JOURNAL OF The Wooden O SYMPOSIUM

Volume 9

Published by the

Southern Utah University Press
in cooperation with the
Gerald R. Sherratt Library and the
Utah Shakespearean Festival

The Wooden O Symposium is a cross-disciplinary conference that explores Medieval and Renaissance studies through the text and performance of Shakespeare's plays. Scholars from many disciplines present papers that offer insights into the era of William Shakespeare.

The symposium is conducted the first week of August in Cedar City, Utah, and coincides with the Utah Shakespearean Festival's summer season. Three plays from Shakespeare's canon are performed each summer in the Adams Memorial Shakespearean Theatre, a unique performance space modeled after the Globe Theatre, Shakespeare's own "Wooden O."

Table of Contents

Rotten Oranges and Other Spoiled Commodities: The Economics of Shame in *Much Ado about Nothing*
Stephanie Chamberlain 1

Appearances and Disappearances: *Henry V*'s Shimmering Irishman in the Project to Make an England
Brian Carroll 11

"A Thousand Marks": Language and Comic Violence In *The Comedy Of Errors* and Shakespeare's Plautus
Eric Dodson-Robinson 33

Figuring the King in *Henry V*: Political Rhetoric and the Limits of Performance
Peter Parolin 43

"The Courses of His Youth Promised It Not:" *Henry V* and The Play of Memory
Anthony Guy Patricia 61

"Jumping O'er Times": Diachronic Design in Olivier's *Henry V*
Howard Schmitt 81

Actors' Roundtable: Acting Shakespeare: A Roundtable Discussion with Artists from the Utah Shakespearean Festival 200 Production of *Henry V*
Michael Flachmann 95

A Fair Youth in the Forest of Arden: Reading Gender and Desire in *As You Like It* and Shakespeare's Sonnets
Amanda Rudd 106

Rotten Oranges and Other Spoiled Commodities: The Economics of Shame in *Much Ado about Nothing*

Stephanie Chamberlain
Southeast Missouri State University

Near the beginning of act 4 of Shakespeare's *Much Ado about Nothing,* Claudio angrily rejects the "rich and precious gift" (4.1.26) Leonato plans to bestow upon him, declaring, "Give not this rotten orange to your friend" (4.1.30).[1] While it seems clear that "rotten orange" functions metaphorically to describe the shamed Hero, the term likewise references an early modern commodity, one which, because spoiled, loses its value within the marketplace. The "jewel" (1.1.146) Claudio once feared too costly to purchase has devolved into fruit, and rotten fruit at that.

While much has been written about the "traffic in women" in early modern marriage making, the economic implications of Shakespeare's gendered commodity exchanges have not, I believe, been adequately addressed.[2] Indeed, the "rotten orange" Claudio forces back on Leonato during the failed altar scene of *Much Ado* functions, I would argue, as more than a simple metaphor to describe Hero's suddenly degraded state. Not only does it explicitly connect marriage to the early modern marketplace, but it taps into the market's system of valuation as well. In pristine condition, the orange constituted a somewhat prized food commodity. In a bruised and moldering state, however, it necessarily lost all value as an object of exchange. While the unsullied Hero may well represent one of Leonato's most prized assets, she becomes virtually un-exchangeable once her sexual chastity is called into question. Using Shakespeare's *rotten fruit* metaphor as a starting point, my paper will examine the means by which spoilage or shame functions as an instrument of devaluation within the play's marriage exchange.

In his 1615 domestic guide, *The English Housewife,* Gervase Markham outlines the value of fruit within the household economy.

Oranges and lemons in particular are prized for their versatility within the pantry. Not only could they be used in pies, in sauces, and as garnishes, but they were also used to correct the flavor of dishes. "When [a dish is] flat and wallowish [insipid]," Markham advises, "quicken it with oranges and lemons."[3] Oranges, as Markam's editor, Michael Best, explains, "intermingle . . . sour, bitter, and hot or spicy flavours."[4] Perhaps the best indication of its value to the household economy may be glimpsed in fruit's inclusion on the banquet table, where Markham calls for a generous assortment of preserved fruits, "wet suckets" (or candied fruits), and sliced oranges.[5] By its nature somewhat ostentatious, the banquet constituted a virtual cornucopia of culinary wealth, where the worth of the household could be displayed as well as sampled. Moreover, Best suggests, "The ingredients seem to have been chosen more for their expense and rarity than for any logic of the combination of flavours."[6]

Much of this valuation lay in the relative scarcity of fruit. While some fruits, such as apples, were grown locally, others had to be imported from locales with warmer climates and hence longer growing seasons. Figs, for instance, were imported from southern France, while oranges were acquired from Italy and Spain. While, as a rule, such fruits were generally more abundant in port cities such as London, their availability was subject to seasonal limitations. As food historian Ken Albala observes, "Fruits are special precisely because you cannot have them year round, nor do you often find a perfect, beautiful, and ripe specimen."[7] While it is a rotten orange Claudio rejects during the botched altar scene, he nonetheless gestures to fruit's value within the early modern marketplace.

Given its privileged place within the pantry and on the banquet table, it is perhaps surprising to note that fruit was likewise viewed with considerable suspicion in early modern England. Joan Fitzpatrick, author of *Food in Shakespeare*, reports that "some odd beliefs emerge in particular that vegetables and especially fruit should be treated with caution (regarded as an indulgence, as it were) and that animal flesh . . . was especially good for the body."[8] Raw fruit, in particular, was viewed as dangerous to early modern consumers. As Thomas Elyot (1595) explains in his 1595 *The Castell of Health*,

> before that tillage of corne was invented, and that devouring of flesh and fish was of mankind, men undoubtedly lived by fruites, and nature was ther with contented and satisfied, but by change of the diet of our progenitors, there is caused to bee in our bodies such alteration from the nature which

> was in man at the beginning, that now all fruits generally are noyfull to man and doe ingender ill humours, and bee oft times the cause of putrified fevers, if they bee much and continually eaten.[9]

Thomas Venner's *Via Recta Ad Vita Longam* (1650) describes these humours as "crude and waterish . . .that dispose the blood unto petrefaction."[10] Despite these rather dire warnings, consumers not only ate, but also seemed to relish fruit.[11] The forbidden fruits that early modern physicians warned against were, in fact, a prized commodity.

That fruit was sexualized in early modern England contributes perhaps both to its appeal as well as perceived danger. Historian Albala warns that

> the sensual and almost erotic attention to the texture and glistening skin of ripe wet fruit gives some indication of how interested diners were in eating it . . . [Indeed, fruits] flaunt more than a hint of erotic suggestion, particularly with swollen, rubescent peaches about to pour forth unctuous juice, figs yearning to split from internal pressure, revealing seed-studded flesh, and melons ripe with anticipation before the fork plunges in. In the case of candied and conserved fruit, literally dripping with syrup, a suggestively sexual message probably could not be avoided.[12]

Nor, apparently, could the ripe and preserved fruits lavishly displayed on early modern banquet tables. Fruit was a succulent culinary event in early modern England, an almost guilty pleasure more likely embraced than avoided. Of course, one knew, but at the same time, ignored the dangers that could lie within. Whether that danger lay with "putrefaction" produced from ill humours within the body or from spoiled flesh that hid beneath an undamaged exterior, raw fruit, untempered through the stabilizing process of heat or preservation, proved an uncertain, however enticing, commodity. The same could be said of women.

That women were treated as commodities on the early modern marriage exchange has, of course, been well established. Numerous social historians of the early modern period have documented the value attached to daughters as a means by which to advance family name and social position. Although marriage formations differed widely according to social ranking, as B. J. Sokol and Mary Sokol note in *Shakespeare, Law, and Marriage*, "the convention among the gentry and aristocracy was for marriages to be arranged by families with a view to securing advantages or alliances, conforming to a patriarchal model."[13] Keith Wrightson supports this assessment, adding that "among the propertied, from husbandman to lord, economic arrangements involving both families were often critical to the making or marring of a prospective match, and negotiations were begun as soon as a serious 'motion of marriage' was entertained."[14] Much was obviously at stake in the matter of valuation, including reputation (both of the individual as well as the family) and economic assets (what, in other words, the bride was able to bring to the marriage in the form of money, movables, or, less likely, land). Nor were reputation and asset valuation easily separated. Amy Louise Erickson, discussing *Women and Property in Early Modern England*, argues, "At some level, a bride's portion was not merely a nest egg for the new household—it was a token of her character, and thus of her sexual honour."[15]

As with other perishable commodities, a women's value within the marriage market could be lost. Numerous early modern conduct manuals and sermons, in fact, warn that a woman's worth was linked to her chastity, a worth which could be lost or diminished due to real or, in the case of Shakespeare's Hero, perceived sexual indiscretion. Juan Luis Vives's cautionary treatise is illustrative. As he cautions in his *Instruction of a Christian Woman* (1524),

> You will not easily find an evil woman unless she be one who is ignorant of or at any rate gives no thought to the importance of the virtue of chastity. She is unaware of the evil she commits if she loses it, not considering the blessing she exchanges for a base, empty, and momentary illusion of pleasure and what a train of evils she ushers in with the loss of chastity. She does not consider how empty and senseless a thing physical pleasure is and that one should not even lift a finger for its sake, let alone cast away woman's most beautiful and priceless possession.[16]

While Vives equates chastity with moral integrity, he likewise quantifies it as a "priceless possession," one which, by implication, could be used as a bargaining point. Moreover, the reputation of a woman damaged through sexual impropriety could also interfere with the overall economic system. Laura Gowing notes that while "for both men and women . . . credit [or the ability to transact within the marketplace] was measured through a combination of factors . . . For women, that combination was filtered through the lens of sexual honesty . . . Whatever made a good reputation, sexual discredit could threaten it."[17] Indeed, Craig Muldrew observes that, because reputation and economics were linked in early modern England, "making a distinction between economically rational transactions and other social transactions, such as courtship, sex, patronage or parenthood, does not make sense."[18] If, as Anthony Fletcher has argued, early modern "women were seen as possessing a powerful and potentially destructive sexuality which made them naturally lascivious predators,"[19] women, like fruit, proved a most dangerous, if desirable, commodity, indeed.

Shame, a kind of spoilage, proved the mechanism by which to devalue women within the marriage marketplace in early modern England. Ewan Fernie has argued that "shame constitutes an unwelcome revelation of the self . . . The subject of shame may be ashamed of itself directly or because of others upon whom its honour depends: the closer the connection, the greater the shame here; the disgrace of one's own parent, spouse or child is especially grievous. The subject may feel shame as part of a group. Or it may feel shame vicariously, on the part of another or of others."[20] It is important to consider, however, that *to shame*, in other words, to judge the moral integrity of another, is qualifiedly different than *to feel* shame, although the two may share some connections. Indeed, *to shame* constitutes a disciplinary action taken against one guilty of some kind of moral indiscretion. Fernie further argues, "It is precisely because shame is so private, so intimate a sensation, because the shamed self is *literally not fit to be seen,* that it recoils from exposure."[21] I would suggest, however, that shame always, to some extent, argues public judgment. There is no shame, in other words, unless there is at least the threat of public exposure. And it is this public judgment which ultimately functions as a moral corrective to force the offending individual to conform to accepted community standards.

Despite her ostensible absence from the public arena, an early modern woman's reputation had far reaching implications due primarily to the fact that shame, as Fernie further remarks, was "a largely male affair."[22] S. P. Cerasano observes that "a woman's reputation belonged to her male superior, who owned her and to whom she could bring honour or disgrace. In so far as a woman was 'renamed' when she was slandered and her identity thus altered, her husband lost his good name and was rechristened with abuse—slandered by association."[23] A woman's shame, in other words, constituted household shame, and fathers and husbands necessarily shared in its negative consequences. Not only was a man's good name at stake, but the economic viability of the household as a whole was threatened. Indeed, without good reputation, a household could not easily obtain the credit it needed to purchase basic necessities within the marketplace. Craig Muldrew, in *The*

Economy of Obligation, observes that "because much buying and selling was done by wives, servants and apprentices, the honesty, fidelity and modesty of a wife, and the honesty and diligence of servants, all contributed to the credit or reputation of a family."[24] As Thomas Wilson notes in his 1560 *The Art of Rhetorique*, "A good name is better than all the goodes in the world. . .the losse of money maye be recovered, but the losse of mannes good name, can not be called back againe."[25] In the case of unmarried daughters, good reputation proved key not only to fathers, for whom unblemished family names proved crucial to the arrangement of marital alliances, but to potential grooms, whose future credit potential could well hinge on the unsullied reputations of their wives. Shame, in short, proved damaging not only to individual and family reputation, but to a community's overall economic viability.

Shakespeare's *Much Ado about Nothing* offers important insight into the economics of shame in early modern England. Not only is woman treated as commodity within Messina's marriage exchange, but her value noticeably fluctuates according to assessments of sexual integrity. Claudio's first mention of Hero, in fact, addresses her moral state. His query, "Is she not a modest young lady?" (1.1.133), proves less a question than an observation. Judging from all outward appearances, the blushing Hero appears virginal and duly obedient: a virtual prize within the marriage exchange. Benedick's decidedly cynical, "Would you buy her, that enquire after her?" (1.1.145), in some respect reflects our own bewilderment that Hero could be represented as an object. Claudio's response, "Can the world buy such a jewel?" (1.1.146), however, proves less an objection to Benedick's crass comment than to an appraisal of her worth. Hero's commodity status is underscored a short time later, when Claudio inquires of Don Pedro, "Hath Leonato any son, my lord?" (1.1.242). While it may be argued that he likewise sees her as "the sweetest lady that ever I looked on" (1.1.151-152), Hero's desirability as marriage partner is nonetheless linked to her economic as well as moral valuation. She becomes, in essence, part and parcel of Leonato's estate, her status as sole heir proof that she is worth acquiring.

While Hero's consent is ostensibly necessary to the completion of the proposed matrimonial exchange, such consent does not, I would argue, negate her object status. Indeed, it becomes readily apparent that consent proves pro forma within the early modern world of the play. When Leonato is erroneously informed that Don Pedro means to woo his daughter, this father instructs, "Daughter, remember what I told you. If the Prince do solicit you in that kind, you know your answer" (2.1.55-56). Once Hero has been judged worthy in both a moral and an economic sense, a negotiated transaction between buyer and seller commences; her consent is understood. Writing about sexual and family politics, Harry Berger, Jr., observed, "They are not only prizes of war, but also commodities in the marriage market. Daughters are ducats."[26] Hero becomes, in essence, the precious fruit Claudio happens upon within the marketplace, one which through a process of bartering he hopes to obtain.

The problem, of course, is that like the fruit that Claudio will later reject, women within the play prove an unknown, and thus dangerous commodity. Perhaps nowhere is this uncertainty better expressed than in Benedick's early assessment that all women are by nature dangerous. Though beautiful on the outside, their trustworthiness ultimately proves unknowable. As he concludes,

> That a woman conceived me, I thank her. That she brought me up, I likewise give her most humble thanks. But that I will have a recheat winded in my forehead, or hang my bugle in an invisible baldric, all women shall pardon me. Because I will not do them the wrong to mistrust any, I will do myself the right to trust none. And the fine is—for the which I may go the finer—I will live a bachelor. (1.1.195-201)

That Benedick's mistrust focuses on fear of women's sexual fidelity proves interesting in light of Claudio's own later refusal to receive the defamed Hero. Yet, as has been well established, the fear of cuckoldry was a cultural one in early modern England. Benedick's irrational "rationality" sounds a bit like the physician's advice given to early modern consumers regarding the consumption of raw fruit. It dictates that this reluctant lover avoid women altogether rather than confront the dangers of the unknown.

Interestingly enough, even before the infamous altar scene, Claudio will likewise express Benedick's poisonous concern over a woman's fidelity. Although, he knows of Don Pedro's plan to woo on his friend's behalf, he yields easily to Don John's suggestion that the Prince means to claim Hero for himself. As Claudio bitterly declares,

> Let every eye negotiate for itself,
> And trust no agent; for beauty is a witch
> Against whose charms faith melteth into blood.
> This is an accident of hourly proof,
> Which I mistrusted not. Farewell, therefore, Hero.
> (2.1.156-60)

While it is Don Pedro who purportedly betrays his friend in wooing Claudio's intended for himself, this wounded would-be lover instead attacks Hero. Not that Claudio has any reason to mistrust the woman he only too recently called a "modest young lady" (1.1.133). It is, however, Don Pedro who becomes the victim of Hero's ensnaring sexuality. If men stray, according to Claudio's skewed logic, surely women are to blame. However alluring they may be, they ultimately prove a most dangerous commodity.

It is, of course, at the altar that we confront perhaps the fullest expression of the early modern commoditization of women as well as its most devastating consequences. When asked by the friar whether he will complete the bargain negotiated during Leonato's masquerade, Claudio angrily rejects Hero, insisting,

> There, Leonato, take her back again.
> Give not this rotten orange to your friend.
> She's but the sign and semblance of her honour.
> Behold how like a maid she blushes here!
> O, what authority and show of truth
> Can cunning sin cover itself withal! (4.1.29-34)

Interestingly enough, Claudio's charge of "cunning sin" is delivered through the language of commodity exchange. Hero is the unblemished orange found to be rotten following the initial point of sale. Although she appears pristine and beautiful on the outside, such an exterior merely masks a corrupt interior. Even the setting of this encounter possesses a marketplace feel. Although the attempted exchange takes place at the church door, it is likewise a highly public setting, one where this as well as other commodity exchanges occur. Needless to say, Leonato has been reduced to the role of dishonest vendor, hawking damaged goods to a buyer outraged not only by the poor quality of the merchandise, but the seller's apparently overt deception as well.

Claudio's public shaming is intended to restore, if at all possible, a reputation damaged through association. Although Hero is the shamed one, Claudio has been duped: his apparent inability to discern a pure woman from a virtual wanton, publicly exposed. He declares,

> You seem to me as Dian in her orb,
> As chaste as is the bud ere it be blown.
> But you are more intemperate in your blood
> Than Venus or those pampered animals
> That rage in savage sensuality. (4.1.55-59)

As Fernie has observed, "The woman exchanged between father and groom should be ripe and wholesome, whereas Hero is a . . . corrupt thing dishonouring [her] possessor."[27] This guilt by association is, of course, the reason why Leonato will likewise cruelly reject his own daughter, exclaiming,

> Why had I not with charitable hand
> Took up a beggar's issue at my gates,
> Who smirchèd thus and mired with infamy,
> I might have said "No part of it is mine,
> This shame derives itself from unknown loins." (4.1.130-34)

Hero's shame is a father's shame; it is that of a would-be husband, and even of the matchmaker who seals the deal. Shame is, in fact, collective, touching all who negotiated this marital alliance. It matters not that Hero is a victim of slander at the hands of a scheming bastard. In the early modern world of the play, this spoiled commodity ultimately taints all involved in the failed exchange.

From an early modern perspective, marriage functioned as a moral preservative against the inherent dangers of the flesh. Marriage in this early modern text likewise proves the solution to the collective shame that threatens the well-being of Messina. The problem, of course, proves how to reconstitute the unsullied Hero, to "render her again" (4.1.27) as the pristine figure Claudio once found too irresistible to pass by. The friar's solution, however disconcerting, functions as a means by which to restore Hero to her unblemished state. She must, in essence, "die" to be "reborn" as the unsullied Hero worthy of a father's and a husband's love. And, if her "rebirth" serves to reconstitute a flesh spoiled through public shaming, then marriage functions as a moral preservative, to make safe that made whole again.

Notes

1. William Shakespeare, *Much Ado about Nothing,* in *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition,* ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997), 1389-1443. All in-text citations refer to this edition.

2. For example, Gayle Rubin, "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex," in *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, ed. Rayna R. Reiter (New York: Monthly Press Review, 1975), 157-210.

3. Gervase Markham, *The English Housewife*, ed. Michael R. Best (1615; Kingston, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1986), 81.

4. Michael R. Best, introduction to *The English Housewife,* by Gervase Markham (1615; Kingston, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1986), xxxvii.

5. Markham, *The English Housewife*, 121.

6. Best, introduction to *The English Housewife*, xxxvii.

7. Ken Albala, *The Banquet: Dining in the Great Courts of Late Renaissance Europe* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2007), 83.

8. Joan Fitzpatrick, *Food in Shakespeare: Early Modern Dietaries and the Plays* (Hants, UK: Ashgate, 2007), 4.

9. Thomas Elyot, *The Castell of Health, Corrected, and in Some Places Augmented by the First Author Thereof* (London, 1595), 60. Quoted in Fitzpatrick, *Food in Shakespeare.*

10. Thomas Venner, *Via Recta Ad Vitam Longam* (1650), cited in Best, xxxv-vi.

11. Albala, *The Banquet*, 82-83.

12. Ibid., 83.

13. B. J. Sokol and Mary Sokol, *Shakespeare, Law, and Marriage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 30.

14. Keith Wrightson, *Earthly Necessities: Economic Lives in Early Modern Britain* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 60-61.

15. Amy Louise Erickson, *Women and Property in Early Modern England* (London: Routledge, 1993), 95.

16. Juan Luis Vives, *Education of a Christian Woman*, ed. and trans. by Charles Fantazzi (1524; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 64-65.

17. Laura Gowing, *Domestic Dangers: Women, Words, and Sex in Early Modern London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 129.

18. Craig Muldrew, *The Economy of Obligation: The Culture of Credit and Social Relations in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave, 1998), 149.

19. Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500-1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 5.

20. Ewan Fernie, *Shame in Shakespeare* (London: Routledge, 2002), 10.

21. Ibid., 16.

22. Ibid., 86.

23. S. P. Cerasano, "Half a Dozen Dangerous Words," in *Gloriana's Face: Women, Public and Private in the English Renaissance*, ed. S. P. Cerasano (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992), 37.

24. Muldrew, *The Economy of Obligation*, 158.

25. Thomas Wilson, *The Art of Rhetorique*, ed. Thomas J. Derrick (1560; New York: Garland Press, 1982), 255.

26. Harry Berger, Jr., "Against the Sink-a-Pace: Sexual and Family Politics *in Much Ado about Nothing*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 33 (1982): 302-13.

27. Fernie, *Shame in Shakespeare*, 86.

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 subservience 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.

"A Thousand Marks": Language and Comic Violence In *The Comedy Of Errors* and Shakespeare's Plautus

Eric Dodson-Robinson
The University Of Texas At Austin

Violence is one of the few pervasive characteristics of human culture. What is more, the connection between violence and laughter—taking pleasure in the suffering of others—is almost equally pervasive. At the dawn of the Western literary tradition, Homer tells how the Achaeans "laugh merrily"[1] when Odysseus beats his comrade, Thersites, at an assembly. In Western drama, Old Comedy abounds in examples of comic violence on stage.[2] Comic violence is also a recurring motif in the comedies of Titus Maccius Plautus, written for a Roman audience in the third century before the common era.[3]

It is well known that *The Comedy of Errors* combines and transforms elements of two of Plautus's plays: *Menaechmi* and *Amphitryo*.[4] Although comic violence in Plautus has received attention from classicists such as Erich Segal and Holt Parker, neither Wolfgang Riehle's work, *Shakespeare, Plautus, and the Humanist Tradition*, nor Robert Miola's book, *Shakespeare and Classical Comedy*, makes study of comic violence, and to my knowledge there has been no comparative treatment of comic violence in Plautus and Shakespeare's *Comedy of Errors*. This paper will compare the language of comic violence in *Comedy of Errors* with that in Plautus's *Amphitryo* and *Menaechmi*, and argue that while the language of comic violence in Plautus focuses on the body and the physically grotesque, metaphors pertaining to comic violence in *The Comedy of Errors* consistently compare the abuse of the body with money and debt. Barbara Freedman argues that *The Comedy of Errors* is "obsessed with confronting, punishing, and forgiving debts,"[5] yet Freedman does not discuss comic violence or its relation to the play's thematic emphasis on debt and redemption. The metaphors of comic violence in *Comedy of Errors* relate both to spiritual and to mundane problems of credit, debt, and usury faced by Shakespeare's contemporaries in the 1590s.

In a Freudian reading of comic violence in Plautus, whose servile characters are often threatened with crucifixion, Holt Parker writes, "Crucifixion jokes . . . confirm the Roman audience in its sense of superiority and power. They serve to remind the audience of the servile nature of the characters, as well as the actors who perform them, and of the absolute and everyday nature of the power that the audience wields over them."[6]

It is worth adding that in the Plautine plays, the language of comic violence focuses, in a grotesque and exaggerated way, on the body and the physical.

