

A PSYCHOANALYTIC APPROACH
TO SHAKESPEARE'S SECOND TETRALOGY

A Thesis

Presented to

the Graduate Faculty of the Department of English

University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by
Amnon Gordon
August, 1972

638634

A PSYCHOANALYTIC APPROACH
TO SHAKESPEARE'S SECOND TETRALOGY

An Abstract of a Thesis
Presented to
the Graduate Faculty of the Department of English
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Amnon Gordon
August 1972

A PSYCHOCANALYTIC APPROACH
TO SHAKESPEARE'S SECOND TETRALOGY

Prince Hal, later King Henry V, never manages to outgrow the Oedipal stage. His father, Henry IV, committed a symbolic Oedipal act in usurping the throne, and Hal, in order to avoid facing this fact, escapes from the court. Hal's Oedipal desire, however, prompts him to try to achieve the mother-image. Thus, his escape to the people of East Angles, his tavern friends, represents an attempt to achieve the mother-image in a symbolic way.

Simultaneously, Hal degrades the father-image. By saving Henry IV's life at Shrewsbury, for example, Hal degrades and symbolically castrates his father. Falstaff, who serves him as a father-substitute, Hal degrades in a similar fashion.

When Henry IV dies and Hal becomes king, he feels that he is living in sin with the mother-image, England. He escapes from the English court to war in France. There, however, he repeats the Oedipal act: he defeats a king and takes a woman, Katharine, from that king's family.

In addition to the Oedipus complex, there are other factors at the basis of Hal's behavior. Because he sees the mother-image reflected in any woman, he will regard heterosexual relationships as incestuous. Also, there are indications that Hal's mother is a domineering person. Identification with such a mother plus fear of incest may cause Hal to display latent homosexual tendencies.

There are also in Hal indications of an anal fixation, possibly caused by severe training during the anal period, and of an oral fixation, possibly caused by irregular feeding during the oral period.

When Hal becomes King Henry V, in spite of an external change in him, he continues to manifest the above characteristics. The Prince of 1 and 2 Henry IV and the King of Henry V are, therefore, one person.

FOREWORD

I wish to thank Professor Archibald Henderson for his inspiring seminars in Shakespeare and for his guidance in the writing of this thesis. It was his help that made the writing an instructive as well as enjoyable experience.

CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	iii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE OEDIPUS COMPLEX	11
III. HOMOSEXUAL TENDENCIES	88
IV. ANAL AND ORAL TRAITS AND THE DOMINEERING MOTHER-FIGURE	114
V. CONCLUSION	179
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 185

I. INTRODUCTION

Of the many critics who have approached the plays Henry IV and Henry V, only a few have attempted a psychological explanation of these works and, particularly, of Prince Hal (later Henry V). Generally, their interpretations of the plays fall into two groups: those which see the plays as mainly reflecting a contemporary view of history and politics, and those which see the plays as chiefly investigating the question of the making of the perfect king. The second group, observing in the plays themes such as the education of a prince, follow the stages through which Hal's education leads him. Of this group of interpretations some claim that Prince Hal as presented and developed in the two parts of Henry IV cannot possibly turn into the character known as Henry V. Others assume that Prince Hal develops naturally into Henry V.

The interpretation by Lily B. Campbell, in her Shakespeare's Histories, belongs to the first group mentioned above. Campbell is mainly interested in the reflection of political events and opinions, such as opinions about rebellion and about war, in the history plays. To Campbell, Henry V presents Henry as "the ideal Hero in contrast with the troubled John, the depressed Richard, the rebel Henry IV."¹ He is, from the standpoint of contemporary Elizabethan views, the ideal hero.²

¹ Shakespeare's Histories (San Marino, Calif.: The Huntington Library, 1963), p. 225.

² Ibid., pp. 225-305.

L. C. Knights concurs in the main with this view, but he adds that Henry V is not a mere glorification of the hero king; it is also a criticism of him. Shakespeare as a political realist was, Knights declares, capable of criticizing the political principles of rulers.³

A. P. Rossiter finds in Shakespeare's histories a pattern of retributive action, wherein a series of crimes and punishments develops. However, he adds, it is not clear who is right and who is wrong; Shakespeare, according to Rossiter, criticizes even those characters who, at first sight, seem, like Henry V, to be virtuous.⁴

The approach of J. Dover Wilson belongs to the second group of interpretations, which emphasize the education of Prince Hal. Wilson shows how, in 1 Henry IV, Hotspur and Falstaff have opposite concepts of honor: the former sees it as divinity; the latter is cynical about it. Each provides an example for Hal, who spurns both concepts in favor of the golden mean; he accepts chivalry but he does not make a fetish of it.⁵ In 2 Henry IV, the options presented the Prince are Falstaff, symbolizing riot and misrule, and the Chief Justice, symbolizing law. In this instance Hal (as Henry V) chooses the Lord Chief Justice.⁶ If Part I is "Hal's return to chivalry," Part II becomes his "atonement with Justice."⁷

³ L. C. Knights, "Shakespeare's Politics," in Proceedings of the British Academy, 1957 (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1958), pp. 117-18.

⁴ A. P. Rossiter, "Ambivalence: the Dialectic of the Histories," in Angel with Horns (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1961), pp. 117-18.

⁵ John Dover Wilson, The Fortunes of Falstaff (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1944), pp. 70-72.

⁶ Ibid., p. 75.

⁷ Ibid., p. 64.

It is significant that Wilson uses evidence from both Henry IV and Henry V to substantiate his view. That is to say, Wilson assumes that Hal has developed naturally into Henry V: "The Prince, who is to figure in the sequel to Henry IV as 'the mirror of all Chirstian kings,' is already at Shrewsbury the soul of true honor."⁸

In the same spirit, M. M. Reese goes so far as to state that not only does Henry V not present Henry as a different figure from Hal, but that, indeed, the two parts of Henry IV actually build up Henry V's character, "so that men . . . [will] believe in it . . . conveying the magnitude of the responsibility by hinting at the personal sacrifices which it demands."⁹ William B. Hunter's point of view is similar. He, too, considers Henry V as "not essentially different from Prince Hal."¹⁰

Derek Traversi presents Hal's choice--and the issue that generates much struggle in Hal's soul--as the choice between "public virtue and private dissolution."¹¹ According to Traversi, Shakespeare's purpose in exploring this struggle is mainly to show how Hal develops "the consciousness of the effective political prince," and to clarify what kingship consists of.¹² Finally, in Henry V, Traversi believes, the answer emerges:

⁸ Ibid., p. 72.

⁹ M. M. Reese, "Henry V," in Twentieth Century Interpretations of Henry V, ed. Ronald Berman (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1968), p. 90.

¹⁰ William B. Hunter, Jr., "Prince Hal, His Struggle toward Moral Perfection," in Henry IV Part I, ed. James L. Sanderson (New York: Norton and Co., 1962), pp. 173-81.

¹¹ Derek Traversi, Shakespeare from Richard II to Henry V (Stanford Calif.: Stanford Univ. Press, 1957), p. 77.

¹² Ibid., p. 49.

the ruler whose reason governs his desires--the one whose devotion is to his office, or to public virtue, and not to his "uncontrolled desires"--is the one who leads his country to victory.¹³

Robert Egan finds inner struggle continuing in the character of Henry V. The King is not a finished product; his soul is the arena for a battle between the Machiavellian desire to use war for selfish and nationalistic purposes, and the Christian teaching that such usage of war is not virtuous. Henry first takes to the Machiavellian side, but he later acknowledges in his soliloquy on ceremony (H V, IV.i.216-70)¹⁴ the importance of personal virtue and the superficiality of kingship. Henry thus allots to each its due significance.¹⁵

Many critics puzzle over Hal's transformation at the end of 2 H IV. Most of them, of whom the following are examples, try to show that the transformation is external: since Hal is from the beginning intent on assuming his responsibilities as Prince in due time and never really takes part in any seriously immoral or unlawful act, his change is not at all surprising.

¹³ Ibid., p. 166.

¹⁴ References to the plays will be incorporated in the text of the paper. The editions used are: William Shakespeare, King Richard II (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1968); -----, The First Part of the History of Henry IV (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1968); -----, The Second Part of the History of Henry IV (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1968); -----, The Life of King Henry the Fifth, in Shakespeare, the Complete Works, ed. G. B. Harrison (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1948). The names of the plays will be abbreviated as follows: R II, 1 H IV, 2 H IV, and H V respectively.

¹⁵ Robert Egan, "A Muse of Fire: Henry V in the Light of Tamburlaine," Modern Language Quarterly, 29 (1968), 21-28.

J. Dover Wilson presents this very argument. Hal's "I know you all" soliloquy (1 H IV, I.ii.187-209), Wilson says, proves Hal's wish to return to his princely duties. His interview with his father (1 H IV, III.ii) and his honorable and courageous conduct at the Battle of Shrewsbury (1 H IV, V.iii.iv) prove that he is basically unspoiled by vice.¹⁶ S. C. Sen Gupta, although critical of the Prince's lack of imagination and emotion, agrees with Wilson that Hal is resolved, from the beginning, to live up to his obligations as Prince.¹⁷

Irving Ribner, asserting that the main concern of H IV is the education of a prince and the making of the ideal king, still maintains that Hal requires very little training. The "I know you all" soliloquy proves, Ribner says, that Hal is from the start a completely reformed individual.¹⁸

Elsa Sjoberg concurs. Vernon describes Hal's agility in riding (1 H IV, IV.i.106-108); Canterbury praises Hal's reasoning in divinity (H V, I.i.38). One does not ride well or reason in divinity without some preparation; Hal, then, has prepared himself for kingship, has always known that he will return to the court. And indeed, says Sjoberg, he does not really change; even to his tavern companions he has always been princely and aloof.¹⁹

¹⁶ Wilson, pp. 62-69.

¹⁷ S. C. Sen Gupta, Shakespeare's Historical Plays (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1964), pp. 128, 138, 141, 146.

¹⁸ Irving Ribner, The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1957), pp. 165-88.

¹⁹ Elsa Sjoberg, "From Madcap Prince to King: the Evolution of Prince Hal," Shakespeare Quarterly, 20 (1969), 14.

Alan G. Gross points out that in Holinshed, Shakespeare's chief source, and also in Shakespeare himself, Hal never does any evil; the Prince always commands the reader's confidence.²⁰ Astere E. Claeysens, although basically in agreement, claims that in "I know you all" Hal is rationalizing in order to justify his escape from the Court and is not yet determined to reform.²¹

Finally, Edward Dowden agrees that there is a change in Hal upon his ascent to the throne, and that Hal has not always been what he becomes on that occasion. This change, however, is "no miraculous conversion but merely the transition from boyhood to adult years . . . from . . . freedom to the solemn responsibilities of a great ruler."²²

Other critics view Hal in a less favorable light. A. C. Bradley, explaining Hal's rejection of Falstaff at the end of 2 H IV, points out that Hal has always used others unscrupulously. That he is cold and calculating, his mild sorrow at the sight of the apparently dead Falstaff seems to witness (1 H IV, V.iv. 102-110). His ultimate rejection of Falstaff (which is, I may add, part of what may seem a miraculous conversion) is, therefore, not surprising.²³ In other words, the transformation of Hal is no transformation at all; it is simply another manifestation of existing regrettable characteristics.

²⁰ Alan G. Gross, "The Justification of Prince Hal," Texas State Studies in Literature and Language, 10 (1968), 27-31.

²¹ Astere E. Claeysens, "Henry IV Part 1," in Lectures on Four of Shakespeare's History Plays, no ed. (Pittsburgh: Carnegie Inst. of Technology, 1953), pp. 21-23.

²² Edward Dowden, Shakespeare, a Critical Study of his Mind and Art (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1875), pp. 210-13.

²³ A. C. Bradley, "The Rejection of Falstaff," in Oxford Lectures on Poetry (London: Macmillan and Co., 1950 [1909]), pp. 254-59.

Thomas H. Jameson gives an interesting view of Hal and Henry V. It is possible, Jameson begins, that after Shakespeare's earlier history plays had shown lack of national unity in England, with resulting ill fortune to the realm, Shakespeare had, in order to please the Court, to write a play where unity and prosperity would reign.²⁴ However, Jameson asserts, Shakespeare did not plan for Prince Hal to develop into the ideal king. Hal's "deepest impulse is to stay away from home, not to be reconciled to his father if reconciliation means submission."²⁵ In the Interview Scene (1 H IV, III.ii), for example, Hal resists his father almost till the end, and then he merely pretends to be reconciled.²⁶ Thus Shakespeare portrays Henry V--supposedly, the ideal king--as "a man not pleased with the task laid upon him, of carrying fire and sword into another country"; Henry's displeasure finds expression, for example, in the scene on the eve of Agincourt (H V, IV.i.).²⁷

A less common critical conclusion is that Shakespeare, when creating Hal and Henry V, did not have the same figure in mind. Of the people who advocate this approach, E. M. W. Tillyard is probably the best known. Tillyard, in effect, talks about not one but two turning-points in Hal's, or Henry V's, development: the first, the ascent to the throne; the second, that occurring between H IV and H V. As for the first, Tillyard is in

²⁴ Thomas H. Jameson, The Hidden Shakespeare (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1969), pp. 12-15.

²⁵ Ibid., pp. 77-78.

²⁶ Ibid., pp. 72-82.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 39.

complete accord with the previously-quoted critics. "Far from being a mere dissolute awaiting a miraculous transformation, [Hal] is from the very first a commanding character, deliberate in act and in judgement, versed in every phase of human nature."²⁸ He is "a man of . . . Olympian loftiness and high sophistication."²⁹ Like the hero of morality plays, he has to choose between Chivalry and Vanity in 1 H IV, and between Order and Disorder in 2 H IV.³⁰ As a youth, he escapes from the court because the burden of kingship frightens him; but this is merely a postponement. He will accept the responsibility in due course.³¹ In the meantime he acquires a knowledge of human nature and exemplifies Shakespeare's conception of the kingly type.³²

With regard to the second turning-point, however, Tillyard differs from other critics. To give tradition and the history of England their due, according to Tillyard, Shakespeare counterbalanced the figure of Richard III with that of Henry V. He had to show a miraculous change into a king who was "a bluff, hearty man and a good mixer." The "aloof and Olympian" image of Hal did not accord with such a conception. " . . . By jettisoning the character he had created and substituting one which, though lacking all consistency, satisfied the requirements both of the

²⁸ E. M. W. Tillyard, Shakespeare's History Plays (London: Chatto and Windus, 1948), p. 277.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 269.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 265.

³¹ Ibid., p. 281.

³² Ibid., p. 269.

chroniclers and of popular tradition," Shakespeare provided the necessary miraculous conversion.³³

Not less known and quoted is Mark Van Doren's verdict on Henry V: "Shakespeare has forgotten the glittering young god whom Vernon describes in Henry IV . . . the figure . . . collapses here into a mere good fellow, a hearty undergraduate with enormous initials on his chest."³⁴ The reason, to Van Doren's mind, is that Shakespeare is no longer interested in the image of the ideal king, of "the great man who is also simple," that he has investigated in previous history plays. Rather, he will soon direct his attention to more realistic, more complex characters, such as Brutus and Hamlet. H V was written, so to speak, without inspiration, and this is why the figure "collapses."³⁵

Landon C. Burns basically concurs. According to Burns, Shakespeare is interested in Hal as a person but in Henry V as a symbol. Hal could not have developed into the traditionally perfect Henry V, the patriotic symbol of the wise and just ruler. Hal's companions from his days at Eastcheap, especially Falstaff, are too human to appear side by side with the symbol of perfection, and this is why Falstaff does not appear on the stage in H V, nor are Pistol, Nym, and Bardolph ever seen associating with the King.³⁶

³³ Ibid., pp. 305-306.

³⁴ Mark Van Doren, Shakespeare (New York: H. Holt and Co., 1939), p. 176.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 176.

³⁶ Landon C. Burns, "Three Views of King Henry V," Drama Survey (Minneapolis), 1 (1962), 279.

Thus, critics have interpreted H IV and H V as reflections of contemporary historical and political views and as stages in the development of the conception of the perfect king. Interpretations of the second kind, while attempting to show that Hal develops consistently into the figure of Henry V, or that Hal cannot be the same figure as Henry V, have, for the most part, neglected psychological analysis as a tool of interpretation.³⁷ In this thesis I will therefore attempt to analyze the character of the Prince--later, the King--from a psychoanalytic point of view. I will also attempt to demonstrate that Prince Hal and Henry V are essentially the same character, and that this character, rather than developing in a healthy fashion from a dissolute youth to a responsible and mature adult, never really reaches maturity.

³⁷ The conclusions of those critics who have used psychological analysis will be incorporated in the discussion proper of this thesis.

II. THE OEDIPUS COMPLEX

When in 1398 the historical King Richard II banished Henry Hereford, (later Henry IV), the eleven-year-old Henry of Monmouth, Hereford's eldest son (1387-1422), remained with the King, who "treated him kindly and took him under his own charge."¹ In 1399, when Richard led an expedition to Ireland to quell a rebellion, the young Henry--or Hal--was with him. In Ireland Richard knighted the boy. When Hal's father returned to England and raised a rebellion, Hal claimed that Richard could not hold him responsible for his father's deeds, and the King acknowledged his innocence.²

Under the kingship of his father, Henry IV (1367-1413), Hal led the parliamentary opposition against the King's council. In 1410, when his father was too ill to attend to business of state, Prince Hal ruled in his name. At that time, opposition parties in Parliament proposed "to induce the King to resign his crown in the Prince's favor." Refusing the request, the King relieved Hal of all duties in the council.³

These details were available to Shakespeare from Holinshed. Of the connection between Richard II and Hal there are some echoes in Shakespeare:

¹ The Dictionary of National Biography, ed. by Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee, IX (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1908), p. 494. Hereafter referred to as D.N.B.

² D.N.B., p. 494. Also: Ernst Kris, "Prince Hal's Conflict," Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 41 (1962), 496. Kris quotes Holinshed but does not give a specific reference. Since in Richard II Aumerle is Richard's close friend who accompanies him to Ireland, it is perfectly conceivable that the figure of Aumerle reflects the historical closeness of Prince Hal to Richard II.

³ D.N.B., p. 496. See also Kris, p. 490.

Henry IV points out the similarity between Hal and Richard,⁴ and Henry V speaks about the burial he gave Richard's remains (H V, IV.i.312). Shakespeare used the antagonism between Hal and his father in the creation of the literary Hal, escapee from court and frequenter of lowly inns.

It seems possible to explain the figure of the fictional Hal on the basis of psychoanalytic principles.⁵ In this second chapter, I will suggest that Hal suffers from an Oedipal fixation; he therefore manifests, through symbolic acts, a desire to dispose of the father or to castrate him, and to possess the mother. Hal projects his Oedipal conflict upon other people, whom he regards as substitute father, mother, son, or sibling rivals. Falstaff, Hotspur, and Prince John are such people. When Hal becomes king, although there is a change in his behavior, there is no essential psychological change in him. Falstaff disappears, but others, such as Pistol, the Dauphin, and Williams, serve as the external representations of Henry V's emotional difficulties. Though Henry wages war only in a foreign land (France), he achieves only a momentary sublimation of

⁴ [Richard] mingled his royalty with cap'ring fools,

.....

And in that very line, Harry, standest thou,

.....

As thou art to this hour was Richard then.

(1 H IV, III.ii.63, 85, 94)

⁵ In the discussion throughout the thesis I will make use of psychoanalytic theory; for a presentation of this theory, see Otto Fenichel, The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1945); Sigmund Freud, A General Introduction to Psycho-Analysis, trans. Joan Riviere (New York: Perma Giants, 1949); -----, An Outline of Psycho-Analysis, trans. James Strachey (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1949); -----, The Ego and the Id, trans. Joan Riviere (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1960); Edward Glover, Psycho-Analysis (London: Staples Press, 1949); Calvin Hall, A Primer of Freudian Psychology (New York: The New American Library, 1954); Ernest Jones, Hamlet and Oedipus (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1954 [first published 1949]).

his Oedipal problem. Thus, it will be my contention that Shakespeare's Henry V is different from Hal only in certain external, minor aspects.

A. Hal's Oedipus Complex

To understand Hal's problem as Shakespeare projected it, it is first necessary to posit that Richard II, in his position as king, would automatically constitute a father-figure for his subjects. By the same symbolism, England would be the mother. Deposing a king and ruling the country are thus, to the unconscious, equivalent to the fulfillment of the Oedipal act; they involve the disposing of the father so as to have the mother. Furthermore, to Shakespeare the historical relationship between Richard and Hal must have helped to establish Richard as a father-figure for Hal. Because Shakespeare was not consciously aware of the psychological meaning of the relationship, the fact that he did not deliberately present the relationship fully on stage is immaterial.

Be the significance of the historical facts what it may, the effect of the usurpation of a throne by one's father is to create guilt in the son's mind. This would be true for the literary as for the historical Hal. The son carries part of the blame and part of the guilt. When Hereford (Bolingbroke) usurped Richard's throne, he must have aroused guilt-feelings in the Prince. Years later, on the eve of Agincourt, Henry V still expresses guilt-feelings connected with this usurpation.⁶

6 . . . Not today, O Lord,
 Oh, not today, think not upon the fault
 My father made in compassing the crown!

 . . . my penitence comes after all,
 Imploring pardon.

(H V, IV.1.309-311, 321-322)

There is an additional complication. A child would want to avenge his real father's death. However, in Hal's case, the murderer of the father-figure, Richard II, was Hal's own father. Thus, punishing the Oedipal criminal would mean carrying out the Oedipal act--killing his own father, Henry IV.⁷ It is safe to assume, in addition, that Hal had confronted the Oedipal crisis in childhood. His father performed the symbolic Oedipal act, the usurpation, before his son's very eyes. If fear of the father and the dictates of the super-ego--the internalization of the parents--usually cause the suppression of Oedipal impulses, here it is the father himself whose usurpation has set his son a bad example. Thus, Hal's Oedipal drive, though repressed, would have fewer defensive barriers to overcome.

In addition, Hal's natural Oedipal impulses would certainly have flowed towards Richard as a father-figure. When his father deposed Richard, Hal, through identification with his father, would have felt guilty of his own parricidal tendencies towards Richard. If he was to avenge Richard's death, he would punish not only his father, but also himself.

Refraining from action would promise little consolation. Hal would thus show his quiet consent to the criminal act--which is, in a way, his own act--and, furthermore, would enjoy its fruits: lofty position at the court. The court is, symbolically, the mother won by killing the father, and staying at the court would mean possessing the mother. But

⁷ Lily B. Campbell points out that Shakespeare's two tetralogies display the curse that comes on a dynasty from the fact that the first King has taken the crown illegally (see Campbell, especially pp. 119-125).

the super-ego does not let one enjoy the fruits of an Oedipal act. To avoid this situation, Hal escapes from the court. He does not avenge the dead father-image (of Richard II) but, by departing, he avoids showing tacit consent and does not identify with the murderer. The conflict, however, continues to torture him.

Hal's conflict is similar to that of Hamlet. Hamlet learns that his Uncle Claudius has committed the Oedipal act: killing the King and marrying the Queen, Gertrude. However, killing his uncle in revenge would mean, for Hamlet, killing the father-image and thus repeating the crime. Besides, because of his own Oedipal wishes, Hamlet identifies with Claudius, and if he feels that Claudius deserves to be punished by death, he himself does, too.⁸

This schematic pattern of Hal's psyche explains quite a few actions of his as Prince, and, with slight modifications, continues to operate in him as King.

B. Symbolic Castration of the Father

Several actions of Hal's appear to be symbolic manifestations of the Oedipal wish to castrate the father and deprive him of his authoritative position. At times this wish, though disguised, emerges as a wish to ridicule or humiliate the father, or simply to defy him; at other times there is an accompanying unconscious wish on Hal's part to prove himself sexually an abler figure than his father, and this wish manifests itself also in fields other than sex, such as war.

⁸ This is Ernest Jones' thesis in his Hamlet & Oedipus; see especially pp. 94, 98-100.

Ernest Kris, in "Prince Hal's Conflict," explains that Hal's escape from the court is a result of his refusal to participate in regicide (Henry IV's deposition and killing of Richard II), and that it is also an escape from the regicidal impulses aroused in him by his father's deed. He adds the significant comment that Hal's escape also expresses hostility towards his father.⁹ Certainly the prolonged absence from court is an expression of defiance.

Hal's escape also adds to the King's worries, which in turn prevent Henry IV from carrying out his plan of a trip to Jerusalem. This trip, Henry IV hopes, will "wash . . . [Richard's] blood from off my guilty hand" (R II, V.vi.50). Hal, thus, prevents his father from ridding himself of the Oedipal guilt. Henry V, at a later time, mentions that, for the purpose of atoning for his father's sin, he has given Richard's body a new burial and has erected two chapels with priests singing prayers for Richard's soul. Richard's grave and the chapels, however, serve as an admission and a constant reminder of Henry IV's guilt.

Besides perpetuating Henry IV's guilt, Hal's escape from the court has another effect. The King has planned a crusade to the Holy Land, and if he were to go there and take the country from its rulers, he would be symbolically repeating the Oedipal act. Hal's escape from court delays this act. Thus, Hal's escape serves to keep the King's conscience troubled and to prevent him from symbolically performing the manly act of taking possession of a woman (the Holy Land).

⁹ Kris, p. 498.

Henry Percy, reporting to Henry IV that he has invited Hal to the tournaments at Oxford, says that Hal has answered that he would unhorse the "lustiest challenger" in the tournament with a glove taken from the commonest creature in the "stews" (R II, V.iii.16-19). Percy represents the royal authority; Hal's defiance of this authority makes use of sexual symbolism. The glove, regarded as a phallic symbol, expresses his feeling of sexual superiority to the "lustiest" representative of the world of the court of his father. In the Oedipal situation the father is the "lustiest," or the most active sexually, in the family, and Hal's rejoinder thus emerges as, symbolically, a direct threat of castration.

In the "I know you all" soliloquy (1 H IV, I.ii.187-209), Hal foresees his return to the court in terms of the sun breaking through clouds. The phallic symbolism appears here, too; Hal conceives of the return to the court as a magnificent demonstration of virility. In Elizabethan imagery the sun, of course, symbolizes the king. Hal, then, plans to return to the court only after he has proved his sexual superiority; indeed, it is not until his father's death that he returns to the court permanently.

Hal's participation in the robbery at Gadshill (1 H IV, II.ii) emphasizes his defiance of the law which his father must enforce, and, symbolically, his defiance of his father's ability to subdue rebellious tendencies within his own family. When a nobleman comes from the King to the Boar's Head tavern, looking for Hal, Hal refuses to see him. He tells the Hostess, certainly not the nobleman's peer, to "send him back again to my mother" (1 H IV, II. iv. 287). Hal probably sees the nobleman as

an extension of the King's person or the King's will. Attributing some phallic significance to this extension, Hal, by defying the King's will, may be manifesting a castration wish. He may also be expressing a wish to possess the mother. In so possessing her, Hal would be castrating the father.¹⁰ This is why Hal sends the messenger back to the mother; the castrated father is now woman-like.

However, in response to the King's summons, Hal must go in person to Windsor. In order to "practise an answer," as Falstaff puts it (1 H IV, II.iv.369), the Prince and Falstaff play a game. In it, Falstaff plays the King, but after a brief episode Hal "deposes" him and plays the King to Falstaff's Hal. If the play impromptu is indeed practice, then Hal intends--unconsciously, at least--to depose his father. In a game he can, without risking the displeasure of the super-ego, give vent to his Oedipal wish.

Hal defies the law, and thus again his father's authority, in the same scene: he hides Falstaff from the Sheriff (1 H IV, II.iv.490-517). Then Hal goes to see the King (1 H IV, III.ii). He cannot act out what he has rehearsed in the tavern, namely, depose Henry IV, but he cannot feel reconciled either. His answers to the King's accusations are therefore very brief and forced: after the King's sixty-two line tirade, for example (1 H IV, III.ii.29-91), Hal's answer consists of ten words. In sharp contrast to this short answer is Hal's excited speech following the King's mention of Hotspur (ll. 129-159), but this I shall explain later.¹¹

¹⁰ See below, pp. 22-25.

¹¹ See below, pp. 49-50.

At the Battle of Shrewsbury Hal will have a chance to see his father prove his manliness, his bravery. A battle is symbolic of the sexual act.¹² Hal, then, will be able to watch his father's sexual prowess in action. If the King fails as a warrior, he fails as a sexual father. In addition, if Henry dies at the hands of the rebels, he will fulfill Hal's unconscious wish for his father's death without blame to Hal. Hence, Hal may hope for his father's failure at Shrewsbury.

During the battle the King urges Hal to return to his tent. Hal, refusing, urges the King to hasten back to the battle (1 H IV, V.iv.1-6). Apparently it is Hal's wish to have his father tested further in battle.

Then, paradoxically, Hal saves the King's life (1 H IV, V.iv.38-43). This act is fraught with meaning. For one thing, the son proves to be stronger than the father. Again, the son puts his father in debt for his very life. Also, the son, who was watching his father in the (symbolically) sexual act, intervenes and takes his father's place in the middle of the act. He thus proves that while his father's sword, to which one can certainly attribute a phallic significance, is not equal to the task, his own sword is.¹³ The action of saving the King's life is also a reaction-formation. The Prince announces to the King that

They did me too much injury
That ever said I hearkened for your death.
(1 H IV, V.iv.51-52)

For the historical Hal, who opposed his father politically, ruled in his name when the King was ill, and was the opposition party's candidate for

¹² See Chapter Three, p. 96.

¹³ For the significance of Hal's attempt to borrow Falstaff's sword at Shrewsbury, see below, pp. 30-31.

kingship while his father still lived, this would be a natural statement,¹⁴ but in the play Hal is the only person to mention such accusations. The Prince explains to the King that had he wanted the King's death, he could have let Douglas kill him (1 H IV, V.iv.51-57). This explanation suggests the basis of the reaction-formation. Hal did indeed want his father to die at the hands of Douglas, but to avoid guilt-feelings, he saved his father's life. Though he goes out of his way to explain things to his father, he actually does so in order to convince his own super-ego (the internalization of the father) that there was no desire to see Henry IV die and thus no reason for guilt-feelings.

After the Battle of Shrewsbury, Hal does not return to court. Obviously, the Oedipal problem, instead of clearing up, has intensified. If Hal's super-ego has previously forbidden parricide, now, with the humiliation of the father, it has lost some of its authority. In addition, since Hal has proved his superiority to his father, his unconscious may see the way to the Oedipal goal open. The temptation to usurp the throne has therefore become greater, and a return to the court is consequently unthinkable.

When Hal finally returns to the court (2 H IV, IV.v.6), he sees his father lying as though dead, with the crown near him. Ernst Kris explains that the sight arouses in Hal hostile impulses toward the King and a desire to possess the crown.¹⁵ Kris also believes that Hal finds reassurance in the fact that he does not steal the crown, as his Oedipal impulse

¹⁴ D.N.B., p. 496.

¹⁵ Kris, pp. 495-96.

prompts him to do, but that it is his father who, a bit later, as a matter of course and of his own free will, gives him the crown.¹⁶ One must notice, however, that Hal's first concern, once he is left alone with the King, is with the crown, and that his very first action, once he believes the King dead, is to put on the crown and step out of the room (2 H IV, IV.v.43). In his words to his supposedly-dead father, he says, in effect, I owe you tears, which I shall pay later; you owe me the crown, of which I shall without delay take possession (2 H IV, IV.v.37-43)--certainly a unique order of preference.

Having wished for his father's death, although unconsciously, Hal should experience guilt at this point. Warwick's report of the Prince weeping (ll. 82-84) is, therefore, not surprising. Hal's remark to the King, "I never thought to hear you speak again" (l. 91), is indeed truthful. To ease his conscience, Hal puts the blame for the King's death on the crown:

' . . . But thou, most fine, most honored, most renowned,
Hast eat thy bearer up' . . . Thus, my most royal liege,
Accusing it, I put it on my head,
To try with it, as with an enemy
That had before my face murdered my father,
The quarrel of a true inheritor.

(2 H IV, IV.v.163-168)

As Alan Gross points out,¹⁷ Hal's speech to his father, unlike his answers in their meeting before Shrewsbury (1 H IV, III.ii), is long and sincere. It is clear that, since the King is about to die a natural death, he has preempted Hal's desire to fulfill his Oedipal wish, and he enables his son therefore to release guilt-feelings.

¹⁶ Kris, p. 495.

¹⁷ Gross, pp. 27-35.

Sidney Howard White, however, in a superficial and hasty article,¹⁸ argues that since Hal's speech to the crown (2 H IV, IV.v.21-47) expresses a well-known Elizabethan theme, that of order and kingship, and that since his decision to take the crown follows a strictly logical consideration (ll. 37-43), and especially since (according to Warwick) he has wept (l. 83), Hal manifests no trace of an Oedipal wish in the scene. Since there has been no restriction on the "son in his choice of lowly friends and entertainers," the possibility of repressed hostility towards the father on Hal's part is "ridiculous."¹⁹ Evidently, White has not conceived of the possibility that a speech, or an action, may concern a theme or an occurrence in reality and still provide a cue as to the unconscious reasons for it. A strictly logical consideration is all too often a rationalization of an unconscious drive, and tears can result not only from sorrow but also from hidden guilt-feelings. The claim that no repressed hostility is possible towards a father who has been permissive in his son's choice of friends is indeed amazing. Obviously, the son may interpret this very permissiveness as weakness; an Oedipus complex, having no strong father-image to repress it, will naturally elicit hostility towards the father.

C. Symbolic Taking Possession of the Mother

An important part of Hal's symbolic attempt to castrate and humiliate the father is his taking-possession of substitute-mother figures.

¹⁸ Sidney Howard White, "What Freudian Death Wish in the Crown 'borrowing' in 2 Henry IV?" Ball State Teachers College Forum, 5, no. 3 (1964), 42-44.

¹⁹ White, pp. 43-44.

Significantly, no actual mother-figure appears in the plays in which Hal appears. The historical Hal's mother, Mary Bohun,²⁰ died in 1394, when Hal was seven years old. In 1403, when Hal was sixteen, Henry IV married Joan, daughter to the Duke of Burgundy, who died in 1437 and thus outlived her husband by twenty-four years.²¹ Hal's foster-mother, then, was alive at the time of his accession. With the father replaced by the son, she was, in psychoanalytic terms, "available," Shakespeare chose to avoid all mention of Hal's mother; evidently, it was not only Hal but Shakespeare himself who repressed and sublimated the Oedipal problem.

