

12-20-2009

"Let heaven kiss earth!" The Function of Humanism and Animism in Shakespeare's Richard II and Henry IV, Parts I and II

Kathrin Kottemann
University of New Orleans

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uno.edu/td>

Recommended Citation

Kottemann, Kathrin, ""Let heaven kiss earth!"  The Function of Humanism and Animism in Shakespeare's Richard II and Henry IV, Parts I and II" (2009). *University of New Orleans Theses and Dissertations*. 999.

<https://scholarworks.uno.edu/td/999>

This Thesis is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by ScholarWorks@UNO with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Thesis in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in University of New Orleans Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UNO. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uno.edu.

“Let heaven kiss earth!”: The Function of Humanism and Animism in Shakespeare’s *Richard II*
and *Henry IV, Parts I and II*

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
University of New Orleans
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
English

by

Kathrin L. Kottemann

B.A. Loyola University of New Orleans, 2004

December 2009

Acknowledgement

I cannot express more gratitude to Dr. Catherine Loomis for inspiring this project and for allowing me to expand it from a two-page response paper to a Master's Thesis. Her suggestions, guidance, lending and suggestion of resources, and, most of all, her encouragement are responsible for the success of this thesis.

I would also like to thank the rest of the English faculty at the University of New Orleans, specifically Dr. Earle Bryant and Dr. Susan Krantz for serving on my thesis committee.

A special thanks also goes to Fadi Kordahi for listening to my complaints and feigned surrenders while working on this project. Your continued confidence in me made all the difference.

And, lastly, thank you William Shakespeare.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iv
Introduction: The Divide Between Humanism and Animism	1
Chapter 1: Humanism’s Triumph over Animism in <i>Richard II</i>	7
Chapter 2: Hal Complicates the Humanism/Animism Divide in <i>1 Henry IV</i>	32
Chapter 3: The Hero-King Defies the Humanist and Animist Labels in <i>2 Henry IV</i>	52
Conclusion: Consequences for Shakespeare’s Modern Audience.....	76
Works Cited	80
Vita.....	84

Abstract

As Shakespeare composed the three history plays discussed here, English culture faced a shift in its dominant belief system from an animistic perspective that valued nature and superstition to a humanistic perspective based on reason and personal relationships. In *Richard II*, Shakespeare creates characters that fall on either side of this divide, and he shows humanism triumph over animism when Henry deposes Richard. In *1 Henry IV*, Shakespeare shows that this binary is not so easily reconciled, and Hal (the future Henry V) creates a dual nature that subsumes the tenets of both animism and humanism. After the death of his father and his rejection of Falstaff in *2 Henry IV*, Hal demonstrates that the only solution to the humanism/animism debate is to entirely reject the tenets of both and, instead, blend the two viewpoints together. The result is a newly formed conception of kingship and a hero-king.

Keywords

1 Henry IV, *2 Henry IV*, animism, Divine Right of Kings, eco-criticism, Falstaff, *Henry V*, hero-king, humanism, *Richard II*, Shakespeare, sun-king analogy

Introduction: The Divide Between Humanism and Animism

Humanism is succinctly defined in Christopher Manes's "Nature and Silence" as "human superiority over the natural world" (20). While this is a basic definition of humanism, the concept has a much broader reach not only in ecocritical terms, but also in education and literature. In *Shakespeare's Humanism*, Robin Headlam Wells states that humanism does not just entail a feeling of superiority over nature, but humanism is also identified as a way of life defined apart from the natural world:

Renaissance humanism was a literary culture that concerned itself with the question of how to promote civilized values and at the same time guard against barbarism to which the baser side of human nature always threatened to lead us. Shakespeare's plays are a product of that humanist culture. (7)

Wells asserts that this form of humanism, while concerned with denying the importance of the natural world, had its roots in the meanings of justice and humanity: "Renaissance humanists believed that if you want to build a just society you must begin with the facts of human nature" (ix). So, to Wells, humanism does not just involve superiority over the natural world; instead, it involves a way of living that resists depravity and allows the civilized parts of human nature to define humanity.

Also in *Shakespeare's Humanism*, Wells discusses Elizabethan humanist Thomas Cooper who, in 1565, defined contemporary humanistic culture in three distinct stages. Firstly, humanism includes "the state of human nature common to us all" (8). Just as in Wells's definition, Cooper's humanism involves qualities that all humans share, such as reason, civility, and intelligence. To Cooper, humanism also entails "liberal knowledge, learning, humanity" (8). Humanism was not merely a way of life, but it also involved an education in what is known

today as liberal arts. In “Humanity at a Price: Erasmus, Budé, and the Poverty of Philology,” Alan Stewart quotes Desiderius Erasmus and his opinion of the superiority of a humanist education: “Let others paint lions, eagles, and other creatures on their coats of arms. More true nobility is possessed by those who can inscribe on their shields all that they have achieved through the cultivation of the arts and sciences” (11). Erasmus’s opinion not only shows the belief in the superiority of a humanist education, but it once again reinforces the humanist tenet of the superiority of humans over the natural world. And, lastly, Cooper states that humanism requires “courtesy, gentleness, and humanity” (8). Unlike Manes’s critical definition of humanism as degrading or suppressing nature, Cooper defines humanism in gentler terms—as the interaction and civility that one human feels for another. Cooper’s definition also separates moral behavior from religious beliefs. If a humanist were to practice these three virtues, then that individual would represent civilized behavior.

As a synthesis of these definitions and analyses, humanism is an individual’s belief that the characteristics that are common to all humans—our basic human nature— make us superior to the natural world. Because of our knowledge of this superiority (or our belief in it), we are able to civilize ourselves through reason and simultaneously reject the supernatural while oppressing or dominating the natural. This belief also leads humanists to value human life over the natural world and experience each other with kindness and respect.

Animism, which is not quite the direct inverse of humanism, involves prizing nature and the supernatural while attempting to comprehend the natural world. Graham Harvey, in *Animism: Respecting the Living World*, defines animism as a belief that “the world is full of persons, only some of whom are human, and that life is always lived in relationship with others”

(xi). Harvey shows that animism not only involves human relationships with the natural world but also a re-thinking of humanity itself. In his discussion of animism, Manes concludes that for animistic cultures, those that see the natural world as inspirited, not just people, but also animals, plants, and even “inert” entities such as stones and rivers are perceived as being articulate and at times intelligible subjects, able to communicate and interact with humans for good or ill. (15)

Unlike a humanist who sees natural objects as lifeless and unresponsive, Manes asserts that an animist views these objects as expressive and powerful. In *Animism*, Edward Clodd defines animism using terms that are similar to Cooper’s three criteria for humanism. First, animists believe in the reality of dreams. They believe that the spirit actually leaves the body and performs the actions they dream about; these dreams are not imagined but actual events (31). Clodd also asserts that animism was born out of a fear of the unknown. When members of primitive cultures experienced natural disasters, these people realized that they did not have agency to change or prevent these disasters. Instead, they turned to the supernatural to explain these occurrences (44). Harvey quotes David Hume, who asserts that humans always look for cause and effect, and argues that this curiosity led to the formation of animism. Hume states: “No wonder, then, that mankind, being placed in such an absolute ignorance of causes, and being at the same time so anxious concerning their future fortunes, should immediately acknowledge a dependence on invisible powers possessed of sentiment and intelligence” (4). Hume also suggests that humans give these “invisible powers” human-like qualities in order to make them “nearer to a resemblance with ourselves” (5) which make them more relatable and more sympathetic to human concerns. Clodd states that when man feels helpless, he turns to

something above nature—to the spirit world, which inhabits inanimate objects. Primitive man was

at the mercy of powers stronger than himself, that crossed his path, that thwarted his schemes, and played havoc with anything to which he clung. For so long as affairs ran smoothly with him and his, little heed need be paid to what the spirits did; it was when he was worsted in the struggle that he felt himself in the clutches and at the mercy of powers which were *other than, and above, nature*. (49-50)

Just as in Cooper's three levels of humanism, Clodd emphasizes education—not formal liberal arts education, but education within the natural world. By attempting to understand the world around them, primitive cultures relied on informed guesses and spirituality, which led to the birth of animism.

Some critics believe that the conception of animists as “primitive” is unfair because of the complexity of the relationship between humans and nature expressed in animistic culture. In “Animism Revisited,” Nurit Bird-David discusses Edward Burnett Tylor, the founding father of anthropology. In his seminal work *Primitive Culture*, Tylor derisively describes animism as a savage religion of primitive people trying to explain to themselves a world that they did not fully understand. Tylor portrayed the “primitive as delirious as well as perceiving the world like a child” (70). However, Bird-David asserts Tylor and many anthropologists since have “grossly misunderstood animism as a simple religion and a failed epistemology” (79). Harvey states that this “primitive religion” was not the result of ignorance but a result of profound meaning: “Animism began and continues as a way of trying to make sense of the world, it is a mythopoetic mode of discourse that explains life and events to those not yet fully acculturated to the practice

of rationalist science” (6). To Bird-David, animism is much more complex and also involves initiation into and understanding of the natural world:

To “talk with a tree”—rather than “cut it down”—is to perceive what it does as one acts towards it, being aware concurrently of changes in oneself and the tree. It is expecting response and responding, growing into mutual responsiveness and, furthermore, possibly into mutual responsibility. (77)

Therefore, when these primitive cultures interact with these perceived inspirited objects, they should not be compared to children conversing with stuffed animals.¹ Instead, animism involves an interconnectedness with nature; one is both talking and being talked to while anticipating reactions and feeling accountable for those reactions.

Some authorities suggest that animism not only affects a human’s relationship with nature, but it also affects a human’s relationship with other humans. In “Animals, Animists and Academics,” Harvey advocates what he calls “new animism” that defines this belief as more complex than the origin of religion or as a primitive religion. Instead, he equates animism to an individual’s personal relationship with other individuals, human or otherwise:

Its leitmotiv is “respect,” admirably glossed as “carefully and constructively”. . . Animist relationality is conducted carefully because some persons are predators, some deceive, and some are powerful. It is constructive because every person (however powerful, moral, or immoral) makes the world, others and themselves as they act with and toward others. Everyone is involved; everyone is a participant. (13)

¹ Harvey refers to developmental child psychologist Jean Piaget who contends that all children experience an animistic stage: “[Children] naturally think that a ‘naughty chair hurt me’ and take some time to distinguish between accidents and intentional acts” (14). This animistic stage in children leads to the ability to distinguish between “inert objects and subjects with agency” (14). Harvey points out, however, that this animistic stage is the result of Western child-rearing activities and is not a “natural” stage as Piaget suggests.

According to Harvey, animism is not a savage religion built upon ignorance and misunderstanding, as Tylor suggests in *Primitive Culture*. Instead, animism helps people situate themselves within the world around them, and animistic beliefs also help believers respect and value all beings—whether animate or inanimate, human or animal, vegetable or mineral. In *Animism*, Harvey distinguishes between the “old” animism (or Tylor’s view) and the “new” animism and relates this distinction to ecological concerns:

[D]efinitive animist concerns insist not only the unavoidability but also the great value of human entanglement with all life. . . . Animism, then, might take its place among those ecological philosophies and activisms that prefer not to speak of “environmentalism” but of ecology or ecological ethics, or of living respectfully among “all our relations.” (179)

Animism is not merely a substitution for true knowledge of the natural world; it is a different way of perceiving oneself as related to that world. Animism allows believers to see the interconnectedness of humans and nature and to revere those connections through mutual respect and personal sacrifice.

A blending of these definitions and analyses yields a definition that is much more positive and comprehensive than Tylor’s assertion that animism is employed due to ignorance or childishness. Instead, animism is a belief that natural objects are inspirited and that humans are able to bond with these natural objects on a supernatural and spiritual level. This belief is based on fear, curiosity, and wonder about the unknown and involves not ignorance but a pursuit of knowledge. Animists wish to understand, not dominate, the natural world by listening to its diverse voices and attempting to anticipate its reactions. Animists have a respect for nature that leads them to have respect for others and themselves.

Chapter 1: Humanism's Triumph over Animism in *Richard II*

Feed not thy sovereign's foe, my gentle earth,
Nor with thy sweets comfort his ravenous sense;
But let thy spiders that suck up thy venom
And heavy-gaited toads lie in their way,
Doing annoyance to the treacherous feet
Which with usurping steps do trample thee. (3.2.12-17)

In the course of delivering this speech, King Richard II explains his views of nature as a dominant force whose powers should be both feared and revered. He believes that the Earth and its creatures want to help him and will aid in his righteous plans. However, he does not wish to exploit this power; instead, he speaks to the natural world as a superior and vows to serve the Earth when the Earth serves him. Because of his relationship with nature and his expectations of nature's abilities to serve as his ally, Richard embodies the animistic perspective—he speaks to the spirit of natural objects and displays an interactive relationship with them. However, because of this animistic attitude, Richard is feminized and shown as a weak-willed and feeble-minded ruler who is easily deposed. Richard feels that he deserves nature's help because of the Divine Right of Kings, and he believes that his deposition is unnatural. Whoever usurps his throne must be willing to experience nature's wrath. Unlike Richard's adoption of an animistic perspective, Bolingbroke (hereafter referred to as Henry) adopts a humanistic view of nature and the Earth. He does not view the natural world as inspirited or cooperative; he views it merely as a commodity to be possessed and conquered. Henry's deposition of Richard demonstrates that

successful kingship is indelibly linked to humanism. A true ruler must adopt a humanistic perspective in order to prevail.

As Shakespeare composed *Richard II*, the dominant belief system in England regarding the natural world and human nature was shifting from an animistic perspective to a humanistic one. This dominant belief system moved from an anthropomorphic view of the world—one based on primitive religious beliefs and antiquated political views of nature’s equality with humans—to a view based solely on reason, the attribute that sets humans apart from the natural world. In her introduction to *Richard II* in *The Norton Shakespeare*, Katharine Eisaman Maus argues that Richard’s animistic and bio-centric view of the world was becoming obsolete by Shakespeare’s time: “Advanced thinkers [historians, scientists, and theologians] were increasingly discarding anthropocentric ways of thinking and conceiving of the material world as something alien to human consciousness, ruled by purely physical laws of cause and effect” (946). If Shakespeare’s audience identified Richard’s view of nature as more outdated than the current hegemonic reason-based views, then the logical effect of that cause would be removal of power or extinction. In her article, “‘Sad Stories of the Death of Kings:’ The Revelation of Humanity in *Richard II*,” Kim Axline reiterates this change:

The world of Shakespeare’s play is poised on the cusp between the old and the new: the characters are caught between the forces and ideals of the fading medieval world and the revolutionary energies of the emerging Renaissance. The stronghold and mysticism of the Church, the Divine Right of Kings, and codes of chivalry must make way for a new humanism and pragmatism. (108)

Because of Richard’s representation of this “old guard” of animists and the shifting beliefs of most literate Elizabethans regarding the natural world and humanity, the end of Richard’s reign

seems likely, almost natural. When he is deposed by the humanistic Henry, Richard's death and lack of power mirror the changes that were occurring in the dominant beliefs of English society. Richard's deposition and eventual death put those antiquated animistic views to rest.

Shakespeare uses natural imagery throughout the play, and before Richard's deposition, various characters compare him to the sun.² Instead of showing Richard's kingliness, Shakespeare uses these comparisons to highlight Richard's underlying weakness. After Henry compares himself to "yielding water" (3.3.57), he spies Richard and uses a metaphor to describe Richard's personality: "See, see, King Richard doth himself appear,/ As doth the blushing discontented sun" (3.3.61-2). Henry's comparison of himself to water that will drown Richard's flame demonstrates Henry's desire to be king; he literally wants to "snuff out" Richard's fire and quench his own desires for power and land. However, when Richard compares himself to the sun, he reinforces his own animistic perspective and shows his subservience to the earth/Earth, whether referring to the soil or the planet.³ As Richard stares into the looking glass, he wonders:

Was this face the face
That every day under his household roof
Did keep ten thousand men? was this the face
That, like the sun, did make beholders wink?
Was this the face that faced so many follies,
And was at last out-faced by Bolingbroke?

² During the Elizabethan era, astronomers still ascribed to Ptolemy's geocentric view—that the Earth was the center of the universe and the stars, moon, sun, and other planets revolved around it. The Copernican heliocentric view was still widely rejected, except by only a select few astronomers. However, knowledge of astrology was considered commonplace in Shakespeare's day, and his plays and sonnets are rife with references to astrological bodies. Poet Matthew Arnold even referred to Shakespeare as "Thou who didst the stars and sunbeams know" (Guthrie 210).

³ See Carroll Camden's "Astrology in Shakespeare's Day" (1933); John Candee Dean's "The Astronomy of Shakespeare" (1924); or Moriz Sondheim's "Shakespeare and the Astrology of His Time" (1939).

