Appearances and Disappearances: *Henry V*'s Shimmering Irishman in the Project to Make an England

Brian Carroll
Berry College

In presenting his Elizabethan theater-going audience with the Irish character of Macmorris, Shakespeare chose for *Henry V* one of many "Irish" or Irish-like character possibilities. The appearance of Macmorris, the play's token or representative "Irishman" and Shakespeare's only Irish character in any of his plays, is also the disappearance or never appearing of many other representations of Irishness, potentialities Shakespeare rejected and/or perhaps did not consider. For students and scholars of the origins of Irish identity and of English dominance over Ireland, an interesting question is why Shakespeare chose this particular representation, why Shakespeare presented (or re-presented) this Irishman and not any other, for Macmorris is made to signify all of Ireland in the four captains scene of act 3. (His three co-captains on the "All-British Isles team" represent Wales, Scotland, and England.)[1] What does the character mean, when he asks, "Of my nation? What ish my nation?" (3.3.66-67)?[2] Shakespeare offers a problem, a riddle, but no solution.

No definitive answers are possible, of course, but as David Baker underlined, the Irishman's question is "not a throwaway query from a minor character representing a subordinate people."[3] A study of what Elizabethan audiences might have heard and seen in and through Macmorris could inform how contemporary audiences interpret the four captains scene and, therefore, the play. Of special interest is how England's neighbors are characterized as "others," or as "not English." This inquiry, then, is a reading of the play as an analysis and not merely a portrayal of national identity, seeking meaning through contextualization appropriate to the moment of authorship.

To present some possibilities about what Shakespeare meant or, irrespective of intent, communicated to audiences in 1599 when

the play was written, and in the early part of the seventeenth century when it was adapted, this paper considers a few central questions: What does the four captains scene suggest about the project to create "England," "Englishness," or, in Benedict Anderson's terms, an imagined community predicated on England's political, military, and linguistic hegemony?[4] What is the role of "other" in this project? How does Shakespeare portray and register "otherness" in the scene and play? Identity and meaning seem to hang in the balance between competing visions of what it meant to be English in the late 1500s and early 1600s, with some of this competition staged in Ireland among and between the Old English, who had come over in the wake of Henry II's Anglo-Norman invasion of 1169, and the New English, who crossed the Irish Sea in the sixteenth century. Determining who Macmorris is supposed to represent is a key to unlocking the mystery of how this competition influenced England's nationalist project.

Several interpretations are proposed by various disciplines and methodological approaches as *the* reading, or the correct reading. Textualists, cultural materialists, historicists and new historicists, and theater critics all have weighed in on who Macmorris is meant to be or represent, and not meant to be or represent, and to what his "nation" *ish* supposed to refer.[5] Harmonizing these accounts is impossible. It might be useful to identify intersections or commonalities in these accounts, however, so this paper surveys research from these very different disciplinary and methodological approaches to the play. The theater is a "political institution" because it is a "public institution," as Jonathan Bate observed, so it is up to each and every playgoer to decide for him- or herself what *Henry V* means and to be, in effect, his or her own playwright.[6]

Borrowing from basic communication and rhetorical theory, this paper interrogates the four captains scene at three sites: What were the social, historical, cultural, and political contexts for the negotiation of meaning between speaker (Shakespeare) and his audiences? In communication theory, this is referred to as the site of negotiation. Second, what is it that Shakespeare wished to communicate or, perhaps more accurately, what is it that the playwright wished his characters to communicate (the site of the speaker)? Finally, what would his audiences, from the groundling to the law student, likely have heard (the site of the listener)? This paper cannot definitively or exhaustively answer these questions, but in considering them it can strive to enhance a reading or re-reading of the play, a reconstruction that occurs in a very different cultural field than that in which the play was authored.[7]

SITE 1: CONTEXTS. Interrogation at the site of negotiation can inform examination at the other two sites, those of speaker and listener. Before playgoers, either then or now, could appreciate the four captains scene, historical context of events contemporary to Shakespeare's writing of the play is necessary.[8] Shakespeare completed *Henry V*, his most famous war play and the final play in his second history tetralogy, sometime in 1599, or two years after *Henry IV*. Shakespeare began performing the play probably before September 1599, when the Earl of Essex's Irish campaign ended in failure, and perhaps as early as June.[9] After four decades of rule, Elizabeth was nearing the end of her reign; James I, a Scot, was crowned in 1603, a transition that precipitated an influx of Scots into England.

The Earl of Essex, Elizabeth's political adversary, used Ireland to consolidate his power and had hoped to parlay military might and conquest in Ireland into political currency in London. The chorus in the prologue of act 5 of *Henry V* anticipates Essex's return from his Irish campaign: ". . . from Ireland coming, / Bringing rebellion broached on his sword, / How many would the peaceful city quit / to welcome him!" (5.0.32-34). When he did arrive in Ireland in 1599, Essex took with him with the largest army to leave England during Elizabeth's reign.[10] By the end of the year, however, Ireland's Hugh O'Neill, an Irish chieftain who, because of his affinity for English dress and habit, just might have provided Shakespeare with the inspiration and model for Macmorris, had humbled Essex and England, even embarrassed them. Essex fled tail-between-legs back to England, while O'Neill lived to fight another day.[11]

In one of O'Neill's many successful negotiations with the English, negotiations that for O'Neill were primarily to buy time, the Irish chieftain obtained an English title, Earl of Tyrone. He dressed his soldiers in the English fashion, admiring as he was of English military might. O'Neill, like Macmorris, could have rightly asked, "What ish my nation?" toggling as he did between his Irishness and his adopted Englishness, between otherness and sameness. The defeat of O'Neill at the Battle of Kinsale in 1601 and the subsequent "flight of the earls" from Ireland solidified Elizabeth's national stability just before her death in 1603, and these events divided the predominantly Anglo north from Ireland's Catholic south.[12] During this period, as England was constituting itself as a land-bounded nation rather than as empire, where or even whether the Irish could be enfolded, assimilated, or militarily subdued lingered as an unanswered geopolitical question.

Reports in late 1599 and early 1600 of O'Neill's rebellion and of Irish raids on English settlements would have made Shakespeare's captains problematic and not at all funny, which Macmorris's Irish and Jamy's Scottish dialects certainly were intended to be. There is ample evidence that 1599 audiences did see performances that included the four captains, and it is near certain that by the end of the year and Essex's return, Macmorris and Jamy had been excised from the Quarto.[13] Whether Macmorris was Old English, New English, or Irish, his stage Irishman character had become too politically problematic, a reading that also points to O'Neill as a possible source of at least inspiration, if not for type or prototype of Macmorris. For most of 1599, Macmorris could safely ask, "What ish my nation?" By the middle of 1600 he no longer could, so he vanishes for nearly a quarter-century, or until the publication of the 1623 First Folio.[14] This disappearance and re-appearance is a key to unlocking the riddle of the Irishman's question.

