was that the noble Mortimer,
> Leading the men of Herefordshire to fight
> Against the irregular and wild Glendower,
> Was by the rude hands of that Welshman taken,
> A thousand of his people butchered,
> Upon whose dead corpse there was such misuse,

> Such beastly shameless transformation,
> By those Welshwomen done, as may not be
> Without much shame retold or spoken of. (*Part I*, I. i. 36-46)

We can recognise the historical source for this devilishly cruel deed in the *Chronicles* of Raphael Holinshed (2nd edition, 1587).

> Owen Glendouer, according to his accustomed manner, robbing and spoiling within the English borders, caused all the forces of the shire of Hereford to assemble togither against them, vnder the conduct of Edmund Mortimer earle of March. But coming to trie the matter by battell, whether by treason or otherwise, so it fortuned, that the English power was discomfited, the earle taken prisoner, and aboue a thousand of his people slaine in the place. The shamefull villanie vsed by the Welshwomen towards the dead carcasses, was such, as honest eares would be ashamed to heare, and continent toongs to speake thereof. The dead bodies might not be buried, without great summes of monie giuen for libertie to conueie them awaie.[10]

The following account newly inserted by Abraham Fleming makes a clear description on the details of the situation that Holinshed had chosen to bring to the readers' attention by using the understating narrative in his record, "honest eares would be ashamed to heare, and continent toongs to speake thereof".

> of the Welshwomen; which is worthie to be recorded to the shame of a sex pretending the title of weake vessels, and yet

> raging with such force of fiercenesse and barbarisme. For the dead bodies of the Englishmen, being above a thousand lieng upon the ground imbrued in theire owne blood, was a sight (a man would think) greevous to looke upon, and so farre from exciting and stirring up affections of crueltie; that it should rather have moued the beholders to commiseration and mercie: yet did the women of Wales cut off their priuties and put one part thereof into the mouths of euerie dead man, in such sort that the cullions hoong downe to their chins; and not so contented, they did cut off their noses and thrust them into their tailes as they laie on the ground mangled and defaced. This was a verie ignominious deed, and a woorsse not committed among the barbarous: which though it make the reader to read it, and the hearer to heare it, ashamed: yet bicause it was a thing doone in open sight, and left testified in historie; I see little reason whie it should not be imparted in our mother toong to the knowledge of our owne countrimen, as well as unto strangers in a language unknowne.[11]

In the rhetoric of England, the tragic tone and pity for the dead men sacrificed in the battle to "defend" the national profit of England are increased by showing many women who had taken part in "barbarous" activities in threatening the border area in Wales which the inhabitants repeatedly plundered. Welsh "vice" is contrasted with the "virtue" of England by emphasising the devilish tone in the representation of Welshmen. However, the reasons behind their actions are not mentioned at all. Their behaviour remains unquestioned. There is an inequality in the narrative, in the national, sexual and class levels. It is a stereotype of

colonial discourse to have a group of anonymous women, who are said to take a canibalistic action with cruelty, to represent the devil. Paying attention to the text's order, "Don't be deceived!", which the "Rumour" points out, and Falstaff's maxim about "honour", of which we will see later, that "Detraction will not suffer" (*Part I*, V. i. 139-40) to give it to the living, the truth of the Welshwomen's "devilish" group action is much more uncertain than that of the representation of the Welsh characters in high rank who appear on stage.

Glendower's daughter, the only Welsh female character, is marginalized doubly both as a woman, who cannot communicate with her husband without the intermediation of her father as an interpreter, and as an "other" under the system in Wales where Glendower has absolute authority (*Part I*, Act III, Scene i). "Welshness", as partly embodied by the daughter of Glendower, is placed in a lower position and heightens the position of "Englishness" as represented by Hal as "superior" through the complicity of the correlationships between the problems of sex, gender, and those of "culture" and "nation".

The daughter is not given a proper name and is the only person in Shakespeare who speaks only Welsh, as shown in the stage directions. She is a big "noise" with a mysterious air, though the very situation in which a lady in a "foreign" country knows and speaks English is contradictory. However, she is paradoxically also an impressive person who makes her presence felt and remains in the memory of the audience. Her Welsh is a language of her own neither superior nor inferior to English, and shows the unsteadiness of the symbolic order in culture. The daughter of Glendower has the strong power of "transgression", even if it is temporal, leaving us unable to choose one valuable thing from alternatives. She has a more powerful possibility for transgression than Mortimer understands.

The pleasure of capturing men in the erotic world, of being captured by women, of touching prohibited objects, is conceived through her Circe-like existence, her Welsh language and song. Homosocial relationships and bonds among men are formed through her fetishistic existence in the attractive "Welsh" culture and society of sweet music and magic. She had a driving force to contain Mortimer and his line into Welsh patriarchy, affecting Mortimer's sexuality. As a foreign daughter and wife, she shows women's power of transgression into men's subjective world, in her desire not to stay at home but to go to the battle field accompanying her husband.