A brittle glory shineth in this face:

As brittle as the glory is the face (4.1.274-78)

His comparison to the sun does not reveal his desires or longings; instead, it reveals his relationship to the natural world and his inadvertent upheaval of the sun-king analogy.

According to many critical articles written about this sun-king analogy in *Richard II*⁴ and according to royal iconography in Elizabethan England, Richard's comparison of himself to the sun should symbolize his divine kingship, his closeness to God, and his supremacy in the heavens. Martha Hester Fleischer in *The Iconography of the English History Play* contends that the equation of the king to the sun demonstrates not only his Earthly power but his divine superiority:

The king radiates favor and grace like light, the essential of life; his subjects respond like marigolds to the light of the sun or like the soul to the grace of the Christian God. The rising and setting of the sun parallel the king's fate on the wheel of Fortune. The sun is also the attribute of Truth, Wisdom, Hope and Charity, and these qualities are absorbed into kingship along with the divinity of Jupiter or God. (33)

Fleischer describes this analogy as the most effective depiction of a divinely chosen king in the English history play. During the Elizabethan period, the sun was the most important body in the heavens, superior even to the Earth itself. Despite the dominant geocentric worldview, the sun was a fiery, masculine symbol that symbolized kingship and royalty while the Earth was wet, feminine, and cold. However, when Richard uses the sun-king analogy to describe himself he takes on an inferior role—he revolves around the Earth providing it with warmth and light,

⁴ See Kathryn Montgomery Harris's "Sun and Water Imagery in *Richard II*: Its Dramatic Function" (1970); S.K. Heninger's "The Sun King Analogy in *Richard II*" (1960); Samuel Klinger's "The Sun Imagery in *Richard II*" (1948).

sustaining it, serving its needs. Instead of dominating the Earth, which is central, larger, and more populated than the sun, Richard shows that he views himself in a submissive position. Instead of using the sun-king analogy to express his superiority to Henry and the Earth, he misuses this analogy to inadvertently highlight his own faults as king. S.K. Heninger in “The Sun-King Analogy in *Richard II*,” concludes that Richard uses a comparison to the sun to demonstrate his authority and also his transfer of that authority to Henry, but the analogy, instead, ironically exposes Richard’s failure as king: “Richard first cites the sun-king analogy to corroborate his God-given right to the throne of England. No one can deny his legal claim to this office, and he relies upon the sanctity of kingship as his main defense. . . the image becomes an ironical epithet that emphasizes his failure as God’s deputy” (324). While the sun-king analogy may be the most effective comparison to express a king’s power and to describe his supremacy both on Earth and in heaven, Richard’s use of this analogy exposes his lack of kingliness—it uncovers what he should be and what he is not. By using this metaphor throughout the play, Richard highlights his subservient relationship with the Earth, his failure as king, and his alignment with the natural world.

In addition to his conceit about the sun, Richard also uses a description of coronation ceremonies to show his perception of his power over the water-like Henry. Although Henry’s comparison of himself to water shows his desire for kingship and, perhaps, the death of Richard, Richard claims that: “Not all the water in the rough rude sea/ Can wash the balm from an anointed king” (3.2.50-1). The sacred oil that was used to anoint the King and permanently change him from a mere man to a God-like ruler was not a naturally occurring substance but one that was manufactured for coronation ceremonies, ordination of priests, and last rites before death. This “miraculous oil” (McKenna 102) was meant to be a link between God and man, and

it was meant to cleanse the newly appointed King and inspire him with divine power. This “heavenly unction” (McKenna 102) could not easily be washed away because oil and water naturally repel each other. By comparing himself to the sun, which also cannot be extinguished by water, and reminding his audience of his anointment with oil, Richard shows his belief that Henry’s water-like demeanor will not be victorious.

Richard also insists that the treasonous and unlawful acts that can occur in darkness will be extinguished when he assumes the throne once again:

So when this thief, this traitor, Bolingbroke,
Who all this while hath revelled in the night
Whilst we were wand’ring with the Antipodes,
Shall see us rising in our throne, the east,
His treasons will sit blushing on his face,
Not able to endure the sight of day (3.2.43-8)

Richard contends that Henry’s actions will cease once the sun rises and his vagaries are exposed. By using natural imagery to convey his kingliness, Richard shows his closeness with nature and the power that he sees in the natural world. No law or decree will stop Henry’s treason—only the shining sun will illuminate and terminate his deeds. Because of the dominant belief in the sun as the most important celestial body, Richard believes that the light it emits will be enough to expose Henry as a rebel and a thief; however, he is wrong once again. Just as his alignment with the sun in 4.1 shows his false confidence in his ability to rule and, thus, his subservience to the Earth and to Henry, his belief that the sun will expose Henry’s misdeeds is also inaccurate. Again, in his speech at 3.2.43-8, Richard uses the sun-king analogy to assert his superiority, but

that correlation is flawed—Henry’s “treasons” will not be exposed and Richard’s deposition will commence.

After the deposition, Richard’s self-comparison to the sun shows that Richard will haunt Henry’s reign—even after his deposition and death—and the comparison evokes a feeling of revenge for the wrongs committed by Henry. Richard states: “‘God save King Henry,’ unkinged Richard says,/ ‘And send him many years of sunshine days’” (4.1.209-10). Since Richard still views himself as the sun-king, he vows that his presence will always be felt by Henry during his reign, and Henry needs to atone for his wrongdoings. Instead of “sunshine days” representing the power and glory that have been transferred from the fallen king to the rebel king, Richard means it as an ominous warning about a kingship that was not ordained by God but was, instead, stolen through violent and sacrilegious methods. By wishing for the new king to have days filled with sunshine, Richard reminds readers of an earlier speech in which he sits on the ground with Scrope and Aumerle and speaks about past kings that haunt current reigns:

For God’s sake, let us sit upon the ground,
And tell sad stories of the death of kings—
How some have been deposed, some slain in war,
Some haunted by the ghosts they have deposed (3.2.151-54)

Because of Richard’s comparison to the sun and his wish for Henry to have a kingship filled with sunshine, Richard insinuates that he will haunt Henry’s reign. The sun that consoles Henry after his banishment (“This must my comfort be:/ That sun that warms you here shall shine on me” [1.3.138-9]) is the same sun that Richard embodies and uses to curse Henry’s kingship. Because of the Divine Right and because of his closeness with nature, Richard views the usurpation of his throne as unnatural. He hopes that the sun will expose Henry’s transgressions, and Richard’s

course is that Henry will remember these misdeeds each time the sun shines upon his kingdom—punishment for deposing Richard will come from above.⁵

But, at the end of 3.2, Richard indicates that he has been defeated and symbolically transfers his power to Henry. Richard says: “Discharge my followers, let them hence away,/ From Richard’s night to Bolingbroke’s fair day” (3.2.218-19). This line shows that the sun “becomes a physical symbol of Richard’s authority, and his loss of power can be expressed in imagery as the setting of the sun” (Heninger 323). Richard sits upon the Earth, showing his deference and his respect for it, but also equating himself with it.⁶ Although Henry was analogous to the Earth in earlier scenes, Richard’s realization of his defeat leads him to rest on the ground, literally to conceal himself behind the superior Earth like the setting sun. Richard has transferred his kingly power to Henry, and now aligns himself with the Earth, with the common man; he has been deprived of those qualities that were given to him by God.

Since Henry adopts a humanistic perspective, he believes that his power comes from other people; however, Richard believes that his power comes from God, and he can abuse that power at his own discretion. Maus states, “Whereas Bolingbroke thinks of power as emanating from ‘below’—from the King’s subjects, from the deployment of material resources—Richard thinks of it as descending from ‘above,’ from the God whose representative on earth he was born to be” (946). Richard thinks of his god-like power as being like the sun—“descending from ‘above’”—while Henry’s basis of power comes from the inhabitants of Earth. This statement reinforces both Henry’s humanism and Richard’s animism. Henry looks to the commoners for support, and he decides to invade only after Richard confiscates and disperses his land, when

⁵ In Sonnet 18, Shakespeare says of the sun: “Sometime too hot the eye of heaven shines,/ And often is his gold complexion dimmed” (5-6).

⁶ Norwich states: “On Monday 29 September in the Tower, Richard signed an instrument of abdication before a group of commissioners representing the lords spiritual and temporal, the landed gentry and the law; then, laying his crown on the ground before him, he resigned it, not to the Duke of Lancaster but to God” (121).

Richard violates the laws of inheritance. According to John Julius Norwich in *Shakespeare's Kings*: "To every landowner in the Kingdom, the lesson was plain: in Richard's England that most fundamental law, the law of inheritance, could no longer be relied on" (116). And Peter Saccio in *Shakespeare's English Kings* argues that violating the law of inheritance was justification for Richard's deposition: "That is why Henry IV had gained the support of the English nobility in deposing Richard II after Richard had confiscated his huge inheritance from John of Gaunt. Richard had committed other undesirable and alarming acts, but sequestering a magnate's inheritance (except in cases of treason) was lawless tyranny" (78). These laws also further illustrate the humanism/animism divide because they are a human system of distributive justice—humans decide what is equitable when dividing up and distributing land. This division is not a natural process; instead, it is one that humans created and use to further show their superiority to the Earth, to nature, and to the divided lands. The lands that Richard confiscates not only symbolize power and wealth, but they are also Henry's birthright. Because of Henry's humanism, he easily establishes these human relations, and he sees the Earth itself as something to be bought, owned, sold, and conquered. Unlike Richard's animistic view of the natural world as being inspirited and able to be commanded, Henry sees the land as a commodity that must be justly handled. When Richard banishes Henry, he says his farewell not to friends or family members, but to the land itself:

Then England's ground, farewell. Sweet soil, adieu,

My mother and my nurse that bears me yet!

Where'er I wander, boast of this I can:

Though banished, yet a trueborn Englishman. (1.3.269-72)

Henry shows that he does view the land as the key to life and survival (as mother and nurse), but he also sees the land as a symbol of status. Although he addresses the land, he does not try to communicate with it or physically touch it as Richard does: “So, weeping, smiling, greet I thee my earth,/ And do thee favours with my royal hands” (3.2.6-11). Henry believes that the land will serve him only if he is in possession of it. Henry’s personal connections with other human beings and the importance he places on land possessions illustrate his humanistic attitude.

When Richard disrupts this possession of land, war between humanist and animist commences. After a discussion with York about what to do with the Hereford estate, Richard concludes: “Think what you will, we seize into our hands/ His plate, his goods, his money, and his lands” (2.1.210-11).⁷ Although this order may seem to demonstrate Richard’s disrespect for the land and his desire to own and control it—which is more of a humanistic sentiment than an animistic one—his desire is not to own the land but to teach the rightful owners a lesson.

Richard does not see the possession of Henry’s land as a commodity but as a way to punish Henry and, perhaps, yet another way to gain control of his own kingship. Henry feels betrayed because he has been denied his birthright; the land does not matter as much as the laws of inheritance do. Richard does not want to possess the lands for the same reason Henry does.

Once Henry hears of this denial of inheritance, he decides to forego his banishment and claim what is rightfully his. He tells York:

My father’s goods are all distrained and sold,

And these and all are all amiss employed.

What would you have me do? I am a subject,

⁷ In “A Myrroure for Magistrates,” one of Shakespeare’s sources for *Richard II*, the king explains his gross mismanagement of the land and that this desire for more land stemmed from listening to his favourites instead of his own instincts: “Through Subsidies, sore fines, loanes, many a prest/ Blanke charters, othes, & shiftes not knowen of olde,/ For which my Subjectes did me sore detest” (Bullough 420-21).

And I challenge law; attorneys are denied me;
And therefore personally I lay my claim
To my inheritance of free descent. (2.3.130-35)

Henry decides to invade only after his land is confiscated and disbursed, and his attitude toward his inheritance shows his humanistic belief in the centrality of mankind on the Earth. Nature is no longer a force that guides and interacts with humans; instead, nature must yield to the powers of man. And, when Henry is denied this power, not only has his inheritance been violated, but his humanism has also. Henry would have accepted his banishment and remained in exile if Richard had not divided up Henry's birthright. But, by stealing Henry's land possessions and violating the laws of inheritance, Richard shows his disagreement with Henry's humanistic attitude—the possession of land is not as important as communicating with that land, doing it favors, being its servant. By invading, Henry represents the dominant force that will defeat the current king by reclaiming physical earth.

Because Henry expects Richard to adhere to the laws of inheritance, we see that Henry believes in human superiority over the land, and he is, in effect, successful in establishing human relations by outwardly expressing humility and generosity. His ability to relate to the commoners frightens Richard who would rather commune with nature than with his own subjects. Richard says of Henry:

Ourself and Bushy, Bagot here, and Green
Observed his courtship to the common people,
How he did seem to dive into their hearts
With humble and familiar courtesy,
What reverence he did throw away on slaves,

Wooring poor craftsmen with the craft of smiles

And patient underbearing of his fortune,

As 'twere to banish their affects with him. (1.4.23-9)

As Elizabethan humanist Thomas Cooper affirms in his three levels of humanism, one important facet of this viewpoint is the ability to relate to others with “courtesy, gentleness, and humanity” (Wells 8). Richard believes that the reverence Henry shows to slaves and craftsmen is “wasted,” though he obviously fears Henry’s rapport with these subjects because these relationships facilitate rebellion. Richard believes that the courtesy, gentleness, and humanity are only appropriate when addressing men of gentility, not slaves. Richard does not believe that Henry’s relationships with the commoners are sincere; instead, he thinks that they are hypocritical methods that Henry has learned and “crafted” to create false connections with common people who cannot discern his insincerity.

Richard’s accusations highlight his own inability to create valuable and sincere human connections. According to many accounts of the historical Richard, the king was always surrounded by sycophantic counselors, often referred to as his “favourites,” who influenced his decisions and exploited his power. Norwich comments that Richard’s most damaging weakness was his “blind devotion to his favourites” (74). Chief among them in the play are the characters Bushy, Bagot, and Green. Although his closeness with these men shows that he was able to make some form of human connection, he was not able to benefit from this allegiance and use their presences in a pragmatic way. Even if Henry did not have a sincere affection for the commoners, he was at least able to garner some benefit from these connections, namely, his security regarding Richard’s deposition. Richard’s relationship to his wife, Queen Isabella, is also not shown as a beneficial human connection. The historical Isabella was actually twenty-

two years younger than Richard, a detail that Shakespeare omits in order to “get some women into the cast and to provide occasional pathos” (Bullough 357). This marriage is also unsuccessful because it has not produced an heir to succeed Richard after his death, similar to Queen Elizabeth I’s heir-less reign.⁸ Although the farewell scene between Richard and his Queen allowed Shakespeare to show Richard as a skillful poet, Shakespeare never shows their relationship to be a significant one. In fact, Henry charges Richard’s favorites—specifically Bushy and Green—with ruining not only Richard’s reign but also his marriage:

You have misled a prince, a royal king,
A happy gentleman in blood and lineaments,
By you unhappied and disfigured clean.
You have, in manner, with your sinful hours
Made a divorce betwixt his queen and him (3.1.8-13)

Although it is possible for Richard to forge human connections, these connections seem to backfire and cause Richard grief instead of prosperity. Richard’s favorites help to speed along his downfall that leaves his Queen weeping and alone.

Richard’s divinely chosen kingship also leads to his downfall because it creates a dual personality that weakens the animistic king, making him more vulnerable to rebellion. As a divinely chosen king, Richard is subject to “the king’s two bodies,” and this theory reinforces Richard’s animism while simultaneously robbing him of humanity when he is deposed. In “Unstable Identity in Shakespeare’s *Richard II*,” Charles Forker explains that the theory of the king’s two bodies defined monarchy: “The king’s natural body incorporated his humanity and was thus subject to the frailties and mortality of the flesh like that of any other man; but his body

⁸ Saccio notes: “Four years after [Shakespeare] had composed *Henry V*, the English crown passed to a foreign monarch, James of Scotland, because, as great-grandson of Elizabeth I’s elder aunt, James was the late queen’s nearest living relative” (78).

politic embodied the state and so set him apart from all others being immortal and ubiquitous” (3-4). Because of this duality, Richard sees himself not as a humanist would (as a person with an essential human nature) but as an inspirited object. He is a natural man who is emboldened with the spirit of a king or a god. The body politic that includes his rights as a divinely chosen king resides within and inspirits his human body, making Richard similar to the inanimate objects that animists anthropomorphize. When Henry deposes Richard, Richard becomes an empty shell because his spirit has been taken from him:

Thus play I in one person many people,
And none contented. Sometimes am I king;
Then treasons make me wish myself a beggar,
And so I am. Then crushing penury
Persuades me I was better when a king.
Then am I kinged again, and by and by
Think that I am unkinged by Bolingbroke,
And straight am nothing. (5.5.31-8)

When Richard is robbed of his spirit, or his kingship, he is robbed of humanity. His kingship creates this dualism, and his animistic beliefs help him to accept the dualism. But, when he is deposed, he is no longer inspirited with godliness or kingliness and now lacks identity. Axline supports the claim that Richard’s dualistic nature leads to him being deposed: “No matter how desperately or ingeniously Richard bolsters his claim to divine and human coexistence, he cannot sustain such arguments in the face of Bolingbroke’s opposition. His use of language and doctrine ultimately falls short, as the former king is reduced to nothing more than a corpse.” (114). Richard’s animistic perspective leads him to see the spirit within natural objects, and he

considers himself also to be one of those inspirited natural objects. He has been anointed with oil that cannot be washed off and that assures his kingship and his closeness to God. However, this oil symbolizes an animistic baptism and not a humanistic belief in the laws of inheritance. Once a humanist arrives who does not believe in these spirits or the eternality of that sacred oil, Richard is robbed of his beliefs, his spirit, and his identity.

