



**Prince Hal and the Body Falstaff: Theatre as Psychic Space
in Shakespeare's *1&2 Henry IV***

by

Elise Denbo

(Queensborough Community College,
City University of New York)

ABSTRACT

Aligning psychoanalytic and embodiment approaches, this paper focuses on *1&2Henry IV* using Julia Kristeva's concept of the imaginary father, a 'maternal-paternal conglomerate,' as a third space within primary-narcissism. While Hal's 'education' has been analyzed in relation to dualities of order and disorder, few, if any have considered Falstaff as an intrapsychic figure of intimate revolt who supports the crafting of psychic- theatrical-imaginary space. Hal's youthful narcissism and his ability to connect with the popular voice are explored as a result of Falstaff's presence in the 'prehistory' of his kingship. Falstaff's verbal *copia*, his 'belly of tongues,' recalls the unruly female tongue as the site of disorder, but also the mother tongue that confers national identity as a return to the vernacular richness of the land and its people. While Hal is able to organize the various dialects and settings of *1&2HenryIV*, it is the body Falstaff who impregnates the play.

Keywords: Kristeva, Prince Hal and Falstaff, Psychic Space, Early Modern Theatre, Primary Narcissism, Shakespeare

To cite as:

Denbo, Elise 2020, "Prince Hal and the Body Falstaff: Theatre as Psychic Space in Shakespeare's *1&2 Henry IV*," *PsyArt*, pp. 177-220.

**Prince Hal and the Body Falstaff: Theatre as Psychic Space
in Shakespeare's *1&2 Henry IV***

Prince Harry: I know you all, and will a while uphold
The unyoked humour of your idelness.
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...
(*IH4* 1.2.173-75)

Falstaff: Banish plump Jack and banish all the world.
Prince Harry: I do; I will. (1*H4* 2.5.438-39)

Prince Harry: I know thee not, old man...
But being awake, I do despise my dream.
(2*H4* 5.5.45-49)

“I know you all...”

“I know you all....” Hal steps out of his popular guise as lovable rogue and ‘madcap’ prince at the end of act 1 scene 2 in *1 Henry IV* to address, so it seems, his disreputable companions who have just left the stage but also his audience in the playhouse. Given that numerous folktales, myths, and the highly popular *The Famous Victories of Henry V* portrayed the “riotous behavior” of the young prince with affection, such a shift in regard may well have startled the audience. There Hal

stands at the edge of the stage quite like “an Upstart crow,”¹ no longer framed within an illusionary *locus*, the ‘not I’ that separates audience from fiction, but instead in a *platea* position, what Robert Weimann refers to as that ‘remarkably hybrid space’ that disrupts illusion, connecting character with audience, eye to eye, body to body, inviting us into that visceral space of the drama as it unfolds.² But what is it that Hal actually *knows* – and how are these lines to be spoken or performed? Will the actor impersonating Hal *turn* to the audience – or has he *turned on* his audience, so that rather than perceiving subjects his viewers have shifted positions and become objects of his gaze? The period around 1597, the year the play was most likely written, was marked by class tension following a sequence of failed harvests. A resultant increase in government surveillance allowed newly appointed Provost Marshalls to patrol the alehouses, the streets, or any places of common meeting, and to execute “without delay” those guilty of inciting a disturbance or popular rebellion.³ As such, Hal’s ‘turn’ from lovable rogue to sudden imposter might unsettle the boundary between those watching and those being watched.

England was already on watch! As many critics have commented, the 1590s were marked by periods of unusual anxiety and unrest: in addition to fears surrounding monarchical succession, London experienced unprecedented population growth, alarming food shortages, and increased taxation aggravated by major conflicts with Spain and most pressingly, Ireland.⁴ Perched at edge of the stage, this was a different Hal ‘other’ than the legendary king embedded within England’s consciousness or the mischievous youth who had come to share an affinity with early modern lives. Whether intrigued or disturbed, sixteenth-century audiences were called upon to accommodate a ‘turn’ (or breach) in perspective, to venture into a residual opening (or gap) no longer simply as auditors but also participants in the drama, at once transferred across yet situated beyond the borders of the stage, suddenly immersed, as Shakespeare would have it, in what this paper will explore as

the crafting of psychic space. While the Greek *pneuma* (life-giving breath) and medieval vital spirits were considered ‘crucial intermediaries’ between the corporeal body and incorporeal soul,⁵ given current critical contexts (i.e. psychology, phenomenology, embodied cognition), psychic space remains an elusive yet dynamic configuration, neither inner nor outer, biological nor social, generated but not confined within borders. Similar to the concept of ‘utopia’, which does not – and cannot – exist, psychic space is in actuality ‘no place,’ rather a potentiality to be apprehended by means of a pre-symbolic (ternary) and embodied eye. I associate psychic space with the imaginary dimension of Shakespeare’s theatre which resists *and* enriches Euclidean space as well as the division established by the third term of the oedipal structure, the ‘no’ of the prohibitive father. Renaissance theories of faculty psychology regarded the imagination as a ‘storing place’ between psyche and soma that supplemented the mind’s activity with the impact of the body. Associated with rhetoric and the arts as well as dreams, visions, and occult phenomena, containing spirits of the sacred and the profane, the imagination (Bacon’s “enchanted glass”) was considered anew as a mediating, mysterious, yet also threatening ‘power.’

