

天主教輔仁大學英國語文學系學士班畢業成果
ENGLISH DEPARTMENT, FU JEN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY
GRADUATION PROJECT 2018

指導教授：劉紀雯老師

Dr. Kate Liu

真善美聖

**A Princely Education: How Hal Learns to Perform Kingship
in *I Henry IV***

SANCTITAS BONITAS

PULCHRITUDO

VERITAS

學生：楊紫涵 撰

Cathy Tzu-Han Yang

Cathy Yang

403110711

CCIII – Sec. C Prof. Kate

26 July 2017

RP Final Draft: Outline

Title: “A Princely Education: How Hal Learns to Perform Kingship in *I Henry IV*”

I. Introduction

- A. Thesis: Indeed, in *I Henry IV*, Shakespeare portrays the concept of kingship as a matter of performance. Central to the development of Prince Hal’s own performative ruling archetype are three key figures – the King, Falstaff, and Hotspur, who serve different roles, an authority figure, a mentor, and a rival, respectively, in teaching Hal the art of performance as applied to kingship.

II. Literature Review (Context)

- A. This paper deals with only part one of Henry IV due to perceived dissimilarities between the focus of the two plays and doubts that the two plays were ever meant to be seen together.
- B. Whether studied separately or as a continuous story, *I* and *II Henry IV* are works of fiction that serve to denote a period of English history. As a playwright and an artist, Shakespeare’s history plays are imaginative (or reconstructed) retellings of England’s history meant to both entertain the viewers and satisfy their worries (cathartically on stage).

III. Kingship as a Performance

- A. There are three main strategies in the performance of kingship. The first is to take on a social role that is already defined and accepted by the supporters of the monarchy. The second is to become a spectacle, making sure that the monarch is distinguished as a figure superior to and more special than anyone else in the kingdom. Then, the third strategy is to fashion a kingly identity, acquiring positive qualities that help to retain power while ridding oneself of characteristics that might tarnish the monarch’s image.
- B. Since Hal’s social position as the future king is challenged by circumstances outside of his control, Hal seeks to mitigate the blemish of his father’s past by performing a role that adheres to traditional definitions of kingship as that of inheritance or embodiment of chivalric ideals.

- C. Another legitimizing factor is the king's spectacle, which serves to emphasize the importance of the role of the king.
- D. Finally, the final and arguably the most effective strategy is for a king to fashion an identity of power and control.
- E. Another example of this definition of kingship is Hal, who is introduced as a privileged, hedonistic young man who surrounds himself with lowly highwaymen, but later fashions his own identity as a way of dealing with the pressures and expectations of kingship.

IV. The King and Hal

As the reigning king trying to reign in the inappropriate behaviors of his successor, Henry IV's efforts to educate Hal are the most overt and, perhaps, the most important. As a father, Henry holds a certain kind of emotional and political authority over Hal. His repeated expression of disappointment in his son and unfavorable comparison of his son to Hotspur impresses on Hal the need to project an outward appearance of nobleness and helps to jumpstart Hal's reformation.

V. Falstaff and Hal

Falstaff and his fellow band of mischiefs educate the prince on how to maneuver the political environment in a playful and theatrical manner. In other words, Falstaff helps Hal develop his social skills and sharpen his tongue, teaching him how to perform convincingly and what to say to attain power verbally

VI. Hotspur and Hal

Unlike the King and Falstaff who help Hal build his princely persona in an enclosed setting (at the inn or in private chambers), Hal learns from Hotspur right from the battlefield. A hotheaded rival with violent intention to overthrow the throne, Hotspur inadvertently teaches Hal how to present an honorable self through a display of military prowess.

VII. Conclusion

VIII. Works Cited

Cathy Yang

403110711

CCIII – Sec. C Prof. Kate

26 July 2017

A Princely Education: How Hal Learns to Perform Kingship in *I Henry IV*

Introduction

A prince or not, everyone is beholden to societal expectations, especially that of a parent's. Prince Hal from Shakespeare's *Henry IV* is no exception. Upon being lectured by his father, King Henry IV, Hal obediently responds by swearing to leave his youth of debauchery behind for the life of a regal prince, telling his father to "Find pardon on [his] true submission" (*IHIV*, 3.2.28). But is it so simple for a not-prince-by-birth young man to turn back on a culture of petty thievery and fun in exchange for royal responsibility? Young, but required to succeed his sickly father, perhaps Hal is a Shakespearean contemporary who embodies the modern day concept "Fake it 'til you make it," putting on a performance in order to satisfy certain expectations of his role. Indeed, in *I Henry IV*, Shakespeare portrays the concept of kingship as a matter of performance. Central to the development of Prince Hal's own performative ruling archetype are three key figures – the King, Falstaff, and Hotspur, who serve different roles, an authority figure, a mentor, and a rival, respectively, in teaching Hal the art of performance as applied to kingship.