While the duality of nature resulting from the Divine Right makes Richard easier to depose, his closeness with nature also weakens his ability to combat rebellion and deposition. In the following passage, Richard equates himself to the natural world with a parental comparison:

Dear earth, I do salute thee with my hand,
Though rebels wound thee with their horses' hoofs.
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 favours with my royal hands. (3.2.6-11)

This passage suggests Richard's deference to the Earth while also showing his vulnerability and femininity. Richard compares himself to the mother, while nature is the child. This, once again, creates a dual nature and a hierarchy wherein Richard is nature's superior. Now that he has borne nature, he expects it to do his bidding. If Richard is nature's mother, then nature was once inside of him, inspiriting him. He compares himself to a post-partum woman. According to Gail Kern Paster in *The Body Embarrassed : Drama and the Disciplines of Shame in Early Modern England*, pregnancy was considered unclean and like a disease:

Perhaps pregnancy was perceived this way because it entailed so many physical changes within a bodily paradigm where change was cause for fear, perhaps it

was because the baby itself could be regarded, like an unwanted growth, as an alien presence altering the humoral balance of its mother and destined for evacuation and release. (182)

Before Richard expelled the Earth from his womb, it was like a parasite—perhaps robbing him of his masculine traits and turning him into a vulnerable and feeble mother, a weak woman who weeps and smiles at her creation. These hardly seem to be the traits of a king who will defend himself against Henry’s powerful forces. Richard’s animistic perspective not only leads him to respect the Earth as an ally and a vengeful force, but it leads him, once again, to create a split in his nature. He is, at once, a king and a mother. And when Richard compares himself to Earth’s mother, this comparison is not necessarily a sweet and loving image because of the weakness it represents. Instead, it is an image of shame, disease, and instability.

When Richard is imprisoned, he once again refers to himself as a parental figure, but, in this comparison, he populates his prison with aborted thoughts and further emasculates himself. Unlike his comparison of himself to Earth’s mother, Richard’s imprisoned musings connote loss of power and confusion:

My brain I’ll prove the female to my soul,
My soul the father, and these two beget
A generation of still-breeding thoughts;
And these same thoughts people this little world
In humours like the people of this world. (5.5.6-10)

In this passage, Richard refers to his soul as the father and his brain as the mother of this “generation” of thoughts, and these thoughts, because of Richard’s solitude and anger, are similar in “humours” to people in the real world. These thoughts are also “still-breeding,”

meaning that they are dead before they are fully formed. Within his own body, he is able to populate his prison with half-dead thoughts. This hermaphroditic and incestuous imagery, while similar to Richard's image of giving birth to the Earth, puts Richard in an empowered position—he is a creator of life. There is not a sperm or an egg in these births, only Richard's mind and soul. However, because of Richard's dejected outlook as he gives birth to these thoughts, they are doomed to inadequacy and failure. Paster asserts that when women in early modern England were pregnant, their psyches or "longings" sometimes led to difficult births with unsavory outcomes:

Obstetrical texts and diary records alike abound with anecdotes of mothers whose frights or longings during pregnancy were thought to have marked their babies with harelips, blood- or wine-stained markings, hairy moles or other deformities. In such accounts, responsibility for avoiding a poor outcome comes to rest heavily upon the mother, who must submit herself quietly and submissively to her state. (180)

Because the mother's state-of-mind and longings could negatively affect the outcome of birth, the thoughts that Richard gives birth to must be disturbingly deformed. He goes on to say that "no thought is contented" (5.5.11), so these thoughts that populate Richard's prison, that have come from within his body, that have resulted from an incestuous marriage of his spirit and mind, are as vulnerable and discontented as he is. Instead of being surrounded by the Earth, an entity that can presumably aid in his endeavors, Richard now surrounds himself with thoughts that have no power to help him. His motherhood has been unsuccessful, and the fruits of his labor are useless in his fight for power and kingship.

Some of the actions that Richard requests the Earth to perform in order to aid his cause demonstrate his misunderstanding of the natural world and his faulty animism. While Henry is the consummate humanist, Richard's animistic beliefs seem to be based on subservience and respect on one hand and misinterpretation and ignorance on the other. When Richard asks nature to do his bidding, he is asking nature to perform actions that it would have performed anyway, similar to the storm in *King Lear*. These natural actions become seemingly unnatural because Richard commands them to occur:

Yield stinging nettles to mine enemies,
And when they from thy bosom pluck a flower
Guard it, I pray thee, with a lurking adder,
Whose double tongue may with a mortal touch
Throw death upon thy sovereign's enemies (3.2.18-22)

As Gabriel Egan claims in *Green Shakespeare: From Ecopolitics to Ecocriticism*, “many of these are things that happen anyway” (82). Richard, who purports to commune with nature, do favors for it, give birth to it, and rely upon it for survival and vengeance, is merely asking snakes to bite and spiders to poison. Because of his Divine Right as king, Richard believes that he can ask nature to use its weapons against particular individuals at particular times, which is an unnatural command of the natural world.⁹ Egan demonstrates that these commands, whether resulting from Richard's divine kingship or merely his need for vengeance, show Richard's “mistaken beliefs” about the natural world:

⁹ In “Jacobean Political Theology: The Absolute and Ordinary Powers of the King,” Francis Oakley quotes St. Peter Damian about God's omnipotence and its relationship to the natural world: “God, being omnipotent, can act in a manner ‘contrary to the common order of nature’ or ‘the custom of nature’—as he did, indeed, when he saved the three youths from Nebuchadnezzar's fiery furnace—for he who gave ‘the law and order to nature’ can hardly be subject to its laws” (333). Because Richard is God on Earth, he also believes that he is not subject to nature's laws and can command nature. However, nature does not bend to his whims, further establishing his faulty kingship and animistic beliefs.

This opens up the possibility that fallible human interpretation of natural occurrences might be the important element in the relationship of human affairs and earthly happening, and indeed that self-confirming superstitions might be at work. . .In *Richard 2*, belief in Tillyardian correspondence between the human and cosmic planes is right even though wrong: believing makes it so. (83)

Richard's requests are not incredible feats of nature; they are inevitable occurrences that frequently occur in the natural world, and he further demonstrates his ignorance of natural occurrences by expecting nature to obey his specific commands. Richard shows that his beliefs in the connection between man and nature are right simply because he believes them, but these beliefs are also wrong because he has misunderstood nature's reaction to human intervention. Whether he is a divinely chosen king or a mere commoner, nature is ambivalent. These natural events would or would not have occurred despite Richard's requests. This argument is similar to Hotspur's argument in *1 Henry IV* when Owen Glendower details his miraculous birth—"The front of heaven was full of fiery shapes,/ Of burning cressets" (3.1.13-4)—and Hotspur maintains that Glendower's birth had no effect on the natural world: "Why, so it would have done/ At the same season if your mother's cat/ Had but kittened, though yourself had never had never been born"(17-9). Richard's commands and Glendower's description of his nativity show that humans, even animists, interpret nature incorrectly—all of these events happen naturally and not because of human interaction or need. Although Richard is an animist who attempts to commune with nature, he does not anticipate its reactions as Nurit Bird-David suggests animists should in "Animism Revisited." Instead, Richard views the natural world selfishly, as if he has some control over it and it should obey his commands.

When nature does not obey Richard's commands, Shakespeare highlights the main differences between Richard and Henry. Egan contends: "The non-materialization of these impossibilities in [*Richard II*] provided the key contrast between the fantasist king and the realist rebel" (87). Although Egan uses other terms to describe Richard and Henry, he easily could have substituted "animistic" for "fantasist" and "humanistic" for "realist." While Richard acts as if he is subservient to nature (by comparing himself to the sun and giving birth to the Earth), he still exploits the natural world, which leads to his downfall. Although he is an animist and feels subservient to the natural world, he still attempts to exploit it; he still sells Henry's land; he still expects the Earth to respond to his pledges and whims; he still submits to the whims of his two favourites with nature-related names, Bushy and Green. John of Gaunt says of Richard: "Landlord of England art thou now, not king" (2.1.113).

This exploitation of nature is best exemplified in the scene between the Queen and the Gardener in 3.4. In this scene, the Gardener uses natural imagery and a comparison of the commonwealth to a garden to explain Richard's unsuccessful and damaging reign:

O, what pity is it
That he had not so trimmed and dressed his land
As we this garden! We at time of year
Do wound the bark, the skin of our fruit trees,
Lest, being over-proud in sap and blood,
With too much riches it confound itself.
Had he done so to great and growing men,
They might have lived to bear, and he to taste,
Their fruits of duty. (3.4.56-64)

The Gardener says that if Richard had not allowed his favourites, or “noisome weeds” (3.4.39), to infect his kingship and if he had interacted more effectively with those he ruled, then Richard would have had a more successful kingship. But, because he exploited the land and caused it to be “[s]warming with caterpillars” (3.4.48), Richard made it easier for Henry to depose him. The Gardener, who is “old Adam’s likeness” (3.4.74), further illustrates Henry’s humanistic triumph over Richard’s faulty animism when he maintains that, while Richard is now alone and overthrown, Henry has “all the English peers” (3.4.89) on his side. Heninger argues that this scene represents a biblical condemnation of Richard’s actions: “And underlying the entire scene is the standard of order which prevailed in the Garden of Eden, God’s prototype of natural harmony” (321). Shakespeare shows Richard not just as a faulty animist who exploits the land, but as a failed king who had violated this idyllic image of England as God wished it to be. Richard has not only sullied his reputation through acts of “commission as well as omission” (Heninger 321), but he has disrupted both natural and religious order. Despite his animism and his seeming respect for the natural world, Richard’s faulty views become hypocritical, and they cannot ward off the threat of deposition from the bold and humanistic Henry. Ultimately, Richard was not able to save his land or himself from himself.

Once Henry deposes Richard, the commoners show their true feelings for both the former and new king by cheering for Henry and throwing earthly items such as “dust and rubbish on King Richard’s head” (5.2.6). This action shows a symbolic burial of Richard—he has moved from the sun-king that radiates power and light to an Earth-bound man who cannot escape the judgment and wrath of the commoners who side with Henry. He is no longer the divinely chosen king, and his deposition shows the king’s animistic beliefs also being buried by the humanistic attitudes of the new king. Although Shakespeare shows the importance of moving toward a

humanistic perspective in order to be a successful ruler, his presentation of the characters of Richard and Henry do not necessarily indicate that this movement is favorable, simple, or gratifying. In *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*, Geoffrey Bullough suggests that, while readers respect Richard during his dethronement, they begin to lose respect for Henry, the future king: “So the political tragedy becomes a tragedy of ‘passion’ as Richard’s suffering issues in vehement outbursts of feeling, and paradoxically as the King gives up his power and his rights he becomes more and more interesting. . . As Richard gains our pity Bolingbroke loses some of our admiration” (379). Although this cultural shift indicates that animism must be defeated (or buried) for humanism to thrive, Shakespeare addresses his audience’s attachment to animistic beliefs and shows the harsh realities that humanism may bear. Maus claims: “The pragmatic Bolingbroke, then, is associated with a new, effective, but not necessarily moral or satisfying way of thinking about the manipulation of men and matter” (947). Not only does humanism encourage human connections, but it encourages a ruthless, violent, and unsympathetic extinction of animistic beliefs.

One aspect of the definition of animism that has been neglected thus far is the contention of the reality of dreams. Shakespeare uses the word “dream” only once in *Richard II* in Richard’s last conversation with the Queen before his death. The Queen asks Richard what has become of him and his kingdom, and he responds:

Join not with grief, fair woman, do not so,
To make my end too sudden. Learn, good soul,
To think our former state a happy dream,
From which awakened, the truth of what we are
Shows us but this. (5.1.16-20)

In this desperate and heartbreaking passage, Richard tells his wife that there is no hope for their futures and that they should remember their former lives fondly because that “happy dream” will no longer be a reality. In *Animism*, Clodd asserts that “the dreams which come to these people [in animistic cultures] are to them as real as any of the events of their waking lives. Dream acts and waking acts differ only in one respect: the former are done only by the spirit, while the latter are done by the spirit in its body” (31). Richard claims that his life up until his imprisonment was a dream—a dream that his soul experienced. When he wakes after this long and laborious kingship, he realizes that he is merely human and that he has squandered this dream. He urges the Queen to move to France, while he will be moved “towards the north,/ Where shivering cold and sickness pines the clime” (5.1.76-7). The reality of his waking life is almost too much for Richard to endure. When he realizes that the dream is over, that he has been deposed, that nature has turned against him, and that he must live the rest of his life as a captive without his land or his crown, Richard’s dream becomes a waking nightmare.

As the play ends, the final speeches of both Richard and Henry demonstrate each character’s attitudes toward the natural world. When Henry discovers that Richard has been killed, his final speech to his lords shows his remorse for deposing Richard:

Lords, I protest my soul is full of woe
That blood should sprinkle me to make me grow.
Come mourn with me for what I do lament,
And put on sullen black incontinent. (5.6.45-48)

Henry uses a seemingly natural image of growth to explain his remorse for Richard’s death, but his growth is facilitated by blood instead of water.¹⁰ While he has compared himself to the water

¹⁰ In Elizabethan England, a common practice involved using animal blood as agricultural fertilizer. In *Maison Rustique*, Charles Estienne comments on this regular occurrence: “Cast a great deale of earth into a great hole of

that will douse Richard's sun-like flames, now Henry admits that it is bloodshed that nurtures his development. Richard's final speech before his death contrasts the unnatural imagery in Henry's final speech. Before he is killed by Exton, Richard uses a natural image—one that he has been associated with throughout the play—to curse Exton:

That hand shall burn in never-quickning fire
That staggers thus my person. Exton, thy fierce hand
Hath with the King's blood stained the King's own land.
Mount, mount my soul; thy seat is up on high,
Whilst my gross flesh sinks downward, here to die. (5.6.108-112)

In this final speech, Richard once again refers to the comparison of himself to the sun and Henry to water. Whoever kills Richard will burn in a “never-quickning fire”—a fire as hot as the sun that can never be extinguished, an earthly hell. Next, Richard refers to his land being stained with his own blood, and this demonstrates that, even in his last grave moments, Richard is concerned about the kingship he has lost due to his reverence for the land. He does not lament the subjects who will suffer due to his death; he merely laments the earth, the land that he ruled over, his beloved England. Lastly, Richard addresses his soul and orders it to heaven. While Richard's deposition makes him feel like nothing—like a man with no identity—his death demonstrates his belief in a soul separate or detached from the body. Just as primitive animists believed that inanimate objects were inspirited, so too does Richard see himself as one of these inspirited objects. The soul that has resided within him that was once the soul of a divinely

purpose made for such an end, which you shall besprinkle with the blood of Oxen and other beasts, killed onely for the Hide; afterward you shall cast a reasonable quantitie of Oates vpon the same, and you shall turne the said earth the vppermost lowermost: in a small time there will be engendred such a great quantitie of wormes, as that the Pullen shall haue picking worke there for a long time; and the grasse which shall sticke there, will correct the fat which they shall get by the wormes which they haue picked: And when you shall see the prouision of wormes to faile, you may begin againe your watering of the earth with blood, and sowing of Oates thereupon, as at the first” (94).

chosen king, a man who gave birth to nature itself, a sun who provides light and heat for the entire world must now ascend to heaven and leave Richard's body upon the Earth that has betrayed him. Richard's animistic viewpoint led him to believe that the Earth would come to his aid, that it would enact his vengeful plans and preserve his kingship. In the end, however, Richard is still human, and he must die.