Into the Welsh cultural area, a group intervenes that originally rendered services to the King of England to keep the order of the patriarchy in England. This powerful anti-establishment group is organized through relationships mediated by women. The marriage between Mortimer's elder sister Kate and Hotspur is a basis for the formation of this threatening local group which challenges "English" hegemony. The group's stronghold, shown in the text, is in Wales (Theobald gave, Act III, Scene i, the location at the Archdeacon's house in Bangor in Wales from the description of Raphael Holinshed's *Chronicles*) and is made to be "other" in a strange way. As Howard and Rackin point out, "An alien world of witchcraft and magic, of mysterious music, and also of unspeakable atrocity that horrifies the English imagination, Shakespeare's Wales is inscribed in the same register that defined the dangerous power of woman" (1997:168).

We can see here fissures caused by the pressur of patriarchy in the Welsh camp where the negotiations between England and Wales are described.

First, the fact that the organized body of the rebels, though it looks

like a great menace, is brittle in unity and is exposed. Hotspur has a quarrel with Glendower, emphasising their cultural differences, and making the unrepaired crack between them tangible. The private crack between them develops into a political and territorial one, as shown in the quarrel when the domain after the war is divided into three parts. Mortimer and Worcester break them up and urge them to cooperate, but the root of the crack is deep and leads to Glendower's lack of cooperation and estrangement from Percy. For Glendower, Hotspur is merely a brother-in-law of a son-in-law, and in spite of being related to him by blood, there is no necessity to dispatch his troops while the Earl of Northumberland is absent. In general, on the rebel's side, the bonds between fathers and sons are described as weak. Even Hotspur's "real" father, the Earl of Northumberland, who shares the name of Henry Percy with his son, and therefore should be the most reliable person to Hotspur, uses the excuse of illness to refuse to fight against the King. The reason for his absence is shown by the "Rumour" at the opening in *Part II* and by Kate who keeps nagging him for his unmanly behaviour. The Earl himself considers his own behaviour as "womanish" in the lines "thou silky coif! / Thou art a guard too wanton for the head / which princes, flesh'd with conquest, aim to hit" (*Part II*, I, i, 147-49). Generally, nobles on the rebel's side show weak male bonds.

Secondly, the situation in which Mortimer cannot display his patriarchal power to control his wife, the daughter of Glendower, is shown. Mortimer lost his subjective power, through taking as his wife a "foreign" woman in Wales, who has an erotic attraction and a horrific charm, and he is robbed of the initiative in the conversation without the capability of saying a word in Welsh (Glendower, the father-in-law, a bilingual, has the initiative). The emasculated Mortimer conveys a sort of terror of being

brought into the patriarchy of a "foreign" country, shedding "unmanly" tears over parting with his wife, and exposing his soul.

On the other hand, in the case of Hotspur and Kate, Hotspur loses the right to know of his wife, regarding her as a weak vessel who exposes secrets to others. He makes fun of women's faithlessness, without clarifying the details of the secret information, though Kate keenly senses political changes in the rebellion, and avoids questioning him about his affairs. However, Kate is a noisy wife who in *Part I* complains about her distress to her husband, domesticates him in her lap, resists his order to sing, and in *Part II* gives her political opinions to her husband's father.[12] In *Part II* Kate speaks with a strong voice, and with Lady Northumberland shows her feelings and opinions to the Earl, and makes him change his political decisions, so that he does not participate in the war but flees to Scotland and observes the tide of war from a safe distance. She shows women's capabilities to be different from those of men.

Another geographical "other" represented in opposition to England is Northumberland in the north. This territory borders on Scotland, and is ruled by the male head, the Earl of Northumberland, Henry Percy. This geographical position allows the Earl to change his policies depending on the circumstances, for or against Scotland.

Bonds in blood as well as territorial bonds are important to control the relationships, at both the public level and the private level, and to decide policy. The greatest cause of anxiety for Henry IV who came to the throne with the support of Percy is that he should be driven from his present status because of being betrayed by the Percies, as was Richard II. Mortimer, whom King Richard II proclaimed to be the next in line, now participates in the local group in Northumberland as a relative in marriage. Through the marriage of Mortimer, Northumberland comes to be a

pivotal resistance area to have a special relationship with Wales.

The Percies seem to be a "medieval" local group that do not want to reach the throne by themselves directly, but elect and support someone worthy to be a monarch, and by making him come to the throne, secure economically, socially and politically "steady" lives in their territory. Because the area is ruled by the lord of the manor, Hotspur sticks to the territorial problem of the division, and his uncle Worcester agrees to his nephew's proposal to straighten the stream of the Trent.

> *Hot.* Methinks my moiety, north from Burton here,
> In quantity equals not one of yours:
> See how this river comes me cranking in,
> And cuts me from the best of all my land
> A huge half-moon, a monstrous cantle out.
> I'll have the current in this place damm'd up,
> And here the smug and silver Trent shall run
> In a new channel fair and evenly;
> It shall not wind with such a deep indent,
> To rob me of so rich a bottom here.
> *Glend.* Not wind? It shall, it must—you see it doth.
> *Mort.* Yea,
> But mark how he bears his course, and runs me up
> With like advantage on the other side,
> Gelding the opposed continent as much
> As on the other side it takes from you.
> *Wor.* Yea, but a little charge will trench him here,
> And on this north side win this cape of land,
> And then he runs straight and even.

