Prince Hal, Queen Elizabeth, and the English Identity in *1 Henry IV*

Miki Nakamura

In discussing *1 Henry IV*, most critics in this century have regarded Prince Hal as the one who would provide the key to a full understanding of the play. For them Prince Hal has served as the most venerable ground on which they should rely so that they could give a complete explanation of the play. Consequently, in their investigation critics consciously or unconsciously posited Prince Hal as the center, so to speak, of *1 Henry IV*, and the other characters in the play were given a marginal place. Terry Eagleton, for example, says that the character in *1 Henry IV* who most resembles Falstaff is Hotspur in that they both are a type of extremity (16). He does not write about Prince Hal in this context, but it is apparent that Eagleton views Prince Hal as a kind of desirable *medius res*, as a person from whose standpoint things should be considered. In terms of his character and dramatic role that permits him to go between the court and the tavern, the historical world and the comic world, Prince Hal has been offered a central place by critics.

This critical trend is partly derived from the fact that scholars are more or less fascinated by Prince Hal. As Jonathan Goldberg states, they cannot "resist the attractions of the prince" (145). Like Falstaff in the play who is attached to the prince in spite of his frequent defiant attitudes, and like Vernon who, though opposing to the prince, asserts, "If he [Prince Hal]

outlive the envy of this day, / England did never owe so sweet a hope / So much misconstru'd in his wantonness" (5. 2. 66-68), critics are helplessly intrigued by him. Prince Hal proffers to them various images of ideality : Prince Hal as a man, as a ruler, and finally, as "an ideal image of the potentialities of the English character" (Mack xxxv). The prince, in the end, is conceived as an ideal male ruler who represents the Englishness, or the English identity itself.

The term "the English identity" will be used in this paper to refer to a concept by which people picture the nature of England. The concept is, as we will see, a cultural product, and it necessarily has to do with prevailing ideologies which bring about various discriminations. Moreover, it may be added that behind that concept lies the fantasy of national unity, or the desire to see the nation as unified : when one talks about a national identity, there always exists in his mind a sense of supposed wholeness of the country.

It seems that critics share such conception of Prince Hal with the Elizabethan audiences who watched the play. Or it would be more correct to say that critics inherit it from them. Indeed, the Elizabethan audiences seemed to have a favourable impression of the prince. This can be recognized if we glimpse a colonial problem in Ireland in the end of the sixteenth century and the content of *1 Henry IV* respectively. *1 Henry IV* is assumed to be written and first performed between 1596 and 1598 (Humphreys xi -xv), and at that time English rule in Ireland became rather unstable. One English official named Maurice Kyffin, who was dispatched to Ireland in 1597, saw the chaotic situation there. English soldiers were no more under control, and Kyffin could not make up his mind which was the more grievous, the outcries of the soldiers for want of pay, or of the country people whom they robbed and pillaged (Falls 201). Moreover, the complete suppression of the Irish rebels was not realized yet at that time : there often

appeared the Irish leader, like Hugh O'Neill, earl of Tyrone, who resisted English command. Thus English colonial enterprise in Ireland was at stake.

In contrast to the failure of English colonization in Ireland, in *1 Henry IV* the power of England has predominance. At the end of the play Prince Hal defeats the allied forces of the Welsh, the Scot, and the Percies at Shrewsbury and then heads for Wales in order to crush the Welsh rebel thoroughly. The play describes the suppression of foreign enemies, alluding to the coming stabilization of English rule in Wales. In the last scene King Henry IV says, "Rebellion in this land shall lose his sway, / Meeting the check of such another day" (5. 5. 41-42).

Here two points must be taken into account. First, as Christopher Highley notes, the Elizabethans generally identified Ireland with Wales (92). The identification in fact comes from English officials' attempt to apply Welsh method of government to Ireland (Williams 31). Secondly, in the Elizabethan reign the Irish rebel often allied with the English noble and opposed the Queen as Glendower, a Welsh, does in the play. Such an alliance was usually resulted from the intermarriage between them, and the English court was very nervous about it for political as well as cultural reasons (Falls 230-31). These things considered, it can be said that *1 Henry IV* dispels the anxieties concerning Ireland by showing a successful correction of Welsh rebellion. To put it another way, the play resolves the colonial problem in Ireland in a fictional way. The young figure of Prince Hal who brings the success, it seems reasonable to suppose, looked attractive for the Elizabethans.