Literature Review

As a prince, Hal stars in two of the four history plays, *I* and *II Henry IV*, in Shakespeare's second tetralogy, the *Henriad*, which consists of *Richard II*, *I Henry IV*, *II Henry IV*, and *Henry V*. The four plays are widely regarded as a literary cycle wherein *Richard II* chronicles the usurpation of King Richard II by Bolingbroke (later Henry IV), *I Henry IV* presents Hal's process of reformation, *II Henry IV* follows Hal's journey towards kingship, and *Henry V* demonstrates Hal as the king. Part one addresses the issue of Hal's initial reformation from a rogue to a proper prince, aided in part by three tangible characters – his father, his friend, and his enemy.

This paper deals with only part one of *Henry IV* due to perceived dissimilarities between the focus of the two plays and doubts that the two plays were ever meant to be seen together. First, even though the main cast – Hal and Falstaff – stays the same in both plays, part two presents two separate storylines (Falstaff and Hal), which is evidently different from the single narrative found in part one. These two storylines create two diverting paths of

experience within the same temporal spectrum and are indicative of warring sub-cultures (plebeian vs. noble life) apparent in the Middle Ages. The two plotlines only merge at the end of the play as Hal makes the final move to leave behind his youthful indiscretions. In stark contrast, the centerpiece of part one is Hal, with Falstaff serving only as a sidekick and comic figure. The narrative of part one follows Hal's journey and personal development, a storyline of growth rather than storylines of division and breakdown like the ones presented in part two. One purported reason for part two's lack of a singular narrative and focus on the separate struggles of upper and lower social groups may be attributed to the fact that the main historical events occur in part one of *Henry IV*, leaving little but the death of Henry IV and ascension of Henry V for part two (Tillyard 269). Unlike part two's segmental storylines, which are peppered with lesser rebellions instead of one central rebellion, part one ends with the culmination of action at the Battle of Shrewsbury, marking a complete cycle in the development of Hal's character. Therefore, although the two plays are certainly related, they tell two different stories, with the content of part one being more or less self-contained, which allows for analysis independent from part two.

Second, the tone of part two is significantly darker than that of part one, with the sickness and death of the king and Hal's moral compromises and rejection of Falstaff. In this case, part two can be seen as an upset to the relatively happy ending of part one where Hal is still friendly with Falstaff, but also seems to be on his way to becoming a responsible leader. Bulman asserts that part two is "an independent work which, while it brings to closure the royal narrative of Hal's growth to kingship, is concerned with other things," where much of the narrative is centered around the "'state' of Elizabethan England – the whores, drunks," and the lives of people outside of the courts rather than chronicle history (174). Likewise, R.A. Law, in his article "Structural Unity in the two Parts of 'Henry IV,'" suggests that the two parts should be regarded separately as they serve different purposes and are written with different motives. The main conflict of part one revolves around Hal and Hotspur and climaxes in the Battle of Shrewsbury. However, in part one, Hal is the subject which is being "fought over...by the royal household and the Lord Chief Justice on one hand and by Falstaff, the epitome of the Seven Deadly Sins, on the other," rather than the one participating in actual verbal or physical swordplay. In other words, Law believes part two is a morality play, and thus incongruent with part one (Tillyard 270). Similarly, Harold Jenkins in his essay "The Structural Problem in Shakespeare's *Henry IV*," states that the two plays do not show "two princely reformations but two versions of a single reformation" and that they are "mutually exclusive" (qtd. in Chernaik 18). At the end of part one, Hal seems to be

superficially reformed, but that regal bearing he presents is diminished as he once again consorts with commoners at the beginning of part two. In other words, another reformation happens in part two. This time, Hal's reformation is set in grimmer circumstances, with the threat of the king's illness looming above a troubled nation. Therefore, parts one and two are two different plays that deal with different contents in different ways. This paper, which focuses on Hal's initial reformation, only analyzes *I Henry IV* without influence from the latter plays of the tetralogy.