Hot. I'll have it so, a little charge will do it.
Glend. I'll not have it alter'd. (*Part I*, III. i. 92-112)

These quarrels show how important the matter of the land is for Percy. Hotspur cannnot put up with the fact that he has been robbed of the richest land made by the meandering of the river. He wants to push the northern border back south so that there is no unevenness or disadvantage for the North.

It is important to notice that the Earl of Northumberland does not appear in the quarrel scene. Northumberland is only a middle, always threatened by its surroundings, so the Earl cannot leave his land. He remains in his domain and adopts a strategy of a wait and see. The personal bond between the two Henry Percies naturally grows weak. By the Earl's nonattendance for the second time, though it is anticipated in *Part II*, Act I, Scene iii, the rebellion, led by the Archbishop of York obliged to fight with only twenty-five thousand, is soundly beaten, having been badly deceived by the cunning device of Prince John of Lancaster. It is clear that at least in *Part I* the Earl's refusal to send troops causes great damage to the rebellion. This is confirmed by Bardolph's, "For in a theme so bloody-fac'd as this / Conjective, expectation, and surmise / Of aids incertain should not be admitted" and the Archbishop's " 'Tis very true, Lord Bardolph, for indeed / It was young Hotspur's case at Shrewsbury" (*Part II*, I, iii, 22-26), and Kate's long reproachful speech in *Part II*, Act II, Scene iii. After the persuasion of his wife and Kate, in *Part II*, the Earl, changes policy and flees to Scotland. He betrays the bonds in blood and territory, which should have been his greatest support. Harcourt reports, "The Earl Northumberland, and the Lord Bardolph, / With a great power of English and of Scots, / Are by the shrive of Yorkshire overthrown" (*Part*

II, IV, iv, 97-99). Thus Northumberland's power has been weakened by wandering and prevaricating.

Let us draw some conclusions from what we have discussed so far. As Rackin notes, the female characters in Shakespeare's Histories "are typically defined in gendered antithesis by low social status and foreign nationality" (1995: 268). In other words, generally speaking, there are few "virtuous" "high ranking" "English" women especially in the history plays. In the text of *Henry IV*, the wife of Henry IV (the mother of Hal) is dead and there is no reference to any wife, mother or daughter of the noblemen or members of the King's staff. On the other hand, there are many references to "marginalized" "objective" women. Does this show Shakespeare representing the superiority of "Englishness" by excluding "others" from the frame of the patriarchy in England? In the court of England, the go-betweens and the enforcement of the relationship between Prince Hal and Prince John of Lancaster made by the mediation of their father, King Henry IV, are impressively depicted and there seems to exist a man-to-man bond without the "intervention" of any woman; whereas in Wales and Northumberland, women are visible, and male bonds look fragile. The clear contrast is surely a strategy of the dramatist. The English side, to build up an advantageous discourse for maintaining the establishment, skillfully and effectively conceals the existence of women who have the potential to undermine the authority of the patriarchal system. Prince Hal, who as a subject, emerges from among the "others", wearing on all his body the governing authority of "England", is represented as strong, steady, stable, safe and superior in this structure.

Let us now look into the representational function of the lower strata of society. The Highway of Gat's Hill and Eastcheap are the places where Hal leads a life of debauchery, violence and vulgarity. Hal soars brilliantly

against the background of such "low" places and disgraceful behaviour to the "high" position of the next King, Henry V. The strategical structure is shown in the "skill" speech of Hal himself.

> I know you all, and will awhile uphold
> The unyok'd humour of your idleness.
> Yet herein will I imitate the sun,
> Who doth permit the base contagious clouds
> To smother up his beauty from the world,
> That, when he please again to be himself,
> Being wanted he may be more wonder'd at
> By breaking through the foul and ugly mists
> Of vapours that did seem to strangle him.
> If all the year were playing holidays,
> To sport would be as tedious as to work;
> But when they seldom come, they wish'd-for come,
> And nothing pleaseth but rare accidents:
> So when this loose behaviour I throw off,
> And pay the debt I never promised,
> By how much better than my word I am,
> By so much shall I falsify men's hopes;
> And like bright metal on a sullen ground,
> My reformation, glitt'ring o'er my fault,
> Shall show more goodly, and attract more eyes
> Than that which hath no foil to set it off.
> I'll so offend, to make offence a skill,
> Redeeming time when men think least I will.
>
> (*Part I*, I. ii. 190-212)

That is, Hal offends, "to make offence a skill," in the lower area . It is much better for him to keep dishonourable company with Falstaff, the greatest liar and the low life characters who ought to be undesirable for the maintenance of the establishment in England. Prince Hal, taking the best advantage of his "superior" position in rank, in economical and social status, uses the cants in the tavern as soon as he is acquainted with them, abuses Francis, a drawer who has to serve another five years to take up his indentures, gets use to the proprietress, Madam Quickley's malapropisms, the knight, Falstaff's excuses in his sliding technique of the meaning of words, the prostitute, Doll Tearsheet's sexuality, all of whom Hal would later banish, arrest, contain, or let go.