O'Neill's Nine Years War with England posed one of the last and greatest threats to Elizabeth's reign, particularly with the Irish chieftain's alliance with Spain in allegiance to the pope. Ireland threatened to give Spain a point of attack into England; thus when *Henry V* was written and first performed, it was not at all clear that England could in fact hold Ireland. The potential independence of its geographically close neighbor put into dramatic relief the project to establish English military, political, and linguistic dominance in the region. Strangely, however, this threat is almost completely "unregistered in the imaginative literature of the period," as Michael Neill observed.[15] That Ireland was in play underlines the volatile moment in which *Henry V* was introduced, a moment in which the political entity of England was in flux and in which national identity was potentially treacherous. The play opened to a "tense and rumor-racked" city, as Joel B. Altman described.[16] It was not clear in 1599-1600 just what England would include, or exclude, or what the future of its constituent parts (Wales, Ireland, Scotland, and England) might entail. Shakespeare's four captains scene evidences this volatility by presenting an unstable alliance of disparate parts.

Essex in Ireland is critical to interpreting the scene, possibly explaining why it is missing in the Quarto version of the play published in 1599, an edition printed by Thomas Creede, but disqualified by scholars because of the dubiousness of its authenticity.[17] Who in the audience would not have thought of Essex and Henry as mirrors? Representations of England's island

nationalities, or "pilfering borderers" in the Bishop of Canterbury's words (1.2.140-42) in *Henry V*, were perhaps too politically problematic for a drama troupe dependent on the Crown's good graces to put on plays and take in a gate. Some have argued that more than simply trying to fly under the censors' radar, Shakespeare "dedicated his theater to a royally mandated project: the creation of a Britain," reading the play as "Jacobean propaganda" in support of a common British realm. In this service to nation, Shakespeare "offered up his dramaturgy and his playhouse" to this nationalist dream.[18] At the very least, London playwrights likely sought to avoid any association with Essex or his failed exploits in Ireland. When the First Folio version was published in 1623, long after the taint of Essex had faded, long after England's *de jure* and *de facto* authority over Ireland had been secured at Kinsale, and well into the Jacobean era, the four captains re-appear, as does the Chorus speech that introduces them.

When Macmorris can again ask, "What ish my nation?" he could be aligning himself with Henry and, therefore, with England. If his nation is in fact England, which, if Macmorris is either Old English or New English, it very well could be, the captain could be asserting his claim to English identity. To interpret the term locally, which in 1599, before "nation-states" and "nationalism," would have been a natural thing to do, "nation" could simply mean "clan" or "tribe," particularly if the term was used by a Celt.[19] Macmorris could thus be read as genuinely philosophical, sincerely probing his own loyalties and identity, an interpretation the Gaelic "clan" reading of "nation" supports. As many scholars read the scene, Macmorris in his question could be anticipating in Fluellen's provocations an indictment of Ireland and, therefore, of his Irish national identity and loyalty to Henry. Macmorris could also be more generally resisting his appropriation as object lesson in Fluellen's lecture on cultural and political imperialism.[20]

Whatever the character is doing, his presence in the play foregrounds difference among the national identities represented in the play and their articulation. Depending on the reading, Macmorris could also be foregrounding the interactions between and among the various groups in Ireland—the native Irish, Old English, and New English—groups that include and exclude in forming, negotiating, and communicating their group identities.

A hint for answers for Macmorris's question can be found even in Ireland's name, which was conferred upon the island by the English, a name that inspired many of England's writers to refer to her neighbor as "Land of Ire." John Derricke, poet Barnaby

Googe, and Sir John Davies each used this pejorative, as did the anonymous author of the "Dialogue of Sylvanus and Peregrine" in 1599, a work contemporary to *Henry V*. The name of Ireland can be seen as a negative English image, or "not English," as Andrew Hadfield and Willy Maley point out.[21]

Ireland as nation can also be seen as a fiction, an invention by the English for English purposes. Certainly Ireland as a geographical entity owed its definition to Elizabeth, whose administration in Ireland established towns and made roads. This administration needed a discrete geopolitical entity to govern, so one was essentially created as Ireland was mapped and written about; Nicholas Canny has called England's Ireland "a geographic expression."[22] The Irish quickly learned that English maps of Ireland were almost always created either for military purposes or to distribute the land.[23] Of course, Ireland refused to cohere, even in map-making, a complexity explored by Fintan O'Toole in *The Lie of the Land*. "One of the things that helped to give the illusion of fixity to an identity that was actually in perpetual motion was the availability of an overwhelming Other-England," O'Toole wrote, describing the role of this "other" in defining Ireland.[24]

SITE 2: INTENTIONS. Asking (and answering) the question of what the playwright intended to say is, of course, to venture into the swamps of intentionalism and interpretive sinking sand. The intentions of authors are not simply conjunctive, nor are they necessarily even stable. These intentions are contingent on interpretive beliefs that can change even while the work is being written. John Fowles changed his mind about the intentions of his story, *The French Lieutenant's Woman*, in the midst of writing it, to cite just one example.[25] This paper considers Shakespeare's possible intentions, but it will not and cannot force the value of the play to turn on a narrow view of these intentions, be they real or imagined. The play has a life and meaning of its own, wholly independent of its author, as do all creative works.

Identifying the sources that were available to Shakespeare is possible, however, and it can help contextualize the play as a text and reveal ideas accessible to the playwright at the time of *Henry V*'s writing. Likely on his bookshelf were Raphael Holinshed's *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland* in six volumes, first published in 1577. Stephen Booth argued that "we care about Holinshed's *Chronicles* because Shakespeare read them."[26] At a time when England was forging its own national identity, a project Holinshed, Spenser, Derricke, and Davies joined, Ireland provided a convenient foil as "not English," the contrasted inferior to prove

England's might and rightness. Part of Englishness—and a significant part, judging by turn-of-the-century historical texts such as Holinshed's *Chronicles*—could be constructed by negating Ireland and, more specifically, Irishness. To do this, authors such as Giraldus Cambrensis, Holinshed, Richard Stanihurst, Derricke, and Spenser wrote into existence a simple, savage, superstitious, and intemperate people. These adjectives coalesced in descriptions of Ireland as early as the twelfth century, largely because of Giraldus.[27] Such an unflattering portrait could only emphasize by contrast the self-fashioned image of the English as sophisticated, superior, refined, and rational.