Indeed, there were many reasons for them to be intrigued by Prince Hal. Queen Elizabeth never went to Ireland for herself and failed in her attempt to conquer Ireland repeatedly. Together with these failures, her old age and lack of heir caused people to hope the appearance of new ruler, in this case not female but male one. A particularly impudent rebel protested that "the

land had been happy if Her majesty had been cut off twenty years since, so that some noble prince might have reigned in her stead" (qtd. in Marcus 142). What the Elizabethans wished for was nothing but the male ruler like Prince Hal who would lead the army for himself and remedy the colonial disarray.

Moreover, the growing consciousness of national identity in late sixteenth-century England seems to have backed the image of Prince Hal. As we said earlier, the fantasy of national unity accompanies the sense of national identity, and a legendary figure of Henry V who conquered France must be an appropriate key in thinking about the expected unity of the state ; the supposed unity of the country in his reign became an object of nostalgia and admiration. The fact that many stories of Prince Hal were written in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century England partly results from such nostalgic feeling of people (Humphreys xxix). They pictured the national unity in their minds by thinking about Henry V, and the image of him was naturally turned into the image of the English identity itself.[1]

From this view point we can assume now that in *1 Henry IV* Prince Hal is depicted as an ideal male ruler who embodies the English identity, and the covert exclusion of Queen Elizabeth is carried out. The purpose of this paper is to investigate the way in which the play begins to betray that assumption and to consider what that betrayal indicates. In the first section of this essay we will examine the fashioning of the English identity represented by Prince Hal. What the play shows us is the construction of the English identity by means of the oppression of the alien people. The term "the alien people" is used in this paper to refer to foreign people like the Welsh on the one hand, and women and the lower class people in the kingdom, the native aliens, so to speak, on the other hand. The second section attempts to show how that identity is finally eroded by the menace of the alien people. We will see that our assumption is overthrown by this

erosion. In the last section, considering this failure of assumption, Shakespeare's relation with the fictional figure of Prince Hal and Queen Elizabeth will be analyzed.

I

Prince Hal, as noted before, fascinates critics and the Elizabethan audiences as well as characters in the play like Falstaff and Vernon. Prince Hal offers to them an ideal image of the male ruler who embodies the English identity. What is important is that that image has to be produced constantly and that Prince Hal needs other people than him for its production. The attractive image Prince Hal offers, or the English identity itself that he comes to represent eventually, is constructed through his relation with the alien people. The relation is a forced one : first, the alien people are defined as an inferior being ; secondly, with that definition they are marginalized and subjugated. Thus the English identity establishes its superiority and ideality. As David Cairus and Shaun Richard say, it is based upon difference and discrimination and the positional superiority of it is produced through the otherness and inferiority of the alien people (7). The English identity represented by Prince Hal requires the alien people for its self-definition and maintenance.

In this process of the establishment of the English identity we can see the workings of oppression in four ways. The oppressions are performed through violence and expression. Or they are practised psychologically and linguistically. In the following we will see how these oppressions work both in a foreign land and in the kingdom and how they contribute to the fashioning of the English identity.

First, we will consider the oppression through violence. Prince Hal's conquest at Shrewsbury is a typical example. His victory over the enemies

at the place is significant. Shrewsbury is at the border between England and Wales, and this borderland is an area in which English power and Welsh power always compete each other. By subduing the rebels at this borderland, England can display its superiority to Wales in power. And the violence that makes this conquest possible is implicitly justified by Prince Hal. After killing Hotspur at Shrewsbury, Hal talks to his dead body as follows :

> Ill-weav'd ambition, how much art thou shrunk !
> When that this body did contain a spirit,
> A kingdom for it was too small a bound ;
> But now two paces of the vilest earth
> Is room enough. (5. 4. 87-91)

In telling us that defeated Hotspur's "Ill-weaved ambition" shrunks and the space he occupies diminishes, and thus criticizing Hotspur's ambitious revolt based on violence, Prince Hal actually legitimizes his and his father's act of maintaining and extending their territory through violence : negation of the enemies' violence validates his violence. The English identity represented by Prince Hal is constructed by this oppression through violence which makes the superiority of English power manifest, and in this sense the violence exerted by the prince and his father necessarily has to be legitimized.

Let us now turn to the oppression through expression. First, concerning the alien people in a foreign land, generally they are represented as a devilish, degenerate, superstitious, and beastly person : they are given degraded epithets, and it is this degradation that brings the supremacy of the English. For example, for Falstaff, Douglas, a Scot, is a "fiend" (2. 4. 364) and Glendower, a Welsh, is a "devil" (2. 4. 365). Besides, cultural

convention of Wales is referred to as a sign of their degeneration and becomes the object of satire. Falstaff describes Glendower as follows : "he of Wales that gave Amamon the bastinado, and made Lucifer cuckold, and swore the devil his true liegeman upon the cross of a Welsh hook" (2. 4. 332-34). The cultural characteristic, exemplified here by a Welsh hook, is seen as an indication of the inferiority of Wales in a comic way. Moreover, Glendower is rejected by Hotspur as a superstitious person for his use of magic. Concerning their alleged beastliness, it is ascribed to them in terms of their language. We will expound this point later.