The problem of the mother, however, finds expression in more subtle ways. To the unconscious, one's country represents a mother-figure. If Hal deposed his father and ruled England, he would be marrying the "mother." When Hal leaves the court, he goes to live with the common people of England, the people whom his father rules and whom he would like to rule; his escape to them is thus, in the psychoanalytic sense, an elopement with the mother.²² Hal takes pride in being able to "drink with any tinker" (1 H IV, II.iv.17-18). His father is understandably envious of his son's popularity and of the possible mother-association of the fickle populace. He tries to disguise his jealousy as criticism:

Had I so lavish of my presence been,
So common-hackneyed in the eyes of men,
So stale and cheap to vulgar company,
Opinion, that did help me to the crown,

²⁰ Mary was also the name of Shakespeare's mother: Mary Arden, Mary Bohun.

²¹ D.N.B., pp. 482, 484, 489, 492.

²² Conversely, it is also a flight from incest, which leads to homosexuality; see Chapter Three, pp. 89-90.

Had still kept loyal to possession,
 And left me in reputeless banishment.
 (1 H IV, III.ii.39-44)

Later in the speech Henry IV compares Hal to Richard, who supposedly also "mingled his royalty with cap'ring fools" (l. 63). The truth is, however, that Richard II had leveled the same accusation at Bolingbroke:

Ourself and Bushy
 Observed his courtship to the common people,

 As were our England in reversion his
 And he our subjects' next degree in hope.
 (R II, I.iv.23-26)

Obviously, Henry IV sees his son repeating his own courtship of the mother-image and is therefore jealous of him.

I have mentioned the sexual symbolism in the image of the sun breaking through the clouds ("I know you all," 1 H IV, I.ii.187-209). Hal apparently sees the ultimate proof of his sexual superiority and the culmination of the Oedipal act in the sexual taking-possession of the mother-image. Similarly, Hal's sending the King's messenger "back again to my mother" (1 H IV, II.iv.287) may be a symbolic manifestation of the wish to tighten secretly, through a messenger, the relationship with the mother. Possibly, if the messenger has a phallic significance, Hal's words indicate actual symbolic incest.²³

When Falstaff receives news of the Percys' rebellion, he says that land will now be cheap. Hal answers that maidenheads will also be readily available (1 H IV, II.iv.354-58). If "land," or the land of England, is another representation of the mother-image, Hal's reaction to Falstaff's

²³ See above, p. 18.

words is that the impending rebellion may be a means to achieve a sexual goal ("maidenheads"). This sexual goal Hal associates with the mother image ("land").

Finally, when Henry IV is about to die, the Crown Scene occurs (2 H IV, IV.v). The position of the crown on the pillow beside the King is meaningful. Noticing it at once, Hal significantly calls it a "bedfellow" (ll. 21-22). Once he thinks the King dead, the Prince loses no time in putting on the crown. Since the crown symbolizes England, or the King's authority to rule, and since it is the object desired by the rebels, it may stand for the mother-image; and Hal's wearing the crown, or putting his head in it, if taken symbolically, represents the first lawful sexual union with the long-desired woman.²⁴ By the same token, it may symbolize the return to the womb. William M. Schutte notes that Hal swells with pride as he wears the crown, and that his explanation of the reasons for taking it (ll. 139-176) is dishonest. He did not accuse the crown of murdering his father and he did not wear it in order to contend with it as with an enemy. Rather, he put it on his head as an inheritance and swore never to give it up.²⁵

D. Falstaff as a Reflection of Problems in Hal

Two figures in the Henry IV plays serve Hal, through the psychological mechanisms of projection and identification, as channels of expression

²⁴ Henry's taking possession of France has a similar symbolic meaning. See below, pp. 62-66.

²⁵ William M. Schutte, "Henry IV Part II," in Lectures on Four of Shakespeare's History Plays, no ed. (Pittsburgh: Carnegie Inst. of Technology, 1953), p. 45.

of the Oedipal problems discussed above: the wishes to castrate the father and take the mother. These figures are Falstaff and Hotspur.

Falstaff is a composite figure. First, he is a father-figure to Hal. His size, his age, his white hair--all help create the father-image. Furthermore, his role as Hal's guide in the ways of the world is certainly a father's role. Norman N. Holland even writes that "Falstaff is a father in that he . . . gratifies those wishes in Hal that cannot be gratified by his . . . real father."²⁶ For example, Falstaff enables Hal to vent his contempt for his father and thus enables Hal to gratify his parricidal tendencies.²⁷ Indeed, the displacement of filial attachment onto a father-substitute is normally a means of overcoming those parricidal impulses.²⁸

Hal, then, sees Falstaff as a father-figure. It must follow that he treats this father-figure as he treats his real father; and, in fact, he shows towards both of them the wish to castrate or depose the father. Of course, whereas Hal's super-ego forbids open hostility towards the King, it does not forbid its expression towards Falstaff. Hal regularly humiliates Falstaff. Once Hal becomes king, the Prince tells him, Falstaff will hang (1 H IV, I.ii.60-67). The situation is instructive. Hal has taken Falstaff as his model for a certain way of life; now he wishes to hang him for living in this very way. Similarly, Hal has had Henry IV as his model in the Oedipal situation, and he wants to repeat his father's murder of Richard II--in other words, he wishes to kill the father-figure.

²⁶ Norman N. Holland, Psychoanalysis and Shakespeare (New York: McGraw Hill, 1966), pp. 209-210.

²⁷ Ibid., pp. 339-40.

²⁸ Kris, p. 502.

When Falstaff proposes the robbery at Gadshill, Hal refuses. When Poins later repeats the same proposal, Hal accepts it (1 H IV, I.ii.133, 183). He will not accept Falstaff's leadership. But there is probably another reason for Hal's refusal of Falstaff's idea. Poins adds something to the plot. The robbery will involve, in Poins' scheme, a prank on Falstaff. This prank apparently holds a certain charm for Hal. When in the course of the robbery, Poins hides Falstaff's horse (1 H IV, II.ii.1-2), Hal does not help Falstaff find it. Hal then indignantly refuses Falstaff's request for help in locating the animal. Psychoanalytically speaking, to deprive Falstaff of his horse means to deprive him of his manliness--his manly position. By refusing twice to help the old knight, Hal twice punishes Falstaff in a castrating way.

After the robbery, Hal and Poins, sword in hand, deprive Falstaff of the booty (1 H IV, II.ii.100-101). Thereby they take away from him whatever manly glory there might have been in the robbery. Furthermore, since swords are phallic symbols, Hal and Poins clearly treat Falstaff in a sexually degrading way.²⁹

In the Tavern Scene Hal wants Falstaff, whom he calls "damned Brawn," to play Lady Mortimer (1 H IV, II.iv.107). Surely the assumption of the role would be no compliment to Falstaff's masculinity. Falstaff, apparently the very man for Hal to take out his castration wishes on, appears in the tavern with a hacked sword; to prove his manliness--and, on a symbolic level, his virility--Falstaff asks his friends to show their bloody garments; but

²⁹ See Chapter Three, p.90, for further discussion of this sword play.

the blood on the garments came from their noses (ll. 301-309). Taken as a phallic symbol, Falstaff's hacked sword shows impotence. As the sword is not even bloody, it has not achieved penetration. Falstaff does not even display a bloody nose; again, he relies on his friends; but they, in turn, have had to purposely wound themselves, not even in battle (ll. 301-309). As phallic symbols, the noses expose all those connected, and especially Falstaff, as impotent. Falstaff resorts to lying as his last protection against exposure as a coward, or, symbolically, one who has escaped, defeated, from the sexual act, and thus an impotent. But Hal, by presenting the truth to Falstaff's face, cruelly deprives him of this last protection, too (ll. 250-61).

The play impromptu is another scene of degradation for Falstaff. First, Hal practices an answer to Falstaff as Henry IV. Shortly afterwards, however, they exchange roles: Falstaff answers to Hal as King (1 H IV, II.iv.393-71). The reason Hal gives for the "deposition" is that Falstaff does not speak like a King (l. 425). Hal is evidently expressing disappointment with his father, who has not behaved like a true father but has provided him with a confusing model. Evidently, too, Hal wants to do better: by playing Henry IV he shows how to be king. The long list of insulting epithets Hal attaches to Falstaff (ll. 440-450) and Falstaff's banishment at the end of the play impromptu are in the spirit of the previous degradations.

Richard L. McGuire sees the play impromptu in a different light. He believes the play to be a parody of the deposition of Richard II, followed by Hal's "renunciation of his former life," and the beginning of a constant

improvement in Hal's moral character.³⁰ Indeed, it is almost certain that the play impromptu echoes the deposition of Richard II. However, Hal's Oedipal fixation and his desire to depose his father derive, to a great extent, from the fact that it was his father who deposed Richard. Furthermore, by playing the part of his father, Hal shows identification with him as usurper. It seems, then, that there is over-determination of the play impromptu: Hal is not only acting out a haunting memory, but he is acting out, simultaneously, a haunting wish.³¹

Acting out, or bringing to the conscious, a repressed wish or memory is ordinarily a therapeutic act. However, if his father is so weak and easy to depose, Hal could take advantage of the situation and fulfill his Oedipal wish. Simultaneously, because of these aroused wishes, there must be deep guilt-feelings. Thus the play impromptu, rather than allaying the seriousness of Hal's conflict, aggravates it.

Later in the scene, Hal's hiding of Falstaff from the Sheriff (ll. 490-516) exposes Falstaff as helpless, and Hal's emptying of Falstaff's pockets is an obvious symbolic castration. The father-figure is asleep, and the son, both envious of the sexual aspect of the parent and curious about it, examines the father and castrates him. As the contents of Falstaff's pockets are not impressive, Falstaff is a suitable substitute for Henry IV, who has evidently proved to be a disappointing father and king. The scene ends with a new prank on Falstaff: the Prince will procure him a charge

³⁰ Richard L. McGuire, "The Play Within the Play in 1 Henry IV," Shakespeare Quarterly, 28 (1967), 49-51.

³¹ The play impromptu very possibly echoes the primal scene, or the occasion in which the child unexpectedly discovers his parents in coitus. See Chapter Four, p. 123.

of foot, and will obviously enjoy the difficulties that Falstaff will experience in marching his men to war (ll. 536-37).

Another point. The Prince has heard that Falstaff has mockingly threatened to cudgel him (1 H IV, III.iii.143-47). Punishing a son is the father's prerogative; there is also phallic symbolism in cudgeling. Hal forces Falstaff to admit that he is afraid to cudgel him, and thus he both deprives him of the authoritative fatherly position and exposes Falstaff's impotence.

At Shrewsbury (1 H IV, V.i,iii,iv) Falstaff plays the soldier. Should he fight well, he will regain the manly honor of which the Prince has consistently tried to deprive him. This may be the unconscious reason that the Prince asks for the loan of Falstaff's sword.³² Since the sword is a phallic symbol, its removal would involve the castration of Falstaff. Falstaff refuses to lend the sword. Hal finally settles for Falstaff's pistol, but he finds it to be a bottle of sack.³³ This discovery satisfies the castration wish: as in the pocket-searching scene (1 H IV, II.iv), Hal searches Falstaff and finds not a dangerous masculine weapon, but an unimpressive item.

Hal's request for Falstaff's sword has another significance too. As I will suggest later,³⁴ Hal regards Hotspur as a sibling-rival. Since

³² See above, p. 19.

³³ If empty, the bottle of sack would suggest Falstaff's impotence. A gesture by the actor playing Hal could reveal the emptiness of the bottle. The bottle of sack also symbolizes a phallus, and thus represents a homosexual bait to Hal (See Chapter Three, p.91). It also symbolizes a breast. Since Falstaff is a substitute mother-image, the bottle is also an oral bait. For a discussion of Hal's oral traits, see Chapter Four, pp. 115-135.

³⁴ p. 50.

Falstaff is Hal's substitute father-figure, and since Hal plans--unconsciously, at least--to fight Hotspur at Shrewsbury, the request for Falstaff's sword is like a request of the father to sanction the killing of the sibling-rival. Such sanctioning would take the burden of the killing off Hal's conscience.

When later Hal discovers Falstaff's seemingly-dead body, he utters a eulogy (1 H IV, V.iv.102-110) that is less generous than a good friend's death would invite. The only expression of compassion is "poor Jack." Indeed, there are several insults in the speech. For instance, Hal remarks that pity for Falstaff means being in love with vanity (ll. 105-106). Obviously, because of Hal's Oedipal problem, Falstaff's death, or the father-figure's death, is not unpalatable, and since Falstaff is not Hal's real father, no guilt-feelings arise. Finally, Hal's intention to disembowel Falstaff is one more expression of his castration wish (l. 109).

When Falstaff unexpectedly "revives" and claims that he has killed Hotspur, Hal agrees to support the lie (1 H IV, V.iv.156-57). The reason is not a sudden wish on Hal's part to support Falstaff's claims of glory, but the desire to take the killing off Hal's conscience. Hal perceives clearly that Hotspur is a sibling-rival in the desire--conscious or unconscious--to overthrow the King (the father) and rule England (the mother).³⁵ By killing Hotspur, Hal has apparently cleared the way for the final possessing of the mother.³⁶ His realization of this fact intensifies

³⁵ I shall explain the point later. See p. 50.

³⁶ Prince John of Lancaster, Hal's younger brother, remains a rival, and he will disqualify himself through his Machiavellian behavior at the battle in 2 H IV, IV.ii.

his guilt-feelings. If Falstaff is to have credit--or blame--for the killing, he becomes in Hal's mind the father who has punished a rebellious son, and he, not Hal, has killed the rival. Also, Hal's allowing Falstaff to claim credit is a manifestation of the Prince's wish to degrade his father. Hal is telling his father, in effect: Not you, my real father, were strong enough to subdue rebellion in your kingdom (symbolically, your family). Not even your own flesh and blood, Hal, could do it. A thief and a drunkard proved stronger than either of us.³⁷

By 2 Henry IV Hal has almost abandoned the company of Falstaff. In fact, until he hears that Falstaff plans a rendezvous with Doll Tearsheet, Hal does not see the old knight at all. However, since he is curious about the rendezvous, he decides to spy on Falstaff (2 H IV, II.ii.156-57). Here Hal's sexual curiosity draws him into a prank on Falstaff. Hal's disguise as a drawer, which puts him in a subservient position in relation to Falstaff, simulates to a certain extent the relationship between son and father. Hal serving Falstaff and Doll is like a child spying on his parents engaged in the sexual act. Falstaff proves that he is not equal to the sexual task. Poins, who is watching with the Prince at this time, observes: "Is it not strange that desire should so many years outlive performance?" (2 H IV, II.iv.259-260), and Falstaff himself, between feigned protestations of love from Doll, admits: "I am old, I am old" (l. 270). This verification of Falstaff's inadequacy is, of course, exactly parallel to the results of Hal's earlier search of Falstaff's pockets and request for Falstaff's sword.

³⁷ This gesture could have the effect also of enabling Hal to identify more freely with Henry IV.

Hal apparently does not want his two father-figures to meet. Falstaff, sensing that the King is his rival in Hal's affection, speaks irreverently of the King in order to arouse Hal's angry reaction. At the same time, however, Hal protects Falstaff from the law, which is an extension of the King's person. For example, after Falstaff imitated the King with a pillow on his head and commented on the "foolish hanging of the nether lip" which is supposedly characteristic of the King (1 H IV, II.iv. 373, 399), Hal protests: "Dost thou speak like a king?" (l. 425). Then he "deposes" Falstaff and finally promises to banish him (l. 471). At another time, after Falstaff had jealously compared the King to "the singing man of Windsor," Hal "broke [his] head" (2 H IV, II.i.89-90). A confrontation between the two father-figures would destroy the illusion in which Hal lives, namely, that he can regard Falstaff as a father. Hal would confront the fact that the King was his real father and that he must come to terms with his Oedipal situation.

When Hal's real father dies, Hal sees his way clear to fulfillment of the Oedipal wish. He need not kill the father or risk excessive guilt-feelings. During the coronation procession, however, Falstaff forces himself on King Henry V (2 H IV, V.v.42-47). He is saying, in effect, that Henry's father is here. Seeing the father-image immediately after having taken possession of the realm (the mother-figure) and after believing the father dead, poses the threat of heavy guilt-feelings to Hal and predictably arouses an aggressive reaction in him. Hence, he rejects Falstaff in a fashion that critics have denounced as overly harsh.

Martin Grotjahn explains that many times in comedy the reverse of the Oedipal situation occurs. The father, presented as weak and impotent,

tries in vain to outdo the virile and successful son. The clown, says Grotjahn, is this very father-image; his awkward behavior, his drooping tassels symbolizing impotence, declare his sexual harmlessness.³⁸ Continuing Grotjahn's line of thought, I suggest that if there is a clown in the Henry IV plays, Falstaff is it.¹ The very name Shakespeare chose for him when he had to relinquish the use of "Oldcastle" signifies the impotence that Grotjahn sees in the drooping tassels: "Fall-staff" or "False-staff" equally suggest impotence. It is clear why the Prince, with his Oedipal and castration wishes, would choose Falstaff for a father-substitute.

Hal's attitude to his mother is, as I have mentioned, suppressed in the plays. There are, however, indications that allow a few conjectures. Just as Hamlet, who blames his mother Gertrude for adultery, sees her as sexually impure,³⁹ so Hal, who unconsciously blames his mother for betraying him with the father, and whose wish to possess her must also have triggered a reaction-formation, sees the mother-figure as sexually loathsome. Only two women are close to Hal: the Hostess and Doll Tearsheet, both women of doubtful virtue. Just as Hal selected a clown-father in Falstaff, so he selected a prostitute-mother figure in the Hostess. She is old enough to be his mother, she takes care of a house, she prepares food--in short, she does the typical chores of a mother. Most important of all, Falstaff, the

³⁸ Martin Grotjahn, Beyond Laughter (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1957), pp. 86-97.

³⁹ William Shakespeare, Hamlet, ed. Cyrus Hoy (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1963). See, for example, III.iv.92-95:

Nay, but to live
In the rank sweat of an enseamed bed,
Stewed in corruption, honeying and making love
Over the nasty sty--[sic]. . . .

father-substitute, has promised to make the Hostess the lady his wife (2 H IV, II.i.90-92). Before the play impromptu in Part 1, Falstaff has called the Hostess "My tristful queen" (1 H IV, II.iv.87). Although Hal does not say anything about this title, he seemingly accepts it as part of the play--that is, he accepts the equation of the Hostess with his mother--and his "deposition" of Falstaff is thus partly due to the closeness and availability of the substitute mother-image, the Hostess.

Whether Hal, having "deposed" the father, would have claimed the mother in some disguised manner at the end of the play impromptu is uncertain: Bardolph's entrance cuts short the action (1 H IV, II.iv.472). It is, of course, very significant that Bardolph announces the arrival of the messenger from the King--the real father--at the very moment when Hal decides to banish the (substitute) father-image and may therefore symbolically take possession of the mother. Growing into full manhood and kingship is to be a long, difficult task for Hal.

The reader will remember that when Hamlet has killed Polonius, who is a father-figure,⁴⁰ and is dangerously close to Gertrude, Hamlet's mother, in the Closet Scene, the ghost of Hamlet's father appears and stops him from doing whatever his excitement would have made him do.⁴¹ The super-ego being, to a great extent, an internalization of the father-image, one may regard the occurrence in both plays--the arrival of the messenger from Henry IV and the appearance of the ghost of Hamlet Senior--as the intervention of the super-ego to prevent the fulfillment of the Oedipal act.

⁴⁰ For a discussion of Polonius' function as a father-figure of Hamlet see Jones, pp. 98-99, 138-39, 154-55, 157.

⁴¹ Hamlet, III.iv.103-113.

If this is the case, Falstaff's arrival at the coronation of Henry V echoes the above two occurrences; however, Falstaff, being a clown-father, is too weak to protest (all he wants is some advantage for himself), and he appears after the fact (Hal has become King), so his intervention is easy for the newly-crowned King to deal with. But Hal's aggressive rejection speech to Falstaff ("I know you not, old man." " . . . a fool and a jester!" 2 H IV, V,v.48-71) indicates that at this stage, at least, Hal has not outgrown his Oedipal fixation. His ego is therefore still at odds with his super-ego.

The Drawers Scene (2 H IV, II.iv) repeats the theme of the play impromptu. Hal watches the substitute-mother and father in an amorous embrace. As Hal's description of Falstaff as a "parrot" shows (l. 258), he feels jealousy of the love-scene. He is later angry with Falstaff for having spoken disrespectfully of him before "this honest, virtuous, civil gentlewoman," the Hostess (ll. 300-301). As in the scene of the play impromptu, Hal defies the father's authority and stresses the mother's light morals. By questioning Falstaff over and over, Hal deprives him of any manly pride that his boasting earlier in the scene may have built up; but, as before, the name of Henry IV--the real father--stops the Oedipal degradation of the father in front of the mother (l. 352).

Although Hal refers ironically to the Hostess' light morals, he never speaks a harsh word as such to her. He thus protects her from Falstaff's accusation that she has stolen Falstaff's ring (1 H IV, III.iii.93-132). Hal says to the Hostess: "How doth thy husband? I love him well, he is an honest man" (ll. 93-94). He thus professes emotional affinity with

the Hostess' husband.⁴² Hal is naturally interested in the mother-figure's husband, and his "love" to him may be a reaction-formation that disguises the Oedipal hatred. Later, however, the latent substance of the Prince's attitude towards the Hostess becomes clear: he agrees wholeheartedly that "any man knows where to have [her]" (1. 130). Hal's kind words to the Hostess are, then, hidden criticism of her sexuality.

In addition to his treatment of the Hostess, there are other indications of Hal's contemptuous attitude to the mother-image. He wants to play the part of Hotspur to Falstaff's Kate (1 H IV, II.iv.107). When he chooses Falstaff for the part of Hotspur's wife, he immediately attaches to him the epithet "damned brawn" (1. 107). As I shall explain later,⁴³ there is reason to believe that Hal sees Hotspur on one level as a father-figure. Disgust with flesh thereby becomes associated with the image of the wife or the mother.⁴⁴ Again, when a messenger from Hal's father arrives at the tavern, Hal sends him "back again to my mother" (1 H IV, II.iv.187). Obviously, Hal does not think of his mother in very respectful terms.

Hal turns Falstaff not only into a father-substitute but a substitute-mother as well. Holland mentions that Falstaff is a "generalized parent (both father and mother) who gratifies those same childish wishes in Hal

⁴² It is not clear whether the Hostess has a husband or not. Hal here refers to her husband, but Falstaff, in 2 H IV, II.i.90-92, promises to marry her. The contradiction may be due to a mistake or to forgetfulness on Shakespeare's part; it is also possible that Hal's mention of the husband is ironic, or that he is referring to Falstaff, the Hostess', future intended.

⁴³ See pp. 48-49.

⁴⁴ Hamlet's description of the "enseamed bed" indicates similar feelings (Hamlet, III.iv.92-95).

that he himself embodies."⁴⁵ Indeed, in that Falstaff caters to Hal's wishes, is physically large and warm, he functions as a mother-image; but, most importantly, in symbolizing or representing the people of England, Falstaff becomes the mother to whom Hal escapes from the court and for whose affection he and his father contend.

Hal wants Falstaff to play the wife of Hotspur, whom, as I shall explain later,⁴⁶ he also at times regards as a father-image. Falstaff, then, is the mother-image. When Hal refuses to hear the King's messenger (1 H IV, II.iv.287), he is in Falstaff's company. In other words, he is with the mother and refuses to let the father in. Thus the castration-impulse discussed above,⁴⁷ which is expressed in the refusal, achieves another dimension. Later, but with greater emphasis, the same theme appears. Hal prevents the Sheriff, the representative of the law (the King), from taking Falstaff into custody. Immediately after sending the King's representative away, Hal has Poins search Falstaff's pockets (1 H IV, II.iv.472-522). In this context, the penetration symbolizes a sexual act. Hal may feel that since he has saved the woman from the angry father, he has the right to fulfill the rest of his wishes, and he sublimates those wishes into the form of penetration into the pockets.

Finally, the reason for Hal's rejection of Falstaff during the coronation procession now becomes clearer. By ascending the throne, Hal has "married England," and he no longer finds Falstaff a satisfactory mother-figure.

⁴⁵ Holland, p. 210.

⁴⁶ See pp. 48-49.

⁴⁷ See pp. 15-22.

Franz Alexander sees Falstaff as the embodiment of the infantile side of Hal's personality, of the pleasure principle. Falstaff, Alexander says, represents the narcissistic self-adoration and the oral receptiveness typical of the pre-Oedipal stage.⁴⁸ Indeed, like a child, Falstaff renounces all responsibility. The Hostess he expects to satisfy all his needs like a mother, but he never thinks of repaying her; and the Prince he sometimes regards as a father-image. The Prince, future King, is socially above Falstaff. As King he will have the power to forgive or punish Falstaff for his robberies and purse-snatchings, and even as Prince he can save Falstaff from punishment or subject him to it. Like a child, Falstaff never worries about the future; he is sure that "when thou [Hal, the father-figure] art king" (1 H IV, I.ii.16), all will be well. Similarly, when Hal protects Falstaff from the Sheriff, Falstaff falls asleep behind the arras (1 H IV, II.iv.519-20). Like a child whose father is going to take care of everything, he is completely relaxed.

Falstaff remarks to Hal at the Battle of Shrewsbury, "I would t'were bedtime, Hal, and all well" (1 H IV, V.i.125). This remark is again typical of a child dependent on an adult. The same protection that Hal gave him in the tavern, Falstaff is seeking on the battlefield.

In 2 Henry IV, Hal degrades and shows contempt for Falstaff, as in the Drawers Scene (2 H IV, II.iv), and he has begun to spend less and less time in Falstaff's company. But when Falstaff hears about Henry IV's death, he is sure that "the laws of England are at my commandment" (2 H IV, V.iii. 139-40). He remains the narcissistic child. Thus, Falstaff's second role

⁴⁸ Franz Alexander, "A Note on Falstaff," Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 2 (1933), 592-606.

in the play impromptu, that of the son, was more than just a whim of the Prince, and his pleading for himself (1 H IV, II.iv.457-70) was, in a way, that of a son before his angry father. The rejection in the Coronation Scene is the realization of all of Falstaff's infantile fears.

Prince Hal, because of his Oedipal impulses, continues to have guilt-feelings and consequent fear of impending punishment. He may project this fear on others and be sure that they want to do unto him as he wants to do unto his father. Falstaff, as Hal's "son," is one person upon whom Hal can project the Oedipal wish to kill the father. This attributed Oedipal impulse in Falstaff helps to account for the acts of degradation and symbolic castration of Falstaff already discussed, and even for his final rejection. When Hal finally "marries" England, his guilt intensifies and with it his suspicion of Falstaff. This increase of guilt may throw light on another curious action: Hal's giving Falstaff the credit for killing Hotspur (1 H IV, I.iv.156-57). Since Hotspur is similar to Hal in his regicidal intentions, Hal, as I will propose later,⁴⁹ unconsciously regards him as his alter ego. Thus, if the supposedly rebellious son, Falstaff, has punished the would-be regicide, Hotspur, Hal has nothing to fear. Falstaff has taken off Hal's shoulders the responsibility for killing the father and King.

E. Hotspur as a Reflection of Problems in Hal

Like Falstaff, Hotspur, too, serves, because of Hal's projection and identification, as a means of expressing some of Hal's internal conflicts.

⁴⁹ See p. 48.

Hotspur suffers from problems that closely resemble Hal's. The relationship between Hotspur and his father, Northumberland, is probably at the root of Hotspur's problems. M. D. Faber summarizes the evidence regarding this father-son relationship.⁵⁰ Hotspur and his father never exchange an affectionate word. Before the Battle of Shrewsbury Northumberland becomes "crafty sick" (2 H IV, Introduction, 37), but still urges his son to go to battle alone (1 H IV, IV.i.36-38). Without his father's forces, Hotspur has little chance of winning the war. When Lord Bardolph brings the news of Hotspur's supposed victory, Northumberland, as if trying to prove that the news is not true, questions Bardolph:

How is this derived?
Saw you the field? came you from Shrewsbury?
(2 H IV, I.i.24-25)

But when Travers claims that Hotspur is dead, Northumberland only wants to hear his words again, and even seems to be making fun of Hotspur's name:

Ha? Again!
Said he young Harry Percy's spur was cold?
Of Hotspur Coldspur? . . .
(11. 49-50).

Later Northumberland defends Travers' version of the news against Bardolph's, and when Morton approaches, Northumberland hopefully observes that his brow "foretells the nature of a tragic volume" (1. 61). Morton hesitates to break the news, and Northumberland virtually puts the words into his mouth: "'Brother, son, and all are dead'" (1. 81). Still, as if in order to leave no place for doubt, he wants Morton to say the words himself (11. 87-88).

⁵⁰ M. D. Faber, "Oedipal Patterns in Henry IV," Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 36 (1967), 426-34).

Finally, Northumberland says,

. . . these news,
 Having been well, that would have made me sick,
 Being sick, have (in some measure) made me well.
 (11. 137-39).

Northumberland's illness, however, is mock-illness. The news, then, has made it possible for him to stop feigning illness.⁵¹

Faber concludes that Hotspur does not have a loving father-image and that therefore he has developed into "a fiercely destructive, fiercely independent sort of person more interested in war than in women."⁵² Actually, Faber adds, Hotspur's Oedipal hatred of his father is at the basis of his aggressiveness. His rebellion against the King is actually a disguised rebellion against the father.⁵³

It may be necessary to add to Faber's explanation the probability that Northumberland is not a strong father-image, and that this also is a reason why Hotspur could not shape his character through identification with his father. Northumberland's indecisiveness causes him to change his mind at the last moment before the battles of Shrewsbury and Gaultree, and to refrain from going to the battles (1 H IV, IV.i.17; 2 H IV, II.iii.62-68). Also, Northumberland is apparently afraid of his son's virility, and he therefore, in part, savors the news that Hotspur has become a "Coldspur." The "spur" here apparently has phallic significance, and Northumberland then regards Hotspur's death as castration and rejoices at it.

⁵¹ Faber, pp. 428-32.

⁵² Faber, p. 433. The homosexual aspect of Hotspur, who is "more interested in war than in women," will be discussed in Chapter Three, pp. 97-99.

⁵³ Faber, pp. 433-34.

Northumberland himself, by joining Bolingbroke's rebellion in Richard II, had participated in an Oedipal act. He must conceive of Henry IV, then, as a sibling rival, and apparently he himself has wished to take the mother--England--away from the King. This is one reason that he rebels against Henry IV. However, because he had participated in Bolingbroke's rebellion, and because he now saw Henry IV, against whom he has planned to fight, as a father-figure, Northumberland suffered from guilt-feelings. These guilt-feelings, in turn, have formed the basis of his indecision. Also, he unconsciously believes that as he has rebelled against Richard II, so his son, Hotspur, will in turn rebel against him. He projects his super-ego's desire to punish the ego onto his son. It is therefore clear why he is happy that his son has died. He no longer has to fear this punishment. Also, it is clear why he is happy to think of his son as castrated ("Cold-spur"): a castrated son cannot take the mother-figure away from the father.

The weakness of the father-figure hampers Hotspur in any efforts he might have made to resolve his Oedipal difficulties. Hotspur therefore rebelliously defies all authority figures. He refuses to hand over prisoners to the emissary of Henry IV (1 H IV, I.i.92-95). He rebels against the King. Later, he reacts in similar fashion to the Welsh general, Glendower. As long as Glendower tries to impose his own border settlement on areas they hope to rule after the rebellion, he hears nothing but objections from Hotspur, but once Glendower relents, Hotspur immediately becomes generous and accepts Glendower's version (1 H IV, III.i.114-38). Hotspur, in other words, will not accept the dictates of authority, but he has no objection to generosity toward a friend.

Obviously, Hotspur, with his Oedipal situation,⁵⁴ is very much like Hal. Like Hal, Hotspur suffers from Oedipal guilt-feelings. Indeed, he marries, but since to the Oedipally-fixated person any woman is the mother-image, Hotspur must feel that his marriage is incestuous.⁵⁵ He behaves like a complete stranger towards his wife. The very first words he says to her in 1 Henry IV are, "How now, Kate? I must leave you within these two hours" (II.iii.37-38). He never shows his wife any affection, wards off her attempts to make him declare his love to her (1 H IV, II.iii.91-104), and when Glendower mentions Hotspur's wife, Hotspur shows greater interest in the map of England (England being the mother-image, in whom he is really interested) than in his wife (1 H IV, III.i.89-95). When his wife comes in later, Hotspur has only a lewd remark for her: "thou art perfect in lying down" (l. 226). Also, he hints that he would like to go "to the Welsh lady's bed" (l. 242). The Welsh lady being the wife of Mortimer, Hotspur's brother-in-law, Hotspur may be seeing her as a mother-image, and directing his Oedipal wish toward her. The similarity to Hal's Oedipal wishes is obvious. Interestingly, both Hal and Hotspur are called "Harry," and both their wives are called "Kate."⁵⁶ Shakespeare apparently conceived of Hal and Hotspur as parallel figures.

⁵⁴ Perhaps he has regressed to the Oedipal level as a result of his family's involvement in the dispute with Henry IV.

⁵⁵ When Hal becomes Henry V, he feels the same about being King of England. See below, pp. 60-61.

⁵⁶ Hal wins his "Kate," of course, in Henry V.

Because of the guilt-feelings aroused by what his unconscious regards as incestuous marriage, Hotspur leaves home and escapes to war.⁵⁷ There, he hopes to find honor. It seems to him very simple to perform the impossible task of plucking honor from heaven (1 H IV, I.iii.201-208). As Henry V will later do,⁵⁸ Hotspur, after his allies have deserted him, faces war alone. There is a suicidal note in his words, "Doomsday is near--die all, die merrily" (1 H IV, IV.i.135). Hotspur, like a man who feels unconsciously that he has achieved the Oedipal goal, cannot live. Since he has married the mother-figure and attempted the direct overthrow of the father, he seeks out his punishment--death.