Falstaff, who receives the order of banishment directly from the mouth of Hal (*Part II*, V, v, 47-72), and the order of being taken to the Fleet from the Lord Chief Justice (91-92) and explanation about his future from a dancer in the Epilogue, is a very big character in his body, scale and role. It is Falstaff who makes a protest against the "manly aesthetism", or "heroism" that men should display in the battle field, mocking "honour" through insights into it (in *Part I*, V, i, 127-41; V, iii, 30-39 and 56-61; V, iv, 110-28). Falstaff is a master of transgression in language and social codes since he never releases a trustful thought, being good at defending himself, using violence sometimes, reproaching it at other times, giving excuses with skillful ways, adopting the Kings's right of conscription to his private means to make an economical profit. Here are a few examples.

> Though I could scape shot-free at London, I fear the shot here, here's no scoring but upon the pate. Soft! who are you? Sir

> Walter Blunt—there's honour for you! Here's no vanity!
>
> (*Part I*, V. iii. 30-33)

> I like not such grinning honour as Sir Walter hath. Give me life, which if I can save, so: if not, honour comes unlooked for, and there's an end. (*Part I*, V. iii. 58-61)

Sir Walter deserves to wear "honour" on him because he is an Englishman of high rank and his death is caused after his valorous behaviour acting voluntarily as the double of the King. However, Falstaff ironically sees the vivid image of "honour" in Sir Walter dead and grinning. The quotation increases the irony making a contrast with his soliloquy about "honour" in the previous scene.

> 'Tis not due yet, I would be loath to pay him before his day—what need I be so forward with him that calls not on me? Well, 'tis no matter, honour pricks me on. Yea, but how if honour prick me off when I came on, how then? Can honour set to a leg? No. Or an arm? No. Or take away the grief of a wound? No. Honour hath no skill in surgery then? No. What is honour? A word. What is in that word honour? What is that honour? Air. A trim reckoning! Who hath it? He that died a-Wednesday. Doth he feel it? No. Doth he hear it? No. 'Tis insensible, then? Yea, to the dead. But will it not live with the living? No. Why? Detraction will not suffer it. Therefore I'll none of it. Honour is a mere scutcheon—and so ends my catechism.
>
> (*Part I*, V. i. 127-41)

Falstaff thus in a series of questions wisely points out that "honour" is an "airy" "word" to be given to the dead, somebody without name and sense, and hard to figure out because of its elusiveness, unless it were once engraved in memory. Compared with the case of "marked" Sir Walter, "He that died a-Wednesday", who is just supposed to have "honour", is an unmarked person without any kind of heroic description to display his "manliness". His "honour" does not glorify him even if "Wednesday" is marked for him.

Similarly, there is skill in the exchanges of jokes originating in the allegorical name, Shadow.

> *Fal.* Shadow, whose son art thou?
> *Shad.* My mother's son, sir.
> *Fal.* Thy mother's son! Like enough, and thy father's shadow. So the son of the female is the shadow of the male; it is often so indeed—but much of the father's substance!
> (*Part II*, III. ii. 126-31)

"[M]other's son" and "father's shadow" is a skillful combinations of homophones and antonyms. Especially, in this case, "father's son", which implies the possibilities of his mother's sexual deviation, enhances the comedy.

Transgression into the frame of the "self-evident" can be seen in the next example.

> Will you tell me, Master Shallow, how to choose a man? Care I for the limb, the thews, the stature, bulk, and big assemblance of a man? Give me the spirit, Master Shallow. Here's Wart; you see

> what a ragged appearance it is—a shall charge you, and discharge you, with the motion of a pewterer's hammer, come off and on swifter than he that gibbets on the brewer's bucket. And this same half-faced fellow Shadow; give me this man, he presents no mark to the enemy—the foeman may with as great aim level at the edge of a penknife. And for a retreat, how swiftly will this Feeble the woman's tailor run off! O, give me the spare men, and spare me the great ones.
>
> (*Part II*, III. ii. 252-65)

Falstaff can be guilty of making a feeble joke but there is rather a good joke here. Feeble, is a unique character who, in tune with his allegorical name and his profession, "the woman's tailor", has an effeminate body but an admirable spirit with never fears death. Feeble thus overturns the expectation: Men with a weak body like Feeble might normally be judged "unsuitable" for conscription. Falstaff, however, judges by Feeble's "manly" "spirit" and chooses him as his soldier in spite of his "feeble" body. Falstaff's "give me the spare men" gives the impression that he never recruits wealthy men, (sons of the rich or first sons who will succeed to the wealth of their parents, and so easily pay bribes). We remember his speech in *Part I*, "If I be not ashamed of my soldiers ... such as indeed were never soldiers, but discarded unjust serving men, younger sons to younger brothers ...." (IV, ii, 11-48). In this way, Falstaff unconsciously preserves the "precious" supporters of patriarchy in England, having selected their "spare men", or "reserves" instead. Falstaff makes a fortune, misappropriating the King's press to collect soldiers as the King's men and gives "common sense" a new meaning.