Secondly, we will consider how women, one of the native aliens, are dealt with. In England what can be seen is the exclusively male-centered world. The battlefield most clearly shows its characteristics, where men fight each other, and where women and womanish men like the lord Hotspur describes who uses lady terms and talks "like a waiting-gentlewoman" (1. 3. 54) must not enter. The male codes, such as the knighthood and the courtesy as a gentleman which Prince Hal shows by covering dead Hotspur's face with his favours in act 5, scene 4, support this male-centered world. In a homo-social environment like this, women are continually excluded and become a target of despisement. In act 3, scene 3, Falstaff accuses hostess of the tavern of telling a lie, though it is Falstaff himself who lies :

> *Hostess.* There's neither faith, truth, nor womanhood in me else.
> *Falstaff.* There's no more faith in thee than in a stewed prune, nor no more truth in thee than in a drawn fox — and for womanhood, Maid Marian may be the deputy's wife of the ward to thee. (108-14)

In his retort Falstaff denunciates faith, truth, and womanhood of hostess completely. For Falstaff she is nothing but a disgusting bawd and inferior

than notorious Maid Marian. Here we must draw attention to the fact that Falstaff's desperate renunciation of hostess is caused by his anxiety about losing Prince Hal's affection because of hostess' testimony. In order to keep his relation with the prince as it is, Falstaff tries to exclude a woman and make her silent. As Goldberg states, placed between men, Prince Hal and Falstaff, hostess is nonetheless outside their circuit of relations (155). The tight relation between men is established by the exclusion of women. Women thus are marginalized in the kingdom.

Both foreigners like the Welsh and women in the kingdom are given degraded epithets. What can be seen in this process is a forceful definition of them and the allotment of their status. In this sense, the oppression leads to a containment of the alien people within the prescribed area ; or, to the drawing of the boundary as Prince Hal literally does by subduing the Welsh rebel by violence. The point will be considered later.

Next, we will observe the way in which the psychological oppression operates. In *1 Henry IV* there are many references to the punishment : in ordinary speeches the lower class people talk about the gallow, strappado, and the rack. This tells us the fact that in the kingdom horror of the law haunts the lower class people. They are oppressed psychologically. Such psychological oppression makes the lower class people conscious of their subjugated status, and in consequence brings the stability of the rule of King Henry IV and Prince Hal. To understand this, it is useful to look at Prince Hal's conversation with Bardolph :

Bardolph. My lord, do you see these meteors ? do you behold these exhalations ?
Prince. I do.
Bardolph. What think you they portend ?
Prince. Hot livers, and cold purses.

Bardolph. Choler, my lord, if rightly taken.
Prince. No, if rightly taken, halter. (2. 4. 315-21)

The prince, using Bardolph's words "if rightly taken" in a different way, gives an pointed answer : what he is saying is that Bardolph who drinks too much will soon be hanged. Prince Hal oppresses Bardolph in a psychological way by alluding to the punishment. The comical quality of this drama is often pointed out, but the dramatic world is rather gloomy ; horror of the law latently afflicts the lower class people. And the power of the law is to be actualized at the end of *2 Henry IV* as Falstaff and his friends are banished by Prince Hal. It can be said that Falstaff's request to Prince Hal, "Do not thou when thou art king hang a thief" (1. 2. 59-60), indicates how horror of the law haunts him and the lower class people.

Falstaff, however, always tries to escape such oppressions. In fact, his ontological quality makes him one of the "alien" character in the play who attempts to reject repressive definitions of himself. This question is taken up in the next section.

Lastly, the linguistic oppression and its effect shall be analyzed. The oppression in terms of language takes two forms : assimilation and exclusion. "Assimilation" is the process in which unfamiliar language is made familiar and consequently is deprived of its potential threat. "Exclusion" means the strategy by which the alien people are driven into a state of "the linguistic poverty" (Greenblatt, *Shakespearean* 44) as their language is rejected or they are made silent. In this two ways the alien people are linguistically suppressed, and in both cases what is attempted is an annihilation of the power of the alien people's voices, exemplified by the unheard testimony of hostess, which can harm the fashioning of the English identity.