In *Menaechmi*, for example, hyperbolic threats of physical violence are frequent. The plot turns on a case of mistaken identities: twin brothers, Menaechmus and Sosicles, travel with their father to Tarentum, where Menaechmus becomes lost. He is adopted and raised by a merchant of Epidamnus, while Sosicles's grieving parents rename him Menaechmus in memory of the missing boy. Having grown to adulthood, Sosicles goes in search of his long-lost twin. After he arrives in Epidamnus, several comic encounters follow between Sosicles and the mistress, wife, and father-in-law of Menaechmus, who all mistake Sosicles for his brother. At one point in the play Sosicles, who is beset by Menaechmus's wife and father-in-law because Menaechmus has stolen his wife's dress, pretends to be insane to frighten them off: "Behold! The word of Apollo commands me to burn her eyes out with torches blazing."[7]

"I'm done for, Daddy!" the wife of Menaechmus says. "He's threatening to barbecue my eyeballs!"[8] Sosicles orders the woman to avoid his sight. His threat simultaneously transforms, makes literal, and exaggerates his wish in a grotesque way: If she will not leave his sight, he will burn her eyes out. Sosicles's threats to the woman's father are equally physical and exaggerated: "So, you command me to make mincemeat of his members and bones and limbs,"[9] he says. Sosicles threatens to thoroughly pulverize the old man. He insults the father by mocking him as aged and decrepit, and threatens to pulverize the father-in-law's limbs with the walking-stick—a prop which identifies the father to the audience as a *senex*, or old man.[10] This is verbal cartoon violence that emphasizes the corporeal.

Later in the play, in another episode of comic violence onstage, the father-in-law sends a gang of slaves to subdue Menaechmus, whom the father-in-law believes to be insane and in need of a doctor because of Sosicles's violent behavior. When the quack doctor and the gang of slaves attempt to abduct Menaechmus, he calls out for help. Sosicles's slave, Messenio, who happens to be close by, mistakes Menaechmus for his own master, and runs to Menaechmus's rescue. In the ensuing melee, the gang of slaves gets the worst of it:

> *Messenio:* Gouge out his eye, Master—that one that's got you by the arm. I'll sow the seeds of a sound beating on *these* faces. You won't move him without a major mauling: let him go!
> *Menaechmus:* I have this one's eyeball.
> *Messenio:* Make a peep-hole in his head.[11]

In this play, the language of comic violence is brutal and physical, yet also comically overblown.

The Roman economy depended on slave labor, and required a large population of slaves. As Holt Parker has argued, the Romans feared violence at the hands of their slaves, who revolted on more than one occasion. The scene in *Menaechmi*, in which a free citizen attacked by a gang of slaves violently defends himself, touches on Roman anxieties about their social order and on fantasies of securing personal safety through violent reprisals against rebellious the slaves. Such violent reprisals included mass public crucifixions and the summary execution of all slaves in a household if one slave killed his master.

Threats of violence against old men in Plautus, Parker argues, reflect fears of paternal authority. The *senex* or old man, was a stock character in Roman drama who is almost invariably what the wife of Menaechmus says. calls an a*gelast*, or "blocking character," who attempts to thwart the fun of the amorous adolescents and their clever slaves. According to Roman law, the *pater familias* or patriarch had power of life and death over all members of his family.

The language of comic violence is similarly physical, brutal, and absurd in *Amphitryo*, which, like *Menaechmi*, is a comedy of mistaken identities. The play dramatizes Zeus's seduction of Alcmena. Because Alcmena is steadfastly faithful to Amphitryo, Zeus takes Amphitryo's form and deceives Alcmena into sleeping with him while her husband is away. Zeus stations Mercury, who is disguised as a slave named Sosia, to guard the door. When Amphitryo returns to Thebes and sends the real Sosia from the harbor to the house to announce their return, Mercury denies him entry, insists that he is the true Sosia, and threatens to beat the slave if he does not go away. Mercury tells his fists, "You filet every face you break."[12] In an aside to the audience, Sosia says, "He wants to filet me like an eel."[13] The metaphor makes Sosia's face—the unique features that identify him—a piece of meat, emphasizing the fragility of the slave's identity. When Sosia explains to Amphitryo what happened at the house, Amphitryo takes him for a liar and threatens to cut his tongue out.[14] Amphitryo's threat of violence is particularly dehumanizing because, if carried out, it would permanently deprive Sosia of speech.

Amphitryo and Mercury both threaten Sosia with violence that would destroy fundamental features of his identity: his speech and his face. Just as Amphitryo would destroy Sosia's capacity for human speech if he were to cut out his tongue, Mercury would transform Sosia from a human being into a butchered animal. The parallel between the two scenes emphasizes the absolute power masters hold over their slaves in ancient Rome by comparing it with that which a god such as Mercury wields over mortals. The slave, by virtue of the fact that he is subject to such threats, has no identity, but is merely a piece of property. In Plautus, violence and the threat of violence are grotesque reminders of real violence inscribed within the social order of Rome.

In *The Comedy of Errors*, the language of physical violence is witty rather than grotesque, and one of its recurring motifs is the comparison of violence with debt and money. An episode of slapstick violence and accompanying banter occurs in the second scene of act 1. Antipholus of Syracuse has given one thousand marks to Dromio of Syracuse, with instructions that he take it to an inn called the Centaur and see that it be kept safe. When Antipholus of Syracuse meets Dromio of Ephesus, he takes him for his own Dromio: "Where is the thousand marks thou hadst of me?" Antipholus of Syracuse demands (1.2.81).[15] Dromio says,

> I have some marks of yours upon my pate,
> Some of my mistress' marks upon my shoulders,
> But not a thousand marks between you both.
> If I should pay your worship those again,
> Perchance you will not bear them patiently. (1.2.82-86)

The comic misunderstanding continues, and Antipholus strikes Dromio. So in this scene, Dromio of Ephesus puns on the word *mark*, which can mean both "a bruise" and "a standard unit of currency equal to two thirds of a pound." Dromio's answer is simultaneously a complaint and a veiled threat. His message to Antipholus is, you've lent me a number of blows: do you want me to make you a fair return?[16] The pun associates blows with currency, and comic violence with the creditor / debtor relationship: Dromio owes his master a beating.

Dromio also puns on the word *bear* in line 86, which emphasizes the ambiguity between currency and blows. *Bear* can be understood to mean "to carry," if Dromio is speaking of currency, or "to suffer or endure," if he is speaking of a beating. Dromio's words also have a potential religious significance, in that they suggest not only patiently bearing the oppressor's wrong—or turning the other cheek—but also Christ's patiently bearing the cross. Given the performance context of the play on Holy Innocents' Day of December 28, 1594 and 1604, and the comedy's Christian references, which Arthur F. Kinney calls, "consistent (and overt),"[17] such associations are thematically relevant and would have come easily to mind for early modern audiences.[18]

Another incident of comic violence occurs in act 2, scene 1, when Antipholus of Syracuse beats Dromio of Syracuse after Dromio denies that he denied attending to the gold. Dromio of Syracuse says, "Now your jest is earnest! / Upon what bargain do you give it me?" (2.1.21-25). The pun this time plays on the ambiguous meanings of *earnest* and *bargain*.[19] *Earnest* money is a payment made to demonstrate good faith of completing a transaction or *bargain*.

The play repeatedly connects comic and tragicomic violence with money and debt. Angelo the goldsmith owes a debt of money to the Second Merchant, who confronts Angelo in the first scene of act 4. Angelo must either pay the debt or be arrested. Yet Antipholus of Ephesus owes Angelo for the gold chain, which Angelo mistakenly gave to Antipholus of Syracuse in act 3, scene 2. In other words, there is a "chain" of debt. Shakespeare verbally associates the golden chain with a rope used for beating. In act 3, scene 1, Antipholus of Ephesus, enraged that his wife has locked him out, sends Angelo for the golden chain. "That chain will I bestow / Be it for nothing but to spite my wife— / Upon mine hostess there" (3.1.118-20). In act 4, scene 1, Antipholus of Ephesus uses similar language about the rope with which he intends to beat his wife: "Buy a rope's end,"[24] he tells Dromio; "That will I bestow / Among my wife and her confederates / For locking me out of my doors by day" (4.1.16-18). Not only is the diction almost identical—"That chain will I bestow" (3.1.118) versus "That will I bestow" (4.1.16), but both phrases occur at the same metrical position, at line's end. Antipholus of Ephesus plans to "bestow" a rope—in other words a beating—in place of the golden chain.

This metaphor, which compares violence with giving, emphasizes the contrast between the two. Antipholus of Ephesus feels that he owes his wife a beating rather than a gift.

An implicit contrast appears here between gift and debt, which receives explicit emphasis later in the play. The beating rope is consistently associated with debt and money. Dromio of Ephesus compares the rope with currency in a pecuniary pun: "I buy a thousand pound a year, I buy a rope," he says (4.1.21). Here *pound* means both "a unit of currency" and "a blow." When Antipholus of Ephesus is arrested for his debt to Angelo, he sends Dromio of Syracuse to bring his bail (4.1.102-108). Yet it is the other Dromio, of course, who returns with the rope: "Here comes my man. I think he brings the money.— / How now, sir? Have you that I sent you for?" Antipholus of Ephesus says (4.4.8-9). "Here's that, I warrant you, will pay them all," Dromio answers (4.4.10), and gives him the rope, which Antipholus then uses to soundly beat Dromio. The rope is an instrument of violence associated with money and with debt and redemption.

Debt was a pressing problem—social, legal, and religious—in early modern England. Norman Jones writes, "The parameters of the credit market are hard to define, but, taking our cue from contemporaries, we can safely say that 'everyone' was involved in it. In 1570 Richard Porter defined it as a universal vice '[N]ot only money men, Merchant men, and Citizens, be usurers,' he wrote, 'but also Noblemen, Courtiers, Gentlemen, . . . Plowmen and Artificers, yea, I would the clergie were free.'"[20]

In fact, Robert Bearman has shown that Shakespeare's father, John, was himself in debt.[21] A writ of *distringas* was issued against him, but he had nothing of which he could be distrained, and in January 1587 he was actually arrested for the debt of his brother.[22] Shakespeare's father was also prosecuted twice for charging high interest.[23] The involvement of Shakespeare's father on both sides of the diffuse and murky credit market as both lender and borrower was probably not atypical. Marjorie McIntosh documents a similar pattern among people of substantial and of meager means during the late sixteenth century.[24] Joseph Matthews recounts that 13 Elizabeth, section 2, repealed 5 and 6 Edward VI, chapter 10, which had "completely outlawed any loan at interest,"[25] and re-enacted 37 Henry VIII, chapter 9, which, Matthews writes, "had been construed to give a license and sanction to all usury not exceeding 10 per cent."[26] In other words, 13 Elizabeth, section 2, reversed her brother's previous absolute prohibition of usury by allowing loans at interest rates up to 10 per cent.

The need for credit at higher rates, though, resulted in a pervasive under-the-table economy of shady deals contracted between small-time creditors and debtors. Norman Jones describes in detail some of the various ways of making such deals appear legal and of making them contractual. For example, usurers would advance cash to borrowers and receive in turn a bond that the lender would deliver commodities or merchandise that could then be sold for more than the amount of the loan.[27] Because the transactions were technically legal, those who could not pay their debts could be sued and distrained of their property. Those dispossessed of their property could become homeless, and vagrancy in early modern England was a crime punishable by whipping, by mutilation, or even by execution for repeat offenses, as Judith Koffler documents.[28] There is, then, a connection in late sixteenth-century law, which is both symbolic and real, between debt and violence, a connection evoked by the association of comic violence with money and credit in *The Comedy of Errors*.

The metaphor of violence as financial transaction, which is bilateral or reciprocal, emphasizes fantasies and anxieties about the opportunities and risks afforded by the rapidly changing early modern economy. Such risks and opportunities made the formerly inflexible social hierarchy increasingly labile. The rhetoric against usury in the late sixteenth century was particularly concerned with the downfall of members of the upper classes who ruined their fortunes by incurring excessive debts to the rising merchant class. In *Comedy of Errors*, Antipholus of Ephesus is, in Angelo's words, "of credit infinite" (5.1.5), yet finds himself violently "bound": arrested in the street for debt and tied up by Pinch and his assistants at his wife's orders. Dromio of Ephesus verbally calls attention to the double meaning of *bond*: "Master, I am here entered in bond for you" (4.4.126). A rope is again associated with debt, or a bond, and with the literal binding of Antipholus and Dromio. Dromio later makes a similar pun on his social position as "bondman" in the concluding act of the play (5.1.289-91).

Credit, debt, and usury were questions of both practical and spiritual concern in early modern England. In addition to decrying the ruinous financial consequences of borrowing at interest, a vast discourse condemned the immorality of usury and prescribed the principles of Christian charity that should govern lending. Mark Valeri writes,

> Preaching to Puritan immigrants as they prepared to depart England for Massachusetts Bay in 1630, John Winthrop labored to define the difference between a godly society

> and the one they were about to leave in England. . . . How were the godly to achieve the solidarity required by the law of love when God had embedded hierarchies of wealth and poverty in the order of creation itself? His answer was specific. The 'duty of mercy,' he instructed the immigrants, was 'exercised' in 'Giving' one's material possessions to those of lesser means, in 'lending' goods or money to those in need, and in 'forgiving' the debts of others.[29]

Winthrop's argument presents three components, each of which has a structural analogue in *The Comedy of Errors*: the gift, the loan, and forgiveness. Winthrop's discourse builds upon and reinterprets the extensive Western critique of usury, a tradition which extends through Thomas Aquinas back to Aristotle.[30] The early modern condemnation of usury was pervasive. Valeri notes, "Anti-usury moralists from staunch Puritans such as Miles Mosse and John Blaxton to moderate Anglicans such as Roger Fenton and secular theorists such as Thomas Wilson appropriated Calvin as an authority for their position."[31] He argues, "They feared that disregard for customary restraints on prices, wages, and the use of loans would elevate the individual over the body social and set loose the most vicious of human instincts."[32]

The association of violence with debt in *The Comedy of Errors* takes on religious significance in the context of the anti-usury discourse and of the play's tragicomic frame: Egeon, the father of the Antipholi, is bound by Solinus, the Duke of Ephesus, for execution if he does not pay the one thousand marks ransom. Yet, at the conclusion of the comedy, the Duke forgives Egeon's debt: it is the *anagnorisis*, the recognition of supposed enemy as kin, that delivers Egeon. While the Christian themes of the scene have surely been noted, we should also take notice of the programmatic contrast the play draws between the forgiveness of debt and the social violence of debt—which, this comedy suggests, has its roots in failing to recognize kinship with one's fellow human beings.

Notes

1. "*Þäù ãÝëáóóáí*," *Iliad*, 2.270. Unless noted otherwise, all translations are my own.

2. For example, in Aristophanes' comedies when Pisthetaeros beats Meton in *The Birds*; the old man beats the boy in *The Wasps*; the old women repulse the old men's raid on the Acropolis in *Lysistrata*, and so forth.

3. In addition to the examples discussed below, the infamous Ballio of the *Pseudolus* rules his slaves with an iron fist.

4. See for example Robert Miola, *Shakespeare and Classical Comedy: The Influence of Plautus and Terence* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 21; Wolfgang Riehle,

Shakespeare, Plautus, and the Humanist Tradition (Rochester, New York: D.S. Brewer, 1990), 2, 4; David Bevington, "*The Comedy of Errors* as Early Experimental Shakespeare," *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 56, no. 3 (2003): 19; Louise George Clubb, "Italian Comedy and *The Comedy of Errors*," *Comparative Literature* 19, no. 3 (1967): 242; Thomas W. MacCary, "The Comedy of Errors: A Different Kind of Comedy," *New Literary History* 9, no. 3 (1978): 525-27; Erma Gill, "A Comparison of the Characters in *The Comedy of Errors* with Those in the *Menaechmi*," *Texas U Studies in English* 5 (1925); Erma Gill, "The Plot Structure of *The Comedy of Errors* in Relation to Its Sources," *Texas U Studies in English* 10 (1930); and Thomas Whitfield Baldwin, *Shakespeare's Five-Act Structure* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1947), 605-718. For the elements of medieval romance in the comedy, see C.L. Barber, "Shakespearian Comedy in *The Comedy of Errors*," *College English* 25, no. 7 (1964): 496.

5. Barbara Freedman, "Reading Errantly: Misrecognition and the Uncanny in *The Comedy of Errors*," in *The Comedy of Errors*, ed. Robert Miola (London: Routledge, 2001), 276.

6. Holt Parker, "Crucially Funny or Tranio on the Couch: The Servus Callidus and Jokes about Torture," *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974—)* 119 (1989): 240.

7. Plautus, *Menaechmi* "*ecce, Apollo mi ex oraclo imperat, / ut ego illi oculos exuram lampadibus ardentibus*," 841-842. References refer to line numbers.

8. Ibid., 843. "*perii, mi pater, minatur mihi oculos exurere*."

9. Ibid., 855-856. "*ita mihi imperas ut ego huius membra atque ossa atque artua / comminuam illo scipione quem ipse habet*."

10. Riehle, *Shakespeare, Plautus, and the Humanist Tradition*, 113. Sosicles might have jumped up on the altar during this scene in his affected madness, according to Riehle's interpretation.

11. Plautus, *Menaechmi*, 1010-14.

Messenio.	*eripe oculum isti, ab umero qui tenet, ere, te obsecro.*
	hisce ego iam sementem in ore faciam pugnosque obseram.
	maximo hodie malo hercle vostro istunc fertis, mittite.
Menaechmus.	*teneo ego huic oculum.*
Messenio.	*face ut oculi locus in capite appareat.*

12. Plautus, *Amphitryo*, 315. "*exossatum os esse oportet quem probe percusseris*."

13. Ibid., 316. "*mirum ni hic me quasi murenam exossare cogitat*."

14. Ibid., 556-57. "*quid est? quo modo? Iam quidem hercle ego tibi istam / scelestam, scelus, linguam abscidam*."

15. William Shakespeare, *The Comedy of Errors*, in *The Norton Shakespeare,* ed. Stanley Wells, Gary Taylor, John Jowett, and William Montgomery (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988). In-text references are to act, scene, and line.

16. Also see act 3, scene 1, line 15 and following, where Dromio threatens to kick Antipholus like an ass.

17. Arthur F. Kinney, "Shakespeare's *Comedy of Errors* and the Nature of Kinds," *Studies in Philology* 85, no. 1 (1988): 31.

18. Also see Robert Miola, ed., *The Comedy of Errors* (London: Routledge, 2001), 10, on the Bible as a source for Shakespeare's *The Comedy of Errors*.

19. Riehle, *Shakespeare, Plautus, and the Humanist Tradition*, 148. Riehle's extensive work on Shakespeare's reception of Plautus does not treat comic violence, but he does mention the scene in a discussion of puns: "Dromio tries to explain to himself the situation he is in and thus produces highly intellectual comedy."

20. Norman L. Jones, *God and the Moneylenders: Usury and the Law in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989), 67.

21. Robert Bearman, "Shakespeare: A Papist, or Just Penniless?" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 56, no. 4 (2005): 417-419.

22. Ibid., 419.

23. Donna Kish-Goodling, "Using *The Merchant of Venice* in Teaching Monetary Economics," *The Journal of Economic Education* 29, no. 4 (1998): 337.

24. Marjorie K. McIntosh, "Money Lending on the Periphery of London, 1300-1600," *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 20, no. 4 (1988): 567-70.

25. Joseph Matthews, *The Law of Moneylending, Past and Present* (London: Sweet & Maxwell, 1906), 15.

26. Ibid., 15-16. Also see Jones, *God and the Moneylenders*, 47-65, for a detailed history of sixteenth-century temporal statutes regarding usury.

27. Jones, *God and the Moneylenders*, 72-75.

28. Judith S. Koffler "Terror and Mutilation in the Golden Age," *Human Rights Quarterly* 5, no. 2 (1983): 126.

29. Mark Valeri, "Religious Discipline and the Market: Puritans and the Issue of Usury," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Series, 54, no. 4 (1997): 747.

30. John Draper, "Usury in *The Merchant of Venice*," *Modern Philology* 33, no. 1 (1935): 42; Marc Shell, "The Wether and the Ewe: Verbal Usury in *The Merchant of Venice*," *The Kenyon Review*, New Series, 1, no. 4 (1979): 67.

31. Valeri, "Religious Discipline and the Market," 747.

32. Ibid., 752.

Figuring the King in *Henry V*: Political Rhetoric and the Limits of Performance

Peter Parolin
University of Wyoming

It seems somewhat perverse to use *Henry V* to talk about the limitations of rhetoric when the play is substantially about the way the heroic English king uses rhetoric to fashion an unforgettable image of himself and the nation-building enterprise on which he is embarked. But while the play does chronicle Henry's military victories in France, it ends with a vision of his death and the squandering of his legacy. It is surely worth considering that if rhetoric was a major source of Henry's strength, it might also contain the seeds of his undoing. Rhetoric is the vehicle by which Henry V establishes himself as an irresistible king, but it is also the vehicle that enmeshes him in contradiction, in the condition of loss, and in the messiness of collaboration, where other points of view complicate his self-presentation.

My starting point is the Chorus to act 5, which indirectly raises ideas about rhetoric circulating in Shakespeare's culture. The Chorus breaks the historical frame and explicitly refers to the Earl of Essex's military expedition to Ireland. Essex's expedition lasted through the late spring and summer of 1599, the exact time, it seems, that Shakespeare was writing this play. The act 5 Chorus is the holy grail for historicist scholars, the one indisputable place where Shakespeare unequivocally refers to a contemporary political event. It is a celebratory passage, comparing Henry V not only to Essex, but also to Julius Caesar, and endowing all three figures with military greatness. Here is the Chorus describing Henry's welcome home from his victory in France:

> How London doth pour out her citizens.
> The Mayor and all his brethren, in best sort,
> Like to the senators of th'antique Rome
> With the plebeians swarming at their heels,

> Go forth and fetch their conqu'ring Caesar in—
> As, by a lower but high-loving likelihood,
> Were now the General of our gracious Empress—
> As in good time he may—from Ireland coming,
> Bringing rebellion broached on his sword,
> How many would the peaceful city quit
> To welcome him![1]

Celebratory as it may be, this passage turns out to be anything but clear. Through the two figures with whom Henry is linked, the Chorus evokes the specter of overweening ambition: Caesar's triumphs prompted speculation that he aspired to be king, which led to his assassination, chronicled in *Julius Caesar*, the play Shakespeare wrote immediately after *Henry V*. Essex, of course, engaged in rivalry and brinksmanship with the most powerful figures in the English court, up to and including the queen; his assignment to lead English forces in Ireland was both a reward and a curse to him, and it ended in a failure exceeded only by his later failed rebellion against the queen in February 1601. Although Shakespeare could not have known about the disastrous conclusion to Essex's career when he wrote *Henry V*, he did know about Essex's ambition. It is surely significant that at the height of Henry V's success, Shakespeare links his English hero king with two charismatic military figures whose victories paled in the face of questions about their personal ambitions.[2]

Thinking through some of the links connecting Henry, Essex, and Caesar, I was drawn to the issue of rhetoric because all three of these figures pursued their ambitions through rhetorical performance; in all three cases, their ascendancy, while guaranteed by military conquest, depended heavily on rhetoric. Given the heights all three figures reached, one aspect of rhetoric that merits scrutiny is the possibility that the skilled rhetor can use language to approximate the condition of a god.[3] I want to examine the political implications of rhetoric that promises to make men like gods, to lift them beyond the ordinary sphere, perhaps to lift them beyond their proper sphere. The topic of rhetoric has great cultural and theoretical potential and it also has a rich theatrical immediacy: in a play like *Henry V* that features so many rhetorical flights, we can test anything we say about rhetoric against how it plays in the theater; also, any director of the play and actor of the part need to confront the question of Henry's relationship to rhetoric and what it means in terms of his political, ethical, and theatrical status.

Elizabethans who wrote about rhetoric stressed its nearly limitless powers of transformation. In *The Garden of Eloquence*, Henry Peacham says that the orator's rhetorical skill makes him "in a manner the emperor of mens minds and affections, and next to the omnipotent God in the power of persuasion."[4] Like God, the skilled rhetor creates new realities, even if those new realities exist only in other people's minds. In *The Art of English Poesy*, George Puttenham suggests that rhetorical prowess is capable of pulling a poet "first from the cart and thence to school, and from thence to the court," where he can be preferred to the Queen's service;[5] in other words, rhetorical skill allows an individual poet to transform himself socially, raising himself from humble origins to the center of power. In both these quotations, rhetoric confers dizzying power: a gifted rhetorician can change men's minds and his own stature; he is like a god in his ability to alter the givens of reality.