Although this paper is enriched by theories of embodied cognition, neuroscience, and historical phenomenology, my reference to ‘psychic space’ will most fully rely on concepts from psychoanalytic theory, especially the psycholinguistic and psychosocial theories of Julia Kristeva as distinguished from Freud and Lacan and object-relation theorists such as Melanie Klein or D. W. Winnicott, who tend to privilege the oedipal father **or** the preoedipal mother respectively. One issue that is not fully considered in *1 & 2 Henry IV* is the process of individual psychic development in relation to a positive father, most specifically a preoedipal and imaginary presence. A key argument of this paper is that Hal’s early selfhood, his prehistory to kingship, emerges retrospectively in correlation with the body Falstaff, a figure who fulfills – **not** as most critics would have it – the role

of a surrogate father *or* the occluded ‘preoedipal maternal,’ but rather Kristeva’s notion of the imaginary father (a ‘maternal-paternal conglomerate’), which she revises from Freud’s ‘father of individual prehistory.’⁶ While Hal’s ‘education’ has been explored in relation to dualities of order and disorder, few, if any have considered Falstaff as an archaic figure of intimate revolt and play who supports the crafting of a creative, ethical space that invites reciprocity and an encounter with ‘otherness.’ As such, Hal’s *turn* is situated within the imaginary dimension, what Kristeva would refer to the triadic ‘structuration’ of primary narcissism, a primordial site within the semiotic or bodily dimension of the sensorimotor drives. The transformation Shakespeare calls forth in Hal’s soliloquy, I argue, plays upon a ‘third’ space of metaphorical motility enabled by the body Falstaff, a double-gendered presence (and process) within the prehistory of Hal’s kingship whereby art and identity are not fixed but continually in process, co-evolving and open to psychic, social, and ecological intertwining, what Gail Kern Paster might refer to as a “framework of early modern personhood.”⁷

Kristeva’s view of primary narcissism revises traditional (and often contradictory) views of how we understand this enigmatic three-tiered ‘structure,’ whose “spoors we might detect in the unconscious.”⁸ Rather than stressing the subject’s founding within the Freudian/Lacanian oedipal structure, Kristeva asks “Does the mirror emerge out of nowhere?” as a means to explore a process that precedes the narcissistic moment, the passage from being to symbol to re-valuate this structure in a more complex and profound way. Although Kristeva’s view of primary narcissism has significant implications for psychoanalysis, it can help us reconsider the renovation of psychic space within the imaginary dimension Shakespeare’s theatre anticipates and models. While the imaginary father functions as an intuition of otherness within the domain of the semiotic *chora*, the mother provides the emerging subject with the material sustenance and love that enables access to an

'otherness' beyond her figure.⁹ Unlike the dyadic structure of the Lacanian imaginary or Descartes' mind-body divide,¹⁰ Kristeva identifies primary narcissism as a metaphorical *process* rather than a representation involving three terms: "two poles, the maternal and the third party, and the emerging subject who vacillates between each."¹¹ In relation to early modern views of the humoral body, Kristeva's notion of the imaginary as a hybrid site of renewal applies to Shakespearean characters who *return*, even if unexpectedly, to an archaic dimension that offers compassionate support as a means to renovate psychic space and enrich an embodied 'I'. Characters such as Rosalind, Viola, Hamlet, or Hal, whether through holiday or exile, trauma or play, recover access to intimate space before they once again transition to more traditional roles. "Living [playing] at the border, at the edge,"¹² however, retroactively offers access to a more complex and open eye that informs the dominant discourse with a new heterogeneity and exchange.

As playgoers we are first addressed by means of the border. Shakespeare's Hal's announces his arrival on the threshold, enacting a theatrical agency that enlivens the gap upon which the paradoxical nature of theatre depends, the actor both *is* and *is not* his role, the stage *is* and *is not* the world, the present *is* and *is not* the past.¹³ Such a key moment plays upon the contrariety of borders to imbue the familiar with the strange: Hal participates in yet steps outside his fictional role to announce the pattern of his future reformation while invoking access to the historical past as well as a future yet to come.¹⁴ At this point, we, as well as Hal, are positioned in-between two highly contrasted personages and settings: King Henry IV, a ruler "wan with care" from past civil wars yet threatened anew with rebellion in the making, and Falstaff, a Lord of Misrule, ruddy from drinking sack yet assimilating pleasure anew with a robbery in the making. Although the notion of thievery limns borders of order (King's Henry's 'theft' of the crown) and disorder (Falstaff's pilfering of monetary 'crowns'), there has been no mediating presence between the king's authority and the

voice of the people. Shakespeare assigns this third or middle space to Hal, whose soliloquy, I argue, plays upon conceptual metaphors (“bright metal”/“sullen ground”) and patterns of movement (“imitate”/“throw off”) as a means to embody difference rather than demonstrate the rhetorical duplicity of highly aware or calculated speech.¹⁵ As such, Hal’s soliloquy inhabits an emergent space of becoming that transfers across corporeal, psychic, and cultural thresholds of play and asks us to encounter the overlapping layers that Hal/Harry/Henry embodies and performs.¹⁶ Unlike major characters such as Falstaff, Hotspur, or King Henry IV himself who remain somewhat fixed in place, Hal – like his audience – is a subject-in-process, assimilating, rejecting, and shaping the contours of imaginary/psychic space. Shakespeare has taken time to craft such a gap as an energized *aporia*, not simply as a space of articulation but as an event *in action*, a ‘blended’ or third space through which something new emerges – or through which something ‘other’ arrives.¹⁷