First, we will examine assimilation. In act 2, scene 4, Prince Hal tells Poins about his intimacy with the drawers and the tinkers :

> They call drinking deep "dyeing scarlet", and when you breathe in your watering they cry "Hem !" and bid you "Play it off !" To conclude, 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. (15-19)

Prince Hal's linguistic "towardness" (Mullaney 79) is apparent here : he tries to learn the language used at the tavern. The tavern constitutes a rebellious underworld, its rebelliousness embodied by Falstaff who tries to abolish the law. The important point to notice here is that by making unfamiliar language of this rebellious underworld familiar to him, Prince Hal attempts to put that world itself under his command. He complacently repeats the drawers' words, "when I [Prince Hal] am King of England I shall command all the good lads in Eastcheap" (2. 4. 13-14). The absorption of the mutinous underworld and its obedience are achieved through the absorption of language.

Then let us see how the linguistic oppression in the form of exclusion is carried out. First, we will consider the way in which Welsh is treated. In act 3, scene 1, Hotspur quarrels with Glendower over the division of the kingdom :

> *Hotspur.* Who shall say me nay ?
> *Glendower.* Why, that will I.
> *Hotspur.* Let me not understand you then, speak it in Welsh.
> *Glendower.* I can speak English, lord, as well as you,
> For I was train'd up in the English court,
> Where being but young I framed to the harp
> Many an English ditty lovely well. . . . (114-19)

As Hotspur's words in line 115 indicate, Welsh is regarded by Hotspur as an unintelligible language : by pointing out its unintelligibility, Hotspur

debases Welsh. Moreover, Glendower's desperate assertion of his ability to speak English tells us the fact that there is an established tendency to regard English as being superior to Welsh : the evaluation of the two languages is fixed. Such subordination of Welsh can be seen again later in the same scene when Hotspur answers his wife that "I had rather here Lady my Brach howl in Irish" (230) than hear Glendower's daughter sing in Welsh. Hotspur condemns both Welsh and Irish as incomprehensible like a dog's cry. Thus, as we said earlier in this paper, the language of Wales is regarded as beastly.

If the Welsh are denunciated and rejected in terms of their language, women and the lower class people in the kingdom are put into silence. Concerning women, it is useful to quote Hotspur's opinion of his wife :

> I know you wise, but yet no farther wise
> Than Harry Percy's wife ; constant you are,
> But yet a woman ; and for secrecy
> No lady closer, for I well believe
> Thou wilt not utter what thou dost not know ;
> And so far will I trust thee, gentle Kate. (2. 3. 108-13)

It must be noted that in this passage Hotspur actually alludes to women's talkativeness. Hotspur, by making his wife ignorant of what he intends to do, compels that allegedly talkative woman to be silent. And Hotspur's wife says nothing but the words of subjugation : "It must [content me], of force" (2. 3. 118). Relevant to this point is Catherine Belsey's following remark : "Able to speak, to take up a subject-position in discourse . . . they [women] were none the less enjoined to silence, discouraged from any form of speech which was not an act of submission to the authority of their fathers or husbands" (149). It is the silence of women which makes the male-centered

world potent.

It is Prince Hal who does same linguistic reduction toward Francis, one of the lower class people. In act 2, scene 4, Prince Hal intrigues with Poins and forces Francis to say nothing but "anon." S. P. Zitner points out the intellectual limitation of Francis (68), but we must not forget that Francis' lack of language in this scene results from Prince Hal's strategy of exclusion ; it seems that Zitner unknowingly justifies the prince's strategy, as the prince himself consciously does by referring to Francis' supposed intellectual inferiority as a man, "That ever this fellow should have fewer words than a parrot, and yet the son of a woman !" (96-97). Both Hotspur's wife and Francis are thus deprived of their language and have to remain reticent in a subjugated way.

In this section we have seen the oppression of the alien people in the four ways. In all cases, what is attempted finally is a forceful definition of them and the allotment of their status : they are contained within the area from which they are not permitted to go out. The oppression is an act of drawing a strict boundary, and through such discrimination the English identity is produced : it is constructed in a relative way. Thus, the English identity represented by Prince Hal requires the existence of the alien people for its self-definition and maintenance. In this sense it is based on the alien people. In the next section we will see how their existence eventually threatens the English identity and puts the ideal image Prince Hal embodies into question.