Whether studied separately or as a continuous story, *I* and *II Henry IV* are works of fiction that serve to denote a period of English history. As a playwright and an artist, Shakespeare's history plays are imaginative (or reconstructed) retellings of England's history meant to both entertain the viewers and satisfy their worries (cathartically on stage). Although Shakespeare does incorporate historical persons and events into his writing, ultimately, these two plays are dramatic works in which Shakespeare purposefully manipulates history so as to dramatize the performative aspects of kingship. This follows the convention of Elizabethan history plays that are less interested in historical accuracy and more in adjusting facts in order to highlight patterns or conflicts, more effectively dramatizing the matter (Chernaik 12). For example, although Hotspur is a historical figure, the Hotspur as presented in the play is a forced foil of and same-aged counterpart to Hal. They are pitted against each other as polar opposites in terms of personality and leadership behaviors. In reality, Hotspur was actually a decade younger and Hal a decade older than they were depicted in this play. The two even had a "cooperative" or "mentoring relationship," having fought side-by-side on the battlefield (Edmondson 248).

In addition to historical anomalies, non-historical characters are also added into the historical narrative to suit Shakespeare's need to fuel Hal's personal development. Most evidently is Falstaff, a completely fictional character, who supposedly has a great influence on the growth and development of Prince Hal as a friend and father-like figure. Falstaff and the world of debauchery (e.g. tavern, brothels) represents the "social history of the *other* England" (Bulman 169), making a stark contrast to the decorous, controlled environment in the king's courts. This contrast formed between the royals and the commoners reflect contemporary issues of the Elizabethan times, a period of transition marked by the rise of the new aristocracy – enterprising landowners – and the fall of the feudal order (Siegel 22). Falstaff, a knight past his prime, becomes a representative of "the declassed members of the declining feudal sector of society" (Siegel 27) and "the degeneration and decomposition of an

absolute class” (T. A. Jackson qtd. in Siegel 27), a complete foil of the still surviving feudal order of some English nobility, such as the morally upright Hotspur.

Writing the plays so that the content parallels “the situation of England in the early nineties” (Leah Marcus qtd. in Chernaik 14), Shakespeare “exploited fears and anxieties and shaped opinions” and “spoke directly to audiences’ prejudices and sympathies” (Hadfield 152), creating works that gripped the audiences’ attention and addressed “suppressed cultural anxieties about the Virgin Queen, her identity, and her capacity to provide continuing stability for the nation” (Leah Marcus qtd. in Chernaik 14). In order to connect the political state of England in the Elizabethan era to the Plantagenet era, Shakespeare portrays Henry IV’s rule anachronistically, depicting him as an early modern monarch, when in reality, England as a nation-state did not come about until much later (Bulman 158). These intentional discrepancies in history are present in order to create frameworks of comparison that highlight Hal’s differences from the excessively self-indulgent Falstaff and the rigidly honorable Hotspur. Moreover, the purpose of these comparisons is to dramatize the play “to have contemporary relevance” (Chernaik 13). One reason why Queen Elizabeth was able to hold onto the crown was her performance as a capable monarch, strictly censoring and controlling her subjects so that only a certain image of her and her ancestors are presented to the public. Taking a page from her book, Shakespeare problematizes the concept of kingship as a performance in *I Henry IV* through Prince Hal, who formulates his own style of performative behavior through interacting with his father, Falstaff, and Hotspur.

Kingship as a Performance

There are three main strategies in the performance of kingship. The first is to take on a social role that is already defined and accepted by the supporters of the monarchy. The second is to become a spectacle, making sure that the monarch is distinguished as a figure superior to and more special than anyone else in the kingdom. Then, the third strategy is to fashion a kingly identity, acquiring positive qualities that help to retain power while ridding oneself of characteristics that might tarnish the monarch’s image. In *I Henry IV*, Shakespeare showcases the need for these performative strategies through Hal or his father.

Since Hal’s social position as the future king is challenged by circumstances outside of his control, Hal seeks to mitigate the blemish of his father’s past by performing a role that adheres to traditional definitions of kingship as that of inheritance or embodiment of chivalric ideals. Based on the feudalistic tradition, kingship is the divine right of the monarch and it is God’s will for the position to be passed down as inheritance through patrilineal succession.