Notably, the moment Hal steps forward to deliver his speech in 1.2, critical interpretations have typically placed Hal within the hierarchical trajectory of the privileged male subject who fulfills the role of England’s ideal king or who mirrors Machiavellian precepts and misuses of power.¹⁸ Although there are a few exceptions, Hal is either lionized as the begetter of a new English identity or regarded as a manipulative youth who will use those closest to him for personal as well as political gain. Unlike Hal’s earlier romanizations, most critics today concur that while Hal may be a performer, he is really quite a cold fish, a “war machine,” a wheeler-dealer, simply a very unlikeable fellow. Such bifurcation, however, recalls Lear’s ‘digesting the third’ -- “Call Burgundy, Cornwall and Albany, / With my two daughters’ dowers digest this third” (1.1.118)¹⁹ -- and flattens out Shakespeare’s portrait of a national hero, whose mythic proportions and folkloric tales provide fodder for drama, animating the transformative power of play. It is the immediacy of this moment, however, its Aristotelian vitality, that I find particularly striking, not simply Hal’s performance as

consummate player prince nor the varied, often opposing (and anamorphic) views of his character, but rather Shakespeare's dramatic rendering of psychic (or third) space at the primordial interface between body, mind, and world.²⁰ Although psychic space (as mentioned earlier) is a difficult term to define – even Freud maintained the space of the psyche can only be read metaphorically – I correlate 'psychic space' with the transformative site of Shakespeare's theatre, not only the shaping power of Shakespeare's 'airy' fictions, the soundings, rhythms, and touch of his language, but also the transferences and counter-transferences, the movement of bodies that travel back and forth between stage and world, between psyche and soma, between the 'I' and the 'not I.' Rather than limiting the eye to Henry IV as the titular character of his two plays, Shakespeare activates a double-eyed awareness that suggests imaginary thirdness as a rite of passage for creative and responsible making. Hal's transition to kingship, when restricted to any one position, effaces the complexity of Shakespeare's play, which questions the image it proposes *and* exposes as a means to consider creative as well as ethical issues.²¹

While current approaches of new materialism and object-oriented ontology have taught us to "re-encounter the non-linguistic and non-human dimensions" of theatre and to eschew human exceptionalism, Julia Reinhard Lupton maintains the "Shakespearean corpus nonetheless harbors an investment in human action, consciousness, and experience at its core."²² Similarly, while theories of enactive cognition develop a deeper understanding of the body and relocate the Freudian unconscious in sensorimotor or proprioceptive processes, Shakespeare's fictions dramatize crises or dilemmas within family relationships as faultlines that extend to the nation state. During the Elizabethan period, families followed a domestic structure modeled on national order with monarchs as heads of state and husbands as heads of households whereby obedience was seen as an obligation of child to parent, wife to husband, servant to household, household to kingdom as outlined in the

“Exhortation concerning Good Ordre and Obedience to Rulers and Magistrates” from *The First Book of Homilies* (1547). While Lawrence Stone stresses the lack of affective bonds between family members within the “patrilinear, primogenitural, and patriarchal” culture of early modern England, Lynda Boose demonstrates that Shakespeare’s plays dramatize the highly emotional and complex bonds that exist between parents and children especially when rituals that demarcate sacred space such as marriage, birth, monarchal succession are transgressed or deformed.²³

Hal’s soliloquy functions on the threshold as a kind of enunciation *and* chorus, a thinking in movement, affectively mapping a demarcation of space that animates the progression of his character as well as the rhetorical and geographical patterning of *1 & 2 Henry IV*.²⁴ If read through the Cartesian divide or the Lacanian symbolic, Hal appears a cunning and callous politician. I would argue, however, if read through recent findings in neuroscience and embodied cognition, especially as reconfigured through Kristeva’s imaginary, we are able to glimpse, even appreciate, Hal’s common humanity.²⁵ Hal’s soliloquy might be said to enact a pre-symbolic rehearsal of space, the Freudian *fort/da* of practice and play,²⁶ a dramatic activity that will choreograph the various settings and discourses of the play, the tavern, the court, the battlefield, the rebels’ homes whether in Northern England or Wales. Within the realm of individual prehistory, Hal is engaged in a progressive motion to separate his “bright” image from “sullen ground,” abjecting “base contagious clouds” and modeling “the sun,” a corporeal as well as psychic struggle which will transfer him to the site of his monarchal ‘I’ and set him on the throne of symbolic order. Although no one setting or focus takes center stage, Hal’s soliloquy, perched on the threshold between semiotic and symbolic domains reveals what Freud would term a new psychical action, at once the “advent-and-loss” of a subject but not yet the mastery of the Lacanian linguistic metaphor.²⁷ Hal is situated within the realm of what Kristeva would refer to as the triadic structure of primary narcissism: as Hal ‘speaks’

to himself, to his companions, and to the audience, he reaches beyond the frame of illusion to an intuition of otherness – not yet the ‘captation’ of the ego in idealization of its own image – but an idealization nevertheless “opening up to and through” identification with a preobjectal third: such a disruption invites us to join in his evolving consciousness, his imaginary play, and ultimately to partake in the crafting of psychic space.²⁸