II

Although oppressed, the alien people never fade away. Their existence itself is, as we will observe, potentially dangerous for the English identity which is based on it. First of all, it must be noted that attitudes toward the alien people are strangely ambivalent : while the alien people are rejected

as we have seen in the preceding chapter, they attract one in a compelling way.[2] This ambivalence indicates some difficulty in understanding the alien people. The Welsh scene in act 3, scene 1 provides an example. Glendower translates his daughter's words for Mortimer, her husband, as follows :

> She bids you on the wanton rushes lay you down,
> And rest your gentle head upon her lap,
> And she will sing the song that pleaseth you,
> And on your eyelids crown the god of sleep,
> Charming your blood with pleasing heaviness. . . . (207-11)

The scene, as often pointed out, bears resemblance to the scene of the Bower of Bliss in Book II of *The Faerie Queen*. If Guyon can reject the sexual allurement and destroy the Bower, and with that destruction he can fashion his identity as a gentleman (Greenblatt, *Renaissance* 188), Mortimer cannot do so. As Phyllis Rackin says, Mortimer is totally absorbed in his sensuality and his wife, and his manhood is lost to female enchantment (171). And even Hotspur, another Englishman who formerly despised Welsh, cannot help expressing his desire for the lady. To his wife's cry, "Now God help thee," he replies, "To the Welsh lady's bed" (3. 1. 235-36). Thus in this scene two English nobles are almost tamed by the attraction of the enticing Welsh woman. The attraction to the alien people incongruously coexists with the rejection of them in Englishmen's minds.

It should be added that Mortimer's marriage to the Welsh is a threat to the English court, for it leads to the united revolt against the king. We are shown King Henry IV resenting the marriage in act 1, scene 3. In the Elizabethan period, it must be recalled here, there were anxieties about such political alliance between English noble and the Irish leader that resulted from marriage. If we take this fact into account, it seems natural that

Prince Hal's victory over the allied force of Glendower and Mortimer was really fascinating for the Elizabethan audiences.

The ambivalent attitude toward the alien people tells us that there is some difficulty in understanding them. And it suggests the intractable nature of their existence. Their existence, with its peculiarities, falls out of the prescribed categories of thought. Such unmanagebleness of the alien people is fully expressed in Falstaff's conversation with hostess, a lower class woman :

Falstaff. Setting thy womanhood aside, thou art a beast to say otherwise.
Hostess. Say, what beast, thou knave, thou ?
Falstaff. What beast ? Why, an otter.
Hostess. An otter, Sir John ? Why an otter ?
Falstaff. Why ? She's neither fish nor flesh, a man knows not where to have her. (3. 3. 121-27)

What the passage makes clear is that Falstaff cannot understand what hostess is as they do not know how to understand an otter : for him she is an incomprehensible being. To put it another way, he cannot define her strictly. The indefinableness is a possible menace to the English identity represented by Prince Hal since that identity is firstly fashioned through the definition of the others. If the others, or the alien people, cannot be defined and remain unfamiliar, if their existence rejects rigid categorization and goes beyond the prescribed boundary, the English identity represented by Prince Hal begins to collapse.

Indeed, the inability to understand the alien people deeply affects Prince Hal himself. Heather Findlay, pointing out the play's emphasis on "knowing the *other*," says : "knowing the other . . . is the explicit condition for

speaking about and constituting the self" (236). As Prince Hal's famous phrase, "I know you all" (1. 2. 190), suggests, Hal's production of his image is continually based upon knowing, and taming, the other. So the incomprehensible and, moreover, indefinable nature of the alien people necessarily damages the production of Hal's image.

It is such crisis of the English identity that *1 Henry IV* finally shows us. As a beginning, it is necessary for us to focus attention on the first scene of the play. Westmoreland, in reporting Mortimer's defeat, refers to the Welshwomen's act of violence :

Westmoreland. A thousand of his [Mortimer's] people butchered,
Upon whose dead corpse there was such misuse,
Such beastly shameless transformation,
By those Welshwomen done, as may not be
Without much shame retold or spoken of.
The King. It seems then that the tidings of this broil
Brake off our business for the Holy Land. (42-48)

Westmoreland hesitates to speak the real state of this event. He displays his difficulty in retelling it. And for him the violence of the Welshwomen is a deed that must not be legitimized. The king also does not touch on the event directly. It seems that both Westmoreland and the king try to hide the fact and contain its atrocious significance. And there is no reference to the event later in the play. The event is a historical fact, but Shakespeare, as the above passage indicates, does not write it in detail. It is noteworthy that Shakespeare as well as characters of the play do not, or, cannot, describe the fact.