While rhetoric holds exhilarating promise, it also raises concerns about social control. The powers of rhetoric challenge social categories designed to protect reality and confine individuals to culturally sanctioned roles. Trading in rhetoric, Shakespeare explores the danger of the skillful orator's ability to transcend prescribed categories. If we consider *Julius Caesar*, which Shakespeare was thinking about when he wrote *Henry V*, we might notice that the title character often refers to himself in the third person, thereby assuming a monumental status that dwarfs his fellow Romans and raises the possibility that he will become king. To the Soothsayer, Caesar says, "Speak. Caesar is turned to hear" (1.2.19); in the Senate, he asks "What is now amiss / That Caesar and his Senate must redress?" (3.1.31-2). And he refers to himself in superhuman terms: "I am constant as the Northern Star, / Of whose true fixed and resting quality / There is no fellow in the firmament" (3.1.60-2). Through his grandiose rhetoric, Caesar challenges the basic principle of shared political participation on which the Roman Republic depends. Although it is unclear in Shakespeare's play whether or not Caesar really wishes to become king, his explicit intentions are less important than his use of a sovereign rhetorical mode directly opposed to Rome's republican principles. Crucially, when Caesar refuses to go to the Senate on the Ides of March, he justifies his decision in terms of his sovereign will: "The cause is in my will; I will not come. / That is enough to satisfy the Senate" (2.2.71-72). This sovereign rhetoric explodes the categories designed to limit Caesar's or any Roman's political ascendancy and as such it presents an intolerable threat to Rome—Caesar literally gets killed for it.

In the case of the Earl of Essex, whom Shakespeare was also thinking about while writing *Henry V*, the link between rhetoric and the sovereign will was again a problem. In Elizabeth's England, the existence of a sovereign will *per se* was of course *not* a problem, although the appropriation of the sovereign's rhetorical position by someone other than the queen herself was cause for grave concern. One of the reasons the Earl of Essex got into trouble was that he aspired to a sovereign use of rhetoric, a mode in which he would be the ultimate authority, able to reprimand even the queen when she steered off course, as he often believed she did. On one such occasion, in the summer of 1598, Essex was enraged when Elizabeth rejected his advice about whom to appoint as Lord Deputy in Ireland; the earl responded by turning his back on the queen in the middle of their consultation; she in turn boxed his ear and sent him away. Trying to make peace between the two, the Lord Keeper Thomas Egerton wrote to Essex, specifically reminding him of the limits of his own position as subject, not sovereign: "Policy, duty, and religion, inforce you to sue, yield, and submit to your Sovereign, between whom and you there can be no proportion of duty."[6] Essex chafed at this advice, writing to Egerton, "What, cannot Princes err? Cannot subjects receive wrong? Is an earthly power or authority infinite? Pardon me, my good Lord, I can never subscribe to these principles."[7] Essex's dilemma was that as Elizabeth's subject, his proper rhetorical relation to the queen was one of subjection, yet he disdained having to forego the possibility of self-aggrandizement that an aggressive use of rhetoric could afford him. Thus the general Shakespeare celebrates so enthusiastically in *Henry V* was locked in an ongoing contest with the queen that, among other things, dealt with the appropriate rhetorical positions available to each of them.[8]

Like Caesar and Essex, Henry depends upon artful rhetoric to define himself; but their examples show the cultural anxiety swirling around rhetoric and its powers. Cultural ambivalence about rhetoric may account for why Henry puts such a major part of his rhetorical energy into disavowing rhetoric, in the same way that Antony in *Julius Caesar* engages in brilliant oratory even while insisting "I am no orator as Brutus is" (3.2.208). For Henry, the disavowal of rhetoric is not merely calculated modesty; it is also the strategy on which his long-term transformation to heroic king depends. What makes this character so attractive theatrically in the *Henry IV* plays, although so questionable politically, is the plenitude of his rhetoric. He congratulates himself on his facility at speaking the language of many different kinds of people: "I am so good a proficient in one quarter of an hour that I can drink with any tinker in his own language during my life" (*I Henry IV*, 2.4.15-17).

To mark his transformation into Henry V, though, this king disavows plenitude, the quality that defined his earlier self; he will no longer brag about his linguistic dexterity and play multiple roles, but rather will be "like himself," in the words of the Prologue. Paring down his language, he will make good on his promise in *Henry IV, Part I* to learn the language of the tavern dwellers only to reject it when the time is right: "I'll so offend to make offense a skill, / Redeeming time when men think least I will" (1.2.194-95). When it comes to redeeming time, Henry bides his time so that even at the end of *Henry IV, Part II*, his father still worries that his wild character unfits him to be king. Warwick soothes the dying king by repeating the narrative of the prince's imminent reformation, which he figures in terms of language:

> The Prince but studies his companions,
> Like a strange tongue, wherein, to gain the language,
> 'Tis needful that the most immodest word
> Be looked upon and learnt, which once attain'd,
> Your highness knows, comes to no further use
> But to be known and hated. (4.3.68-73)

The plan is a bold one: to reject linguistic fullness in favor of an uncontaminated kingly language. While Henry does emerge as a hero king in *Henry V*, he does not do it through paring down his language. The stated plan to purify his language is a red herring because the prince's transformation into Henry V requires every bit as skilled a rhetorical performance as did his self-presentation as the wayward heir to the throne. We should ask, then, how he pulls it off; how this skilled rhetor creates the impression of linguistic artlessness; and how he uses this impression to persuade his subjects to support him in a foreign war. When all is said and done, Henry V's greatest performance may lie not in his stirring set speeches, but rather in passing off those speeches as the blunt language of a warrior "for the working day" (4.3.110).

I will argue that even as Henry promotes himself through walking a rhetorical tightrope, there is something in the condition of rhetoric itself that brings him down—he is not brought down in the shocking manner of Caesar or Essex, to be sure, but as the final Chorus makes clear, Henry's legacy is disaster, both to his dynasty and to his country. The problem may lie in the fact that, fashioning himself rhetorically, Henry necessarily engages in performance—the verbal performance of self—and performance is always slippery and transient: it is glorious in the moment, but it cannot deliver the enduring heroic legacy that Henry craves.

If Caesar shapes his rhetorical self-presentation in the context of ideas about the inviolability of republican Rome, and if Essex shapes his rhetorical self-presentation in relation to the queen's sovereignty, Henry V shapes his rhetorical self-presentation in relation to a world in which his own primacy is in doubt, especially initially. Henry compensates for his vulnerable position by asserting the inexorability of his sovereign will. For example, he says, "France being ours we'll bend it to our awe, / Or break it all to pieces" (1.2.224-25): here Henry assumes the right to employ the royal *we*, assert possession, and threaten destruction. But despite claiming a position of unrivalled power, Henry strategically dilutes his sovereignty throughout the play by deferring scrupulously to God, much as Egerton advised Essex to defer to the Queen. Thus, before he declares his intention to invade France, Henry secures the support of his religious advisers, asking the Archbishop of Canterbury to "justly and religiously unfold" the justice of his claim to the French throne (1.2.10); later, on the night before Agincourt, Henry prays, "O God of battles, steel my soldiers' hearts. / Possess them not with fear" (4.1.271-72); after the battle is won, he insists that "God fought for us" (4.8.114) and decrees, "be it death proclaimed through our host / To boast of this, or take that praise from God / Which is his only" (4.8.108-10). By subordinating himself so thoroughly to God, Henry achieves a paradoxical effect: he comes to seem less like God's servant and more like God's partner or even a god himself—the Prologue introduces this possibility (albeit with the protection of a pagan cover) when he wishes that the warlike Harry would "assume the port of Mars" (Prologue, 6).

Shakespeare intensifies the impression of Henry as god-like through a couple of significant changes to the source materials in Holinshed. For example, in Holinshed when Henry discovers that Scroop, Cambridge, and Grey are conspiring against him, he calls them before him and simply exposes their treason. In Holinshed, Henry speaks directly to the traitors: "Having thus conspired the death and destruction of me, it maie be no doubt but that you likewise have sworn the confusion of all that are here with me," and he pronounces their deaths;[9] only in the play does Henry engage in a cat-and-mouse game with the traitors, pretending to seek their counsel and then using their own words to damn them. As Bedford says, "The king hath note of all that they intend / By interception that they dream not of" (2.2.6-7). The King's knowledge runs deep, surpassing the comprehension of his subjects in a way that reinforces his all-seeing and all-knowing godlike image.[10]

Shakespeare further alters his sources to strengthen the divine aura around Henry in the circumstances of the English victory at Agincourt. In both Holinshed and the anonymous source play, *The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth*, credit for the victory goes to the technology of the English longbow and to the king's excellent military strategy. In *The Famous Victories*, Henry explicitly commands that "every archer provide him a stake of / A tree, and sharpe it at both endes, / And at the first encounter of the horsemen, / To pitch their stakes down into the ground before them, / That they may gore themselves upon them, / And then to recoyle back, and shoote wholly altogether, / And so discomfit them."[11] *The Famous Victories* thus takes much more care to account in rational military terms for the success of the outnumbered English. In Shakespeare, the king says, "How thou pleasest, God, dispose the day" (4.3.133); and once he wins the battle against the fiercest odds, he adds, "O God, thy arm was here!" (4.8.100), explicitly suggesting a divinely sanctioned victory.

While on the one hand, Shakespeare's play supports Henry's heroic rhetoric by connecting it with God, on the other hand, the play massively undercuts Henry's godliness and calls his use of godly rhetoric into question. The irony begins in the first scene of the play where the bishops of Canterbury and Ely determine to support Henry's war in France in return for his opposition to a parliamentary bill deeply hostile to the church's interests. To win Henry to their position, they propose filling the coffers for his French war with "a greater sum / Than ever at one time the clergy yet / Did to his predecessors part withal" (1.1.80-82). At this stage of the play, the bishops already know that their offer has been received "with good acceptance of his majesty" (1.1.84), so in the next scene, when Henry solemnly asks Canterbury to "unfold / Why the law Salic that they have in France / Or should or should not bar us in our claim" (1.2.10-12), his rhetorical presentation is exposed, to the audience at least, as a fraud: he and the bishops have already agreed about a matter that they now pretend is an open question.[12]

The disjunctive gap between the first two scenes suggests that the King's godly self-presentation is untrustworthy, and here I would suggest that the play exposes not just the King, but also rhetoric itself as an always insufficient mode for stabilizing identity. The first two scenes of the play show that rhetoric can never be a neutral conduit for conveying reality; rather, rhetoric fashions the very reality it purports to describe. This exposure of rhetoric puts us in the world of Machiavelli, who advised princes to pursue power ruthlessly even while they publicly justified their actions in the language of common values, which in the case of *Henry V* would be the value of deference to the church. The exposure of rhetoric puts us, too, in the world of George Puttenham, who recognizes in *The Art of English Poesy* that the artful use of language is effective precisely because of its power to misrepresent persuasively: thus of metaphorical language, Puttenham says, "As figures be the instruments of ornament in every language, so be they also in a sort abuses, or rather trespasses, in speech, because they pass the ordinary limits of common utterance, and be occupied of purpose to deceive the ear and also the mind, drawing it from plainness and simplicity to a certain doubleness, whereby our talk is the more guileful and abusing."[13] If figures of speech are essentially deceptive, then Henry V is compromised from the moment the Chorus wishes for "the warlike Harry, like himself" to "assume the port of Mars" (Prologue, 5; 6); Harry is not going to *be* Mars, he is going to put on the demeanor of Mars; even worse, he is not going to *be* himself, he is going to *perform* himself. The language suggests that Harry is always necessarily playing a role, which in Machiavellian terms means the possibility of deception and dissonance. The danger of "like" plays out in *Julius Caesar* as well, where Brutus, drinking wine with Caesar "like" a friend, mourns the fact "that every like is not the same" (2.2.128).

Because Henry is described rhetorically, he is buffeted by the play of signs—he is like Mars, like himself, like the strawberry under the nettle, like a king. Always the product of linguistic play, he can never be the transcendent signifier who guarantees the rightness and stability of the entire linguistic system. Indeed, the figurative speech that defines Henry heralds the imminence of loss, because the assertion of likeness, however appropriate it might seem in a given moment, is also an assertion of transience: likeness may exist in the moment but it does not last forever. Rhetoric thus does not fashion a permanent reality but rather outlines a present reality and persuades others to accept it, for now. As Puttenham sees it, rhetoric is perfectly suited for improvisational persuasion because it "is decked and set out with all manner of fresh colours and figures, which maketh that it sooner inveigleth the judgment of man and carrieth his opinion this way and that, whithersoever the heart by impression of the ear shall be the most effectively bent and directed."[14] Again, rhetoric is not about conveying the truth; it is about creating an impression of the truth that others are willing to accept.[15] Puttenham's verbs, *decking*, *inveigling*, *bending*, and *directing*, suggest that the rhetorical process is subject to abuse.

In this context, it is interesting to note that at crucial moments, Shakespeare's play echoes Puttenham's verbs: "'tis your thoughts that now must *deck* our kings," says the Prologue, and the Epilogue reports that "Thus far, with rough and all-unable pen, / Our *bending* author hath pursued the story" (Prologue, 28; Epilogue, 1-2, italics mine). Our *bending* author. It's not clear what is being bent: whether the author is bending himself to the authority of the historical sources, or bending the historical sources in the service of his play, or bending his body in the physical act of writing. Whatever the case, the image suggests that the transmission of narrative is not straightforward and the author himself emerges as a "crooked figure" (Prologue, 15).[16]

Henry V might himself be called a bending author in that he frames events in a motivated way in pursuit of his goals. Chief among those goals is the political legitimacy that initially eludes him because of his father's usurpation of the throne and because of his own performance as the wastrel prince.[17] At the beginning of the play, the Dauphin can legitimately taunt Henry with a tun of tennis balls because Henry has not yet proved his political seriousness. And on the eve of the decisive battle, Henry can be legitimately nervous about his political past because his own claim to the throne rests on his father's theft: "Not today, O Lord, / O not today, think not upon the fault / My father made in compassing the crown" (4.1.274-76). Here, past moments of rhetorical performance, such as Prince Harry's wildness or Henry IV's success in persuading the English nobles to accept him as king, come back to haunt the present, and we see how no rhetorical performance, no matter how initially successful, can hold the field forever.

To build legitimacy at this new moment requires new acts of rhetoric, and Henry delivers them. Before the besieged city of Harfleur, he delivers a masterful combination of apocalyptic threats—"look to see / The blind and bloody soldier with foul hand / Defile the locks of your shrill-shrieking daughters" (3.3.110-12)—alongside questions designed to place responsibility for the promised destruction on the people of Harfleur themselves: "What is't to me, when you yourselves are cause, / If your pure maidens fall into the hand / Of hot and forcing violation?" (3.3.96-98); "What say you? Will you yield, and this avoid? / Or, guilty in defense, be thus destroyed?" (3.3.119-20). Henry's bravura performance prompts the surrender of the town; the degree to which the speech may simply be rhetoric without force to back it up is brilliantly suggested in Kenneth Branagh's film where the shots reveal that the effort required merely to deliver the speech exhausts the King;

Branagh's Henry is deeply relieved when the Governor of Harfleur capitulates, freeing him from the need to make good on his threats. In Branagh's interpretation, rhetoric alone creates the impression that Henry's small and sickly army could overrun a fortified city.

Henry is equally rhetorically successful in rousing his troops before the Battle of Agincourt. In the Saint Crispin's Day speech, he famously inspires his army by defining them as a band of brothers: he uses terms like "share" and "fellowship" to insist that there is no hierarchy on the battlefield, and he promises that participation in the fighting will literally create a social parity between king and common soldier: "For he today that sheds his blood with me / Shall be my brother. Be he ne'er so vile, / This day shall gentle his condition" (4.3.61-63). Of course, the king's promise of shared gentility is worthless in the long run; reading the list of the dead a few scenes later, he reasserts a hierarchical world view, painstakingly cataloguing the names of dead French aristocrats but giving short shrift to English commoners when he reads the list of his own side's casualties: "Edward the Duke of York, the Earl of Suffolk, / Sir Richard Keighley, Davy Gam Esquire; / None else of name, and of all other men / But five-and-twenty" (4.8.97-100). Henry never again mentions his promise to gentle the condition of his brothers in arms, although a fleeting exchange between Williams and Gower hints that the soldiers remember it: when the King sends Williams for Gower, Williams tells his fellow soldier, "I warrant it is to knight you, Captain" (4.8.1). Wrong he is: Henry has simply sent Williams away to set up the joke he will play by putting Williams's glove into Fluellen's cap, thereby prompting an argument between them. But while the King apparently has no intention of *actually* gentling his soldiers' condition, his rhetorical construction of a band of brothers serves its purpose—the men win a stunning and unexpected victory.[18]

Basing his identity so heavily on rhetoric, Henry inexorably links himself to performance, because rhetoric is the *performance* of language to persuade others. Effective use of rhetoric requires a performer's expert attention to shifting circumstances; a skillful rhetorician must be capable of adapting rhetorical modes to meet the demands of changing conditions. For example, Henry's joke at Williams's expense may respond to the changing circumstances after the Battle of Agincourt. Having won the battle, Henry's goal shifts from needing to unite his army into a victorious fighting force; his goal is now to create the peace on favorable terms, one of which is the reinstitution of internal hierarchy in his own army. Henry does this by shifting from a heroic to a comic rhetorical mode. We usually recognize that the shift from martial to comic rhetoric occurs in the play's final scene, where Henry woos fair Katherine of France, but the shift actually begins while the army is still on the battlefield. In an unexpectedly playful mood, Henry toys with the common soldier, Williams, who is unaware that the man he challenged the previous evening was the king himself. Rather than confront Williams directly, Henry gives the soldier's glove to Fluellen so that Williams will challenge Fluellen when he recognizes it. It may seem bizarre and degrading that Henry stage-manages a comic scene of conflict between his soldiers even before the names of the battle dead have been announced. Henry doesn't even let the loyal Fluellen in on the joke, but perhaps he cannot afford to. On the battlefield, Fluellen has come closer than any commoner to enjoying the brotherhood Henry promised them all; the King may then find it imperative to reinstate a difference between himself and Fluellen by manipulating the unknowing Welshman as part of his joke.

The King intensifies his shift into a comic register in his scene with Katherine of France. Wooing her, Henry insists he is "a fellow of plain and uncoined constancy" (5.2.149); part of the pleasure of the scene comes from the clumsiness with which the King shifts from a heroic mode to a romantic mode, wooing Katherine in garbled French that is a far cry from the English poetry which flowed so easily from his lips on the battlefield. Stumbling in French, Henry takes the opportunity to disavow rhetorical facility: "For these fellows of infinite tongue, that can rhyme themselves into ladies' favours, they do always reason themselves out again. What! A speaker is but a prater, a rhyme is but a ballad" (5.2.151-54). Henry is audacious to critique "fellows of infinite tongue" in a speech lasting thirty-four lines, but once again the point of his speech is not to present the objective "truth" about himself; the point of his speech is to represent himself artfully, rhetorically, in a way that will earn the princess of France's free consent to what is in effect a forced marriage.[19]

As if to emphasize Henry's strength as a performer, Shakespeare goes to great lengths to make Henry's comic rhetoric possible, altering the source material in Holinshed and *The Famous Victories*, where Katherine figures differently than she does in the play. Holinshed writes of "a certaine sparke of burning love" that "was kindled in the kings heart by the sight of the ladie Katherine";[20] in the simplest terms, this is a story about love at first sight. In *Henry V*, by contrast, the King refers to Katherine as "our capital demand" in the peace negotiations with France (5.2.96);

Shakespeare thus frames the scene between them by stressing that Henry's romantic rhetoric responds to a political imperative. There is also a significant difference from *The Famous Victories*, where Katherine possesses a much greater command of English than she does in *Henry V*, allowing her to be a more equal partner to Henry. At one point in the earlier play, she even engages in a political argument with him: "I would to God, that I had your Majestie / As fast in love, as you have my father in warres, / I would not vouchsafe so much as one looke / Until you had related all these unreasonable demands."[21] Diminishing Katherine's linguistic competency, Shakespeare creates much more room for Henry to perform, allowing him to play not only his own part, but also Kate's: "At night when you come into your closet you'll question this gentlewoman about me, and I know, Kate, you will to her dispraise those parts in me that you love with your heart" (5.2.186-89); "Take me by the hand and say, 'Harry of England, I am thine!'—which word thou shalt no sooner bless mine ear withal, but I will tell thee aloud, 'England is thine, Ireland is thine, France is thine, and Henry Plantagenet is thine'" (5.2.220-23). Like Bottom in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Henry V aspires to play all the parts; more to the point, King Henry is like his earlier self, Prince Harry of the *Henry IV* plays, who could drink with any tinker in his own language: as king, Henry speaks comically as well as heroically, French as well as English, the woman's part as well as the man's. To complete his victory, Henry must re-engage his linguistic plenitude; the military triumph of the historical king must be supplemented with the performative triumph of the theatrical character who plays multiple roles in multiple languages.

Directly contradicting his pose of the blunt-spoken soldier, the king's rhetorical self-fashioning is fraught with the misrepresentations potential in any use of rhetoric: "List [the king's] discourse of war," says the Archbishop of Canterbury, "and you shall hear / A fearful battle rendered you in music" (1.1.44-45); apparently the king's ability to entice his followers into war depends on his ability to reorder the messiness of war into controlled measures. It depends, too, as any rhetorical performance depends, on the audience's willingness to assent to various acts of misrepresentation. Henry cannot succeed without his audience's willing collaboration, whether his audience is other characters in the play or paying customers in the playhouse. In the play, there are occasional moments of dissent, as when Nym contradicts Henry's exhortation, "Once more unto the breach" (3.1.1), by saying to Bardolph, "Pray thee, corporal, stay. The knocks are too hot, and for mine own part I have not a case of lives" (3.2.2-3). But for the most part, characters accept the king's words, even when the audience in the playhouse might be more critical: thus the audience might be uneasy when the Hostess in the tavern says of Falstaff that "the King has killed his heart" (2.1.79), and Nym replies, "The King is a good king, but it must be as it may" (2.1.114), seemingly willing to overlook Henry's betrayal of friendship. Similarly, after Henry orders Bardolph executed against Pistol's express plea to the contrary, Pistol nonetheless affirms that "The King's a bawcock and a heart-of-gold" (4.1.45).

Capable of giving an audience in the theater pause for critical reflection, the dissonance in perspective is a danger inherent in any rhetorical performance. Rhetorical performance is a collaborative art; saying this is another way of saying that rhetorical performance requires an audience; it requires "buy-in"; it requires audiences to let performers work on their imaginary forces. But once a play engages the audience's imagination, it implicitly licenses multiple perspectives, some of which may directly contradict each other. For example, in assenting to the king and supporting his agenda, even Henry's most devoted friends introduce perspectives that call his words into question. Multiple voices, even voices of confirmation, highlight the problem of rhetorical misrepresentation. Thus, in the midst of the battle, the king's most terrible command, the order to kill the French prisoners, is almost immediately misrepresented by one of the king's fervent supporters: Henry says, "The French have reinforced their scattered men. / Then every solider kill his prisoners. / Give the word through" (4.6.36-38). The king's command is a preemptive measure against the possibility of a French counterattack, but just a few lines later it is misrepresented as a defensive retaliation against the French for killing the English boys: Gower reports that "'tis certain there's not a boy left alive . . . Besides, they have burned and carried away all that was in the King's tent; wherefore the King most worthily hath caused every solider to cut his prisoner's throat" (4.7.4; 5-8). Far from assuaging an audience's concerns about the king's harsh order, Gower's misrepresentation of Henry's actions is just as likely to intensify those concerns. Jarring with what the audience has just seen and heard, Gower's words permit the audience to activate its critical sensibilities. The same dynamic holds true with the Chorus, which time and time again offers a perspective on the action that is positive toward Henry, but that also misrepresents the action of the play itself. For example, in introducing act 4, the Chorus speaks of Henry walking among his soldiers before the battle: "Forth he goes and visits all his host, / Bids them good morrow with a modest smile / And calls them brothers, friends, and countrymen. / … / That every wretch, pining and pale before, / Beholding him, plucks comfort from his looks" (4.0.32-34; 40-42). This description is worlds away from the scene that follows of the King in disguise sounding out his troops to learn what they really think of him, and disputing with them when they question the justice of his war.[22]

As multiple perspectives proliferate, one way to hold the king's identity in place is to generate more rhetoric. In the case of *Henry V*, this rhetoric relates to war, which Machiavelli says is the indispensable topic for a successful ruler to consider: "A prince must have no thought or objective, nor dedicate himself to any other art, but that of war with its rules and discipline, because this is the only art suitable for a man who commands."[23] Committed to the prosecution of wars, a king must therefore also be committed to a rhetorical campaign meant to show those wars in the most favorable light. In *Henry IV, Part II*, the old King also advocates war, advising his son to "busy giddy minds / With foreign quarrels," a course of action that Henry V follows in France (4.3.341-42). But victory in France is not sufficient; when he projects himself into the future, Henry V imagines nothing so easily as further wars, asking Katherine, "Shall not thou and I, between Saint Denis and Saint George, compound a boy, half-French half-English, that shall go to Constantinople and take the Turk by the beard?" (5.2.193-96). The rhetorical self-presentation held in place by victory in one war is apparently so precarious that it can only be preserved through further fighting.