As noted earlier, the key to this is Falstaff, who contains doubles as well as a “whole school of tongues” in his womb-like belly (*2H4* 4.2.18). Falstaff is Hal’s imaginary ‘other,’ the young prince’s “identification with the father-mother conglomerate.”²⁹ Falstaff’s life-renewing force is embodied in his gargantuan appetite for pleasure and freedom from restraint, an irrepressible knight who counters chivalric order with a festive misrule that attracts and repels, at once taking in and expelling (*abjecting*) all forms of matter. Falstaff’s wide girth, his verbal and corporeal excess, will extend Hal’s personal struggle to the workings of earth, country, and cosmos, not simply worship of the sun’s bright eye but also service to the feminine variability of the moon. As Falstaff tells him, “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’” (*1H4* 1.2.21-23). Rather than privileging the dominant focus of king or court as he does in *Richard II*, Shakespeare crafts the shaping of individual and communal identity through the consciousness of unfamiliar tongues as well as the everyday voices of common working folk. Although Falstaff as an intrapsychic or archaic father enriches Hal’s eye and ear, Hal is ultimately the character who is able to traverse and organize the disparate settings (and languages) of *1 Henry IV*.³⁰ Like us, Hal is a role player who tries on and casts off his various parts. Shakespeare leaves his lens wide open.

Theatre’s Play on Psychic Space

Theatre, as has often been discussed, is a spatial art. Once the theatre is empty, the stage as Peter Brooks tells us, is an empty space waiting to be filled, but even when the performance is over and the doors have been closed, the stage, now vacant, is resonant with various lingerings, echoes, odors, textural auras of fictional and historical personages who have strutted upon its boards surely signifying more than nothing. But ‘nothing’ of course – as Shakespeare’s fascination with the concept of zero suggests – always means ‘something’ – a *mattering*.³¹ In his book, *The Feeling of What Happens*, the neuroscientist Antonio Damasio explains:

I have always been intrigued by the specific moment when, as we sit waiting in the audience, the door to the stage opens and a performer steps into the light; or, to take the other perspective, the moment when a performer who waits in semi-darkness sees the same door open, revealing the lights, the stage, and the audience. I realized some years ago that the moving quality of this moment, whichever point of view one takes, comes from its embodiment of an instance of birth, of passage through a threshold that separates a protected but limiting shelter from the possibility and risk of a world beyond and ahead.³²

Similarly, Shakespeare would have understood that historical events play upon a three-dimensional yet palpable threshold of past, present, and future offering audiences an occasion to bring forth – to engender – a ‘preternatural’ spatio-temporal reality, an opening that enables the crafting of imaginary/psychic space. Unlike the timeline of *The Famous Victories of Henry V*, beginning around the fourteenth year of King Henry IV’s reign (1413) and concluding with the marriage arrangement between Henry V and the French princess Katherine (1420), Shakespeare’s three *Henry* plays significantly widen the temporality of events. Notably *1 Henry IV* begins with reports from

the Battle of Humbleton Hill (1402) and ends with the Battle of Shrewsbury (1403).³³ Such an enlargement of narrative time not only adds an entire ‘prehistory’ to *The Famous Victories of Henry V* but structurally aligns with the dilation of the body Falstaff, an alluring figure of deferral and delay that Patricia Parker and Garrett Sullivan Jr. affiliate with the romance episode as that which interrupts the hero’s trajectory within epic genre. Clearly Shakespeare reconfigured his sources adding a Hotspur (historically aligned with Henry IV’s generation) as a foil to Hal, “Harry to Harry... hot horse to horse” (*IH4* 4.1.123). Falstaff amplifies a role in *The Famous Victories of Henry V* by means of his globe-like figure, at once a conglomerate of Shakespeare’s “fat lady” and a carnivalesque Lord of Misrule, a Circe-like temptress who entices Hal to take in the urban pleasures of Eastcheap, a locus at odds with Acrasia’s Bower of Bliss but no less a *locus amoenus* of its own making.³⁴

The Mirror’s Double: Critical Reflections of Hal

“I know you all...” To turn once again to Hal’s soliloquy, what is it Hal *knows* or how might these lines be spoken in any performance or retrospective telling of the tale? It is quite possible, of course, Hal may not *turn* at all but instead say these lines as if to himself, to his kingly father, or to an ‘eavesdropping’ other as in Orson Welles’ *Chimes at Midnight*, or even the memory of a long departed mother, Mary de Bohoun, who is barely a trace in the play.³⁵ During the latter part of the sixteenth century, popular narratives such as the Prodigal Son and the myth of Icarus were no longer simply regarded as transgressive of patriarchal law or symbols of excessive pride but instead expressive of a son’s “desire for the open sky,” a means to resist the dictum that a “childe in small letter is Man, the best Copie of Adam before he tasted of Eve or the apple.”³⁶ Given a fledgling’s struggle toward flight (the daring Icarus or Henry IV’s “unthrifty son”), it is quite possible Hal’s

words gesture toward some mysterious space through which Hal attempts to revision himself, shamed yet energized by his own falsehood in a robbery about to take place, yet caught like Francis the drawer between the “anon” of competing demands, a “debt” he “never promised” but one which must be repaid. Or quite possibly Hal might be alluding to the ‘debt’ of his own birth, for which we all must pay, the irrefutable passage between life and death and the shaping moments in-between, the moments of rehearsal and play but also personal and public responsibility.