Giraldus Cambrensis (or Gerald of Wales, or Gerald de Barri) is, in Lisa Hopkins's words, "arguably the originator of modern English anti-Irish prejudice."[28] Giraldus wrote two books on the twelfth-century invasion and colonization of Ireland, books that were influential not just in his own time, but in Shakespeare's day as well. His first book, *The History and Topography of Ireland* (*Topographia Hibernica*), was delivered as a series of lectures at the University of Oxford around 1187. The following two years, Giraldus wrote *The Conquest of Ireland* (*Expugnatio Hibernica*), which dealt with contemporary events in Ireland. *The Conquest* appeared in the second edition of Holinshed's *Chronicles* in 1587, bolstering the status of Giraldus's two volumes as "the most significant and influential presentations of Ireland and the Irish in the early modern period," according to Hadfield and McVeagh.[29] No writers in the sixteenth century could surpass Giraldus "in his vituperative dismissal of Gaelic culture," wrote Nicholas Canny.[30]

In *The Conquest*, Giraldus attributes these words to Maurice Fitzgerald, an Anglo-Norman warrior of Henry II: "For as we be odious and hatefull to the Irishmen, even so we now are reputed: for Irishmen are become hatefull to our owne nation and countrie, and so we are odious both to the one and the other."[31] The emerging sense of Britishness depended in the twelfth century in part on not being Celtic, and in being superior and even hostile to Celtic culture and societies, a plurality that included Wales and Scotland also as early as the twelfth century. It is important that the existence of these themes pre-dated Shakespeare's resources by more than three centuries, themes that by 1599 were entrenched and deeply held, floating in the air, and, therefore, seemingly natural.

In considering Macmorris, it should be noted that Stanihurst contributed "A Plaine and Perfect Description of Ireland" to the first edition of Holinshed's *Chronicles*, a piece he wrote as a member of one of the most prominent Old English families in the Pale.

Perhaps to re-assert his Englishness, Stanihurst wrote a scathing critique of the Gaelic language, calling it a "degenerate" sundering from the mother tongue, a language so difficult "scarse one in five hundred can either read, write or understand it."[32] The Old English met prejudice in England as a people too tainted, too removed from English culture and refinements to be seen as true English, and language was seen as a yardstick with which to measure this distancing. "What ish my nation?" would be a natural question for a person like Stanihurst to ask—that is to say, a prominent, loyalist Old English of the Pale.

Macmorris could very well be Old English. Stanihurst's evaluation of the Irish language is important to any reading of *Henry V* because Shakespeare utilizes language and linguistic difference perhaps more so than in any of his other plays. Language differentiates the ethnic characters, renders the French as wholly "other," and is the bridge for the French princess Catherine to cross over into English reign. It is Catherine's willingness, even eagerness to learn English in act 3 that re-makes her as one of England's "us." Her language lesson, a scene that shows the French royal enthusiastically learning English, also allows her to speak in French without translation. Rare in Shakespeare's plays, even those set in foreign lands, Catherine's French could be an acknowledgement by Shakespeare of the equality of French and English and, therefore, of the inequality of English and Irish, as Michael Cronin has suggested.[33] Playgoers are not expected to be able to understand Irish, Gaelic, Scots, or Welsh. The Celtic languages are "translated" by Shakespeare, or presented as already translated into English, as if the translation process would not in itself produce miscommunication.[34]

As in no other of his plays, Shakespeare uses language to identify and perhaps even to nationalize. English is the authorized, reified language, the language of Henry, of England. It is, therefore, an important tool in the fashioning of nationhood, as Benedict Anderson discusses in *Imagined Communities*. "Language is to the patriot as the eye is to the lover," Anderson wrote. "Through the mother tongue, the past is restored, fellowships are imagined, futures dreamed . . . The important thing about language is its capacity for generating imagined communities, building in effect particular solidarities."[35]

Notions of English superiority did more than establish an identity for the English; they justified conquest of Ireland as well. The ethnography of writers such as Stanihurst and Spenser anchored this justification in empirical (or empirical-like) "science."

Barbarians must be tamed; savages must be civilized; sinners must be saved. Another Englishman of the Pale, John Davies, wrote in 1612 that "a barbarous country must be first broken by a war before it will be capable of good government; and when it is fully subdued and conquered, if it be not well planted and governed after the conquest, it will eftsoons return to the former barbarism."[36]

English planters established the Pale, the area of English control centered at what is now Dublin, to civilize an undeveloped, uncultivated wasteland. This trope is prominent in Spenser's *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, in which "waste wild places," or "waste places farr from the danger of lawe" must be transformed and redeemed, and it is in stark contrast to the depiction of England as the best of all possible human arrangements.[37] Spenser writes in *A View* that the laws of England are "surelye most juste and must Agreable bothe with the government and with the nature of people."[38] The Irish legal system, by contrast, had "no sette or settled forme of judicature," according to Sir James Perrot, in his *Chronicle of Ireland 1584-1608* diary, which, like Spenser's *A View*, likely was not available to Shakespeare. Though written in 1596, *A View* was not published until 1633; Perrot's diary was not in circulation until after Shakespeare had died. Irish judges were "skilled in noethinge but in the customes of that parte of the contrie wherein he leived . . . The brehons were men unlearned and barbarous," Perrot wrote.[39]

Also readily available to Elizabethan readers was Derricke's *The Image of Ireland*, one of the few books on Ireland published during Elizabeth's reign. For Derricke, the Irish were sub-human; he described them as "beasts," "boars," "swine," "toads," "hungry dogs," and "monsters," among other bestial terms.[40] The oeuvre of works such as Derricke's, Spenser's, and Stanihurst's, described by Michael Neill as a "historical ethnography of Irish barbarism," is an ethnography that, Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass argue, "helped to produce a paradigmatic transformation in English policy toward the native Irish from one of gradual assimilation to one of conquest and terror."[41] Macmorris's inclusion among the four captains, and his accomplishments as a soldier, then, support a reading of the character as someone from inside the Pale. He is not, therefore, a barbarian of the bogs or woods, someone who survived, in Sir John Davies's description of the wild Irish, "little better than Cannibals, who do hunt one another."[42] Davies published his *A Discovery of the True Causes Why Ireland Was Never Entirely Subdued* in 1612, or after *Henry V*, but his views and sources for those views would have been contemporary to Shakespeare.