Holland, comparing Hal to Hotspur, asserts that both have parricidal tendencies.⁵⁹ William Empson, too, sees the similarity between them. He adds that when they meet on the battlefield (1 H IV, V.iv.59-101), they are what Ernest Jones would call "a decomposition of one person."⁶⁰ They are, in other words, two versions of a single individual with specific problems.

Ernst Kris develops the comparison. The father-son conflict, he says, appears three times in Henry IV, and in each version of it there are three characters. Henry IV compares Hal to Hotspur and wishes Hotspur were his son (1 H IV, I.i.78-90). Here the conflict is between a father and two son-images. Hal himself has a father and a father-substitute,

⁵⁷ Henry V does the same. See pp. 60-61 below. As for the homosexual aspect of this escape, see Chapter Three, p. 97-98.

⁵⁸ See below, p. 61.

⁵⁹ Holland, p. 399.

⁶⁰ William Empson, Some Versions of Pastoral (London: Chatto and Windus, 1935), p. 43.

Falstaff. Hotspur, on the other hand, has his father, Northumberland, and his uncle, Worcester. Again there is a son with two father-images. These triangular relationships underline the fact that Hotspur is Hal's parallel, and that the rebellion represents unconscious parricidal impulses in both of them.⁶¹

Not surprisingly, Hotspur is extremely interested in Hal. The reason may be that Hal openly expresses feelings that Hotspur does not express. Whereas the Prince has run away from home, Hotspur still lives close to his father. Hal leads a free life, but Hotspur has a nagging wife, whose inquiries he must ward off (1 H IV, II.iii.37-120). Most importantly, Hotspur feels they share the Oedipal difficulty. Just as Hal mocks Hotspur's married life and military prowess (1 H IV, II.iv.99-107),⁶² so Hotspur mocks Hal, but at the same time he projects himself on the Prince. Because of this projection, he expresses his unconscious belief that the Prince's relationship with Henry IV is like his own relationship with Northumberland:

And that same sword-and-buckler Prince of Wales,
But that I think his father loves him not,
And would be glad he met with some mischance,
I would have him poisoned with a pot of ale.
(1 H IV, I.iii.230-33)

In other words, because Hal is at odds with his father, Hotspur feels an affinity with him and would rather not kill him.

When, before the Battle of Shrewsbury, Hotspur hears about Hal's challenge to single combat, he asks apprehensively, "How showed his tasking?"

⁶¹ Kris, pp. 492-94. Like Empson, Kris, too, adds that "impulses pertaining to one situation have been divided between two personages."

⁶² See below, p. 49, for a discussion of this passage.

Seemed in it contempt?" Obviously, Hal's opinion is important to Hotspur. The reason is probably the identification he feels with Hal. Hal's disapproval would be to Hotspur like his own disapproval of himself.

When finally the two meet, Hotspur calls both himself and Hal "Harry" (1 H IV, V.iv.59, 61, 77). His words are not hateful or boastful. He admits that either of them can die--and not necessarily Hal alone (ll. 68-69).

The problem of the father-son relationship apparently troubled Shakespeare. This problem appears also in connection with Aumerle and York in Richard II. It is instructive to deviate briefly at this point from the discussion of Hotspur and Hal in order to investigate this parallel. Like Henry IV and Northumberland, York is a weak, indecisive character. He criticizes King Richard bitterly, but immediately thereafter he accepts the appointment as Lord Governor of England (R II, II.i.219-20). Upon Bolingbroke's return from exile, York does not fight. After a short hesitation, he joins the rebel.

Aumerle, like Hotspur and Hal, has no suitable father-image to create the castration-fear that would suppress the Oedipus complex. Also, he has no model after which to fashion a strong super-ego. Aumerle's joining the rebellion in support of Richard, against Henry IV (R II, IV.i.324-334) indicates Oedipal impulses, but his letting the list of conspirators hang out of his dress so that his father may see it (R II, V.ii.56-57) indicates a wish to let the father discover those rebellious impulses. There is phallic significance to the list hanging out of the clothes. Aumerle, whose super-ego prompts him to invite punishment, is almost asking to be castrated. When he later comes to the King to beg for his life, Aumerle states his purpose once but while his father tries to persuade the King to take his

son's life, Aumerle remains silent (R II, V.iii.46-147), and lets his mother plead for him.⁶³ Again, his wish to be punished is apparently the dominant factor.

York's vehement wish to cause his son's death is, of course, reminiscent of Northumberland's wish to hear about Hotspur's death.⁶⁴ Like Northumberland, York, having joined Bolingbroke's rebellion, has Oedipal guilt-feelings. He projects his super-ego's wish to punish the ego on his son; consequently, he fears Aumerle.

Aumerle, of course, does not appear simultaneously with Hal in Richard II, but Hotspur does. Hal's attitude towards Hotspur indicates that the Prince is unconsciously aware of the parallelism between himself and Hotspur. First and foremost, Hotspur, as a rebel, expresses openly the Oedipal impulses suppressed in Hal. Hal may think about him, "There, but for the courage to bring the rebellion into the open, go I." Hotspur is therefore, in Hal's unconscious, Hal's alter ego. He is also Hal's political and military rival, and this puts him in the position of a sibling-rival.

Hal leads a life among thieves, Hotspur pursues honor; Hal is unmarried, Hotspur has a wife. Hal certainly feels the sting of the contrast. Hal no doubt sees Hotspur as a person who has successfully passed through the Oedipal stage and who has successfully internalized the parents' figures

⁶³ For a discussion of the Duchess as a domineering mother and of her effect on Aumerle's character, see Chapter Three, pp. 99-100, and Chapter Four, pp. 143-144.

⁶⁴ See above, pp. 41-42.

to create a healthy super-ego. The fact that Hal has probably not yet done so and the fact that Hotspur is a husband, the head of a family, may cause Hal to see Hotspur as a father-figure.

Hal's great interest in Hotspur, as expressed, for example, in Act II, Scene iv, of 1 H IV, is probably a reflection of these factors. In the beginning of this scene Hal plays a prank on Francis. Concluding that he understands Francis and all other people very well, he says: "I am now of all humors . . . since the old day of goodman Adam" (ll. 90-93). Obviously, understanding Francis and being able to play a prank on him involve a feeling of superiority. However, a few lines after that the Prince says, "I am not yet of Percy's mind" (l. 99). Then he lists, under the pretence of mockery, the qualities which puzzle him in Hotspur: ability in war and married life (ll. 99-108). Taken symbolically, war and killing may mean sexual acts, and it is quite possible that what intrigues the Prince most is Hotspur's supposed sexual prowess. Out of envy and curiosity the Prince decides to play a game in which he can become the envied character. The wish to play and identify with Hotspur is similar to the wish of a child to imitate his envied father. Hotspur here is, thus, a father-figure.

Hal wants Falstaff to play "Dame Mortimer" (l. 107). "Dame Mortimer" is the maiden name of Hotspur's wife; the choice of name here indicates both a reluctance to realize that Hotspur is actually married and therefore supposedly grown up, and an Oedipal wish to "unmarry" Hotspur, the father-image, and thus have the wife, or the mother-image, available to Hal.

The King summons Hal, and Hal's behavior in the interview is at the outset forced and reserved. Then he hears from the King a lengthy praise

of Hotspur's military exploits (1 H IV, III.ii.96-120). Hotspur, both because he aims to possess the mother, England, and because the father praises him and condemns Hal's "vassal fear" (ll. 121-128), becomes a sibling-rival in Hal's unconscious. Hal answers very excitedly. It has taken him but two lines to answer the King's previous accusations (ll. 92-93); it takes him thirty lines (ll. 129-159) to defy the image of Hotspur and promise to challenge him to single combat. The King has mentioned the honor Hotspur has acquired by fighting Douglas and taking him prisoner. He adds that, by freeing Douglas later, Hotspur made the Scot a friend (ll. 106-107, 114-115). At the Battle of Shrewsbury, Hal proves that he can do as well: he saves the King's life by overcoming Douglas (1 H IV, V.iv.38-48), and later he sets Douglas free (1 H IV, V.v.27-28).

Before the battle Hal repeats his offer to fight Hotspur alone (1 H IV, V.i.97-100), and if Vernon's testimony is trustworthy, he utters the challenge as

. . . a brother should a brother dare
To gentle exercise and proof of arms.
(1 H IV, V.ii.55-56)

The picture here is that of two brothers--or siblings--playing. The praises that Hal has given Hotspur may be due to Hal's seeing an admired father-image in him. Shakespeare's Hal, unlike the historical one, has never been to a war prior to Shrewsbury, and his real father was not renowned for military valor. Hal's military ability may be due to a long identification with Hotspur.

As is typical of the Oedipal stage, Hal has an ambivalent love-hate attitude towards the father. The powerful, heroic father he admires; the

sexual, mother-possessing father he hates. This hatred, in addition to other factors (such as the sibling rivalry), prompts Hal to challenge Hotspur on the battlefield.

Finally, Hal and Hotspur meet. Although no one has previously said that the purpose of the rebellion is to crown Hotspur King of England, Hal announces that England cannot

. . . brook a double reign,
Of Harry Percy and the Prince of Wales.
(1 H IV, V.iv.67).

Hal's feeling is that Hotspur is his rival for England, the mother. He therefore proceeds to kill Hotspur.

Kris says that Hotspur, like Hal, wants to kill the King, and that in killing Hotspur Hal kills his alter ego.⁶⁵ Indeed, Hal's eulogy over Hotspur's body (1 H IV, V.iv.86-101) demonstrates Hal's identification with Hotspur. If Hal were the one dead, the eulogy would fit him. The ill-weaned ambition and the desire for a kingdom (ll. 88, 90) represent Hal's own Oedipal wish. It is the Hal who escaped from Court to tavern who was not "sensible of courtesy" (l. 94). His covering of Hotspur's face with favors (l. 96) proves his courtesy and shows an affection stemming from deep understanding of the causes of Hotspur's rebellion.

Hal cannot be happy and proud of the feat; while he has killed a person who has had an Oedipal wish, he himself has had a similar wish. Consequently, he is happy to give Falstaff the credit for the killing (1 H IV, V.iv.156-57).⁶⁶

⁶⁵ Kris, p. 498.

⁶⁶ See above, pp. 31-32 , for other reasons for this action.

F. Prince John of Lancaster as a Reflection of Problems in Hal

Another figure with a psychologically significant role in Hal's world is Prince John of Lancaster. At the Battle of Shrewsbury, after the King has told Hal to retreat to his tent, John of Lancaster refuses to accompany Hal. He urges Westmoreland, whom the King also urged to lead Hal to his tent, to return with him to the battle (1 H IV, V.iv.1-16). This may appear to be a hint to Hal that he should not withdraw. Hal's remarks about Lancaster (ll. 17-20) may be sarcastic. "I did not know thee lord of such a spirit" and "Now, I do respect thee as my soul" may indicate that the Prince suddenly realizes that Lancaster, like himself ("as my soul"), shares the Oedipal wish, which leads him to regard Hal as a dangerous rival, and that he has urged Hal to return to the battle in the unconscious hope that the sibling-rival, Hal, may die there. Hal's words also imply identification with Lancaster.

By praising Lancaster's bravery against Hotspur (ll. 21-23), the King inflames the implicit rivalry between the brothers. The King has thus pitted three sibling rivals one against the other: Hal, Lancaster, and Hotspur. Hal's

O, this boy
Lends mettle to us all!
(ll. 24-25)

is virtually a promise to learn from what Lancaster has done; and as he will free Douglas (1 H IV, V.v.27-28) to prove that he is as generous as Hotspur, so he will kill Hotspur to show that he is an even more able soldier than Lancaster.

At the end of the battle, having proved himself, Hal pays Lancaster a compliment which could very well apply to Hal himself:

. . . full bravely has thou fleshed
Thy maided sword.

(11. 138-39)

Again there is identification with Lancaster, but also a feeling of superiority. Obviously, of the two Hal has performed better.⁶⁷ An interesting fact then emerges from Lancaster's words: in spite of Hal's impatient attitude to Falstaff before the battle (1 H IV, V.i.121-126) and his only mild sorrow at Falstaff's death (1 H IV, V.iv.102-110), he has, in the short time since leaving the stage seventeen lines before, told his brother about Falstaff's death (1 H IV, V.iv.131). Falstaff is a father-substitute for Hal; it is not surprising that Hal would give word of the father's death to the sibling-rival with whom he identifies. Hal's identification with Lancaster, in fact, goes so far as to let Lancaster perform the act which Hal must have planned to perform since his interview with the King (1 H IV, III.ii): freeing Douglas (1 H IV, V.v.25-26). Since it is Hal who has initiated this act, however, he is the one who gains; there is no danger of it strengthening the sibling-rival.

G. Hal's "Reformation"

The point at which Hal becomes Henry V (2 H IV, V.ii.v) is a decisive point in his life. This is where, according to some critics,⁶⁸ Hal changes from the irresponsible prodigal son into the perfect King. As a closer investigation will show, however, this interpretation of Hal leaves something to be desired.

⁶⁷ There are also homosexual overtones to the situation; see Chapter Three, pp. 96-97.

⁶⁸ See Chapter I.

Franz Alexander sees the rejection of Falstaff as indicative of the nature of Hal's transformation. Falstaff, says Alexander, represents the non-social portions of Hal's personality, a fixation of Hal's in a pre-genital, instinctual stage of life. He is the pleasure principle, the infantile layer of the personality. The rejection of Falstaff is the repression of all that, a growth out of the stage at which the fixation had taken place.⁶⁹

Holland suggests a different explanation of Hal's transformation. To overcome parricidal impulses, a child will identify with the aggressor, internalize the father-figure, and create his own super-ego. Hal, says Holland, does so, but since his father is not a good example for moral ideals, Hal surpasses him in the strictness of his own moral standards. In the rejection of Falstaff, the substitute father-image, Hal expresses his rejection of the imperfect and questionable father-image.⁷⁰ Basically, then, Holland agrees with Alexander that Hal's transformation is a healthy step towards maturity.

Ella Freeman Sharpe, discussing a completely different subject, offers a different key to the transformation. Often, she says, a patient in a psychoanalytic treatment will be "reformed." Having realized some psychological problems in himself, the patient will artificially adopt an opposite mode of behavior, and he will believe that he is well. Actually, of course, the factors at the basis of his problem are still operating, but in the opposite direction.⁷¹ Would it not be possible to say that,

⁶⁹ Alexander, pp. 598-99.

⁷⁰ Holland, pp. 399-40.

⁷¹ Ella Freeman Sharpe, Collected Papers on Psychoanalysis, ed. Marjorie Brierley (London: Houghton Press, 1950), p. 42.

first, Hal realizes that he has a problem and, secondly, that he is determined to "cure himself"? In the "I know you all" soliloquy (1 H IV, I.ii. 189-209), Hal makes it clear that he is suffocating in his present condition and that when the time comes he is determined to reform. The play impromptu proves that no change has occurred in Hal's state of mind: "I do, I will" banish Falstaff, and, if need be, all the world, in order to reform (1 H IV, II.iv.470-71). Why he does not do so right away Hal does not know, but his Oedipal problem, as I have suggested,⁷² makes it impossible for him to return to the court as long as his father is alive. When his father dies, the time has come. He declares: "I have turned away my former self" (2 H IV, V.v. 59).

Kris says that a possible defense-mechanism against parricide is the development of a very strong super-ego.⁷³ It may very well be that Henry IV's death finally triggers a pseudo-reformation of the nature that Sharpe describes. Instead of less guilt, Hal feels more. In order to repress his parricidal impulses once and for all--in other words, in order to reform--he gives free rein to his super-ego.

An important characteristic of this external transformation in Hal is what he, as Henry V, expresses thus:

I have turned away my former self;
So will I those that kept my company.
(2 H IV, V.v.59-60)

Hal identifies the companions of his tavern days with the problems that he believes he has now set aside--i.e., resolved. By rejecting his earlier

⁷² See above, pp. 13-15.

⁷³ Kris, p. 502.

companions--mainly, Falstaff--the newly-crowned Henry V tries to dispose of his psychic problems--that is, repress them. Unfortunately, Henry V is simplistic in this regard. He promises his brothers: "I'll be your father and your brother too" (2 H IV, V.ii.57). He will try to eat his cake and have it too; be a father (enjoy the fruit of the Oedipal act), but still remain in the state of innocence, be one of the brothers.

If Henry accepts the fact that he is not a regular "brother," or child, anymore, he will have to acknowledge that he is in the position of one who has unconsciously accomplished the Oedipal act. It is true that he has not killed his father, but he has unconsciously wished for his death. To ward off realization of this fact, Henry adopts the Lord Chief Justice as a father-figure.

The Justice cannot be a strong father-image. He is a pale character, a symbol of law and order rather than a personality. It is interesting, however, to see--and Henry makes it very clear (2 H IV, V.ii.67-72)--that, like Henry IV before him, the Justice actually owes his life to Hal's kindness. Hal had saved Henry IV's life at the Battle of Shrewsbury. When the Justice "did use the person of . . . [Hal's] father," Hal, defying the authority of the law as he defied his father's, struck him (2 H IV, V.ii. 73-80). Unlike Henry IV, however, the Justice punished Hal (ll. 81-83). If Henry V installs the Justice as a father-figure who punishes when necessary and to whom Henry submits, Henry cannot be blamed for unconsciously committing the Oedipal crime (murdering the father in order to marry the mother). Towards the new father-figure, however, he does not experience the rebelliousness he felt towards Henry IV; it is Henry V, and not his newly-adopted father, who possesses the mother now.

The historical Lord Chief Justice, Sir William Gascoigne, was replaced by another upon the succession of Henry V to the throne.⁷⁴ The adopted-father theme, then, is Shakespeare's, and the reason he introduces it is clear. It is to suggest that Hal needs to bolster his super-ego against still-active Oedipal trends.

Just as Hal's father dies and leaves his place for the weak figure of the Justice, so Falstaff, the father-substitute, disappears (and later dies--H V, II.iii) and leaves his place for weaker characters. As if to indicate symbolically what has actually happened in Henry's unconscious, the figure of Falstaff undergoes "decomposition."⁷⁵ Falstaff disappears from the stage after his rejection by the King, or, in other words, after the King's repression of the impulses and wishes symbolized by Falstaff. However, Falstaff's gang remains; it even grows with the addition of Nym. More important, however, is the fact that Pistol replaces the braggart Falstaff. Earlier, the Hostess had revealed Falstaff's promise to marry her (2 H IV, II.i.90-92). In Henry V, Pistol turns out to have fulfilled that expectation (H V, II.i.28). Pistol continues the role of Falstaff also in displaying blown-up pride, false honorableness, and real cowardice (H V, II.i; III.ii; V.i). He captures a French soldier (H V, IV.iv) very much as Falstaff has captured Coleville of the Dale (2 H IV, IV.iii). It is therefore possible to raise the conjecture that Pistol assumes the father-substitute role of Falstaff. The symbolism here, however, is much more obscure than in Henry IV, for Henry V has repressed the Oedipal complex.

⁷⁴ D.N.B., p. 497.

⁷⁵ See Jones, pp. 149-51.

This repression is expressed by the fact that the substitute for the father-substitute is not close to the King at all, and when he does talk to the King, the King is disguised as a common soldier (H V, IV.i.35-62).

The King's approval of Bardolph's execution for stealing (H V, III.vi.113-20) further emphasizes the extent of the repression in Henry. Henry himself once indulges in such acts as theft. Bardolph thus symbolizes this dissolute aspect of the King's character, and Bardolph's execution proves that Henry will keep this element repressed at any cost. It is true that whereas Henry stole during peace time, Bardolph steals in war, and that during the war Henry is enforcing the law more severely than before; but this very enforcement of the law stems from Henry's attempts to repress in himself, and therefore in others, any illicit behavior. While another King could have allowed his soldiers to plunder a little, Henry's sudden severe virtuousness forbids it.

Nym is another reincarnation of Falstaff. He promises: "I dare not fight, but I will wink and hold out mine iron. It is a simple one, but what though? . . . It will roast cheese . . . " (H V, II.i.7-9). Falstaff expressed similar feelings about fighting (1 H IV, V.iii.34-35, 56-58). Nym is also Falstaff's heir in that he has been the Hostess' trothplight (H V, II.i.21). There is even a figure that echoes Prince Hal himself: the boy. As Hal had been with Falstaff (the father-image) and his gang, so the boy associates with Nym, Bardolph, and Pistol, who are his elders and supposedly his betters, and thus possible parental images; but just as Hal knew them all, so the boy has standards high enough to criticize Nym, Bardolph, and Pistol (H V, III.ii). Like the Prince, the boy is also better educated than his companions--he speaks French, and much as Hal

has seen through Falstaff, the boy sees through Pistol's show of valor (H V, III.ii.29-57). However, Hal has repressed his former mode of behavior, and if the boy represents the way Henry V has dealt with his former internal conflicts, he rightly disappears after a short appearance.⁷⁶

Henry V, then, undergoes a pre-determined change. However, rather than cure the illness, he represses the symptoms. Rather than develop a balanced personality, he goes to the other extreme, from dissolute prodigal son to severely-virtuous ruler. The repressed problem will therefore inevitably find its way into various sublimated forms of expression.

H. The War in France

When Henry adopts the Lord Chief Justice as father-substitute, he expresses his hope--or his fear--of seeing his own son offend and then obey the Justice. As already explained, he projects his guilt-feelings and his fear of punishment on people who might rebel against him as he has rebelled against his father. He is therefore afraid of his yet-unborn son's rebelliousness, and he hopes that the Justice will offer protection as an ideal strong father-figure. Of course, if the father-substitute is still present to protect Henry, then the son--the executor of the Oedipal punishment which it will be Henry's share to face--has no reason to punish his father. However, when in the beginning of Henry V King Henry is laying plans for war, the Justice has somehow disappeared.

Since Henry V has initiated the war,⁷⁷ a sublimated Oedipal act, he can expect the Justice, whom he has adopted as a father-figure, and

⁷⁶ The boy probably dies in the French's massacre of the boys, H V, IV, vii.1-7.

⁷⁷ See below, pp. 62-66.

therefore as a personified super-ego, to object. The war would then become, instead of sublimated rebellion against the father, actual defiance of the adopted father's advice, and this defiance would contradict Henry's newly-acquired virtuous ways. To avoid this situation, Shakespeare disposed of the Justice. The disappearance of the Justice--a super-ego figure--also shows some slackening of the severity of Henry's super-ego; it is perhaps this slackening which allows Henry to proceed with the unconsciously-Oedipal war in France.

Another father-figure that disappears from the stage when Hal becomes King is Falstaff. Although he has never been a demanding and restricting father-figure, Falstaff has continued in a diminished capacity as a father-figure into Henry V--but offstage. He dies both actually and symbolically as a result of Henry's rebellious drives.⁷⁸

The war is a product of "over-determination."⁷⁹ Franz Alexander, discussing Hotspur, explains that when social restrictions are too rigorous, they "mobilize the destructive instinct of man's nature."⁸⁰ This analysis can certainly apply to Henry V. The war may well be, among other things, Henry's outlet for severe self-imposed perfection. The war is also an escape from the super-ego. Henry is "living in sin" with the mother-figure, England. Guilt-feelings drive him from the unconscious incest to take up arms against

⁷⁸ His death is overdetermined. He dies as old friend, and he dies as meaningful father-substitute.

⁷⁹ Overdetermination is the situation in which more than one psychological factor is at the basis of a psychological or behavioral phenomenon. Thus, as explained below, Henry V's war in France is the result of a number of psychological factors.

⁸⁰ Alexander, p. 598.

France, where, though victorious, he will have to confront his Oedipal problem yet again.

Another reason for Henry's going to war is his wish to incur punishment. Because of Henry's guilt-feelings concerning the symbolically incestuous position as King of England, he unconsciously realizes that he deserves punishment. It is because Henry fears punishment and yet unconsciously invites it that he is so sensitive to the conspiracy of Scroop, Grey and Cambridge and that he expresses extreme hurt and indignation at it (H V, II.ii). He goes as far as to call it "another fall of man" (H V, II.iii.142). He projects his guilt onto the conspirators, and killing the conspirators is an attempt to repress this guilt. Henry's attitude towards his guilt, however, is ambivalent. At the same time that he attempts to repress the guilt-feelings, he is attempting to incur punishment in war. Even when he finds the French army obviously superior in numbers, he continues to advance. He rejects the possibility of summoning reinforcements from England: "I pray thee wish not one man more" (H V, IV.iii.23). He calls the goal of this almost-suicidal advance "honor" (H V, IV.iii.28). In this respect his behavior is reminiscent of Hotspur, who has an unrealistic concept of honor (1 H IV, I.iii.201-208). The reason for Henry's relentless advance and refusal of reinforcements may be a reluctance to gather more siblings around him. He does acknowledge his soldiers as "brothers" (ll. 61-62); still, he reserves the term "brother" to those siblings who are obviously not dangerous rivals. For example it is not until after the victory that he calls the French King "brother" (H V, V.ii.2). He may also consider punishment as the expiation of guilt, and as such it indeed brings honor.

Thus Henry's endangering of his life and incurring of punishment may be an attempt to achieve honor.

The war in France is also a sublimated Oedipal act. Henry is taking a country from its King. The mother-image, however, is not only France. There is the real wife of the French King, and there is also Katharine, the French Princess who is the wife Henry wins as booty. By becoming the actual ruler of France and by marrying a woman from the royal house, Henry possesses a "mother." The French Dauphin, as heir to the throne, is, of course, a sibling-rival. However, being part of the ruling family that Henry tries to overthrow, the Dauphin is also, partly, a father-figure. He has taken issue with Henry from the outset; the present of the tennis balls (H V, I.ii) was a double insult. On the one hand it meant that Henry was a mere playboy, whose place was on the playground rather than on the battlefield. On the other hand, the balls were symbolic of that part of the human anatomy that carries the same name, and as such, they were a clear sexual insult. Thus, the Dauphin's present was an expression of a wish to prove Henry's sexual inferiority. Here, then, is another reason for the war: a desire in Henry to show the sibling, or the father, or both, through actual performance, Henry's sexual superiority.

Henry sends Exeter with a message to the French King and the Dauphin (H V, II.iv.76-126). The Oedipal theme and the virility-contest theme are clear in the message. In his claim to the French throne, Henry, apparently in order to allay guilt-feelings and to make his demand more persuasive, represents the French King not as a father-image but as a sibling-rival, one who holds the title without right. The father-image is Edward III (II. 79-95). Thus Henry's war against the French King is

not a war against the father-figure. If the father-figure is Edward III, Henry's war is merely a war against a sibling-rival, and not an Oedipal act. Henry's message to the Dauphin is much more explicit: Henry will cause the "caves and womby vaultages of France"--obviously, France becomes a female symbol--to suffer from his cannons, which represent Henry's maleness (ll. 124-126). The tennis balls of the Dauphin have become cannon balls to represent the very masculine quality which the Dauphin has mocked in Henry. This quality will now take revenge on France.

The French King offers Katharine's hand, but Henry refuses:

[The French Ambassador] Tells Harry that the King doth offer
him
Katharine his daughter, and with her, to dowry,
Some petty and unprofitable dukedoms.
The offer likes not.

(H V, III.Prol. 29-32)

Evidently, Katharine the woman does not interest Henry. He wants Katharine as a symbol of France, the mother-image. As long as Katharine's father remains the ruler of France, marrying Katharine will not be a sublimated taking-possession of the mother; it will signify only an acceptance of the father-figure's peace offer and thus will be a submission to the father-figure. Since Henry's Oedipal purpose is to defeat the father and take possession of the mother, he rejects France's offer.

Before the Battle of Harfleur Henry encourages his soldiers to prove that they are really their fathers' sons:

. . . now attest
That those whom you call fathers did beget you.

(H V, III.i.22-23)

When Henry's father, Bolingbroke, was about to dethrone a king, it was Richard II whom he was about to dethrone (see especially R II, IV.i.190, 200).

Young Hal then probably regarded the dethronement as an Oedipal deed.⁸¹ Now, before Harfleur, Henry V, unconsciously realizing that he is about to carry out a similar dethronement, identifies with his father. It is Henry V and not his soldiers, who, by repeating his father's act, will prove to be really his father's son.

In Henry's speech to the people of Harfleur (H V, III.iii.1-43), he shows by the images he chooses that he sees the taking of a city as an Oedipal act. He addresses his speech to the governor, who is the father-image in this context:

. . . the fleshed soldier, rough and hard of heart
 In liberty of bloody hand shall range
 With conscience wide as Hell, mowing like grass
 Your fresh-fair virgins and your flowering infants.

 . . . in a moment look to see

 Your fathers taken by the silver beards
 And their most reverend heads dashed to the walls,

 While the mad mothers with their howls confused
 Do break the clouds.

(H V, III.v.11-14, 33, 36-37, 39-40)

The city is the mother-figure and Henry threatens to bombard it (l. 7). Apart from general threats such as "spoil" and "villainy" (l. 32), Henry describes in detail the anticipated rape of virgins (ll. 14-15, 20-21, 34-35), murder of fathers (ll. 36-37), murder of infants (ll. 14, 38), and agony of mothers (ll. 39-41). All these threats have their Oedipal significance. Henry's unconscious wish is to kill the father, or, in the immediate future, the French King; dispose of the infants (such as

⁸¹ See above, p. 13.

the Dauphin), who are potential sibling-rivals; and take the mother. Because Henry's super-ego apparently will not let him talk about the rape of mothers, however, he divides the possession of the mother into the rape of virgins and the agony of mothers.

In this speech, Henry also expresses not only envy of those who have families but also a desire to destroy them.⁸² Similarly, he was once envious of Hotspur's married life (1 H IV, II.iv.99-108),⁸³ and later killed Hotspur (1 H IV, V.iv.71-85). This envy and desire to destroy may simply be the Oedipal envy of the father and the desire to destroy the father's relationship with the mother so that the son can take possession of her.

In his refusal of Montjoy's offer of ransom (H V, IV.iii.90-125), Henry V continues the virility contest. As the "caves and womby vaultages of France" will sound with cannon shots (H V, II.iv.124-26), so will the hills of France rot with bodies of English soldiers buried in them (H V, IV.iii.98-103). Here the ground--a symbol of the mother-image--receives bodies of English soldiers; this is a symbol of the fulfillment of the Oedipal wish. The bodies become phallic symbols; the earth becomes the female symbol. However, since Henry has referred to caves in this very ground as wombs, his description of his own soldiers in these caves may also indicate a wish to return to the womb. This wish can indicate a desire to be cleansed and re-born, and could also indicate a death-wish. In

⁸² As pointed out above, Shakespeare has deprived Hal of a mother (p. 23). See below, Chapter Four, for a discussion of the mother-figure in the entire Second Tetralogy.

⁸³ See above, p. 49.

Henry's case, however, the return to the womb parallels the penetration into the womb in the sexual act. The sexual consummation of the Oedipal wish would involve such a partial return to the womb. Not surprisingly, Henry clearly conceives of such a return to the womb as sinful, and he therefore associates it with stench and plague. One immediately remembers the feeling of suffocation in the "I know you all" soliloquy⁸⁴ and Hamlet's sense of physical disgust caused by a similar problem.⁸⁵

I. The Eve of Agincourt

The virility contest and the Oedipal act come to their conclusion at the end of Henry V, but before that moment a very long and complex scene takes place, on the eve of the Battle of Agincourt. The Battle of Agincourt is a decisive step in Henry's war in France. Should the King retreat, he would not commit the Oedipal act; winning the battle is winning the war and France, the mother-image. The super-ego is evidently at odds with the Oedipal drive, which is about to have its way, and this inner conflict helps to account for Henry's restlessness on the night before the battle. Throughout the scene (H V, IV.i), Henry tries to cope with the problem and restore balance to his mind. Henry has, in addition, the difficulty that he has suppressed the conscious awareness of the existence of a problem; having suppressed the symptoms, he is certain

⁸⁴ Yet herein will I imitate the sun
 Who doth permit the base contagious clouds
 To smother up his beauty from the world

 . . . breaking through the foul and ugly mists
 Of vapors that did seem to strangle him.
 (1 H IV, I.ii.189-95)

⁸⁵ Hamlet, I.ii.129-30; II.ii.291; III.iv.92-95, 188-89.

that all is well. Thus, much of the scene depicts a blind attempt to identify the problem, and it is only towards the end that he locates it and finds a way to restore balance.

First, Henry makes an interesting remark about the enemy: "They are our outward consciences" (l. 8). That is, they represent the father-image. The father, until the child internalizes him and creates his own conscience, or super-ego, is indeed the outward conscience. Following this comment, Henry borrows Sir Thomas Erpingham's cloak (l. 24). In hiding behind old Erpingham's cloak, Henry wishes to find assurance of a father's love and a father's endorsement of his planned Oedipal act. Erpingham's function here is similar, then, to that of the Lord Chief Justice at the end of 2 Henry IV. Like the Justice, Erpingham is not dangerous as a father-image and is dependent upon Henry. Also, lending Henry a change of identity, Erpingham enables Henry to approach the problem that he has pretended did not exist anymore. As an anonymous soldier, visiting among his troops, King Henry V may discuss fears and hesitations to his heart's content, and since it is only the King's hesitations that he is discussing, he can be more objective.

As in a play within a play, Henry sees the major characters in his Oedipal drama in the figures of different people. First, the father appears in the figure of Pistol. This is a clown-father, who poses no danger, and he puts Henry in a good mood (ll. 35-63). Interestingly, Henry is hiding his identity behind a transparent mask: "Harry le Roy," and "a Welshman." As if in reply to this, Pistol--the father--threatens to knock Fluellen's leek off his head, or symbolically, castrate him;

Fluellen, as I suggest below,⁸⁶ is parallel to Henry. Naturally, Henry sides with Fluellen. He warns the clown-father that the rebellious son may yet knock Pistol's dagger off Pistol's head, or, symbolically, castrate him.

It is difficult to say whether Henry knows Pistol in the dark, but it is interesting that when Pistol identifies himself, Henry is not at all surprised. There is also no indication as to whether Henry has heard of Pistol's marriage to the Hostess. If he has heard of it, and if he recognizes Pistol's voice and associates him with Falstaff, the original clown-father, then the conversation has a symbolic significance for Henry himself. In any event, there is obvious symbolic significance for Shakespeare and the audience.