Richard's animistic beliefs taint his reign and lead to his deposition. In the political landscape of kingship, what matters is conquering lands and peoples, pleasing subjects, and establishing a reputation of courage and valor. Unfortunately for Richard, his animistic perspective, which makes him an effeminate servant to the Earth, lead to the usurpation of his throne. Because of the Divine Right and his comparison of himself to a mother, Richard creates a duality of his own nature that leads directly to his downfall. Ready to seize the opportunity of power is the humanistic Henry, who values the commoners and his earthly birthright; his relationship with his subjects and respect for common practices of land dispersal demonstrate that Henry is ready to be king. He does not need natural forces to help rule his kingdom. He does not feel indebted or subservient to the Earth. He is a man of the people who fights for what is just, rules with a fair hand, and believes in "courtesy, gentleness, and humanity." When Richard dies and Henry becomes king, humanism triumphs over animism.

Chapter 2: Hal Complicates the Humanism/Animism Divide in *1 Henry IV*

Unlike *Richard II*, which focuses most of its attention on the troubled and animistic king and his deposition, *1 Henry IV* concentrates on the young Prince Hal's exploits in Eastcheap and the impetuous Harry Hotspur's attempts to subvert Henry IV's kingship. While *Richard II* sets up a binary between the animism of Richard and the humanism of Henry, this divide is both obscured and complicated in *1 Henry IV* because Shakespeare creates a duality in Hal's character, showing his ability to participate in a variety of discourses, a skill rhetoricians call code-switching, depending upon his current surroundings and duties. If he is at the Boar's Head tavern—the place that represents the natural world because of its patrons' belief in superstition, closeness with nature, and fulfillment of bodily desires—he can easily deflect Falstaff's clever insults and recruit Poins to trick and fool the fat knight. When Hal is at court—the humanistic world of reason and politics—he can convince his father and brother of his worthiness as heir to the throne and lead a successful and deadly battle against the rebels. Instead of a binary between current king and deposer, as in *Richard II*, Shakespeare highlights the prince's double nature—that of drunkard and heir. Hal is, of course, contrasted with Hotspur, the impulsive and intrepid son of Northumberland. But Shakespeare sets up parallels between various characters in this play—Hal with Henry, Hal with Richard, Falstaff with Henry—that further demonstrate the complexity of the animism versus humanism debate, and these parallels further complicate the binary that is so well-established in *Richard II*. Humanism triumphs over animism in that play, but like the civil war in *1 Henry IV*, the winner in the humanism/animism debate is not as immediately obvious or certain.

Just as Shakespeare contrasts Richard and Henry in *Richard II*, Shakespeare creates a similar contrast between Hal and Hotspur in *1 Henry IV* by demonstrating the former's ability to learn lessons from his surroundings and the latter's inability to adapt to challenging situations. This contrast also highlights Hal's blending of humanism and animism as well as Hotspur's failed humanism. While Hal can adapt his rhetoric and actions for the crowd at the Boar's Head and then shift to a new discourse and set of actions at the royal court, Hotspur is a boastful and reactionary character who is unable to exhibit civility and respect, even toward those characters closest to him who could have aided in his rebellion against the King. In *Shakespeare's Humanism*, Robin Headlam Wells states that the purpose of humanism is to "guard against barbarism to which the baser side of human nature always threatened to lead us" (7). Shakespeare shows Hotspur as far from civilized; he is, in fact, a rash and prideful dissenter who disrespects others and refuses to commend his enemies. Not only does the heat of Hotspur's name suggest that he is impulsive, but Hotspur's fondness for his horse and aversion to poetry also demonstrate Hotspur's failed humanism. When Hotspur decides to attack Hal in single combat, he says:

Come, let me taste my horse,
Who is to bear me like a thunderbolt
Against the bosom of the Prince of Wales.
Harry to Harry shall, hot horse to horse,
Meet and ne'er part till one drop down a corpse. (4.1.120-4)

In *Shakespeare Among the Animals: Nature and Society in the Drama of Early Modern England*, Bruce Boehrer suggests that this speech, along with Hotspur's exchange with Lady Percy at 2.4,¹¹ indicates that Hotspur is equated with his horse and also desires the horse sexually:

In fact, the line [4.1.123 above] conveys not so much a sense of antagonism or opposition as of amalgamation: of rider with horse, of warrior with opponent [...]
Associated thus with women and fools and horses, the youthful Hotspur (his youth itself a deliberate departure from Shakespeare's source) is marked as a proper object for Prince Hal's disciplinary ministrations. (24)

Hotspur's pathological fondness for his horse not only highlights his failed humanism, but it also reinforces Hal's devotion to defeating Hotspur.

Hotspur's disdain for poetry also shows his failed humanism. During his conversation with Owen Glendower in 3.1, Hotspur reveals his hatred for poetry and poets alike:

I had rather be a kitten and cry "mew"
Than one of those same metre ballad-mongers.
I had rather hear a brazen can-stick turned,
Or a dry wheel grate on the axle-tree,
And that would set my teeth nothing on edge,
Nothing so much as mincing poetry.
'Tis like the forced gait of a shuffling nag. (3.1.125-31)

Hotspur's disdain for poetry is his least humanistic quality. The creation of poetry is an act performed solely by humans who use their instinct and their imaginations to create "mincing poetry." If Hotspur rejects an art that is created solely by human beings, then he is also rejecting

¹¹ Hotspur says to Kate: "Come, wilt thou see me ride?/ And when I am a-horseback, I will swear/ I love thee infinitely" (2.4.91-3). *The Norton Shakespeare* glosses "a-horseback" as "On my horse; having sexual intercourse" (1178).

the act of looking within for inspiration and using one's imagination to create art. Since humanists are supposed to "guard against barbarism," as Wells contends, a true humanist should embrace a creation that separates humans from the natural world; instead, Hotspur shows that he does not respect such talents and considers them frivolous or impractical.

Hotspur's uncle, the Earl of Worcester, explains that Hotspur's impetuous nature and his refusal to act civilly toward his enemies turns away potential allies instead of making Hotspur a hero worthy of praise. Worcester says:

Though sometimes it show greatness, courage, blood—
And that's the dearest grace it renders you—
Yet oftentimes it doth present harsh rage,
Defect of manners, want of government,
Pride, haughtiness, opinion, and disdain,
The least of which haunting a nobleman
Loseth men's hearts, and leave behind a stain (3.1.177-83)

Although Henry—the consummate humanist—praises Hotspur for his courage while comparing him to his own son Hal, Worcester tries to explain the negative side of this courage to Hotspur. Worcester tries to instruct Hotspur in the correct behaviors of a humanist, but Hotspur disregards this lesson and continues to exhibit a "willful-blame" (3.1.173) and uncompromising attitude toward his fellow allies and the King. When Hotspur explains his reason for rebelling against the King to Sir Walter Blunt, Hotspur refers to Henry's humanistic attitude and its limitations: "The King is kind, and well we know the King/ Knows at what time to promise, when to pay"

(4.3.54-5).¹² Hotspur asserts that Henry's appeals to his would-be subjects as he returned from his exile and deposed Richard were strategic—once Henry took the throne he betrayed those who helped him become King. Hotspur also explains his affection for Richard and his disdain for Henry by using natural imagery: “To put down Richard, that sweet lovely rose, /And plant this thorn, this canker, Bolingbroke?” (1.3.173-74). Once again violating the tenets of humanism, Hotspur compares these two kings to natural objects and denies Henry his kingship by referring to him as Bolingbroke. Hotspur does not seem to feel the civility and respect toward his fellow man—or even his King—that Wells describes in his definition of humanism, and Hotspur's refusal to listen to his uncle's warnings will prove to be this failed humanist's downfall.

Despite his father's preference for Hotspur in the beginning of the play, Hal does exhibit the qualities that Wells ascribes to humanists when he praises Hotspur's bravery and valor. In the opening scene of the play, Henry laments Northumberland's fortune for having such a valiant son in Hotspur whom he describes with a natural image as the “straightest plant” (1.1.81) in the entire forest. Henry continues:

O, that it could be proved
That some night-tripping fairy had exchanged
In cradle clothes our children where they lay,
And called mine Percy, his Plantagenet!
Then I would have his Harry, and he mine. (1.1.85-9)

This time using a supernatural image, Henry explains his preference for Hotspur's seemingly humanistic characteristics over his son's lackadaisical and misguided experiences with the Eastcheap commoners. Henry's initial preference for Hotspur demonstrates that the humanist

¹² Henry explains his own opinion of his humanistic attitude when he converses with Hal: “And then I stole all courtesy from heaven,/ And dressed myself in such humility/ That I did pluck allegiance from men's hearts,/ Loud shouts and salutations from their mouths,/ Even in the presence of the crownèd King” (3.2.50-4).

characteristics of having initiative and being valiant in battle are important to rulers, but Hotspur soon demonstrates the underlying damage that these characteristics can cause when used in a barbarous way. Hal, on the other hand, epitomizes Wells's description of a humanist by praising his enemy and by challenging Hotspur to one-on-one combat. While Hal prides himself on insulting his friend Falstaff for his deceit and corpulence, Hal praises Hotspur, the leader of the rebels against his own father. Before battle and in front of his father, brother, and others, Hal extols Hotspur while confessing his own shortcomings, which could either be Hal's sincere praise of Hotspur's bravery or Hal's way of making his defeat of Hotspur seem more heroic because of Hotspur's valor:

I do not think a braver gentleman,
More active-valiant or more valiant-young,
More daring or more bold, is now alive
To grace this latter age with noble needs.
For my part, I may speak it to my shame,
I have a truant been to chivalry;
And so I hear he doth account me too. (5.1.89-95)

By praising his enemy and pointing out his own inadequacies, Hal exemplifies the humanistic tenets Thomas Cooper describes: "courtesy, gentleness, and humanity" (Wells 8); he becomes chivalrous while denying his own chivalry; he succeeds where Hotspur fails.

Unlike the comparison between Richard as an animist and Henry as a humanist in *Richard II*, the contrast between Hal and Hotspur does not show one as a humanist and one as an animist; instead, it shows Hotspur as a failed humanist—one who should be trying to win over the masses to his side of conflict (as Henry did when deposing Richard), but who actually pushes

them farther away with his anti-humanist attitude. Before the rebellion, Glendower and Hotspur's own father opt not to participate in the rebels' cause. This withdrawal would not have happened if Hotspur had calmed his barbaric attitude and appealed to the affections of the people as Henry did when he usurped Richard's throne. In fact, Hotspur is less concerned with acquiring and ruling land and more concerned with ownership. When Henry orders Hotspur to release his prisoners so that Henry may collect the ransom money, Hotspur claims that he would not release them because of the effete messenger the king sent to collect them. Hotspur says that this lord was:

neat and trimly dressed,
Fresh as a bridegroom, and his chin, new-reaped,
Showed like a stubbled-land at harvest-home.
He was perfumèd like a milliner (1.3.32-5)

Hotspur also claims that this man was of questionable masculinity because he used "holiday and lady terms" (1.3.45) and was "like a waiting gentlewoman" (1.3.54). Hotspur, who was "breathless and faint" (1.3.31) after the battle, felt extreme contempt for this "popinjay" (1.3.49), who was so clean and feminine, because he asked Hotspur to surrender his prisoners. Hotspur refused to do so not because of his lack of allegiance to Henry or for financial gain but because of his dislike for the messenger. While Hal can code-switch—change his speech and attitudes according to his surroundings—Hotspur is unable to do so and, instead, becomes angry and belligerent. Shakespeare shows Hotspur as the worst kind of humanist—one who is only concerned with owning land, keeping prisoners, and destroying his competitors without consideration for their humanity or remorse for his own wrongs.

Just as Shakespeare highlights Hotspur's failed humanism, he also reveals Henry's ineffectual humanism and parallels it with Glendower's unsuccessful animism. In *Richard II*, Shakespeare depicts Henry as a valiant leader who forged successful human relationships in order to further this cause. In *1 Henry IV*, Shakespeare shows Henry's humanistic attitude to be less effectual and more of a hindrance than an asset. Henry does not see the parallel between his own ability to make human connections and his son's decision to connect with his future subjects. Instead of acknowledging Hal's pursuit of knowledge and beneficial human connections, Henry chastises and disowns his son. Henry, who still believes himself to be the savior of his people, wants to rule without animistic influences and with a more equitable consideration of his court. He does not want to rely on the "favourites" that led to Richard's downfall. But, by embracing the humanist tenets and overtly rejecting the animistic ones, Henry incites rebellion. Shakespeare compares Henry's rejection of animism with Glendower's belief in it. Henry calls the Welsh ruler "that great magician, damned Glyndŵr" (1.3.82) and compares him to the devil because of his animistic beliefs: "He durst as well have met the devil alone/ As Owain Glyndŵr as an enemy" (1.3.114-5). Unlike Henry, Glendower is the consummate animist; he eschews the humanist tenet of reason in favor of a belief in nature's power, wrath, and premonition. In his meeting with Hotspur, Glendower describes the mystical occurrences during his birth and contends: "These signs have marked me extraordinary,/ And all the courses of my life do show/ I am not in the roll of common men" (3.1.39-41). Glendower believes that nature sends him signs and that his ability to commune with nature makes him more than a man and closer to a god. Unlike Richard, whose faulty animism revealed hypocrisy and misunderstanding, Shakespeare shows Glendower's animism as unmanageable and unrestrained. If Hal continues to surround himself with commoners who believe in superstition and exercise

other animistic qualities, he may become a ruler like Glendower. Henry fears that fate most of all. This fear explains Henry's comparison of Hal to Richard, another animistic ruler.

While the binary in *Richard II* exists between the animistic Richard and the humanistic Henry, in *1 Henry IV*, this humanist/animist divide exists within the dual nature of Hal, the heir to the throne. Vernon mentions this dual nature when he describes Hal to Hotspur: "As if he mastered there a double spirit/ Of teaching and of learning instantly" (5.2.63-4). Unlike Richard's duality that was created because of the theory of the king's two bodies, Hal's double spirit comes from the two worlds or lifestyles that he attempts to embody—the world of the tavern and the world of the court. In order for Hal to become a better humanist and, therefore, a better leader than his father or Hotspur, Hal must blend the world of authority with the world of retreat; he must unify the humanistic world of court that is concerned with land and power with the animistic world of the tavern that is concerned with natural and bodily pleasures.¹³ Of course, the benefits of blending these two worlds is not made immediately apparent to Henry, and he wishes for his son to act more like a prince and less like a tippler. Henry asks:

Could such inordinate and low desires,
Such poor, such bare, such lewd, such mean attempts,
Such barren pleasures, rude society,
As thou art matched withal and grafted to,
Accompany the greatness of thy blood,
And hold their level with thy princely heart? (3.2.12-7)

¹³ In his article "Henry IV," Harold C. Goddard asserts that we can understand why Shakespeare chose to alternate between scenes at court and scenes in Eastcheap once we understand Hal's dual identity: "The moment we follow Falstaff's lead and cease thinking of Henry as Henry and conceive him as Hal-and-the-prince we see how right Shakespeare was to build this play on an alternation of 'tavern' scenes and political-military ones. Instead of being just chronicle play relieved by comedy (as historians of the drama are bound to see it), what we have is a genuine integration, both psychological and dramatic, the alternating character of the scenes corresponding to the two sides of a dual personality" (23-4).

Henry asks his son how he can reconcile his high birth with his low company. Ironically, the very people that Richard praises Henry for understanding are the ones Henry chastises Hal for emulating, and the audience knows Hal's plans because of his soliloquy in 1.2: "I'll so offend to make offense a skill,/ Redeeming time when men think least I will" (1.2.194-5). In "'To Demand the Time of Day:' Prince Hal," Elliot Kreiger asserts that Hal uses his time in the tavern to obtain information that would make him a better ruler:

Prince Hal, like other aristocratic protagonists, uses the second world as part of his strategy for maintaining authority in the primary world, but he does not accept the tavern as a retreat, a holiday interlude. . . Hal maintains his own authority in the midst of indulgence rather than perpetuate the fiction that indulgence temporarily releases a whole society from the need for authority. (103)

Instead of permanently relinquishing his duties as prince and engrossing himself in the tavern lifestyle, Hal allows these two opposing locales to combine within himself; he allows these two disparate lifestyles to inspire him. Hal can be both regal and common, and he can "drink with any tinker in his own language during [his] life" (2.5.16-7). Hal embodies the humanistic attitude that made Henry a successful deposer and allowed him to claim the throne and reign as a worthy king, but Hal's method of relating to the commoners is more intensive than his father's method. Hal's dual nature, instead of inhibiting his ability to lead, to defend the crown, and to please his father, allows him to blend the two seemingly opposing environments and emerge as the "hero-king" (Bullough 159) in *Henry V*.