The collective portrait of the Irish is unremittingly unflattering; the Irish are untamed, uncultured, intemperate, brutish, and primitively superstitious. In this context, Shakespeare's only Irish character would seem progressive; in Macmorris there is nuance rather than a wholly negative stereotype. To borrow from a distinctly American cultural phenomenon, Macmorris could have been presented in stereotypical fashion, in the type of Uncle Remus, Aunt Jemima, or Al Jolson's blackface Sambo. But he is not a "rug-headed kern" seeking only his next drink or sexual conquest. As such, Macmorris challenges English hegemony, albeit in a stereotypical Irish brogue.

Macmorris's name, including how the name changed over time, and what that name might have signified to and for Shakespeare, also promises interpretive utility. Macmorris could have been derived from "son of Maurice," which would be ironic, and doubly so. The name *Maurice* has French origins and was anglicized over time as *Morris*. This interpretation produces a stage Irishman with an English name of French origins in a play about English military victory over the French using conscripted Irish. In *A View*, Spenser explained the naming conventions in Ireland at the time, an explanation that supports "son of Maurice" as the origin of Macmorris: "All men used to be called by the name of their septs (or clans) . . . and had no surnames at all," he wrote, explaining the use of Macmorris as a stand-alone moniker. In time, Spenser wrote, Irish should drop the name of the head of their clan, "but also in time learne quite to forget his Irish Nation" and become English, or English-like. For this reason, Spenser advocates banning "O's" and "Mac's" altogether.[43] Of course, Macmorris could also mean "son of Morris," for a more English reading requiring less interpretation, a reading that resists investing into the playwright a nuanced, historically accurate, even symbolic deployment of character names. It cannot be known if Shakespeare calibrated his naming scheme to register French origins of an anglicized surname to be applied to a lifelong resident of Ireland.

J. O. Bartley in 1954 wrote that "Mac" in "Mackmorrice" was the Gaelic equivalent of the Norman "Fitz," which would suggest that Macmorris is in fact not a stage Irishman but rather a member of one of the older settler families.[44] He perhaps would have been educated in England and, if serving in the Queen's army, represented the "good" Irishman, or he who is loyal to England. As Old English living in the Pale, Macmorris could in a sense claim dual nationality or identity, though he would want to be thought of as English first and last. He would be a Palesman, the son of

Morris/Maurice, descendant of a clan tracing his roots to the Anglo-Norman conquest. But we cannot know this for sure, and looking to the name as signifier of the character's role could be a mistake. He could just as likely be a commentary on what could happen to an Anglo-Norman aristocrat marooned or exiled in Ireland, or the very critique to which men like Stanihurst felt they had to defend themselves.

It is also important to remember that the Folio version has been amended by four centuries of editors, further complicating purely textual approaches to the play and its meanings. Andrew Murphy studied the four captains scene in Folio 1 versions over time, including their stage directions, and revealed telling differences, particularly in naming conventions.[45] For example, in the Folio 1 as it appeared in 1623, the English captain Gower refers to Macmorris as "an Irish man, a very valiant Gentleman," to which Fluellen responds, "It is Captaine Makmorrice, is it not?" (3.2) The respect Gower, an Englishman, pays to Macmorris, spelled with its French origins intact, weakens somewhat an interpretation of Macmorris as native Irish.

In two editions, including the "original," he is "Makmorrice," according to Murphy, but from the third edition onward, he is "Mackmorrice." The change could be crucial, for "Mac" is the Irish for "son of," while in English "Mack" could mean "a Celtic Irishman." According to the Oxford English Dictionary, "Mack" was pejorative when used by the English. Makmorrice and Mackmorrice are used through 1709, when, in Nicholas Rowe's edition, Mackmorris displaces them, according to Murphy's research of the play's manuscripts. Rowe also drops the ethnic marks, and they subsequently remain absent in favor of the characters' names. Samuel Johnson switches to "Macmorris" for his 1765 version of the folios, the nomenclature that has appeared in nearly all published versions since and, therefore, the name considered in virtually all textual interpretations of the play.[46]

What these changes represent cannot be known, but they underline the complexity of national, cultural, and linguistic identity vis-à-vis the dominant English identity. They also reveal how fluid the presumably fossilized Folio text has been in the hands of editors with different sensibilities and subjective, contingent perspectives. To meaningfully address what Shakespeare might have intended with his stage Irishman, it would be important, if not essential, to know which of these many spellings he used, if he used any of them at all.

References to Fluellen, too, vary over time.[47] After Macmorris is introduced as the third Celt in the scene, Fluellen becomes

"Welch." Jamy is always referred to as "Scot," and Macmorris always as "Irish." In contrast, Fluellen is only "Welch" after the introduction of Macmorris, reverting to Fluellen afterward and for the rest of the play. And unlike his captain cousins, Fluellen was not excised from the Quarto version. Gower is never referred to as "English," but only as Gower throughout. For Murphy, this sets up a sort of matrix of nationality and individuality, with each of the Celtic figures linked to their "ethnic ciphers," while the dominant cultural identity, the individuated English, requires no ethnic marking at all. This reading clearly establishes an "otherness" counterpoised with Englishness, as do the dialectic marks of Macmorris in particular, but also of Fluellen and Jamy. Fluellen's "looke you" and Jamy's "ayle," "gud," and "grund" are distinctive of their languages, as are Macmorris's most distinctive "ish," "tish," and "be Chrish." These "verbal tics," in Murphy's description, both distinguish the Celts from their English compatriot, and flatter Gower by making their speakers comical.[48]

There is ample evidence from Shakespeare's own works that the Macmorris scene is in fact meant to be pejorative of Irish and not, as Maley wonders, as Shakespeare's commentary on the effects of English occupation on the Old English, a reading that still allows for a pejorative view of Ireland as a whole. Hadfield, for example, cites *The Comedy of Errors* (1593), in which Shakespeare provides a comical, geographical description of Luce the kitchen maid. Her forehead is France; England, her chin; Spain, her hot breath; America, her nose; the Netherlands, her nether parts; Ireland? "In her buttocks. I found it out by the bogs" (3.2.115-16).[49] Here Shakespeare sounds much like Derricke. In *Richard II*, Shakespeare has his king tell Buckingham that "a bard of Ireland told me once/ I should not live long after I saw Richmond" (4.2.104-105), making Ireland a place of superstition and prophecy. The play, according to Hadfield, represents Ireland as a threatening and sometimes exotic "other."[50] Hotspur in *Henry IV, Part One* (1597) disparages Welsh by linking it with the devil (3.1.233), just after reacting to the prospect of the singing of a Welsh song by ridiculing both Welsh and Irish: "I had rather hear Lady, my brach, howl in Irish" (3.1.230). Hotspur's is a sentiment similar to Rosalind's in *As You Like It* (c.1599), when she describes the wordplay of the would-be lovers as being "like the howling of Irish wolves against the moon" (5.2.110-11). If the moon signifies Elizabeth, an Irish howling might refer to Hugh O'Neill's rebellion. In *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (c.1597), Frank Ford says that he would "rather trust . . . an Irishman with my acqua-vitae bottle" than his wife (2.2.292-93). In these

plays that pre-date Henry, Shakespeare's Irish are wild, howling, profane, untrustworthy bog-dwellers.