However, the rebellious Henry IV has overthrown the reign of an ill-fitted king, and the kingship is then passed onto his line. As a usurper, Henry is constantly in a struggle to legitimize his position, especially with adversaries like Mortimer in part one who is the rightful successor to Richard II. As such, Hal's own inheritance of the crown is threatened by his father's earlier actions. Hal would succeed during his lifetime to be regarded as a "hero-king," only for his efforts to stabilize England to fail with the fall of his successor Henry VI (Siegel 49), suggesting that mere succession is not enough to solidify the reign of a particular branch of the royal family. More than inheritance is at play in regards to kingship. The element of performing the social role of a king is crucial in legitimizing kingship.

Another legitimizing factor is the king's spectacle, which serves to emphasize the importance of the role of the king. The king appears in public wearing a golden and jewel-laced crown with opulent clothing, at times performing religious rituals thought to be vital motions to secure the well-being of a nation. The crown may be passed from father to son, but, as a symbol of the moral, political, and social order of society, it is heavy with responsibilities. In the Elizabethan world picture, the king is viewed as the source of "order and stability" of which the harmony of society is rooted in and dependent upon. Society can only reach harmony when guided by the "inner harmony" of the monarch (Siegel 56). Therefore, the king is put on a pedestal and must exemplify all the most proper characteristics that would enable him to assert control over the kingdom. Henry IV is well aware of the role that he must fulfill and presents kingship as that of chivalric ideals, distinguishing himself from Richard II who had little in the way of honor and much in gratuitous behaviors. Henry acts as a moral king, who, based on a romantic and courtly definition, is a king that embodies the chivalric ideals of honor and duty, so as to preserve the integrity of the kingdom and everyone in it. Under this definition, the king is the moral center of the nation, having both a heavy political and cultural duty to his subjects. Henry IV might not be the legitimate king due to his lack of direct inheritance, but he serves God and works for the good of the nation, which is more than Richard II can claim. He is a spectacle, presenting himself as the most honorable man of all honorable men who has the innate ability to embody these qualities because he is of royal blood, not of humble birth.

Finally, the final and arguably the most effective strategy is for a king to fashion an identity of power and control. Henry IV creates an illusion of his great omnipresence during the Battle of Shrewsbury by sending out decoys who don the armor of the monarch as per his orders. As Hotspur notes, "The King hath many marching in his coats" (*IHV*, 5.3.25), with Sir Walter Blount and the Lord of Stafford just two of the loyalists who died pretending

to be the king. When confronted about his identity, Blount lies directly to the rebel Douglas: “They tell thee true” (*IHV*, 5.3.5-6). Out in the battlefield, the identity of the king can only be established through hearsay, superficial appearance, and oaths. Henry IV uses the chaos and confusion surrounding the battle to his advantage. By having imposters, who become willing sacrifices, Henry pretends and asserts the idea that he is invincible and cannot be defeated. Every time a rebel kills someone of the king’s likeness, another king shows up. Therefore, Henry has constructed his own identity as an omnipotent force, which is a matter of performance.

Another example of this definition of kingship is Hal, who is introduced as a privileged, hedonistic young man who surrounds himself with lowly highwaymen, but later fashions his own identity as a way of dealing with the pressures and expectations of kingship. The role of the king is an act to appease or gain the acceptance of the royal courts (the actor and the audience must believe that the actor in question is the rightful monarch). Whoever can satisfy these requirements and put on the air of the king can retain kingship. Hal, who does not come from a divine line of kingship and does not indubitably epitomize chivalric ideals (marred by his riotous behavior with his merry band of thieves), relies on performance to rise to kingship. In an ahistorical moment and in “true Machiavellian fashion,” as Hal asserts himself, he misbehaves “so that his later transformation will be all the more impressive” (Edmondson 250). Hal is essentially declaring that he is in charge of and is the creator of his own identity, reflecting Shakespeare’s belief as an architect of drama that “men could, by thinking strategically, construct a new kind of society” (Hattaway 21). He knows that he is being closely watched by members of society, so he seeks to construct a better societal opinion of himself. Hal, clever and manipulative, fashions his own style of kingship based on performative actions, setting “realistic goals” that he reaches by the end of part one (Hattaway 21). Taking a New Historicist perspective, Stephen Greenblatt’s essay “Invisible Bullets” claims that the power struggle in *Henry IV* can be characterized by the containment thesis where “subversive voices are produced by and within the affirmations of order” (qtd. in Chernaik 19). Essentially (and ironically), Hal is able to reach his goals of attaining honor and respect through the very factors that sought to undermine them e.g. Falstaff’s debauchery and Hal’s own lack of likeness to the established hero Hotspur. Indeed, these subversive factors turn into an advantage as Hal experiences or creates an apparent inversion of his own character and performs the role of a proper king-to-be. Therefore, the inputs and outputs of Hal’s reformation is entirely “contained” within the social structure of the monarchy. Amidst

an uneasy political climate, Hal seeks to attain legitimacy and power through performance and is pushed along this transformation by influencers like the King, Falstaff, and Hotspur.