If ongoing war is essential to preserving the king's image, then death presents a special challenge. What is left to keep the king's image in place once he can no longer conduct further wars or engage in further rhetorical self-fashioning around war? This question is important to Henry, concerned as he is with the perpetuation of his image. In the St. Crispin's Day speech, the King imagines his victories living on in the stories war veterans will tell their friends and family: "He that shall see this day, and live old age, / Will yearly on the vigil feast his neighbors / And say, 'Tomorrow is Saint Crispian.' / … / … Then shall our names / … / Be in their flowing cups freshly remembered" (4.3.44-46; 51; 55). In Henry's imagination, his victory at Agincourt will live on in the form of story, or, if we recast the terms slightly, in the form of theater, where past heroic deeds are given new life by being embodied on the stage. "How would it have ioyed brave *Talbot* (the terror of the French)," asks Thomas Nashe in *Pierce Penilesse his Supplication to the Divell*, "to thinke that after he had lyne two hundred yeares in his Tombe, he should triumphe againe on the Stage, and have his bones newe embalmed with the teares of ten thousand spectators at least … what a glorious thing it is to have *Henrie* the fifth represented on the Stage leading the French King prisoner, and forcing both him and the Dolphin to swear fealty."[24] Brave Talbot might indeed have seen it as a tribute to be brought back to life two hundred years after his death, but being reincarnated is also a curse because it suggests that living once isn't enough; accomplishments are not in and of themselves sufficient. If accomplishments are to survive, they must be revived, bodied forth again, but this time by a generation of players whose actions are imitations and whose performances come and go faster than the original.

By the end of the play, Henry V's own dependence on an endless cycle of rhetorical performances is made clear: "Small time," says the Epilogue,

> but in that small most greatly lived
> This star of England. Fortune made his sword,
> By which the world's best garden he achieved,
> And of it left his son imperial lord.
> Henry the Sixth, in infant bands crowned king
> Of France and England, did this king succeed,
> Whose state so many had the managing
> That they lost France and made his England bleed,
> Which oft our stage hath shown. (Epilogue, 5-13)

Henry's legacy survives through the repeated work of Shakespeare's own company. Yet however much *Henry V* celebrates the king, the Epilogue poignantly reminds us that Henry leaves a legacy of loss, both through his own early death and through military defeat in the next generation.

Interestingly, though, Shakespeare's play gives us a tantalizing hint that England's upcoming losses were not simply the result of the lords who mismanaged Henry VI's state, but also the result of a moment of rhetorical failure on Henry V's part. As I mentioned, before he goes to France, Henry unmasks a nest of traitors from the ranks of his own aristocracy. In pronouncing their doom, Henry unleashes a torrent of magisterial rhetoric designed to assert his superiority over the men he is condemning. Perhaps the pressure of his own rhetorical performance leaves Henry less attentive to the rhetorical performances of the traitors when they confess their guilt and accept their fate. One of them, Richard, Earl of Cambridge, says, "For me, the gold of France did not seduce, / Although I did admit it as a motive / The sooner to effect what I intended" (2.2.150-52). This is a strange moment; it openly contradicts Henry's claim that the traitors turned against him for financial profit, but nobody comments on the discrepancy. The moment is amplified in Holinshed, however, where it is clear that Cambridge's cryptic remark points to his desire to place his own dynasty on the English throne. Here is Holinshed:

> Diverse write that Richard Earl of Cambridge did not conspire for the murdering of King Henry to please the French king withal, but only to the intent to exalt to the crown his brother in law Edmund Earl of March as heir to Lionel Duke of Clarence; after the death of which earl of March … the earle of Cambridge was sure that the crown should come to him by his wife, and to his children, of hir begotten. And therefore (as was thought) he rather confessed himself for need of monie to be corrupted by the French king, than he would declare his inward mind and open his verie intent and secret purpose, which if it were espied, he saw plainlie that the Earl of March should have tasted of the same cuppe that he had drunken, and what should have become of his owne children he much doubted.[25]

In Shakespeare's play then, Cambridge's quasi-confession that he betrayed the king for French gold must be a carefully wrought rhetorical performance designed to protect his family and preserve them for a later challenge to the English throne, a challenge that played out in the Wars of the Roses, "which oft our stage hath shown." It is perhaps too hard to blame Henry for being misled by this rhetorical performance; after all, it passes in a moment and is never referred to again. But the fact that Henry overlooks a crucial threat to his own dynasty reminds us that whoever manipulates rhetoric is also subject to being manipulated by it. Even the sovereign is just one player in the crowded linguistic marketplace, and if for a while he has a good claim to being the dominant player, in time his dominance wanes and he owes his continued existence to the labors of the bending author and of the players, who recreate his triumphs even as they subject him to the judgment of the theater audience and who perform his glorious rhetoric even as they hint at those moments when, taken in by the rhetoric of a condemned man, he fails to recognize the danger to himself.

Notes

1. William Shakespeare, *Henry V*, in *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean Howard, and Katharine Eisaman Maus (New York: Norton, 1997), 5.0.24-34. All quotations from Shakespeare are taken from *The Norton Shakespeare*.

2. For accounts of Essex's expedition to Ireland and his rebellion against the queen, see G.B. Harrison, *The Life and Death of Robert Devereux Earl of Essex* (London: Cassell and Co., 1937); James Shapiro, *1599: A Year in the Life of William Shakespeare* (New York: Harper Perennial, 2005); and Penry Williams, *The Later Tudors: England, 1547-1603* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).

3. Stephen Greenblatt, *Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988). Showing how English explorers used their technological superiority to cast themselves as gods in the new world, Greenblatt argues that this self-serving approach, while shocking, also characterizes Henry V's strategies of self-presentation. See also Joel Altman, "'Vile Participation': The Amplification of Violence in the Theater of *Henry V*, *Shakespeare Quarterly* 42, no. 1 (Spring 1991): 1-32. Altman considers the ways in which the King may read as a kind of god.

4. Henry Peacham, *The Garden of Eloquence* (1593), quoted in Frank Whigham and Wayne A. Rebhorn, introduction to *The Art of English Poesy: A Critical Edition*, by George Puttenham, ed. Frank Whigham and Wayne A. Rebhorn (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007), 35.

5. George Puttenham, *The Art of English Poesy: A Critical Edition*, ed. Frank Whigham and Wayne A. Rebhorn (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007), 378.

6. Harrison, *The Life and Death of Robert Devereaux*, 197.

7. Ibid., 201.

8. Shapiro, *1599: A Year in the Life of William Shakespeare.* For Essex's self-presentation in the months leading up to his appointment as the leader of English forces in Ireland, see esp. 43-57.

9. Raphael Holinshed, *Third Volume of Chronicles,* 1587 edition, in *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare,* ed. Geoffrey Bullough, vol. 4 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962), 385.

10. Altman, "Vile Participation," 23. Speculating about Henry's intelligence system, Joel Altman suggests it may evoke an image of "the sinister spy network like those operated by Walsingham, the Cecils, and Bacon."

11. Anonymous, *The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth* (1598), in *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*, ed. Geoffrey Bullough, vol. 4 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962), 333.

12. Numerous scholars have noted that the multiple perspectives in the play complicate Henry's self-presentation. See, for instance, Andrew Gurr, introduction to *King Henry V*, by William Shakespeare (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 2. Gurr notes the uneasy juxtaposition of the "patriotic triumphaslism of a Chorus who glorifies Henry's conquests" to "a strong hint of skepticism about the terms and the nature of his victories."

13. Puttenham, *The Art of English Poesy*, 238.

14. Puttenham, *The Art of English Poesy*, 44.

15. Phyllis Rackin, *Stages of History: Shakespeare's English Chronicles* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), 28. Rackin suggests that on a deep structural level, *Henry V* thematizes the unavailability of any objective truth: refers to the "disquieting dramatic structure that sets the historical narrative of the chorus

against the dramatic action on stage and suggests the impossibility of ever discovering the full truth about the past."

16. For a discussion of the "bending" author, see Altman, "Vile Participation," 20.

17. Ibid., 7. Discussing the carefully constructed image of the wastrel prince that comes back to haunt Henry, Altman argues that "the Prince has disadvantaged himself to gain a larger advantage."

18. Andrew Gurr, introduction to *Henry V*, 33, argues that the victory at Agincourt "allows Henry to adjust his attitude back again to its former strong sense of the differences in degree"; Phyllis Rackin, *Stages of History*, 229, notes that "the common English soldiers, unlike the nobles who died in both armies, have no names in the historical record."

19. See Lisa Jardine, *Reading Shakespeare Historically* (London: Routledge, 1996), 9-10, for a discussion of how the comic wooing elides questions of force in her account of the scene.

20. Hollinshed, *Third Volume of Chronicles*, 404.

21. Anonymous, *The Famous Victories*, 339.

22. Altman, "Vile Participation," 25, argues that the scene of the king among his soldiers is not meant to illustrate what the Chorus has just described; Altman holds that Shakespeare is "resuming the action from where the Chorus left off." While this argument is tenable, I think it depends upon the luxury of retrospect: during the speech, it is reasonable to assume that the Chorus is previewing actions that the audience is about to see. When this assumption is proved wrong, dissonance occurs.

23. Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Prince*, in *The Essential Writings of Machiavelli*, ed. and trans. Peter Constantine (New York: Random House, 2007), 56.

24. Thomas Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse his Supplication to the Divell*, 1592, in *The Elizabethan Stage*, ed. E.K. Chambers, vol. 4 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), 238-39.

25. Hollinshed, *Third Volume of Chronicles*, 386.

"The Courses of His Youth Promised It Not:" *Henry V* and The Play of Memory

Anthony Guy Patricia
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

For the distinction between the historian and the poet is not whether they give their accounts in verse or prose . . . the [real] difference is this: that the one [i.e. the historian] tells what happened, the other [i.e. the poet] [tells] the sort of things that *can* happen.[1]

Memory is the raw material of history.[2]

We learn in Plato's *Phaedrus* of the Egyptian god Theuth, who was the "first to discover number and arithmetic, geometry and astronomy, besides draughts and dice, and in particular writing."[3] One day, Theuth went to Thamus and described his many innovations and discoveries to the king of all Egypt. Theuth presented writing to the monarch as "a skill which will make the Egyptians wiser and better at remembering things. It is an elixir of memory."[4] Thamus, however, was not impressed with what Theuth claimed writing would allow the Egyptian people to do. "'You are the father of writing,'" Thamus told Theuth, "and your fondness for it makes you completely mistaken about its effect.'"[5] Continuing, he warned, "This is something which will produce forgetfulness in the minds of those who learn it, through disuse of memory. Their reliance on writing will make them look for external reminders, in marks made by other people, rather than their own internal reminders, in themselves. It is therefore not an elixir of memory you have found, but of reminding."[6]

Despite what might be termed the provinciality of his argument against writing as an elixir of memory, Thamus could not have foreseen how vast and complicated the world, nor how complex and intricate the lived experiences of the myriad people in that world, would become as time marched ever onward beyond his own era. Remembering everything that happened to oneself and others in such a world would be for most, if not all, a complete impossibility. Too much would be forgotten and lost with memory as the only tool available for remembrance. Had Thamus, as Theuth asked him to do, actually considered the potentiality that writing, rather than making people forgetful and entirely dependent on their fellows, could be a powerful helpmeet to individual and collective memory, he might not have reacted as negatively as he did to its invention by Theuth. Such is Egyptian mytho-history as presented to posterity through the "voice" of Socrates by one of the greatest of the Greek philosophers. It can, however, be said that without writing, the concept—indeed, the very possibility—of memory as we understand it today would be something very different from what it is.

Though composed some two thousand years ago, the concerns with human remembrance that *Phaedrus* raises have not faded; if anything, in fact, they have intensified, and perhaps no more so than in the present moment. The function of memory in relation to works of literature, for instance, has been of particular interest to academic critics for much of the latter half of the twentieth century, and curiosity about this intriguing field continues rampant into the twenty-first. Where studies of Shakespeare are concerned, two recent scholarly books call attention to some of the current specificities of this area of inquiry. These are Peter Holland's edited collection of essays entitled, *Shakespeare, Memory and Performance*, published in 2006, and Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr.'s *Memory and Forgetting in English Renaissance Drama: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Webster*, which appeared in 2005.[7] In the spirit of these and other similar critical works, I direct attention in this essay to the role memory plays in Shakespeare's much-celebrated historical drama, *Henry V*, one of the works that seemingly confirms Jonas Barish's notion that Shakespeare is "nothing if not deeply preoccupied with memory and its pitfalls."[8] My overarching proposition is that memory serves as one of the most significant tropes in *Henry V*, in turn affecting our understanding of nearly every aspect of the play that concludes the second tetralogy.

Immediately following its justly famous Prologue in which the Chorus sets the scene in a feat of metatheatrical brilliance, Shakespeare's *Henry V* proper begins with the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Ely formulating a strategy so that they can save the Church's extensive—and valuable—holdings in England from being seized by the Crown at the urging of some members of the House of Commons. Before long, Canterbury's and Ely's ruminations turn to the king himself, Henry V, whom they consider to be "full of grace and fair regard," and a "true lover of the holy church" (1.1.23-24).[9] For Canterbury and Ely, the king has blossomed into the kind of man they esteem quite highly and, furthermore, think can be of use to them in their cause. Neither expected this to happen given that the "courses of his [Henry's] youth promised it not" (1.1.25). Indeed, the things Henry indulged in during his younger years suggested a far different outcome for the sometime prince and now recently crowned king. So notorious was Henry for his behavior growing up that Canterbury likens him to Adam, who so offended God that he and Eve were driven from the Garden of Eden as punishment for their disobedience to His laws. A perusal of *1 Henry IV* reveals that what Canterbury and Ely are remembering about the king is his earlier penchant for iniquities, including drinking, gaming, thievery, deceit, carousing, the keeping of ill company with the likes of the dissipated Falstaff, the patronage of low-class taverns in Eastcheap, and an utterly reprehensible disregard for his status in the court of his father, King Henry IV, as both prince and heir to the throne. Hal, according to Canterbury, would not free himself from his ignominious lifestyle of choice, nor did anyone of note expect him to ever do so, least of all his father, although they more than likely longed for his eventual transformation to respectability.

Now, however, Henry V reasons "in divinity" so well that he should be "made a prelate," discusses "commonwealth affairs" as if he has been a dedicated student of them his entire life, and renders "fearful battle" into nothing less than beautiful music when discoursing about war (1.1.39-45). In fact, according to John Julius Norwich, unruly Henry's "early life may have been—stories about it were already in circulation during his lifetime—but those who knew him only after his accession found those stories hard to believe."[10] At his coronation in April of 1413, "he appeared solemn and unsmiling, and was observed to eat virtually nothing at the banquet which followed the ceremony. For ever afterwards he was known for his piety, which was exceptional even by the standards of the time and which more than once laid him open to charges of sanctimoniousness."[11] Even so, in Shakespeare's history play *Henry V*, given the king's dramatic metamorphosis from reprobate sinner to pious and upright leader of the realm, which finds precedent in history and memory, it proves most interesting to consider why Canterbury and Ely, who knew him before and know him after his ascension to the throne, recall Henry's dissolute youth in the first place. The obvious reason for this is so that they can celebrate and rejoice in the kind of person Henry has become as the king versus the kind of person he was in the years immediately prior to his ascension. In what seems like true and dramatic Christian fashion, Henry has succeeded in reforming himself from very nearly the worst sort of human being into someone with grace and fair regard, who also exhibits an exemplary love for his church. He has, in other words, lifted himself up and out of the gutter and placed himself on a pedestal for all, high and low, to marvel at and learn from. As prominent religious figures, small wonder attaches itself to Canterbury and Ely's exaltation of Henry's conversion.

However, reconsidering the uncertain predicament the archbishop and the bishop find themselves in as regards the status of the wealth of the Church in England, the intriguing possibility that Canterbury and Ely remember Henry's youthful exploits in order to use those memories as bargaining chips in their dealings with the king on the matter of the Church's fortune begins to emerge. Canterbury has already approached Henry about "his true titles to some certain dukedoms, / And generally to the crown and seat of France" (1.1.88-89) in what can be considered nothing less than an attempt to turn the king's attention away from domestic and toward international affairs. Further concealing the true desire to protect the riches of the Church from seizure, Canterbury has promised Henry that he and Ely will see to it that the coffers of the king's exchequer are filled with funds substantial enough to finance any kind of military campaign the king wishes to pursue in France. Presumably such a sum would make but a paltry dent in the Church's wealth, whereas confiscation by the Crown, at the behest of the Commons, of the entirety of the Church's holdings in England would be beyond disastrous for Canterbury, Ely, and the Church. That Canterbury and Ely would put the lives of thousands of English and French soldiers and civilians at risk in their quest to protect the Church and its holdings in England leaves little doubt that they would not scruple to use their memories of King Henry's riotous past to, in effect, blackmail him and force him to agree to engage in the massive, complicated, and distracting undertaking an invasion of France would be. Also, Canterbury and Ely well know that Henry's leading his troops in France means he would be unable to provide the full power of his backing to the Commons' suit for the appropriation of the Church's assets in England. Thus the measure will die as it did before and without being enacted into law.

It is learned as the play continues that Canterbury and Ely are not the only characters who remember Henry V's sordid past and are just as willing to use those memories against the king in the defense of their own interests. After he has been called into the presence of the king, the Dauphin's ambassador enters with an attendant bearing a chest containing a gift for his highness, and proceeds to address Henry with the following words:

> Your highness lately sending into France
> Did claim some certain dukedoms . . .
> . . . .
> In answer of which claim, the Prince our master
> Says that you savour too much of your youth,
> And bids you be advised, there's naught in France
> That can be with a nimble galliard won:
> He therefore sends you, meeter for your spirit,
> This tun of treasure, and in lieu of this
> Desires you let the dukedoms that you claim
> Hear no more of you. This the Dauphin speaks. (1.2.246-57)

Before responding to the ambassador's greeting from the Dauphin, Henry asks what the nature is of the treasure he has received from France. "Tennis balls," his Uncle Exeter tells him after opening the barrel and glancing at its contents (1.2.259). Here, the Dauphin, via his messenger, uses remembrances of what have to be reported accounts to describe Henry as no more than a child still caught up in the wild and errant throes of his minority. He also points out that there is no possible way Henry could ever take into his possession anything in France by dancing the nimble galliards he is reputed to be so skilled at performing in the disreputable taverns of London. Therefore, since they are far more suited to his childish disposition and personality, Henry should merely play games with the tennis balls the Dauphin has generously condescended to send him, and leave France to the French.

The Dauphin, in effect, is telling Henry through his emissary that a dissolute young man like him can neither claim—nor hardly deserves—any dukedom in France, much less the rule over the entire country. And, as evidenced by his response to the ambassador, Henry is very aware of the utter disdain and contempt with which France holds him:

> And we understand him well,
> How he comes o'er us with our wilder days,
> Not measuring what use we made of them.
> We never valued this poor seat of England,

> And therefore, living hence, did give ourself
> To barbarous license. (1.2.265-71)

With his explicit reference to his wilder days, it becomes clear that Henry also realizes that the French have no compunction about using the memory of his past to castigate him in their attempt to prevent him from taking action against their country, its nobility, and its ordinary citizens. This proves to be an ill-conceived strategy on the part of the Dauphin. While the French are by no means misremembering Henry's adolescent exploits, they are deliberately forgetting to what ends those indiscreet capers are being put by Henry in the present and now that he is the king of England. And, Henry promises, a significant price will be paid for this mistake:

> Tell the pleasant Prince this mock of his
> Hath turned his balls to gunstones, and his soul
> Shall stand sore chargèd for the wasteful vengeance
> That shall fly from them—for many a thousand widows
> Shall this his mock mock out of their dear husbands,
> Mock mothers from their sons, mock castles down;
> Ay, some are yet ungotten and unborn
> That shall have cause to curse the Dauphin's scorn. (1.2.281-88)

Henry prophesies here that countless French widows and mothers who have lost their beloved husbands and sons, along with babes not yet thought of who have lost their fathers in battle with the English forces, will have more than sufficient reason to remember the Dauphin's mockery of Henry and his ambitions as regards France. The memories of the loved ones of these women and children will always be tainted by the fact that their loss did not have to be but for the French prince's fatal underestimation of King Henry.

Despite the ferocity of King Henry's response to the none-too-subtle admonishment and the gift of the tennis balls he received from the French, the Dauphin continues to misremember Henry as *Henry V* continues. With the English army bearing down on them, and their defenses not as adequately prepared as they could be, the French king Charles VI orders that appropriate measures be taken immediately to secure the country as far as possible. The Dauphin agrees that he and his fellow nobles ought to be visible out in the state itself at this time of crisis, but not in a show of fear. Rather, they should betray on their individual and collective countenances nothing but strength and resolve. They should present themselves as if they have heard

> that England
> Were busied with a Whitsun morris dance.
> For . . . she is so idly kinged,
> Her sceptre so fantastically borne
> By a vain, giddy, shallow, humorous youth,
> That fear attends her not. (2.4.24-29)

England, in slightly different terms, is by no means a threat to France because her king is but a foolish child unworthy of serious concern. The English are not to be dreaded because their king is partial to vanity, giddiness, shallowness, and humorousness; he is not a fit figure for French apprehension. But, once again, the Dauphin is remembering the Henry who once was and is not thinking of the Henry who is now within the time scheme of the play. From this perspective, the prince is not only underestimating Henry, he is misremembering the English king on the eve of a potentially devastating series of battles. For his lack of judgment on this matter, the Dauphin is chastised by the Constable of France who warns him that he is "too much mistaken in this king" (2.4.30). Delabret adds that the prince will find Henry's

> vanities forespent
> Were but the outside of the Roman Brutus,
> Covering discretion with a coat of folly,
> As gardeners do with ordure hide those roots
> That shall first spring and be most delicate. (2.4.36-40)

The constable thinks that Henry's wildness of youth, like that of Rome's great Brutus, was merely a pretense, a cover for his true, kingly self that he is only now beginning to reveal to France and the world. Henry can harvest his determination and might now precisely because he cultivated them with excess of vanity and folly earlier in his life. To understand otherwise is to completely mistake Henry. Before long King Charles VI, whom Robert C. Jones describes as "the only French leader with enough sense to fear him,"[12] speaks out in contradiction of his son's perception, and in support of the constable's view of the English monarch: "Think we King Harry strong" (2.4.48). Hence, between Delabret and Charles, we find two prominent Frenchmen who are remembering Henry correctly, as a man who has turned his past devotion to sinful pursuits into a formidable inner and outer power that they must reckon with or risk almost certain peril.

Focusing on the courses of Henry V's youth as in the above paragraphs allows us to see how persistent memories of the king's less-than-admirable behavior during his adolescence and early adulthood affect him personally in the present. The Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Ely seem willing to use Henry's past against him should he refuse to pursue his claim to France, while the French Dauphin evinces nothing but disrespect and scorn for Henry because of the king's sometime entertainments and associates. Henry, however, remembers his former self not as a negative, but as a deliberate prelude to his current, far more glorious and virtuous self. But regardless of to whom they belong, it is important to realize that personal memories of Henry's younger incarnation also both chafe against and significantly influence events in the realm of national and international affairs within the scope of *Henry V*.

In the play, memory and national affairs come to the fore first when Henry holds off the French ambassadors so that he can hear in full what Canterbury has to say as regards the king's possible future dealings in and with France. Canterbury's response to his sovereign's inquiry begins with the assertion that "no bar" exists that would prevent Henry from making a claim to the throne of France except for the injunction, "No woman shall succeed in Salic land" (1.2.35-36, 39). Michio Tokumi writes that this Salic law "prescribes that descendants from a king's daughter cannot have a right to the succession. That is, according to the law, women should be entirely excluded from the royal succession. French nobles [also] used this ancient law to refuse successive English kings' requests for the French crown."[13] The French, Canterbury reveals in *Henry V*, insist that this caveat was devised by their legendary King Pharamond, but, he argues, they "unjustly gloss" where the Salic land is located (1.2.40). For the French, the Salic area is in France itself, yet, as Canterbury points out, even the official French chroniclers publish the fact that the Salic region is in Germany, somewhere between the Saale and the Elbe rivers. However, despite the import of the Salic law—and regardless of the Salic's actual location in either France or Germany—King Pepin, Hugh Capet, and King Louis IX, among others, all claimed their right to the throne from the female side of their respective lineages. As such, in what Tokumi describes as an "arbitrary and strained interpretation of the law,"[14] many of the kings of France took and held the throne because of their matrilineal connections, which was expressly against the terms of the Salic statute. Despite the muddled nature of these circumstances, Anthony B. Dawson asserts that "one thing is clear: Henry is as much French as he is English (or Welsh)."[15] This being the case, the French can have no cause to contest Henry's far stronger claim to the throne of their country because Henry's suit rests on his indisputable link with his great-great-grandmother, Isabella of France, and Queen to England's Edward II.