Next, Fluellen appears (ll. 64-86). Again, as if in a play-within-a-play, Henry does not even participate in the conversation with Fluellen. Fluellen, as I will suggest, is the symbol of Henry the Oedipal son. Henry has unconsciously projected onto Fluellen the role of the rebellious son against Pistol. Again, Henry's unconscious may not know this, and the symbolic significance may be for Shakespeare and the audience only. Not unexpectedly, Henry praises the "care and valor in this Welshman" (l. 86).

If until now Henry has been more of an amused spectator of the scene, he now becomes deeply involved in the discussion with Williams, Court, and Bates (ll. 87-246). Erpingham has expressed satisfaction with the conditions of the camp (ll. 16-17), and, as Henry notes, has spoken "cheerfully" (l. 34).

⁸⁶ See below, pp. 74-75.

When Henry reports Erpingham to have expressed despair at the situation of the English, he is evidently expressing his own fears.

Then begins an argument in which Henry tries to defend himself against different accusations. Since Henry's conscience is not clear regarding his planned Oedipal act, the whole argument is undoubtedly a projection of Henry's internal struggle. The soldiers, standing for the super-ego, find fault with the actions of the person and the wishes of the id. Henry himself, as ego, tries to settle the dispute and convince the super-ego that all is according to the law.

The soldiers, who are under the King's command, also stand for rebellious id impulses. The fact that Henry has to defend his actions to them indicates that the id impulses have undergone rationalization and appear disguised as super-ego criteria. For example, Bates, morality-play fashion, tries to advise the King of the right path--immediate retreat from the (Oedipal) venture (ll. 118-122). Although, to all appearances, Bates, in so advising, represents Henry's super-ego, he may actually represent Henry's pleasure principle disguised as the super-ego. The reason for wishing to return is probably not a moral consideration but the fear of discomfort and death.

Then the question arises as to whether the King's cause is just (ll. 129-139). This is a dangerous question, for its answer lies dangerously close to the Oedipal truth, and it is one that Henry has avoided since early in the play. At that point, he had led the Archbishop to make the decision for him (H V, I.ii.9-97). The Archbishop was a fatherly figure. Henry became impatient with the Archbishop's long explanation and wanted only to secure clear authorization from the father-image to pursue

the war: "May I with right and conscience make this claim?" (H V, I.ii.96). For the very same reason Henry again disposes of the question of the rightness of his cause. But his doubts and fears reappear in the guise of the question of the responsibility of the King (H V, IV.i.39-153). Henry easily resolves this problem (ll. 154-201), but since he senses that the question is not the real reason for his restlessness, he shows tension and loss of self-confidence. Henry admits that the battle the next day may cause him never to trust the King--himself--again: "I will never trust his word after" (l. 208).⁸⁷ The super-ego figure--at this point, Williams--is not satisfied (ll. 208-215). The wish of the super-ego, as already expressed by Bates, is to have Henry back in England (ll. 118-122). The end is quite unsatisfactory for Henry; there is a quarrel between the super-ego and the ego, or Williams and the King (ll. 216-241).

The super-ego, and, to the extent that Williams represents rationalized id wishes, the id too, express complete and ironic distrust of the ego. Williams does not believe that Henry--the ego--will honor his promises to the end: "when our throats are cut, he may be ransomed" (l. 205). All Henry can do is promise that this will not happen (ll. 207-208), but Williams sarcastically laughs this promise off--"That's a perilous shot out of an elder-gun!" (ll. 209-210)--and then informs Henry, the ego, that such promises are worthless: "'tis a foolish saying" (l. 215). Henry, intimidated, feels defeated in the quarrel: "Your reproof is something

⁸⁷ The question of the ransom is, of course, again a disguised version of the real problem.

too round. I should be angry with you if the time were convenient" (ll. 216-18).⁸⁸

Finally, all Henry can say is, in effect: Wait till I catch you under other circumstances. He promises defiantly, in effect, to castrate the father-image (the French King) the next day: " . . . tomorrow the king himself will be a clipper [of French crowns]" (ll. 245-246). Clipping pieces off coins was a criminal action,⁸⁹ and Henry associates the crime with his plan to cut off French heads, or, symbolically, castrate the French. Since the coins may also represent maidenheads, Henry's defiant statement also repeats the theme of the virility contest, and, of course, the Oedipal theme too: Henry is going to take possession of the mother (France, symbolized by the French coins) sexually.⁹⁰

When Henry encounters Williams after the battle, he has expended much of his anxiety and he sees Williams as merely a soldier before his King--hardly a super-ego figure. It is therefore possible for Henry to compensate Williams and send him away without trying to prove to him that the war has been just (H V, IV.viii.41-66). Of course, Henry still owes Williams a debt of honor, the promised duel. Henry could have ignored the quarrel. However, Williams represents honor's demand, and thus he also

⁸⁸ Italics mine.

⁸⁹ See fn. to H V, IV.i.242-46 in Shakespeare, the Complete Works, ed. G. B. Harrison (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1948).

⁹⁰ There is anal and homosexual significance to the coins' metaphor. See Chapter Three, p. 105.

represents, as on the eve of Agincourt, Henry's super-ego. Henry satisfies honor's demand by projecting it on Fluellen and sending him to receive the box on the ear (H V, IV.vii.160-166, viii.8).⁹¹

The super-ego's hostility towards the ego may cause dejection. Indeed, as soon as the dialogue ends, dejection sets in; Henry makes his soliloquy on ceremony (H V, IV.viii.246-301). The dejection is the result of Henry's disappointment with what he has achieved in life:

What have kings that privates have not too,
 Save ceremony, save general ceremony?

 But for ceremony, such a wretch [a slave],
 Had the forehand and vantage of a king.
 (11. 255-56, 295-97)

Simultaneously with the acceptance of kingship, Henry underwent a pseudo-transformation. He had gained "ceremony"; ceremony has not, however, been the solution for his Oedipal conflict. Henry has not achieved a balanced personality but only the external appearance of balance. In the position he has inherited from his father, the kingship, he might have looked for the warmth and love of a mother-image; he has found only pomp. He envies a slave. Although the slave has not fought like Henry to achieve a desired goal, and perhaps because of this (not fighting here means not performing the Oedipal act), Henry believes the slave to be happier than the King himself.

Henry also apparently envies the slave's sexuality. "What have kings that privates have not too" may be a pun on "private parts." Then

⁹¹ For further explanation of the homosexual and prankish aspects of the encounter with Williams, see below, Chapter Three, pp. 108-110, and Chapter Four, pp. 152, 153-154.

Henry says that but for ceremony the slave "had the forehand and vantage of a king." "Forehand" may carry a phallic significance. Both statements seem to imply that a King is not superior to a slave in the sexual respect. Thus Henry regards what he has achieved in his life as worthless.

At this point, Erpingham appears. He and the nobles have been worried about Henry (ll. 302-303). This means, to Henry's unconscious, that the father (Erpingham) and the siblings (the nobles) love him enough to be worried about him. Henry feels that the father (the super-ego) is not irreconcilably angry. He can then make peace with his super-ego through prayer (ll. 307-322). The concept of God is the projection of the super-ego on a universal scale, and Henry asks God's forgiveness for his father's usurpation, an Oedipal act in which he, as Hal, unconsciously participated. Finally, he consoles himself with the fact that he has tried to atone for his father's crime. This is sufficient to allay his guilt-feelings, and he feels sure now that "the day . . . and all things stay for me" (l. 326).

Ernst Kris notes that in the scene on the eve of Agincourt Henry still shows guilt-feelings over his father's Oedipal act (H V, IV.i.309-311).⁹² In another place, however, Kris says that Henry IV's regicide had aroused in Henry V regicidal impulses.⁹³ It is easy, then, to suggest on the basis of Kris' interpretation that in his prayer (H V, IV.i.306-322) Henry V identifies his own sin with that of his father.

⁹² Kris, p. 495.

⁹³ Kris, p. 498

J. Fluellen as a Parallel to Henry V and as a Means of Criticism

Although Shakespeare may present Henry V as being able to satisfy his own super-ego, the playwright still hints that there is much to criticize in the King. One instrument for expressing this criticism is Fluellen, the Welsh captain. Among the comic characters of Henry V, Fluellen is prominent. Some parallels between him and Henry V suggest that he may parallel the rebellious-son aspect of Henry's character. Pistol insults Fluellen about his leek, and Fluellen takes revenge by making Pistol eat the leek (H V, V.i). The Dauphin insults Henry with tennis balls, and Henry reacts by firing cannon balls into French cities and conquering France and Katharine. The parallel of the sexual symbolism is obvious. The cannon balls and the leek are phallic symbols; the insults mock the virility of Henry and Fluellen, and in both cases the reply is to make the insulting party suffer, symbolically, from the insulted bodily function itself.

I have suggested that in conquering France, Henry is performing a sublimated Oedipal act.⁹⁴ Shakespeare mirrors the act through the two characters who represent aspects of Henry's character: Pistol, the deposed, ineffectual clown-father, and Fluellen, the old-fashioned but virile, rebellious son, who proves his sexual prowess to his father's very face, so to speak. One remembers, in this connection, that Hal has pricked Falstaff with his sword from behind (1 H IV, II.ii.101) and degraded him in other ways.⁹⁵ In Henry V, Fluellen takes Henry's place in order to

⁹⁴ See pp. 62-66 above.

⁹⁵ See pp. 26-34 above.

receive from Williams the blow that Henry was to receive (H V, IV.viii.8), and later, following Henry's example, he "forgives" Williams and bestows money on him (ll. 67-71).⁹⁶

A further point in the parallelism between Henry and Fluellen is the fact that in spite of their psychological difficulties, both are capable of deferring satisfaction to a more opportune moment. Henry, saying "I should be angry with you if the time were convenient" (H V, IV.i.216-218), stops his quarrel with Williams and agrees to continue it after the battle the next day; and Fluellen relates that Pistol had insulted him, but that "it was in a place where I could not breed no contention with him." However, he promises to wait "until I see him again, and then I will tell him a little piece of my desire" (H V, V.i.5-14).

Fluellen stands in contrast to the Chorus. In the tradition of the Shakespearean fool, he exposes as a mere facade the picture of Henry as an ideal king ruling a patriotic England. The fact that Fluellen is Henry's parallel lends the greater weight to his criticism. The Chorus presents an exaggeratedly favorable picture. The second Prologue, for example, describes how "honor's thought reigns solely in the heart of every man" (H V, II.Prol.3-4). In Scene i, however, Nym, by saying "I dare not fight" (H V, II.i.7), exposes the Chorus' statement as absurd. The same Chorus is the one that gives Henry what many regard as his deserved epithet, namely, "the mirror of all Christian kings" (l. 16). Again, the fourth Prologue glorifies Henry. It describes how, walking majestically among his soldiers, he encourages them and shows no sign of

⁹⁶ For a discussion of the homosexual symbolism connected with Fluellen, see Chapter Three, pp. 110-113.

fear (H V, IV.Prol.28-47). In the actual play, Henry walks among the soldiers incognito, and his purpose is not to encourage them but to find reassurances for his troubled conscience. Later, Henry orders the slaughter of the French prisoners (H V, IV.vi.37). Gower's explanation, that killing the prisoners was Henry's reaction to the French slaughter of the boys (H V, IV.vii.5-11), is either wishful thinking or misinformation, for Henry's order preceded his knowledge of the slaughter of the boys. Since Gower's justification makes the reader wonder why, indeed, Henry ordered the prisoners' execution, it in itself entails criticism of him.⁹⁷

Then Fluellen appears. Whereas the Chorus attempts to create a heroic image of the perfect King, Fluellen compares Henry to "Alexander the pig" (l. 14). This is a humorous mispronunciation, but it is consistent with the denigration of Henry that follows. Henry's rejection of Falstaff--a rejection which Henry and all the world thought to have been done "in his [Henry's] right wits and his good judgements"-- was, in Fluellen's opinion, no better than "Alexander the pig's" killing, "in his rages, and his furies, and his wraths, and his cholers, and his moods, and his displeasures, and his indignations," of his best friend, Cleitus (H V, IV.vii.32-41). Fluellen, or, perhaps, Shakespeare using Fluellen as a mouthpiece, hints here that the rejection of Falstaff was as good as murder. Since Falstaff was a father-substitute to Henry, and since his rejection was a sublimation of parricidal impulses in Henry, this rejection was indeed as good as murder.

⁹⁷ I suggest that Henry's unconscious homosexual tendencies motivate his killing of the prisoners. See Chapter Three, p. 106.

After the victory over France, another of Fluellen's "praises" follows. As a Welshman he "confesses" himself to be Henry's countryman,⁹⁸ bravely holds that he does not care who knows it, and asserts that as long as the King is an honest man, he need not be ashamed of his liege (11. 116-120). Whether a man who has killed a friend in his rages, and his furies, and his wraths, is honest, is a question Fluellen does not answer. However, Henry's action immediately following this conversation is certainly not honest. Fluellen mentions that "the Welshmen did good service . . . wearing leeks in their Monmouth caps" (11. 102-104), but Henry slyly makes his own Welshman, Fluellen, wearing not a leek but a glove, receive a blow intended for Henry himself (11. 160-166).

Henry tries to find reasons why the confrontation with Williams should not take place, but Fluellen judges that, even if Williams' enemy be "as good a gentlemen as the Devil is, as Lucifer and Beelzebub himself" (11. 143-146), Williams should meet him. Fluellen is not aware of the fact that the Devil and Beelzebub are, in this case, the King himself. The fact remains, however, that the person whom Shakespeare caused to compare the King with the Devil is Fluellen. Since Fluellen has used comparisons before, e.g., the comparison of Henry to Alexander, in order to criticize the King, his comparison of Henry to the Devil continues his criticism.

The last stage in Fluellen's criticism comes after Williams blames the King for the quarrel (11. 53-60). By praising Williams for doing so and offering him money (11. 67-71), Fluellen expresses his acceptance of

⁹⁸ Henry V was born at Monmouth, Wales. See D.N.B., p. 494.

Williams' version of the story of the quarrel. Thus, Fluellen joins Williams in blaming Henry for the quarrel.

Fluellen compulsively refers to "the true and auncient prerogatives and laws of the wars" (H V, IV.i.67-68).⁹⁹ This constant reference to law may indicate that Fluellen stands in part for Henry's super-ego. His criticism of the King is, then, not surprising. However, Fluellen's reference to the discipline of war is compulsive, and compulsive adherence to rules is an anal trait.¹⁰⁰ Also, it is characteristic of the Oedipal stage to see the parent as two separate images, one virtuous and good and the other sexual and base. Henry, being King, is a father-figure to Fluellen. Since Fluellen at one time calls the King Lucifer and at another time counts him among "good men" (H V, IV.vii.55), he apparently has an ambivalent view of the father-image. Fluellen, then, is fixated in some pre-Oedipal stage. When Henry declares his Oedipally-oriented war on France, the reaction of Fluellen in his capacity as Henry's super-ego is his criticism of the King. The child in him, however, apparently because of an Oedipal possessiveness towards the mother-figure (France), sees the father-image as a sexual and base one,¹⁰¹ criticizes him, and calls him Lucifer and Beelzebub.

It is true that Fluellen does not know that the "gentleman" he is calling Beelzebub is the King. He does know, however, that this person

⁹⁹ For an example of Fluellen's compulsive reference to the discipline of war, see H V, III.ii.63, 76-77, 82-87, 100-108, 140-141, 152.

¹⁰⁰ See Chapter Four, pp. 162-166, for a discussion of Fluellen's anal characteristics.

¹⁰¹ For similar reasons, Hamlet sees Claudius as a "murderer and a villain" (Hamlet, III.iv.97).

is, as the King has described him, "a gentlemen of great sort, quite from the answer of his [Williams'] degree" (H V, IV.viii.141-142). If so, this person is quite from the answer of Fluellen's degree, too, and quite suitable to serve as a father-image. Fluellen also knows that there has been a quarrel between Williams, who is not of a higher social rank than Fluellen's, and this person. He thus assigns to this individual the role of the hated father, the base, sexual image against whom the son rebels.¹⁰² Also, one must not forget that it is Shakespeare who has given the characters their psychological validity, and that this creative process in Shakespeare was to a great extent unconscious. If Shakespeare unconsciously conceived of Fluellen as having an ambivalent Oedipal attitude toward the father, he had reason enough to make the soldier compare the King (the father-image) to Beelzebub. The fact that, logically, Fluellen could not have known that it was the King he was talking about probably had little significance in Shakespeare's creative unconscious.

Fluellen not only reacts to the father-image's Oedipal deed by hating the sexual aspect of this image--he himself defies and degrades another father-image, Pistol. Apart from the obvious degradation in forcing a person to eat hateful food, there is added humiliation in the fact that the leek--especially because it was worn on the head--is a phallic symbol. Forcing Pistol to eat it proves symbolically that Fluellen's virility, or the son's virility, is greater than that of the clown-father, Pistol.¹⁰³ The symbolism in this scene and that in the scene in which

¹⁰² Hamlet, too, rebels against the sexual father-image and admires the spiritual, virtuous one (see Hamlet, III.iv.54-66).

¹⁰³ For a discussion of the obvious homosexual symbolism in the act, see Chapter Three, pp. 111-113.

Hal pricks Falstaff from behind with his sword are, then, very similar. Fluellen's parallel to Henry thus embraces an unconscious sexual deviation.

There are only two scenes in the Fifth Act of Henry V. Both show the same theme in different versions: the victory of the rebellious son. Scene i shows Fluellen making Pistol, the clown-father, eat the leek. Scene ii shows Henry performing a parallel act with respect to the Dauphin and the French court.

K. The Peace Treaty and the Courtship of Katharine

The French King has from the first been a weakling. Even before the Battle of Agincourt he offered his daughter to Henry. When Henry comes to the French court after the victory, he is apparently determined to humiliate the King. He has previously humiliated Falstaff and even his father, Henry IV. What Henry V does in Act V is very similar to what he did in the tavern after the Gadshill robbery (1 H IV, II.iv.109-279): there he picked the old knight's pocket in order to deprive him of all manly respect, or castrate him. It is also reminiscent of his conversation with his father after the Battle of Shrewsbury (1 H IV, V.iv.51-57). There he emphasized that he had saved his father's life, and that, had he so desired, he could have let his father die.

The French King, besides being the father-image, is a sibling-rival. He is the King of a rival country. Henry, in his message to France (H V, II.iv.76-95), presents him as one holding the kingship unlawfully. Supposedly, the right to the throne of France descends from another father-figure, the English Edward III.¹⁰⁴ However, it is only after the French

¹⁰⁴ The right to the French throne descends through a woman. See Chapter Four, p. 167, for the significance of this fact.

King has lost the war and is no longer dangerous that Henry calls him "brother" (H V, V.ii.2, 83).¹⁰⁵ Henry then presses relentlessly towards the fulfillment of all his demands. He makes it clear that only "full accord to all our just demands" (l. 71) can restore peace. The French King, sensing Henry's cruel persistence, or wishing to permit Henry an interview with Katharine, or both, suggests that he would rather deal with members of the King's council than with Henry himself (ll. 79-80). At this point Henry virtually ejects Queen Isabella in order to have Katharine to himself. Such a lack of manners, though not a direct insult to the French King, is still degrading to him and his family. When the negotiators return to find Henry kissing France's daughter, Burgundy tries to save the situation with a half-joke, "Teach you our Princess English?" (ll. 306-308). Henry, however, wants to assure the acquisition of the only woman of the royal family that he could possibly wish to have (l. 352). When it turns out that there is still one demand which France has refused, Henry will not relent. The French King must submit even to this item.

This final requirement has, indeed, special significance. After Prince Hal had become King, he adopted the Lord Chief Justice as a father-substitute in order to avoid facing the psychological consequences of completing the Oedipal act.¹⁰⁶ Now, having completed the Oedipal act in France, he takes a similar measure. He insists on a certain terminology in the peace treaty. The French and Latin inscriptions used therein (ll. 367-370) are important: "Notre très-cher fils Henri . . . Héritier de

¹⁰⁵ As noted above, p. 61.

¹⁰⁶ See above, pp. 56-57.

France": "Our very dear son Henry . . . heir to the throne of France." If the father calls Henry his very dear son, and appoints him his heir, surely he has removed Henry's Oedipal guilt-feelings. Also, this item is the only one which Henry agrees to request rather than command (1. 363); evidently, had the French King consented under pressure, the phraseology would lose some of its reassuring effect. Like the Lord Chief Justice, the French King owes Henry his life and authority, for "Héritier de France" is no empty phrase. Henry actually allows the King to continue, in name at least, as monarch. He could have appointed another ruler or could at least have demanded nominal authority for himself--in the form of an inscription such as "Henry, King of England and France." It is interesting to note that while his father still lived, Henry, symbolically, enjoyed at least partial possession of the mother; he associated with the simple people of England as represented by Falstaff, who thereby represented mother England. Now Henry creates a similar situation. He leaves the father; he will wait until France's death, as he has waited for his own father's natural death; and then he will, as the King's heir, take France as his kingdom. Through such means he will appease his guilt feelings.

In this tetralogy, Katharine becomes the first female character to interest Henry. Because of his Oedipus complex, he has apparently been too preoccupied with the mother-image to have any interest in women. Interest in a woman would mean betrayal of the mother. On the other hand, any woman would remind Henry of the mother-image, and relationship with a woman would thus be incestuous. However, Henry has decided to "reform," and his unconscious apparently sees marriage as a test of the success of the "reformation." At first sight, Katharine seems to be a suitable bride:

she does not speak English, she is from a different country, a different milieu; she is "from a different family." Marriage to someone like her, therefore, should pose no threat of incest to Henry's unconscious.

A closer look, however, reveals that in marrying Katharine Henry merely reveals his Oedipal problem in another guise. The very fact that he has to take a foreigner as a wife shows that he is still haunted by his mother-image. In addition, as I have suggested above,¹⁰⁷ the marriage is the culmination of an Oedipal act, and Katharine plays the role of the mother-image. The language-barrier is a literary device that demonstrates some inability in Henry to communicate with his wife; this inability is probably the result of fear of incest.¹⁰⁸

Furthermore, Richard II's wife had been French (see, for example, R II, V.i.22); Richard was, as I have submitted,¹⁰⁹ a father-figure to Hal. Historically, Henry IV's second wife was French.¹¹⁰ By analogy, then, in marrying a French woman, Henry may simply be showing an unconscious desire to marry as exact a copy of his mother as possible.

Henry's courtship of Katharine (H V, V.ii.94-306) is instructive. Henry's very first words to her are a request to teach him how to court

¹⁰⁷ See p. 62.

¹⁰⁸ It is interesting to note that in 1 Henry IV Mortimer and his wife, Glendower's daughter, can communicate only through an interpreter (1 Henry IV, III.i.190-225). Glendower has taken Mortimer prisoner in war (1 Henry IV, I.iii.77-80), and thus possibly acquired a father-figure's significance for his prisoner. When Mortimer married Glendower's daughter (1 Henry IV, I.iii.84-85)--symbolically, took his woman--he may have felt that, to some extent, he was performing an Oedipal act. It is possible that the language barrier between Mortimer and his wife, as the one between Henry V and Katharine, dramatically symbolizes fear of incest.

¹⁰⁹ See above, p. 13.

¹¹⁰ D.N.B., p. 489.

(11. 99-101). His inability to court I interpret to be a result of his Oedipal fixation. Furthermore, I suggest that Henry would see any woman--here, Katharine--as identical with the mother-image, and this is why he naturally turns to her in request of permission to court as well as for guidance in doing so.

Later, Henry is happy that Katharine cannot understand him (1. 126). He may be afraid that if she could, she would realize how unnatural his suit is. She would see what he has been trying to suppress--successfully, he has probably thought--ever since he became King. He would rather not become emotionally involved, but he concludes the courtship as if it were between two friends, or merchants: "And so clap hands and a bargain. How say you, lady?" (11. 134-135).¹¹¹

Then Henry mentions some areas in which he excels--all manly, soldier-like action--and deprecates his lack of rhetorical skill (11. 137-151). And, as if for that reason, he mentions his lack of love for himself; he professes to be "a fellow . . . that never looks in his glass for love of anything he sees there" (11. 152-154). Since the beginning of 1 Henry IV, as the "I know you all" soliloquy (1 H IV, I.ii.187-209) and his sudden suppression of the symptoms of the Oedipus complex show, he has been dissatisfied with himself, but the speech on ceremony (H V, IV.i. 242-301), and the statement here, suggest that the "transformation" has not changed Henry's feelings of dislike for himself.

¹¹¹ Henry concludes the courtship as if between two men. For a discussion of Henry's homosexual tendencies as underlying parts of the courtship scene, see Chapter Three, pp. 112-113.

Significantly, Henry blames his inability to please women on his father's ambition: "Now, beshrew my father's ambition! He was thinking of civil wars when he got me."¹¹² Therefore . . . when I come to woo ladies, I fright them" (ll. 241-246). It is hard to see what Henry IV's ambition could be except Oedipal ambition, with which Henry V identifies. Henry is actually saying that his own Oedipus complex is the cause of his ineptness. Since Katharine is the mother-image, Henry's complaining to her about his father looks like an attempt to deface the father so as to have the mother's affection. Hamlet defaces Claudius in the Closet Scene¹¹³ for a similar reason, and both in Hamlet and in the Courtship Scene in Henry V, as well as in other scenes in the Second Tetralogy,¹¹⁴ the son's advances (symbolic or real) towards the mother-figure stop upon the appearance of the father-image (the Ghost in Hamlet, the French King in Henry V).

Before the French King appears, Henry expresses hope that time will change him for the better (ll. 246-247), or, in other words, that in time he will outgrow his Oedipal fixation. He apparently sees marriage as a step in that direction, but, as I have already explained, the situation is not promising.

Were it not for Henry's complaints to Burgundy (ll. 312-341), it might not be clear what Katharine's attitude towards Henry is at the end

¹¹² Hal was born in 1387. In 1386 "the struggle between Richard II and the baronial opposition began," and a year later, in 1387, Bolingbroke joined a group of noblemen who entertained the idea of deposing the King. They did not do so, but Bolingbroke "was first in the field in the hostilities that ensued" (D.N.B., p. 482).

¹¹³ Hamlet, III.iv.

¹¹⁴ See above, pp. 35-36.

of their private conversation. Henry kisses Katharine, and she protests, but an actress can play Katharine as a frightened innocent girl or as a flirt protesting for show. However, Henry later complains to Burgundy that he "cannot . . . conjure up the spirit of love in her" (ll. 315-316), and he even asks Burgundy for help: "Teach your cousin to consent winking" (ll. 331-332). Evidently, Katharine has been genuinely reluctant. To prove to himself that he has overcome his Oedipal problem, Henry, rather than order Katharine to be his wife, has tried to court her and win her heart, and his partial failure indicates that his problem is far from being solved.

Paul A. Jorgensen, in an article called "The Courtship Scene in Henry V," offers additional insight into this scene.¹¹⁵ In pre-Shakespearean Elizabethan drama, Jorgensen explains, there was the low comedy character of the courting soldier. This soldier was a "clownish ruffian," with an awkward manner of courtship. Generally, the attitude of the playwright and the audience towards this character was not sympathetic. Jorgensen suggests merely that the Courtship Scene in Henry V is in the tradition of the courting soldier.¹¹⁶ However, it is certainly possible to hold that Shakespeare chose to write the scene in this tradition so as to draw attention to the unnatural and awkward in Henry's courtship of Katharine. This awkwardness indicates that in courting, Henry is doing something that is against his nature. Since Henry's unconscious sees any woman as a

¹¹⁵ Paul A. Jorgensen, "The Courtship Scene in Henry V," Modern Language Quarterly, 11 (1950), 180-88.

¹¹⁶ Jorgensen, pp. 181-86.

mother-image, and since it regards Katharine in particular as the mother-image won in the French war, courting Katharine is an incestuous act, and Henry does it unnaturally and awkwardly.¹¹⁷ To the very end of Henry V, then, the King suffers from his Oedipus complex.

¹¹⁷ The fact that for Henry, courting Katharine has an unconscious incestuous significance reinforces his homosexual tendencies. See Chapter Three, pp. 112-113.

III. HOMOSEXUAL TENDENCIES

Because of the Oedipal fixation I have posited for him, Prince Hal sees the mother-image reflected in any woman. Sexual relationship with a woman will thus, to Hal's unconscious, be incestuous. Ernest Jones explains that when the child intensely represses the Oedipal feeling toward the mother, he may never feel affection toward women and thereby may become a homosexual.¹ Through the Henry IV plays Hal attempts to suppress the Oedipal impulse; at his coronation he makes an especially strenuous effort.² It is possible, then, that the process Jones describes, or one similar to it, takes place in Hal.³

Henry IV, father of Prince Hal, is a weak and effeminate character. In Richard II he does not act decisively; he lets events lead him to kingship, but he never once declares an intention of taking the throne. After he becomes king, Henry IV manifests an even weaker personality. It is possible that he entertains guilt-feelings resulting from his Oedipal act

¹ Jones, pp. 88-89.

² See Chapter Two, pp. 53-59.

³ For the theoretical psychoanalytic background to the discussion of the homosexual tendencies in Hal and other characters, see Fenichel, pp. 112, 328-337, 520; Sigmund Freud, Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego (New York: Liveright Publishing Corp., 1957), pp. 66-67; Freud, The Ego and the Id, pp. 27, 33-34; Glover, pp. 105, 236-40, 257-58; Jones, pp. 88-89.

(usurping the throne), and that he therefore unconsciously fears and expects punishment. For example, his refusal to ransom Mortimer, whom Richard II has designated as his heir (1 H IV, I.iii.145-46), shows fear for his throne, and letting other people wear his coat and thus die at the Battle of Shrewsbury (1 H IV, V.iii.25) indicates some lack of self-confidence.

If Hal realizes his father's weakness, and he certainly is able to criticize his father,⁴ it is doubtful that he conceives of his father as an admired image with whom he wishes to identify. Clearly, he does not have a masculine model to imitate. Thus, Hal may identify more strongly with his mother. This identification would, on the one hand, enhance feminine qualities in him; on the other hand, it would encourage the development of a reaction-formation in which apparent masculinity might disguise the feminine qualities. Homosexual tendencies often result from such situations.

Shakespeare does not present Hal, or Henry V, as an overt homosexual. Rather, he shows the homosexual tendencies, existent in some embryonic form in every psyche, as developing to a recognizable degree and then finding expression in symbolic or sublimated ways. At one point, to be discussed later,⁵ these tendencies may have developed into overt homosexuality, but there is not enough evidence to state this positively.

I have suggested that Falstaff represents the mother-image to Hal.⁶

⁴ See Chapter Two, pp. 15-22.

⁵ See below, pp. 101-103.

⁶ See Chapter Two, pp. 37-38.

As such, he stands for the woman Hal unconsciously desires. However, since Falstaff is a man, the relationship between him and Hal has homosexual overtones. At Gadshill, after the robbery, the Prince and Poins attack Falstaff with their swords (1 H IV, II.ii.101). Falstaff's hacked sword later symbolizes impotence--hence, the character of a eunuch or passive (castrated) male. Hal's attacking him with a sword may be a subtle expression of homosexual tendencies.

Hal intends to play Hotspur, wants Falstaff to play Lady Mortimer, and in this connection he calls him "damned brawn" (1 H IV, II.iv.106-107). He wants Falstaff, then, to play Lady Hotspur. Hal envies Hotspur and wants to play the envied figure. He would like to be Hotspur, and the person in his world who is parallel to Hotspur's wife is Falstaff. "Damned brawn" obviously expresses Hal's dissatisfaction with this situation; consequently, among other problems he will try to repress when he becomes king will be the homosexual tendencies.

After Falstaff relates his fantastic tale of the encounter with the men in buckram suits, the amazed Prince calls him a "whoreson, obscene, greasy tallow-catch" (1 H IV, II.iv.224-25). The epithet, denoting a receptacle for fat, may possibly convey the symbolic significance of the passive party in the sexual act.

Later, after Hal saves Falstaff from the Sheriff, he searches the fat man's pockets (1 H IV, III.iii.87-88). I have suggested an Oedipal significance to this scene; but I suggest now that the penetration into the pockets and the very hiding of a beloved person from danger can also have homosexual significance.

Falstaff promises the Hostess that he will cudgel Hal (1 H IV, III.iii.87-88). Cudgeling has a sexual significance. At Shrewsbury Falstaff says, "Hal, if thou see me down in the battle and bestride me, so, 'tis a point of friendship" (1 H IV, I.i.121-22). Without conscious intention, Falstaff gives the reader an insight into the nature of the friendship between himself and Hal. Hal's request for Falstaff's sword or at least his pistol (1 H IV, V.iii.39-52) may, if the weapons are phallic symbols, prove homosexual curiosity.

Falstaff apparently reciprocates some of Hal's feeling. It is he who asks Hal to "bestride" him, and, further, it is he who feels jealous of the Prince. Falstaff feels that Hal's noble birth keeps Hal away from him. In the play impromptu (1 H IV, II.iv.399) Falstaff mentions a "foolish hanging of the nether lip" as characteristic of the King (l. 399). Himself he presents as "of a most noble carriage" (ll. 415-416). He claims that if Hal were but a man and not a prince, he would cudgel him (1 H IV, III.iii.145-46). This claim may have the underlying meaning that Hal's being a prince prevents a homosexual relationship between him and Falstaff. Soon afterwards, however, Falstaff finds out that Hal has searched his pockets. Falstaff seems quite happy about this: "You confess, then, you picked my pockets?" and he is willing to "forgive" the Hostess immediately (1 H IV, III.iii.168-170). Falstaff may see in the pocket-searching a symbolic assurance of the Prince's homosexual love.

The knowledge that it was the Prince who has searched his pockets and not, say, the Hostess, can also be a particular sort of relief for Falstaff. Had it been the Hostess who searched his pockets, Falstaff could have interpreted the act as a threat to his masculinity, an attempted

castration by womankind. To the extent that the Hostess is, in Falstaff's mind, a mother-figure,⁷ her searching his pockets would have been a symbolic incestuous act.