The King and Hal

As the reigning king trying to reign in the inappropriate behaviors of his successor, Henry IV's efforts to educate Hal are the most overt and, perhaps, the most important. As a father, Henry holds a certain kind of emotional and political authority over Hal. His repeated expression of disappointment in his son and unfavorable comparison of his son to Hotspur impresses on Hal the need to project an outward appearance of nobleness and helps to jumpstart Hal's reformation. Meanwhile, Henry's personal history of mutinous behavior presents a concrete example of the continuous threat of rebellion should Hal fail to portray himself as the rightful, capable king. The King's low opinion of his son prompts Hal to want to prove him wrong and be the dutiful son who can show his father that he does have the capacity to be his proper successor.

Henry IV, haunted by the burden of his guilt in overthrowing Richard II, is chiefly concerned that his heir would not reflect in any way the misdeeds of the previous king, which would undermine their legitimacy as the monarch. Henry sees in Hal similarities with Richard, such as associating with low class individuals and following one's own hedonistic pursuits (Siegel 75). Furthermore, he is threatened by Hotspur's apparent likeness to himself as a rebel with courage in combat and with the support of fellow noble conspirators coming to usurp the throne: "As thou art to this hour was Richard then / When I from France set foot at Ravenspur, / And even as I was then is Percy now" (*IHIV*, 3.2.94-96). In Henry's eyes, he "See[s] riot and dishonour stain the brow / Of my young Harry" (*IHIV*, 1.1.84-85), a rebellious prince who spends time at taverns amongst disreputable and dishonorable commoners representative of chaos and disorder not found within the strict hierarchy of the royal courts. In contrast, Northumberland's son, Hotspur, is blessed with "the theme of honour's tongue" (*IHIV*, 1.1.80), essentially the total inverse of what the King sees in his own son. Hotspur's reputation for honor has been cemented by valorous deeds in battle. However, Hal, up to this moment in the plot, has not yet proved to the public his worth as the future monarch. Henry is keenly aware of this and stresses to Hal that he should, in a way, model himself after Hotspur. Henry makes Hal acknowledge the fickle reality that the line of succession may be disrupted and Hotspur, who exhibits bravery and nobleness, is considered more worthy than Hal, even though he is the prince. Henry asserts that the journey to repairing Hal's reputation begins by disassociating with unfavorable company. He teaches his

son that a proper king must make himself scarce from the common people and “shines seldom in admiring eyes” (*IHIV*, 3.2.80), so that when he does appear in public, he presents a “spectacle” of nobleness that dazzles and captivates his subjects (Kastan 124). Even if Hal might prefer the company of knaves to knights, the leader of a nation, or future leader, must not dally with commoners and thereby lower his own status in association. Thus, being a proper king-to-be means that Hal needs to suppress one aspect of himself – the will to find good humor in the company of Falstaff – in exchange for promoting another aspect of himself – the Hal with leadership abilities and the regal demeanor that legitimizes his position.

Wanting his son to be like another can be seen as a matter of performance since Hal would have to act based on a prototype of honor and social responsibility and not fully as initially roguish self. This desire for Hal to carry the honorable qualities of Hotspur is shown in the follow passage where Henry acknowledges the apparent differences between Hal and Hotspur and goes as far as him wishing that Hotspur were his son instead:

Oh, that it could be proved
That some night-tripping fairy had exchanged
In cradleclothes our children where they lay,
And called mine “Percy,” his “Plantagenet”;
Then would I have his Harry, and he mine. (*IHIV*, 1.1.85-89)

In being such a critical father, Henry succeeds in rousing Hal’s sense of filial responsibility. Hal responds to his father’s comparison of him to Hotspur by solemnly vowing “in the name of God” (*IHIV*, 3.2.153) to “make this northern youth exchange” where Hal would exchange Hotspur’s “glorious deeds for [his] indignities” (*IHIV*, 3.2.145-46) by defeating him in battle. In other words, Henry prompts the beginning of Hal’s reformation in which he makes an oath to his father to defeat Hotspur. In being pitted physically and spiritually against Hotspur, Hal promises to take on more of Hotspur’s qualities. And in doing so, Hal would fashion a new, kingly identity, which is ultimately what Henry wants his son to do. In defeating Hotspur, Hal would be seen as a competent and capable leader. No matter how Hal experiences a change in identity internally, what’s important to Henry is the outward appearance of a stable line of succession, a matter of performance.