There is a common transgression to deceive and rob between Prince

Hal's snatching away the money which Falstaff robbed from the travellers and Falstaff's appropriation of "victory" and "honour" which Hal wins in man-to-man combat with Hotspur. Hal and Falstaff seem to be described as alternatives. In *Part I*, Act II, Scene iv, where Falstaff and Hal have a mock father-son relationship in rehearsal for an audience with the King the next day, proceeding the scene in *Part I*, Act III, Scene ii, where Prince Hal is summoned by Henry IV, the borders of the meanings and values become ambiguous in the network woven by people and things: The tavern becomes the King's court, the chair his throne, the dagger his sceptre, the cushion his crown, and the roles exchanged between them; Falstaff becomes Henry IV, Prince Hal the King and Falstaff Prince Hal. In such a chaotic world, Falstaff regards Madam Quickley as the Queen now dead, and says that he believes Hal to be his own son making the Queen's fictional testimony and the Prince's ugly face proof of it. Falstaff mockingly alludes to the fact that in the English court the existence of women and their sexuality are concealed. This is probably because women have the potential to bring forth another father's blood into the family line. In principle, an unbroken line is ideal in a patriarchal system, so it is reasonable to consider that, in the text, women are excluded from the "noble" world in England.

We may regard Falstaff in *Part II* as a real hero who saves England, though he is a cowardly dishonest, rude, womanish man. Falstaff succeeds in taking one of the famous rebels Coleville of the Dale, as identified in his own speech, that "Had they been rul'd by [him], / You should have won them dearer than you have" (*Part II*, IV, iii, 64-65), without exchanging a match with him owing to the military fame in the name of Falstaff. This reminds us of the case of Talbot in *The First Part of Henry VI,* whose name alone has the power to threaten the enemy and whose substance and

shadow are shown to be alternative and exchangeable. However, the role of mock father is switched to the Lord Chief Justice as Hal's speech shows "You [the Lord Chief Justice] shall be as a father to my youth" (*Part II*, V, ii, 118), and the high court of parliament is called. The new King, Henry V, adopts the policy of putting its bases on the law, talks highly of the stability of social order, and discards Falsaff, the mocking hero with a genius of "alternative" manipulation, an embodiment of chaos. Hal is reborn as a "worthy" monarch "to attract more eyes" (*Part I*, I, ii, 209) against the background of the disgraceful days of dissipation with Falstaff.

What of Madam Quickley and Doll Tearsheet? They are both professional entertainers, whose jobs are legally admitted. They live on and take advantage of their sexuality as females. At least, in the body of the text, only men are their visible customers. However, there are female customers who are satisfied with the play's entertainment, as shown in the dancer's suggestive speech in the epilogue, which mentions the "gentlewomen" who have potentiality of being a "satisfied" audience. What is the relationship between sexuality and entertainment? What is a "satisfied" audience? It may be reasonable to consider that customers who can enjoy the assertions of female characters in "low" rank, who have no opportunities to commit politically "noble" acts and are allowed to speak at length of their free will, are a "satisfied" audience. Madam Quickley and Doll Tearsheet, boy actors on the stage, entertain "women" and "men", making the tavern scene their place of work. In such a space with an air of sexually twisted entertainment, how can these characters satisfy the "female" and "male" customers that come from outside?

Madam Quickley, low life character as she is, is a virago wife who runs the tavern in Eastcheap. Though she has a husband of just four lines who

appears in *Part I*, Act II, Scene iv, it is she who merrily entertains the men, sometimes with hospitality, sometimes with a polite brush-off. Quickley's tavern is a very lively space full of drunkards, boasters, roughs and a prostitute. Just as the inside world of the theatre is linked to the outer world, so Quickley's bar is connected to the outer world. We see the similarity between these entertaining places. In the amusement space governed by "women", Quickley's malapropisms, which have played an important part in the formation of the English language, appropriating loan words and making fun of their stems, her bawdy allusions, her prose, sometimes in rude coquettish words and other times in polite and ingratiating style, entertain the customer. In this way, she amuses the audience with her own language style, which is quite different from Falstaff's.

The real business place of Doll Tearsheet is not referred to in the text. Being a prostitute, she does not need to choose a particular public place but needs a private one.[13] She is free from any kind of boundary, from any bond of blood as well as any bond of land. An unspecified number of men of the general public throng around her private body for public use, and break into it to indulge their desires. Doll's private parts are a place to entertain the customer and send him back with a satisfaction. Doll is an unenclosed common, as it were, that men imagine with their lecherous thoughts as ideal and desirable, as seen in the selfish speech of Jack Cade in *The Second Part of Henry VI*, "we charge and command that their wives be as free as heart can wish or tongue can tell" (IV. vii. 106-07).

In the following scene full of bawdy words where Madam Quickley arbitrates the quarrel between Falstaff and Doll Tearsheet, we see violence at different levels.

Fal. If the cook help to make the gluttony, you help to make the

diseases, Doll; we catch of you, Doll, we catch of you; grant that, my poor virtue, grant that.

Doll. Yea, joy, our chains and our jewels.

Fal. 'Your brooches, pearls, and ouches'—for to serve bravely is to come halting off, you know; to come off the breach, with his pike bent bravely; and to surgery bravely; to venture upon the charged chambers bravely;—

Doll. Hang yourself, you muddy conger, hang yourself!

Host. By my troth, this is the old fashion; you two never meet but you fall to some discord. You are both i' good truth as rheumatic as two dry toasts, you cannot one bear with another's confirmities. What the goodyear! one must bear, [*To Doll*] and that must be you—you are the weaker vessel, as they say, the emptier vessel.