SITE 3: READINGS. To consider what Shakespeare's audiences might have seen and heard in the play is also problematic, requiring the mining of material culture and the narrative fictions of history for chestnuts of meaning. As early as 1954, scholars such as J. O. Bartley were proposing an interpretation of the four captains scene for early sixteenth-century playgoers as Shakespeare's attempt to provide an object lesson in imperialist incorporation, or as the taming of the wild Celtic peoples by the English crown.[51] A quarter-century later, Philip Edwards interpreted Shakespeare's comic rendering of Macmorris as condescension and a way, therefore, for the English to project themselves as superior.[52] To Edwards, as a collective the four captains are used by the playwright to offer "a furious repudiation of difference," he wrote, a view subsequently elaborated by David Cairns and Shaun Richards, and also by Stephen Greenblatt.[53] For Greenblatt, placing the four on the battlefield at Agincourt "tames the last wild areas in the British Isles."[54] Important for Greenblatt is Shakespeare's identification and grouping of the three (Irish, Welsh, and Scottish), for to be able to absorb or silence the "other,'" that "other" first must be identified.

The assimilation and incorporation interpretation has been criticized by scholars such as Dollimore, Sinfield, Baker, and Neill, who point out the paradox required to support that reading. To silence an "other," the other must be given a voice, and such articulation undercuts the efforts at subjugation and incorporation. In planting the seeds of its own failure, the ideology cannot sustain itself, as Murphy and Baker each argue.[55] Shakespeare's attention to Ireland, in other words, marks the country as one outside (though alongside) England, an exercise that simultaneously defines and questions England as an ideology and as a nation, an interpretation put forward by Neill.[56] Murphy uses the notion of unity to conceptualize these two very different readings of the play, the subordination and incorporation of Celtic peoples by the English on the one hand, and this incorporation disrupted or destabilized in its attempt on the other. The first approach sees unity forming; the other sees its impossibility.[57] Supporting the latter interpretation is the fact that these "other" voices do not go away; they persist. For *Henry V* to be a British play, it could not have these contradictions that, Baker argues, are just what the play seems to imply.[58]

The contributions of Murphy not only in organizing the interpretations, but also in revealing in them a fundamental flaw,

are valuable. The scholars mentioned, and many others as well, rely on modern editions of *Henry V*, as the examination of changes in Macmorris's name over time demonstrated. The lack of unity in the various versions and editions of the play that have appeared since Shakespeare's works were first collected and published, versions that Murphy describes as "multiple and divergent," must be at least recognized if not accounted for or otherwise harmonized.[59] These versions cannot be reduced to a single, coherent, unified object of analysis. As solution, Murphy proposes a more catholic approach, one that embraces (or "converges") bibliography and literary theory, textualism and cultural materialism.

Due to the Quarto's dubious character, it cannot be looked to for what audiences in 1599 saw or heard, but England's geopolitical situation at the time of *Henry V*'s writing suggests that five themes in or of the play would in fact have been resonant for Elizabethan play-going audiences. These themes are justification of war; Elizabeth as worthy political, military, and even spiritual leader; the futility of insurrection or rebellion; the need for and even nobility of England's neighbors; and, most elaborately, England as natural, God-ordained, unified, eternal "nation" (or, in Bhabha's less anachronistic term, "nation space").[60] This last theme depended on "othering," the trope of difference, by arraying France, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales on a spectrum of "otherness" vis-à-vis the dominant England. Used to communicate and develop this last theme are England's military might, language, religion, and law.

Justifying war as ordained by God, and claiming affinity by and affiliation with God for His purposes, *Henry V*'s Bishop of Canterbury analogizes England's "armed hand" in fighting abroad and defending herself at home with the natural work of honeybees, "creatures that by a rule in nature teach the act of order to a peopled kingdom" (1.2.185, 186, 195-97). The bishop even recommends a military strategy of dividing England's forces into four, one to attack France and three to defend against the "dogs" at England's "own doors" (1.2.222-26). Ireland, Scotland, and Wales as "dogs" is a usage compatible with the ethnography of Holinshed, Derricke, Spenser among others, a mongrelization of the "other" that serves also to undergird Englishness as divinely, particularly human.

If England's warring proved just, its leader, too, was praiseworthy, even heroic, an "angel," a "paradise," and a "scholar" worthy of his nation's trust and fealty (1.1.66, 68, 70). As surrogate for Elizabeth, Henry is celebrated as a general, but also as England's political and even spiritual father. On the eve of the Battle of Agincourt, Henry counsels his forces: "Every subject's duty is the

king's; but every subject's soul is his own. Therefore should every soldier in the wars do as every sick man in his bed, wash every mote out of his conscience" (4.1.182-85). In serving a priestly function, Henry also serves to justify war, England's war, as sanctified by God, and he legitimizes or collapses his stately role with or into a religious one. Later in the scene, as father to his nation, he bears the responsibility for his children's souls and their sins (4.1.236-38). Shakespeare thus effects a fusion of political, military, and religious authority and ideology, and he does it with and through ceremony, or the rites and rituals expected in these headship roles.[61] Henry laments the burden of performing this ceremony in contrast to the "happiness" of those who fear him, because they fear him:

> O Ceremony, show me but thy worth!
> What is thy soul of adoration?
> Art thou aught else but place, degree, and form,
> Creating awe and fear in other men?
> Wherein thou art less happy being fear'd
> Than they in fearing.
> What drink'st thou oft, instead of homage sweet,
> But poison'd flattery? O, be sick, great greatness,
> And bid thy Ceremony give thee cure! (4.1.250-58)

As Dollimore and Sinfield observed, syntactically the king collapses into ceremony, as the "thou" in the third line refers to "ceremony," but in the fifth it refers to Henry.