Jonathan Bardo states that Canterbury's "colloquy gives the impression of ecclesiastical memory channeled into national directions . . . This scene [also] establishes the partnership between official memory and forgetting."[16] On the latter assertion, Bardo explains that Henry will "conveniently forget the proposed law that would cause so much of the Church's wealth to be forfeit to the crown if, in addition to a healthy contribution to the war effort, the archbishop turns in a convincing exercise in historical memory that will discredit the Salic Law and thereby legitimate Henry's claim to France."[17] Thus Canterbury skillfully constructs his argument by using Henry's personal and familial memories, in tandem with his interpretation of French law and history, in the service of a semi-concealed, though no less specific, agenda: that of justifying an imperial enterprise that will likely demand England's invasion of a nation that has done nothing to provoke such an action on the part of its northern neighbor—to ensure that Henry will be distracted from throwing the full weight of his support behind the bill in the House of Commons that would, if approved, strip the Church of much, if not all, of its accumulated wealth in England.

With Canterbury's next words, history and memory merge into a form that is at once personal, familial, and imperial for Henry V:

> Stand for your own; unwind your bloody flag;
> Look back into your mighty ancestors.
> Go, my dread lord, to your great-grandsire's tomb,
> From whom you claim; invoke his warlike spirit,
> And your great-uncle's, Edward the Black Prince,
> Who on the French ground played a tragedy,
> Making defeat on the full power of France,
> Whiles his most mighty father on a hill
> Stood smiling to behold his lion's whelp
> Forage in the blood of French nobility. (1.2.101-10)

The words "stand for your own" gesture in a number of important directions. Here, Canterbury is telling the king to take his rightful place among his illustrious and accomplished relations, such as the fierce and warlike Edward III and his warrior-son Edward the Black Prince. In addition to standing shoulder-to-shoulder with the memories of this pair of Edwards, Henry needs also to understand himself as being in their stead, given that he is of a generation or so beyond them in time. Henry's flag will be bloody when he unfurls it because Edward III and the Black Prince's flags were bloody, symbolizing the blood running in their veins that binds all three men together, and the collective blood of the French dead at their several hands. After all, Henry's forefathers apparently enjoyed decimating both the noblemen and commoners of France in their campaigns on French soil and against the full power of the French forces defending their monarch, their lands, and their persons from the English onslaught. Furthermore, Canterbury's words in the passage above are meant to encourage Henry to make his own mark on England and France, a mark that will equal or surpass those made by Edward III and the Black Prince.

To help him manifest the necessary frame-of-mind and level of resolve to engage the French on his own terms and in his unique way, Canterbury instructs Henry to go to his great-grandfather's grave—something human beings (and their literary counterparts) do, not only to pay their respects to the dead, but to remember the dead, as well—in order to recall the past in a general sense, but also to evoke an entire history he has a personal and a familial connection to in the realm of collective, if not actual, memory. Henry will then be able to tap into and make use of the warlike spirits of Edward III, Edward the Black Prince and, perhaps, Henry IV. In effect, Canterbury implies that, so armed with explicit and specific knowledge of his predecessors' deeds and triumphs, King Henry will be able to create his own tragedy on French ground while the spirits of his father, great-uncle, and great-grandfather watch with approval from wherever death has taken them. As Jones writes, instead of the "invidious comparison between then and now, old and new, we find here an absolute identification of the present with the past, whose heroes are not lost but will live again through their 'ripe' young heir."[18] There is probably no way for a king like Henry, eager both to prove and to make a name for himself, to remain unaffected by Canterbury's masterful use of a rhetoric of memory. And the persuasion of the English monarch continues with the Bishop of Ely's brief speech to Henry:

> Awake remembrance of those valiant dead,
> And with your puissant arm renew their feats.
> You are their heir, you sit upon their throne,
> The blood and courage that renownèd them
> Runs in your veins—and my thrice-puissant liege
> Is in the very May-morn of his youth,
> Ripe for exploits and mighty enterprises. (1.2.115-21)

Ely charges Henry with the task of remembering his near-immediate male ancestors and in a specific way: as warriors unparalleled. Henry is not only their descendant; he is their legacy to England, France, and the rest of the world. With his combined strength and courage, which derive from and through the blood of Edward III and the Black Prince, Henry will be able to re-memorialize the incomparable military successes of his great-grandfather and great-uncle as he attempts his own similar accomplishments on the battlefield. Such triumphs and countless others are very nearly assured him, given Henry's patriarchal lineage and comparatively young age. He is, to put it baldly, the perfect king to lead a new venture of aggression against France in order to gain that country's crown.

Guilt and responsibility enter the mix of persuasion being worked on King Henry when his uncle Exeter tells him, "Your brother kings and monarchs of the earth / Do all expect that you should rouse yourself / As did the former lions of your blood" (1.2.122-24). Westmoreland adds to Exeter's words the following: "They know your grace hath cause; and means and might / So hath your highness" (1.2.125-26). As scholar Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr., notes in *Memory and Forgetting in English Renaissance Drama*, these various appeals to remember seek "to mobilize the subject to comport himself or herself in a particular way. Remembering is about praxis; it entails the arrangement of one's utterances and/or actions, even one's body as a whole, in relation to the imperatives expressed in the appeal[s]."[19] Remembering, he adds, is "action taken in response to a call to behave in a certain (more or less precisely defined) fashion."[20] In this case, Henry must take up arms in order to win France for himself and England or he will disappoint his fellow rulers as well as his royal ancestors, all of whom are in accord with the notion that Henry has not only the right, but the obligation to claim the French crown. Henry's only choice is act for himself and England, for the living and the dead, for what is remembered at the present time, and for what will be remembered in the future.

Of course, Henry and his council members are not the only parties mindful of history and memory—and their combined influence on present events—at the national and international levels. So is King Charles VI of France. After proclaiming Henry of England stronger than the Dauphin derisively makes him out to be, Charles recalls how

> The kindred of him hath been fleshed upon us,
> And he is bred out of that bloody strain
> That haunted us in our familiar paths.
> Witness our too-much-memorable shame

> When Crécy battle fatally was struck,
> And all our princes captived by the hand
> Of that black name, Edward, Black Prince of Wales,
> Whiles that his mountant sire, on mountain standing,
> Up in the air, crowned with the golden sun,
> Saw his heroical seed and smiled to see him
> Mangle the work of nature and deface
> The patterns that by God and by French fathers
> Had twenty years been made. This is a stem
> Of that victorious stock, and let us fear
> The native mightiness and fate of him. (2.4.50-64)

Here, as he does so brilliantly in this and many of his other plays, Shakespeare presents an example of the rhetorical technique known as *prosopopeia*, this time in the form of a substantial dramatic monologue in which, effectively, an Englishman (the playwright Shakespeare) puts words into the mouth of the character of the French monarch. Charles VI recognizes the real, or the more true, Henry V through his memories of Henry's relatives, King Edward III and Edward the Black Prince, both of whom wrought significant military havoc upon France in the, for him, not so distant past—so much havoc, in fact, that the French were brought to a "too-much-memorable shame" by this pair of English foes. By remembering them in this manner, Charles cannot forget the defeat and destruction they put his people to: the troops sent to their deaths on the battlefield; the many princes captured and held by the Black Prince while his father, Edward III, beamed with pride and joy down at his son from his mountain perch atop a horse. Henry, Charles realizes, given the force of this collection of remembrances, is a direct descendant of Edward III and the Black Prince. Henry is not merely, or only, the dissolute youth of the recent past; he is a formidable enemy to be reckoned with on the basis of his genealogy alone.

In due course, we learn that the rhetoric of memory that Canterbury, Ely, Essex, and Westmoreland have used to persuade the king to accept their respective points of view has been a successful stratagem when Henry, while waiting briefly for the appearance of the ambassadors from France, lets it be known that

> Now are we well resolved, and by God's help
> And yours, the noble sinews of our power,
> France being ours we'll bend it to our awe,
> Or break it all to pieces. (1.2.222-25)

Tokumi suggests that, though resolute, Henry's posture, along with his desire, indeed, his willingness, to be convinced as he is by those in his inner circle, "hints that his authority as a king is very weak because his nobles and subjects all know his father usurped the throne of Richard II."[21] His decision to attack France is, therefore, an assertion of his power as the true king of England and a bid to control the memories of his father's deeds his advisors and people continue to harbor. If Henry fails to bend France to his awe, or to break it all to pieces, he vows that his bones will be put

> in an unworthy urn,
> Tombless, with no remembrance over them.
> Either our history shall with full mouth
> Speak freely of our acts, or else our grave,
> Like Turkish mute, shall have a tongueless mouth,
> Not worshipped with a waxen epitaph. (1.2.228-33)

Henry has been convinced by his closest spiritual, political, and military advisers to take decisive action against France in order to claim that country's crown as his own. He also calls on God's help in bringing France to submission under his rule or to destroy it and its people, whichever proves necessary in the circumstances. The invocation of the Christian deity serves as a reminder to one and all of Henry's stunning transformation from reprobate to righteous leader of England, as well as a reminder of the divine right of kings, or the notion that God has invested Henry, like many other English monarchs who reigned before him, with His faith and power as His half-divine, half-human representative on Earth. Perhaps even more astonishing is what Henry insists must happen should his quest to gain France prove less than successful: he wants his remains to be placed in an urn of no value and disposed of accordingly. There will be no construction of a monument to him in the form of a tomb. The only way Henry will be remembered is as a victor triumphant over France, or he will be forgotten by one and all. Such is his prophecy.

Henry has used prophetic memory before, and will do so again at two other significant points in *Henry V*. The first of these points occurs in act 3, when the English are besieging the small French town of Harfleur. To inspire his troops to further feats in battle, Henry delivers the following words:

> On, on, you noblest English
> Whose blood is fet from fathers of war-proof,
> Fathers that like so many Alexanders
> Have in these parts from morn till even fought,
> And sheathed their swords for lack of argument.
> Dishonour not your mothers; now attest

> That those whom you called fathers did beget you.
> Be copy now to men of grosser blood,
> And teach them how to war. (3.1.17-25)

Regardless of their actual birth or social status, Henry wants his soldiers to know that they are among the most noble and elevated of the English people because they are fighting in his name and for his cause. They stand taller than tall, as well, because the red-hot blood that flows in their veins comes from their fathers, all of whom proved themselves on the battlefields of France by fighting from dawn until dusk without cease and, indeed, stopped fighting only when no more French enemies were left to confront them. It is in this sense that Henry wants his men to recall their specifically male ancestors and, in so doing, to remember themselves as being endowed by blood with the exact same martial resolve and determination to prevail over their opponents. Henry takes this rhetoric of memory one step further when he exhorts his troops to think about how they want to be thought of—to be remembered—by both their mothers and fathers once the hostilities between England and France have ceased. At the very least, Henry makes clear, the men would not want to disgrace themselves in either of their parents' eyes by performing their duties less than valiantly as they try to subdue Harfleur and its citizens to the English will. Doing so would surely only blacken their parents', friends', and other loved ones' memories of them as sons, brothers, husbands, lovers, kinsmen, comrades, and soldiers, perhaps irrevocably. Prophetic memory, in other words, will not be at all kind to them in the scenario Henry describes should Harfleur not surrender or be taken.

The night before the climactic Battle of Agincourt, Henry wrestles with the idea of whose responsibility it is if any of his men die in the fighting they will do on his behalf. He rationalizes his own culpability on this point by noting that he did not seek the death of his soldiers when he took them into his service; therefore, each individual troop is accountable to himself and to God no matter the outcome of his fate. Nevertheless, Henry begins to pray that his men will be strong and fearless when they meet the French the next day on the battlefield. His prayer soon becomes both familial and personal when Henry recalls two specific and related events from the past and considers them in relation to the present moment:

> Not today, O Lord,
> O not today, think not upon the fault

My father made in compassing the crown.
I Richard's body have interrèd new,
And on it have bestowed more contrite tears
Than from it issued forcèd drops of blood.
Five hundred poor have I in yearly pay
Who twice a day their withered hands hold up
Toward heaven to pardon blood. And I have built
Two chantries, where the sad and solemn priests
Sing still for Richard's soul. More will I do,
Though all that I can do is nothing worth,
Since that my penitence comes after ill,
Imploring pardon. (4.1.274-84)

After begging God to fill his soldiers with resolute courage, Henry implores the Lord to forget—to not remember—the errors his father, Henry IV, committed in usurping the crown from his, at the time, sovereign, Richard II, and later indirectly having Richard put to death at Pomfret Castle where the former king was being held under what amounted to house arrest. Nigel Saul, one of Richard II's recent biographers, speculates that it was Henry Bolingbroke's sense of "self-preservation rather than vaulting ambition that was the main spur to his" seeking to wrest the throne of England away from his cousin given Richard's "vengeful and untrustworthy" reputation.[22] Richard had, after all, banished Henry rather than effect peace between Henry and Hotspur, and Richard was still the true and lawful king of England.

Nevertheless, Richard's abdication came about at the end of September 1399, and only at the last of three meetings over a two-day period between Richard and Bolingbroke's delegation that, on this occasion, included Bolingbroke himself rather than a representative. Bolingbroke demanded that Richard resign the crown immediately and unconditionally. This time, a defeated Richard "finally gave in. Under pressure he read out the schedule which had been prepared for him and asked only for one favour: that he retain the lands he had acquired in order to endow an anniversary for his soul in Westminster Abbey; this request was conceded" by Bolingbroke.[23] Saul notes that, following his accession, Henry IV "had to decide what to do with the person of his predecessor. The issue was a difficult one. Richard was young, and there was every expectation that he would live for some time. He could easily become the focus for disaffected elements" in the kingdom.[24] After some debate, Richard was moved from the Tower in London "to the mighty Lancastrian fortress at Pontefract" where, Henry hoped, Richard "would be quietly forgotten: that with the passage of time the memory of his rule would fade and affection for his person weaken."[25] This did not happen as Henry wished. In fact, several earls of the realm banded together in a plot against Henry so that they could secure Richard's release and place him back on the throne. The plan was discovered and quickly and brutally suppressed, but the traitorous actions of the earls "brought home to Henry the vulnerability of his regime so long as Richard lived."[26] This being the case, Henry's plight as regards Richard was discussed by the king's council in early February of 1400. Saul explains that the "minute made of the meeting was strangely portentous: if Richard was alive, it said, he should be kept in safe-keeping; but, if he were dead, he should be shown openly to the people, so that they would be aware of the fact. The implication of the minute . . . was clear: Richard was to be disposed of. Whether or not a direct order to this effect was sent to Pontefract there is no way of knowing. But certainly in mid-to-late February Richard met his end."[27] Even so, as Shakespeare demonstrates so powerfully in his history plays, the memory of Richard II lingered so palpably and so tenaciously after his death that Henry IV never felt totally secure on the throne.

What follows in Shakespeare's *Henry V* is an accounting of the new King Henry's efforts to atone for the sins of his father that seems to be in full accord with Catholic tradition. In this tradition, the dead spent an unspecified amount of time in a place called Purgatory suffering various torturous punishments so that their souls could be purified and eventually allowed to ascend into Heaven and reunion with God. According to Stephen Greenblatt, the retributions of Purgatory were the same as those inflicted on souls in Hell and, therefore, just as stratified for particular kinds of sinners. As such, we find in Purgatory "thieves hung over flames; the envious plunged first into vats of ice and then into boiling water; the angry stoned by raging demons; the proud stretched on rotating wheels, and so forth."[28] Greenblatt, later citing the account of a medieval monk who claimed to have visited there during a significant health crisis, allows Purgatory to be understood also as featuring a "nightmarish landscape of fire, snow, and stinking water" in which souls were subjected to even more horrific and extensive tortures than those just mentioned.[29] Presumably, what made Purgatory and its painful chastisements bearable for the dead (as well as for the living who remembered them while simultaneously thinking about their own fate in death and how they might be remembered and, thus, helped by others to shorten their time in Purgatory) was the possibility of their eventually rising and entering the bliss of Paradise once their souls were sufficiently cleansed so as not to be abhorrent to God.[30] Henry V implies that Richard II's soul may well be enduring the torments of Purgatory and, therefore, stands in need of intervention in the form of active and specific forms of remembrance.

Catholic doctrine allowed for the idea that the living could help to shorten the amount of time the dead were required to spend in Purgatory by using prayer as a petition on behalf of their souls. Sullivan explains that to "remember the dead was to enact a series of social performances—from funeral processions and feasts to requiem masses to daily prayer to the production of monuments for the deceased—that served both as an ongoing engagement with the dead . . . and as intercessionary acts designed to help hasten their passage to heaven. To forget the dead," on the other hand, "was to extend their stay in purgatory."[31] In this regard, Henry has put five-hundred poor persons to work who, twice every day, pray to God for Richard II's soul, and he has had two chapels built in which the priests sing continuous Masses for the dead monarch. Given their obvious expense, only royalty and other noble or aristocratic individuals and families of fortune could afford to endow such ongoing memorial rites and projects. Henry has also had Richard II's body reinterred—presumably in a tomb far more fitting to what he was in life: a king of England—and has shed more heartfelt tears for Richard II than ever drops of blood fell from Richard's body in the throes of death. On these points, Saul informs us that Shakespeare's representation accords with historical memory. Following Richard II's death at Pontrefact, the coffin bearing his body was taken to London where not one, but two masses were celebrated in Richard's honor. After the observance of this pair of "ceremonies the body was taken to the Dominican friary at King's Langley, where it was laid to rest. The body arrived at the house in the dead of night, and the ceremony of interment took place on the following morning" and was attended by only a few, comparatively unimportant individuals.[32] Richard's bones remained at King's Langley for the rest of Henry IV's lifetime. On Henry V's "accession it was exhumed and reburied in its intended resting place at Westminster."[33] Saul goes on to note that the

> ceremony of reinterment was a grandiose if sombre one. A special hearse was commissioned and fixed up with lights for the service, and the banners used only a few months previously for Henry IV's funeral were borrowed for the occasion from Canterbury. Richard's body was stripped of its leaden lap and laid in a new elm coffin. A large

> congregation of bishops, abbots, lords and knights followed the procession to the abbey, and 100 marks were distributed as largesse along the route. The service of reinterment was attended by Henry himself.[34]

After Richard was laid to rest again in Westminster Abbey, Henry "ordered that four large tapers were to burn continually at the tomb; at the same time a dirge and a requiem mass were to be sung and 6s 8d to be given to the poor each week, along with £20 in pennies at each yearly anniversary."[35] Singly and in tandem then, in history, memory, and in drama, these measures signal the fact that Richard II has not been forgotten by the descendants of the one who usurped his throne and sent him to an ignoble end. The memory of Richard II lives on in the mind of Henry V as much as it ever lived in the mind of his father, Henry IV. It is this memory that Henry V asks God to overlook as the English engage the French in battle at Agincourt on Henry V's behalf.

Prophetic memory returns and forms the core of Henry's renowned St. Crispin's Day, or Band of Brothers, speech in act 4 that, once again to inspire his men in feats of arms, he delivers to them immediately prior to the beginning of the Battle of Agincourt. Indeed, Jones remarks that "when Henry does look ahead to his 'story' as it will be remembered in the future, he does so with the consciousness that it may be shaped both in the making and in the remembering (or telling)."[36] Furthermore, Henry "foresees the celebration of his memory in precisely the spirit that we are to experience it at this moment in the play."[37] As such, those that live to see this and future days through, Henry prophesies,

> Will yearly on the vigil feast his neighbours
> And say, "Tomorrow is Saint Crispian."
> Then will he strip his sleeve and show his scars
> And say, "These wounds I had in Crispin's day."
> Old men forget; yet all shall be forgot,
> But he'll remember, with advantages,
> What feats he did that day. Then shall our names,
> Familiar in his mouth as household words—
> Harry the King, Bedford and Exeter,
> Warwick and Talbot, Salisbury and Gloucester—
> Be in their flowing cups remembered.
> This story shall the good man teach his son,
> And Crispin Crispian shall ne'er go by
> From this day to the ending of the world
> But we in it shall be rememberèd. (4.3.45-59)

As with Henry's Harfleur address, how the men who fight at Agincourt will be remembered in the future for their deeds is the paramount rhetorical motivator. It is, as Dawson writes, the acts of remembrance "that will confer that sense of continuing brotherhood" on these soldiers.[38] They will stand not only proud, but revered among their fellows, and they will revel in uncovering their arms and showing their battle scars to those assembled with them on every feast of St. Crispin's Day henceforward. Their names will become household knowledge alongside those of King Henry and his nobles. Furthermore, these soldiers will teach their sons, grandsons, and great-grandsons about their accomplishments at Agincourt, meaning that they will remember these undertakings through their memories of them that, in turn, will be passed from generation to generation without cease. No St. Crispin's day celebration will pass in the future without Henry and his Band of Brothers being remembered by one and all in perpetuity and until the world itself comes to its inevitable end.

Hyperbole aside, the English do go on to devastate utterly the French forces: according to the logic of *Henry V*, in excess of some ten thousand French men die in the battle, versus the loss of barely thirty of England's men. And while his men may well have been inspired by his speech to triumph decisively over the French, it seems as if God heard and granted Henry's request for God to forget the circumstances in which Richard II died. In any case, Henry remembers at this point that he is a Christian king as well as God's instrument and representative on Earth, and therefore attributes the English victory to Him above and to none other. Certainly the mirror of all Christian kings could do no less.

Notes

1. Aristotle, *Poetics*, trans. and with a commentary by George Whalley, ed. John Baxter and Patrick Atherton (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1997), 81.

2. Jacques Le Goff, *History and Memory*, trans. Steven Rendall and Elizabeth Claman (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992), xi.

3. Plato, *Phaedrus*, in *Symposium and Phaedrus*, Everyman's Library 194, trans. Tom Griffith (New York: Alfred A Knopf, 2000), 171.

4. Ibid., 172.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid.

7. See Peter Holland, ed., *Shakespeare, Memory and Performance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); and Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr., *Memory and Forgetting in English Renaissance Drama: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Webster* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

8. Jonas Barish, "Remembering and Forgetting in Shakespeare," in *Elizabethan Theater: Essays in Honor of S. Schoenbaum*, ed. R. B. Parker and S. P.

Zitner (Newark: University of Delaware Press and Associated University Presses, 1996), 218.

9. All quotations from Shakespeare's plays are from *The Norton Shakespeare, Based on the Oxford Edition*, 2nd ed., ed. Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, Katherine Eisaman Maus (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2008).

10. John Julius Norwich, *Shakespeare's Kings: The Great Plays and the History of England in the Middle Ages: 1337-1485* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1999 and 2001), 174.

11. Ibid.

12. Robert C. Jones, *These Valiant Dead: Renewing the Past in Shakespeare's Histories* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1991), 127.

13. Michio Tokumi, "The Salic Law in *Henry V*," *Shakespeare Studies* 37 (1999): 48.

14. Ibid., 51.

15. Anthony B. Dawson, "The Arithmetic of Memory: Shakespeare's Theatre and the National Past," *Shakespeare Survey: An Annual Survey of Shakespeare Studies and Production* 52 (1999): 56.

16. Jonathan Bardo, "Wars of Memory in *Henry V*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 47, No. 2 (Summer 1996): 156.

17. Ibid., 156-57.

18. Jones, *These Valiant Dead*, 126.

19. Sullivan, *Memory and Forgetting*, 9.

20. Ibid.

21. Tokumi, "Wars of Memory in *Henry V*," 52.

22. Nigel Saul, *Richard II* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 418.

23. Ibid., 421.

24. Ibid., 424.

25. Ibid.

26. Ibid., 425.

27. Ibid.

28. Stephen Greenblatt, *Hamlet in Purgatory* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 52-53.

29. Ibid., 64-65.

30. Greenblatt points out that, in artistic and verbal renderings of souls enduring chastisement in Purgatory, the presence or mention of angels as rescuers capable of delivering purified souls up and into the warm and peaceful light of God "is perhaps the most brilliant solution to the representational problem posed by Purgatory, since it gets at a crucial way of differentiating the suffering endured for eternity by souls in Hell from that endured by souls whose term of punishment is limited" (59). One piece of art (of many) that exemplifies this point for Greenblatt is Hieronymus Bosch's dramatic painting, "Vision of the Otherworld." See *Hamlet in Purgatory*, Color Plate 4.