Falstaff and Hal

What are friends for, if not to banter with and learn from? Although Henry IV is Hal’s biological father and the one whose commands Hal must obey, Hal spends a significant

amount of time with the gluttonous, portly old knight Falstaff who serves as a mentor, or a sort of pseudo-father, to him. Falstaff and his fellow band of mischiefs educate the prince on how to maneuver the political environment in a playful and theatrical manner. In other words, Falstaff helps Hal develop his social skills and sharpen his tongue, teaching him how to perform convincingly and what to say to attain power verbally. The most evident of this is Hal and Falstaff's role-playing of a scenario in Act II, Scene IV of part one. In this role-play, the two act out a scene of Hal being confronted by the King about his roguish behaviors and his unsuitable companions, whereby Falstaff teaches Hal the art of negotiating, an art in which Falstaff has ample experience from constantly inventing excuses to waylay consequences from his roguish deeds. There are two layers of this role-play that can be analyzed. At one point, Hal acts as his father, and Falstaff acts as Hal, so that Falstaff may show Hal how to defend himself against the King's scolding. This is verbal practice for the prince who will soon have to face his father and numerous other nobles prior to the Battle of Shrewsbury. However, in this exchange, Falstaff finds himself having difficulty countering Hal's swift admonishments and fails to justify why the prince should be allowed to keep disreputable companions. Falstaff's failure to defend himself with his quick tongue is another example shown to Hal that he does not have a truly justifiable reason to hang around misfits, given his role as the king's heir. Furthermore, once Hal is acting as the King, his now regal manner of speech and demeanor is drastically different from how he behaves normally around Falstaff. In this case, Falstaff's usual interactions with Hal helps to set up a contrast that highlights Hal's ability to perform and exhibit king-like behavior similar to that of his father who is actually the king. Falstaff acts as an anti-template. In other words, in order for Hal to act like a king, he needs to act like the opposite of Falstaff, which he succeeds in this role-play. Hal's superior use of language even when pitted against the linguistically clever Falstaff demonstrates, to Hal himself, his own talent at performing kingship. Falstaff, in part, helps Hal realize and rehearse his future role, their wordplay helping to refine Hal's technique.

Indeed, Falstaff never lets Hal forget who he is (or who he should be, or who he has to be), making sure that Hal is acutely self-aware that he has a role to perform. Even while in the company of scoundrels, Falstaff is always quick to make references to Hal's position as the prince in wordplay, reminding Hal of his special status above others. For example, Falstaff "equates theft to manhood and royal lineage" (Hart 136), ironically pointing out that bravery (in carrying out their plan of highway theft) is a trait that Hal should have as a royal: "There's neither honesty, manhood, nor good fellowship in thee, nor thou cam'st not of the

blood royal, if thou darest not stand for ten shillings” (*IHV*, 1.2.121-23). In doing this, Falstaff emphasizes the need for one to embody the role they are given. How one should behave is dependent on the situation they are in and the position they hold, in other words, performative responses to stimuli. This philosophy is what Falstaff lives by and how he gets by, being a scoundrel. Falstaff’s very existence is a reminder that Hal has a role to play and Falstaff’s company guarantees a consistent opportunity to practice a verbal battle of wills, albeit playfully.

Hotspur and Hal

According to Norman Rabkin, Shakespeare often sets characters who are polar opposites (foils) against each other in many of his dramatic works, especially in a setting where the ideals that they represent “exist in tandem” and the audience is “caught between assertions of two conflicting extremes (Grudin 2). Such defines the symbolic relationship between Hal and Hotspur. Unlike the King and Falstaff who help Hal build his princely persona in an enclosed setting (at the inn or in private chambers), Hal learns from Hotspur right from the battlefield. A hotheaded rival with violent intention to overthrow the throne, Hotspur inadvertently teaches Hal how to present an honorable self through a display of military prowess.