A hydra-headed, all-seeing, all-knowing king will of course make any attempt at overthrow futile and fatal, a theme that would have been resonant for Elizabethan audiences hungry for news of Essex's campaign against O'Neill in Ireland and for private, "illegal" Catholics in Protestant England as well. The treasonous earls Cambridge, Grey, and Scroop are effortlessly exposed and summarily executed, their betrayals standing in stark contrast to the fealty of the Celtic captains, whose service to the Crown makes them with England a "band of brothers" (4.3.60). Shakespeare presents this Celtic brotherhood as united with England in fealty to her. As Dollimore and Sinfield describe, "The Irish, Welsh and Scottish soldiers manifest not their countries' centrifugal relationship to England but an ideal of subservice of margin to centre."[62] Like the earls, the captains renounce resistance in their service and submit to Henry in his fight against France. These "celtic fringes," in Steven Ellis's words, are thus bonded with England against a common enemy, a more extreme "other" in France.[63]

In this "intensely nationalistic" and "deliberately propagandistic" play, to borrow Ribner's terms, Shakespeare's nation is achieved or wrought in a process of incorporation and elimination.[64] It is worth noting that such a Celtic military alliance with England would have been in 1599 historically inaccurate. Holinshed's *Chronicles* give evidence of both Scots and Welsh fighting for France and against Henry. By 1599, such an alliance was at least possible, giving Shakespeare contemporary political license, if not imperative, to emphasize Elizabeth's consolidation of power, most importantly in and among her Celtic neighbors.

France as the unifying "other," as the quintessential "other" in the play, provides another anvil upon which Shakespeare hammers out an England. To defeat this distinctly effeminate enemy, Elizabethan England welcomes Celtic brotherhood, but on England's terms, in her language, and by her laws. This England, Henry's England, is God-ordained, natural, unified, and eternal. As act 2's Chorus proclaims, "O England! model to thy inward greatness, / Like little body with a mighty heart, / What mightst thou do, that honour would thee do, / Were all thy children kind and natural!" (2.0.16-19). As Richard Helgerson argued, *Henry V* is a play about English national identity written at a time when literate people were "laying the discursive foundations both for the nation-state and for a whole array of more specialized communities that based their identity [*sic*] on their relation to the nation and the state."[65] H. A. Evans described the play as evoking an English national pride, "the nearest approach on the part of the author to a national epic."[66]

This nationalism was predicated on military might and warring competency, which provides the four captains with contingent entry into the national family; those of all four are accomplished on the battlefield, in contrast to the English Pistol, whose heart is questioned, even though his is true English. This nationalism is also predicated on linguistic unity. Every character speaks English except the French "other," and even then Catherine speaks French to learn English. This nationalism is built with religion, signified by Henry's appropriation of Christian themes and terms, and with and through the law, which, to name just two examples, illegalized Catholicism in England and required any official in Wales to be proficient in English as a requirement of office.

Macmorris's nation could be England, Britain, the island of Ireland, Munster in the north, the Pale, his own clan, none of these, or some combination of these. It is unlikely, even historically impossible, for Macmorris to be New English, or a planter of the

Elizabethan period. His dialectical tics give him away. He is native Irish, an Englishman in Ireland for most of his life, or a native Irishman with a great deal of English education and/or breeding. It is most likely that Macmorris was meant to be either Old English from the Pale or of the type of O'Neill, and these categories are not mutually exclusive dramatically, as caricature. If he is Old English, his nation is Ireland or England or both. If he is to represent an O'Neill-like Irishman with ties to and affinity for English ways, his nation could be England, his own island, Munster, his own clan or tribe, or, again, some combination of these geographic and political entities. If Macmorris hints at his own clan's involvement in the fighting, Fluellen's observation that "there is not many of your nation" is apt. Because the enemy is France, Macmorris could be interrogating all of these possibilities, reflecting and refracting identity through the prism of the true "other." His "nation" would be both England and Ireland, because neither alone would suffice.

Macmorris's Irishness shades into his Englishness, and vice versa, rendering Shakespeare's stage Irishman a complex representation that affirms, but also denies, both his Irishness and his Englishness. His Irishness is denied by subservience to the King and his origins in a nation not recognized as a unified nation-state. Shakespeare seems to insist that Macmorris is fundamentally Irish at a time when Ireland was recognized by England only as a colonial adjunct or, in Baker's description, "a debased subsidiary" of England.[67] In 2009 Macmorris could be a Palestinian from Gaza fighting for Israel. In his distinctive Irish tics and blasphemies, through language, he is denied a fundamental Englishness. His "limbs" are not made in England, after all, so regardless of his military mettle, he cannot be Henry's "noblest English" soldier, one worth his English breeding (3.1.24-28). According to Henry's words, he can never be authentically English, which is ironic given Henry's Welshness, origins that are emphasized and de-emphasized throughout the drama, depending on the King's tactical or rhetorical need of the moment, and also prominently celebrated by Fluellen.

What *ish* Macmorris's nation? Whatever it is or was, it was created by England for England; it was a myth. In *Henry V*, Shakespeare participates in and, given his currency both then and now, authorizes England's "invention of the idea of Ireland."[68] With Shakespeare's help, English identity became contingent on notions of Ireland and on the process of re-presenting Ireland and the Irish. As the ethnography of the period of *Henry V*'s writing demonstrates, this process traded on a series of negative images

and portrayals of the savage, bestial Irish and of their wild, untamed, uncivilized land. Englishness came to depend on a negation and rejection of Irishness, explaining in part Macmorris as a stereotypical, albeit sympathetic Irishman. "Villain? Bastard? Knave?" Macmorris wonders. Ask the English, because from England, Macmorris and his Ireland got their names, language, and law, and it is England Macmorris serves on the battlefields of France.

At play's end, Shakespeare "hath pursued his story" about a "small most greatly lived" land, "this star England," where "fortune made his sword, by which the world's best garden [Henry] achieved" (5.3.2-8). Fortune *made* or *achieved* his might, furnishing the world with its best garden—that most English of metaphors for design, order, and all that is right and good. This garden is achieved in part because the playwright has written it into the popular imagination. England is an appearance, and every appearance is also a disappearance.

Notes

1. "All-British Isles team" from David Quint, "'Alexander the Pig': Shakespeare on History and Poetry*,*" *Boundary 2*, 10 (1982): 51.