In Part II Falstaff is no longer the constant companion of Hal. Falstaff's indignant reaction to this situation is, "He may keep his own grace, but he is almost out of mine, I can assure him" (2 H IV, I.ii.26-28), and later: "I cannot rid my hands of him" (l. 198). His letter to Hal (2 H IV, II.ii.102-132) shows deeply-hurt feelings. The titles "knight" and "Sir," and Falstaff's "Roman" style ("I will imitate the honorable Romans in brevity," ll. 121-122), seem to say, If you think you are too good for me because of your noble birth, well, I can be as noble as you are. Seeing that his beloved friend is making no attempt to renew their relationship but has replaced him with Poins, Falstaff writes like a rejected lover who thinks to arouse the loved one's interest by pretended indifference. Thus he jealously mentions that Hal is "nearest his father"--and not nearest to Falstaff, the father-substitute. Then he declares, "I leave thee," and asks Hal, "be not too familiar with Poins . . . he swears that thou art to marry his sister Nell" (ll. 125-126). Obviously jealous of Poins, Falstaff fears the possibility of a close sexual relationship between Hal and Poins. So that it will be possible to bring this fear from the unconscious into the open, Falstaff's unconscious disguises Poins as Poins' sister, Nell.

Falstaff's letter is a threat to leave Hal. The maneuver succeeds. Hal inquires whether Falstaff is in town; as if out of fear that Falstaff has betrayed him, he asks, "Sup any women with him?", and when the answer

⁷ See Chapter Two, p. 39.

is in the affirmative, he decides, as if out of jealousy, to go to Falstaff immediately (2 H IV, II.ii.142-57). Evidently, although Hal's treatment of Falstaff has never been overtly affectionate, he is attached to him. Hal's attitude to Falstaff has indeed been ambivalent from the beginning of 1 Henry IV. Unconsciously regarding Falstaff as a parent-figure, Hal has manifested a love-hate attitude, typical of the Oedipal period, towards his friend. He has degraded Falstaff,⁸ but has remained his friend.

In the tavern--again, as if out of jealousy--Hal interferes with Falstaff's love-making at the point where Falstaff prepares to go to bed--apparently, with Doll. Falstaff says, "a' grows late, we'll to bed," and at the first chance the Prince and Poins hurry forward with "Anon, anon, sir" (2 H IV, II.iv.275-81). Hal does not want his friend to consummate a love-relationship with a woman.⁹

Thus there are symbolic homosexual overtones to the relationship between Hal and Falstaff. The rejection of Falstaff, apart from being an attempt to repress the Oedipal problem, as explained above, is also an attempt to defend against homosexual tendencies.

In developing a defense-mechanism to protect his ego from the latent homosexual tendencies, Hal projects them onto persons toward whom he feels or might feel homosexual affection. By then rejecting, punishing, and

⁸ See Chapter Two, pp. 26-37.

⁹ The splitting of the female image into the Hostess and Doll Tear-sheet is an interesting feature of 2 Henry IV. In 1 Henry IV the Hostess was a mother-image (see Chapter Two, pp. 34-35). Now there is another woman, playing the role of the sexual woman with whom Falstaff (the father-figure) associates: Doll. Thus, while the Hostess remains a feeding and house-keeping mother-image, Doll takes the role of the sexual mother.

degrading these people, he creates for his super-ego the appearance of fighting the forbidden tendencies. Thus the defense-mechanism involves the exploitation of certain sadistic tendencies. All the degradations and symbolic castrations of Falstaff discussed in Chapter Two derive not only from the cause mentioned in that chapter, but also from this sadism.¹⁰ For example, Hal's request for Falstaff's sword at Shrewsbury (1 H IV, V. iii.39-52) may be a means of symbolically depriving Falstaff of his sexual potential to prevent any future possibility of sexual relationship with him.¹¹

Especially interesting in this connection is Hal's rejection of what his suspicious and sensitive super-ego could interpret as symbolic homosexual approaches by Falstaff. Thus, Hal reacts angrily to Falstaff's intention to cudgel the Prince (1 H IV, III.iii.87-88), and he refuses to "bestride" Falstaff at Shrewsbury (1 H IV, V.i.123-24). The fact that Hal never tries to realize his plan of having Falstaff play his wife (Dame Mortimer in the play impromptu, 1 H IV, II.iv.106-107) has a similar significance. He toys with the homosexual idea but puts it aside.

Hal, in fact, never agrees to anything Falstaff suggests. Thus, he says that when he is king he will not help Falstaff escape punishment (1 H IV, I.ii.16-46). Hal also refuses Falstaff's invitation to take part in the Gadshill robbery. Only when Poins supports the idea does Hal agree (1 H IV, I.ii.153-185)--and then only on the condition that the robbery

¹⁰ See Chapter Two, pp. 25-40.

¹¹ Hal's proneness to prankishness, here and elsewhere, also expresses a recognizable sadistic trend. See Chapter Four, pp. 130-135, 148-154.

will be a prank to make a joke of Falstaff. Hal's sadistic defense-mechanism also explains the cruelty in his rejection speech to Falstaff at the end of 2 Henry IV (V.v.48-71). Here, too, it is Falstaff who approaches Hal, and it is Hal who refuses to acknowledge him.

A similar defense-mechanism is operating in Hal's prank on Francis. This prank, like ones played on Falstaff, follows a sign of affection shown by the object of the prank. Hal has made friends with the drawers, and Francis has given him a pennyworth of sugar as a sign of friendship (1 H IV, II.iv.4-23). Hal is familiar enough with the drawers to use the figure of speech "dyeing scarlet" (ll. 14-15), which means using urine for dyeing (see note to ll. 14-15). This familiarity apparently suggests disguised homosexuality to Hal, and Francis' present of a "pennyworth of sugar" (1 H IV, II.iv.21-23) may suggest oral homosexuality to Hal. His own defense-mechanism reacts. Rather than accept and appreciate the drawers' friendship and Francis' gesture, Hal mocks the drawers and plays a somewhat cruel prank on Francis (ll. 33-77).¹²

Hal's sadistic strain shows hatred of the suppressed projected quality in himself. Rather than punish himself, however, he behaves sadistically towards others. This self-hatred also results from the Oedipus complex and the super-ego's wish to punish the ego because of it.

William Empson refers to the fact that in 1 Henry IV Shakespeare uses love images in connection with war.¹³ Since war recalls love, and since in it encounters followed by penetration take place entirely between

¹² What Hal projects on Francis is more than the homosexual tendency; I shall explain the scene further in Chapter Four, p. 131-132.

¹³ Empson, p. 34.

males, it may well be a disguised expression of homosexuality. For example, in Richard II Hal threatens to joust with knights with a glove out of a brothel (R II, V.iii.16-19); also, after the Battle of Shrewsbury, he tells Prince John,

Full bravely has thou fleshed
Thy maiden sword.

(1 H IV, V.iv.138-139)

I have already mentioned that this accolade, though addressed to John, is applicable to Hal himself. In both cases, there are phallic symbols, a glove and a sword, and the context is the same--one in which men fight.¹⁴ Thus homosexual overtones are present. The remark to Prince John is a projection onto another person of a homosexual perspective on war. It is as if Hal were saying, You, and not I, have committed this act. The interest that Hal manifests in John's "maiden sword" (symbolically, his sexual organ) may also indicate an incestuous homosexual feeling in Hal towards his brother.

There may be homosexual overtones in Hal's attitude to Hotspur, too. Although pretending to be facetious, Hal, in the Tavern Scene (1 H IV, II. iv.96-107), does express admiration of Hotspur's manliness. I have

¹⁴ Since Ovid's Amores through the tradition of courtly love, and in Petrarch as well as in Shakespeare, combat had been an accepted metaphor for love. Jousting, for example, often stood for the love encounter, and thus weapons often symbolized those parts of the human anatomy that take part in the love encounter. In modern times the sexual significance of weapons and war has received substantiation from psychological authorities. Freud, for example, in The Interpretation of Dreams (New York: Basic Books, Inc., n.d.), presents the interpretation of weapons in a dream as phallic symbols (pp. 350-404). Since in battle men use weapons against other men, it is very probable that military encounters carry a symbolic homosexual meaning.

suggested that Hal's bravery in war may be a result of identification with Hotspur;¹⁵ it is then possible that this identification is partly an identification with a love object. Indeed, Vernon says that Hal has challenged Hotspur modestly, as one would challenge a brother. Hal has also praised Hotspur warmly (1 H IV, V.ii.53-67). Hal's very challenge may express a desire to meet Hotspur in a symbolically homosexual context (war).

When Hal meets Hotspur on the battlefield, he praises him as "valiant" (1 H IV, V.iv.62). After he kills him, he calls him "great heart" and does what he himself calls "fair rites of tenderness": he covers Hotspur's eyes with his favors (ll. 87-101). This affection that Hal expresses to Hotspur may be a sublimation of homosexual affection.

Like Hal, Hotspur, Hal's parallel in the Oedipal complex, shows evidence of latent homosexual tendencies. As mentioned above,¹⁶ Hotspur's father is not an impressive character. Hotspur, then, has very possibly identified with his mother. Also, since he has not had a strong father-image that would help him to suppress the Oedipus complex, or because he has regressed to a pre-Oedipal stage as a result of the Oedipally-motivated plot to overthrow Henry IV (the father-image), Hotspur, like Hal, sees any woman as a mother-image. Such factors encourage homosexual tendencies. Hotspur's enthusiasm about war apparently indicates as much. Hotspur finds in war an outlet for his repressed homosexual tendencies. War is also an outlet for aggressiveness, and it eases Hotspur's Oedipal hostility

¹⁵ See Chapter Two, p. 50.

¹⁶ See Chapter Two, p. 42.

towards his father. It may have been the existence of such an outlet that has enabled Hotspur to marry, but, as I have observed,¹⁷ the marriage is not successful. Hotspur evidently feels, as Hal will on succeeding to the throne,¹⁸ that he is living in sin with the mother-image. Consequently, his need for the outlet, war, grows, and he joins a rebellion against the father-image, the King.

Another reason for Hotspur's enthusiasm about war is a reaction-formation in him against femininity. By identifying with his father, the weakling, or his mother, the presumably dominant figure, Hotspur has probably developed feminine character traits. Ashamed of them, he tries to hide them behind a show of manliness. Hotspur's disgust at the "certain lord, neat and trimly dressed" who demanded the prisoners "with many holiday and lady terms" (1 H IV, I.iii.29-64) thus expresses unconscious fear of these very qualities in himself. Hotspur's description of his conversation with this lord has strong homosexual overtones. The description of wounded, bleeding soldiers, the sword on which Hotspur was leaning (a phallic symbol--the same tool that was used to wound the bleeding soldiers), and the dead bodies carried by, reinforce the homosexual suggestion implicit in Hotspur's indignation at the aide's femininity. Had not Hotspur's reaction-formation caused him to become a soldier, he might have been like the effeminate lord. When this lord appears on the battlefield, he symbolizes Hotspur's repressed femininity, and the latter reacts aggressively.¹⁹

¹⁷ See Chapter Two, p. 44.

¹⁸ See Chapter Two, pp. 60-61; Chapter Three, p. 101.

¹⁹ The lord, of course, also represents the King, and Hotspur's answer to him expresses his Oedipal rebelliousness, too.

In Hotspur's attitude to Hal, too, there are homosexual elements. In his first remark about the Prince, Hotspur describes Hal as "that same sword-and-buckler Prince of Wales" (1 H IV, I.iii.230), and he expresses a wish to poison him with ale (l. 233). Hotspur associates Hal with swords, or phallic symbols. Also, his threat of poisoning would involve the introduction of poison (symbolically, semen) into a body, and may thus symbolize the sexual act.

Before Shrewsbury, Hotspur worries about Hal's attitude towards him: "How showed his tasking? Seemed it in contempt?" (1 H IV, V.ii.52). Later he promises:

I will embrace him [Hal] with a soldier's arm
That he shall shrink under my courtesy.
(ll. 75-76)

Hotspur promises to have some physical contact with Hal on the battlefield. The duel, and the death at its end, may unconsciously symbolize a sexual act to Hotspur. When Hotspur is about to die after the duel, he addresses Hal quite affectionately and poetically: "O, Harry, thou hast robbed me of my youth!" (1 H IV, V.iv.77).

There is no indication whatsoever, of course, that Hotspur is an overt homosexual. Rather, as is the case with Hal in 1 Henry IV, Hotspur has latent homosexual tendencies, which he represses.

It is interesting to see that the figure of Aumerle is parallel in the aspect of homosexuality, too.²⁰ Like Hotspur, Aumerle has a weak father. Aumerle's mother, who also appears on the stage, is a woman of

²⁰ See the discussion of the Oedipus complex in Aumerle as compared to that in Hal and Hotspur, Chapter Two, pp. 47-48.

strong will, and it is obvious that Aumerle is under her countrol. At her insistence, he rushes to Bolingbroke to beg for pardon (R II, V.ii. 111-17). Then she, too, appears before Bolingbroke to ask him to pardon her son. Aumerle remains quiet (R II, V.iii). Aumerle, then, identifies with a female, his mother, and by refraining from action demonstrates passive feminine character traits.

Aumerle has been a close advisor to Richard. In this closeness, he has been like Bushy, Bagot, and Green, whom Bolingbroke accuses of sinfully causing a divorce between Richard and his queen and breaking the possession of the royal bed (R II, III.i.11-13). As Richard's first cousin, Aumerle was even closer to Richard than the three favorites. It is not impossible that his relationship with the King has been overtly homosexual.²¹

When Bolingbroke deposes Richard, Aumerle may unconsciously interpret the deposition as punishment of the King--possibly, for homosexuality. He undergoes a period in which he tries to repress his passive feminine traits. He bravely challenges any person who accuses him of being an accomplice in the murder of Gloucester (R II, IV.i.19-85), and he joins a conspiracy against Bolingbroke. However, his femininity and passivity get the upper hand. He lets his father discover the seal on the list of conspirators. The seal, hanging out of Aumerle's clothes, is a phallic symbol, but, because of its drooping form, a very unimpressive one. Aumerle, in declaring his manly weakness, almost invites castration. His failure to react before Bolingbroke when his head is at stake also indicates the same

²¹ The description of Aumerle's death at Agincourt (H V, IV.vi.6-32) is further evidence of homosexual tendencies in him. See below, pp. 105-106.

passivity and unconscious wish to be castrated.

Aumerle and Hotspur, then, in addition to echoing Hal's Oedipal problem, echo his latent homosexuality as well.

When Hal becomes King, he confronts the very same problem. Exeter mentions that Scroop has been Henry's

. . . bedfellow,
Whom he hath dulled and cloyed with gracious favors.
(H V, II.ii.8-9)

This remark presents an interesting problem. It is not impossible that upon ascending the throne and feeling that he is living in sin with the mother (England), Henry's inability to become emotionally and sexually involved with women increases, and that consequently his homosexual tendencies become overt. His close association with Scroop serves as a defense against women.²² On the other hand, Henry's general tendency at this stage of his life is to deny in his ego all the unhealthy symptoms of his behavior.

Robert L. Kelly, who discusses the bedfellow theme, says that in Holinshed's Chronicles the same motif appears: "The said Lord Scrope [sic] was in such favor with the King that he admitted him sometimes to be his bedfellow."²³ The wording here seems to indicate more clearly an actual sexual relationship. Kelly goes on to say that in the play Sir John

²² Cf. Richard II's association with Bushy, Bagot and Green as a defense against a relationship with his wife. Bolingbroke accuses Bushy and Green of sinfully causing a divorce between Richard and his wife and breaking the possession of the royal bed (R II, III.i.11-13):

²³ See Shakespeare's Holinshed, ed. Richard Hosley (New York: Capricorn Books, 1968), p. 124.

Oldcastle, possibly Shakespeare's work, Scroop says,

I am his bedfellow,
And unsuspected nightly sleep with him.
What if I ventured in those silent hours,
.
To murder him in bed?²⁴

Beside the obvious homosexual significance of the lines, murder--or the causing of a dagger, poison, or any other instrument of death, to enter a body--has a symbolic sexual significance. Since here one man plans to murder another man, the significance of the lines may be homosexual.

It seems that the picture that Shakespeare must have gathered from his sources was that there was a homosexual relationship between Henry and Scroop. The word "bedfellow" occurs in the Crown Scene in 2 Henry IV, where it is the attribute that Hal gives the crown; there the crown symbolizes England the mother-image, and as such it is certainly a sexual bedfellow (2 H IV, IV.v.22). It is true that the word "bedfellow" can simply denote "friend," but why should Shakespeare choose this word, with its obvious connotation, rather than "friend," "companion," or some other synonym? Finally, Henry expresses shocked disbelief that the enemy could bribe Scroop to "annoy my [Henry's] finger" (H V, II.ii.100-102). There may be phallic symbolism in the line and further evidence as to the existence of a homosexual relationship between Henry and Scroop.²⁵

²⁴ Robert L. Kelly, "Shakespeare's Scroop and the Spirit of Cain," Shakespeare Quarterly, 20 (1969), 71.

²⁵ The Elizabethan audience would accept the existence of such a relationship. Characters with homosexual tendencies, overt and latent, appeared on the Elizabethan stage. Edward II and Gaveston in Christopher Marlowe's King Edward II, Achilles and Patroclus in Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida, as well as Bertram and Parolles in Shakespeare's All's Well that Ends Well, are examples of characters who have rather manifest

Conversely, it is obvious that there is less emphasis on the bedfellow theme in Henry V than in Oldcastle or even Holinshed. Shakespeare, in accordance with his apparent intention of showing Henry as repressing unhealthy modes of behavior, has purposely muted this theme. Rather than overt homosexuality, all the above evidence may indicate strong homosexual drives that the ego still keeps under control.

Overt or latent, the homosexual drives are a threat to Henry's peace of mind, and the defense-mechanism mentioned above helps explain the severity and excitement in Henry's speech to Scroop. The announcement of the conspirators' sentence involves a cruel prank. Henry makes the conspirators decide a question which, unbeknownst to them, involves their own fate, and then hands them, instead of their commissions to rule England in his absence, charges of conspiracy. He tortures them by his pretended ignorance of the contents of the documents he has just handed them, and apparently enjoys their sudden frightened realization of the fact that the conspiracy has been discovered:

. . . Why, how now, gentlemen!
 What see you in those papers that you lose
 So much complexion? Look ye how they change!
 Their cheeks are paper. Why, what read you there
 That hath so cowarded and chased your blood
 Out of appearance?

(H V, II.ii.71-76)

Here, as before, there is sadism towards the possible object of the homosexual drives.

homosexual tendencies; Antonio and Bassanio in Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice, as well as Don Pedro and Claudio in Shakespeare's Much Ado about Nothing, are examples of characters in whose friendship there is the possibility of latent homosexual overtones.

The defense-mechanism and the repression apparently succeed. If "bedfellow" indicates overt homosexuality, Scroop's execution is a symbolic repression of it; if it represents latent homosexuality, the execution at least partially represses it. In addition, Scroop is part of the court, and the court, once ruled by Henry's father and now by Henry himself, is a mother-image. A sexual relationship with Scroop, whether actual or unconsciously desired, is a sexual relationship within the court, and therefore possibly an inverted expression of the Oedipal desire towards the mother. Thus the war in France is, and from this point of view, too, a flight from (symbolic) incest. And since this flight is to war, it is a flight to sublimated homosexuality.

When the Dauphin sends Henry tennis balls, he lends the war a definite homosexual meaning.²⁶ Henry will try to prove to the Dauphin that his cannon balls are more terrible than the Dauphin's tennis balls. It is not surprising to find the Dauphin in this homosexual contest. His admiration of his horse, for example, clearly exceeds his admiration of women. The Dauphin himself explains very plainly: " . . . my horse is my mistress" (H V, III.vii.47). The horse, which stands in clear contrast to the mistress, is in this context a male figure.

Expectedly, there is a sadistic reaction to the homosexual threat. The war itself is such a reaction, and it follows the tennis balls gesture. In the Battle of Harfleur, for example, the city, in addition to

²⁶ The tennis balls, of course, represent part of the human anatomy. The gift indicates that Henry lacks this part (and is therefore feminine). The Dauphin's gift of the (tennis) balls to Henry is thus parallel to the act of the male in sexual intercourse.

symbolizing a mother-figure,²⁷ can symbolize a passive or castrated male (the male infant, upon discovering the difference between his sexual organs and those of a female, sometimes interprets the difference as evidence that the female is a castrated male). Henry's battle cry, "Once more unto the breach, dear friends" (H V, III.i.1), carries, then, a homosexual significance. It is interesting to note that Henry conceives of the Battle of Agincourt as a clipping of French coins: "It is no English treason to cut French crowns, and tomorrow the King himself will be a clipper" (H V, IV.i.244-46). Coins, or money, are symbolic of feces, and to the extent that the original coins were gold, they are also reminiscent, in color, of urine. Thus, the fact that Henry chooses to refer to war--which is for him symbolic of homosexuality--by money imagery, indicates that anal traits tint his homosexuality.²⁸ He conceives of the homosexual contact as playing with the other party's feces. In any event, the attack on Harfleur is an expression of sadism resulting from homosexual provocation (the tennis-balls present).

Another such sadistic reaction occurs in the Battle of Agincourt. Henry hears a description of the death of York and Suffolk (H V, IV.vi. 6-32); the description is very sensual, and the scene resembles a farewell of lovers:

So did he [York] turn, and over Suffolk's neck
 He threw his wounded arm and kissed his lips,
 And so espoused to death, with blood he sealed
 A testament of noble-ending love.

 But I had not so much of man in me,

²⁷ See Chapter Two, p. 64.

²⁸ For a discussion of Henry's anal traits, see Chapter Four.

And all my mother came into mine eyes
 And gave me up to tears.
 (11. 24-32)²⁹

Immediately after, Henry orders the execution of the French prisoners (1. 37). The scene between Suffolk and York (Aumerle) is suggestive of homosexual love. The actions of York are, of course, part of the reason for this suggestiveness, but another reason is the fact that the participants in the scene are soldiers. Regarded symbolically, the men's wounds prove that a penetration (of a sword, which, of course, can carry a phallic significance) has occurred, and the death that follows this penetration--a penetration inflicted by men upon men--can appear to be a punishment for a homosexual act. Also, "death" in Elizabethan literature can mean a sexual climax.

The effect of the scene upon the onlooker, Exeter, is significant, too. The scene excites him, makes the man in him give way to the mother (the identification with whom causes feminine character-traits), and finally causes the shedding of tears--with its obvious sexual symbolism. All of this apparently threatens Henry's thin defense against his homosexual drives, and he reacts, as before, with sadism. The French prisoners represent the enemy who have caused the death scene to take place, and Henry therefore orders the prisoners killed.

After Henry had given strict orders against pillaging, he agreed

²⁹ Aumerle of Richard II is, historically, York of Henry V (see the "Genealogical Tables" in Shakespeare, the Complete Works, ed. G. B. Harrison, p. 1652, and also D.N.B., 15, pp. 1287-89). The scene discussed here is further evidence of the existence of homosexual tendencies in the character. For a discussion of Aumerle's relationships with Richard II, see p. 100 above.

wholeheartedly to the hanging of Bardolph for disobeying these orders (H V, III.vi.113-14). This agreement has the sadistic characteristics of Henry's previous sadistic acts. It is another act of symbolic repression of Henry's previous dissolute life with Falstaff and his gang. It follows a sexual innuendo: Bardolph has stolen from mother-church, or the mother-image. The object he has stolen Holinshed calls a pyx, which is "a vessel in which the consecrated wafer is kept."³⁰ As the wafer is a representation of the body of Christ, the theft of the pyx is, symbolically, an atrocity: tearing a child in the womb (the pyx) out of the mother's body. In war-time, such an atrocity is not unheard of.

Shakespeare has made the theft less atrocious. Bardolph steals a pax, or "a plate stamped by the figure of the crucifix, kissed first by the priest and then by the laity."³¹ The stealing of the child from the mother still appears, symbolically, but the child is not in the womb. However, since the priest, who belongs to the church, kisses the child, there may be a suggestion of incestuous homosexual relationship between two sons of one mother. Certainly, the theft expresses insolence towards the mother-image.

Although Henry has not yet achieved the mother, he adopts the role of the father. During the Oedipal stage the child develops a fear that the jealous father will castrate him. By hanging Bardolph, Henry, to protect the mother-image, symbolically castrates the thief.

While the hanging noose is a feminine sexual symbol, Bardolph's

³⁰ Harrison, Shakespeare, the Complete Works, fn. to H V, III.vi.42.

³¹ Ibid.

head is a phallic symbol. To the extent that the noose represents the King in the hanging, the hanging is a symbolic representation of a homosexual scene, with Henry playing the feminine role and Bardolph playing the male role. Henry, however, is not at all passive in this scene; indeed, he cruelly causes Bardolph's death. Hence, the hanging of Bardolph again expresses Henry's homosexual and sadistic tendencies.³²

The story of Henry and Williams also has an underlying homosexual theme. Henry visits his troops in disguise, and he may be giving vent to impulses that he would otherwise repress. He goes incognito to find the company of men. I have suggested that the soldiers represent Henry's super-ego; they may more specifically represent the father-image. If Henry felt that his father was a weakling, it is possible that he has partly identified with the mother-image. This, as mentioned above,³³ would further explain his unconscious homosexuality as an expression of the feminine qualities acquired through an identification with the mother. Henry, identifying with a woman whose husband's manliness was not satisfactory, may be trying to look for a strong male figure. If so, when Henry searches by night for an endorsement of his war, he seeks its endorsement by a strong male figure (the father-figure, or even, to a certain extent, a husband-figure) that he is looking for.

Williams, with his fearless criticism of the King (H V, IV.i.135, 140-53, 204-206, 209-15), appears to be such a figure. Williams' opinion of the war is therefore especially valuable, and understandably, his

³² For a discussion of the noose as symbolizing the mother-image, see Chapter Four, p. 171.

³³ See p. 1, this chapter.

refusal to approve of it irritates Henry. However, Henry is impressed with Williams. He willingly agrees to the idea of the quarrel, and he says that he will wear the gage in his bonnet (H V, IV.i.223-24). The head with the gage on it, regarded as a phallic symbol, can add a homosexual significance to the planned meeting between the two. A king would probably think twice before accepting the gage of a simple soldier. Likewise, Henry V, who has "reformed," would probably hesitate to accept a rendezvous that has a suggestion of homosexuality about it. "Harry le Roy" (H V, IV.i.49), the anonymous soldier, however, can do both without hesitation. Williams, in this context, is the temptation: he suggests the future encounter. He also promises to give Henry "a box on the ear" (H V, IV.ii.220-32). Through the process of displacement upward, the ear may have a sexual significance, the box may be a symbol of the sexual act, and Henry is to play the feminine role in that act. The encounter with Williams, which arouses the partly-repressed homosexual tendencies, increases Henry's guilt feelings and restlessness.

After the battle, Henry, now reformed King and no longer anonymous soldier, tries to avoid the encounter with Williams. First he tries to find reasons why the encounter should not take place (H V, IV.vii.137-142). Then he does what he has done in the past: he projects the problem onto another, in this case, Fluellen. A sadism similar to that which appeared in connection with the conspirators appears again: Fluellen has judged that the encounter must take place, so Henry sends Fluellen to suffer the box on the ear (ll. 160-66).

Since a prank involves enjoyment of another person's distress, there is sadism in Henry's prank on Williams, too. Henry plans to enjoy

Williams' distress when he finds out that his adversary was the King himself. Events, however, develop differently. Upon the reappearance of Williams, a dialogue develops which is very much like the dialogue with the Lord Chief Justice (2 H IV, V.ii.67-72). Henry blames the other for what appears to be an insult to his person, and like the Justice (2 H IV, V.ii.73-101), Williams, answering bravely, blames the King himself (H V, IV.vii.52-60). Just as Henry rewarded the Justice with a sword (2 H IV, V.ii.103), so he gives Williams a glove full of money. Both rewards are, at one level, phallic symbols. In both cases Henry is probably impressed with the male as a strong father-husband image. In the case of Williams, however, there is reference to a continuation of the story: Henry tells Williams to wear the glove in his cap until he, Henry, challenges it (H V, IV.vii.63-64). Henry, apparently, has failed to repress the homosexual drive completely.

The failure of Henry finds an interesting parallel in the failure of another character, Fluellen, to repress his own homosexual drive. Fluellen's constant reference to the discipline of war indicates a severe super-ego. Fluellen's ego must find authorization in the law for every action.³⁴ Henry, however, with his Oedipally-oriented war in France, apparently causes a weakening of Fluellen's defense against id impulses. Fluellen experiences an awakening of latent homosexuality. A direct result of this awakening is the sadistic defense-mechanism. Like Henry, Fluellen, in an attempt to repress his homosexual tendencies, projects

³⁴ In H V, III.ii.61-63, Fluellen refuses to go to the mines: "the mines is not according to the disciplines of the wars."

them on possible objects of these tendencies and treats these objects sadistically.

In Act IV, Scene vii, Fluellen establishes a familiar relationship with the King. He reminds Henry of a service that the Welshmen, wearing leeks in their caps, performed for Edward, the Black Prince (H V, IV.vii.101-108). The leeks in the caps are phallic symbols. The story causes Henry to call Fluellen "good countryman" (l. 110). Later, Henry asks for Fluellen's opinion about the encounter with Williams (ll. 137-38). The mention of the leeks in the caps, which was the remark that initiated the familiarity between Henry and Fluellen, may have homosexual overtones. Later, however, Fluellen hears about Henry's quarrel with Williams. It is possible that this quarrel, with its homosexual overtones, arouses the Welshman's jealousy. Also, Henry has Fluellen take the passive role in the box-on-the-ear encounter, or, symbolically, in the sexual act. Fluellen's defense-mechanism, very much like Henry's, leads him to react with sadism. Fluellen's suggestion, "let his neck answer for it" (H V, IV.viii.45-46), may be an expression of a disguised wish to castrate his rival in the King's friendship, and also to end the threat to his defense against the homosexual tendencies represented by Williams.

A further example of Fluellen's awakening homosexual and sadistic tendencies is his quarrel with Pistol. This quarrel is amazingly reminiscent of Henry's quarrel with Williams. Like Henry, Fluellen must, because of circumstances, discontinue a quarrel with one who has insulted him, and like Henry he later meets his adversary again. Henry has given Williams a glove, and Fluellen gives Pistol a leek. Both glove and leek

are phallic symbols. Fluellen's gift, however, is much more expressive of homosexuality and sadism than Henry's. Pistol hates leek, but Fluellen forces him to eat it (H V, V.i.25-28); and the action is a symbolic representation of oral sex. In its homosexual and sadistic themes the act resembles Hal's pricking Falstaff with his sword at Gadshill (1 H IV, II. ii.101). In this scene, Fluellen, never once mentions the laws of war. Apparently, although his sadism proves that the defense-mechanism is still active; his super-ego, because of Henry's example, has lost or relaxed its strict command over the ego.

After the eating of the leek, Fluellen tells Pistol never to mock leeks that he may see afterwards (H V, V.i.58-59), and Pistol takes Fluellen's present of a coin "in earnest of revenge" (H V, V.i.67). Similarly, Henry tells Williams to wear the glove in his cap until the King challenges it (H V, IV.viii.64-65). At the end of the play, then, both Henry and Fluellen plan to continue their symbolic homosexual encounters.

Finally, when Henry courts Katharine, he stresses that as a good soldier he can jump into a saddle skillfully, but he finds it difficult to court a lady (H V, V.ii.137-147). War and riding being symbols of sexual acts, Henry's apology can mean that it is his homosexual drives which prevent him from having normal relationships with women. Immediately afterwards Henry mentions that he "never looks in his glass for love of anything he sees there" (ll. 152-154). Homosexuality, a severe super-ego, and resulting guilt-feelings, may cause self-hatred, or inadequacy feelings, and this is possibly what Henry's words indicate. Even by the last scene

of Henry V, then, King Henry has not succeeded in overcoming his difficulties with homosexual trends.

IV. ANAL AND ORAL TRAITS AND THE DOMINEERING MOTHER-FIGURE

A. Anal and Oral Traits in Prince Hal

There are in Prince Hal, and later in Henry V, indications of anal and oral fixations.¹ An investigation of possible reasons for these fixations leads to the hypothesis that the mother-figure may have been responsible. One cause of an anal fixation is that in childhood a parental authority demands some mode of performance in connection with the actions of discharging or withholding bodily products. If this parental authority is severe, the anxiety which develops in the infant in connection with these actions can cause a fixation. Prince Hal developed such a fixation. Since the mother and not the father probably took care of Hal's education during the anal period, the anal fixation leads back to the mother-image.²

During the anal period the child learns that he may not relieve himself whenever he pleases. If he is anally fixated, the child may transfer the ban on anal pleasure to any sort of pleasure. Thus, the anally-fixated

¹ For the theoretical psychoanalytical background to the discussion in this chapter see the works mentioned in Chapter Two, p. 12, fn. 5. Some specific references to the oral and anal stages are: Fenichel, pp. 62-68; Freud, A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis, pp. 287-89; Freud, An Outline of Psycho-Analysis, pp. 9-13; Glover, pp. 60, 101-106, 270-72; Hall, pp. 103-109.

² It is irrelevant at this point whether Hal's real mother or a nurse took care of his education in the anal period; a nurse would still be a mother-image.

person may pursue a goal, but when he is about to achieve it and enjoy the satisfaction involved in the achievement, the super-ego--the internalization of the parental figure that has forbidden uncontrolled anal pleasure--intervenes. It interprets the pleasure about to be gained as a sublimation of anal pleasure and, as a result, forbids it. Sexual pleasure, which is anatomically experienced in a location very close to where anal pleasure occurs, falls easy prey to such interventions of the super-ego. Furthermore, any achievement, with the pleasure it involves, may appear to the super-ego as a sublimation of anal pleasure.

The person deprived of one form of satisfaction will unconsciously shift the frustrated psychic energy towards a different goal, and then, when the super-ego intervenes again, towards still another goal. Since his attempts to achieve satisfaction seem to have failed, he may become obsessed with the need to achieve satisfaction at any cost. Thus, the anal fixation may result in a repetition-compulsion (the person will repeat his futile attempts to achieve satisfaction) and in an obsessive hesitation: When the person is about to achieve a goal, he will begin to doubt whether he may enjoy his achievement or not. The anal fixation will also result in an obsessive need to achieve a goal that will satisfy the frustrated energy. In Prince Hal, as I will soon demonstrate,³ there are indications of such a repetition-compulsion.

At the oral level a similar set of frustrations occur. If the infant is irregularly fed, he may develop an oral fixation. He is

³ And in other characters as well--see pp. 135-144.

uncertain as to whether food will be available in the future. Later, as an adult, he will show a desire to incorporate food or objects symbolizing food; he will also maintain retentive characteristics, originally caused by the infantile fear that he will not have sufficient food.⁴ Since the source of food is the mother, it is again the mother-figure who is at the basis of an oral fixation.