As Shakespeare is reticent about the event, so Raphael Holinshed does not say very much about it in his chronicle published in 1587 : "The

shameful villanie vsed by the Welshwomen toward the dead carcasses, was such, as honest eares would be ashamed to heare, and continent toongs to speake thereof" (20). Holinshed also finds it difficult to speak about it. What the Welshwomen did is beyond the imagination of Holinshed who is an "honest," "continent" Englishman that he cannot write it. Thus for Westmoreland, Shakespeare, and Holinshed, the event is really intractable and incomprehensible. Indeed, it is not too far from the truth to say that they are psychologically afflicted by it. Consequently all of them try to hide what the Welshwomen, the alien people, did by dismissing it. It can be said that the event is triply oppressed by the characters of the play, by Shakespeare, and by Holinshed.

It is Abraham Fleming, the editor of the second edition of Holinshed's chronicle, who gives the concrete account of the event by adding these lines :

> [Y]et did the women of Wales cut off their [the Englishmen's] privities, and put one part thereof into the mouthes of everie dead man, in such sort that the cullions hoong downe to their chins ; and not so contented, they did cut off their noses and thrust them into their tailes as they laie on the ground mangled and defaced. (Holinshed 34)

We said earlier that in the Welsh scene in act 3, scene 1, two English nobles are almost tamed by the attraction of the Welsh woman. Here we see the complete subjugation of English soldiers by the Welshwomen : they show their superiority in power to the Englishmen through their violence. Moreover, the Englishmen who should reject womanishness and show their manliness, who should make women silent as Hotspur did previously, are deprived of both the symbol of manhood and their voice : it is the Englishmen who are sexually and linguistically oppressed in this event. Besides, the

Welshwomen's deed caricatures the exclusively male-centered world in the kingdom by representing fake homosexual intercourse ; the caricature ironically suggests the supposed degeneration of the Englishmen. The Welshwomen thus completely transgress the prescribed boundary by their vengeful oppression of the Englishmen. If we consider these things, it is clear how this event, with its unintelligibility, is threatening to the English identity represented by Prince Hal and why the event should become the object of so severe containment and oppression.

The event, in spite of the threefold oppression, comes to the surface at the end of the play. And it is Falstaff who invites that release from the oppression. In act 5, scene 4, after Prince Hal practises courtesy toward dead Hotspur by covering his face, resurrected Falstaff abuses Hotspur's corpse : "Nothing confutes me but eyes, and nobody sees me : therefore, sirrah [*stabbing Hotspur*], with a new wound in your thigh, come you along with me" (126-28). Thus Falstaff denies Hal's courtesy by repeating the thing what the Welshwomen did.[3] This symbolical repetition, in the first place, suggests the ambivalence, or the "overdetermined" (Traub 464) nature of Falstaff. While he seems to support the fashioning of the English identity in his negation of Welsh and women, Falstaff at the same time damages it by nullifying Hal's courtesy. As is often pointed out, Falstaff rejects any definitions of himself. In this sense, he is another "alien" character in the play. Prince Hal's words, "I know you all," finally sound hollow as he, suprised by Falstaff's resurrection, "thou [Falstaff] art not what thou seem'st" (5. 5. 136), reveals his difficulty in understanding Falstaff : "This [Falstaff] is the strangest fellow" (5. 5. 154).

In the second place, and most importantly, Falstaff's stabbing of Hotspur necessarily reminds us of the Welshwomen's atrocity and its threat that the play once seemed to hide ; the threat finally overpowers the containing pressure. As Highly says, with Falstaff's blow "the repressed

returns" (107). Arising from the below, the Welshwomen and their act remain to be unfamiliar and indefinable, eroding the English identity.

It is just when Prince Hal conquers the rebels by killing Hotspur and looks most attractive for the Elizabethan audiences that the English identity represented by him is threatened by the menace of the alien people, Falstaff and the Welshwomen. The attractive image of Prince Hal begins to collapse at the end of the play.

III

We assumed in earlier parts of this paper that in *1 Henry IV* Prince Hal is depicted as an ideal male ruler who embodies the English identity and the covert exclusion of Queen Elizabeth is carried out. However, it was observed in the preceding chapter that the English identity represented by Prince Hal is in a critical situation at the end of the play as a result of the menace of the alien people. While depicting Prince Hal as the ideal ruler, Shakespeare put that ideal image into question ; our assumption is here overthrown. Then, the question is, why does such contradiction beget itself in the play ?

To answer this question, we must now consider the problems concerning Queen Elizabeth. As we have mentioned before, her failure of colonization in Ireland made people anxious for the male ruler who would suppress Ireland completely. What must be noticed is that in this process a political problem was turned into a question of gender ; Elizabeth's femininity was regarded as the cause of political difficulty. Indeed, as Winfried Schleiner writes, ever since Elizabeth had succeeded to the throne, opponents had kept alive the controversy about the appropriateness of female rulers (172). The recurrent failure of Irish colonization served for Queen's opponents as a good reason for the indictment of her femininity and her rule.