2. Line references are taken from William Shakespeare, *The Life of Henry V*, Folger Shakespeare Library, ed. Barbara A. Mowat and Paul Werstine (New York: Washington Square Press, 1995).

3. David J. Baker, *Between Nations: Shakespeare, Spenser, Marvell, and the Question of Britain* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1997), 44.

4. "Hegemonic" is used here to mean the way the English (and Irish) are convinced of the naturalness of their situation, in the case of the English, of their nationhood.

5. See, to cite just a few examples, Baker, *Between Nations*, in which the author provides an exhaustive review of scholarship on the question of nationalism; J. O. Bartley, *Teague, Shenkin and Sawney: An Historical Study of the Earliest Irish, Welsh and Scottish Characters in English Plays* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1954); Jean Howard and Phyllis Rackin, *Engendering a Nation: A Feminist Account of Shakespeare's Histories* (New York: Routledge, 1997); Phyllis Rackin, *Stages of History: Shakespeare's English Chronicles* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1990); Peter Womack, "Imaging Communities: Theatres and the English Nation in the Sixteenth Century," in *Culture and History 1350-1260: Essays on English Communities, Identities and Writing*, ed. David Aers (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992), 91-145; Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); Michael Neill, "Broken English and Broken Irish: Nation, Language, and the Optic Power in Shakespeare's Histories," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45 (Spring 1994): 1-32; Claire McEachern, *The Poetics of English Nationhood, 1590-1612* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 83-137; A. Truninger, *Paddy and Paycock: A Study of the Stage Irishman from Shakespeare to O'Casey* (Bern: Francke, 1976); Kathleen Rabl, "Taming the 'Wild Irish' in English Renaissance Drama," in *Literary*

Interrelations: Ireland, England and the World, ed. Wolfgang Zach and Heinz Kosok, *Studies in English and Comparative Literature* 3 (Tubingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1987): 47-59; Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980); and Jonathan Baldo, "Wars of Memory in *Henry V*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 46 (Summer 1996): 132-159.

6. Jonathan Bate, *Shakespearean Constitutions: Politics, Theatre, Criticism, 1730-1830* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989).

7. For more on communication theory that considers artifacts at the sites of speaker, listener, and social and cultural contexts, see Michael K. Halliday, *The Semiotics of Culture and Language* (London: Pinter, 1984); Halliday, *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning* (London: Edward Arnold, 1978); and Halliday, *Explorations in the Functions of Language* (London: Edward Arnold, 1973).

8. This tetralogy also includes *Richard II*; *Henry IV, Part 1*; and *Henry IV, Part 2*. The first tetralogy comprises *Henry VI, Part 1*; *Henry VI, Part 2*; *Henry VI, Part 3*; and *Richard III. Henry V* covers 1415-1422, concluding with Henry's death at the age of 35 and focusing on the campaign in France in 1415. The campaign includes the siege of Harfleur, the Battle of Agincourt, and the treaty at Troyes.

9. For support of June as a first performance date, see Keith Brown, "Historical Context and Henry V," in *Cahiers Elisabethains* (Montpelier: Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches Elisabethaines de l'Universite), 77. If June is correct, the play was first performed at the Curtain and not the Globe.

10. Andrew Hadfield, "'Hitherto she ne're could fancy him': Shakespeare's 'British' Plays and the Exclusion of Ireland," in *Shakespeare and Ireland: History, Politics, Culture*, ed. Mark Thornton Burnett and Ramona Wray (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), 52.

11. O'Neill's supporters attacked and destroyed the Munster Plantation in 1598 as part of the Nine Years War.

12. The victory was ensured by Lord Mountjoy's defeat of O'Neill's forces at Kinsale on Christmas Eve, 1601, a victory that has been described more as a defeat. Rather than English might, Ireland's disorder is cited as decisive in the war as O'Neill, MacDonnell, FitzMaurice, and Desmond clans fought each other more than the English. O'Neill did not surrender until 1603, however, in exchange for an English title.

13. David Baker, *Between Nations*, 30-31.

14. Andrew Hadfield, "English Colonialism and National Identity in Early Modern Ireland," *Eire-Ireland* 28, no. 1 (Spring 1993): 82. As Hadfield points out, in 1588 the hope was to integrate the Irish. By 1598, this hope was replaced by a drive to assert "English identity vis-à-vis the Irish."

15. Michael Neill, "Broken English and Broken Irish: Nation, Language, and the Optic Power in Shakespeare's Histories," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45 (Spring 1994), 18.

16. Joel B. Altman, "Vile Participation: The Amplification of Violence," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 42 (1991): 9.

17. Quartos for various plays were sometimes lifted by actors or even members of the audience, then sold to publishers for profit.

18. Baker, *Between Nations*, 21.

19. Joseph Leersen, *Mere Irish and Fior-Ghael: Studies in the Idea of Irish Nationality, Its Development and Literary Expression Prior to the Nineteenth Century* (Amsterdam: John Benjamin's Publishing Company, 1986), 25.

20. Among those scholars who interpret in this scene the subjugation or incorporation or "taming" of Celtic lands by the English crown are David Cairns

and Shaun Richards, *Writing Ireland: Colonialism, Nationalism and Culture* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988); Stephen Greenblatt, *Shakepearean Negotiations* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988); Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield, "History and Ideology: The Instance of Henry V," in *Alternative Shakespeares*, ed. John Drakakis (London: Methuen, 1985); Philip Edwards, *Threshold of a Nation: A Study in English and Irish Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979); and, in one of the earliest versions of this interpretation, Bartley's *Teague, Shenkin and Sawney*.

21. Andrew Hadfield and Willy Maley, "Introduction: Irish Representations and English Alternatives," in *Representing Ireland: Literature and the Origins of Conflict, 1534-1660*, ed. Brandon Bradshaw, Andrew Hadfield, and Willy Maley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 3.

22. Nicholas Canny, *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: A Pattern Established* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1976), 3.

23. As maps were made, Ireland was redefined as an English province. Derry, for example, became Londonderry. Gaelic was replaced by English transliterations as Ireland's counties and towns were redrawn.

24. Fintan O'Toole, *The Lie of the Land: Irish Identities* (London: Verso Books, 1997), xv.

25. Ronald Dworkin, *A Matter of Principle* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 156.

26. Stephen Booth, *The Book Called "Holinshed's Chronicles"* (San Francisco: Book Club of California, 1968), 72, quoted in Willey Maley, "Shakespeare, Holinshed, and Ireland: Resources and Con-texts," in *Shakespeare and Ireland: History, Politics, Culture*, ed. Mark Thornton Burnett and Ramona Wray (New York: St. Martin's Press), 28.