Because of his dual nature and his ability not only to win the commoners' respect but actually to be one of them, Hal becomes one of England's greatest kings. In *Henry V*, Hal uses these abilities to inspire his troops at Agincourt because he speaks to them as an insider, not just

as a ruler. Hal says to his outnumbered troops: “Once more into the breach, dear friends, once more/ Or close the wall up with our English dead” (3.1.1-2), and he inspires his troops to rally behind him and defeat the French. There are also many instances of Hal conversing with his soldiers, specifically Bates, Court, and Williams, using vernacular, similar to the vernacular used at the Boar’s Head. As Hal converses with these three soldiers, disguised as a soldier himself, at the English camp at Agincourt, he uses the common speech he has learned in the taverns to boost the soldiers’ morale and allegiance to the king: “For though I speak it to you, I think the King is but a man, as I am. The violet smells to him as it doth to me; the elements shows to him as it doth to me. All his sense have but human conditions” (4.1.98-101). Hal uses his animist education to further his humanist relationships—he uses the language of the tavern to form personal bonds. Instead of choosing humanism over animism, Hal combines the two; there is no triumph of one over the other as with Henry’s usurpation of Richard’s throne. This difference shows that not only will Hal be king, but he will be a king who understands the needs of commoners as well as the rights and responsibilities of being King. Hal will be both.¹⁴

Before he metamorphoses from the rogue prince into the hero-king, Hal must set himself apart from both his companions in Eastcheap as well as the rebels who seek to depose his father. However, Shakespeare not only contrasts Hal with Hotspur, but he also contrasts Hal with Falstaff and compares Hal to Richard. These links are similar to a motif found in *Richard II*—comparison of characters to celestial bodies. Richard compares himself to the sun in order to show that he is superior to Henry, but he inadvertently demonstrates his deference to both the

¹⁴ Geoffrey Bullough in *Narrative and Dramatic Sources for Shakespeare* also highlights Hal’s dual nature and emphasizes the differences between Hal and Hotspur: “Hal seems to lack dignity, but he can assume it at need; he seems to mock irreverently at good behavior, and at the code of honour, yet he conforms gloriously in time of need; he wastes his time in brawls and the trivial mock-battle of Gadshill, yet he will slay Hotspur in single combat; he seems to lack all sense of responsibility, yet when the call to duty comes, to father and to country, he obeys it nobly” (174).

Earth and Henry. In Hal's soliloquy in 1.2, he compares himself to the sun as a symbol for his future kingship, and this comparison does not fail as Richard's did in *Richard II*. Hal states:

Yet herein will I imitate the sun,
Who doth permit the base contagious clouds
To smother up his beauty from the world,
That when he please again to be himself,
Being wanted he may be more wondered at
By breaking through the foul and ugly mists
Of vapours that did seem to strangle him. (1.2.175-81)

In this speech, Hal compares himself to the sun—a bright and ever-present object—that is obscured from view by mist and clouds. Hal's presence in the tavern with commoners is not allowing his true kingliness to shine through, and he is deliberately obscuring his kingliness so that, when the time is right and he feels he must prove himself, his triumphs will seem all the more valiant. He plans to emerge from the haze of sack, robberies, and a lowly existence and surprise those who doubt him, and they will respect him even more because of his reformation. This lowly existence reminds the audience of Richard's curse on Henry's reign: "'God save King Henry,' unkinged Richard says, / 'And send him many years of sunshine days'" (4.1.209-10). Richard curses Henry to a reign plagued by the sun. This homophone could also be interpreted as a kingship plagued with a "son," and Hal's preference for a common life may be the curse that Richard enacted against Henry. Although Richard's self-comparison to the sun should serve to highlight his successes as king, the comparison actually shows his inadequacies. However, Hal's self-comparison to the sun highlights the perceived inadequacies that he will overcome as soon

as he brings his kingliness to the forefront and rids himself of the mists—his friends in the tavern.

Also in 1.2 in *1 Henry IV*, Falstaff aligns himself and his friends with the moon, which serves as both a regulator of tides and the light that aids in their crimes:

Marry then, sweet wag, when thou art king let not us that are squires of the night's body be called thieves of the day's beauty. Let us be "Diana's foresters", "gentlemen of the shade", "minions of the moon", and let men say we be men of good government, being governed, as the sea is, by our noble and chaste mistress of the moon, under whose countenance we steal. (1.2.20-6)

Falstaff hopes that, by day, he will be seen as a friend to the king—as a nobleman. But, by night, he will continue to steal and drink. He uses the image of the moon not as a regulator of the ebb and flow of the tides but as a guiding light for him to continue his transgressions even after his friend has ascended the throne. If Falstaff and his friends at the Boar's Head identify with the moon, then it is logical for Hal—who hopes to use what his friends have taught him in order to become a more effective king—to compare himself to the sun. He does not wish to become the opposite of his companions when he becomes king, but he wishes to be a celestial body in the same sky—just one that shines brighter, is more powerful, and is not obscured by "foul and ugly mists." By comparing himself to the sun, Hal shows that he will be the light that leads either to his friends' salvation or to their ruin.

Not only does Hal compare himself to the sun, but Henry also uses this image to draw a comparison between Hal and Richard. Henry states that, when he was trying to depose Richard, he excited people's curiosity by staying out of sight, by only appearing at certain times, by remaining invisible but with a palpable presence. By being seen infrequently, he was easily able

to gain more allies, and he uses an allusion to another celestial body to express his sporadic appearances:

By being seldom seen, I could not stir

But, like a comet, I was wondered at,

That men should tell their children "This is he."

Others would say "Where, which is Bolingbroke?" (3.2.46-9)

Because Henry did not consistently make his presence known, the commoners did not tire of him; instead, they marveled at him and beheld him as someone to be revered. Ironically, in Renaissance astronomy, the appearance of a comet signified a disturbance on Earth and was more feared than any other celestial occurrence. In "The Astronomy of Shakespeare," John Candee Dean notes that "comets portended greater woes than all the other celestial bodies combined" (403). He continues:

Luther declared them to be the work of the devil and called them "harlot stars."

Even Milton says that the comet "from its horrid hair shakes pestilence and war."

Whole nations from the king down to the lowest peasant were frequently plunged into direst alarm by the appearance of these messengers of misery. (403)

While Henry compares himself to a comet in the hopes of inspiring his son to appear less often in the taverns and more frequently at court, he is actually expressing a prophesy about his own kingship,¹⁵ and he misuses this celestial metaphor in the same way Richard does with his self-comparison to the sun. Henry wants the comparison to show Hal that he should be less present in the daily lives of his future subjects, but the comparison, instead, reveals Henry's future.

Comets portended the impending death of a monarch. As a comet, Henry signified the end of

¹⁵ In Henry's opening speech, he discusses the state of his reign's affairs by using celestial imagery: "Those opposèd eyes,/ Which, like the meteors of a troubled heaven,/ All of one nature, of one substance bred,/ Did lately meet in the intestine shock/ And furious close of civil butchery" (1.1.9-13).

Richard's reign, but Henry does not wish for Hal to be a comet, just to be an infrequent presence. Henry's reign was the product of war; it was plagued by misery and discontent; and the sun-like Hal's valiant reign overshadowed that of his predecessor.

Henry also compares Hal to the sun in this section and uses this comparison to equate Hal with Richard. Henry says that Richard's "sun-like majesty" (3.2.79) was his downfall; because he was so often in the limelight, his subjects deemed him as equal to themselves and not someone to be respected, unlike the elusive Henry who remained mysterious and praise-worthy in the eyes of the commoners. Henry fears that Hal is following in Richard's path:

And in that very line, Harry, standest thou;
For thou hast lost thy princely privilege
With vile participation. Not an eye
But is a-weary of thy common sight,
Save mine, which hath desired to see thee more (3.2.85-9)

During his time in Eastcheap, Hal gains an education in common life, and education is, of course, one of the most important tenets of humanism. He learns intimate details about the commoners that Henry never knew. Henry's subjects may have wondered at him, but Hal's future subjects actually interacted with him on a personal level and may, thereby, respect him even more. Goddard says:

But [Henry] got the truth there exactly upside down. He did not see that his son was acting far more like himself than he was like Richard. The prince was doing precisely what his father had done, only in a wiler way. The king had kept himself literally hidden and then suddenly appeared. The prince was keeping

himself figuratively hidden by his wild ways in order to emerge all at once as a self-disciplined king. (21)

In Hal's soliloquy and in Henry's accusation we see the same comparison used in different ways. Hal compares himself to the sun in order to highlight his potential kingliness—in order for him to demonstrate that he will shine brightly in the future. Henry uses this comparison to chastise Hal for being so open and accessible to people who are of low standing—to punish him for consorting with the same people who supported Henry in his deposition of Richard. Because of the inaccuracy of his comparison of Hal to Richard and his self-comparison to a comet, the audience begins to foresee Henry's failures, failures that the hero-king will overcome despite his father's warnings.

Henry disagrees with Hal's mischievous dealings in Eastcheap because of the caliber of people he surrounds himself with—the “vile” commoners who drink, have sex, fight, and steal. One explanation of Henry's feelings about these tavern patrons derives from another tenet of humanism—anthropocentrism. Boehrer outlines the meaning of anthropocentrism and its many conditions. Absolute anthropocentrism states that humans are different from and superior to all other life forms and “earthly creation” (6), and because of this superiority, humans should be able to exploit nature. This description is aligned with the tenets of humanism that value human connections with other humans over human connections with nature. Boehrer also describes relative anthropocentrism, which has an even “narrower view of humankind” (17) because it equates some groups of people with animals. Certain racial and religious groups, women, the mentally challenged, and people of low social rank were equated to beasts. “[A]pprentices, servants, farm laborers, the young, the poor, and the unemployed” (18) fell into this last and lowest category, and there is no doubt that this qualification also extended to thieves, drunks,

prostitutes, and fat knights. If Henry is the consummate humanist, his disapproval of Hal's exploits with the commoners may result from his view of the people themselves. In *2 Henry IV*, when Warwick tries to convince the King that Hal will abandon his tavern life, the King says: "Tis seldom when the bee doth leave her comb/ In the dead carrion" (4.4.78-9). To Henry, Hal may as well be communing with horses and pigs; the people that Henry's anthropocentrism tell him he is superior to and should exploit are the very same people the prince chooses to surround himself with—Hal disgraced his father for farm animals.

Worcester and Falstaff also reveal their views of anthropocentrism by using animal imagery as insults and revealing the monstrosity of nature, but Worcester's and Falstaff's comparisons yield differing results. Worcester compares Henry to a bird when he confronts Henry about his rebellion against Richard, and his comparison shows his own anthropocentric views:

And being fed by us, you used us so
As that ungentle gull, the cuckoo's bird,
Useth the sparrow—did oppress our nest,
Grew by our feeding to so great a bulk
That even our love durst not come near your sight
For fear of swallowing. (5.1.59-64)

Worcester claims that Henry did not acknowledge those who helped him depose Richard and, instead, would devour them like a hungry bird devours morsels of food. Worcester also claims that Henry has treated his supporters like the cuckoo treats her offspring—depositing her eggs into the nest of another bird until that bird pushes them from the nest, leaving them to starve. Because of their help, Henry became hungry for more power, and his helpers feared that he

would turn against them in order to gain more authority. In this instance, Worcester shows that instinct, not reason, controls animals—this further illustrates the humanist belief in the supremacy of mankind over nature and reinforces Henry’s fears concerning his son’s animistic friendships. However, Hal and his friends at the Boar’s Head also use animal imagery to insult each other and to describe themselves, but their use of this imagery further supports their animism and closeness with nature.

Hal’s interactions with the commoners are rife with animal imagery. When Hal confronts Falstaff about the Gad’s Hill robbery, Falstaff says of himself: “If there were not two- or three- and-fifty upon poor old Jack, then am I no two legged creature” (2.5.171-3). When Hal responds that he hopes Falstaff killed some of the men, Falstaff replies: “I tell thee what, Hal, if I tell thee a lie, spit in my face, call me a horse.” (2.5.177-8). Later in this scene, Falstaff compares himself to a lion that “will not touch the true prince” (2.5.250). *The Norton Shakespeare* indicates that a “popular belief derived from classical texts” (1184) was that lions instinctually would not harm royalty. Although Worcester and Falstaff use animal imagery as insults, these characters use this imagery in different ways. Worcester uses his anthropocentric views to insult Henry’s kingship—to show it as ill-gotten, monstrous, and uncontrollable. These insults derive from fear about nature because it is something that cannot be controlled through reason. Falstaff compares himself to animals, however, to show his closeness with nature. Like a lion, Falstaff will not harm the prince. To show his deference to the prince’s position as heir, Falstaff compares himself to a horse. And Falstaff reinforces his own ability to use reason by comparing himself to four-legged creatures that cannot. Worcester uses his animal imagery to show the monstrosity of nature and of Henry; Falstaff uses this imagery to show his understanding of nature and its shortcomings, but he would rather be compared to an animal than to any other entity. Even

though Falstaff uses these animal references as insults, he shows a queer respect for the animal world by comparing himself to it. These differing uses show that the humanistic characters use animal imagery to convey human atrocities, but animists use animal imagery in wordplay and pun to insult each other or themselves while showing reverence for the instincts of the animal world.

If *Richard II* shows the audience a picture of Shakespeare's England, as Kim Axline asserts in "'Sad Stories of the Death of Kings,'" "on the cusp between the old and the new" (108), then *I Henry IV* shows a picture of England that combines the new reason-based views with the outdated views of the supremacy of nature. Shakespeare's audience members, who would have been actively trying to reconcile these two dominant viewpoints in their own lives, may have seen Hal as their saving grace. Because the audience knew that Hal would go on to become Henry V, one of the most revered Kings in English history, the audience members may have been inclined to combine their animistic beliefs in the supernatural and superstitions with the new humanistic tenets because Hal showed that it could be done. He showed that it is possible to be both an animist and a humanist, and that this mixture was a recipe for victory. Instead of showing a humanistic character triumphing over an animistic character, which mirrored the shift in contemporary hegemonic beliefs, Shakespeare shows an alternative solution to the humanism/animism debate. Perhaps this alternative solution makes clear the audience's apprehension concerning this cultural paradigm shift and their reluctance to eschew one viewpoint for the new dominant viewpoint. Perhaps Hal's double nature represented the conflict present within each audience member who was struggling to reconcile these opposing views. Perhaps the character of Hal was Shakespeare's way of telling his contemporaries not to reject animism or humanism but to choose the tenets of each that were personally beneficial. Perhaps

this suggestion would lead to success and heroism in the audience members' everyday lives, whether common or royal, tavern patron or heir to the throne.

Chapter 3: The Hero-King Defies the Humanist and Animist Labels in *2 Henry IV*

Some critics consider *2 Henry IV* to be “as much the obverse of *Part I* as its sequel” (Bulman 167) because of its equal treatment of undocumented “low” English culture and the historical facts of Henry IV’s death and Hal’s accession, yet *2 Henry IV* does more to highlight the binaries apparent in English society than its predecessor did. *1 Henry IV*, concerned with the hijinks of the future king and his reformation into a formidable heir to the throne, sets up these dichotomies in the audience’s minds, but *2 Henry IV* shows how these binaries serve not only to illuminate differences between people, places, and societal structures but also how they create internal struggles that Hal inventively overcomes and Falstaff does not. In “Falstaff and the Art of Dying,” Paul M. Cubeta lists the binaries that are present in Shakespeare’s history plays: “order/disorder, bawdy/sentimental, innocence/experience, youth/age, physical/spiritual, salvation/damnation, time/sea, life/death” (201). For *2 Henry IV*, this list should also include tame/wild, truth/rumor, linear succession/Divine Right, language of the court/language of tavern, and masculine/feminine. Geoffrey Bullough in *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare* indicates that these binaries represent the “good and bad instincts” (267) inherent in human nature; we can simultaneously hope for justice while partaking in self-indulgence.

Shakespeare continually highlights the divide between order/disorder, or tameness/wildness, throughout *2 Henry IV* when he shows Hal’s continued reformation and the contrasts between characters, such as Henry and Falstaff. Shakespeare shows the binary between truth/rumor in the Prologue with a character named Rumor and in 1.1 when Northumberland receives conflicting information about the death of Hotspur. Henry discusses the split between linear succession/Divine Right when he assures Hal that his reign will be less troubled because

of his justified claim to kingship. The binary between the language of the court/the language of the tavern introduced in *1 Henry IV* is even more pronounced in *2 Henry IV*. There are alternating scenes between the Boar's Head and the palace in both plays, but *2 Henry IV* moves the vernacular "from the margins to the centre" (Bulman 171). Falstaff, who provides most of this vernacular showmanship, also embodies the dichotomy of masculine/feminine; equation with the Greek god Dionysus and the giant belly he calls a womb indicate his inherent femininity and his presence as a maternal figure for Hal.