Elizabeth evaded such replacement of the problem by her rhetoric and attire. In her speeches she often called herself "prince" or "king." And in the final years of her reign, the time when *1 Henry IV* was supposedly written, Elizabeth's adoption of male epithets became particularly prominent (Marcus 143-44). Moreover, she was wont to clothe herself in men's wear. At Tilbury in 1588, for example, she carried a truncheon and wore upon her breast a silver cuirass ; thus she disguised herself as a male soldier. We see the masculinization of her repesentation. By appropriating masculine epithets and attires Queen Elizabeth fashioned herself as a male ruler in order to oppose her male rivals.

The point to observe here is, however, not Elizabeth's tactical dependance upon and invocation of the authority of the male modes of representation but rather her "manipulation of gender and sexual ideologies" (Traub 474). As she unhesitatingly called herself "prince" or "king" and adorned herself like men, Elizabeth rhetorically and visually transgressed gender boundary. Her representation "confounds our own preconceived notions about gender" (Marcus 137). It is upon such indefinable nature of her figure that Elizabeth's politics depends, and it is through such instability, the continual crossing, not the drawing, of the boundary, that she tries to acquire the stability of rule.

Goldberg writes, "Shakespeare cannot write about sovereignty without thinking about the woman on the throne" (157). It is true that such unfamiliar existence of Elizabeth had a great effect upon Shakespeare when he wrote *1 Henry IV*. While depicting Prince Hal as an ideal male ruler, Shakespeare cannot ignore the real ruler, Queen Elizabeth. Or, to put the assertion more concretely, there is strong anxiety about the instability Queen Elizabeth embodies from which male Shakespeare cannot free himself : the anxiety about the possibility of the upsetting of gender category, and about the possibility of manly women's domination over men

that Elizabeth actually practises. The contradiction which begets itself in *1 Henry IV* reflects Shakespeare's oscillation between expectation and latent anxiety. The fictional figure of Prince Hal who resolves the colonial problem is indeed attractive for Shakespeare who describes such a figure again in *Henry V* and who is said to have expected male Essex's successful conquest of Ireland as he writes that play. But that figure cannot be left as it is when Shakespeare's concern emerges, the concern about the real ruler who shows the potential of female rule, the potential which the Welsh-women showed in their inconceivable deed, with the unfamiliarity of her existence. The crisis of the English identity in *1 Henry IV* therefore indicates Shakespeare's ineradicable anxiety over his sovereign. In the end Shakespeare hovers between the expectation and the anxiety, between Prince Hal and Queen Elizabeth.

Notes

1 David Cairus and Shaun Richards write that after the breach with Rome, a narrower definition of Englishness, or the English identity, emerged. They expound the emergence by borrowing Michel Foucault's argument. Prior to the sixteenth century, the pre-classical episteme was based upon resemblance and the finding of affinities and similarities. In contrast, the classical episteme was based upon difference : that is, discrimination and establishment of the identity of things. In the case of late sixteenth-century England, they defined Englishness by such discovery of difference, by defining the 'otherness' of other countries like Ireland or France (1-2). The fact that historical Henry V typically showed the difference between England and France by his conquest may also contribute to the Elizabethan construction of his image as the English identity itself.

2 Patricia Fumerton states that there is a similar English ambivalence toward Ireland in the Elizabethan period (256).

3 Gayle Whittier also sees Falstaff's stabbing of Hotspur as the reproduction of the act of the Welshwomen (32-33).

Works Cited

Belsey, Catherine. *The Subject of Tragedy : Identity and Difference in Renaissance Drama*. London : Routledge, 1985.

Cairus, David, and Shaun Richards. *Writing Ireland : Colonialism, Nationalism, and Culture*. Manchester : Manchester UP, 1988.

Eagleton, Terry. *William Shakespeare*. Oxford : Blackwell, 1986.

Falls, Cyril. *Elizabeth's Irish Wars*. London : Methuen, 1950.

Findlay, Heather. "Renaissance Pederasty and Pedagogy : The 'Case' of Shakespeare's Falstaff." *The Yale Journal of Criticism* 3 (1989) : 229-38.

Fumerton, Patricia. "Exchanging Gifts : the Elizabethan Currency of Children and Poetry." *ELH* 53 (1986) : 241-78.