27. John Gillingham, "The English Invasion of Ireland," in *Representing Ireland: Literature and the Origins of Conflict, 1534-1660,* ed. Brendon Bradshaw, Andrew Hadfield, and Willy Maley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 24. According to Gillingham, by even the mid-twelfth century, "barbarity" had become a cliché in describing the Irish.

28. Lisa Hopkins, "Neighbourhood in *Henry V*," in *Shakespeare and Ireland: History, Politics, Culture*, ed. Mark Thornton Burnett and Ramona Wray (New York, St. Martin's Press), 9. It is worth noting that Giraldus was Welsh, and that at various times in his career, he referred to himself as Welsh, while at others he referred to "we English."

29. Andrew Hadfield and John McVeagh, eds., *Strangers to That Land: British Perceptions of Ireland from the Reformation to the Famine* (Cornwall, Great Britain: TJ Press, 1994), 7.

30. Nicholas Canny, *Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Atlantic World* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988), 3, quoted in John Gillingham, "The English Invasion of Ireland," 24.

31. Giraldus Cambrensis, *The Conquest of Ireland*, quoted in Hopkins, "Neighbourhood in *Henry V*," 23.

32. Raphael Holinshed, *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, vol.6, (London, printed by Henry Denham, 1587), available: http://www.gutenberg.org/etext/16496, and http://dewey.library.upenn.edu/sceti/printedbooksNew/index.cfm?TextID=holinshed_chronicle&PagePosition=1.

33. Michael Cronin, "Rug-headed kerns speaking tongues: Shakespeare, Translation and the Irish Language," in *Shakespeare and Ireland: History, Politics, Culture* ed. Mark Thornton Burnett and Ramona Wray (New York: St. Martin's Press), 198.

34. Ibid., 206. According to Cronin, citing Sir Dunbar Plunket Barton's *Links Between Ireland and Shakespeare* (Dublin, 1919; Whitefish, Montana: Kessinger Publishing, 2008), approximately 90 percent of Irish in Ireland were Irish-speaking in 1600, or roughly 540,000 of the 600,000 on the island.

35. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso Books, 1991), 133.

36. John Davies, *A Discovery of the True Causes Why Ireland Was Never Entirely Subdued and Brought Under Obedience of the Crown of England Until the Beginning of His Majesty's Happy Reign (1612)*, quoted in Nicholas Canny, *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland,* 15.

37. Edmund Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, ed. James Ware (Oxford: Clarendon 1970), 67. Available: http://www.uoregon.edu/~rbear/veue1.html.

38. Ibid. Spenser's title is significant, employing the power of optics, to use Michael Neill's term from his article, "Broken English and Broken Irish: Nation, Language, and the Optic Power in Shakespeare's Histories."

39. James Perrot, *The Chronicle of Ireland 1584-1608*, ed. Herbert Wood (Dublin: The Stationery Office, 1933), 20. The author's name is sometimes spelled "Perrott."

40. John Derricke, *The Image of Irelande with A Discoverie of Woodkarne* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Scholars Facsimiles & Reprints, 1998), 9, 188, 11, 192, 200, and 203.

41. Michael Neill, "Broken English and Broken Irish," 4; Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass, "Dismantling Irena: The Sexualizing of Ireland in Early Modern England," in *Nationalism and Sexualities*, ed. Andrew Parker, Doris Sommer, and Patricia Yaeger (New York: Routledge, 1992), 157-71.

42. John Davies, *A Discovery of the True Causes Why Ireland Was Never Entirely Subdued (1612)*, in *Ireland Under Elizabeth and James the First*," ed. Henry Morley (London: George Routledge and Sons, 1890), 213-342.

43. Spenser, *A View*, 94-96.

44. J. O. Bartley, *Teague, Shenkin and Sawney: An Historical Study of the Earliest Irish, Welsh and Scottish Characters in English Plays* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1954), 16.

45. Andrew Murphy, "'Tish ill done': *Henry the Fifth* and the Politics of Editing," in *Shakespeare and Ireland: History, Politics, Culture*, ed. Mark Thornton Burnett and Ramona Wray (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), 213-34.

46. Ibid., 226.

47. Ibid., 223-24.

48. Ibid., 224.

49. Andrew Hadfield, "'Hitherto she ne're could fancy him,'" 47.

50. Ibid., 50.

51. Bartley, *Teague, Shenkin and Sawney*, 7-43.

52. Philip Edwards, *Threshold of a Nation*, 74-86.

53. David Cairns and Shaun Richards, *Writing Ireland: Colonialism, Nationalism and Culture* (Manchester: University Press, 1988), 9.

54. Stephen Greenblatt, *Shakespearean Negotiations* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), 56.

55. In addition to Dollimore and Sinfield, see David J. Baker, "'Wildehirissheman': Colonialist Representation in Shakespeare's *Henry V*," *English Literary Renaissance* 22 (1992): 42-43.

56. Neill, "Broken English and Broken Irish," 1-32.

57. Murphy, "'Tish ill done,'" 217.

58. Baker, *Between Nations*, 22.

59. Murphy, "'Tish ill done,'" 218.

60. Homi K. Bhabha, the Anne F. Rothenberg Professor of English and American Literature and Language, and the Director of the Humanities Center, at Harvard University, is a prolific writer in post-colonial theory. His concept of "nation-space" is cited in Baker, *Between Nations*, 24.

61. For an analysis of the use of ceremony in Shakespeare's drama, see Neill, "Broken English and Broken Irish," 10-14.

62. Dollimore and Sinfield, "History and Ideology," 217.

63. Steven G. Ellis, *Tudor Ireland: Crown, Community and the Conflict of Cultures* (London: Longman, 1985), 15.

64. Irving Ribner, *The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare* (New York: Octagon Books, 1979), 2.

65. Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 299.

66. H. A. Evans, Introduction to *The Life of King Henry the Fifth*, by William Shakespeare, The Arden Shakespeare (London: Methuen and Co., 1904), xli, cited in Lily B. Campbell, *Shakespeare's 'Histories': Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy* (San Marino, Calif.: Huntington Library, 1947), 255.

67. Baker, *Between Nations*, 36.

68. Declan Kiberd, "Anglo-Irish Attitudes," in *Ireland's Field Day* (South Bend, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1986), 83.