31. Sullivan, *Memory and Forgetting in English Renaissance Drama*, 4.

32. Saul, *Richard II*, 428.

33. Ibid.

34. Ibid.

35. Ibid.

36. Jones, *These Valiant Dead*, 130.

37. Ibid., 132.

38.Dawson, "The Arithmetic of Memory," 56.

"Jumping O'er Times": Diachronic Design in Olivier's *Henry V*

Howard Schmitt
University of Southern California, Los Angeles

> From the start Olivier's film had vocal proponents, among them . . . Jean Mitry, who thought the stylized setting and *mise en scène* 'exceptional solutions to the dilemma of a play adaptation for the cinema.' . . . Mitry at once recognize[d] the subtlety in the shifts in spatio-temporal organization that allow for a cinematic representation of a world view of the Middle ages, one different from our own but one which Henry has to negotiate.[1]

Sandra Sugarman Singer, in her influential 1979 disssertation,[2] and others after her,[3] have written on the groundbreaking multiple diegeses in Olivier's film, *Henry V*. Ace Pilkington observes that British scholar Graham Holderness, in his 1985 book *Shakespeare's History*, "maintains that the film's interpretation is more complex than it is often taken to be and that Olivier's 'aesthetic devices' have been seriously underestimated."[4] And in 2008, Anthony R. Guneratne wrote in his book, *Shakespeare, Film Studies, and the Visual Cultures of Modernity*, that *Henry V* was "Olivier's most profound contribution to the cinematic visualization paradigm of seeing, no less indeed than to the pictorial transition from the medieval to the early modern."[5]

I would like to suggest that movement through time found in Laurence Olivier's film—its spatio-temporal organization, multiple diegeses, aesthetic devices, and cinematic visualization—is rooted in a couplet from Shakespeare's text. Lines 28-29 of the prologue suggest the device:

> For 'tis your thoughts that must now deck our kings,
> Carry them here and there, *jumping o'er times.* (1.0.28-29; italics mine)[6]

The Riverside Shakespeare editor, G. Blakemore Evans, provides the following footnote for Shakespeare's expression "jumping o'er times": "The play deals with the events between Henry's preparations to invade France in 1414 and the Treaty of Troyes in 1420."[7] In the text of play, the notion of jumping o'er times is largely "the telescoping of events between Agincourt and Troyes,"[8] which, as Shakespeare puts it, is "turning th' accomplishments of many years / Into an hour-glass" (1.0.30-31).

Geoffrey Bullough, writing on Shakespeare's use of his sources, notes that in *Henry V* "Shakespeare picks his way through Holingshed's numerous details, limiting himself mainly to the French business, omitting happenings in England."[9] Bullough argued that "by compressing the reign into what is virtually one campaign . . . and closely following Agincourt with the successful peace negotiations of five years afterward, he made [t]his play less fragmentary than"[10] previous histories.

As film moves from the verbal to the visual, it often opens up the visual elements of the narrative. In the written text, the parameters of jumping o'er the times are six years. In adapting Shakespeare's play for the screen, Olivier has broadly expanded the scope from six years to several centuries. Likewise, he expands the spatio-temporal dimensions of carrying the king here and there. Olivier has carried his king from playhouse to soundstage to location, and jumped over the times—from the world of the playwright, to the world of the historical story, and at times even to his own day.

Olivier's film is also a study in both period and style. Harry M. Deguld points out in his 1973 book, *Filmguide to "Henry V,"* that "much controversy has centered on the visual styles of *Henry V*. There is no critical agreement as to what the various styles are, whether they are integrated, or whether they are relevant to an adaptation of Shakespeare."[11] Douglas A. Russell, in his book *Period Style for the Theatre*, comments that "the word *style* is frequently an obstacle when discussing period plays because to many theatre people it means a superficial composite of manners, movement and customs to be incorporated into a production. Admittedly, the term is a treacherous one—vague and meaning different things to different people."[12]

While there may be some hyperbole in Russell's use of the word "treacherous," terms for styles cannot be depended upon to carry the same meaning (much less connotations) to all readers. In discussing *design*, most observers tend to favor the discussion of *period*. It has a more concrete vocabulary. The opening scenes of Olivier's film are set in an Elizabethan playhouse. Eponymous period names, such as Elizabethan, are quite specific; Webster's defines it as "of or characteristic of the time when Elizabeth I was queen of England."[13]

While a *period* is defined as an interval of time, *style*, because it seeks to describe aesthetics, is a more abstract idea to discuss. The style associated with Elizabethan England is Mannerism. Geoffrey Squire, in his book *Dress and Society*, begins a chapter on the Mannerist style with the sentence, "The complex of attitudes and tendencies which are indicated by the stylistic term Mannerism (a selective term not applicable to all works produced during a specific period) seemed to move like a wave across Europe in the sixteenth century."[14] Though it will take a full chapter to describe or define Mannerism, this opening sentence gets across the key ideas about style: complex, attitude, tendency, selective, and a sense of being a movement.

Although words about style often mean different things to different groups and have different meanings in different times and places, style is the more integral issue in design. A change in style influences the interpretation of the text more than a change of period. For example, when costuming one of Shakespeare's plays in his own time, many directors will opt for French or Italian styles for the female romantic characters—the softer lines of the continental styles are thought to be more flattering than the angular or boxy English fashions. Likewise, with men's fashions, German Renaissance styles, particularly those of the soldiers of fortune or *landsknechts*, are often found to be more comical for vain or bombastic characters since the "panings and 'pullings-out' in Germany were carried to ridiculous extremes."[15] In Olivier's film, the costumes of the low-born, such as Pistol and Bardolph, display the bombast and excess of Mannerism.

Some of the visual elements in Olivier's *Henry V* are seen in two guises—that simulating a piece of Elizabethan scenery and that simulating a contemporary cinematic rendering of the world of the story. At times we see the same scenic elements or the same clothing in two different periods. In this paper I will look at visual elements of the movie that move from one period to another as the story progresses. The shifts in period and style are not uniform throughout the design areas; therefore, scenery, props, costumes, and hair will each be examined separately.

Scenery. Kenneth S. Rothwell, in his book *Shakespeare on Screen,* notes that "the lively realism of the Elizabethan playhouse is contrasted with the subsequent artifice of the sequences in France."[16] Harry M. Deguld observes that "the scenery against which Charles and his court move helps to reinforce the impression that the French are essentially out of touch with reality. The settings have fairy-tale-like quality and a frail elegance that is sharply contrasted with the more naturalistic scenery and real landscapes in which Henry and his army appear."[17]

In Olivier's film, the Boar's Head tavern is presented in two guises and in two periods. In the screen rendering of Shakespeare's act 2, scene 1, we see an Elizabethan stage representation of the tavern; but for act 2, scene 3, the same design is transformed into a cinematic simulation of the medieval tavern. As Michael Anderegg writes, "The [second] scene at the Boar's Head tavern is no longer set at the Globe Theatre but is presented with a stylized cinematic realism, with a three-dimensional set for the tavern."[18]

Even the Boar's Head sign itself is more realistic in the second scene. Jack J. Jorgens, in his book *Shakespeare on Film*, writes, "The style [in the second Board's Head scene] is somewhere between illusionist theatre and the 'realism' of studio sets of the 1940s."[19] This observation brings up an important aspect of movement through periods when looking at cinema—the stagecraft or scenic conventions of the time that the film was made are present in the film and are increasingly apparent as time goes on.

The Boar's Head sign has many levels of visual interpretation. At first it is a placard presented by the boy introducing the scenes. But it is a self-reflexive pun as he turns it to reveal the reverse side painted with a boar's head. As the boy hangs it on the set, the perception of this prop has shifted from a sign for the Elizabethan playhouse audience to read into a pictorial sign that is a part of the Elizabethan scenic interpretation of a Gothic alehouse. The item projects self-awareness in naming itself, but it also marries the words "Boar's head" to the image of a painted boar's head. As a member of the film audience, I always laugh when the sign is flipped over, but the on-camera playhouse audience doesn't; they simply applaud the start of the scene. The writing on the placard that the boy presents to the playhouse audience suggests that, for the most part, the Elizabethan playgoer was literate; however, the Boar's Head sign when it hangs as a scenic element implies that its owners and clientele—the comic low-life characters in the play (Pistol, Nym, Bardolph, Quickly and the boy)—are illiterate.

The cinematic transition into the Boar's Head scene is notable. Just before the first Boar's Head scene, storm clouds gather and it starts to rain. Anthony Davies notes that the visual effect of "the violent downpour which suddenly drenches the both the players and the audience in the Globe [theatre] switches concentration from theatrical involvement into the area of cinematic realism."[20]

This rendering of a storm is a cinematic effect, and as such it begins to take the viewer out of the world of watching a filmed stage production into a purely cinematic world. It has a thematic significance as well. Rain imagery has many overtones. If the storm clouds do indeed gather after the declaration of war, it is the little people—the underclass—who get rained on, not the nobility. This scene is, in a sense, the moment in the film that is most at odds with the patriotic spirit of the time.

The storm may also be viewed as a use of the pathetic fallacy—granting the heavens human emotions and misgivings over the declaration of war, knowing the toll that war takes on the common folk. Although the film omits or glosses over the deaths of the low-life characters, Pistol is the only one of the five who survives to act 5 of Shakespeare's text. The rain is Olivier's cinematic invention; it is not in Shakespeare's text. Decades later Baz Luhrman will follow in Olivier's footsteps and make use of the pathetic fallacy in a similar manner. He inserts an even more dramatic storm into his film adaptation of *Romeo + Juliet* shortly after the deaths of Mercutio and Tybalt. Like Olivier before him, Luhrman's storm is not in Shakespeare's text, but occurs at a pivotal plot point for a title character.

One last note on the scenery: Deborah Cartmell, in her book, *Interpreting Shakespeare on the Screen*, comments about the forward movement of the scenic elements as the film presents the Duke of Burgundy's speech in act 5, scene 2: "Burgundy's nostalgia for the past in his meditation on the cost of war is visually accompanied by . . . a landscape hitherto unfamiliar in the film. Almost imperceptibly we move forward in time—the rural scenes are close to a Constable landscape— . . . the film is concerned with transportations from one state to another—from theatre to film and from one moment in history to another."[21]

Props. A different kind of movement between times occurs with certain props. Specifically, I'm going to address the props containing writing. To me, the presence of these written props serves to bring the language from the period of the writer to the contemporary viewer. In his article, "Redefining Originality: Pearce and Luhrman's conceptualization of *Romeo and Juliet*," Francisco Menendez writes on the use of putting the words from Shakespeare's text on the screen in the opening montage of Luhrman's *Romeo + Juliet*: "In the opening of the film, Luhrman departs from his and Pearce's screenplay to create a cathartic montage that mixes images, title cards and Shakespearean dialogue. It . . . demonstrates how Luhrman . . . prepare[s] the audience for his screenplay adaptation. The opening marries the word to the image and the image to the word, an approach that will be the key for the audience to be able to accept the language in this [contemporary film adaptation]."[22]

To a far lesser extent and in a much less bold style, Olivier's *Henry V* is a precursor to Luhrman in picturing "words" on the screen. The archaic spelling in the floating playbill that opens the film puts early modern English visually on the screen before we hear it. Then we see and hear the hubbub of the theatre before the play is to begin. The music and the camera work extend the time between first seeing the archaic spelling and first hearing it spoken. We are given almost four and one-half minutes to acclimate to the sights and sounds of Elizabethan London before we encounter its spoken language. Just before the first speech of the Chorus, a young boy presents a placard to the playhouse audience. This placard duplicates the writing on the floating playbill of the film's opening.

Bruce Eder, in his commentary on Olivier's film, notes that to Olivier and his collaborator and text editor Alan Dent, "the biggest problem was the language. Shakespeare's plays were written in what is officially referred to as Early Modern English, a form of English, especially in its grammar and meaning, just different enough from twentieth-century usage to repel mass audiences."[23]

Eder's commentary focuses on the many ways, particularly the comic staging of the opening scene, that the film makes the language more accessible to a modern filmgoer. The film uses sight and sound to make way for language. The recurrence of the same archaic spelling of *fift* and *battel* on the placards in the Elizabethan playhouse scene lets us see the unfamiliar spelling of the words shortly before we encounter the unfamiliar structure and meaning of the language. It also ties in with the idea of the dual identities of an Elizabethan production of the play *Henry V* being simultaneously presented with and within the Olivier film. The playbill, when presented cinemagraphically, introduces the film; and then, when presented by the boy according to stage tradition, it introduces the play within the film.

The music has a subtle yet tremendously effective way of drawing the viewer into the film. The score alternates between William Walton's film music and period music. While the camera is showing the hustle and bustle of the Elizabethan playhouse, period music fleshes out the atmosphere. At other times, the familiar style of twentieth-century film music eases us through the more difficult verbal passages of Elizabethan verse. A notable example is the underscoring during the narration of the Chorus's opening monologue. The film music sets the tone for the speech and, as music has a notable emotional link with the filmgoer, it helps us understand the language of Shakespeare's world.

Another instance of the presence of the written word in the staging of this story is passively present in the film's opening sequence. The bespectacled stage manager holds a text of the script through the first scenes of the film. The visual presence of the script maintains the idea not only of words, but also of an old story, an old play within the picture frame. It is self-referencing as it reminds us that we are watching the same written dialogue being performed that the stage manager is following in his prompt book.

The prop papers pertaining to Salic Law, used to much comic effect by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Ely, also warrant discussion. They figure prominently in how Olivier starts to present the story, but they are not props required by the script. Unlike many props in Shakespeare, they are not mentioned in the dialogue. Nor are they indicated by the spare stage directions in the script. In her 1991 book on Shakespeare's stage properties, Frances Teague does not include them in her "Property Lists For Shakespeare's Plays,"[24] yet they figure prominently in the comic business of Olivier's film. They also have a more subtle role in the film: Like the playbill, placards, and the prompter's script, they present another example of a prop containing archaic words, and in this case archaic information, on the screen during the first scenes of the film.

Just as the text of *Henry V* is present as a promptbook in the first scene in the Elizabethan playhouse, a different kind of book, an illuminated manuscript is present in the first scene in the French court. This prop is self-referencing as well. Whereas the promptbook presents the source of the words of the film that we are watching as present in the film, the illuminated manuscript may be a conscious acknowledgement of the visual inspiration for the French scenes of the film—the twelve calendar images from the Duc de Berry's illuminated manuscript, *Les Très Riches Heures* (also called a *Book of Hours*). Harry M. Deguld simply comments that the character of "the Duc de Berry scrutinizes an illuminated manuscript—presumably *Les Très Riches Heures*."[25] Sandra Sugarman Singer writes more on this prop and the Duc de Berry as well: "It is not only that he is named, but the manner in which we see him that makes [Berry's] presence notable . . . [Berry], magnifying glass in hand, is interrupted at a tall slender reading stand on which rests, of course, an illuminated manuscript. He turns at the mention of his name, his costume is distinguished by its trapezoidal hat, exactly that of the January plate. To be sure, the moment reflects on Olivier's wit."[26]

Costumes. Much less is written on the costumes in this film than on the scenery. The practice of maintaining continuity in formal design elements (such as color, proportion and texture) through a shift in period is more apparent, and more extensive, in the costume design. It occurs for both the royalty and the comic low-life and is quite fascinating when considering the issue of period versus style. The costumes change periods when the film transitions from the Elizabethan stage to simulating the actual time of Henry's reign; however, the design elements remain the same. They wear what is essentially the same design, but the design takes the form of the earlier period. As Michael Anderegg notes in his 2004 book *Cinematic Shakespeare*, "The costuming, almost *imperceptibly* [italics mine], has changed—no longer pseudo-Elizabethan, as in the Globe scenes, but now pseudomedieval."[27]

Costume details specific to the artificial silhouette of Elizabethan times, such as the Boy's pumpkin hose and Pistol's ruff and wrist ruff, are gone. The men's breeches with their slashing and puffing have given way to the simpler lines of medieval *hosen*. Quickly's attifet is now a Gothic wimple, and the width of her bum roll is scaled down. Although the period has changed, the aesthetic attitude remains the same. The character delineation remains the same. Their social milieu is the same. The color palette remains the same. Quickly is still in an off-white headdress and chemise, a tan bodice, an olive green skirt and a brown apron. Pistol is still in the same shade of red. Nym is in the same shades of dark greens and dark reds.

Bruce Eder in his commentary on the Criterion Collection DVD of *Henry V* notes that this was the first of Shakespeare's plays to be filmed in color, and the dramatic use of color is a prominent part of the overall design. It would be a decade before another major film release of Shakespeare in color.[28] *Hamlet*, Olivier's next film adaptation of Shakespeare was in black and white; and the color in his *Richard III*, is muted and subdued, nothing like the vibrant color of *Henry V*.

In addition to the color in the costume design, almost all the formal design elements, such as proportions (e.g., Quickly's body is divided up into roughly the same sections of color in both periods, and the ratio of one area to another is basically unchanged) and homespun texture and pattern (e.g., Bardolph's striped sleeves), remain the same. The visual manifestation of the character relationships remains the same, yet the period has changed.

The same transformation of period occurs with some of the court costumes as well. Olivier's regal dress is interpreted as both Elizabethan stage costume and as medieval court costume. The details, such as the shoulder crescents, lace collar and matching cuffs, and silhouette of Olivier's playhouse costume (corresponding to Shakespeare's act 1, scene 2 and the curtain call in the film) are Elizabethan. The details, such as the high collar and silhouette of his long Gothic gown in Southampton (act 2, scene 2), as well his short Gothic tunic in the wooing scene at the French court (act 5, scene 2), are medieval. But what is important is how all three of these costumes are variations on the same image. In all three he wears a bright red wool garment ornamented with much gold decoration and his legs are in white. It is not surprising that the jewelry is slightly more stagy in the Elizabethan playhouse. The Elizabethan stage costume features an open robe worn over a doublet. The open robe is comparable to the long Gothic gown worn at Southampton; the Elizabethan doublet is comparable to the short tunic worn in the wooing scene. All three costumes use similar materials to create the same character image—a leading man whom the audience will find bold, virile and noble.

On stage this play could be costumed in Elizabethan costumes or costumed in the more historical medieval fashions. Both stage traditions exist and co-exist. But the movement from one period to another asynchronous period, particularly a backward move in fashion during the forward progression of the narrative, was novel.

As a side note, I find this example of movement between periods insightful. It shows that a design idea can take form in more than one period. It conveys the idea that period does not in and of itself make a design. Design is about creating character. The character can be designed and created independently of the period choice.

Apropos of the Chorus's invocation for the audience that "'tis your thoughts that must now deck our kings" (1.0.28), I would like to broach the issue of whether our ability (or verbal facility) to more readily discuss period influences the convention of varying the period of these plays. Another way of looking at the costume design in this film is interesting: the question of whether the popularity of this film influenced (or opened up) the acceptance of shifting costume conventions concerning period pieces. The change of period is not text-based; it is a cinematic convention. As has been written elsewhere, this film broke the rules on narrative film. Its visual conventions for multiple time frames were novel and have been widely written about. However, it also broke costume conventions in the presentation of narratives. As I mentioned earlier, the costumes move back in time as the narrative moves forward. This isn't a flashback. Older fashions are conventionally used to signal a flashback. But here the costume choices support a less conventional vision of storytelling. The film had an exceptionally wide distribution, and I wonder if it was influential in forging the public's ability to see and accept historical "period" narratives in multiple guises.

Fashion historian Edward Maeder writes about the influence of contemporary fashion on the adaptation of period fashions in contemporary films. The fit, cut, and fabric choices are very much influenced by the prevailing aesthetic of the decade when a film is made,[29] yet another manifestation of the movement of design between periods. We now see much 1940s styling in the cut of the Gothic gowns in Olivier's film. The center back closure on Renee Asherton's pink gown for her opening scene is done as a mid-twentieth-century costume, not as an actual medieval garment. Likewise, all the costumes are machine stitched with nicely turned linings (particularly on the scalloped edges). More important, the cut of the dress conforms to the contours of the contemporary full-foundation undergarment. The placement of bust line, waistline, and hipline reflect the aesthetics and curves of the 1940s figure. No attempt is made to alter the actress's body into a medieval shape or posture. The period pattern is adapted to go over a modern body. The dress has several touches that reflect 1940s fashions. The drape in the shoulder area is a 1940s touch. It gives the performer some freedom of movement and looks quite elegant to the modern audience, but is not characteristic of medieval garment construction. The four pleats under the bust, which open just below the waistline, use a popular 1940s cut to achieve fullness in the skirt. The stiffened blue faux collar is a variation on the boat neck, which was also popular during the middle of the twentieth century. These adjustments reflect the practice of blending modern and historical fashions in film costume.

The men's costumes as well reflect contemporary aesthetics. The form-fitting tights are modern. They are not the bias-cut *hosen* of medieval times. The strong shoulder line reflects contemporary taste rather than the sloping Gothic shoulder. And in general the fullness of the doublets reflects the fit of a contemporary suit, not the more form-fitting laced period doublet.

One final observation on the costumes: in his book *Laurence Olivier and the Art of Film Making*, Dale Silviria writes insightfully on the movement through time which occurs in the costumes as

Olivier returns the film from the French court to the Elizabethan playhouse at the wedding of Henry and the Princess Katherine:

> Olivier begins the transformation considerably before the couple reaches the twin thrones . . . [B]eneath the white wedding robes Olivier and Asherton have already donned their Elizabethan apparel. The instant of the costume change occurs between the midshot in which the couple retires to their respective circles of attendants and the long shot that picks up the entire assembly as Katherine and Henry emerge from the circles. Thus, even as Olivier moves towards the approaching mystical climax, he is taking us away from it, back to the first reality of the film, the Globe.[30]

Hair. Overall, the actor's hair and makeup have a clear sense of stage versus cinematic traditions and correspond directly to the acting styles. The hair reflects the period shifts as well.

It is interesting to look at Olivier's hair vis à vis Alicia Annas's essay on hair and makeup in Maeder's book, *Hollywood and History*.[31] The typical cinematic practice during the middle decades of the twentieth century was to keep the leading men's hairstyles very close to the actor's own hair. The character image yielded to the star's image—particularly when viewed from the front. The duality of periods in this film is quite interesting in terms of Olivier's hair. The hairstyle of Olivier as the actor playing Henry on the Elizabethan stage conforms to standard cinema practice. His hair looks rather like the popular hairstyles of his day. However, his hair for the medieval sections is quite striking and quite daring for an actor of his stature. For the lead in a major motion picture, it is surprisingly close to medieval styles.

The film makes an insightful use of a reappearing prop wig. Renee Asherson's hair is covered by elaborate medieval headdresses during the French court scenes. However, after the film returns to the Elizabethan playhouse for the closing bows, she appears in the same red curly wig that the boy actors were playing with backstage at the Elizabethan playhouse (between act 1, scene 1, and act 2, scene 2). As Princess Katherine moves through time and appears in Elizabethan garb, she takes on the hair color and style of her descendant Elizabeth Tudor. Elizabeth I was the great-great-granddaughter of Katherine via Katherine's second marriage to Owen Tudor.

One hairstyle in the film, that of the Duke of Burgundy, looks neither Elizabethan, medieval nor modern. It is late 18th century. I find it more interesting to regard this as a movement through time rather than a mistake. To me it suggests the vision of a voice from the Age of Enlightenment speaking for reason. As Deborah Cartmell observes, "This speech is a plea for peace, not a celebration of the achievement of peace."[32] It is interesting to wonder if Olivier's film is also a plea for understanding and unity in the post World War II peace negotiations.

Design for Occasion. The last aspect of design in this film that I'm going to discuss is how the design visually supports Olivier's use of *Henry V* as World War II propaganda. As a designer, I read Shakespeare's script as indicating an economic disparity between the English and the French, and that the disparity would be reflected in the design of the English nobles and the French nobles in both their appearance and their surroundings. The initial textual basis for this comes from the dialogue between the prelates in act 1, scene 1, concerning the wealth of France. It is also present when the French boast of the quality of their armor and other accoutrements.

Fashion history also supports this approach to design. French fashions of the early fifteenth century were more colorful, opulent, ostentatious, frivolous and ornamented than those of the English. However, we find no economic disparity in costume design between French and English nobles in the costumes for this film. In Olivier's presentation of *Henry V*, the English are as richly dressed as the French, though they tastefully forego the foppish excesses of French fashion. To me this is consistent with the propagandist objectives of this film. While the English are the underdogs, they are not seen as lacking in resources. So on to the scenery—their palaces and castles.