These binaries are also further illustrations of the humanism/animism debate. Humanism, with its emphasis on civility, respect, and genuine human connection, represents order, reason, and heroism. Conversely, animism encompasses an inherent wildness that embraces the spiritual and the natural. In *1 Henry IV*, Hal creates a dual identity and combines all of these binaries within himself in order to become a more deserving heir, but in *2 Henry IV*, Hal eschews all of these binaries in order to forge his own path as a hero-king, becoming King Henry V at the end of the play. In *1 Henry IV*, Hal accepts a dual nature and embraces humanism and animism, order and disorder, court and tavern. He does so in order to prove to his father and to his country that he will be fit to reign, but once he proves his abilities by coming to his father's aid and killing Hotspur, Hal no longer needs both animism and humanism to be a successful ruler. Hal has seen the reigns of one purely animistic King and one purely humanistic King; he not only wants to have a more successful kingship than his predecessors but he wants to completely revise the role of the King. He also has witnessed and taken part in the common lifestyle where animism reigns supreme. Because Hal wants to create this unique and exceptional kingship, unlike any he has witnessed, he must also reject the person who represents animism—Falstaff. If Hal continues to align himself with Falstaff and the commoners, the disorderly lifestyle that

they represent will overtake the court and create a reign worse than Richard's and Henry's. If this occurs, Hal will not have proved himself as a worthy heir, as he promised to do in *1 Henry IV*, and his kingship will suffer and, perhaps, be threatened with rebellion. To combat these troubles, Hal rejects both humanism and animism and, instead, creates a kingship that is unique and does not ascribe to a singular viewpoint. Hal's reign both combines these tenets and abstains from them. He does not need an ordered side and a wild side to rule; instead, he creates an alternative space for his new viewpoint where he can emerge as a successful king who is also the hero of his people and a model for them to follow. At the end of *2 Henry IV*, Hal rejects the formulaic roles that Richard and Henry embraced and shows that individualism is the most important tenet of successful kingship; neither humanism nor animism triumphs, and, instead, individualism reigns.

The set-up of the binary between order and disorder begins early in the play in 1.1 and continues throughout, highlighting the differences between characters, Hal's dual nature, and Henry's worries about his son's accession to the throne. In 1.1, Northumberland learns of Hotspur's death and the triumph of Henry's military forces over the rebels. The distraught Northumberland swears revenge and speaks of the fall of order and the rise of wildness:

Now bind my brows with iron, and approach
The ragged'st hour that time and spite dare bring
To frown upon th'enraged Northumberland!
Let heaven kiss earth! Now let not nature's hand
Keep the wild flood confined! Let order die! (1.1.151-55)

Because of his grief, Northumberland states that the order of Henry IV's reign should not be allowed to continue but that Northumberland and his allies should act with abandon to facilitate

the reign's disorder and fall. Northumberland wants the heavens—a spiritual, supernatural space—to combine with the Earth, the place of humans and reason. He wants to conflate both sides of the humanism/animism debate because he thinks this mixture will cause chaos and wildness to rule. By creating a dual nature in *1 Henry IV*, Hal shows that this mixture is not riotous and disorderly and is, instead, a desirable condition. At the end of *2 Henry IV*, Hal shows that he was kissed by heaven and Earth when he combined his animistic and humanistic beliefs, and he will show that the result is not chaos but unique wisdom and unparalleled heroism.

This split between order and disorder also illuminates differences between characters in *2 Henry IV*. Shakespeare contrasts the humanistic Henry with his animistic predecessor Richard, whose presence is still felt because of Henry's disquiet concerning his own kingship. Henry ends his first monologue of the play with the line: "Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown" (3.1.31). Shakespeare also contrasts Henry with Falstaff, Hal's surrogate father in the taverns of Eastcheap. While Henry represents the orderly qualities that Hal should want to embody as heir, Falstaff, even more so in *2 Henry IV* than in *Part I*, embodies the diseased, lowly, self-indulgent properties that Hal should want to avoid. The contrast between Henry and Hal further creates tension because of the king's illness and Hal's continued interest in tavern life. Before his death, Henry wonders if Hal's reign will turn the country from order to disorder: "O, thou wilt be a wilderness again,/ Peopled with wolves, thy old inhabitants" (4.3.264-5).¹⁶ The differences between Falstaff and the Lord Chief Justice also demonstrate this order/disorder binary because

¹⁶ In this quotation, Henry also draws a connection between animism and predation because he compares Hal's animistic friends in the tavern to wolves. Although Henry means this comment as an insult, it speaks to a common misconception that all animists, because of their respect for nature, do not hunt. In *Animism: Respecting the Living World*, Graham Harvey notes this misconception: "Animism does not require vegan dietary rules, and is often (perhaps even *most* often) found among hunters and fishers" (116). This claim is evident, Harvey contends, in the respect that hunters have for the beings they kill, often seeing them as gifts from nature. Henry's insult shows his misunderstanding of the tenets of animism.

Falstaff embraces the chaos of the commoners while the Lord Chief Justice promotes governmental order. When these two characters meet, they discuss Falstaff's damaging relationship with Hal and show how Falstaff has tried to lead Hal from order to disorder:

LORD CHIEF JUSTICE. You have misled the youthful Prince.

FALSTAFF. The young Prince hath misled me. I am the fellow with the great belly, and he my dog. (1.2.132-34)

The Norton Shakespeare asserts that Falstaff's line is a reference to the myth of the "man in the moon" (1314) who was usually followed by a dog. This allusion refers back to Falstaff's self-comparison to the moon in *1 Henry IV* and further reinforces his alignment with disorder—crimes can more easily occur at night by the moon's light. Later in the conversation, the Lord Chief Justice says that Falstaff follows Hal "up and down like his ill angel" (1.2.150-51). These characters, who themselves embody opposite sides of the order/disorder divide, argue about who has encouraged Hal to the side of wildness. The Lord Chief Justice blames Falstaff, thereby blaming the tavern lifestyle in general, and Falstaff places the blame on Hal himself.

The disparity between the court and the tavern also demonstrates the differences between order and disorder. Just as in *1 Henry IV*, part two of the play alternates between scenes in Eastcheap and scenes in the palace, and the language used by the characters in each setting demonstrates this split. Shakespeare contrasts the formal, somber, rigid language of the court with the language of the tavern that is filled with puns, rhetorical devices, mixtures of high and low language, and malapropisms because of characters like Pistol, Mistress Quickly, Doll Tearsheet and, especially, Falstaff. Mistress Quickly, who appears in both *1 Henry IV* and *2 Henry IV*, speaks more lines in the latter play, and this higher quantity gives her more chances to amuse the audience with her misuse of the English language. For example, after Mistress

Quickly confronts Falstaff about the money he owes her and his promise of marriage, a brawl ensues. Mistress Quickly yells: “Ah, thou honeysuckle villain, wilt thou kill God’s officers, and the King’s? Ah, thou honeyseed rogue! Thou are a honeyseed, a man-queller and a woman-queller” (2.1.44-6). Mistress Quickly misuses the words “honeysuckle” and “honeyseed” to mean “homicidal” when insulting Falstaff. And this malapropism creates a pun because the word “honey” was a slang term for “sexual pleasure” (*Norton* 1320). In her rant, Mistress Quickly manages not only to insult Falstaff’s misdeeds but also his sexuality. Pistol and Doll Tearsheet do not appear in *Part I* but are added to *Part II* as Falstaff’s cohorts, and they also exhibit the unruliness of the language of the tavern. Pistol’s language is comical because he uses bits of antiquated speech from heroic plays, and James Bulman in “Henry IV, Parts 1 and 2” asserts that this language “recalls those hyperbolic sentiments which once invoked a world of greatness not unlike that imagined by Hotspur, but which now sound ludicrously out-of-date” (171). For example, when Pistol converses with Mistress Quickly, Bardolph, and Doll Tearsheet, he uses affected language:

These be good humours indeed!
Shall pack-horses
And hollow pampered jades of Asia,
Which cannot go but thirty mile a day,
Compare with Caesars and with cannibals,
And Trojan Greeks? (2.4.139-144)

Pistol’s character shows a dedication to the stage because he imitates, as Jean Howard states in *The Norton Shakespeare* introduction to *2 Henry IV*, “sensational plays from the 1590s and earlier” (1331), but Pistol’s use of unnatural and exaggerated language does not endear him to

the audience as Falstaff's puns do. Instead, Pistol is comical because of his piteousness. Doll Tearsheet's sexually charged banter with Falstaff shows that she can verbally compete with one of Shakespeare's greatest wordsmiths. After Falstaff brawls with the drunken Pistol, Doll Tearsheet sits upon Falstaff's lap and praises his valor: "Ah, you sweet little rogue you! Alas, poor ape, how thou sweatest! Come, let me wipe thy face; come on, you whoreson chops. Ah rogue, I' faith, I love thee" (2.4.193-5). Doll Tearsheet shows that she can verbally defend herself using insults and vernacular just as aptly as her male counterparts in the tavern. Bulman comments that the use of the vernacular in *2 Henry IV* further illuminates the differences between leisurely tavern life and ordered court life:

The rich variety of idioms in *Part 2*, whereby socially marginalized characters reveal differences in region, degree, and occupation, dramatizes an expansion of the cultural boundaries of nationhood unattempted in Shakespeare's earlier plays [. . .] Shakespeare provides alternatives to the official speech of the court. (171)

By incorporating scenes from both the palace and the tavern, Shakespeare reinforces these differences in "region, degree, and occupation" and further creates a rift between order and disorder, tamedness and wildness, humanism and animism. And by moving these marginalized characters to the forefront, Shakespeare continues to keep the audience wondering with which side Hal will choose to align himself.

Shakespeare also reveals this binary between order and disorder within Hal's nature and with other characters' opinions of him as a friend and as a ruler. As Hal plots with Poins, once again, to fool Falstaff, Hal says of himself: "From a prince to a prentice—a low transformation—that shall be mine" (2.2.152-53). In these lines, Hal recognizes these two sides of the duality within his own nature; while his goal is reformation, moving from disorder to order, he decides

to regress for one last practical joke and enacts his father's fears about his future kingship—that Hal will permanently relapse and embrace the disorderly common lifestyle during his reign. Falstaff says of Hal that his valiant nature comes not from his title of prince but from a marriage of order and disorder facilitated by his tutelage under Falstaff. Falstaff uses natural imagery—of land being fertilized—to express Hal's valor:

Hereof comes it that Prince Harry is valiant; for the cold blood that he did naturally inherit of his father he hath, like lean, sterile, and bare land, manured, husbanded, and tilled with excellent endeavour of drinking good, and good store of fertile sherry, that he is become very hot and valiant. (4.2.104-109)

To Falstaff, the reason for Hal's valor confirms Henry's fears; Hal inherited order from his father, but he mixed that order with disorder—"fertile sherry"—in order to become valiant. This opinion explains why, when Hal becomes Henry V, Falstaff expects the king to call for him in secret and does not accept Hal's outright rejection.

Warwick also gives his opinion of Hal's progression from disorder to order and reassures Henry that Hal eventually will become a deserving king. When Henry tells Warwick of his apprehension about Hal's ability to move from disorder to order, Warwick says:

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

Warwick reassures the king that, once Hal has learned what he needs to from his lowly companions, he will discard them and ascend the throne. Warwick almost agrees with Falstaff: Hal must blend the traits that he has inherited from his father with the lessons he has learned in Eastcheap. To become a skillful humanist like his father, Hal must learn about common life from the commoners themselves by making genuine human connections. Warwick believes that Hal will be a more complete ruler—more apt at addressing the needs of his subjects—because he is able to relate to them on a personal level. Warwick’s and Falstaff’s opinions differ because the former thinks Hal will completely reject the tavern lifestyle while the latter believes that Hal will continue to help his friends once he becomes king.

Henry still questions Hal’s reformation from disorder and order, and Hal continues, throughout *2 Henry IV*, to keep the audience in suspense about which side he will choose. Hal mistakenly thinks that he has become king in 4.3 when he removes the crown from the seemingly dead Henry and places it on his head. When the King awakens, he confronts Hal about his fondness for disorder. Hal confirms that he has done wrong and will reform himself:

If I do feign,

O, let me in my present wildness die,

And never live to show th’ incredulous world

The noble change that I have purposed. (4.3.279-82)

Hal admits that he has embraced “wildness” and that he still plans a reformation; he admits that he is still grappling with order and disorder. After Henry IV dies, Falstaff tries to take advantage of Hal’s evolving reformation when he learns that Hal has ascended the throne, and Falstaff’s reaction reinforces the former King’s fears—that Hal’s reign will be wild instead of tame:

I know the young King is sick for me. Let us take any man's horses—the laws of England are at my commandment. Blessed are they that have been my friends, and woe to my Lord Chief Justice. (5.3.124-7)

Upon hearing the news, Falstaff assumes that Hal will continue to align himself with disorder even after he has been crowned King, and Falstaff hopes that the animistic world of the tavern will overtake the humanistic world of court. Since Hal has been enmeshed in the tavern scene, Falstaff hopes that Hal will run the palace as Mistress Quickly runs the Boar's Head—with prostitutes and an abundance of sack. Falstaff's line "woe to my Lord Chief Justice" echoes the rebel Northumberland's line in 1.1 when he says "Let order die!" (155); while Falstaff hopes that the Lord Chief Justice (who represents order) will suffer because of Henry V's rule, Northumberland wishes for Henry IV's reign to end. Northumberland does get his wish, but Henry V states that he will also lead with order like his father: "My father is gone wild into his grave,/ For in his tomb lie my affections" (5.2.122-3). When Hal buries his "affections" with his father, he shows that he is repressing his animistic side and not letting it take over his reign as his father feared and as Falstaff hopes. By incorporating some of the tenets of animism, but not an overwhelming amount, as well as some of the tenets of humanism, Hal will be a more legitimate king than his father. This binary between order and disorder highlights contrasts between characters and within Hal's nature and builds the tension surrounding Henry IV's death and the fate of Falstaff. If order must triumph for Henry V to emerge as the hero-king, then what will happen to the fat knight? Will Hal relapse once more because of his craving for "small beer" (2.2.6)? Will Hal reject the animistic and disorderly part of his own human nature in order to become a successful king? Although the answers to these questions may seem obvious because

of the mythic quality of Henry V's reign, we will see that Hal's solution to the order/disorder binary is more complex and involves difficult decisions for the sake of a successful reign.

Another dichotomy present in *2 Henry IV*, linear succession/Divine Right, also signifies a shift from disorder to order. Because Henry usurped the throne from Richard (who ruled by Divine Right), the kingship must pass through linear succession to the current King's eldest son. Henry contends that, because of linear succession, Hal's reign will be less troubled than his own because Hal has more of a right to claim kingship:

God knows, my son,
By what bypaths and indirect crook'd ways
I met this crown; and I myself know well
How troublesome it sat upon my head.
To thee it shall descend with better quiet,
Better opinions, better confirmation (4.3.311-16)

Henry assures Hal that, even though Henry deposed Richard in order to become king, the grievousness of that action will not weigh as heavily on Hal's reign as it did on Henry's reign.

Hal also reassures Henry when he says:

My gracious liege,
You won it, wore it, kept it, gave it me;
Then plain and right must my possession be,
Which I with more than with a common pain
'Gainst all the world will rightfully maintain. (4.3.348-52)

Hal says that Henry was the rightful king because he won the crown and that the linear succession of the crown to Hal will cause his reign to be plagued with fewer rebellions. Hal also

reassures Henry that the people in the tavern are no longer Hal's friends; instead, he sees them as a "common pain" that must be shunned in order to "rightfully maintain" the crown. Hal further reinforces his conversion from drunkard to rightful heir. As a usurper of the crown, Henry never felt quite comfortable with his kingship, but he hopes that the crown will rest upon Hal's head "in a more fairer sort" (4.3.328). According to Bulman, Hal's assurance at 4.3.348-9 "occludes the sin of regicide that accompanied Henry's occupation of the throne and thus permits Hal to substitute linear succession for divine right" (169). Of course, Richard was the last king to reign by Divine Right, so this scene also shows Henry encouraging Hal to reject the disorder, favoritism, and animism of Richard's reign. Henry hopes that Hal's reign will be orderly and that Hal will truly reform himself as he promised. If this reformation does not take place, then anarchy will rule over order and the animistic world of the tavern will overcome the humanistic tenets that helped Henry win the crown. If Hal fails, so does humanism. Just as in the binary between tameness and wildness, Henry hopes that Hal will chose the former and be a more successful ruler than his father.