I realize the error in responding to fictional beings as if they were real; yet current theories of embodied cognition (the ‘new unconscious’) tell us the relationship between character and audience is highly interactive. Although the “unworthy scaffold” of the Globe may appear no more than a mere “cockpit,” the Chorus in *Henry V* famously summons our participation in creating the “vasty fields of France... And let us, ciphers to this great account, / On your imaginary forces work” (11-19). Early modern writers were fascinated by the nature of fiction and its ability to act in the world. Imaginary fictions were less bound by nature or the law: they not only possessed a mysterious capacity to move both passion and spirit, but also to reconfigure agency and authority, private and public beliefs. As Ros King notes Shakespeare’s theatrical art, the tangible expression of his multidimensional language, gives playgoers more than one motive or cause, more than one way of thinking or feeling as a means of “throwing the moral imperative back at his audiences, making us participants in meaning making.”³⁷ As such, audiences assign agency and subjectivity to characters as if they were autopoietic systems with a life pulse of their own. Either way, we already know more about Hal than do many others in the play, his father, his companions, perhaps even the young prince himself. What might be surmised, however, is that Hal longs to break free, to step outside the numerous ties that bind him, the idealizations of history and myth, the popular tales of a ‘madcap’ prince, a scripted role he must play. As such, it would seem that Hal, like most of us, wants some say in the matter of his own

making, not to have to obey his father's law or take on another's mistakes, but be free to choose for himself, to access a being and agency that alas, even Shakespeare (or the actor who plays Hal) cannot quite give him. As Hal 'speaks' to himself, his companions, his audience, he reaches beyond the frame of illusion inviting us to participate in the crafting of psychic space. "The counterchange," as Shakespeare will later write, "is severally in all" (*Cym.* 5.6.397-98).³⁸

While critical views of Hal often posit binary perspectives, if viewed through the lens of individual prehistory, the prince has neither foreclosed the 'third' (like Lear) nor has he like Zeus (an archetypal/agonistic ruler) swallowed the pregnant Metis as a means to control the maternal reproductive body and prevent birth of a son who will replace him.³⁹ Although it is not possible to present an adequate scope of criticism, a brief review of crucial approaches to Hal deserve some attention. To E. M. W. Tillyard, Hal is a "man of large powers... Shakespeare's studied picture of the kingly type"⁴⁰; to others such as Stephen Greenblatt, Hal is scheming, calculating and cold: "Hal is a juggler, a conniving hypocrite" whose "characteristic activity is playing or more precisely, theatrical improvisation."⁴¹ Hal not only dons more roles than Hamlet, his constant putting on and putting off become intrinsic to a schemata of counterfeit and disguise rather than an educational rite of passage, so that, according to Hugh Grady, unlike Falstaff's festive misrule and unruly appetite, Hal is a Machiavel, a self-interested man who "fully understands his own behavior."⁴² Ellen M. Caldwell comments Hal's role dramatizes "princely power as representational, iconic, and false.... Hal's reformation will glitter o'er his fault, simply covering it with the pretense of another act."⁴³ Even while many critics acknowledge Falstaff gives pleasure to Hal, for David Scott Kastan, "Hal is using the fat knight to construct his own political authority." Although Henry IV wishes that "some night-tripping fairy had exchanged/In cradle clothes our children where they lay" (*IH4* 1.1.86-87), it soon becomes apparent that "Hotspur is the child of Henry's desire" while Hal is

“clearly the child of his loins.”⁴⁴ Marjorie Garber in turn comments: “Manifestly the Prince is enjoying himself – only the dourest and most suspicious critic, however, could claim that he is merely ‘using’ his tavern friends – but he does have an ulterior motive, something we might call, in modern parlance, ‘fieldwork,’ or even less appealingly, ‘ethnography’”⁴⁵

The speech remains an anomaly that continues to perplex as well as unsettle subject/object and critical positions even as it puts forth a remarkable new subjectivity in the making. Similar to Richard III’s appearance on stage, critics such as Marc Grossman and Daniel Seltzer see Hal as “the voice of a fully developed subjectivity,” evoking what Janet Adelman refers to as the “characteristically Shakespearean illusion that a stage person has interior being, including motives that he himself does not fully understand.”⁴⁶ According to Grossman, “The speech serves to disclose...the acuteness with which Prince Hal, uniquely among the cast of *I Henry IV*, internalizes or mirrors the tension between the two comic and morally serious perspectives, placed in opposition by the play.”⁴⁷ Samuel Johnson, on the other hand, views the contradictions in Hal’s soliloquy as a strikingly human dilemma: the speech “exhibits a natural picture of a great mind offering excuses to itself and palliating those follies which it can neither justify or forsake.”⁴⁸ For Daniel Seltzer, Hal is “the stage character whose ‘personality’ is one of the most pivotal in the playwright’s career, for in its composition he acquired the ability to make a character change internally,” a personation without which Shakespeare “could never have carried Hamlet, Othello, Macbeth, or Lear to their ultimate moments of inner perception.”⁴⁹

Current theorists of embodied cognition also have trouble with Hal – yet most place Hal within the locus of a fully realized subjectivity. Garret Sullivan Jr. maintains “Hal’s selfhood is bound up in Falstaff’s” whereby he “constructs a model of selfhood that allows him to be *in* the tavern world without being tainted *by* it’: his speech reveals a “particular articulation of selfhood...