Doll. Can a weak empty vessel bear such a huge full hogshead? There's a whole merchant's venture of Bordeaux stuff in him; you have not seen a hulk better stuffed in the hold. Come, I'll be friends with thee, Jack, thou art going to the wars, and whether I shall ever see thee again or no there is nobody cares. (*Part II*, II, iv, 44-66)

Amongst the commercial and military terms, sexuality in both sexes is associated with imageries of exchange, robbery and violence: venereal disease received in exchange for sexual intercourse, the plunder of her money, her noble metal, her jewellery and everything of hers: a cannon, a symbol of "manliness" which plunges into and retreats from the breach; furthermore, the large body of Falstaff is compared to a hulk full of Bordeaux stuff, making progress in and out of the port. The point to note

is that the bodies of women are represented as objects to attack, a place into and out of which "manliness" goes with violence. The song of Falstaff rouses the image common to attacking the city of Harfleur in *Henry V*.

There is a clear difference between the two women in Eastcheap, which brings another form of violence into play. This is well expressed in Quickley's remarks, "one must bear, [*To Doll*] and that must be you—you are the weaker vessel, as they say, the emptier vessel". In association with the multisense word of "bear", after the lines aside, Doll is doubly treated as "other": as a woman and as a prostitute. Madam Quickley's phrase "the emptier vessel" seems to come from her discriminative ideology that a prostitute should not bear a child to participate in the "right" family line under the system of patriarchy. To call a woman a "prostitute" is to disgrace her in an instant. A good example is seen in the portrait of Joan la Pucelle in *The First Part of King Henry VI*.

On the other hand, Quickley's lines suggest the possibility that women can survive in the world, utilizing their sexuality. Following her logic containing the proverbial phrase, a woman is "the weaker vessel" compared with a man, the stronger vessel. However, the weak empty vessel can display a strong power to do something taking advantage of a multivocal word "bear" at her will: she can bear troubles, children and men. As expected, Doll, the prostitute, who does not keep any particular family through marriage with a man and makes a living by putting her sexuality to practical use, tries to protect herself with the excuse that she is pregnant, when dragged by the beadles in *Part II*, Act V, Scene iv. Though the child of a prostitute is an illegitimate or "natural" child since even the mother does not know its "real" father, there is an interpretation on the Hostess's line, "But I pray God the fruit of her [Doll's] womb miscarry!" (*Part II*, V, iv, 13-14) that Falstaff is the father (see. Arden 2,

178n). If this is true, Doll will require the status of the wife of a knight, transforming her class from low to high. However that may be, since only the mother knows who the father is, her status is achieved on the insistence of Doll herself and the "father's" acknowledgement of paternity of the child. We remember Falstaff's evasion, "I dispraised him before the wicked [*Turns to the Prince*] that the wicked might not fall in love with thee" (*Part II*, II, iv, 315-17). When we consider the potential meaning in these words, it is useful to analyse the parallel lines of Poins and Prince Hal in *Part II*, Act II, Scene ii.

> *Poins.* [*Prince.*] ... Be not too familiar with Poins, for he misuses thy favours so much that he swears thou art to marry his sister Nell.
>
> . . . .
>
> *Prince.* That's to make him eat twenty of his words. But do you use me thus, Ned? Must I marry your sister?
>
> *Poins*. God send the wench no worse fortune! But I never said so.
>
> (120-33)

The intimacy of Hal and Poins is frequently impressed on us. They have many opportunities to act together. Hal had deep knowledge of the private life of Poins (*Part II*, II, ii, 12-17) and calls him "Ned". These seem to raise the question of Doll's, "Why does the Prince love him [Poins], then?" (*Part II*, II, iv, 240). Then, Nell, whose brother talks of himself that "the worst that they can say of me is that I am a second brother, and that I am a proper fellow of my hands" (*Part II*, II, ii, 62-64), should approach the prince and get married with him, as Falstaff suggests in his letter. Similarly, if Doll should fall in love with the Prince of Wales, a "marvellous"

unexpected twist would have happened in the royal blood. The child of a "prostitute" might become the next line for the throne to succeed to Hal. It is paradoxical that the prostitute, who accepts all men's desires and keeps the order of patriarchy, has at the same time great potential of movement in class and in gender (and sometimes in "nationality").

Earlier, we observed the significance of the connection of the tavern and outside. The swaggering violence in the tavern also links with the outer world. Pistol, a swaggering man, whose name implies military and sexual violence, appears in the tavern several times. Pistol is one of the visitors whom the space dominated by "women" receives from outside. In *Part II*, Act V, Scene iv, that the "man" is dead whom Doll and Pistol beat is reported in the lines of the first beadle, though both have been quarreling in *Part II*, Act II, Scene iv. Quickley and Doll are arrested there, and in the following scene, in Act V, Scene ii, Falstaff, Pistol and Bardolph are to be carried to the Fleet by the order of the Lord Chief Justice. The "base" characters in Eastcheap are locked up in jail waiting for punishment by law, represented by Hal's new father, the Lord Chief Justice, the embodiment of great and even-handed "manliness". The "mean" hybrid characters are moved to a rigid space, surrounded by law, under constant surveillance, and prohibited from leaving. This, perhaps, corresponds to the new King's policy of establishing a unified Britain.