Before the Battle of Shrewsbury, Hal heroically offers to have a one-on-one battle with Hotspur to determine the outcome of the rebellion as an attempt to lessen the bloodshed. However, Hotspur’s warmongering tendencies may mean that this proposition is doomed even before being uttered. Although he is the one who proposes this possible method of resolution, it is unknown whether Hal might have anticipated this refusal with his offer being a mere bluff. Indeed, although Hal outwardly presents honorable intents in front of the king and his subjects, he is willing to adapt himself to various situations and compromise his honor in return for victory, a fact that he does not make known to the respectable public. Perhaps Hal gained a sense of flexibility from maneuvering around his father and playing with Falstaff. Regardless, the conflict with Hotspur presents Hal the opportunity to learn how to present an honorable front from Hotspur, inner honor notwithstanding. In a climactic scene, Hal and Hotspur duel, a one-on-one battle with a seemingly redeemed prince on one end and an honorable, but aggressive rebel on the other. When pitted with Hotspur in single combat, Hal emerges the winner. Tiffany, for instance, offers a symbolic reading of his victory, “suggesting that Hal represents the more modern military opponent, rapierlike and flexible, superior to the heavy and rigid broadsword that...is Hotspur” (302). Hal’s victory despite inexperience, in other words, is attributed to his more flexible, adaptable, and

forward-thinking attitude than that of Hotspur, qualities that are important for a leader of a modern state to circumvent struggles both on the battlefield and in the courts. Hotspur provides Hal a chance to test the merits of his performance-based kingly actions and the outcome reaffirms Hal's confidence in his developing ruling archetype. Additionally, in order to defeat his opponent and suppress the rebellion, Hal learns to take his rival seriously and to treat him with proper respect amongst the generals so as to gain prestige for the winning party once the embellished Hotspur is defeated.

Furthermore, although it does not come to fruition, Hal would willingly swap traditional, honorable means for pragmatic, survivalist means to put an end to the threat that Hotspur poses. If given the opportunity, he would use (at the time) unconventional means to get an advantage over his opponent. For example, he demands Falstaff to hand over the pistol during the Battle of Shrewsbury, the pistol being a weapon that would give him a cheap advantage over Hotspur and his sword, the traditional, but respectable mode of combat. "Always the improviser, he will accommodate himself to circumstances, even if doing so means using an ignoble (and anachronistic) pistol to kill a sword-wielding hero" (Tiffany 315). This event, of course, happens privately between the two and Hal's moment of compromised honor is never exposed to the public. Thereby, Hal is able to maintain his performance of nobleness.

Standing over the body of Hotspur, Hal, even in private, displays a moment of noble intention when he pays respect to Hotspur's bravery: "For worms, brave Percy. Fare thee well, great heart" (*IHIV*, 5.4.86). When Falstaff chooses to take credit for killing Hotspur, Hal does not argue or banter with Falstaff, simply the issues of the death of Hotspur to rest. This willingness to forsake staking claim over his defeated opponent shows Hal's growing maturity and kingly behavior, as he has already proven his worth in battle – to himself, to his father, and to the soldiers – and, thus, has no need for the limelight. He knows that he has performed his role as the dutiful son adequately, for now, and so he can let Falstaff perform the role of a victor. In other words, Hal is in control of the scope of his performance. Part of this awareness is developed thanks to Hotspur. Hotspur's presence as his foil pushes Hal to know when and what to perform, embracing only Hotspur's good qualities while dismissing Hotspur's flaws. Indeed, through his victory, Hal adopts Hotspur's good traits just as he said he would, but with none of Hotspur's outdated code of honor (Siegel 77): "And all the budding honors on thy crest / I'll crop to make a garland for my head" (*IHIV*, 5.4.71-72). Therefore, following his battle with Hotspur, Hal endeavors to create his own version of the crown with honor passed to him through the defeat of Hotspur and essentially becomes a better version of Hotspur. "Without hesitating as to whether or not he has the wisdom or the authority, Hal picks and chooses the

parts of Hotspur's character to praise and emulate and banishes his more inconvenient qualities 'to sleep with thee in the grave, / But not remembered in thy epitaph'" (*IHV*, 5.4.100-01) (Hoffman 378).