Historically, Hal was born in 1387.⁵ Thomas, John, and Humphrey, Hal's brothers, were born in 1388, 1389, and 1391, respectively.⁶ In other words, during the first two years of Hal's life two younger brothers were born in his family, and when Hal was four another son was born. All were born of the same mother, Mary Bohun, who died only in 1394.⁷ The birth of these brothers probably added to the oral frustration that caused Hal's fixation: he had to share with his sibling rivals his mother's love and attention. The fact that Thomas of Clarence, Hal's brother, took Hal's place in the council (both historically and in the play)⁸ probably echoes this childhood experience, in which the sibling displaced Hal in the mother's love.

It seems possible that the mother-figure who has caused Hal his fixations was a domineering one. Since Henry IV is not a strong figure,

⁴ This retentiveness is, of course, an anal trait, too: the infant exercises his will by the action of withholding.

⁵ D.N.B., p. 494.

⁶ D.N.B., Vol. XIX, p. 638; Vol. X, pp. 864, 238, respectively.

⁷ D.N.B., Vol. IX, p. 484.

⁸ D.N.B., Vol. XIX, p. 638; 1 H IV, III.ii.32-33.

and since Hal shows the homosexual characteristics discussed in the previous chapter,⁹ the mother-figure may have dominated the family. An irregularly-fed child becomes dependent on the mother, the source of food; and a child who must control his bowel movements according to the demands of a severe mother identifies with the parent and develops anal traits. Thus the mother becomes a powerful factor in the world of the infant and in the super-ego he develops.

The historical Hal's mother, Mary Bohun, died in 1394. At the time, Hal was seven.¹⁰ The sudden disappearance of the mother may arouse in the child a fear that the source of food will disappear; her permanent disappearance would be likely to have an even more impressive effect. Once aroused, the fear may recur at any time. Thus the mother's disappearance may strengthen the dependence upon any later substitute mother-figures. It may also strengthen the oral and anal (retentive) fixations.

Age seven is close to the classic age five, the archetypal age for passage through the Oedipus complex. Prince Hal, as I have demonstrated, has an Oedipus complex. He therefore remains dependent on the mother-image. He probably feels that his mother's death was punishment of both of them for his incestuous Oedipal wish. A sense of guilt towards the mother-figure would certainly strengthen the dependence upon her. It would consequently intensify the anal identification with her

⁹ See Chapter Three.

¹⁰ D.N.B., Vol. IX, p. 494.

demands and the anal and oral retentiveness.

Finally, the parallelism between Hal, Aumerle, and Hotspur points to the existence of a domineering mother in Hal's childhood. Aumerle has a domineering mother. Since Aumerle parallels Hal in other respects,¹¹ it is likely that he parallels the Prince in the possession of a domineering mother, too. Hotspur, another parallel,¹² has a domineering wife. For the regressed Hotspur, the wife-figure may very well symbolize the mother-image.¹³ Indeed, the reason that Hotspur has chosen this particular type of woman as his wife is, no doubt, her resemblance to his mother. To sum up, if Shakespeare conceived of Hal, Hotspur, and Aumerle as parallel, he probably envisioned Hal as a person with a domineering mother.¹⁴

One reinforcement of anal and oral traits in Hal is his identification with King Richard II.¹⁵ Richard's splurging, his farming-out of the lands of England (R II, I.iv.45), and his extravagant living, show anal wastefulness; his confiscation of Gaunt's property (R II, II.i.160-62) and his poetic speeches¹⁶ show oral traits. The confiscation

¹¹ As pointed out in Chapter Two, pp. 47-48, and in Chapter Three, pp. 99-101.

¹² See Chapter Two, pp. 40-51, and Chapter Three, pp. 97-99.

¹³ This is part of the reason for his escape from domestic life to war; see Chapter Three, p. 98.

¹⁴ For further discussion of the domineering mother see below, pp. 166-178.

¹⁵ See Chapter Two, pp. 11, 13-14.

¹⁶ As one of the numerous examples, see
 Down, down I come, like glist'ring Phaethon,

 In the base court? Come down? Down court! Down king!

shows the oral need to incorporate food (symbolized here by the property). The speeches, which obviously give Richard great satisfaction, are a source of oral pleasure. But Richard as king is a father-image deposed by Bolingbroke, Hal's real father. Since Hal has guilt-feelings about that deposition, he may be trying to atone for it by making Richard re-live in him, the son of the deposer. Furthermore, since the historical Hal was close to Richard and served him loyally,¹⁷ he may simply have identified with Richard. In so identifying, Hal would have strengthened his oral and anal traits.

Anal and oral fixations express themselves in sadistic ways. The anally-fixated person may project his severe self-control on others and attempt to train them as his parents have trained him in the anal period. Sadism involves imposing one's will on others, and since in the anal period the infant learns to exercise his will in connection with bowel movements, he develops a sort of sadism. An oral fixation may also result in sadistic behavior. Sadism may be a later version of the action of a child who, trying to incorporate the mother's breast for fear that it may disappear, bites it with his teeth.¹⁸

Generally speaking, a domineering mother precipitates sadistic behavior. As the infant grows, he incorporates the figure of his mother¹⁹

For night-owls shriek where mounting larks should sing.
(R II, III.iii.178-83)

¹⁷ See Chapter Two, p. 11.

¹⁸ See, for example, Freud, An Outline of Psycho-Analysis, pp. 10-11, and Hall, p. 106.

¹⁹ Hal, of course, has other reasons, such as his Oedipal wish, for doing so.

and imitates her behavior. At times he may unconsciously assign others the role of children but see himself as the parent image, and so he will treat others as his mother has treated him and try to dominate them.

The above suggestions, of course, are conjectures. What is beyond doubt is the fact that Hal's behavior is, at times, anally, orally, and sadistically motivated. One of the reasons for Hal's escape from the court is his Oedipal wish to possess the mother. His tavern friends represent England, the mother-image. Once he has joined his cronies, however, he feels suffocated among them and plans to return to the court (1 H IV, I.ii.195-209). It is possible that his super-ego intervenes and warns him not to enjoy the way of life that he has believed will fulfill his wishes.

At the same time, Hal's obsessive indecision prevents him from returning to Court. Again, as in his escape, his Oedipal wish to possess the mother (now represented by the court that his father rules) is what draws him back to the court, but the super-ego apparently intervenes again and keeps him from achieving his aim. It is not until events (including the death of his father) force him to return to the court that he does so.

There is another significance to Hal's indecision. Before he becomes king, Hal initiates very little action. Falstaff and Poins suggest the Gadshill robbery; Henry IV invites Hal to fight at Shrewsbury; and the King's death pushes Hal into the kingship. Hal can initiate only imitations of action. Thus, he plans the play impromptu (1 H IV, II.iv. 370-71), which is an acting-out of his Oedipal wish. He does not,

however, actually depose his father. The inability to decide and take action not only indicates obsessive doubt, but has additional anal significance. The child must learn to discharge his bodily products at certain times; Hal has not learned how to do this, and so he does nothing at all. It may be added that if Hal wanted to be a "good boy," he would return to the court. For him to do so would gladden the hearts of his father and all of England (the "mother"). Similarly, parents who have been attempting to train an infant are happy when the child on the chamber pot proves that he has learned his lesson. Hal, figuratively sitting on the chamber pot of his doubt, enjoys the anxiety he is causing his parents. While on the one hand Hal's refusal to act shows indecision, it also shows that Hal, in revenge on the severe mother-figure, is exerting his own infantile will.

Another aspect of Hal's obsessive indecision is his flight from responsibility. When pushed by events to act, or even when performing an act symbolically (as when he "deposes" the King in the play impromptu), Hal puts the responsibility for the act on another. This shifting of responsibility, which I shall illustrate below, is typically anal-obsessive. After an action, or even in preparation for one, Hal retraces his steps; he declares that it is not he who is responsible for the action. He is thus able to satisfy his suspicious super-ego that even if the act performed is unlawful, the blame is not with Hal. Shifting responsibility to another at will is normally not such an easy feat; hence, the inclination to do so indicates Hal's failure to accept the reality principle. This failure may be a result of Hal's unconscious refusal to mature, to

become a man like his father. This refusal, in turn, is perhaps the result of Hal's Oedipal hatred of his father. In any event, the tendency to shift responsibility is an indication of a pre-Oedipal fixation.

The first evidence of the flight from responsibility is Hal's flight from the court. In removing himself physically from the court, Hal declares, in effect, that he has no part in the Oedipal crime that brought his father to the throne. He puts the blame on Henry IV, who remains at Court. Hal's escape is no expiation of the crime: he is still the Prince, and he will presumably become king upon the death of his father. But his apparent belief that by changing his location he can escape guilt certainly does not have the reality principle at its basis.

The fact that, as I have just suggested,²⁰ Hal initiates very little action before he becomes king²¹ may also be a result of his reluctance to assume responsibility. At the Battle of Shrewsbury Hal tells his father:

They did me too much injury
That ever said I heark'ned for your death.
(1 H IV, V.iv.51-52)

No one in the play accuses Hal of "hearkening for" his father's death.²² Why does Hal introduce the subject? Guilt. But the mechanism of shifting responsibility leads him to put the blame on others.

²⁰ See above, pp. 120-121.

²¹ And afterwards too, as I shall demonstrate; see below, pp. 145-146.

²² See Chapter Two, pp. 19-20.

The killing of Hotspur is, symbolically, the killing of a sibling-rival; it opens the way to the achievement of the mother-image. It therefore causes Hal guilt-feelings. As before, he shifts the responsibility to others. First, he praises his brother, Prince John, for having fought well (1 H IV, V.iv.138-39). Obviously, it was Hal who has fought amazingly well--especially for one who has never been in a war before. Then he agrees to support Falstaff's lie that it was the fat knight who killed Hotspur. Hal would rather not be responsible for either the general or the specific glory in combat.

When Henry IV lies on his bed, apparently dead, Hal blames the crown for eating up its "bearer" (2 H IV, IV.v.163-64). Hal, because of his Oedipus complex, has had an unconscious wish for his father's death, but when he believes his father dead, he hopes that by shifting the responsibility for the King's death to the crown, he can avoid guilt feelings. The crown symbolizes England, and thus the mother-image.

Hal's watching the King lying on his bed with the crown (symbolizing England, the mother-image) on the pillow near him may be a symbolic rendition of the primal scene.²³ Otto Rank holds that any situation on the stage where a character is watching other characters is, symbolically, a primal scene.²⁴ In the Crown Scene--symbolically, then, a primal scene--Hal sees the King (apparently) dead, and the Prince

²³ The primal scene is the situation in which the child unexpectedly comes upon the parents in the act of sexual intercourse.

²⁴ Otto Rank, "Das 'Schauspiel in Hamlet'," Imago, 4 (1915), 41-51.

attributes the cause of his death to the mother-image. Symbolically, Hal is the child who is observing his parents in intercourse and who realizes that the father is weak, or impotent, and the mother is the active, or domineering, party. Hal, then, is blaming the mother for the father's death, or, symbolically, for the father's impotence.²⁵

B. Hal's Anal and Oral Tendencies
as Expressed Towards Falstaff

While defying the parents by escaping from the court, Hal finds a friend who is to his liking: Falstaff. Falstaff is an orally-fixated character. His obesity is a clear indication of oral indulgence. His numerous references to "sack" also indicate this. For one thing, he regards sack as the only way to attain wit, courage, and mental health. In 2 Henry IV, though bitter at Hal for his unkind separation, Falstaff still recalls with pleasure their drinking days together. No wonder Prince John, who never indulged, is unable to laugh; he does not drink wine like Hal (2 H IV, IV.iii.86-121).

As a thief, too, Falstaff is one who, as a way of life, incorporates external objects. He depends on the Hostess for food but never pays for it (2 H IV, II.i.74-77). These are oral symptoms. Again, Falstaff is always in need of money, but he quickly spends what he procures. This spending, as in the case of Richard II, is an anal trait. In both characters, the splurging proves self-dislike. To punish themselves, they give away what they have; they waste themselves. Falstaff, over-eating and

²⁵ For further discussion of the domineering mother see below, pp. 166-178.

over-drinking, becomes more and more unattractive. He thereby shows his distaste for himself.

When he says, "A plague on sighing and grief! It blows a man up like a bladder" (1 H IV, II.iv.359-360), Falstaff gives the reader a clue to his personality. It is some anxiety or dissatisfaction which has made Falstaff fat--apparently, dissatisfaction with his whole way of life and possibly remorse over it. Falstaff's behavior apparently does not satisfy his super-ego. When the ego is at odds with the super-ego, the result is depression. Depression leaves a gap that the depressive will attempt to fill through resort to food and drink. Like other depressives, Falstaff grows fat.

Falstaff sees Hal as a parental image.²⁶ Since Falstaff apparently feels that he deserves punishment for his way of life, he unconsciously expects Hal to be angry with him, or, in other words, to withhold love. A parental image that withholds love may also, as a punishment, withhold food.²⁷ Falstaff, depressed because of the anger of the parental figure (the super-ego), tries to compensate for this possible punishment by over-eating.

Since Falstaff seems to be a happy, easy-going man, he has evidently repressed his dissatisfaction with himself; but his obesity expresses it. Also, since he is substituting oral satisfaction for another kind of satisfaction unavailable to him, Falstaff's over-eating is very likely to be a compensation for his dissatisfaction with himself.

²⁶ See Chapter Two, p. 39.

²⁷ "Food" = "love."

Like the Prince, Falstaff will not accept responsibility. As I have suggested, Falstaff expects others to take care of all his needs. For example, he expects the Hostess to feed him and Hal to protect him; also, after the Gadshill robbery, he invents an elaborate lie in order to avoid the consequences of his cowardly escape (1 H IV, II.iv).²⁸

Hal, in choosing Falstaff as a friend, identifies with him. With Falstaff, he leads the life of a thief, and in stealing he achieves a form of oral fulfillment. In the company of the fat rogue he also carouses to the fullest.

Hal's sadistic behavior towards Falstaff²⁹ thus emerges as anal-oral. For example, Hal's "biting" remarks to Falstaff after the robbery at Gadshill³⁰ are an expression of oral sadism. So is Hal's cruel rejection speech to Falstaff (2 H IV, V.v.48-71). Hal's refusal to grant Falstaff the fulfillment of his requests is anal sadism; again Hal is the child whom the parent (Falstaff) wants to relieve himself, or give away something (symbolically: grant Falstaff's request), and who refuses to promise Falstaff amnesty when Hal becomes king (1 H IV, I.ii.23-38). He also refuses to help Falstaff locate the latter's horse at Gadshill (1 H IV, II.ii.41). When Hal forces Falstaff to give up the booty from the Gadshill robbery (1 H IV, II.ii.101), he is reversing roles and

²⁸ For more examples, see Chapter Two, pp. 39-40.

²⁹ Discussed in Chapter Two, pp. 26-34.

³⁰ For example, in 1 H IV, II.iv.350 he ironically extenuates Falstaff's cowardice at Gadshill: "Yea, Jack, [you acted] upon instinct." See also Hal's insults in the play impromptu, 1 H IV, II.iv.441-442.

becoming the parental figure. He forces Falstaff to relieve himself. He is also fulfilling Falstaff's unconscious fears that the parental image (the super-ego) will be dissatisfied with the knight's exploits and, as a punishment, will withdraw its love (and food) from Falstaff. The booty, for Falstaff, is symbolically food, and Hal's taking it away is the parent's way of punishing the child (Falstaff).

Hal sees his ability to "drink with any tinker" as proof of his popularity (1 H IV, II.iv.4-20). It is significant that it is the drinking that proves the point and not, say, people's trust in Hal. Generally, eating and drinking are symbolic, in 1 and 2 Henry IV, of the sexual act. The Boar's Head Tavern of 2 Henry IV is a bawdy-house,³¹ but all that actually happens on the stage in that milieu is drinking. Falstaff sits with Doll, the prostitute, and they drink together. Here the Prince becomes the child spying on his parents eating--symbolically, having sexual intercourse.³² Thus Hal's drinking with any tinker may indicate, again, in addition to orality, homosexual tendencies.

Another manifestation of orality, this time not in connection with Falstaff, occurs in the Crown Scene (2 H IV, IV.v.). There Hal says of the crown that it has eaten its bearer up (l. 164). The crown, symbolizing

³¹ In 1 H IV, for example, Falstaff mentions that Hal has "called her [the Hostess] to a reckoning many a time and oft" (I.ii.49-50). In 2 H IV, Doll Tearsheet assumes the sexual aspect of the Hostess. In an attempt to pacify Falstaff, the Hostess offers Doll to him (II.i.162-163). Also, Hal calls Doll a "pagan," or a prostitute. (See William Shakespeare, The Second Part of Henry IV [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968], fn. to II.ii.152.

³² A primal scene; see above, p. 123.

Possibly because of his identification with Falstaff, orally and otherwise, Hal at times shifts the responsibility for acts he has performed to the knight. Thus, in the play impromptu (1 H IV, II.iv), Hal, in the role of the King, blames Falstaff for corrupting Prince Hal. When Hal plays the King, a capacity in which he has to judge Prince Hal (played by Falstaff), he may unconsciously be assuming the authority or the role of his own super-ego (the internalization of the father-image). Hal's super-ego has felt dissatisfied with Hal's behavior: witness Hal's sense of suffocation and his desire to emerge from among his tavern companions as already expressed in the "I know you all" soliloquy (1 H IV, I.ii. 187-209).³³ However, rather than say to Falstaff, who is now playing Hal, that he has transgressed, the "King" puts the blame on Hal's companion: "Thou art violently carried away from grace, there is a devil haunts thee

33 Yet herein will I imitate the sun,
Who doth permit the base contagious clouds
To smother up his beauty from the world,
.....
By breaking through the foul and ugly mists
Of vapors that did seem to strangle him.
(1 H IV, I.ii.189-195)

in the likeness of an old fat man." And later: "That villainous abominable misleader of youth, Falstaff, that old white-bearded Satan" (1 H IV, II.iv.438-40, 453-54). Thus Hal, in the play impromptu, shifts the responsibility for his own behavior from himself to Falstaff. Similarly, as I have mentioned, Hal gives Falstaff the "credit" (the responsibility) for the killing of Hotspur (1 H IV, V.iv.156-157). He also calls him, in the rejection scene, "the tutor and the feeder of my riots" (2 H IV, V.v.63).

Along with the flight from responsibility, and probably resulting from it, there exists in Hal a tendency to play pranks. In 1 and 2 Henry IV Hal plays his pranks mainly on Falstaff. The tendency to play pranks probably results from a number of factors. I have suggested that Hal projects his homosexuality onto other people and attempts to repress this tendency by acting sadistically towards them. It is likely that the attempt to solve problems by projecting them onto others emerges also in Hal's use of prankishness. When Hal devises a prank, he unconsciously assigns each of the participants a role. The roles are reflections of conflicting impulses or drives within Hal himself. In the prank, Hal achieves the semblance of an objective look at the problem and hence a better chance to solve it. Also, he undoubtedly hopes that the problem, thus externalized, will work itself out. As I will demonstrate, Hal may expect the participants in the prank to resolve a difficulty that he presents to them and thus effect a solution of it. Hal's prankishness is, consequently, one of the expressions of his flight from responsibility.

Hal's anal-oral sadism is another feature that seeks expression in the pranks. Pranks bring enjoyment at the expense of others. Because the participants usually have no choice but to take part in the prank, and because their role often involves humiliation, they put Hal, who forces them into the prank, in the position of the domineering mother, who makes her child do what she thinks necessary.

The victims of Hal's pranks are always men. In 1 and 2 Henry IV, as I shall demonstrate, Falstaff is usually the victim. Since his pranks involve the imposition of Hal's will on the other person, who is in a subservient position, they may also be a symbolic expression of homosexual tendencies.

However, while serving the above purposes, a prank is a socially acceptable act. In reinforcing an individual's capacity to control himself and his milieu, the prank becomes a defense of the ego. Rather than turn criminal sadist, for example, Hal channels his sadistic impulses into the carrying-out of the socially-acceptable prank. In this respect, Hal's prankish tendency is a healthy one, and it indicates some degree of maturity.

In the Gadshill robbery (1 H IV, II.ii), for example, Hal plays a prank on Falstaff. First he lets Falstaff win the booty, and then he takes it away. Falstaff being a father-image to Hal, the Prince probably unconsciously hopes to observe, through Falstaff's behavior, his real father's behavior. Hal is troubled over his father's assumption of the throne. He may unconsciously want Falstaff to reenact an unlawful taking-possession of something. Thus Hal will be able not only to observe his father's action at close quarters but also to test his own reaction to the

robbery and to the usurpation that it symbolizes.³⁴ Obviously, Hal is not happy with the father revealed in the prank. This father is weak, and Hal, in taking the booty from him, reveals his dissatisfaction with Henry IV's usurpation (he returns the booty to its rightful owners, 1 H IV, II.iv. 537-38). He also displays his own Oedipal desire: he takes advantage of the father's weakness and hijacks the booty. Symbolically, he is enacting his desire to take England from his real father.³⁵

Soon afterwards, Hal plays a prank on Francis (1 H IV, II.iv). In it, he puts Francis in a confusing situation: he has two people call Francis at the same time. In addition, Hal asks him a confusing question: would he dare escape from his indenture? (ll. 44-47). Francis does not answer the question, but the symbolic significance of Hal's question is clear. Hal projects onto Francis his own Oedipal wish to rebel against his father. Therefore he asks Francis whether he would find it in his heart to break his indenture. In doing so, Francis would be rebelling, in effect, against the authority of the vintner. The vintner, in this context, symbolizes the father-image.

There is a parallel between Francis' situation, away from his home, under the vintner, and Hal's situation away from the court, with a substitute father-figure (Falstaff). Francis is unable to react suitably. He hesitates. In so doing he acts out the hesitation that Hal has felt about returning to the court. Hal, then, succeeds in projecting onto

³⁴ In that Hal observes Falstaff, the situation is a symbolic primal scene. See above, pp. 123, 127.

³⁵ For the homosexual aspect of this prank, see Chapter Three, p. 90.

Francis not only his Oedipal wish but also his hesitation regarding a return to the court.

The play impromptu (1 H IV, II.iv.432-471), as mentioned above,³⁶ is an acting-out of Hal's desire to depose his father. First Hal lets Falstaff play the King, but in so doing he must himself play the role of the Prince. Hal would rather have others in his place to face his problems and probably solve them for him. This is one of the reasons why he makes Falstaff, in turn, play the son. Hal's taking the role of the father also expresses, of course, his Oedipal desire. In the play impromptu Hal tests his father, too, through the figure of Falstaff. The Prince observes how his father would react--or, possibly, how any father would react--if his son deposed him. As Richard L. McGuire suggests,³⁷ the play impromptu may be a reenactment of the deposition of Richard II. If so, it parallels the Gadshill robbery: in both events Hal causes the reenactment of his father's crime. Apparently, this crime obsesses Hal. In the robbery and in the play impromptu the memory of this crime emerges symbolically; much later, in Henry's prayer on the eve of Agincourt, the memory emerges directly into his consciousness:

O, not today, think not upon the fault
My father made in compassing the crown!
(H V, IV.i.310-311)

Hal's interest in his father's crime and in its results appears again in 2 Henry IV. As a result of the crime, Henry IV possesses the mother (England). It is not surprising, then, that Hal is curious about

³⁶ Chapter Two, pp. 28-29.

³⁷ McGuire, pp. 49-51. See Chapter Two, pp. 18-19.

the relationship between his father and the sinfully-acquired mother-figure. In the Drawers' Scene (2 H IV, II.iv), where Falstaff associates with a woman (unknowingly playing the father-image for Hal), Hal plays a prank on him: he appears as a drawer, but he then reveals his identity and interrupts Falstaff's love-making. As I have mentioned above,³⁸ Falstaff proves to be weak and impotent, and it is when this weakness in the father-figure becomes clear that Hal breaks into the scene and stops it.

As in the Gadshill robbery, Hal's intervention in the Drawers' Scene carries two meanings: first, Hal will not allow the father to enjoy the fruits of the sinful act. Intervening, he restores the mother-image to her place (by returning the booty in one case, and by interrupting the intimacy of Falstaff and Doll Tearsheet in the other). Conversely, however, the second meaning of the intervention is that Hal, having discovered his father's weakness, feels the Oedipal urge to rob him of the fruits of his act. In the first case he actually takes the booty from Falstaff; in the second, he appears as the stronger, the wiser, and, symbolically, the more virile of the two.³⁹

It is interesting to note that in this scene Hal is playing himself, or the child watching his father. However, he does also project himself onto Falstaff. Falstaff being a parallel of the Prince, and the Prince

³⁸ Chapter Two, p. 32 . This, as pointed out, p. 127 above [in this chapter], is a disguised primal scene.

³⁹ For a discussion of the castration of Falstaff symbolically expressed by Hal's intervention in the Drawers' Scene, see Chapter Two, p. 32.

feeling identification with him, Hal may be attempting to answer the question, How will I act when with a woman? The answer is discouraging; the actor standing for Hal--Falstaff--appears impotent. Significantly, a verbal encounter between the Prince and Falstaff, in which the Prince attacks Falstaff with insults, follows: "You whoreson candle-mine, you, how vilely did you speak of me even now" (2 H IV, II.iv.299-300). The scene may demonstrate how Hal, through the figure of Falstaff, attempts symbolically to have a sexual relationship with a woman. This woman is, as I suggested, symbolically the mother-image, but in reality - a prostitute. This fact is no coincidence; Hal, as I suggested earlier,⁴⁰ hates the sexual mother-image and sees any woman as a base sexual figure. So Doll, both a symbolic mother-image and a prostitute, is typical of womankind. This may be the reason why Shakespeare caused Hal's symbolic attempt in this scene to have normal relationship with a woman through a representative (Falstaff) to fail. Thus the verbal attack on Falstaff may carry a homosexual significance. Having failed to perform with a woman, Hal turns to homosexaultiy.

It is possible to see Hal's rejection of Falstaff as the end of a long prank. First, Hal befriends the knight, and although he never promises him anything, his behavior naturally arouses in the friend a hope of favors to come. Indeed, the rejection astounds not only Falstaff but the spectator, too. In the rejection of Falstaff Hal may be reenacting the "betrayal" of his mother, who (historically) disappeared when he was young, and who, in the plays, does not appear at her son's side even at

⁴⁰ Chapter Two, pp. 34-37 , and Chapter Three, p. 1.

moments such as the coronation.⁴¹ In the reenactment, Hal, as mother, disappears from Falstaff's life. He repeats what his own mother has done to him. He makes it clear to Falstaff that the blame lies with the knight. It is immoral behavior that causes the rejection:

I have long dreamed of such a kind of man,
So surfeit-swelled, so old, and so profane,
But, being awaked, I do despise my dream.
(2 H IV, V.v.50-52)

In other words, Hal purposely instills guilt-feelings in Falstaff. He may thus be giving vent to guilt-feelings that he entertains, guilt-feelings which result from the unconscious belief that his sinful Oedipal wish has brought about his mother's death. Hal, then, unconsciously assigns Falstaff the role of the Prince himself in the prank; he projects and creates in the knight the guilt-feelings found in his own mind. Hal wants Falstaff to resolve the guilt-feelings or prove that he deserves Hal's forgiveness. Indeed, he even indicates that by reforming, Falstaff can win the new King's favor (2 H IV, V.v.69-71). Thus Hal creates an imaginary model for his own future success. But the fact that Falstaff dies soon afterwards (H V, II.iii), without redeeming himself in the eyes of the King (Henry V), may mean, to the King's unconscious, that there is no way to rid oneself of the Oedipal guilt.

C. Northumberland, Hotspur, York, and Aumerle as Reflections of Hal

The figures of Northumberland and Hotspur, like those of York and Aumerle, echo the Oedipal and homosexual problems of Hal. Northumberland,

⁴¹ For a discussion of this point see above, p. 117.

for example, shows indecision before the battles of Shrewsbury and Gaultree. After deciding to join the rebels at Shrewsbury, he changes his mind and feigns illness (2 H IV, Induction, 36-37). Then he decides to fight at Gaultree, but he lets his wife and daughter-in-law dissuade him (2 H IV, II.iii). This indecision is obsessive (anal) in character. As in Hal's case, Northumberland keeps others--the other rebels--waiting for him to perform in a certain way, and he apparently derives a certain satisfaction from allowing them to wait and then disappointing them.

Also, Northumberland may, if he wins the battle, fulfill an Oedipal wish (take England, the mother-image). As in Hal's case, it is probable that, when Northumberland is about to fulfill a desire, his super-ego intervenes and prevents the fulfillment. Thus Northumberland suffers from obsessive doubt. His behavior also illustrates a repetition-compulsion: twice he plans to fight, and twice he changes his mind.

Like Hal, Northumberland shifts the responsibility for his decisions from himself. The first decision to avoid battle he blames on his illness, and the second one he blames on his wife and Lady Percy. Northumberland also shows oral-sadistic traits. He joins a rebellion in order to take something (England) from another (the King). This acquisitive wish to possess external objects is oral in nature; Northumberland wants, so to speak, to incorporate England, or "devour" it. When he learns about Hotspur's death, Northumberland makes the pun, "of Hotspur Coldspur?" (2 H IV, I.i.50). As a result of his son's death, Northumberland may be truly grief-stricken. This grief, however, may in part be a result of guilt-feelings, which, in turn, spring from Northumberland's relief at

having Hotspur's threatening figure removed.⁴² He is one step nearer to the realization of his oral wish. Northumberland's pun at this point, with its "biting," sarcastic meaning, not only indicates the speaker's conscious grief, but, very probably, also expresses unconscious oral-sadistic pleasure.

In similar fashion, Hotspur refuses to surrender his prisoners to the King (1 H IV, I.iii.125-128), and later, when he believes that Glendower plans to rob him of a piece of land, he becomes furious (1 H IV, III.i.94-133). If Hotspur's wife resembles his mother,⁴³ Hotspur's behavior echoes childhood reluctance to relieve himself as expected. Such reluctance is an attempt to rebel against the authority of the domineering mother. Hotspur also shows oral traits. Like his father, he wants to possess England, or "devour" it. He attempts to do so by sword, and the devouring is connected with sadism. He wants to acquire honor, and this acquisitiveness is an oral trait. He wants to have honor for himself alone, and this reluctance to share is an anal trait:

By heaven, methinks it were an easy leap
To pluck bright honor from the pale-faced moon,
Or dive into the bottom of the deep
Where fathom line could never touch the ground,
And pluck up drownéd honor by the locks.
So he that doth redeem her thence might wear
Without corrival all her dignities.

(1 H IV, I.iii.201-207)

Hotspur is very eloquent and talkative. For example, during the planning of the rebellion against Henry IV, Hotspur continually interrupts by talking--not necessarily about the matter at hand (1 H IV, I.iii.125-255). Thus Hotspur expresses a need for oral satisfaction; talking, of course,

⁴² For the psychological mechanism at the basis of Northumberland's fear of Hotspur, see Chapter Two, pp. 41-43.

⁴³ As she probably does--see p. 118.

is an oral activity. In that Hotspur's talking hinders the rebels from deciding on their plans, it echoes Hal's anal indecisiveness.

At the basis of Hotspur's behavior there is, indeed (as in Hal's case), anally-motivated obsessive doubt plus a resulting repetition-compulsion. Obsessive doubt appears in Hotspur's quarrel with Glendower about the map. Glendower gives in, but when Hotspur is about to achieve his desire, he suddenly changes his mind and rejects the land offered him (1 H IV, III.i.93-138). This change of mind is anal obsessive: Hotspur attempts to achieve a goal, but once he is about to achieve it, his suspicious super-ego intervenes, and Hotspur retraces the steps taken towards his goal.

Hotspur marries, but his super-ego will not allow him to achieve pleasure in his marriage. He escapes from his marriage to war.⁴⁴ His doubt regarding his marriage manifests itself, for example, in his first seeing his wife as a sexual object and then in shifting his attention to Mortimer's wife, with whom he expresses a wish to sleep:

<u>Hotspur.</u>	Come, Kate, thou art perfect in lying down. Come quick, quick, that I may lay my head in thy lap.
<u>Lady Percy.</u> Now God help thee!
<u>Hotspur.</u>	To the Welsh lady's bed.

(1 H IV, III.i.226-227, 241-242)

The repetition-compulsion is also obvious in Hotspur's behavior. He sets himself a goal, but when he is about to achieve it, he changes his mind. The desire that Hotspur repeatedly tries and fails to achieve is basically, like Hal's, the Oedipal desire. His repetition-compulsion manifests itself

⁴⁴ See Chapter Two, pp. 44-45.

in his attempts to achieve the land (a part of England), his wife, and the Welsh lady, all of whom are mother-figures to Hotspur. The desire to achieve the mother-image becomes an obsession with Hotspur, and he expresses this obsession as a wish to achieve honor. The moon and the ocean, where Hotspur hopes to find honor (1 H IV, I.iii.202-205), are symbolic mother-images. Honor itself Hotspur refers to as feminine ("her," l. 207). Evidently, it is again the Oedipal wish to achieve the mother-image that appears as a sublimated desire here.

This Oedipal wish is one of the reasons that cause Hotspur to become a rebel. However, his super-ego, in the guise of the obsessive doubt, intervenes again. Hotspur learns that Northumberland's army will not join forces with him (1 H IV, IV.i.28-30). He understands that he has very little chance to win the battle. A retreat and postponement of hostilities until a more opportune time, or possibly negotiations and a peace-agreement, would hardly satisfy Hostpur's desire; immediate battle would, almost certainly, result in complete failure. Hotspur's suicidal decision to fight ("Die all, die merrily," 1 H IV, IV.i.134) indicates an unconscious decision not to achieve the desired aim. The reason for Hotspur's decision is his obsessive doubt, which, as usual, arises when Hotspur is about to fulfill his wish. Also, since Hotspur is fixated in (or has regressed to) a pre-Oedipal stage, he will not accept partial fulfillment of his desires. Like a child who has not internalized the reality principle, he must, regardless of circumstances, satisfy his desire completely.