Olivier finesses the wealth and opulence issue with the scenic elements. Though the French court is pictured in beautiful sets suggestive of a well decorated, richly appointed palace, the English court scenes all take place on the "stage set" of the Elizabethan playhouse. The wealth of their castles cannot be compared; however, something more thematically significant emerges from this staging. He leaves the French in the art of the Duc du Berry's *Book of Hours*—a static art form: art which is found in museums and libraries. But the English, the victors, at the opening and, more importantly, the close of the film are presented in the playhouse—a live art form: an art form that continues from one generation to the next. As we see here this summer at the Utah Shakespearean Festival, plays such as *Henry V* are still being performed in Elizabethan-style playhouses. In fact, there are more facsimiles of Elizabethan playhouses presenting live theatre today than in either

Shakespeare's day or Olivier's. Thematically, the cinematic effect of the shifting through periods and styles is not only interesting, but relates to the film's wartime goal of boosting morale. This may be an old story (as evidenced by the Elizabethan playhouse) of an even older historical event (as evidenced by the stylized depiction of the medieval art); but the battle scene is shot on location. The battle is real and the victory is real. And the idea—that such a victory against seemingly overwhelming odds was real—had great appeal in wartime England: If it could be done once, it could be done again.

Notes

1. Anthony R. Guneratne, *Shakespeare, Film Studies, and the Visual Cultures of Modernity* (New York: Palgrave Macmillian, 2008), 56.

2. Sandra Sugarman Singer, *Laurence Olivier Directs Shakespeare: A Study in Film Authorship*, PhD diss., Northwestern University, 1979 (Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 1984), 66-67.

3. Anthony Davies, *Filming Shakespeare's Plays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 34-35.

4. Ace G. Pilkington, *Screening Shakespeare from "Richard II" to "Henry V"* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1991), 110, citing Graham Holderness, *Shakespeare's History* (New York: St. Martins Press, 1985). 190.

5. Guneratne, *Shakespeare, Film Studies, and the Visual Cultures of Modernity*, 130.

6. William Shakespeare, *Henry V*, in *The Riverside Shakespeare*, ed. G. Blakemore Evans (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1974), 936. The lines appear at 1.0.28-29; all in-text line references are from this volume.

7. Ibid., n. 29.

8. Herschel Baker, introduction to *Henry V*, in *The Riverside Shakespeare*, ed. G. Blakemore Evans (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1974), 930.

9. Geoffrey Bullough, ed., *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare, Volume IV* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962), 355.

10. Ibid., 349.

11. Harry M. Deguld, *Filmguide to "Henry V"* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1973), 58.

12. Douglas A. Russell, *Period Style for the Theatre, Second Edition* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1987), xv.

13. *Webster's New Twentieth-Century Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged,* 2nd ed., s.v. "Elizabethan."

14. Geoffrey Squire, *Dress and Society* (New York: The Viking Press, 1974), 45.

15. Ibid., 48.

16. Kenneth S. Rothwell, *Shakespeare on Screen* (New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers, Inc., 1990), 94.

17. Deguld, *Filmguide to "Henry V*," 61.

18. Michael Anderegg, *Cinematic Shakespeare* (Landham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2004), 37.

19. Jack J. Jorgens, *Shakespeare on Film* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977), 130.

20. Davies, *Filming Shakespeare's Plays*, 34.

21. Deborah Cartmell, *Interpreting Shakespeare on the Screen* (New York: St Martin's Press, 2000), 99-101.

22. Francisco Menendez, "Redefining Originality: Pearce and Luhrman's Conceptualization of *Romeo and Juliet*," *Creative Screenwriting* 5, no. 2. (1998): 39

23. Bruce Eder, "Commentaries," *Henry V*, special ed. DVD, directed by Laurence Olivier (1944; New York City: The Criterion Collection, 2006)

24. Frances Teague, *Shakespeare's Speaking Properties* (London: Associated University Presses, 1991), 177.

25. Deguld, *Filmguide to "Henry V*,*"* 35.

26. Singer, *Laurence Olivier Directs Shakespeare*, 88.

27. Anderegg, *Cinematic Shakespeare*, 37.

28. Eder, "Commentaries."

29. Edward Maeder, ed., *Hollywood and History—Costume Design in Film* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1987), 9. Like most British films, *Henry V* followed similar conventions to those used in Hollywood. Olivier had been in Hollywood prior to filming *Henry V*.

30. Dale Silviria, *Laurence Olivier and the Art of Film Making* (Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1985), 138-39.

31. Alicia Annas, "The Photogenic Formula: Hairstyles and Makeup in Historical Films," in *Hollywood and History—Costume Design in Film*, ed. Maeder (London: Thames and Hudson, 1987), 58.

32. Cartmell, *Interpreting Shakespeare on the Screen*, 99.

ACTING SHAKESPEARE
A Roundtable Discussion with Artists from the Utah Shakespearean Festival's 2009 Production of *Henry V*

Michael Flachmann

Utah Shakespearean Festival Company Dramaturg

Featuring: J. R. Sullivan (Director), Brian Vaughn (King Henry V), Corliss Preston (Chorus), Phil Hubbard (Exeter), Rick Peeples (Fluellen), Will Zahrn (Pistol), Emily Trask (Katharine), and Ben Cherry (The Dauphin)

Flachmann: Welcome to the culminating event in our Wooden O Symposium, the Actors' Roundtable Discussion on *Henry V*. I'd like to begin with a question for Mr. Sullivan, and then move on to the actors for their opinions on the same topic. The primary criticism levied against history plays is that they are often boring recreations of mundane historical details, but anyone who has seen your brilliant production of *Henry V* would certainly disagree with this statement. So I'd like to know your secret for making this play so accessible, so immediate, and so alive.

Sullivan: It's like what happened in school, isn't it? If you had a history class that was simply dates and battles and the important reigns of kings or presidents or prime ministers, it could be awfully dull. But if it's a *story*, as history really is, then you are talking about an entirely different situation. Of course, in the theater storytelling is what we're about. Shakespeare's histories are not so much recitations of history as they are stories about human behavior in crisis.

Flachmann: So these plays are really about people and what they must do to survive.

Sullivan: Absolutely. Shakespeare certainly gives us a national impression about Henry the Fifth, something that was received by his audience from generations before. We have the same in that we as a nation have received impressions about Abraham Lincoln, for example, or George Washington or Amelia Earhart. People may not know the whole story about these heroes, but they usually know something about them: a picture of the person or a notion of that person's character, a sense of his or her impact on the planet. History is always subjective. It's never the whole story; it never can be.

Flachmann: Thank you, Jim. Brian?

Vaughn: For me, the main goal, the main objective in doing these plays, is to try and find as many of the human connections to the characters as possible so the audience can relate to them as people. History plays are more like a big family drama than a boring history lesson, a recital of kings and monarchs. Jim's vision was to make the play as human and as visceral as possible so the audience could strongly identify with these characters. The beauty of playing Henry is that you have three other plays in which he is mentioned or he appears, so you definitely get a thorough back story for his character in the *Henry IV* plays. In *Henry V*, however, he's a different man; he's turned away from his former self and become a king. I loved the journey of trying to find the heart of this guy, of discovering who he is as a ruler, as a king, as a lover. There's lots of theatrical language in the play about becoming one person and then putting on a mask to be an entirely different character, and I think that's the journey for Henry. He plays the politician in the first scene, then the defiant ruler punishing the traitors, then the angry soldier, then the trickster, and finally the lover. So the challenge is in discovering who he is beneath all these personae, which is his own spiritual journey of finding himself in the play. Much of this culminates in the prayer scene before the Battle of Agincourt, when he discovers that all these different aspects lie within himself. After this pivotal moment in the play, he is no longer concerned with trying to play all these different roles. He can be the "role" itself.

Flachmann: Thanks, Brian. Corliss?

Preston: At the first readthrough, Jim told us that this is a play about language, about the ability to communicate or miscommunicate, and it's also very muscular. So all of a sudden he gave me two things that helped me greatly as the Chorus. I knew instinctively that I could move around, that I didn't have to stand there and just say the words. I was given freedom to "embody" the action, and that made a lot of sense to me personally. I also know that you and Jim broke up some of the speeches, which allowed me as Chorus to remain present throughout the entire play. I love watching the action on stage, which keeps me connected to the play. I invite the audience into a world of imagination that I truly believe in. And it's not easy language; there's a density to it. We really tried to make it accessible to the audience. I also immediately identified with the war effort in this play because I had just finished working with returning veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan, and the stories these soldiers told gave me a strong emotional connection to Shakespeare's script. This role is sometimes divided into an ensemble, with many people doing it. I knew we didn't have time for that here. Choral work takes an enormous amount of rehearsal time to do it well. What I found playing the role as one person was that I felt emotionally connected to the characters on stage, which was a wonderful surprise for me.

Flachmann: Thank you, Corliss. Phil?

Hubbard: I play the Duke of Exeter, which is a lovely supporting role. He's a bit of a father figure, I think, to the King, a confidant to the King, a huge fan and supporter to the King. In a supporting role like this, what's important is finding out where my character fits into the story. It's easy to admire Brian, because he's a friend of mine and I love his work, so it's easy to play Exeter for that reason. I played Cominius in *Coriolanus* a few years ago, who is also a huge supporter of the key figure in the play. I tend to play roles like that. [laughter] Exeter is also somewhat ambassadorial. The scenes with the French are a little bit like United Nations meetings—well, we've talked about Colin Powell bringing those satellite photos to the UN and proving why we should go to war. That aspect of Exeter is in there, too. He's like a Secretary of State.

Flachmann: That's excellent. Rick, how about Fluellen?

Peeples: He's been a problematic character in productions because he's really hard to understand and often gets cut a lot. [laughter] I had the experience as a younger actor of being in a couple of different productions of *Henry V* and almost feeling sorry for the poor actor playing Fluellen. I could never understand what he was saying, and neither could anybody else. So I was resolved coming into this production that my main goal was to make Fluellen understandable and accessible, so that the language was at least clear, After that, if he was funny or engaging or interesting, that was just going to be gravy. [laughter] Fluellen's a clown, obviously, but he has his serious side, too, because he's kind of like Lear's Fool. He's also like a new Falstaff. It's really interesting, in fact, that Falstaff dies early in this play without ever having his name mentioned. So we had some discussions about whether Fluellen is a reincarnation of Falstaff for Henry, who needs a new common man to be a reference point for him. I'm fascinated with how Fluellen has these hilarious scenes and then turns on a dime when we're counting the French and English dead. It's really an intriguing role for me to play. I'm having a lot of fun doing it.

Flachmann: Thanks, Rick. We've got Will down there who, as Pistol, is our working class representative.

Zahrn: Yes, but I think Pistol and his Boar's Head buddies are even lower than working class. [laughter] They won't work! [laughter]

Flachmann: They're the "stealing class." [laughter]

Zahrn: That's right, the stealing class. Nym, Bardolph, the Boy, and I go to France to steal. We're like mercenary soldiers who are going over there to glean what we can off whomever happens to be dead or dying or not looking. [laughter] When we started working on the Boor's Head scenes in rehearsals, Jim Sullivan equated us with the three Stooges, and we kept shifting who was Moe and Larry and Curly. [laughter] But I feel really special because this is my second season in Utah and this is my second Shakespeare play, and my GI bill ran out before I got to the third year at the Goodman School of Drama, and that's when you learn Shakespeare! [laughter and applause]. So it's taken me a while to figure out what we're talking about. [laughter] It's a joy at this late date for me to get to work on the real stuff. I'm in hog heaven! [applause]

Flachmann: Thank you, Will. Now let's move down to the French characters, who are already giving me trouble for having marginalized them on the dais. [laughter] I apologize. Emily, talk to us about the beautiful Katharine, please.

Trask: The word "beautiful" is a good introduction to Katharine. I have the pleasure of providing a dash of estrogen in a very testosterone-heavy play. [laughter] It's certainly only a dash, but I think it's a very potent dash. When I approach a history play, I see it first as a story involving real people and real lives. I feel like there's a greater charge to it, a greater sense of responsibility, almost an amplification of life, especially since these people have actually lived and breathed historically. So I think the story is especially alive, and that's the way I've tried to approach Katharine. It's a lovely, lovely challenge. French is such a beautiful language, and I think it's perfect for the separation between the men and women in this play. Like Henry, Katharine is also coming of age through the play, and so her journey through those two scenes kind of mirrors Henry's through the feminine aspect.

Flachmann: That's excellent, and if I might ask while you have the microphone, Emily, you had some prior experience with speaking French, isn't that correct?

Trask: I took French starting in junior high through high school, but wasn't a very good student. To pass, I ended up having to do some extra credit, which was a French forensics competition. My French teacher asked if I would get a group of friends together to do a play, and we did a little five-minute farce. It was so much fun that we continued doing it every year until I was a senior in high school, when we put on a production of *Waiting for Godot* in French. We took Nationals, which sounds pretty impressive, but French forensics competition isn't too stiff. [laughter] That's actually how I got into theatre: doing extra credit for my French class. [applause]

Flachmann: Thank you, Emily. Ben, tell us about the Dauphin.

Cherry: Emily speaks beautifully in the show, by the way. I, on the other hand, got a "C" both times I took French in high school, so I apologize to you and everyone else who has to hear me speak French on stage. Often when this show is done, the Dauphin and the French court are very stylized, covered in pounds and pounds of frills and bows and lace, with really high heels, so the audience sees this masculine English court and these frou-frou French people, and it's obvious who's going to win. [laughter] Jim decided to stay away from that interpretation. He wanted the audience to see the French as equals to the English, though he certainly didn't take away their boastfulness. He also didn't want the Dauphin to be evil, but rather realistic just like all the other characters.

Flachmann: You're not evil; you're just misunderstood. [laughter]

Cherry: Totally misunderstood!

Flachmann: Lovely. So is this play pro-war or anti-war? That's a hot scholarly topic these days. I wonder if anyone has an opinion about that? Jim?

Sullivan: I don't think Shakespeare takes a political view on that. He just presents the situation as it is and lets his audiences respond to it. I think he gives us both sides of the question. Soldiers will go to war for a phrase. So that makes language powerful and also potentially dangerous. Some productions of *Henry V* explore Henry's Machiavellian nature and emphasize his manipulative side, but I don't see the play that way. These characters are all "actors" in life. Like Hamlet, he is the most observed of all observers. He has public speech and private speech. That was rather new for

Elizabethan drama, and that created the theater we have today. As Harold Bloom would argue, that created human beings, the consciousness of "self." We all have an inner life that we can connect to the inner lives of the characters, while our outer lives are connecting to their outer lives as well.

Flachmann: Very good. Phil?

Hubbard: I think a play always resonates within the period in which it is performed. In other words, we are doing this play in 2009, so it's appropriate for us to ask that question about our world now. Over the past few years in the United States, there's been an anti-war sentiment about conflicts we've been involved in, so the topic of war is certainly on the minds of everyone who sees this production. I definitely think our show deals with the cost of war and whether war is ever justified. When Brian is speaking to the Mayor of Harfleur, what he says is really horrible, and that resonates within our anti-war sentiment today. We don't want to go in there and do the things he is saying we will do if they don't surrender. I wouldn't personally classify it as an anti-war play, but this is certainly one of the voices we listen to and deal with when we perform the play.

Flachmann: Brian?

Vaughn: I agree with Phil completely. I think our production takes both sides of the question during the course of the play. One of the beauties of its dramatic structure is that all these contradictions are represented within the script, and the audience gets to walk away from it and ask themselves what they think. "Conscience" is a word that comes up frequently during the play. I think the cost of war is represented clearly. We found it much more interesting to portray Henry as a guy who has a great deal of trepidation of about going to war and a lot of guilt about making this fatal decision. That first scene with the Archbishop of Canterbury really has to set that up. After the Dauphin's insult involving the tennis balls, Henry doesn't have much choice but to attack France.

Flachmann: Corliss, would you like to weigh in on this question, too? You and I have talked a lot about how a female narrator influences the audience's perception of the play.

Preston: Well, it certainly influences me personally. I believe the play is about the emotional and political necessity of having a leader, someone you can believe in and follow. That's the journey I see. As a female watching all that testosterone on stage getting ready for war, I am acutely aware of our current conflicts around the globe, and I feel a profound responsibility to help the audience connect to that awareness as well and buckle their seatbelts! [laughter]

Flachmann: The play is obsessed with war for such a long time, and then interestingly enough it veers near the end toward more comic scenes with the duping of Williams, Fluellen making Pistol eat the leek, and the wonderful wooing scene with Katharine. I wonder if I could get Brian and perhaps Emily to talk a little bit about that shift and especially the purpose of the wooing scene.

Vaughn: The wooing scene is almost a retelling of what Henry has been going through emotionally during the whole play. The last scene is a throughline for Henry. When he says to her, "Shall not thou and I, between St. Denis and St. George, compound a boy, half French, half English, that shall go to Constantinople and take the Turk by the beard," that's the ultimate goal for Henry: future generations of England and France walking together in the realm. That to me is what Henry is ultimately trying to accomplish in this play. And I think this scene is a relief for the audience. They can see these people not as leaders involved in a bitter war, but as human beings pursuing love and peace. This is Henry's discovery in the play at the end. From the prayer scene in 4.1, what Jim has called the "Gethsemane moment," the play is about brotherhood. Henry never again mentions "conscience" after the victory at Agincourt. All of a sudden, he begins to delegate all these tasks to different people. He tells the French King and Exeter to go make the final decisions on the peace treaty. "I'm going to woo Katherine," he says. [laughter]

Flachmann: Emily, Henry really doesn't have to "woo" you. You are his principal demand, to which your father has already agreed. How do you see that wooing scene?

Trask: Well, Henry and I shift into prose in 5.2, which makes the scene all about communication. Perhaps he moves into prose because he's more relaxed, but Katherine speaks in French prose, too. I love the fact that he doesn't have to fight this battle, but he chooses to anyway. That he continues to say all these beautiful things, knowing full well that she doesn't really understand him, is highly romantic. It's a lovely release for all of us, I think, especially during the kiss. In some productions, she is played as a pawn, a pushover, but one line in there is quite wonderful. When she asks "Is it possible dat I sould love de *ennemi* of France," that takes some pretty serious guts for this little French princess to say to the King of England. I think it's a meeting of the minds, even though the minds speak different languages.

Vaughn: Yes, she brings him down a peg, which is a stripping away of ceremony, of royalty, and reveals the core of these two lovely characters, which again is what makes a history play like this so "human" and "alive" for its audience.

Flachmann: I think you get a different type of love in the scene when Bardolph is being led off for execution. Pistol is the only one of the Boor's Head crew who survives all of this. How painful is it for your character, Brian, to watch this?

Vaughn: It's incredibly difficult, but also incredibly necessary. If Henry doesn't have Bardolph killed, his army would be out looting and pillaging with no code of conduct at all. This is just as painful as saying goodbye to Falstaff at the end of *Henry, Part II*. Henry has to get people to see a new way of thinking, and Bardolph doesn't inhabit that new world view. I've heard of productions where Henry just turns his back on Bardolph as he is led away with no emotional connection whatsoever, but I find that personally wrong.

Flachmann: Thank you. I'd like to get back down to Ben with a question about the difference between the "real" history upon which the play is based and Shakespeare's dramatic, imaginative version of that historical past. For example, the Dauphin was actually dead at the end of the play, and yet Shakespeare has your character appear in the final scene. In the same fashion, your father in the script, played beautifully in this production by Mark Light-Orr, was mentally ill, but Shakespeare does not choose to bring that aspect of his life into the play.

Cherry: The French king was certainly mad. He believed he was made of glass. So we have taken that historical reality and used it to inform his scenes. Rather than being insane, he's very sad and passive, as if he might break if he did anything too large or alarming. So we have taken all the research work Michael [Flachmann] has done for us and used it in our own way throughout the production.

Flachmann: Brian, another notable departure from historical reality involves the killing of the prisoners, which was strategically done to free up the soldiers because the French were massing together for another assault. Historically, and in Shakespeare's play, the prisoners are killed before the massacre of the boys guarding the luggage. In our cutting of the script, however, the murder of the boys happens first, which so angers Henry that he orders all the French prisoners killed.

Vaughn: This was something that Jim and I talked about a lot before we began rehearsals. I was drawn to this new cutting because

I thought it made Henry a little more sympathetic. Killing the prisoners was a tactical move on Henry's part: He needed the men who had been guarding them because the French were regrouping, and the odds were still over five to one. This one decision has weakened Henry's historical reputation and made him seem more merciless, but it's just one of those orders made in the heat of battle. He had to protect his troops, and this was an action that saved many lives for him, which goes back to the role of conscience in warfare. I'm particularly fond of the way we've arranged these scenes, because I think it helps soften Henry's character a bit. It was just something he had to do.

Flachmann: Will, I think you lose two hundred crowns when you're forced to kill your prisoner.

Zahrn: Yes, it's a bittersweet moment for me. That's more money than I could make in a lifetime.

Flachmann: That's a lot of pockets to pick! [laughter] How do you think the Adams Theatre lends itself to a show like this? Corliss, you've got a particularly acrobatic role going up and down those ladders. How do you feel about that?

Preston: Well, of course, it's a joy. If you're going to do the Chorus in *Henry V*, it's nice to have a Wooden O to do it in! [laughter]

Vaughn: I believe the play was written for the newly rebuilt Globe Theatre. It was the first play presented there. So performing this show in a replica of Shakespeare's theatre really presents us with some wonderful opportunities. When you see the play on film, it takes away all the audience's imagination, and that's the beauty of Corliss' role as the Chorus: painting a picture so the audience can see the proud hoofs, the receiving earth, the magnificent horses. For a war play, there is actually very little fighting in this production. You principally see the after effects of the battles. The only actual fighting you see is the Pistol scene with the French soldier. The scene with the archers above is not in the original script. We put that in our production because the English longbow was so crucial in winning the battle. That and the rain, of course!

Flachmann: Rick, there are so many different kinds of language use in this play. We have aristocratic language; we've got working-class or tavern language; and we've also got Welsh, French, Scottish, and Irish. What does such linguistic profusion say about bringing this country together?

Peeples: One of the main themes of the play is how Henry is going to unite not only France and England, but all of these separate nationalities within England. Remember the hilarious scene between

Captains Jamy, Macmorris, and Fluellen? They can't even understand each other. Henry's most important job is to unite all these people, which he does by the end of the play.

Sullivan: Absolutely right. It's interesting to me that at the conclusion of our part one, Henry's soldiers have just held the bridge. I think that's a poetic idea in the play and a metaphor for connecting two different points of view. Henry rouses his soldiers to magnificent deeds simply by helping them understand that their mortal bodies carry a profound, deep, and enduring spirit. Because of what they are going to do that day, they will live forever. His ability to connect to his people is extraordinary, but the whole play is really about people connecting with each other. Henry has to build a bridge to Katharine by virtue of his own character and his mind. That scene in our production is staged around a simple wooden table, which is, in effect, a "bridge" between nations. Even the scenes involving Pistol and the Eastcheap gang help deepen this important theme in the play. They have a very colorful vernacular, and their scenes are filled, particularly for Mistress Quickly, with the misuse of language. Thematically, Shakespeare is exploring the use of language in every scene in the play.

Flachmann: What about the relationship between religion and history in the script. Do you feel manipulated by the Archbishop of Canterbury at the outset of the play, Brian?

Vaughn: I don't see Henry as being manipulated by the Archbishop; rather, I see them manipulating each other. You scratch my back, and I'll scratch yours. If you fund this war for me, I'll forget about the tax. This political maneuvering helps both their agendas. That's why the first scene is so public: He wants support from all the constituents in the kingdom. There was a massive snowstorm during Henry's coronation, which is a wonderful metaphor for this guy. He comes out of this storm and makes a personal journey of self-discovery throughout the play. During the prayer scene, he realizes that he doesn't have to live in the past and continue paying for the mistake his father made in seizing the throne from Richard. He realizes that success lies within him, which is very Christ-like. He's very much like Hamlet, who goes to England and comes back a changed person.