> And let us choose such limbs of noble counsel
> That the great body of our state may go
> In equal rank with the best-govern'd nation;
>
> (*Part II*, V. ii. 135-37)

Hal thus comes to the fore as a national hero who secures order in

England. However, even at the end of the drama, the subject of England is, only narrowly established through the exclusion process, at the cetntre of which Hal tries to take his position, in fact, holding cracks, contradictions and possibilities of corruption inside of it.

III

In historical chronicles, people who have recorded their own existence or who hold privileged positions become the heroes of history. It is also certain that the selected descriptions of the past, whether by historians or by dramatists, depend on their sense of values, which inevitably include political considerations. Thus "history" merges not from a single text but from the interaction of various texts and discourses. Marginalized or suppressed figures can appear in the pattern, sometimes connected with, and on other occasions breaking relations with the "present".

People placed at the centre of governing authority construct "superior" subjects by suppressing and excluding "others", which is essentially necessary for the creation of their better selves. However, since the "upper" subjects cannot be formed without dependence on "others", and since various elements are needed to fix the relation between a subject and an object, men or things (including culture, codes, and so on) are not actually located in fixed, steady, "higher" positions. "Superior" and "inferior" can be seen in binary opposition. However, when this is recognised, breaking up the opposition can also be a progression. Therefore, the "superior" keeps the higher position only with difficulty. Under such dynamically delicate conditions, when the ruling authority, aiming at achieving hegemony and maintaining it, recognises the ambivalent feeling of terror and pleasure, it faces violence in itself. Representations of "others" are projections and tranformations of the cracks and contradictions

submerged inside the "subject".

In the 1590's when "nationalism" was gradually growing, Shakespeare wrote *Henry IV* under the restriction of "historical facts" projecting into the "past" the ideology and problems of his own time. In this experiment, with the incipient rise of "nationalism", the depiction of "England" as a subject and the representation of "Englishness" as superior, the labour of drawing boundaries against "others" can be seen. Though defining it must be, of course, a very complex act, Shakespeare seems to have approached and tried to present his "Englishness" as a topic in *Henry IV*.

We have discussed both parts of *Henry IV* from the point of view of the "trivial" "others" marginalized by geography, class, sex, gender, race and language, and we have investigated the myth of "Englishness", the making of Hal into a "national hero", the violence submerged in the myth of "manliness", the never ending dynamism of exclusion and containment. We have considered, from our modern viewpoint that the "nation state" is now an imagined community, how Prince Hal, who in the end shines brilliantly as the epitome of a Christian monarch, and becomes the "national hero" indispensable for the formation of England is able to be the "central" character by continuously excluding or containing the marginal which is in fact indispensable for the ideology of "Englishness". However, subversive elements are never completely contained by royal authority even in the final stages of the drama.

Notes

1. The original paper was first presented at the seminar I, entitled "Rereading the Histories: *Henry IV*" at the 35th annual Conference of the Shakespeare Society of Japan, 20 October, 1996, at Ritsumeikan University, Kyoto, Japan. I am indebted to other seminar members, Takayuki Katsuyama (Doshisha University), Kotaro Ishibashi (Iwate Prefectual University), Kazuaki Ota (Kyushu University), Naoko Komachiya (Japan Women's University), Takaya Sano (Kobe University of

Commerce), Shunmi Ri (Poole Gakuin University), and also to my friends, Shuntaro Ono (Seijyo University), David Taylor (Kyushu University), and my colleague, Martin Gore (Kagoshima University), for helpful criticisms of earlier versions of this paper.

2. Cf. with the concept of "nationhood", also Helgerson 1992 and Bhabha 1993.
3. With the commentary on the sources for the *Henry IV* plays, see Bullough (1962: 155-343).
4. Citations are from *The First Part of King Henry IV*, ed. A. R. Humphreys, *The Arden Shakespeare* (London: Methuen, 1960), *The Second Part of King Henry IV*, ed. A. R. Humphreys, *The Arden Shakespeare* (London: Methuen, 1966), *The First Part of King Henry VI*, ed. Michael Hattaway, *The New Cambridge Shakespeare* (Cambrigde: Cambridge University Press, 1990), *The Tempest*, ed. Frank Kermode, *The Arden Shakespeare* (London: Methuen, 1954), *Macbeth*, ed. Kenneth Muir, *The Arden Shakespeare* (London: Methuen, 1951). Hereafter quoted as *Part I*, *Part II*, *Henry VI*, *The Tempest* and *Macbeth* respectively.
5. See the comments on Falstaff's close relationship with Glendower in Hawkes 1998: 128; 139.
6. Cf. Traub 1992.
7. See *OED*[2], "Welsh". The word derives from the two Anglican and Kentish types in OE *Welisc*, *Waelisc* (from *Walh*) "foreign". However, once historically considered, it would be a great irony that the Welsh have been taken for alian, since they used to belong to the "native" British population of England in ancient times. Also, there exists the verb "Welsh" which has two negative meanings, see *OED*[2], "to swindle (a person) out of money laid as a bet" and "to fail to carry out one's promise to (a person); to fail to carry to keep (an obligation)". In the Anglicalising project, "Welsh" and "Welshness" seems to have been marginalised in this way.
8. As for the "Welsh" matter, see Williams 1985: esp., 117-19, Davis 1995: 5-34, Howard and Rackin 1997: 168-74.
9. As for the portrait of Owain Glendower, see Davis and Frankforter 1995: 189, Davies 1995 and Henken 1996. Shakespeare "Anglicizes" the name of Owain Glyn Dŵr, so he does on the name of Fluellen in *Henry V*. Cf. "Fluellen's name is evidence of his Welsh origin, and the spelling illustrates the Englishman's way of coping with the initial voiceless *l* of *Llewellyn* by putting a voiceless consonant before it in the hope that assimilation will achieve the required result" (Brook 1976: 209).
10. Holinshed 1587: 520.
11. Ibid.: 528.
12. There are six women given the name "Kate" in Shakespeare: the central three are Kate the wife of Hotspur, Kate in *Taming of the Shrew* and Kate the wife of Henry