One further reason for Hotspur's suicidal behavior at the Battle of Shrewsbury is his search for the parental image. He looks for such an image in Glendower--only to be disappointed. For instance, when Glendower

boasts of his magic, Hotspur mocks him (1 H IV, III.i.17-67). The conviction that one can affect the world of reality with magic is typically infantile and indicates that the believer has not internalized the reality principle. Hotspur himself is, as pointed out above, infantile in this regard. When he sees another person manifest such symptoms, he identifies with him. Seeing a potential father-figure in Glendower but rejecting the infantilism, Hotspur reverses his position. He takes the role of the parental figure to criticize the unrealistic belief.

In similar fashion, Hotspur criticizes Glendower's orality:

He held me last night at least nine hours
In reckoning up the several devils' names
.
. . . O, he is as tedious
As a tired horse, a railing wife.
(1 H IV, 146-162)

Hotspur himself has the same quality that he criticizes in Glendower. As before, he adopts the role of the parental figure to criticize his own shortcoming, as represented by Glendower.

However, Hotspur can criticize his own infantile traits only when reflected in others. To criticize them when they are in himself, he needs a parental image. When he hears of how the rebels are trying to organize their rebellion, Hotspur's incessant talking may be an unconscious request for his father or other authority-figure to check him. His father, however, says nothing. Worcester protests only mildly:

Nay, if you have not [finished talking], to it again,
We will stay your leisure.
(1 H IV, I.iii.256-257)

It is therefore possible that Hotspur, by being a "bad boy" (participating in a rebellion), hopes to arouse the parent-figure to punish him and

check his infantile behavior as he himself is to check Glendower's. At the Battle of Shrewsbury Hotspur provokes a firm reaction at the hands of the father-image, the King. At last he has discovered a figure that reacts authoritatively.

Hotspur and Northumberland also show signs of a prankish tendency similar to that of Hal. Northumberland tells Hotspur that he will fight with him but then changes his mind (1 H IV, IV.i.17). Before the Battle of Gaultree he again decides to fight and then changes his mind. Being a rebel himself, Northumberland probably projects his Oedipal rebelliousness and his guilt-feelings onto Hotspur, of whose own rebellious impulses Northumberland is afraid.⁴⁵ By deserting his son before the battle he may be trying to find out what a rebel, facing punishment for his rebelliousness in a battle which he is probably going to lose, feels and does. Northumberland, of course, is afraid of finding himself in the same position, and this is why he attempts a prank in order to find the answer. Hotspur ridicules Glendower for belief in his own magic powers (1 H IV, III.i.17-67). Hotspur may be projecting his own immaturity on Glendower in order to see how a person accused of immaturity will react. In so doing Hotspur is playing a prank on Glendower.

York, like Northumberland, is anally indecisive. He accepts the position of lord governor of England (R II, II.i.101-124) and finally joins the rebels. After Bolingbroke's triumph, a sadistic trait very similar to that of Northumberland appears in York. He asks Bolingbroke to punish his son, Aumerle, with death for joining in a conspiracy to restore

⁴⁵ See Chapter Two, pp. 41-43.

Richard II to the throne (R II, II.iii). York has "pledged for his [Aumerle's] truth" in parliament (R II, V.ii.44). Once he realizes, however, that his pledge may connect him with conspiracy, York hastens to shift the responsibility. By hurrying to tell Bolingbroke about the rebels' plans, York is declaring, in effect, that he is no longer responsible for Aumerle's acts.

There are also indication of prankishness of a sort in York. By not fighting Bolingbroke, York is guilty of not fulfilling his duties as lord governor of England. Obviously, he is strongly tempted to join Bolingbroke. His guilt, then, is akin to treason. However, when he meets the rebel, he blames him for treason against Richard (R II, II.iii.83-112). He assumes a position of authority, causes Bolingbroke to justify himself and try to prove that he has no intention of overthrowing Richard, and the whole time he half consciously recognizes that he is going to join the rebel. Also, projecting onto Bolingbroke the guilt-feelings aroused by his failure to stop Bolingbroke and his wish to join him, York experiments to see what happens to a person accused of rebellion against the King.

York's son, Aumerle, who has joined a conspiracy, cannot remain resolute. He comes into his father's presence with the list of conspirators in a conspicuous position (R II, V.ii.56-57). What Aumerle has to do is refrain from "discharging" his secret, but he, symbolically, cannot control his bowel movement. He is revealing his anal and obsessive tendencies--anal, in lack of control; obsessive, in the doubt as to whether to reveal or not to reveal the letter.

In showing his parents the list and thus unconsciously asking for their approval or disapproval of his action, Aumerle is also fleeing from

responsibility: he is shifting the responsibility for the action to his parents. Aumerle also echoes Hal's tendency to play pranks. He plays a prank, in a sense, on his fellow-conspirators: he joins them and then gives away their secret (R II, V.ii). He may be projecting onto them his guilt-feelings concerning the Oedipally-motivated conspiracy and his wish to be punished. By revealing their secret, he may unconsciously be trying to experiment and see what it means to be guilty of conspiracy and to be discovered.

Later, by refraining from action until his mother suggests it, Aumerle proves his lack of will-power. It is the Duchess who sends him to Bolingbroke (R II, V.ii.111-117). Aumerle's anal indecisiveness, revealed in his inability to keep a secret, finds expression again in his failure to make a plea to Bolingbroke when his life is at stake (R II, V.iii). His dependence on the Duchess brings the figure of the domineering mother into view again. Aumerle is dependent on his mother both anally and orally: he cannot decide what to do until she tells him (anal dependence), and even after she has decided that he should fight for his life he does not speak before Bolingbroke but lets her do so (oral dependence).⁴⁶

Sadism, too, appears in Aumerle's behavior. In his case, it is clearly sadism that arises from the wish to elicit punishment. Aumerle, by revealing the names of the conspirators, brings on them the punishment that he likewise deserves. He thus projects his own guilt on them and has

⁴⁶ Aumerle's failure to plead for his life may also have passive aggressiveness at its basis. By refraining from action (symbolically, refusing to relieve himself) the child (Aumerle) is causing anxiety to the mother (the Duchess). See above, pp. 120-121, for an example of similar behavior in Hal.

them punished in his place. However, by not pleading for his life before Bolingbroke, Aumerle masochistically invites his own punishment. It is interesting to note that his punishment is a direct consequence of anal failure. The punishment will follow Aumerle's failure to keep the secret (control his bowel movement). Aumerle, identifying with the figure of the domineering mother, penalizes himself for the act that a mother is likely to punish a child for. It is not surprising, then, that only after his mother allows it does he ride to Bolingbroke to beg forgiveness, and that he allows his mother to protect him. He knows that if he wins absolution from the domineering mother, he need not feel guilty.

D. Oral and Anal Traits in Henry V

Hotspur and Aumerle and their fathers, then, as parallels to Hal, echo his anal and oral sadistic fixations. On Hal's ascent to the throne, these fixations, instead of disappearing, change their form. As Henry V he represses certain modes of behavior. This defense, or exercising of will to control undesirable behavior, is of an anal nature. Previously he has projected his anal and oral guilt-feelings upon Falstaff. By behaving sadistically towards the knight, he has satisfied his wish to punish himself. The final act of this nature has been the rejection of Falstaff. Hence, this rejection is not only the result of his Oedipal and homosexual problems, but also of his anal and oral fixations.

Simultaneously with this final punishment of himself in Falstaff, however, he undergoes a transformation. To keep the repressed impulses from emerging again, the super-ego has to impose severe inhibitions, and the result is the severely-virtuous Henry V. Henry will unconsciously

interpret rebellious behavior or disobedience on the part of his subjects as an attempt of the repressed id impulses to emerge, and he will therefore react sadistically.

At the same time, Henry's tendency to shift responsibility to others intensifies.⁴⁷ The reason for this intensification may be Henry's increased reluctance to feel responsible for acts of doubtful moral nature. The drive to commit such acts is too strong to be repressed, but Henry's obsessive indecision manifests itself in a desire which accompanies the acts--to undo what has been done, or at least to avoid the responsibility. Thus, just as Henry did not initiate action as prince, so he waits for others to initiate action for him as king. His main enterprise, the invasion of France, is apparently the idea of the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Archbishop relates:

I have made an offer to His Majesty,
Upon our spiritual convocation
And in regard of causes now in hand,
Which I have opened to His Grace at large,
As touching France.

(H V, I.i.75-79)

Another meaningful act of Henry's is his marriage to Katharine. However, it is the French King who first suggests this marriage:

⁴⁷ A number of critics observe this quality in Henry. Landon C. Burns, in his "Three Views of King Henry V," Drama Survey (Minneapolis), I.iii.(1962), 278-300, lists most of the examples of Henry's flight from responsibility to be cited hereafter. See also Campbell, p. 280; William F. Keirce, "Henry V," in Lectures on Four of Shakespeare's History Plays, no ed. (Pittsburgh: Carnegie Institute of Technology, 1953), pp. 63-65; and William M. Schutte, "Henry IV Part II," in Lectures on Four of Shakespeare's History Plays, no ed. (Pittsburgh: Carnegie Institute of Technology, 1953), p. 44. These critics, however, do not discuss the flight from responsibility in a psychoanalytic context, and their conclusions, when such emerge, do not bear on my discussion.

Suppose the Ambassador from the French comes back,
Tells Harry that the King doth offer him
Katharine his daughter.

(H V, III.Prol. 28-30)

Both the Archbishop and the French King are father-figures, and in their authorization of an Oedipally-motivated act (the war in France and the marriage with Katharine, a mother-figure) they take the guilt off Henry's conscience.

Other examples of Henry's flight from responsibility are numerous. He wants the Archbishop to authorize the attack on France (H V, I.ii.96). He blames the war on the Dauphin's present of tennis balls (H V, I.ii.261-297). By a prank he puts the responsibility for the conspirators' death-sentence on the conspirators themselves: he leads Scroop, Grey, and Cambridge to suggest a severe punishment for the drunkard who has talked against the King (H V, II.ii.44-51). Henry uses their suggestion to conclude that greater offenses must receive even more severe punishment:

If little faults, proceeding on distemper,
Shall not be winked at, how shall we stretch our eye
When capital crimes . . .
Appear before us?

(H V, II.ii.54-57)

Thus Henry makes the conspirators suggest their own punishment, and he can feel that he is not to blame for their death. Later, Henry declares that he personally does not seek revenge on them. It is his duty as king, he says, that prompts him to punish them (H V, II.ii.174-177). Here, Henry shifts the responsibility from himself to his office as king.

In his speech to the people of Harfleur Henry puts the blame for the impending battle on the inhabitants of the city (H V, III.iii.1-43). On the eve of Agincourt he expresses his fears of the battle of the

following day as Sir Thomas Erpingham's fears (H V, IV.i.99-100).

Erpingham himself has expressed confidence and contentment with his condition (H V, IV.i.16-17). Later Henry, in disguise, makes a great effort to prove that the King (himself) is not responsible for the souls of his soldiers who die in battle (H V, IV.i.136-199).

Henry's prayer follows, and in it the King first declares that the guilt that burdens his soul is his father's (H V, IV.i.310-322). Actually, his own Oedipal crimes, both completed and planned, are apparently what causes his restlessness. Another way in which Henry tries to allay his guilt-feelings is to hire people to pray for Richard II's soul (H V, IV.i.315-317). Again, Henry has others atone for what he feels to be his own crime. It is possible that Henry's mention, at the end of his prayer, that he, too, is imploring pardon (H V, IV.i.320-322), is what enables him to regain peace of mind.⁴⁸ However, he does not admit that it is his own crime for which he is imploring pardon.

The most noticeable way in which Henry tries to avoid responsibility for his Oedipally-motivated acts is the complete reliance on God that he recurrently expresses. I have mentioned that Henry requests a religious authority's endorsement of the war. He also tells the Dauphin's messenger that his quarrel with the Dauphin

. . . . lies . . . within the will of God,
To whom I do appeal, and in Whose name
Tell you the Dauphin I am coming on.
(H V, I.ii.289-291) .

Henry's battle-cry during the Battle of Harfleur is "God for Harry, England,

⁴⁸ See Chapter Two, p. 73.

and Saint George!" (H V, III.i.34). Before the Battle of Agincourt

Henry says:

How thou pleasest, God dispose the day!
(H V, IV.iii.132).

Finally, after the Battle of Agincourt, Henry declares,

Praisèd be God, and not our strength for it!
(H V, IV.vii.90)

And later:

And be it death proclaimed through our host
To boast of this or take that praise from God
Which is His only.
(H V, IV.viii. 119-121)

In this constant reference to God as the authority in whose name the war is waged and won, Henry apparently attempts to create a situation where God as the father-image is present during the Oedipal act, the war in France. If Henry is fighting in the father's name, he need not feel guilty of an Oedipal crime. Thus Henry tricks his super-ego. He wages war in order to achieve an Oedipal goal, France (the mother-image). His suspicious super-ego intervenes and an obsessive doubt emerges, but Henry solves the problem by "convincing" the super-ego that his actions are by no means contrary to the dictates of the super-ego (the father-image, or God), but rather in accordance with these dictates. If he is performing any improper (i.e., successful) act, Henry contends to his super-ego, it is not Henry who is responsible for it. It is God.

Henry's tendency to play pranks, which is, at least in part, another expression of his oral-anal sadism and his tendency to shift responsibility,⁴⁹ continues to function in him as king. However, there is

⁴⁹ See above, pp. 121-124.

a change in the nature of his pranks. Although, as I shall demonstrate, he continues to play pranks and to stage in them symbolic representations of his internal conflicts, he does not commit symbolic Oedipal crimes in them. In other words, the repression of undesirable modes of behavior reaches even the unconscious level. This is why Henry must believe that he is righteous and that he is fulfilling all his duties towards God. He convinces himself of his righteousness so thoroughly that the conviction will reach the unconscious. Of course, he cannot do so with complete success, and doubt still arises at times, as in the scene on the eve of Agincourt, to be discussed below.

The first prank Henry V plays he plays at the expense of the Lord Chief Justice (2 H IV, V.ii). He has just assumed the crown. It is up to Henry to choose his advisors. His words give the listener the impression that he is about to take sadistic revenge on the Justice, who had once ordered Hal to jail:

What! rate, rebuke, and roughly send to prison
Th'immediate heir of England! Was this easy?
May this be washed in Lethe, and forgotten?
(2 H IV, V.ii.70-27)

However, Henry only plays with the Justice, cat-and-mouse fashion, for a short time, and then restores him to his office. He has to prove to all the world, and mainly to his own super-ego, that he has reformed, that he holds no Oedipal hatred towards the father-image, the Lord Chief Justice. Of course, in that Henry makes it clear that the Justice owes his life as well as his authority to him, he symbolically castrates him as he symbolically castrated his own father;⁵⁰ but to avoid the guilt for

⁵⁰ See Chapter Two, p. 56.

this symbolic act, he restores the Justice to his office and calls him "father" (2 H IV, V.ii.118,140).

Henry plays his second prank on the Archbishop of Canterbury. He asks the prelate to authorize the war in France (H V, I.ii.96). It is clear that the Archbishop wants Henry to go to war, and that he has suggested the war to Henry simply as a means of saving the church from losing property (H V, I.i). Henry's request for the Archbishop's honest opinion regarding the war is therefore a prank, played partly on the Archbishop and partly on the court. Henry tries to project his super-ego onto the Archbishop, a father-figure, and lets him settle the contradiction between Henry's Oedipal wish to control France and the ethical requirements of the super-ego, or the newly-adopted religious virtuousness. The fact that the Archbishop has no choice but accept the role and reply as Henry expects him to reply echoes the sadistic qualities of previous pranks. Also, the fact that the Archbishop is playing his part in order to save the church money may indicate that the relationship of mother and child symbolically exists between himself and Henry. He is acting as Henry, the authority that can give or take away money (symbolically, the mother who can give or withhold food), wants him to act. Thus Henry plays the role of the domineering mother, who uses food to make the child act as she wishes.

Henry, in still another prank, sentences Scroop, Grey, and Cambridge to death for plotting against him. His pretended ignorance of the contents of the documents he gives them and the dramatic quality he gives the whole scene (H V, II.ii.61-178) indicate that Henry is actually playing a prank on the three. I have mentioned the sadistic quality of his treatment of

the conspirators.⁵¹ Henry also projects his Oedipal problem on the three. In their conspiring against their King (the father-figure), they have become symbolic of Henry's Oedipal wish. By punishing them with death Henry stages a symbolic representation of his attempts to repress unhealthy tendencies in himself. The homosexual motif is also present in this prank, as the suggestion of a homosexual relationship between Henry and Scroop appears,⁵² and so the execution of the conspirators is both a symbolic attempt to repress the homosexual tendencies and a symbolic homosexual act.

On the eve of Agincourt (H V, IV.i), before the decisive battle in his Oedipal venture in France, Henry suffers from guilt-feelings and anxiety. Attempting to allay these feelings, he stages a symbolic representation of them. The first actor he finds is himself. I have suggested that although Henry as King Henry cannot admit that he is about to perform a deed motivated by drives that he believes he has managed to repress, he can as Harry le Roy face issues he has tried to repress and ignore in his regal capacity.⁵³ Thus Henry V projects his Oedipal problem on-to Harry le Roy and expects him to solve it. I have discussed the symbolic significance of the characters that appear in the scene;⁵⁴ it is necessary to observe, however, that the encounter with the clown-father, Pistol (H V, IV.i.35-63), has the characteristics of a prank: Henry pretends to be what he is not, and because he knows more than Pistol, he feels strength and enjoyment at seeing Pistol literally make a fool of himself.

⁵¹ See Chapter Three, pp. 103-104.

⁵² See Chapter Three, pp. 101-103.

⁵³ See Chapter Two, p. 67.

⁵⁴ See Chapter Two, pp. 66-73.

The encounter with Williams, Bates, and Court (H V, IV.i.87-246) has the same characteristics. However, unlike other pranks, this one offers Henry only brief pleasure. Soon the question of the responsibility of the king arises, and (as I have tried to show) Henry does not find the encouragement that he seeks.⁵⁵ In fact, the situation has almost reversed itself. Henry, instead of enjoyably controlling the situation, becomes the butt of the joke. Rather than attack others, as he has attacked Falstaff and blamed him for cowardice after the robbery at Gadshill (1 H IV, II.iv.239-278), he finds himself attacked and desperately defending his own stance. Only if Henry reveals his true identity can he save face. To do so, however, would make him look ridiculous, and would in effect constitute an admission that since he could not win the argument, he had to force the others to agree. However, Henry does agree to a future encounter with Williams; at that point he can appear as himself and, he may unconsciously hope, listen to Williams' frightened apologies.

In the meantime he finds a way to allay his guilt-feelings in prayer (H V, IV.i.306-322). Until this point he has actually not dealt with the question that he unconsciously wants the prank to reflect. While his problem is the dissatisfaction of the super-ego with the Oedipally-motivated war, he has dealt with the question of the king's responsibility for his soldiers' lives. Now, however, Henry finds the right actor: God. He projects his super-ego on God, and, in a way, plays a prank on God.⁵⁶

Henry pretends that his guilt-feelings arise from his father's usurpation of the throne, and, so to speak, convinces God (his super-ego)

⁵⁵ See Chapter Two, p. 70.

⁵⁶ As noted above, pp. 147-148.

that this is indeed the case:

Oh, not today, think not upon the fault
My father made in compassing the crown!
(H V, IV.i.310-311)

Then, by showing that he has atoned as best he can for his father's act, he pacifies God, or the super-ego, and allays his own guilt-feelings:⁵⁷

I Richard's body have interrèd new,
.....
Five hundred poor I have in yearly pay
Who twice a day their withered hands hold up,
Towards Heaven, to pardon blood, as I have built
Two chantries, where the sad and solemn priests
Sing still for Richard's soul.
.....
. . . my penitence comes after all,
Imploring pardon.

(H V, IV.i.312-322)

After Henry is victorious in combat, he sends Fluellen to receive the box on the ear that Williams has promised the King at Agincourt (H V, IV.vii.160-166). Fluellen and Williams almost come to blows, but Warwick and Gloucester, whom Henry has sent, and then Henry himself, arrive in time to prevent the fisticuffs. I have suggested that the encounter with the gloves has a homosexual significance.⁵⁸ In the prank on Fluellen, then, Henry projects onto the Welshman the feminine side of his character, but he then arrives as the representative of the super-ego to break the homosexual encounter, or, symbolically, repress the homosexual tendency.

It is possible that Henry has unconsciously hoped to overwhelm Williams with the fact that his adversary on the eve of Agincourt was

⁵⁷ For a discussion of Henry's "cheating" God, or the super-ego, see below, pp. 159-160.

⁵⁸ Chapter Three, p. 109.

the King.⁵⁹ If he has hoped so, Henry is disappointed. Williams bravely holds that he is innocent (H V, IV.viii.53-60). However, to the extent that Henry still projects drives and tendencies of his own onto Williams, his prank is not over. As I will soon suggest, Henry takes the role of the domineering mother who tries to achieve obedience of the child (Williams) by tempting him with money (food).⁶⁰ He may also unconsciously regard Williams as an admirable, manly father/husband image.⁶¹ By thus projecting the roles of the child and the father/husband on Williams, Henry may be hoping to observe how these figures would behave when tempted by the female figure, here represented by himself. Further, Williams has challenged, although unknowingly, the King himself. Henry may therefore also see in him a projection of his own Oedipal rebelliousness.⁶²

Because the dominated child, the domineering mother, the father/husband, and the Oedipally-rebellious son have to do with Henry's psychological difficulties, the second encounter with Williams is another prank in which Henry, projecting his problems on others, tries to solve these problems.

Playing pranks, then, is one of the ways in which Henry tries to solve the problem of the surging id impulses. Obviously, however, pranks

⁵⁹ See above, p. 152.

⁶⁰ See below, p. 171.

⁶¹ See below, p. 172.

⁶² The fact that he prevents the encounter between Fluellen, his own representative, and Williams, the Oedipally-rebellious son, from developing into a quarrel, shows again that, in order to satisfy his super-ego, Henry will not let a symbolic Oedipal rebellion develop. See above, p. 149.

are not a substitute for a mature and balanced personality. In order to keep the facade of virtuousness, Henry has to make a strenuous effort to repress id impulses. Consequently, he tends to deny himself all sensuous pleasures. Henry unconsciously feels, for example, that he is living in sin with the mother-image, and so he imposes on himself what at times looks like asceticism. The mechanism that enforces this new way of life is anal in nature. Thus not only does Henry become the paragon of virtue; he also wants his subjects and soldiers--symbolically, the repressed id impulses--to be models. Among Scroop's virtues, for example, Henry mentions that the conspirator has been "spare in diet" (H V, II.ii.131). Henry forbids the plundering of conquered cities. When Bardolph offends, he quickly learns that in the army of the virtuous King an offense entails severe punishment (H V, III.vi.113-114). Bardolph's case is interesting in another respect too. Bardolph stole from "mother-church." Henry, because of his attempt to shift responsibility to God, the father-image, is very religious; more importantly, however, he has internalized the figure of mother-church, which is, by virtue of its control over Henry, a domineering mother-image. When Bardolph offends that image, he offends against the domineering mother, whose role Henry assumes. Therefore Bardolph receives punishment appropriate to the offending son.⁶³

Henry's identification with the domineering mother throws yet more light on his prohibition against plundering. The severe mother forbids the children, who have misbehaved, to enjoy themselves orally. In

⁶³ In disobeying Henry's order not to plunder, Bardolph also offends against the father-image (King Henry). Thus his punishment is also the punishment, administered by the father to the Oedipally-rebellious son.

attempting to "swallow" France, Henry has misbehaved orally. He has therefore acquired guilt. The guilt, of course, is another indication of his oral fixation. He says to Katharine that he loves France so well that he will not give up a single village in it (H V, V.ii.183-184). Retentivity adds to the crime of greed and increases Henry's guilt. However, since Henry visualizes the soldiers as repressed id impulses, he projects the guilt--and the punishment--onto them. The punishment, apart from being anal in its strictness, has an oral symbolism, too: the domineering mother (Henry) is withholding the food (the loot) from the children (the soldiers).

On another occasion Henry again adopts the role of the mother, but this time he symbolically gives food rather than withholds it. Henry has to deal with a rebellious filial figure, or a rebellious id impulse, Williams. He has no reason to hang Williams and thereby solve the problem. As domineering mother-figure, however, Henry has another avenue of action: re-acquiring the son's obedience by tempting him with food. Henry offers Williams money, or, symbolically, food. Marilyn Williamson observes that Henry is using Eastcheap tactics here. Though compensating someone else with money for his own mistake was useful in the Boar's Head Tavern, it does not become a king. Williamson concludes that at this point Henry does not seem to have matured since his Eastcheap days.⁶⁴ Indeed, in one respect Henry has certainly not matured: he still suffers from his oral fixation.

Henry's oral sadism expresses itself in his descriptions of the horrors of war. In reply to the Dauphin's tennis-balls present, for

⁶⁴ Marilyn L. Williamson, "The Episode with Williams in Henry V," Studies in English Literature 1500-1900, 9 (1969), 280.

example, Henry gives a sonorous description of the war that he will wage in his effort to return the insult:

. . . for many a thousand widows
 Shall this his mock mock out of their dear husbands,
 Mock mothers from their sons, mock castles down;
 And some are yet ungotten and unborn
 That shall have cause to curse the Dauphin's scorn.
 (H V, I.ii.284-288)

To the inhabitants of Harfleur Henry describes how horrible the results of a battle would be:

The gates of mercy shall be all shut up,
 And the fleshed soldier, rough and hard of heart,
 In liberty of bloody hand shall range
 With conscience wide as Hell, mowing like grass
 Your fresh-fair virgins and your flowering infants.
 (H V, III.iii.10-14)

In a similar way, his ironic dialogue with the conspirators is intentionally cruel (H V, II.ii.71-144).

Finally, it is clear that Henry expects to receive gains from his war in France--and from life in general. He calls the French enemy an "outward conscience" (H V, IV.1.8); I have suggested that this name proves that he regards the enemy as a parental figure.⁶⁵ Henry also says that by learning a lesson from the enemy, he is gathering honey from weeds (H V, IV.1.11). The enemy--the parent against whom Henry rebels, the parent who creates Henry's conscience--is thus also a source of food, or the mother-image. Since this source may be unpleasant (weeds can be thorny), it is possible that Henry is referring to the figure of the domineering mother. The mother-figure whom Henry has achieved upon accession to the throne has disappointed him. As already noted,⁶⁶ he

⁶⁵ Chapter Two, p. 67.

⁶⁶ Chapter Two, pp. 72.

expected to find love and warmth; instead he finds ceremony. It is certain that his disappointment has an oral aspect, too. Henry expected to find a mother who would, symbolically, feed him. This is why he asks Ceremony, on the eve of Agincourt, "What are thy rents? What are thy comings-in?" (H V, IV.i.260). Henry does not ask, for example, "What can I do for my country?" but rather, in effect, "What can my position as king give me?" This desire to receive is, of course, an oral trait.

Furthermore, Henry is apparently intent on retaining all he receives. I have mentioned his declaration that he would not give up a single French village. His retentiveness also underlies his reluctance to have reinforcements sent from England. Henry himself explains clearly:

The fewer men, the greater share of honor.

.

. . . if it be a sin to covet honor,

I am the most offending soul alive.

(H V, IV.iii.22, 28-29)

Henry's words immediately remind one of Hotspur's speech on honor.⁶⁷

As I have suggested, both Henry (as prince and as king) and Hotspur suffer from obsessive doubt that leads to a repetition-compulsion.⁶⁸ Henry's repetition-compulsion expresses itself in his recurrent attempts to take possession, symbolically, of the mother-image. Thus he escapes to the people of England (the mother-image), returns to the court and becomes King of England (the mother-image again), goes to France to take the country (the mother-image) and from its king (the father-image), and marries Katharine (still another mother-image).

⁶⁷ 1 H IV, I.iii.201-207. See above, p. 137.

⁶⁸ See above, p. 138.

There is, however, a difference between Hotspur and Henry in this respect. Whereas Hotspur sets himself goals that are unrealistic (as, plucking honor from the face of the moon, 1 H IV, I.iii.202), attempts to achieve them without sufficient means of doing so (he goes to battle with too small a force to win, 1 H IV, IV.i.28-30, 131-134), and consequently dies in his attempt to achieve his aims, Henry is more realistic. Although, as I have submitted, Henry does not outgrow his Oedipal and pre-Oedipal fixations even by the end of Henry V, he has internalized the reality principle sufficiently to cease to attempt impossible projects. For example, until the way to return to the court (possession of the mother) is open (his father is dead), he does not attempt to do so. He does, however, come dangerously close to rushing into battle suicidally, like Hotspur. This is when he rejects the idea of summoning reinforcements from England and decides to go to battle with a force obviously inferior to the French force (H V, IV.iii.28-33).

Another advantage of Henry over Hotspur is Henry's unconscious ability to identify and visualize his problem. In the child it is the super-ego, the internalization of the severe parental figure training the child in the anal period, that intervenes when the anally-obsessed person is about to fulfill a desire. Henry conceptualizes this authority as God. By appeasing God with deeds of penitence, as I have suggested, Henry is able, so to speak, to trick his super-ego and enjoy at least a partial satisfaction of his desires.⁶⁹ Henry does not succeed completely, however. The

⁶⁹ Although Henry projects onto God qualities which have originally been qualities of the severe mother-image, he does not necessarily visualize God as a mother-figure. Rather, he projects on him only those qualities which cause Henry's anal obsession, such as severity and suspicion; thus Henry is able to trick these qualities of the super-ego.

super-ego's criticism makes him restless, and he soon feels (in response to the repetition-compulsion) the need to abandon his achievements in favor of another attempt to fulfill his Oedipal desires.

Henry's need to appease God (the super-ego) is, as I have submitted, at the basis of his piety. His sense of guilt springs from his identification with the Oedipal act of his father, Henry IV, who has usurped the throne, and from his own Oedipal wishes to take England, the mother-image, away from his father. It is likely that Henry unconsciously sees in his behavior a reflection of the original sin, Adam's Oedipal rebellion against God. Despite God's command, Adam bit into an apple (a female sexual symbol). The snake, an obvious phallic symbol was instrumental in causing this contact between Adam's teeth (again, phallic symbols) and the forbidden apple. God, the father-figure, feeling threatened by this sudden virility⁷⁰ of the son, Adam, drove him out of the Garden of Eden.

If Henry V (or Hal) unconsciously sees Adam's fall in his own guilt, he may also want to internalize Jesus' atonement for Adam's sin. In this connection, Jesus is the son-figure and Adam is the father-figure. In imitating Jesus' penitential pilgrimage as a poor and meek outcast among men, Henry V may want to atone for his own father's sin (the usurpation), in which he unconsciously sees his own guilt.

Twice Henry V goes on a pilgrimage and becomes a poor stranger among others. The first time is when, as a prince, he escapes from the court to the lowly company of thieves, and the second time is when he

⁷⁰ "Knowledge"; the verb "know" in the Bible also means "commit sexual intercourse." Eating from the Tree of Knowledge thus symbolizes the acquisition of virility.

leaves a life of peace in the court to become a soldier in a foreign land, leader of an army "with sickness much enfeebled" (H V, III.vi.154).

Henry IV, Hal's father, has also planned a pilgrimage to atone for his sin (R II, V.vi.49-50), but, because his sense of guilt was stronger (he had actually committed an Oedipally-motivated crime), he planned a much more difficult atonement than his son's. Henry IV envisaged an actual crusade. For the king of a country troubled with wars and rebellion, a trip to the Holy Land was almost impossible. His son's penitential pilgrimages are more realistic and more achievable.

Interestingly enough, Hal's pilgrimages also echo Adam's expulsion from the Garden of Eden. In this respect they are direct punishment administered by the super-ego (God) for the Oedipal wish. The fact that there are two such pilgrimages indicates once more the presence of the repetition-compulsion in Henry V and the recurring demands of the Oedipal wish. To the extent that religious ceremonies are repeated sublimations of the wish to rebel against God, and to the extent that the repetition of these ceremonies shows that this rebellious wish is obsessive, Henry's piety and the recurrence of his penitential pilgrimages indicate an underlying anal-obsessive desire to achieve the Oedipal goal. In this obsession Henry is very similar to Hotspur.⁷¹

The recurrence of the pilgrimages indicates that, like Hotspur, Henry suffers from a repetition-compulsion. This compulsion also expresses itself in Henry's recurrent attempts to possess the mother-image (the escape from the court to the people; the friendship with Falstaff as the

⁷¹ See above, pp. 138-139.

representative of the people; the return to the court as king; the war in France; the marriage with Katharine). To the end of Henry V, then, Henry does not succeed in outgrowing his anal and oral fixations.

E. Fluellen as a Reflection of Hal

Fluellen, Henry's parallel in the Oedipal and homosexual respects, is Henry's parallel in the anal and oral fixations too. Fluellen refers compulsively to the law.⁷² Apparently in order to be able to repress undesirable id drives, he acts strictly by the rules of warfare, and he can thus feel secure. If he has done something according to the law, he cannot be wrong, and even if he is, Fluellen is not to blame.

Besides his Oedipal and homosexual drives,⁷³ Fluellen has to repress anal and oral tendencies. These tendencies, however, find expression in sublimated ways. The very adherence to law is anal in nature; Fluellen exercises will to keep an unwanted impulse under control. He has learned, symbolically, to control his bowel movements. Moreover, he is willing to extend his severe self-control to others. He classifies people as good and bad. The good ones follow the rules of war; the bad ones do not. Thus, while he criticizes Captain Macmorris for not being proficient in the rules of war (H V, III.iii.74-77), he praises Captain Jamy for abiding by these principles (ll. 81-87).

When he professes a willingness to have even his brother executed for breaking the law (H V, III.vi.56-58), Fluellen's willingness to extend

⁷² Chapter Two, p. 78 ; Chapter Three, p. 110.

⁷³ Chapter Two, p. 74 ; Chapter Three, pp. 110-113.

the control of the law to others reaches a sadistic extreme. Similarly, Henry V, by punishing Scroop (H V, II.ii)⁷⁴ and agreeing to Bardolph's hanging (H V, III.vi.113-114), has extended the control of his own severe super-ego to others. Fluellen, Henry's fellow countryman and parallel, identifies with the authority (the law). As a result he regards himself as a legal authority in his own right.