For instance, one such negative quality to be banished is Hotspur's impetuous nature, which teaches Hal that he must be anything but quick-tempered. Despite Hal's misgivings, Hal is presented as the likeable, "good-humored fellow" throughout the play, seen joking around with Falstaff and being gracious to Hotspur, honoring Hotspur even while facing him down. Thus, Hal is shown to innately possess a temperament more suitable for leadership than Hotspur who is "an angry and ill-tempered zealot" (Edmondson 250). In terms of personality and behavior, Hal's victory over Hotspur is symbolic victory of flexibility over moral rigidity and of practicality over passion. In other words, Hal has a more adaptable character and is able to be both dishonorable with the likes of Falstaff but also honorable when defeating his opponent. In this manner, he is both suitable to performing and successful at it. In the end, Hal and Hotspur's rivalry is prime breeding ground for Hal to grow his honorable external façade.

Conclusion

With great power comes great responsibility. No one is more aware of this than the king-to-be in question who knows he must play a role. A critical component of being a public figure that carries the greatest responsibility in the kingdom is to seem or present oneself as being dedicated to his duty. Hal's character experiences a superficial inversion from beginning to end in *I Henry IV*. He begins by externalizing roguish behaviors and internalizing his sense of responsibility and ends up vice versa. Such a transformation cannot be accomplished without help. Hal's creation of an artifice of nobility is in part aided by his father's warnings, Falstaff's wordplay, and contrasts with Hotspur.

However, the real question is whether this inversion in outward behavior is necessary. Must the king disassociate with the common people in order to be a king? If he does so, as Hal does, to what extent is Hal performing and to what extent is he being himself? Throughout the play, Hal learns to perform. He learns to take on the responsibility of defeating the rebel leader, the social role of a king. In doing so, he becomes a spectacle that sets him apart from common people. He has adapted to the wartime scenario, behaving, as the serious situation requires of him. By the time of the battle, he has succeeded in changing the nobles' opinion of him, with even his enemies praising him like some kind of mythical hero, "an angel dropped down from the clouds" riding "a fiery Pegasus" to "witch the world with

noble horsemanship” (*IHV*, 4.1.107-109). Hal plays the role of the hero-king (or hero-king-to-be) well. This begs the question: if the role of the king is the role of a performer, then what variations of kingship performance does the public consider acceptable? How many more renditions of performance amongst leaderships will we see as political situation shift with time? Even now, in today’s world, the role of a leader may require theatrical support, such as President Donald Trump of the U.S. and President Vladimir Putin of the Russian Federation who both attract supporters by projecting a “macho” man image, albeit in different ways. Perhaps the literary legacy of Prince Hal is not far from our reality, after all.

Word Count: 5,785

Works Cited

- Bulman, James C. "Henry IV, Parts 1 and 2." *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History Plays*. Ed. Michael Hattaway. Cambridge: Cambridge U Press, 2002. 158-76. Print.
- Chernaik, Warren. *The Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare's History Plays*. Cambridge U Press, 2007. Print
- Edmondson, Henry T. "Why Hotspur Can't Take a Joke: Temperament and Leadership in Shakespeare's Henry IV, Part 1." *Public Integrity* 17.3 (2015): 247-63. Print.
- Evans, Meredith. "Rumor, the Breath of Kings, and the Body of Law in 2 Henry Iv." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 60.1 (2009): 1-24. Print.
- Grudin, Robert. *Mighty Opposites*. U of California Press, 1979. Print.
- Hadfield, Andrew, and Paul Hammond, editors. *Shakespeare and Renaissance Europe*. Thomson Learning, 2005. Print.
- Hart, Jonathan. *Shakespeare: Poetry, Culture, and History*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. Print.
- Hattaway, Michael. "The Shakespearean History Play." *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History Plays*, edited by Michael Hattaway, Cambridge U Press, 2002, pp. 3-22.
- Hoffmann, Christine. "Biting More Than 'We' Can Chew: The Royal Appetite in *Richard II* and *1 and 2 Henry IV*." *Papers on Language & Literature* 45 (2009): 358-85. Print.
- Kasten, David Scott. *Shakespeare after Theory*. Routledge, 1999. Print.
- Shakespeare, William. "The First Part of Henry IV." *Norton Shakespeare*. 3rd ed. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt, et al. New York: Norton, 2016. 1177-1243. Print.
- Siegel, Paul N. *Shakespeare's English and Roman History Plays*. Associated U Presses, 1986. Print.
- Tiffany, Grace. "Rank, Insults, and Weaponry in Shakespeare's Second Tetralogy." *Papers on Language & Literature* 47 (2011): 295-317. Print.
- Tillyard, E.M.W. *Shakespeare's History Plays*. Penguin Books, 1944. Print.