Flachmann: What a brilliant, articulate, thoughtful panel this morning! Don't you all think so? [applause] As you can tell, we only hire really smart actors here at the Festival. [laughter and applause] Before we come to a close, I want to thank Mr. Sullivan and the actors for spending so much time with us this morning. What a thrill to have them all to ourselves. I also want to thank

Michael Barr, Matt Nickerson, Jessica Tvordi, Scott Phillips, Fred Adams, everyone responsible for the Wooden O Symposium, and everybody who supports these roundtable discussions. And thanks especially to our wonderful audience. We couldn't do any of this without you! [applause]

Undergraduate Paper

A Fair Youth in the Forest of Arden: Reading Gender and Desire in *As You Like It* and Shakespeare's Sonnets

Amanda Rudd
Biola University

In the world of Shakespeare scholarship, we rarely think of a comedy as hard to follow. Yet *As You Like It* could prove to be just that. Particularly noted for its allusiveness and intertextuality, this play would demand a remarkably well-read audience to follow all, or even most, of Shakespeare's references to classical and contemporary pastoral sources, and *As You Like It* is perhaps his only play which directly quotes a contemporary playwright. It is clear that Shakespeare wrote in a spirit of dialogue. Less clear is this play's relationship with Shakespeare's other works. Many a critic has noted in passing the eerie similarities between the figures in *As You Like It* and those in Shakespeare's *Sonnets*, and yet the subject has not been seriously considered. I would like to suggest, however, that the parallel figures emerging in *As You Like It* and the sonnets are indeed in dialogue with each other, and that this relationship will have a particular impact on the understanding of gender in Shakespeare's comedy. These analogous characters converse to establish a fabric of interwoven gender relationships which perhaps work to a similar end. In featuring a cross-dressing heroine, *As You Like It* poses a challenge to orthodox constructions of gender, but one which is only entertained in the Forest of Arden. Similarly, Shakespeare's sonnets display a narrative and a *Dramatis Personae* which combine to threaten conventional assumptions of appropriate love, but culminate in a heterosexual union. These parallel trajectories together suggest that reading desire in *As You Like It* as informed by the sonnets will open better understandings of the poet's constructions of gender and desire.

At the center of this dialogue is the figure of Ganymede, profoundly reminiscent of the fair youth of the first 126 sonnets. Indeed, Orlando addresses Ganymede as just that, declaring, "Fair youth, I would I could make thee believe I love"(3.2.369-70).[1] In appearance the figures are remarkably alike. The young man addressed in Shakespeare's first sonnet series is "fair" (1.1), "beautiful" (4.13), and "tender" (1.12). [2] Similarly, when Oliver describes Ganymede, he says, "The boy is fair/ Of female favour, and bestows himself/ Like a ripe sister" (4.3.84-86). The effeminate youth may have been something of a stock reality in early modern England, making this connection rather unremarkable; but the dynamic relationships between the figures of the play and the poetry are impressively conversant and resist such a dismissal.

The choice of the mythical Ganymede for Rosalind's disguise immediately interjects a sexual suggestiveness to the figure at the center of *As You Like It*. The name invokes the cupbearer of Jove, whose youthful beauty attracted the sexual attentions of his master. In choosing "no worse a name than Jove's own page" (1.3.114), Rosalind adds a homoerotic tenor to the play. In some sense, the name "Ganymede" was a byword for notions of male homoeroticism in early modern England. Shakespeare's contemporary, Richard Barnfield, published a sonnet series dedicated to a youth named Ganymede, and Mario DiGiangi explains that Jove's desire for Ganymede has been "of signal importance in describing the particular age- and status-inflected structure of male homoeroticism" at the time.[3] Juliet Dusinberre further explains that Rosalind's act—that of cross-dressing on stage—attracted violent criticism in the early modern period for the very reason that it aroused homoerotic feeling in both actors and audience.[4] In short, Rosalind as Ganymede would have been a suggestively bisexual image for Shakespeare's audience. In removing to the Forest of Arden and taking on her disguise, Rosalind enters into this sphere of homoerotic reference. Sexuality in this wilderness, and under this name, makes no claim to essentialism, but is fluid and multiple. In Ganymede's Arden, women fall in love with other women, men bond with other men, and the general atmosphere of the forest is one of sexual freeplay.

Sonnet 20, infamous for its invocation to "the master-mistress of my passion" (20.2) is a lurking presence in the relationship between Ganymede and Orlando. In Sonnet 20, the poet describes his young lover as doubly sexed: fair and gentle as a woman, but endowed with male genitalia. This "master mistress," Joseph Pequigney defines as "a male mistress, one loved like a woman, but of the male sex."[5] Ganymede's playful and performative interactions with Orlando echo this exact relationship. The effeminate Ganymede parades as "Rosalind," inducing Orlando's love, and yet this Ganymede is supposedly male. The slippery quality of the term "master-mistress" must, however, be acknowledged. It could just as easily be taken as a reference to a woman who masters her lover. In either case, the term is conversant with the Rosalind/Ganymede and Orlando relationship; for as a woman, Rosalind is clearly master of her interactions with Orlando. Indeed, upon first meeting her, Orlando declares, "O poor Orlando, thou art overthrown! / Or Charles or something weaker *masters* thee" (1.2.248-49, emphasis mine).

Moreover, the narrative of Sonnet 20 seems to peer through Ganymede's later conversation with Oliver. In the second half of the sonnet, Shakespeare relates a myth of the fair youth's origin:

> And for a woman wert thou first created,
> Till nature as she wrought thee fell a-doting,
> And by addition me of thee defeated,
> By adding one thing to my purpose nothing:
> But since she pricked thee out for women's pleasure,
> Mine be thy love, and thy love's use thy treasure. (20.9-14)

The youth, originally created as a woman, attracted nature so powerfully that she altered her course and made him a man by the addition of a phallus. Ganymede may very well be toying with this myth when, told to "counterfeit to be a man," he retorts, "So I do. But i'faith, I should have been a woman by right" (4.3.172-75). This statement is both a reminder of the lady underneath the doublet and hose and an allusion to this myth of mis-creation. The youth Ganymede's declaration that he would more rightly be a woman sounds every bit like the fair youth's answer to the narrative of Sonnet 20.

If indeed Ganymede recalls this youth, the relationship between poet and dedicatee, Orlando and Ganymede must be analyzed. Orlando's love may be explicitly for Rosalind, but in role-playing with Ganymede, he performs the actions of an amorous shepherd doting on his "lovely Boy" (126.1). Orlando "mar[s] the trees with writing love songs" to Rosalind, and yet Rosalind is veiled by the figure of Ganymede (2.3.252-53). A fair youth interrupts the successful communication of heterosexual love and interjects homoerotic tensions into the play. These tensions, however, are not unique to Shakespeare's construction, but draw heavily upon the homoerotics of the pastoral tradition. Shakespeare is not creating explicitly homosexual characters; indeed, as critics like Michel Foucault have duly noted, "homosexual" as an ontological category did not exist in the English Renaissance.[6] Rather, love and desire between men was taken for granted in classical pastoral. Homoerotic desires were seen as typical to youthful experience, but were also expected to be outgrown with the entrance into manhood. In Virgil's second eclogue, for instance, the older shepherd Corydon woos the young, aristocratic Alexis with his verse, but the relationship is outgrown with Alexis's maturation. Shakespeare toys with this "myth of The Passionate Shepherd" in his own contribution to the pastoral tradition.[7] The homoerotic for Orlando and Ganymede is merely a phase in the process of growing up and learning to love properly, and an education in loving is precisely the activity in which Ganymede and Orlando seek to engage. Thus, just as Shakespeare's sonnets ultimately urge the fair youth toward more practical heterosexual relationships, the tensions between Orlando and Ganymede finally resolve in Orlando's marriage to Rosalind. In interjecting the fair youth Ganymede, Shakespeare simply makes his conversation with the pastoral tradition explicit.

The language of gentility also participates in the steady dismantling of gender in the Forest of Arden. Banished to the wilderness, Duke Senior has established a sort of idealistic, Edenic court. The men in his company value themselves not for their bravery or honour, but for their gentility. The mythos of the court establishes an ideal courtier who is only vaguely gendered and if anything, effeminate. When Orlando first surprises Duke Senior, he enters the scene aggressively, sword drawn, every inch the masculine hero. Jacques and the Duke, however, chastise his rudeness, explaining that within this sylvan court, "your gentleness shall force/ More than your force move us to gentleness" (2.7.103-104). After but a brief exchange, Orlando seems converted to this courtly ideal. The result is a type of emasculation. "I blush and hide my sword," he says (2.7.120), and then chooses a feminine metaphor to describe his return to the forest to aid the aged Adam: "Like a doe I go to find my fawn/ And give it food" (2.7.129-30). This effeminate, nurturing language is the language of gentility. Of course, Shakespeare's sonnets participate in this same court mythos insofar as the sonnet tradition found its source and support in the locale of the court, and the fair youth himself represents a genteel aristocrat. Taken on its own, the court mythos seems hardly threatening, but combined with the collapse of distinctly male and distinctly female desire in the figure of Ganymede, this vaguely androgynous courtier makes it clear that in Arden, as in Shakespeare's sonnets*,* gender is in flux.

The center of Shakespeare's shorter sonnet sequence—the dark lady—is similarly present in *As You Like It*. Phoebe and Audrey, Shakespeare's country wenches, together perform the role of the dark and domineering mistress established in the last twenty-eight sonnets. Phoebe, one of the only country characters not original to Shakespeare, is left over from Thomas Lodge's *Rosalynde*, the most immediate source for *As You Like It.* Audrey, however, is a completely Shakespearean invention. While Phoebe enacts a pageant of pastoral romance, Audrey functions both to remind the audience of early modern anxieties about the female body and to establish an erotic triangle reflective of that in the sonnets.

Primarily, Phoebe functions to root *As You Like It* within the traditions of early modern poetry of love. It is in the relationship between Phoebe and Silvius that those influences become most evident. Silvius is, if anything, an embodiment of the passionate shepherd. Unlike the majority of the characters in *As You Like It*, Silvius never speaks in prose. He is a poet who pursues his beloved Phoebe regardless of her spite, and, just as Virgil's Alexis is encouraged in his later romantic endeavors by the older shepherd Corydon, Silvius shares his troubles with the shepherd Corin. Phoebe and Silvius are, in a sense, performing iconic roles as pastoral country lovers. Phoebe even quotes Christopher Marlowe's *Hero and Leander*, declaring, "Dead shepherd, now I find thy saw of might: 'Who ever loved, that loved not at first sight?'" (3.5.81-82). Invoking Shakespeare's contemporary poet as a shepherd, she acknowledges the poetic and pastoral influences in the comedy.

Shakespeare, of course, interrupts the development of this ideal country love with the introduction of the fair youth to the Forest of Arden. Phoebe quotes Marlowe not in reference to Silvius, but to Ganymede, with whom she has become unbearably smitten. The lady betrays the poet for the fair youth, who is not, in fact, a youth. Through Phoebe and Silvius then, Shakespeare establishes a relationship with early modern traditions of romantic poetry, which is then turned on its head. Likewise, in the dark lady sonnets, Shakespeare draws upon poetic traditions, such as the blazon or the courtly ideal, and reverses them, as in Sonnet 130, "My Mistress' Eyes Are Nothing Like the Sun." Phoebe lords over her lover, Silvius, just as the dark lady masters the sonneteer, and yet, as Ganymede makes clear, her beauty is "not for all markets"(3.5.39-40). Both works portray a lady who, having constructed an ideal of love from courtly poetry, plays her role with fervor, forgetting that her beauty is something lacking. Observing Phoebe's display, Ganymede rebukes her, saying, "By my faith I see no more in you / Than without a candle may go dark to bed" (3.5.82-83), recalling the dark lady's "face [that] hath not the power to make love groan" (131.6). Phoebe, like the dark lady, both echoes and subverts early modern romantic ideals.

If Phoebe is reminiscent of the sonneteer's dark lady, Audrey is vigorously so. Even superficially, Audrey's dark and foul exterior recalls the mistress of the sonnets with great potency. Audrey quite bluntly states, "I am not fair" and "I am not a slut, though I thank the gods I am foul" (3.3.30, 34-35). She is undoubtedly a "woman colour'd ill" (*Sonnet* 144.4). More importantly, however, Audrey's overt bawdiness serves as a reminder of the anxieties about female sexuality expressed in the sonnets. Touchstone playfully rhymes the name Audrey with "bawdry," but his teasing tone does little to disguise the true tensions which her pure physicality provokes (3.3.89). Even as the play approaches its end, Touchstone begs her to "bear [her] body more seemly" (5.4.69).

For the sonneteer as well, female sexuality is seen as threatening, dark, and horrifying. While his love for the fair youth is seen as pure and even heavenly, association with the dark lady leads to infection. These male anxieties are perhaps best expressed in sonnet 129, where heterosexual intercourse is reduced to "th'expense of spirit in a waste of shame" (129.1). Where love for the youth was idealized, lust for a woman is associated with madness, extremity, savagery, and moral compromise. *As You Like It* participates in this stereotype by associating the woman's body with waywardness. During their mock wedding, Orlando and Ganymede discuss the inconstancy of a wife of wit, quickly translating "wit" to refer to a woman's sexual facility. "The wiser the waywarder," Ganymede laughs (4.1.151), and while the entire conversation is lighthearted in tone, it quite genuinely raises anxieties conversant with those of Shakespeare's sonnets.

Moreover, the appearance of a previous lover laying claim to Audrey mirrors the love triangle of the dark lady sonnets. In act 5, scene 1, the would-be lovers Audrey and Touchstone, re-enter discussing another youth who "lays claim" to Audrey (5.1.7). Curiously enough, this youthful country lover is named William and also claims "a pretty wit" (5.1.29). A jealous Touchstone scolds the lad offstage, and he departs never to return again. The scene is incredibly anomalous. Why would this character, who shares a name with the Arden-born playwright himself, appear for such a brief and seemingly insignificant scene? William's appearance and quick dismissal suggest that, while the character himself is of little importance, the triangle he creates with Audrey is of signal importance to Shakespeare's construction. Several sonnets in the dark lady sequence refer to a triangle established between the poet, the dark lady, and the youth, who is given the name William. Sonnets 135 and 136 make use of extended puns on this proper name: "will" is made to refer to a person, sexual desire, and both male and female sexual organs.

It is the introduction of another William that activates the narrative of these sonnets and establishes an erotic triangle in which the dark lady is possessed by both the poet William and the youthful lover William. It seems peculiar, then, that another William would arrive to claim possession of Audrey, a figure who so clearly recalls the dark lady. What is more, the third member of Audrey's triangle, Touchstone, has a history of sexual exploration, much like the speaker of Shakespeare's sonnets. Upon entering the forest, Touchstone tells Ganymede of a previous love affair in which he was lover to both "Jane Smile" and an unspecified "him," concluding, "We that are lovers run into strange capers" (2.4.47-51). In much the same way, the sonneteer woos both fair youth and dark lady. The rub is that these interrelationships seem to display an analogous triangular structure. Both in Arden and in the sonnets, three similar figures enact a geometry of youthful love. Once again, *As You Like It* and Shakespeare's sonnets display a remarkable parallelism.

Such linguistic, structural, and narrative connections, far too ubiquitous to be thoroughly discussed here, establish a uniquely allusive and conversant relationship between Shakespeare's comedy and his sonnet series. Still, this affiliation seems impossible to concretely define. We cannot create a *Dramatis Personae* for *As You Like It* in which Shakespeare is one character, the youth is another, and the dark lady a third. Rather, both the narrative and the figures of the Sonnets are mapped into the play, weaving in and out of the action, but claiming no distinctly recognizable identity. We catch brief glimpses of the youth or the sonneteer coming through the fabric of the play, but they never remain long enough to be tied down. However, our awareness of the links between these two works can readily alert us to a common trajectory hitherto unrecognizable in the play and the sonnets.

Both *As You Like It* and Shakespeare's sonnets establish tensions with the censorship and rigidity of the court, while simultaneously creating vents for alternative desires—the sonnets through poetry and the comedy through a remove to the pastoral.

Ultimately, however, these tensions resolve in a return to conformity with accepted and self-perpetuating systems of heterosexual love. Despite the gender detours which take place in the forest, *As You Like It* works towards a rigorously heterosexual system. Deeply rooted in the pastoral tradition, the Forest of Arden, much like the Arcadia made so familiar by Philip Sidney, was a place of male society and of escape from courtly systems. In Arden, men bond with other men unhindered by court proprieties and social hierarchies. As a place of pure and unadulterated male society, Arden was christened a Golden World, reminiscent of the age before the human fall. Duke Senior himself describes Arden as "more free from peril than the envious court. / Here we feel not the penalty of Adam" (2.1.4-5). The appeal of this society lies both in its egalitarian freedom from hierarchy and its complete liberty of desire. As Bruce R. Smith has explained, the pastoral was a particular vent for homoerotic fantasy.[8] Undistracted by women and free from the limitations of a court system, these men could freely establish the bonds which might otherwise have seemed threatening. This, Smith says, is the very function of pastoral poetry, which both provides the delights of an essentially escapist fancy and engages in an intellectual criticism of "the world of social and political realities."[9] Just as the pastoral traditionally allows for social criticism that presses the boundaries of acceptability, Arden allows for a freeplay of desire which Elizabethan society would have found threatening.

This realm of Ovidian perfection and complete license is the world into which Rosalind penetrates. As problematic as it may seem to introduce women into this masculine sphere, Rosalind and Celia are allowed to enter because they capitalize on a theme of the forest with which they can participate, that of sport. Rosalind's very decision to enter the woods seems like a continuation of her desire to "devise sports" (1.2.24). For Rosalind, as for the men who people the forest, sport and play are integrally related to the idea of love. In Arden, men can love playfully, just as Orlando can befriend a "shepherd youth that he *in sport* doth call his Rosalind" (4.3.154-55, emphasis mine), and Rosalind can, in masculine disguise, toy with the very man she hopes to woo. Love is play in the Forest of Arden, and a play without rules. Wrapped up in the play of the forest, of course, is an inherent criticism of the court of act 1, where even the sport of wrestling becomes entangled with political concerns.

Shakespeare's sonnets express a similar pessimism toward the censorship of desire found in the court. In Sonnet 66, the poet expresses his general discontent with the realities of the world. He makes bitter reference to "art made tongue-tied by authority" (66.9), indicating censorship, and declares, "Tired with all these, from these would I be gone" (66.13). The sonnet manifests the discontent which leads directly to the escapism of the pastoral tradition. Likewise, Sonnet 36 acknowledges an irrevocable separation between poet and fair youth, created wholly by a soiled public reputation. He grieves,

> I may not evermore acknowledge thee,
> Lest my bewailed guilt should do thee shame,
> Nor thou with public kindness honour me,
> Unless thou take that honour from thy name. (36.9-12)

These lines savour of external judgment placed on the poet's desire. Such censorship, motivated by politics, is enough to make the sonneteer long for some form of escape, to long, in short, for Arden. Within the courtly system, under which success and failure are dictated by the pleasure of authorities, an unorthodox relationship between poet and noble youth proves to be a liability. Shakespeare's sonnets look upon such political influences with disdain, and yet are unable to fully escape them. The sonnets themselves may be a resistant expression of homoerotic desire, but even they resolve into an expression of heterosexual desire with the dark lady sonnets. The poetry provides space for the play of the homoerotic, but must eventually return to the perpetuating systems of heterosexual love.

Arguably, *As You Like It* displays the same trajectory. While the forest is a place of freeplay, re-entry into the patriarchy demands a return to orthodox heterosexuality and lawful systems of marriage. As soon as a removal from Arden is on the horizon, Rosalind resumes her femininity, and she, who in doublet and hose has governed the actions of all around her, freely offers to resume her place under the law of the father. As the fourfold wedding pageant takes place, Rosalind turns to her father, and then to Orlando, repeating, "To you I give myself, for I am yours" (5.4.114-15). Despite her temporary detours, Rosalind arrives at a heterosexual system, dominated by male authority.

In a sense, the return to the court system, which the end of the play anticipates, demands such an erasure of unorthodox gender constructions. This return mirrors what Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick has termed an "obligatory heterosexuality" built into male-dominated kinship systems.[10] A patriarchal system which hopes to perpetuate itself, she argues, will be "necessarily homophobic."[11]

The court in *As You Like It* seems to demonstrate this anxiety with vigor. The tensions of the court are of inheritance—sons argue over the will of their father—and of rivalry. The first is a problem which will only arise in a productive heterosexual system, and the second is itself a type of overly anxious, and perhaps homophobic, male bond. Similarly, the exclusively heterosexual wedding which concludes the comedy casts a dreamlike shadow over all of the playful interactions which have taken place in the forest. Touchstone, announcing his marriage to Audrey, expresses a desire to join the rest of the "country copulatives" (5.4.55), a phrase which both excludes any form of homosexual coupling and effaces any notion of permanence in relationships which won't lead to production. The wedding pageant, an elaborate glorification of heterosexual systems, celebrates Hymen, who "peoples every town" and proclaims honour to "high wedlock" (5.4.106-108). Marriage achieves a sort of apotheosis, and the playful sexualities permitted in the woods are wiped from memory.

Likewise, Shakespeare's sonnets culminate with the association of the divine and heterosexual love. Sonnets 153 and 154, two versions of the same poetic idea, break away from the narrative of the fair youth, the dark lady, and the sonneteer to tell an overtly eroticized story about Cupid, a fair maid, and the sonneteer's mistress. In both sonnets, Cupid lays aside his "heart-inflaming brand" (154.2)—a hymeneal torch, and thus, as in *As You Like It,* an allusion to Hymen, the god of marriage—which a young virgin takes up and tries to quench in a pool nearby. The fire of love, however, proves too strong and turns the water into a hot stream. The poet comes to the stream to cure his sickness, probably venereal disease, but finds that the stream only quickens his love for his mistress. In this pair of sonnets, the poet's desires are directed purely towards a mistress, and the fair youth is forgotten. The homoerotic tensions of the earlier sonnets have been cast aside, and the sequence leaves us with a deeply erotic vision of the heat of male sexuality finding its cure only in female sexuality. Much like the blessing of Hymen, these final sonnets display a divine power—Cupid's brand—bringing about a heterosexual union by which the tensions of homoeroticism are dissolved and forgotten. In the sonnets, as in the comedy, experimental sexuality gives way to a glorification of self-perpetuating love.

The connections between *As You Like It* and Shakespeare's sonnets are charged with some importance when publication and performance history are taken into account. Dates for the earliest performances of *As You Like It* are still a subject of great debate, but a long tradition holds that a court performance was held at Wilton House, the Pembroke estate, in 1603. When the thematic correlations between *As You Like It* and Shakespeare's sonnets are considered, this mythical performance adds impetus to another long standing debate—that of the dedicatee of the sonnets. Many critics, most notably and successfully Katherine Duncan-Jones, have given a strong argument for William Herbert, the 3rd Earl of Pembroke, as the fair youth of Shakespeare's sonnets. Is it possible, then, that *As You Like It*—a play which so prominently features a fair youth—was performed at the home of Shakespeare's own fair youth, William Herbert? Duncan-Jones makes a strong case for the likelihood of plague seasons as a time for sonnet composition, and a 1603 court performance would have coincided with a severe outbreak of plague in London. Indeed, the 1603 plague is the very time in which she posits the sonnet sequence began to take its final shape.[12] Unfortunately, the evidence for the performance at Wilton House is flimsy at best, and so there is no absolute sense in which elements in the play can claim to refer specifically to Herbert or to the contents of Shakespeare's sonnets. Even if the connection is merely the stuff of legend, however, it invites us to draw out the similarities between the gender construction of the play and the poems. Wherever *As You Like It* was initially performed, it would ultimately have featured a fair youth portraying a heroine in a play whose title could suggest a freedom of sexual choice. The parallel figures, common themes, and similar trajectory established between these works create a cross-genre dialogue, a fabric into which the tensions between individual desire and societal expectations are inextricably interwoven. To allow these texts to converse, then, is to open ourselves to a newer and deeper understanding of human desire—and its frustrations—in the works of William Shakespeare.

Notes

1. William Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, Arden 3 edition, ed. Juliet Dusinberre (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2006). In-text line references to *As You Like It* are from this edition.

2. William Shakespeare, *Shakespeare's Sonnets*, Arden 3 ed., ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones (London: Arden Shakespeare, 1997. In-text line references to the *Sonnets* are from the Arden edition.

3. Mario DiGiangi, *The Homoerotics of Early Modern Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 35.

4. Juliet Dusinberre, introduction to *As You Like It* by William Shakespeare, ed. Juliette Dursinberre (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2006), 9.

5. Joseph Pequigney, *Such Is My Love: A Study of Shakespeare's Sonnets* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 31.

6. Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Vol. I: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage, 1980), 43, quoted in Robert Matz, *The World of Shakespeare's Sonnets: An Introduction* (Jefferson, North Carolina: MacFarland and Company, Inc., Publishers, 2008), 67.

7. Bruce R. Smith, *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England: A Cultural Poetics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 82.

8. Ibid., 89.

9. Ibid., 88.

10. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), 3.

11. Ibid.

12. Katherine Duncan-Jones, introduction to *Shakespeare's Sonnets*, by William Shakespeare, ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones (London: Arden Shakespeare, 1997), 13.