at an ethical remove from one's environment."⁵⁰ While insightful, Sullivan's reading is posited within the biopolitical sphere of the Cartesian divide rather than what might be read as Hal's retrospective return to an imaginary corporeal realm as a means to nourish, experience, and reconfigure what he intuits as a dearth of psychic space. Similarly, studies such as Emma Firestone's "Warmth and Affection in *1 Henry IV*" draw on recent findings in social cognition to explore the impact of warm-cold properties as to "why no one likes Prince Hal." Firestone considers how "abstract psychological concepts such as interpersonal warmth," a cold shoulder rather than a warm smile, evoke feelings of distrust that form in early childhood, grounding first impressions in "concrete physical experiences" that continue to build on one another.⁵¹ No doubt Shakespeare draws on the push and pull, the physicality of language, throughout *1&2 Henry IV*, embodying metaphor to flesh out Hotspur's mercurial heat, Falstaff's sack-filled warmth, Hal's fish-like coldness, the King's distant demeanor and encroaching illness. Falstaff, however, tells us that coldness is transformed by the excellence of 'sherries' whereby Hal, who naturally had inherited cold blood from his father has now "become very hot and valiant" (*2H4* 4.2.121-126).

Kristeva, or 'Why is Falstaff Fat?'

If one considers Falstaff an imaginary father, a coalescence of maternal and paternal functions, David Womersley's question "Why is Falstaff Fat?" relates well to one asked by Mary Beth Rose, "Where are the Mothers in Shakespeare?" Given that historical depictions Sir John Oldcastle, the Lollard martyr, show a well-proportioned man,⁵² why is it that Shakespeare dramatizes Falstaff as most emphatically corpulent? While Womersley regards "the fatness of Falstaff" as "the playwright's intention to unify political and spiritual authority in the person of Henry,"⁵³ Mary Beth Rose points to the exclusion of mothers from Shakespeare's plays, especially such a male-dominated epic as the *Henriad*.

Although modern readings offer positive views of early modern motherhood with examples of private and public value which require our attention, the notable absence of mothers in Shakespeare's plays does not necessarily exclude the importance of this figure or point to its negation or lack.⁵⁴ While presentations of female power are objectified or limited to nature, they call forth significant voices and expressions of power that ecological theorists and feminists are not ready to disavow. Restricting women to symbolic categories, not only "forecloses possibilities for both women's power and the power of Nature (as female)," such a practice reinforces narratives that continue to reify masculine domination.⁵⁵ Elizabeth Sacks argues the "creative principle in Shakespeare is rooted in pregnancy, whether literal, figurative or both simultaneously," employing a birthing metaphor that can be aligned with theatrical/psychic space as a latent creative force at once embodied and embedded in his plays. Although such a comment alludes to feminist concerns regarding the distortion or erasure of the reproductive body either by means of natural forces or themes of male parthenogenesis, Sack's statement refers less to male birthing narratives of artistic labor, but instead to the imaginative energy that outlines and imbues Shakespeare's fictions. Even as Hal may serve as the central focus or 'consciousness' through which the audience experiences the play, Hal's subjectivity is crafted through the various 'doublings' and dislocations that he must assimilate and traverse. While Hal is able to organize the various dialects and settings of *I Henry IV*, it is the body Falstaff who impregnates the play. Even after the final act of *2 Henry IV*, when Falstaff and his companions are carried off to the "Fleet" (a London prison), the Epilogue steps out from the frame of the text to assure us there will be a continued "story with Sir John in it." Acknowledging that "Oldcastle died a martyr, and this is not the man," the audience is further assured that our body Falstaff will go free.

For Kristeva, the imaginary father emerges as a presence around the fourth month of life

during the oral phase of development. Along with nourishment from the mother's breast, the infant incorporates a loving model or 'other' through the mother's affection toward the preoedipal father. As such, the pleasure of the mouth, the lips, the tongue correspond to "the joys of chewing, swallowing, nourishing oneself...with words."⁵⁶ The pleasure of oral gratification becomes a prototype for the process of unification (incorporation) whereby biological need is transformed to a psychic level of organization: the imaginary father not only provides a site for the mother's desire but also an *aporia* through which the infant is not sole object of maternal desire (the space of the 'not I'). It is important to note, primary processes of maternal abjection *and* amatory attraction work together, a collaboration integral to Kristeva's imaginary. Unlike Lacan, however, Kristeva regards the ego's captation by the mirror's image as a secondary repression: attraction to the 'other' rather than simply loss or lack mediates access to the divided image; as such, psychic space is shaped not only through the 'void' of material separation but also a coming together with love, generating a poetic rather than a reductive eye. Without the creative labor inherent in primordial thirdness (psychic space), abjection is displaced onto the symbolic domain whereby oedipal division leads to social forms of oppression (i.e. misogyny, prejudice, forms of abuse) arising from a dearth of psychic space.⁵⁷

While semiotics usually refers to the science of signs, for Kristeva, semiotic refers to the rhythms, intonations, and "non-sense" of language that resist logic and representation. The semiotic disposition relates to the child's primal and undifferentiated union with the maternal body that precedes symbolic awareness and the representation of objects. Filled with drive energy and affect, the semiotic in represents the preverbal and material aspects of language that disrupt and inform traditional conceptions of order. Semiotic gestures or intonations that are present in the vocalizations of young infants later appear (in the symbolic) as the rhythms, articulations, and music that permeate

poetic and embodied language. For Kristeva, semiotic energy is never completely repressed by the symbolic, but continues to erupt in moments of crisis whereby the subject experiences a radical displacement or a confusion in meaning that is at once a loss and an opportunity for renewal. As such, the semiotic brings the maternal body back into language, a body which ‘speaks.’