Many critics agree that Hal has not one father but two in *The Henriad*, one of them being the hard-drinking fat knight who spends more money on sack than food and who does not hesitate to steal in order to fulfill his bodily desires. Much has been written about Falstaff— his comedy, his language, his obesity, his rejection, and his death. The following evaluation of Falstaff within the context of humanism and animism is by no means comprehensive, but it serves to illuminate Falstaff's role in the degradation and resulting reformation of the life of Hal with an emphasis on Hal's masculinity and his heterosexuality, as well as on Falstaff's femininity and homosexuality. This discussion will also show some parallels between Hal and

Richard and between Falstaff and Henry, highlighting the significance to the humanism/animism divide of Henry's rejection of Falstaff as well as Falstaff's death.

In his rejection of Falstaff, Hal shows that the illusion of Falstaff cannot be sustained because Hal realizes that the animistic world of the tavern cannot so easily mix with the humanistic world of court. Hal expresses these sentiments in the rejection scene when he addresses Falstaff and compares their friendship to a dream:

I know thee not, old man. Fall to thy prayers.
How ill white hairs becomes a fool and jester!
I have long dreamt of such a kind of man,
So surfeit-swelled, so old, and so profane;
But being awake, I do despise my dream. (5.5.45-9)

This statement about dreams helps to draw a comparison to Richard while also highlighting one of the tenets of animism. In *Animism*, Edward Clodd comments on the reality of dreams for animistic cultures: "The dreams which come to these people are to them as real as any of the events of their waking lives. Dream acts and waking acts differ only in one respect: the former are done only by the spirit, while the latter are done by the spirit in its body" (31). This assertion, while providing insight into Richard's final speech to the Queen about his failed reign, also explains why Hal rejects Falstaff when he ascends the throne. Unlike Richard's dream, which turns into a waking nightmare, Hal does not have to accept the dream of Falstaff and, instead, rejects the image of the fat knight. In "A Little More than a Little," R.J. Dorius also draws this parallel: "The younger Henry apparently dreams of Falstaff as Richard II seemed to dream of Bolingbroke in England's garden, but unlike Richard, he does not succumb to his nightmare" (103). Hal despises his dream, one which is as real to him as any "waking act,"

which shows that he regrets taking part in that dream, being a character in his own nightmare. In describing Falstaff as a dream, Hal insinuates not that the dream itself needs to be despised but that the memory of it does. He does not say that the dream was unpleasant, but the knowledge that the dream-world existed and that he was a part of it pains him. Unlike Richard, a man who cannot escape his dream-world and greatly suffers because of it, Hal projects his wish that Falstaff did not exist by describing him as a dream; if the fat knight was only a figment of Hal's imagination, then Hal could easily dispose of him. In his introduction to *Twentieth Century Interpretations of Henry IV, Part Two*, David Young asserts that Hal is forced not only to reject the man but to reject the dream of the man: "His long friendship with Falstaff he compares to a dream which, being awaked, he must despise, not because it was despicable while it lasted, but because it was an illusion that could not be sustained" (9). Unlike the dream-world in *Richard II*, Hal's dream-world was pleasant but must be rejected in order for him to become a righteous ruler.

Hal may be able to borrow certain tenets of each belief in order to become a powerful ruler, but he cannot let one side dominate over the other as his predecessors did. Hal cannot let the dream of Falstaff pollute his kingship and allow Falstaff to treat England as his personal tavern simply because his friend is King. Hal takes the animistic lessons that he has learned from Falstaff and integrates them into his reign, but he can no longer dream of sack and robberies. Hal both conquers and incorporates animism and humanism when he rejects Falstaff; he denies the animistic Falstaff access to the palace while simultaneously using the lessons Falstaff taught Hal to biting and forcefully reject the "tutor and the feeder of [his] riots" (5.5.60). Falstaff teaches Hal about Dionysian indulgences and encourages Hal to participate in them, but he also teaches Hal about the alternative to the rigid court lifestyle; Falstaff teaches

Hal how to relate to any man—whether common or royal. Just as a hunter hopes to gain his prey's power by eating its flesh, Hal garners benefits from his connection with Falstaff and then must discard his tutor; Hal must rid himself of common people in order to become royalty. The world of the tavern has taught him many lessons, but a righteous King cannot solely align himself with the supernatural common life. Hal must reject this nightmare and the man who stars in it. The animistic dream must die.

Hal's rejection of Falstaff also demonstrates a split between the masculine/feminine and suggests that this rejection may not have just been the result of Falstaff's wayward lifestyle but of Hal's insecurity about his own masculinity and heterosexuality. Shakespeare feminizes Falstaff throughout the play and shows that he is not only Hal's tutor and friend but also the object of his homosexual desire and reason for Hal's heterosexual confusion. Falstaff's femininity undermines Hal's "phallogentric control" (Traub 474) and his masculinity. In "Prince Hal's Falstaff: Positioning Psychoanalysis and the Female Reproductive Body," Valerie Traub suggests that the many descriptions of Falstaff's girth turn him into a "grotesque body," which is similar to a female during pregnancy:

That Falstaff is figured in female terms is suggested first by his body, which is associated with the metaphors of women's bodies and carnality that Shakespeare elsewhere exploits in his denunciation of female eroticism. . . Falstaff's being is exceedingly corporeal; indeed, his corpulence is referred to repeatedly, invoking, in the emphasis on a swollen and distended belly, associations of pregnancy [. . .] Such a focus on the bulging and the protuberant, the opening, the permeability, and effusions of Falstaff's body situate him as a "grotesque body." (461-2)

Falstaff even comments about his own belly and what is contained in it while using a feminine word in his description:

I have a whole school of tongues in this belly of mine, and not a tongue of them all speaks any other word but my name. An I had but a belly of any indifferency, I were simply the most active fellow in Europe. My womb, my womb, my womb undoes me. (4.2.16-20)

Falstaff's womb, or his belly as it is glossed in *The Norton Shakespeare*, is filled with living creatures that speak his name and cause him to have a gut of extreme size. Traub asserts that Falstaff's association with the feminine and Hal's need to be perceived as masculine and, thus, worthy of the throne, forces Hal to reject Falstaff. But Hal is not doing so simply to please his dead father, to be a better leader, or to aid in his father's quest to stamp out animistic beliefs; instead, he rejects Falstaff to secure his role as a symbol of manliness. Since animistic cultures are associated with femininity—because believers are perceived as weak and not part of a rigid or rational community—Hal must reject not only Falstaff but those animistic properties that he represents. Falstaff is a figure of animism because he embodies its major tenets. He associates himself with the mystic and heavenly when he compares himself to the moon. He seems supernatural when he returns from the dead after his fight with Douglass—the audience sees a proverbial resurrection when Falstaff rises from the stage. His great appetite, his bastardization of organized religion, and his inability to lead his troops and fight his own battles all characterize Falstaff as not only an animistic character but a feminine one. Hal is not interested in women, but he is intensely interested in Falstaff, both to learn from him and to love him. Traub suggests that Falstaff's rejection results from Hal's need to portray himself as a confident male figure that cannot be associated with a feminized man:

[I]t is apparent that homoeroticism infuses the relationship of Falstaff and Hal, signaled by both Falstaff's "feminine" qualities and Hal's predominant lack of interest in women. . . Hal's rejection of Falstaff serves simultaneously to temporarily assuage anxieties, first, about male homoeroticism and, second, about heterosexuality based on the equation of woman and maternity. (465)

When Hal rejects Falstaff, he not only rejects a friend but he also rejects someone more intimate—a mother-figure and lover. Falstaff's large belly, his self-comparison to the moon, and his insatiable appetite all categorize him as a feminine animist who represents disorder. However, Hal is able to acquire knowledge from him that will benefit his kingship. Hal sees how the commoners—his future subjects—live their everyday lives, and he understands the differences between a life of privilege and a life of retreat. Hal makes use of Falstaff in particular by experimenting with him—role-playing conversations where Falstaff plays the part of Henry and then of Hal, staging a double robbery at Gad's Hill. Hal experiments with power and does so with his weak, feminine mother-figure—the character at the Boar's Head who would be the most easily controlled and manipulated because of his status as a weak and pathetic woman. Because of his gendered view of animism, Hal inevitably rejects this symbol of weakness and assuages his dead father's fears about his kingship. The rejection of Falstaff shows that Hal's reformation is complete and that he will not let animistic beliefs infect and destroy his reign as Richard did. Instead, he will reject one half of the dual nature that he developed in *1 Henry IV* and further his reputation as a heroic and masculine leader.

Falstaff's death, which is indelibly linked to Hal's rejection of him, also supposes Falstaff's femininity and his deep affection for the Prince. At the end of *2 Henry IV*, the Epilogue states that "our humble author will continue the story with Sir John in it" (23-4) and

that “Falstaff shall die of a sweat,” (25-6) a term usually used to describe symptoms of the plague or other fevers, including those caused by syphilis. Falstaff does die before *Henry V* begins, and he is not given a death scene. The audience learns of his death second-hand as described by Mistress Quickly:

A parted ev’n just between twelve and one, ev’n at the turning o’th’ tide—for
after I saw him fumble with the sheets, and play with flowers, and smile upon his
finger’s end, I knew there was but one way. For his nose was as sharp as a pen,
and a babbled of green fields. (2.3.11-16)

This explanation describes many symptoms of the plague, but in Robert F. Fleissner’s “Falstaff’s Green Sickness Unto Death,” he argues that Falstaff’s death is the result of a broken heart. The green pallor of Falstaff’s skin when he is near death suggests that he died of “green sickness,” or “male green sickness” as Falstaff discusses in 4.2.84. This is an illness usually associated with women, and it is a combination of a “menstrual affliction” (48) and a broken heart:

One of the most characteristic sicknesses, love melancholy (“the lover’s malady or *Amor*), was noted especially in young girls. This was not only due to the fact that the female was considered more susceptible to emotional disturbances than the male, but that her monthly flow of blood could be a physically greater hardship when complicated by disappointment in love. . . [Shakespeare was aware that] psychological aspects of love melancholy could also produce a physical affect in the adult male. (48)

According to Fleissner, this affliction was well-known and a reality for Elizabethan audiences, so it would not have been difficult to accept that Falstaff did not die of the plague, as his symptoms suggest, but he could have died from a broken heart after Hal’s rejection. This form of death

also reinforces the homoerotic feelings that Hal and Falstaff had for each other, as suggested by Traub. Fleissner quotes William Empson who states that the resistance to a sexual link between Hal and Falstaff results from critics' reticence about envisioning Hal and Falstaff in a homosexual relationship: "the idea of Falstaff making love to the Prince, [the critics] may feel, really has to be resisted" (52). But, Falstaff's association with the feminine, his protruding belly, and his broken heart all suggest that the fat knight was more woman than man.

Falstaff's function as a Dionysian character also reinforces his femininity. Dionysus, the Greek god of wine and land fertility and the patron saint of the stage, was associated with orgiastic cult practices that attracted both women and men. Depictions of Dionysus variously show him as a young boy, as a fresh-faced, genderless figure, and as an older, bearded man.¹⁷ Because of his associations with wine, Dionysus represents the joviality of drunkenness as well as its violent and harmful repercussions. Just as in *1 Henry IV* where Hal embodies a dual nature of animism and humanism, Falstaff, as a Dionysian figure, also embodies binaries—man/woman, youth/age, order/disorder. In "Falstaff's Encore," Harry Levin states that Falstaff's equation with the Greek god causes the audience to love him: "We identify with him, in a kind of dionysiac empathy, because he invites us vicariously to shed our own inhibitions" (7).¹⁸ In *1 Henry IV*, Falstaff succeeds in committing outrageous acts, and is even commended for them, which further connects him to Dionysus. Despite his lies and Hal's knowledge of the incident, Falstaff gets away with the Gad's Hill robbery. After Hal kills Hotspur, Falstaff stabs Hotspur in

¹⁷ From Ross Kraemer's "Ecstasy and Possession: The Attraction of Women to the Cult of Dionysus:" "Dionysiac festivals share the temporary license of drunkenness and sexual expression which characterizes agricultural festivals in other cultures as well (compare the activities at the harvest festival in the book of Ruth). Virtually from his appearance as a divinity, Dionysus is associated with various fertility motifs and was one of a number of Greek deities called upon to insure the fruitfulness of fields, flocks and human beings. As far as we can tell, these rural Dionysia were in no way restricted to one sex or the other but involved the participation of the entire community in invoking the protection of the gods and in offering thanksgiving for abundance" (57).

¹⁸ In "Shakespeare's Dionysian Prince: Drama, Politics, and the 'Athenian' History Play," Grace Tiffany argues that Prince Hal, not Falstaff, represents the Dionysian aspects of Greek society. Falstaff, instead, embodies Silenus "the fat, old, drunken companion who lends humor to Dionysian celebration" (366).

the thigh in a homoerotic gesture and then carries the corpse away to claim victory. He even rises from the dead after his battle with Douglas. All of these actions show Falstaff as a mythic figure who escapes time and who revels in actions that would imperil most men. The sack that this Dionysian figure drinks is a factor in his cheerfulness as well as one of his vices. He helps us shed our inhibitions, but we must also face the consequences of doing so. The association of Dionysus with both masculine and feminine traits, and the fact that women and men were allowed to participate in his cult, show that Falstaff's Dionysian characteristics make him a sexually ambiguous as well as an organically animistic character. He represents male and female fertility as well as the fertility of the land. The presence of such a raucous and untruly character would impair Hal's judgment and fairness during his reign, so Hal has no choice but to reject the Dionysian Falstaff and relegate his animistic qualities to the tavern and not to the court. And Hal may have not only rejected a friend who represented disorder, but he may have also rejected his own homoerotic desire. There is no more effective way for Hal to prove himself as the pinnacle of masculinity and power than by breaking Falstaff's heart and leaving him to die in agony where the only words he can utter before death are: "God, God, God" (*Henry V* 2.3.17)

Many critics have commented on the parallels between Falstaff and Henry, and the deaths of these characters provide an insight into Hal's struggle with choosing order over disorder, humanism over animism, the court over the tavern. What the deaths of Falstaff and Henry indicate about the supremacy of one system of belief over another is that there is no supremacy. Shakespeare shows the humanistic king to be no better than the animistic knight. Neither character is allowed a true death scene, and both of their deaths are announced by other characters. Both Henry and Falstaff have false deaths: Henry on the battlefield at Shrewsbury in *1 Henry IV* when his subjects dress in the king's clothes and are slain and also, in *2 Henry IV*,

when Hal thinks the King is dead; Falstaff when he fights Douglas at Shrewsbury and fakes his own death. The only action that seemingly evinces a triumph of one father-figure over another, and, thus, one viewpoint over another, is Hal's repudiation of Falstaff, which is also ambiguous. Hal's reaction to Falstaff during the rejection scene depends on the staging of the action. Does he deliver the line "I know thee not, old man" (5.5.45) as a distant and unfeeling monarch, or does he deliver it with a tear and a longing glance? Shakespeare gives us only Hal's words. If Hal does cold-heartedly reject Falstaff, then humanism triumphs. But if he does so with a heavy heart, then those disorderly, animistic feelings may still be present, and they may still prevail when Hal begins his duties as king. If Hal does allow the court to be transformed into a Dionysian cult and does allow his subjects to become victims of "a divinely-induced madness" (Kraemer 58), then Hal will have enacted his father's fears about Hal's reign of danger and destruction. Henry outlines these fears in his discussion with Warwick:

The blood weeps from my heart when I do shape
In forms imaginary th'unguided days
And rotten times that you shall look upon
When I am sleeping with my ancestors;
For when his headstrong riot hath no curb,
When rage and hot blood are his counselors,
When means and lavish manners meet together,
O, with what wings shall his affections fly
Towards fronting peril and opposed decay? (4.358-64)

Henry fears that if Hal betrays the humanistic court in favor of the animistic tavern he will forever damage the English crown. Henry sees his son's common companions as "weeds"

(4.3.54) that have “overspread” (4.3.56) Hal’s mind and will continue to infect his decisions and corrupt his power when he ascends the throne. The repercussions of this alignment with animism, to Henry, are the most destructive and deadly results possible—damage to his family’s name and honor, rebellion and usurpation of the throne, and a failed kingship. If Hal allows animism to triumph over humanism, he will acquire the same fate as Richard II—deposition, shame, and death.