Fluellen shows signs of an oral fixation as well. His most striking characteristic is probably his wordy, repetitious, and sometimes ungrammatical style. He finds great pleasure in talking. To Gower's disagreement with his comparison of Henry to Alexander the Great, he declares: "It is not well, mark you now, to take the tales out of my mouth ere it is made and finished" (H V, IV.vii.44-46). The figure of speech here arouses an association with food, and is reminiscent of the fear that I have suggested existed in Henry's childhood, namely, that of food not being available in the future.⁷⁵

Fluellen's identification with authority and the pleasure he derives from oral indulgence explain his gift of a coin to Williams (H V, IV.viii.67-72). Williams' explanation of the quarrel with Henry has made the soldier innocent in the eyes of the law (the King). Fluellen, who feels secure when he sides with the law, and who consequently regards himself as an authority, identifies with the King. Forgiving Williams

⁷⁴ Henry calls Scroop's crime "another fall of man" (H V, II.ii.142). In punishing such a tendency in Scroop, Henry represses the same inclination (i.e., the Oedipal wish) in himself.

⁷⁵ The figure of speech is also reminiscent of the oral-sexual element in Fluellen's (and Henry's) psyche; see Chapter Three, pp. 111-113.

for the blow on the ear, he gives the soldier what he regards as the best manifestation of good-will: money, or, symbolically, food. Insofar as Fluellen conceptualizes money as feces, Fluellen is reminiscent here of the infant who gives his feces as a present and regards it as a suitable token of good-will. Fluellen's present to Williams, then, indicates anal traits in the giver.

Fluellen's orality has a sadistic manifestation, too. His criticism of the King (H V, IV.vii) is reminiscent of Hal's "biting" remarks.⁷⁶ At another time Fluellen turns this sadism, fused with anal strictness, against himself and his fellow-soldiers. He holds that, although the enemy is noisy, he and his friends must obey the law and refrain from talking aloud (H V, IV.i.65-83). Anal strictness here contrasts with the wish for oral pleasure, and it represses that wish.

Finally, apparently for reasons discussed above,⁷⁷ Fluellen relaxes his super-ego and forces Pistol to eat the leek. This scene (H V, V.i) is unusual in that here Fluellen does not even mention the laws of war. He allows himself the simple selfish pleasure of taking revenge. His orality, anality, and sadism emerge fully in this scene. The revenge is oral in nature: forcing someone to eat hateful food. The fact that Fluellen forces his will upon the eater is expressive of anal strictness and sadism. The fact that the figure who gives food (ordinarily, the mother-figure) and the figure who forces strict discipline are here one person, and the fact that such a figure probably existed for Henry, Hotspur, and Aumerle (who are parallels to each other and to Fluellen), make it

⁷⁶ See above, p. 126.

⁷⁷ Chapter Two, p. 79; Chapter Three, pp. 111-113.

possible to surmise the existence of a domineering mother in Fluellen's past as well. Fluellen's anal adherence to the law may thus be a result of an identification with an aggressor, the domineering mother. It is possible that this mother has withheld food as punishment for misbehavior, or that the infant Fluellen has for some reason believed it was because of his misbehavior that food did not arrive. Fluellen's orality probably indicates the reason for his subordination to the mother: fear that food would not be available in the future. To abide by the law, to be a "good boy," or, in other words, to incorporate the strict mother-image, would guarantee him food. The security that Fluellen feels when he manifests his adherence to the law is, then, a feeling of certainty that food will be available.

When Fluellen sees that the King defies the law (by performing, for example, a symbolic Oedipal act which goes unpunished), the Welshman may unconsciously have decided to do the same. He dispenses with the law. He relies heavily, however, on his identification with the authoritative figure, the mother-image, who could create her own law. By virtue of his identification with her, he is now the law, and so he punishes Pistol severely--and as befits the domineering mother, uses an oral punishment. He does not, however, justify his action as being according to the traditional discipline of war.

Fluellen also echoes Henry's prankishness. In the leek-eating scene (H V, V.i), Fluellen imposes his will on Pistol. I have suggested that in doing so Fluellen may be playing the role of the domineering mother who imposes her will and her rules on the child. Since Fluellen himself

probably had such a mother, his forcing Pistol to eat the leek may be an attempt to put another in the place that he himself has occupied, that of the dominated son, in order to be able to observe this person in that position from a distance. It is possible that in Fluellen's case this externalization of the problem helps eliminate it. Fluellen, as I have mentioned, does not refer to the laws of war in the leek-eating scene, and it is not impossible that he has freed himself of the influence of the domineering mother.⁷⁸ However, Fluellen does not appear again after this scene, and it is impossible to determine whether this is really the case or not.

Shakespeare has repeated the motif of the anal and oral fixations, with the accompanying sadistic and prankish traits, in the figure of Fluellen. Thus Shakespeare created an often comic parallel that emphasizes the existence of these problems in Henry V. At the basis of these problems, I have tried to show, is the figure of the domineering mother. The existence of such a mother-figure in Henry V's past can explain, as well as receive substantiation from, a number of incidents in the Second Tetralogy.

F. The Domineering Mother-Figure

The figure of the domineering mother can further explain, for example, the homosexual tendencies in Hal and in Henry V which resulted from identification with an aggressor. The young Hal, who identifies with the mother-image, develops feminine character traits, and these traits

⁷⁸ See Chapter Three, p. 112.

lead him towards homosexuality later. The war in France can serve as a model of this process. Henry derives his claim to the French throne from a woman-ancestor (H V, I.ii.33-95), or a mother-image. It is a paradox that Henry's seemingly most manly action--the war--is partly due to identification with the mother-figure. Moreover, in fighting the war, Henry, as if under the aegis of the mother-image, is actually fighting for her rights in France. Since the war, as I explained above, is at one level a homosexual conflict, the war in France demonstrates how the domineering mother-figure drives Henry from peaceful domestic life to quarrelsome homosexuality.

Similarly, Henry's awkward courtship of Katharine is due to Henry's unconscious fear that the mother will not be pleased with his attention to another woman.⁷⁹ This fear results both from the mother-dependence and from the Oedipus complex. Katharine, also, however, is partly a mother-figure (she is the woman whom Henry acquires through his Oedipal war in France), and this is why Henry, in order to allay his fears of arousing the mother's anger, asks Katharine to teach him how to court (H V, V.ii.98-101). If she agrees, she is probably not angry with Henry for courting. Not surprisingly, Henry, describing his performance in the French language, refers to the French that he speaks as "a new married wife about her husband's neck, hardly to be shook off" (H V, V.ii.189-191). The image is that of a woman attempting to hold a man against his will. Because Katharine is also a mother-image, Henry fears that if he marries

⁷⁹ There are other reasons, too, for the awkward courtship. See Chapter Two, pp. 83-87, and Chapter Three, pp. 112-113.

her, he will have a domineering woman for wife. Henry's fear of courting women without the mother's permission, and his impression of women as domineering mother-images, could certainly encourage a trend to homosexuality.

A domineering mother in his past helps to explain Henry's lack of initiative and his flight from responsibility. An infant who is dependent on a domineering mother, and who arouses her displeasure by his very attempts to be independent, will find it difficult, as an adult, to make decisions. If Henry indeed had a domineering mother whose figure he has internalized as part of his super-ego, then the very attempt on his part to decide on an action, regardless of whether the action be moral or not, will automatically arouse his super-ego's displeasure. To be able to initiate and perform any action of some consequence, Henry will have to have the authorization of some authority-figure. Then he will be able to satisfy his super-ego that he has taken no rebellious step against the authority of the mother-image.

The figure of the domineering mother can also further explain Hal's (and Henry V's) sadism. I have mentioned the attempts of an infant to bite the mother's breast, or incorporate it, lest it disappear. This fear, causing the child's dependence upon the mother, makes it possible for the mother-image to become dominating. In later years the person, in behaving sadistically, symbolically repeats the biting with the teeth. In addition, the person with a domineering mother in his past may try, as an adult, to reconstruct the situation that existed between his parents. Now, however, he will play the mother (with whom he has identified), and he will unconsciously assign to someone else the role of the father.⁸⁰

⁸⁰ Or the child; see below, p. 170.

This attempt at reconstructing childhood experiences may, more specifically, be an attempt to reconstruct the primal scene.⁸¹ In the adult reconstruction, the person will play the mother, and just as the mother in the scene he unconsciously remembers had played the active part, so he may attempt to expose the other involuntary actor, the father, as weaker than himself, i.e., impotent.

Prince Hal once threatened to fight the lustiest knight in his father's court with a glove taken from a brothel (R II, V.iii.16-19). The glove, though it may serve as a phallic symbol,⁸² also resembles an udder. It is possible that Hal is threatening to reconstruct the primal scene with his father's representative (symbolically, his father himself) playing the husband role, and with himself playing the domineering wife. In the tournament Hal will, allegedly, "unhorse" the man. Symbolically, he will deprive him of the manly position in sexual intercourse. In doing so, Hal will reenact the primal scene.

The cases mentioned in Chapter Two,⁸³ where Hal symbolically castrates Falstaff, are partly due to Hal's tendency to reconstruct the primal scene. For example, Hal knows that Poins has taken Falstaff's horse, but he refuses to help the knight find it (1 H IV, II.ii.41). He later provides Falstaff with a "charge of foot" (1 H IV, III.iii.185), a position in which the knight will have to walk and not ride. In both cases, Hal deprives a father-figure of the manly position. The play

⁸¹ See above, pp. 123, 127, 131, 133.

⁸² See Chapter Three, p. 110.

⁸³ pp. 26-34.

impromptu (1 H IV, II.iv) also echoes the primal scene. Before the actual play impromptu, Hal has planned a different play, in which he will play Hotspur and Falstaff will play his wife (1 H IV, II.iv.106-107). This play never takes place,⁸⁴ but in the play that the two stage it is likely that the husband-wife relationship is latently present. As in earlier cases, Hal, in depriving Falstaff of the superior position, that of a king, symbolically plays the role of the domineering wife.

When Hal becomes Henry V, he gains authority over others. Thus, in addition to playing the domineering wife, he may see himself as a mother-figure (an authority figure) to his subjects. As such, he will try to dominate them as his mother dominated him. Furthermore, since his mother's domination and his Oedipus complex have made him incapable of normal relationship with women, he will now attempt at times to do the same to the people to whom he assigns the role of the child; that is, he will try, symbolically, to castrate them. The very first such act that Henry commits is the rejection of Falstaff.

I have suggested that Hal is, because of his higher social status, a father-figure to Falstaff.⁸⁵ By the same token, however, he may be a mother-figure whom Falstaff expects to provide him with shelter.⁸⁶ By withdrawing himself and his protection from Falstaff, Hal may be

⁸⁴ If it did take place, Hal would have been in the role of the impotent male (father) rather than in the role of the domineering mother. Perhaps this is why he unconsciously decides to forget the idea of this play.

⁸⁵ Chapter Two, p. 39.

⁸⁶ See 1 H IV, I.ii.23-29, where Falstaff asks Hal for protection when Hal is king, and 1 H IV, II.iv.490-493, where Hal shelters Falstaff from the Sheriff. See also Chapter Two, pp. 39-40.

reconstructing his own mother's death. As his mother, Mary Bohun, in her death, withdrew her love and protection from Hal, so Hal, assuming the mother's role, withdraws his friendship and the benefits that could come with it from Falstaff (the son-figure in this context).

Henry V forbids his soldiers to plunder in France (H V, III.vi. 114-120). In doing so he is probably reenacting cases when his own mother forbade him to eat, or withheld food from him as punishment. When he learns that one of the soldiers has disobeyed the order, Henry wholeheartedly agrees to Bardolph's hanging (H V, III.vi.113-114). I have suggested that Bardolph's theft is like a theft from the mother.⁸⁷ Henry as the domineering mother punishes the thief with hanging, or, symbolically, castration. The fact that the hanging noose has a symbolic female significance demonstrates how the domineering mother utilizes the child's wish to return to the womb in order to dominate him, and, as Henry unconsciously sees it, castrate him (make him incapable of normal relationship with women).⁸⁸

Conversely, there are times when Henry, in the unconscious role of the domineering mother, treats people to whom he could assign the role of the father, or the son, with gentleness and respect. Thus he frees Douglas, a foe whom he could very well treat as a rebellious son and therefore symbolically castrate. Similarly, he forgives Williams and gives him money (or, Henry being the mother-figure, "food"), and so does not

⁸⁷ Chapter Three, p. 107.

⁸⁸ For a discussion of the homosexual significance of the hanging, see Chapter Three, pp. 107-108.

insist that he, Henry, and not the soldier, was right in their argument. Even towards Hotspur, although he does kill him, Hal expresses tenderness. Hal challenges the rebel like a brother, and after his death he treats him with affection. The reason for this tenderness and respect may simply be a reaction-formation against the sadism described above. However, it could also be feminine attraction towards masculine father/husband figures.⁸⁹ Unlike Falstaff or Bardolph, Hotspur and Douglas are not in a subservient position to Hal; and Williams, although he is Henry V's subject, does not hesitate, even when he knows that his adversary is the King, to blame Henry for the quarrel. Hal, and later Henry, identifying with the domineering mother, may also feel, as she may have felt, the need for a strong masculine figure. This figure he finds in the rebellious figures of Hotspur, Douglas, and Williams. It is also possible, of course, that Henry's leniency towards these people is due to his Oedipal identification with them as rebellious sons. Interestingly enough, other rebellious characters, the conspirators Scroop, Grey, and Cambridge, do not qualify for Henry's affection. The reason is probably that they have not been manly and brave. They have conspired secretly against Henry and, unlike Hotspur, Douglas, and Williams, never planned to face him as enemies. And whereas Williams, for example, insisted that he has not done anything that deserves punishment, the conspirators, upon being accused, immediately admit their guilt.

Another reason for Henry's attitude towards the conspirators is probably the fact that they have not guarded their secret closely. This

⁸⁹ See above, Chapter Three, p. 97.

fact, as well as their immediate admission of guilt, may indicate obsessive hesitation similar to that found in Aumerle, who has also let out his secret, and to that, of course, found in Henry himself.⁹⁰ Obviously, Henry will not admire indecision in others. Moreover, in treating the conspirators sadistically, Henry may be expressing his unconscious desire to repress obsessive indecision in himself.

In spite of the strong identification with the mother-image, Hal shows streaks of hatred towards her. The reason is possibly the fact that the mother is not with Hal. She does not appear in the plays, and the historical figure, Mary Bohun, died in 1384, when Hal was seven years old.⁹¹ This unconscious accusation of betrayal intensifies the Oedipal hatred that Hal feels towards the sexual mother-image.⁹² Evidently, there is also rebelliousness against the domineering qualities of the mother-image. Hal's escape from the court may be the outcome of such rebelliousness. The hatred for the mother-image finds expression, for example, in the symbolic castration of Falstaff. Falstaff is a mother-substitute to Hal, and the symbolic castration and degradation give vent to Hal's hatred of the mother-image. Returning the King's messenger "to my mother" (1 H IV, II.iv.287) expresses lack of respect for the mother, and allowing the Hostess to stand for the Queen in the play impromptu,⁹³

⁹⁰ See above, pp. 114-115.

⁹¹ D.N.B., Vol IX, p. 494.

⁹² See Chapter Two, p. 34.

⁹³ As Hal possibly does--see Chapter Two, pp. 34-35.

as well as expressing emotional affinity with the Hostess' husband,⁹⁴ show a derisive attitude towards the sexual mother. Hal's homosexual tendency may also derive in part from his hatred. If all women reflect the mother-image, they will automatically become the object of his hate. He will therefore turn to men for comfort.

Hotspur, Northumberland, Aumerle, and York, parallel to Hal in other respects, are also parallel to him with respect to the domineering mother. Aumerle's aggressive mother, in fact, actually appears, and Hotspur's Kate is a woman who apparently resembles his mother-figure. As in the case of Hal, the anal and oral fixations of these characters point towards domineering mother-images.

A few examples will illustrate how the influence of the domineering mother manifests itself. Hotspur's wife, for example, says to him at one point,

In faith, I'll break your little finger, Harry,
An if thou wilt not tell me all things true.
(1 H IV, II.iii.64-65)

The lines indicate to Hotspur that if he hides anything from his wife, he can expect her (symbolically) to castrate him. If Hotspur's wife is indeed like his mother, there is an echo here of the domineering mother, the mother who wants complete dominion over her son and who, if he does not submit, will castrate him.

At another time Hotspur's wife threatens:

Would'st thou have thy head broken?
(1 H IV, III.i.237)

⁹⁴ See Chapter Two, pp. 36-37.

Here again she symbolically threatens her husband with castration. In that her husband runs away from her to war, or, symbolically, homosexuality, Lady Hotspur indeed castrates him. Hotspur declares, "I love thee not" (1 H IV, II.iii.92), and calls, "God's me, my horse!" (1. 96), in order to get away from his wife. Like Hal, who escapes from the court because of his hatred of the domineering mother-image, Hotspur goes to war to escape a nagging wife. Hotspur's domineering mother-image, as reflected in Lady Hotspur, further explains, then, Hotspur's homosexuality and sadism.

Northumberland, before the Battle of Gaultree, allows his wife and Hotspur's wife to dissuade him from going to battle (2 H IV, II.iii). Although none of the women is Northumberland's mother, one of them is a mother (of Hotspur), and the other, being the wife of Hotspur, of whose virility Northumberland has been afraid and whom he therefore sent to death,⁹⁵ is like a mother-figure won by the son (Northumberland), who has killed the father-figure (Hotspur). Also, if Northumberland does have a mother-fixation, he has probably chosen a wife who resembles his mother. Thus the two women may be a composite mother-figure to Northumberland. The scene demonstrates how Northumberland gives in to the wishes of the mother-figure.

Aumerle's mother, who appears on stage, is certainly a domineering mother. Whereas Hotspur fights his wife's domination, Aumerle is submissive to his mother. Hotspur's wife demands that her husband tell her his secret; Aumerle comes before his mother with the secret list of conspirators ready not only for his father but also for his mother to

⁹⁵ See Chapter Two, pp. 41-43.

discover (R II, V.ii.56). Aumerle's unconscious purpose may be to get his mother's approval of a daring deed that he is about to perform. Similarly, Henry V asks Katharine of France to teach him how to court (H V, V.ii.98-101). Like Aumerle, who unconsciously wants his mother to approve of a conspiracy with a symbolically-Oedipal goal (the dethroning of Bolingbroke), Henry V wants Katharine (the mother-image) to approve of his intention of carrying out an Oedipally-motivated act (taking possession of Katharine, the mother-image). Another possible similarity between Aumerle and Henry is that Aumerle, like Henry, may be searching for a masculine (punishing) father/husband image. This is probably why Aumerle's pleading for his life before Bolingbroke is dispirited. Bolingbroke, by virtue of his authority, is a father-image, and if he were to punish Aumerle, he would become a substitute for the weak father-figure, York.

York himself has a weak character that indicates the possibility of the influence of a domineering mother. As I have mentioned, a child dependent on his mother's decisions finds it difficult to make up his mind as an adult. Like Hotspur, York does not love his wife. He suspects her of betraying him (R II, V.ii.104-109), and this suspicion is reminiscent of Hal's hypothetical hatred of a mother who, by dying, "deserted" him. Just as Hotspur wards off his wife's inquiries and calls for his horse (1 H IV, II.iii.96), so York ignores his wife's pleading and calls, "give me my boots I say, saddle my horse" (R II, V.ii.77). York, then, rebels against the authority of his wife (symbolically, the mother-image). This is why, when he discovers Aumerle's list of conspirators, he decides to

act without delay. He probably feels that if he were to allow his obsessive doubt to delay him, he would let his wife have her way. This is also why, in his indecision about whether or not to join Bolingbroke, he does not seek the decision of a mother-image; however, for that very reason he finds it hard to make up his mind.

One more figure similar to Henry V in respect to the domineering mother is Richard II. His having a domineering mother would explain why Richard has allowed men (Bushy, Bagot, and Green) to cause a divorce between him and his wife and to break the possession of the royal bed (R II, III.i.11-15). Richard sees his mother-image reflected in any woman; thus, as is the case with Hal (Henry), Richard's mother-image drives him to homosexuality.

Identification with the domineering mother would explain, as in Henry's case, Richard's anal splurging and oral confiscation of property, his taxation, and his delight in poetic (oral) speeches. It would also explain why Richard regards himself as the mother of England:

As a long-parted mother with her child
Plays fondly with her tears and smiles in meeting;
So, weeping, smiling, greet I thee, my earth,
And do thee favors with my royal hands.
(R II, III.ii.8-11)

But it is hatred towards the mother that helps to explain Richard's destructive rule over England (England being, in this case, the mother - image). It would also help to explain why Richard leaves England and why, when Bolingbroke rebels, the King almost willingly despairs: he is punishing himself as the mother-figure of England, and he is proving to that mother-figure that she has been a bad mother. She has let others hurt the child (England).

Richard never seriously protests before Bolingbroke, never accuses him of treason, and never tries to command him to dismiss his army and submit to justice. Like Henry V, Richard, identifying with the mother who did not have a real man at her side, and apparently being impressed with the masculine father/husband figure of Bolingbroke, submits to his superior power. In doing so, Richard expresses a homosexually-oriented submission to the virile usurper.

In conclusion, Hal (Henry V), as well as other characters in the Second Tetralogy, show the effects of the influence of a domineering mother on their characters. Hal is virtually preoccupied with the mother-figure. Such a preoccupation may be disastrous. Hamlet, for example, who struggles with a similar problem, solves it only at the time of his death. Hal, however, possibly because of his hatred of the mother-figure and his rebelliousness against her, leaves the court. Perhaps the distance from the court--symbolically, the family, or the mother-image--is what enables him to repress his problems (so that they appear mostly in a sublimated way) and function rather successfully as king.

V. Conclusion

It is the contention of this thesis that Prince Hal (later Henry V) never manages to outgrow the Oedipal stage, and that his Oedipus complex motivates him to attempt the forbidden Oedipal goal in symbolic ways. These assumptions explain much of his behavior.

Hal's own father Bolingbroke's usurpation of the throne from Richard II, a symbolic Oedipal act, arouses in the Prince the desire to do the same. Since Richard II has also been a father-figure to Hal, deep guilt-feelings develop in the Prince. Hal may wish to avenge the crime committed against the pseudo-father, Richard. However, in so doing he would be committing a similar crime against his real father, Henry IV.

In an attempt to escape from this conflict, Hal leaves the court. He is haunted, however, by his Oedipal desire. England being a symbolic mother-figure, the very escape to the people of England, Hal's tavern friends, represents an attempt to achieve the mother-image. In Falstaff Hal finds a composite representation of the father and the mother-images. He befriends Falstaff the mother-image and degrades--symbolically, castrates--Falstaff the father-image. He does the same thing to Henry IV. By saving Henry's life at the Battle of Shrewsbury, Hal degrades and symbolically castrates his real father as well. Hal is jealous of Hotspur, a rival for the throne of England (the mother-image). Hal's killing of Hotspur thus opens the way to the acquisition of the mother-image.

Hal has developed enough of a super-ego not to return to the court and try to usurp the throne, However, upon the death of Henry IV,

Hal becomes king. He immediately experiences deep guilt-feelings; he unconsciously feels that he is living in sin with England, the mother-image. Typically, he escapes from the English court to war in France; there, however, he symbolically repeats the Oedipal act: he defeats a king and takes a woman, Katharine, from that king's family. In other words, he again achieves a symbolic mother-image.

Although basically it is the Oedipus complex which motivates the behavior of Hal (Henry V), there are other factors at the basis of his behavior. Seeing the mother-image reflected in any woman, he will regard heterosexual relationships as incestuous. In addition, whereas his father, Henry IV, is weak, there are indications that Hal's mother is domineering. Identification with the strong mother plus fear of incest may cause Hal to display latent homosexual tendencies.

At times, Hal projects his homosexual tendencies onto possible male love-objects. By degrading them and treating them sadistically, he tries to repress the homosexual tendencies in himself. Thus the attempt to repress homosexuality is one reason for Hal's degradation of Falstaff and for his desire to kill Hotspur.

It is possible that Henry V's relationship with Scroop is one point where his homosexual tendencies become overt; his escape from the court (the incestuous marriage) to war (a homosexual milieu, where men stab other men) again expresses his homosexuality symbolically. In France Henry gives vent to his homosexual sadism in different acts of war, such as the attack on Harfleur and the Battle of Agincourt. Finally, the King's encounters with Williams--before and after the Battle of Agincourt--carry symbolic overtones of homosexual relations.

Together with the Oedipus complex and the homosexual tendencies, there are in Hal (Henry V) indications of an anal fixation. The reason for this fixation may have been severe training during the anal period. An anal fixation may result in obsessive doubt: the person regards the achievement of pleasure, such as sexual pleasure, as the achievement of anal pleasure in disguise. Severe restrictions put on the achievement of anal pleasure prevent the person from wholeheartedly enjoying his accomplishments and cause him to retrace his steps. However, the desire to achieve the pleasure remains, and the process of trying and failing will repeat itself. It will, in other words, develop into a repetition-compulsion.

Hal's obsessive hesitation results in obsessive indecisiveness and in a flight from responsibility. The Prince initiates very little action (he does not, for example, leave the tavern to return to the court), and when he does act he tries to foist off upon authority-figures the responsibility. Thus he asks the Archbishop of Canterbury to authorize the war in France, and he then gives all credit for the victory to God.

The Prince, later the King, even tries to transfer the burden of the need to solve his psychological conflicts to others. He plays pranks, in which he projects onto people conflicting drives in himself, and he hopes to have these people solve the conflict. Thus, for instance, projecting his Oedipal desire to rebel against his father upon Francis, the drawer in the Boar's Head tavern, Hal asks the boy whether he would dare break his indenture with the vintner. In other cases, Hal himself adopts a role in the prank. During the play impromptu, a staging of his Oedipal desire to depose his father, he plays the father; and with

Williams (in Henry V) he plays the domineering mother who tries to pacify a rebellious son (Williams) with food.

In connection with the anal fixation, the figure of a possible domineering mother comes into view. The presence of such a figure will further explain the fixation itself, as well as the lack of ability to make decisions. An infant accustomed to receiving instruction from a domineering mother unconsciously regards it as misbehavior to make his own decisions as an adult. The influence of a domineering mother, a strong character with whom the child identifies, also further explains Hal's latent homosexuality. Excessive identification with the mother-figure rather than with the father-figure encourages the development of homosexual tendencies.

The domineering mother-image also has to do with the oral fixation which manifests itself in Hal's behavior. One possible reason for such a fixation is irregular feeding during the oral period. As a result, the infant becomes dependent upon the mother, the source of food. He may fear that disobeying her will entail the withholding of food as punishment. Later, as an adult, he will display sadistic characteristics, which will be an adult version of the infant's biting the mother's breast for fear that it may disappear.

If Hal had such an oral fixation, he would have been likely to feel a special dependence on the mother-figure and develop an early sadism. The birth of two younger brothers during the first two years of his life probably added to the oral frustration, for these younger brothers would take away from Hal some of the food, love, and attention he had become used to.

To put it in terms of chronological stages of development, Prince Hal was born to a weak father and a domineering mother. During the oral period, probably because of irregular feeding, the Prince developed an oral fixation plus a dependence upon the mother (the source of food). Because of severe training in the anal period he developed an anal fixation, which intensified his dependence on the mother. With the anal fixation, Hal developed obsessive doubt and a tendency to avoid responsibility.

Fear of the father usually helps resolve the Oedipus complex; however, Prince Hal had a weak father. As a result, when the Prince reached the Oedipal stage, he apparently was unable to outgrow his Oedipus complex. To what degree he succeeded in repressing it is unclear. However, when he saw his own father, Henry IV, usurp the throne of England, Hal may unconsciously have conceived of the deed as an Oedipal act. Whether he remained fixated at, or regressed to, the Oedipal stage is not clear. In any event, Hal acts like someone who has an Oedipus complex. As a result, seeing the mother-image reflected in any woman, he developed homosexual tendencies.

The death of Hal's mother when he was seven reinforced all the above traits. It increased the fear that food would not be available (oral fixation). Since the deprivation may have appeared as expression of extreme dissatisfaction on the part of the domineering mother, it may have intensified Hal's incorporation of her strict rules (anal strictness); and it may have appeared as a punishment of the child and of the mother for the child's sinful Oedipal wish, and thus may have enhanced the power of the guilt-feelings resulting from the Oedipus complex.

In the Second Tetralogy, therefore, Shakespeare portrays the figure of Prince Hal, who, because of certain psychological factors--mainly, an unresolved Oedipus complex--escapes from home to become a prodigal son. When the Prince becomes King Henry V, he undergoes a transformation: the prodigal son becomes a virtuous king. The transformation, however, is only external. It consists of an attempt on the King's part to repress certain modes of behavior which strengthen the Oedipal guilt that he unconsciously entertains. The King does not solve his psychological difficulties. To the very end he retains his oral, anal, and Oedipal fixations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, Franz. "A Note on Falstaff." Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 2 (1933), 592-606.
- Bradley, A. C. "The Rejection of Falstaff," in Oxford Lectures on Poetry. London: Macmillan and Company, 1950, pp. 247-75.
- Burns, Landon C. "Three Views of King Henry V." Drama Survey (Minneapolis), 1 (1962), 278-300.
- Campbell, Lily B. Shakespeare's Histories. San Marino, Calif.: The Huntington Library, 1963.
- Claeyssens, Astere E. "Henry IV Part I," in Lectures on Four of Shakespeare's History Plays, no ed. Pittsburgh: Carnegie Institute of Technology, 1953, pp. 19-34.
- Dictionary of National Biography. ed. Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee. 22 vols. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1908-1909.
- Dowden, Edward. Shakespeare. A Critical Study of his Mind and Art. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1875.
- Egan, Robert. "A Muse of Fire: Henry V in the Light of Tamburlaine." Modern Language Quarterly, 29 (1968), 15-28.
- Empson, W. Some Versions of Pastoral. London: Chatto and Windus, 1935.
- Faber, M. D. "Oedipal Patterns in Henry IV." Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 36 (1967), 426-34.
- Fenichel, Otto. The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1945.
- Freud, Sigmund. A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis. Trans. Joan Riviere. New York: Perma Giants, 1949.
- _____. An Outline of Psycho-Analysis. Trans. James Strachey. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1949.
- _____. Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego. Trans. James Strachey. New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation, 1951.
- _____. The Ego and the Id. Trans. Joan Riviere; Ed. James Strachey. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1960.

- _____. The Interpretation of Dreams. Trans. James Strachey. New York: Basic Books, Inc., n.d.
- Glover, Edward. Psycho-Analysis. London: Staples Press, 1949.
- Gross, Alan G. "The Justification of Prince Hal." Texas Studies in Literature and Language, 10 (1968), 27-35.
- Grotjahn, Martin. Beyond Laughter. New York: McGraw Hill, 1957.
- Hall, Calvin S. A Primer of Freudian Psychology. New York: The New American Library, 1954.
- Holland, Norman N. Psychoanalysis and Shakespeare. New York: McGraw Hill, 1966.
- Hosley, Richard, ed. Shakespeare's Holinshed. New York: Capricorn Books, 1968.
- Hunter, William B. Jr. "Prince Hal, His Struggle Toward Moral Perfection," in Henry IV Part I. Ed. James L. Sanderson. New York: Norton and Company, 1962, pp. 172-82.
- Jameson, Thomas H. The Hidden Shakespeare. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1969.
- Jones, Ernest. Hamlet and Oedipus. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1954 [first published 1949].
- Jorgensen, Paul A. "The Courtship Scene in Henry V." Modern Language Quarterly, 11 (1950), 180-88.
- Keirce, William F. "Henry V," in Lectures on Four of Shakespeare's History Plays. no ed. Pittsburgh: Carnegie Institute of Technology, 1953, pp. 53-69.
- Kelly, Robert L. "Shakespeare's Scroop and the Spirit of Cain." Shakespeare Quarterly, 20 (1969), 71-80.
- Knights, L. C. "Shakespeare's Politics," in Proceedings of the British Academy, 1957. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1958, pp. 115-132.
- Kris, Ernst. "Prince Hal's Conflict." Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 41 (1962), 58-60.
- McGuire, Richard L. "The Play-Within-the Play in 1 Henry IV." Shakespeare Quarterly, 18 (1967), 47-52.
- Rank, Otto. "Das 'Schauspiel in Hamlet'." Imago, 4 (1915), 41-45.

- Reese, M. M. "Henry V," in Twentieth Century Interpretations of Henry V. Ed. Ronald Berman. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1968, pp. 88-93.
- Ribner, Irving. The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1957.
- Rossiter, A.P. "Ambivalence: The Dialectic of the Histories," in Angel With Horns. New York: Longman, Green and Company, 1961, pp. 40-64.
- Schutte, William M. "Henry IV Part II," in Lectures on Four of Shakespeare's History Plays. no ed. Pittsburgh: Carnegie Institute of Technology, 1953, pp. 35-52.
- Sen Gupta, S. C. Shakespeare's Historical Plays. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1964.
- Shakespeare, William. Hamlet, ed. Cyrus Hoy. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1963.
- _____. King Richard II. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1968.
- _____. The First Part of the History of Henry IV. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1968.
- _____. The Life of King Henry the Fifth, in Shakespeare, the Complete Works, ed. G. B. Harrison. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1948.
- _____. The Second Part of the History of Henry IV. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1968.
- Sharpe, Ella Freeman. Collected Papers on Psychoanalysis, ed. Marjorie Brierley. London: Houghton Press, 1950.
- Sjoberg, Elsa. "From Madcap Prince to King: The Evolution of Prince Hal." Shakespeare Quarterly, 20 (1969), 11-16.
- Tillyard, E. M. W. Shakespeare's History Plays. London: Chatto and Windus, 1948.
- Traversi, Derek. Shakespeare from Richard II to Henry V. Stanford, Calif. Stanford Univ. Press, 1957.
- Van Doren, Mark. Shakespeare. New York: H. Hall and Company, 1939.
- White, Sidney Howard. "What Freudian Death-Wish in the Crown 'Borrowing' in 2 Henry IV?" Ball State Teachers College FORUM. Vol. 5, no. 3 (1964), 42-44.

Williamson, Marilyn L. "The Episode with Williams in Henry V." Studies in English Literature 1500-1900, 9 (1969) 275-82.

Wilson, J. Dover. "Falstaff and the Prince," in Shakespeare's Histories, ed. Eugene M. Waith. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.