Although the semantic designation ‘father’ may conjure up connotations of patriarchal oppression, it is important to note the imaginary ‘father’ can also be a ‘mother,’ a caretaker, or an ‘elsewhere’ of desire (for example art, literature, a human or nonhuman presence) ‘other’ than the child. Primary narcissism, while founded on self-love, is “unthinkable and unlivable” without the ‘other.’⁵⁸ Kristeva emphasizes both the nourishing *and* separating functions in shaping psychic identity: whether a “daddy or mummy” is less pivotal than their mutual support and heterogeneity. In terms of her valuation of psychotherapy, Kristeva views the analyst as a ‘presence’ situated on a threshold or “ridge, where, on the one hand, the ‘maternal’ position – gratifying needs, ‘holding’ (Winnicott) – and on the other the ‘paternal’ position – the differentiation, distance, and prohibition that produces both meaning and absurdity – are intermingled and severed, infinitely and without end.”⁵⁹ Since the imaginary ‘father’ – like the analyst – is loving yet *fleeting*, ephemeral yet affective, such a presence can be compared to the phenomenon of the theatrical event, the multiple and drive affected crossings between body, stage, and world. Such an imaginary site is prior to representation and the law, avoiding the absolutism of the symbolic (Freud’s fear of mob hysteria and the tyranny of the Führer),⁶⁰ whereby sites of renovation like the theatre enable a retrospective return and recovery of imaginary/psychic space.

The Body Falstaff

Shakespeare’s theatre plays with variations of metaphor/metamorphosis whereby the transference of motion locates itself in more than one person, image, or place. Characters take on

the ambiguous motility inherent in the anamorphic image: Viola: “I am not what I am” (*TN* 3.1.131); Oliver: “’Twas I but ‘tis not I” (*AYL* 4.3.143); and Iago: “I am not what I am” (*Oth.* 1.1.65) play on the biblical Yahweh “I am that I am” to dramatize the mysterious obscurity that resists classification while intimating an unnamable yet resounding otherness. Similarly, Cressida’s “I have a kind of self resides with you” (3.2.148) or Shakespeare’s “Had the essence but in one/two distincts, division none” (“The Phoenix and The Turtle” 1601) evoke the prehistory of the Cartesian subject that allies such permutations with early modern crossings between stage and world, human and nonhuman others. Nancy Selleck maintains while “the selves coined by Renaissance speakers and writers are various...they share a tendency to locate selfhood beyond subjective experience, in the experience of an *other*.”⁶¹ Rather than the enclosure of an ‘atomistic’ subject, Gail Kern Paster addresses the “ceaseless cosmobiological exchange of vapors between body and world as a system of spirits that not only “animate the heavens, the environment, the human body, inanimate objects... [but] that make that cosmos above all a theater of pneumatological interaction.”⁶² Such are the fertile exchanges Shakespeare sets in motion in *1 & 2 Henry IV* by means of the body Falstaff.

Falstaff is often recognized as a father surrogate for Hal while his “big-bellied” presence has been associated with the pregnant body of Bakhtinian excess. W. H. Auden refers to Falstaff’s indefinite sexuality as “the cross between a very young child and a pregnant mother,” maintaining that “fatness in the male is the physical expression of a psychological wish to withdraw from sexual competition and, by combining mother and child in his own person, to become emotionally self-sufficient”;⁶³ Patricia Parker comments Falstaff is “the fat woman of Brainsford” in the *Merry Wives of Windsor* but in both *Henry IV* plays “his belly full of tongues links him...with the proverbially unstoppable female tongue,” a threatening “verbal *copia*.”⁶⁴ Coppelia Kahn maintains “a fat man can look like a pregnant woman, and Falstaff’s fatness is fecund, it spawns symbols.”⁶⁵ Phyllis

Rackin states Falstaff not only “embodies effeminating pleasures...he is able to appropriate the woman’s part”⁶⁶ while Valerie Traub reads Falstaff as the “preoedipal maternal, whose rejection is the basis upon which patriarchal subjectivity is predicated.”⁶⁷ Falstaff is at once abject and exemplary. Positing a challenge to the Renaissance view of male heroic action as opposed to female loquaciousness, Parker comments Falstaff takes on the “monstrous third possibility of a wordy man,” seen also in his aberrant ‘wordiness’ at the Battle of Shrewsbury.⁶⁸

While Hal is a person who marks time by means of his own redemption, Falstaff’s defiance of time is “out of all compass” (*IH4* 3.3.21); unlike Hal, who adjusts *personas* to time and place, Falstaff remains Falstaff wherever he travels. At once embodying and defying nature, Falstaff identifies not only with the moon but also with the vitality of youth (“Bacon-fed knaves! They hate us youth” *IH4* 2.2.78). Even as Falstaff’s multiple nature alludes to historical and religious practices, Falstaff is a person of the immediate present. Janet Hill tells us “Falstaff’s voice, insinuating its way over the edges of the scaffold, is an earthy English tongue, usually talking about material things; the pleasures of food and drink, how all bodies are not sites of honour but feel pain, that death is to be avoided at all costs.”⁶⁹ As mentor to Hal, Falstaff regards his teachings as renovating to body and spirit: as noted, Hal’s leanness benefits from the warm nourishment of sack. Like carnival itself, Falstaff’s disorderly girth enriches Lenten order: reforming the leanness in Hal, who in reference to the large knight, appears a “stock-fish” a “starveling,” a “bull’s pizzle” and “tailor’s yard” (*IH4* 2.5.226-48). Unable to orbit or encompass a body that exceeds its own limits yet coheres to its own pleasures and drives, Hal absorbs its offerings, delimiting boundaries as he emerges through the gaps that generate him into being. In such ways, the interaction between the globe-like Falstaff and the lean agility of Hal invokes the pre-Cartesian subject whereby body and psyche correlate self and other, nature and culture within the pre-discursive play of the poetic imagination.⁷⁰