At the end of the play, after Henry V rejects Falstaff and ascends the throne, the audience’s understanding of the binaries, the “good and bad instincts” of human nature, depends solely on the audience’s sympathies. Historically, most audiences have sided with Falstaff’s humor and humanity and not with Henry V’s newly created sense of royalty. Audiences recognize that both Henry V and Falstaff deserve their fates, but, as Young states: “these facts do not imply that we must suddenly shut off our sympathy, even our pity, for the man” (9). Each of us embodies those good and bad instincts—truth/rumor, order/disorder, and righteousness/treachery—so we can equate ourselves with these characters, whether the character is a monarch or a diseased tavern patron. But we choose to empathize with the character who displays both humanity and vice and who, in the end, is punished for this embodiment. Because human nature includes these splits, we are able to identify it in these characters and determine whether we condemn or applaud Henry V for his rejection of Falstaff; we can also determine whether Falstaff deserves his harsh fate. We know the fates of each character—Henry V becomes a hero-king¹⁹ and Falstaff dies an embarrassing and medically

¹⁹ In *The Norton Shakespeare* introduction to *Henry V*, Katharine Eisaman Maus states that, despite Henry V’s success as King, his kingship is still marred by failure because of his imminent death: “*Henry V* is haunted by problems merely deferred, not resolved; in the long view, its hero’s success looks transitory, even futile” (1445). The problems that continue to haunt Henry V’s reign are the same problems that haunted his father’s—linear succession, rebellion, and inheritance—even though Henry IV hopes that Henry V’s reign will not be plagued by such troubles. And Henry V does die, which does symbolize the transience of power. The Epilogue to *Henry V* states: “Fortune made his sword,/ By which the world’s best garden he achieved,/ And of it left his son imperial

repulsive death—so we would be more likely to align ourselves with valor, with the righteous hero and ruler, with King Henry V. But, the fat knight gets our sympathies because he is fun. No matter how vile his vices, his comedy wins us over. We repudiate him for his animistic qualities and respect and love him for his humanity, the same way that we revile or respect these aspects of ourselves. As Falstaff says of himself, “Banish plump Jack, and banish all the world” (*1 Henry IV*, 2.5.438).

Henry V’s rejection of Falstaff could be viewed as a rejection of animism because Henry V rejected the disorderly tavern lifestyle; however, his rejection of Falstaff could also be viewed as a rejection of humanism. Henry V rejects a friend, tutor, and surrogate father from whom he has garnered many benefits. Bulman states: “Policy inevitably wins out over humanity” (174). Henry V has had two models of kingship to follow—the animistic Richard and the humanistic Henry IV. Instead of identifying with one side over the other and instead of having one side “win out” over the other, Henry V decides that individualism is the key to successful kingship. Instead of trying to encompass both traditions—animism and humanism, order and disorder, tavern and court—he will, instead, be a trailblazer; he will be Shakespeare’s only truly successful and heroic king. He will be, as Howard states, the symbol of “kingly perfection and English masculinity” (1293). During Richard’s reign, humanism triumphed over animism when the king was deposed by Henry; during Henry IV’s reign Henry V showed how he could combine humanism and animism in order to be a successful leader. However, when he becomes King, Henry V shows that he should reject both viewpoints outright and, instead, combine them to show the primacy of government and monarchy—not of nature or of human relations. Instead of a split between animism and humanism, Henry V shows that rejecting both order and disorder,

lord” (6-8). But Henry V dies a hero, unlike Richard, Henry IV, or Falstaff, and his death merely shows that even a hero-king cannot escape the reality of mortality and time.

and the trappings of each, yields sound policies, improved monarchical attitudes, a more efficient government, and an effective hero-king. In *2 Henry IV*, there is no triumph of humanism over animism and no formation of a dual nature that encompasses both; instead, an altogether new product results from the rejection of both failed viewpoints: King Henry V. In his rejection speech to Falstaff, Hal states, “I have turned away my former self” (5.5.56) meaning that he has not only banished the disorderly tavern lifestyle that he is known for, but he has also banished the dual nature that he tried to cultivate in *1 Henry IV*. Henry V, by rejecting both humanism and animism in his repudiation of Falstaff, shows that the true essence of successful kingship is individualism—a rejection of the mistakes of Richard and Henry and the embracing of a kingship, monarchy, and politics that are uniquely his own. Henry V demonstrates his rejection of order and disorder, his relinquishing of individual identity, his goal to forge his own path as the hero-king, and his acceptance of his role as monarch in his speech after his father’s death:

The tide of blood in me
Hath proudly flowed in vanity till now.
Now doth it turn, and ebb back to sea,
Where it shall mingle with the state of floods,
And flow henceforth in formal majesty. (5.2.128-32)

Henry V does not simply pick and choose which tenets of humanism and animism to follow, but he simultaneously rejects and follows both viewpoints. This mixture does not create a duality, as it does in *1 Henry IV*, but it creates a unique perception of kingship. Henry V’s reign will not be animistic or humanistic; instead, it will be both and neither.

Conclusion: Consequences for Shakespeare's Modern Audience

In the introduction to *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*, Cheryll Glotfelty suggests some questions that relate literature to the environment. These questions are worth quoting at length:

How is nature represented in this sonnet? What role does the physical setting play in the plot of this novel? Are the values expressed in this play consistent with ecological wisdom? How do our metaphors of the land influence the way we treat it? How can we characterize nature writing as a genre? In addition to race, class, and gender, should *place* become a new critical category? Do men write about nature differently than women do? In what ways has literacy itself affected humankind's relationship to the natural world? How has the concept of wilderness changed over time? In what ways and to what effect is the environmental crisis seeping into contemporary literature and popular culture? What view of nature informs U.S. Government reports, corporate advertising, and televised nature documentaries, and to what rhetorical effect? What bearing might the science of ecology have on literary studies? How is science itself open to literary analysis? What cross-fertilization is possible between literary studies and environmental discourse in related disciplines such as history, philosophy, psychology, art history, and ethics? (xix)

Glotfelty asserts that these questions summarize the inquiries of ecological criticism which "negotiates between the human and the nonhuman" (xix) and involves "the fundamental premise that human culture is connected to the physical world, affecting it and affected by it" (xix).

Although these questions and assertions are not particular to the works of Shakespeare, I have

attempted to show in this project that the changes of a dominant cultural conception of nature can affect individuals from every section of that society. These hegemonic shifts affect the lowly, superstitious tavern-dweller who is primarily concerned with bodily desires as well as the monarch who is expected to cultivate personal relationships, reject supernatural invention, and display heroic qualities. That hero-king should not be concerned with the individuals who dwell in the natural world and should only be concerned with reason, ownership, and domination.

When Glotfelty asks “What view of nature informs U.S. Government reports, corporate advertising, and televised nature documentaries, and to what rhetorical effect?,” she refers to the contemporary effect of literature and ecological understanding on our current cultural trends in the Western world. She asks that same question today that Shakespeare proposed in the three history plays discussed here. Shakespeare asked his contemporary audience how this shift was going to affect not only their everyday lives but the lives of their rulers. If this shift did affect the King’s life, then how would his attitudes toward nature affect governmental policies concerning land possession and inheritance laws? The “rhetorical effect” of these queries involves not only a cultural paradigm shift but a personal and intimate change in the audience’s views of the natural world. Shakespeare’s audience members may have asked themselves these questions: If the playwright shows Richard II as an animist (despite his faulty beliefs) and he is deposed and murdered, then why should I continue to hold animistic beliefs? If Hal is able to embody the animistic life of the tavern as well as the humanistic life of the court, then can I simultaneously hold both views? If Hal becomes Henry V by eschewing both viewpoints and, instead, forms them into his own conception of kingship, will I be able to do the same with my own beliefs and become heroic in my own right? Of course, these questions suggest a certain level of sophistication and are self-serving because of the project at hand. But these are questions

that result from an ecological criticism of Shakespeare's conceptions of nature in *Richard II* and *Henry IV, Parts I and II*, and they are not questions that are particular to Shakespeare's day.

Shakespeare's contemporary audience grappled with the shift in the dominant belief system from animism to humanism, and Shakespeare's modern audience must also contend with similar binaries. Just as Hal had to distinguish between animism/humanism, wildness/tameness, and tavern/court, modern American audiences must also struggle with similar dualities: Republican/Democrat, pro-life/pro-choice, rich/poor, black/white, Northern/Southern, public/private, urban/rural, religious/secular, and blue collar/white collar. Shakespeare highlights this modern dilemma in his history plays through the lens of Renaissance England, but these issues translate to a modern audience. And, now more than ever, the increasing awareness of the problem of global warming and climate change has refocused American's attitudes about the environment and our treatment of the natural world. Some take the environmentalist stance that we should change our interaction with nature to save ourselves from future calamity. Others deny that climate change even exists. These binaries are not only issues that Shakespeare's contemporary audience had to debate when they saw the first stage productions of *The Henriad*, but they are also issues that modern audiences must manage today.

It is inherent in the concept of a binary that one side must win over the other. An individual cannot simultaneously be pro-life and pro-choice or religious and secular. According to the characters that Shakespeare creates, a humanist cannot also be an animist. One side of the binary must dominate. So, what is the solution? Shakespeare offers a complicated one. In the creation of Hal (and in the historical accounts of Henry V), Shakespeare shows a character who does defy the binary of humanism/animism by understanding both sides of the debate and deciding not to let either side win his sympathies. Instead, Hal chooses to conflate these two

viewpoints and emerge with his own unique belief system. The animistic world mingles with the humanistic world. Shakespeare suggests that the solution to these debates does not need to be so definite; instead, the solution to the struggles of both his contemporary and modern audiences is independence, autonomy, and self-rule. Instead of choosing one side in the debate, letting one viewpoint dominate the other, shutting out one group in favor of another, Shakespeare suggests that the members of his audience should embrace all sides, understand the advantages and disadvantages of each, determine which tenets are worthy of acceptance, and forge new paths that are uniquely their own. As Glotfelty suggests about the environmental debate, we should understand “the reciprocal relationships between humans and land, considering nature not just as the stage upon which the human story is acted out, but as an actor in the drama” (xxi). Shakespeare’s modern audience should not shun nature in favor of human connection, but we should also not avoid personal relationships in order to forge a better understanding of the natural world. Instead, like Hal, we should marry the two and view the natural world not as a setting for the struggle but as a partner in the struggle—as both site and associate.

Works Cited

- Axline, Kim. "'Sad Stories of the Death of Kings': The Revelation of Humanity in *Richard II*." *On-Stage Studies*. 22 (1999-2000 1999): 108-21.
- Bird-David, Nurit. "Animism Revisited." *Current Anthropology*. 40.1 (1999): S67-S79.
- Boehrer, Bruce. *Shakespeare Among the Animals: Nature and Society in the Drama of Early Modern England*. NY: Palgrave, 2002.
- Bullough, Geoffrey. *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*. NY: Columbia UP, 1960.
- Bulman, James. "Henry IV, Parts 1 and 2." *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History Plays*. Ed. Michael Hattaway. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002. 158-76.
- Camden, Carroll. "Astrology in Shakespeare's Day." *Isis*. 19.1 (1933): 26-73.
- Clodd, Edward. *Animism*. Chicago: Open Court Company, 1918.
- Cubeta, Paul M. "Falstaff and the Art of Dying." *Studies in English Literature*. 27.2 (1987): 197-211.
- Dean, John Candee. "The Astronomy of Shakespeare." *The Scientific Monthly*. 19.4 (1924): 400-06.
- Dorius, R.J. "A Little More than a Little." *Twentieth Century Interpretations of Henry IV, Part Two*. Ed. David P. Young. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1968. 103-07.
- Egan, Gabriel. "Nature and human society." *Green Shakespeare: From Ecopolitics to Ecocriticism*. NY: Routledge, 2006. 51-91.
- Estienne, Charles. *Maison Rustique*. Tr. Gervase Markham. London, 1600.
- Fleischer, Martha Hester. *The Iconography of the English History Play*. Salzburg: Universität Salzburg, 1974.

- Fleissner, Robert F. "Falstaff's Green Sickness Unto Death." *Shakespeare Quarterly*. 12.1 (1961): 47-55.
- Forker, Charles R. "Unstable Identity in Shakespeare's *Richard II*." *Renascence*. 54.1 (2001): 3-23.
- Glotfelty, Cheryll. "Literary Studies in an Age of Environmental Crisis." *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. Ed. Cheryll Glotfelty and Harold Fromm. Athens: U of Georgia UP, 1996. xv-xxxvii.
- Goddard, Harold C. "Henry IV." *Modern Critical Interpretations: Henry IV, Part I*. Ed. Harold Bloom. NY: Chelsea House Publishers, 1987. 9-40.
- Guthrie, W.G. "The Astronomy of Shakespeare." *The Irish Astronomical Journal*. 6.6 (1964): 200-11.
- Harvey, Graham. "Animals, Animists, and Academics." *Zygon: Journal of Religion & Science* 41.1 (2006): 9-20.
- Harvey, Graham. *Animism: Respecting the Living World*. NY: Columbia UP, 2006.
- Harris, Kathryn Montgomery. "Sun and Water Imagery in *Richard II*: Its Dramatic Function." *Shakespeare Quarterly*. 21.2 (1970): 157-65.
- Heninger, S.K. "The Sun King Analogy in *Richard II*." *Shakespeare Quarterly*. 11.3 (1960): 319-27.
- Howard, Jean. "The Second Part of Henry IV." *The Norton Shakespeare*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. NY: Norton, 1997. 1293-1301.
- Kliger, Samuel. "The Sun Imagery in *Richard II*." *Studies in Philology*. 45.2 (1948): 196-202.
- Kraemer, Ross S. "Ecstasy and Possession: The Attraction of Women to the Cult of Dionysus." *The Harvard Theological Review*. 72.1/2 (1979): 55-80.

- Kreiger, Elliot. "'To Demand the Time of Day': Prince Hal." *Modern Critical Interpretations: Henry IV, Part I*. Ed. Harold Bloom. NY: Chelsea House Publishers, 1987. 101-8.
- Levin, Harry. "Falstaff's Encore." *Shakespeare Quarterly*. 32.1 (1981): 5-17.
- Manes, Christopher. "Nature and Silence." *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. Ed. Cheryll Glotfelty & Harold Fromm. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1996. 15-29.
- Maus, Katharine Eisaman. "Henry V." *The Norton Shakespeare*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. NY: Norton, 1997. 1445-53.
- Maus, Katharine Eisaman. "Richard II." *The Norton Shakespeare*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. NY: Norton, 1997. 943-51.
- McKenna, J.W. "The Coronation Oil of the Yorkist Kings." *The English Historical Review*. 82.322 (1967): 102-04.
- Norwich, John Julius. *Shakespeare's Kings*. NY: Scribner, 1999.
- Oakley, Francis. "Jacobean Political Theology: The Absolute and Ordinary Powers of the King." *Journal of the History of Ideas*. 29.3 (1968): 323-46.
- Paster, Gail Kern. *The Body Embarrassed: Drama and the Disciplines of Shame in Early Modern England*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1993.
- Saccio, Peter. *Shakespeare's English Kings*. NY: Oxford UP, 1977.
- Shakespeare, William. *The History of Henry the Fourth (1 Henry IV)*. *The Norton Shakespeare*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. NY: Norton, 1997. 1147-224.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Life of Henry the Fifth*. *The Norton Shakespeare*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. NY: Norton, 1997. 1445-523.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Second Part of Henry the Fourth*. *The Norton Shakespeare*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. NY: Norton, 1997. 1293-379.

- Shakespeare, William. "Sonnet 18." *The Norton Shakespeare*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. NY: Norton, 1997. 1929.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Tragedy of King Richard the Second*. *The Norton Shakespeare*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. NY: Norton, 1997. 952-1014.
- Sondheim, Moriz. "Shakespeare and the Astrology of His Time." *Journal of the Warburg Institute*. 2.3 (1939): 243-59.
- Stewart, Alan. "Humanity at a Price: Erasmus, Budé, and the Poverty of Philology." *At the Borders of the Human: Beasts, Bodies, and Natural Philosophy in the Early Modern Period*. Ed. Erica Fudge, Ruth Gilbert, and Susan Wiseman. NY: St. Martin's, 1999. 9-25.
- Tiffany, Grace. "Shakespeare's Dionysian Prince: Drama Politics and the 'Athenian' History Play." *Renaissance Quarterly*. 52.2 (1999): 366-83.
- Traub, Valerie. "Prince Hal's Falstaff: Positioning Psychoanalysis and the Female Reproductive Body." *Shakespeare Quarterly*. 40.4 (1989): 456-74.
- Wells, Robin Headlam. *Shakespeare's Humanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005.
- Young, David P. "Introduction." *Twentieth Century Interpretations of Henry IV, Part Two*. Ed. David P. Young. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1968. 1-12.

Vita

Kathrin Kottemann received her B.A. in English Literature from Loyola University of New Orleans and her M.A. in English from the University of New Orleans with a concentration in American Literature and Composition Studies. Her interests in the English language greatly vary from African American literature to Modern Rhetoric to Shakespeare. She wrote her undergraduate thesis on the role of Penelope in Homer's *Odyssey*. The foundation of this Master's thesis, a paper entitled "Richard the Animist: Humanism's Triumph over Animism in Shakespeare's Richard II," won UNO's Malcolm Magaw Prize for the best graduate paper of 2008. She considers this thesis her best piece of writing to date.