Goldberg, Jonathan. *Sodometries : Renaissance Texts, Modern Sexualities*. California : Stanford UP, 1992.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning : From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago : U of Chicago P, 1980.

———. *Shakespearean Negotiations : The Circulationof Social Energy in Renaissance England*. Berkeley : U of California P, 1988.

Highley, Christopher. "Wales, Ireland, and *1 Henry IV*." *Renaissance Drama* 21 (1990) : 91-114.

Holinshed, Raphael. *Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*. vol. 3. 6 vols. 1587. New York : AMS, 1976.

Humphreys, A. R. Introduction. *The First Part of King Henry IV*. By William Shakespeare. Ed. A. R. Humphreys. London : Methuen, 1960. xi-lxxxii.

Mack, Maynard. Introduction. *1 Henry IV*. By William Shakespeare. Ed. Maynard Mack. New York : New American Library, 1965. xxiii-xxxv.

Marcus, Leah S. "Shakespeare's Comic Heroines, Elizabeth I, and the Political Uses of Androgyny." *Women in the Middle Ages and Renaissance : Literary and Historical Perspectives*. Ed. Mary Beth Rose. New York :

Syracuse UP, 1986. 135-53.

Mullaney, Steven. *The Place of the Stage : License, Play, and Power in Renaissance England*. Chicago : U of Chicago P, 1988.

Rackin, Phyllis. *Stages of History : Shakespeare's English Chronicles*. New York : Cornell UP, 1990.

Schleiner, Winfried. "*Divina Virago* : Queen Elizabeth as an Amazon." *Studies in Philology* 75 (1978) : 163-80.

Shakespeare, William. *The First Part of King Henry IV*. Ed. A. R. Humphreys. London : Methuen, 1960.

Traub, Valerie. "Prince Hal's Falstaff : Positioning Psychoanalysis and the Female Reproductive Body." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40 (1989) : 456-74.

Whittier, Gayle. "Falstaff as a Welshwoman : Uncomic Androgyny." *Ball State University Forum* 20 (1979) : 23-35.

Williams, Penry. "The Welsh Borderland under Queen Elizabeth." *Welsh History Review* 1 (1960) : 19-36.

Zitner, S. P. "Anon, Anon : or, a Mirror for a Magistrate." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 11 (1960) : 63-70.

Synopsis

Prince Hal, Queen Elizabeth, and the English Identity in *1 Henry IV*

By Miki Nakamura

In discussing *1 Henry IV*, most critics in this century have regarded Prince Hal as the one who would provide the key to a full understanding of the play. Consequently, they consciously or unconsciously posited Prince Hal as the center of the play. This critical trend is partly derived from the fact that scholars are more or less fascinated by Prince Hal. Prince Hal proffers to them various images of ideality : Prince Hal as a man, as a ruler, and finally, as the embodiment of the English identity itself.

It seems that critics inherit such conception of Prince Hal from the Elizabethan audiences who watched the play. Indeed, there were many reasons for the Elizabethan audiences to be intrigued by the prince. When *1 Henry IV* was written and performed, there was a serious colonial problem in Ireland. Queen Elizabeth failed in her attempt to conquer Ireland repeatedly, and at that time English rule in Ireland became rather unstable. In contrast to such political situation, *1 Henry IV* describes the suppression of foreign enemies by a male leader, Prince Hal ; the play dispels the anxieties concerning Ireland in a fictional way. For the Elizabethans, it seems reasonable to suppose, Prince Hal who brings the success looked attractive. What they wished for was nothing but the male ruler like Prince Hal who would remedy the colonial disarray. Together with these circumstances, the growing consciousness of national identity in late sixteenth-century England helped the Elizabethan construction of the image of Prince Hal as the embodiment of the English identity.

From this view point we can assume that in *1 Henry IV* Prince Hal is depicted as an ideal male ruler who represents the English identity, and the covert exclusion of Queen Elizabeth is carried out. The purpose of this paper is to investigate the way in which the play begins to betray that assumption and

to consider what that betrayal indicates. In the first section of this essay we will examine the fashioning of the English identity represented by the prince. What the play shows us is the construction of the English identity by means of the oppression of the alien people. The term "the alien people" is used in this paper to refer to foreign people like the Welsh on the one hand, and women and the lower class people in the kingdom on the other hand. The oppression leads to a forceful definition of the alien people and the allotment of their status, and in this process the English identity is produced. The second section attempts to show how that identity is finally eroded by the menace of the alien people. We will see that our assumption is overthrown by this erosion. In the last section, considering this failure of assumption, Shakespeare's relation with the fictional figure of Prince Hal and Queen Elizabeth will be analyzed.