V; the minor trio are Kate in *Loves Labour's Lost,* Kate in *Henry VIII,* Kate Keepdown in the line of Overdone in *Measure for Measure.* Shakespeare might hold an obsession with Kate because there are lines in the song of Stephalno in *The Tempest,* "Lov'd Mall, Meg and Marian, and Margery, / But none of us car'd for Kate" (II, ii, 49-50). Cf. Patterson 1993: 146. She points out that there are many *Kate/cat* puns around Shakespeare's Kate in *The Taming of the Shrew*, and these words, Kate and cat, were pronounced in the same way in Shakespeare's times, referring to Helge Kökeritz's *Shakespeare's Pronunciation* (New Heaven and London: Yale University Press, 1953: 98). She also analises that in an inserted part in the 1587 edition of Holinshed's Chronicles "Fleming/Stow assume the "cat" is female and therefore make available the demotic meaning of the word as denoting a prostitute (as in cathouse) and perhaps also food ("cates")". It is notable that a cat is one of witches' familiars, as "Graymalkin", an old, gray she-cat in *Macbeth* (I. i.8). There might be an EMod project of implying a demonized meaning in these words.

13. Cf. Singh 1994 with her discussion on the "prostitutes".

References

Anderson, Benetict (1991) *Imagined Community: Reflections on Origins and Spread of Nationalism*, Revised Edition, London: Verso.

Bhabha, Homi K. (1993) *Nation and Narration*, London and New York: Routledge.

Bukhtin, M. M. (1978) *The Reversible World: Symbolic Inversion in Art and Society,* Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Bullough, Geoffrey (1962) *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare,* Vol. IV, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Brook, G. L. (1976) *The Language of Shakespeare,* London: André Deutsh Limited.

Davies, R. R. (1995) *The Revolt of Owain Glyn Dŵr,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Davis, J. Madison and Frankforter, A. Daniel (1995) *The Shakespeare Name and Place Dictionary,* London and Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers.

Edwards, Philip (1979) *Threshold of a Nation: A Study in English and Irish Drama,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hawkes, Terence (1998) "Bryn Glas", *Post-Colonial Shakespeares,* ed. Ania Loomba and Martin Orkin, London and New York: Routledge.

Helgerson, Richard (1992) *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Henken, Elissa R. (1996) *National Redeemer, Owain Glyndwr in Welsh Tradition,* Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Holinshed, Raphael (1587) *The Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland,* 3 vols,

London.

Howard, Jean E. and Rackin, Philis (1997) *Engendering a Nation: A feminist account of Shakespeare's English histories,* London and New York: Routledge.

Neill, Michael (1994) "Broken English and Broken Irish: Nation, Language and Optic of Power in Shakespeare's Histories", *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45, 1-32.

OED²=The Oxford English Dictionary (1989), 2nd edition, ed. Simpson J. A. & Weiner E. S. C., et al., Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Patterson, Annabel (1993) *Reading between the Lines,* Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Rackin, Philis (1990) *Stages of History: Shakespeare's English Chronicles,* Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

----- (1995) "Engendering the Tragic Audience: The Case of *Richard III*", *Shakespeare and Gender: A History,* ed. Deborah E. Barker and Ivo Kamps, London: Verso.

Shakespeare, William (1951) *Macbeth,* ed. Kenneth Muir, London: Methuen (The Arden Edition).

----- (1954) *The Tempest,* ed. Frank Kermode, London: Methuen (The Arden Edition).

----- (1960) *The First Part of King Henry IV,* ed. A. R. Humphreys, London: Methuen (The Arden Edition).

----- (1966) *The Second Part of King Henry IV,* ed. A. R. Humphreys, London: Methuen (The Arden Edition).

----- (1990) *The First Part of King Henry VI,* ed. Michael Hattaway, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (The New Cambridge Edition).

Singh, Jyotsna (1994) "The Interventions of History: Narratives of Sexuality", *The Weyward Sisters: Shakespeare and Feminist Politics,* eds. Dympna Callaghan, Lorraine Helms and Jyotsna Singh, Oxford: Blackwell.

Traub, Valerie (1992) *Desire and Anxiety: Circulations of Sexuality in Shakespearean Deama,* London: Routledge.

Williams, Gwyn A. (1985) *When Was Wales?,* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.