In his exploration of couvade syndrome, a term used to designate symptoms of male pregnancy, Nicholas Shane Johnson explores the phenomenon of ‘cultural couvade.’ Using it as a theoretical model to explore Elizabethan figures of pregnancy, Johnson links “the anthropologists ‘couvade,’ the physician’s ‘couvade syndrome,’ and the psychoanalyst gender-inflected model of the unconscious” to argue a “disabled masculinity” reflected in “a bodily incapability to give birth.”⁷¹ As such, literary themes of male parthenogenesis that occlude the maternal compensate for an inherent lack. Couvade syndrome addresses a husband’s empathic response to his pregnant wife through accompanying symptoms and bodily changes: weight gain, food cravings, mood swings, breathlessness, and fatigue. Compiling data from field reports of cultural couvade in Indonesia, Guiana, India, and Sudan in 1929, W. R. Dawson, an English anthropologist, describes the practice: “In its perfect form, the husband...takes to his bed and pretends to be lying-in, sometimes even simulating by groans and contortions, the pains of labour, and sometimes even dressing in his wife’s clothes. Whilst in bed, he is pampered and fed on dainties, nurses the infant and receives the felicitations of his relatives and friends.”⁷² Johnson applies his reading of cultural and literary couvade to Shakespeare’s *Henriad* as a “performative couvade on an epic scale; the four plays construct England itself as a heroic womb and the antics of prince Hal as the slow-motion delivery of a heroically masculine king.”⁷³ Although Johnson addresses an insightful reading of cultural couvade as it relates to *1 & 2 Henry IV*, he relies on a symbolic narrative that opposes paternal and maternal functions, whereby one term, either male or female, is rendered deficient. Rather than privileging the preoedipal mother or the oedipal father, I would extend such a reading to the intermingling of form and matter that explores the imaginary as a psychic, biological, and rhetorical practice, engaging difference as informative rather than irreconcilable.

Interestingly, Robert Shaughnessy considers prosthetic devices currently used to create the character but especially the body of Falstaff, notably the “mixture of wadding, foam, and polystyrene balls” that serve as Falstaff’s belly worn by Michael Gambon in a 2005 National Theatre production of *1 & 2 Henry IV*, or the outsized spherical contraption worn by Simon Callow in *Merry Wives: The Musical* in 2006 by the Royal Shakespeare Company. Although the cultural forces of the period cannot so easily be recuperated by putting on such a device, both actors attest to the affective alteration in lumbering about on stage with such a marked change in physical girth as they enact a “prosthetic rehearsal of maternity” at once gender ambiguous yet integral to the experience of the self. Considering Johnson’s reference to couvade syndrome, Gambon’s prosthetic ‘belly’ holds a striking resemblance to an apparatus manufactured by the Birthways Childbirth Resource Center and sold in the United States as an “Empathy Belly.” A similar body suit has been worn by women and men anxious to experience the symptoms of pregnancy: it has also been used as a “successful tool” for “Teen Pregnancy Prevention.”⁷⁴ Kristeva, I think, would admire such an empathic listening to the body. As such, it is helpful to consider what we, as audience, might learn from Falstaff’s belly – and to reconsider what Hal might also have learned.⁷⁵

The Body Falstaff in Ritual and History

Theories of the imagination in the early modern period were located within changing notions of the humoral (and passionate) body:⁷⁶ such theories can be related to Kristeva’s concept of the semiotic maternal body as well as her configuration of the imaginary dimension. An argument of this paper is that the theatre recreates the presymbolic/psychic space inherent within the triadic ‘structuration’ of primary narcissism, a theory Kristeva develops in her analysis of literary texts but also in relation to the psychoanalytic setting and the position of the analyst as “imaginary father/mother.” The theatre neither replicates nor replaces the relationship between analyst and

analysis nor the healing treatment that occurs; but the theatre, especially as Shakespeare conceives it, helps historicize Kristeva's notion of the imaginary, the drive affectivity and idealization involved in the formation of psychic space.

While Kristeva's imaginary offers a means to explore individual prehistory, her theories apply to larger historical and cultural narratives far beyond her psychological focus. As David Hillman points out, "the inextricability of selfhood and corporeality" formed a large part of Galenism, the prevailing medical view based on ancient Greek humoral theory of the human body as open and porous, a view that reinforced female gender positions as 'leaky vessels.'⁷⁷ During the early modern period, re-visioning human embodiment was a cause of increasing anxiety: as men and women began to consider their bodies private and closed, numerous illustrations of the body's interior put forth in medical and anatomy treatises stirred up fears regarding political persecutions and 'foreign invasions' incited by the prying eyes of science. Falstaff's body and his own expansive cultural prehistory help to reconfigure these narratives. Falstaff's corporeality and sensual appetites, like the Bakhtinian body, portray an inversion of bodily dimensions and class order as a means to challenge authoritarian rule and serve as a site of material, psychic, and social nourishment. Falstaff's body is abject: not only does Hal refer to him as a "fat-kidneyed rascal" (*IH4* 2.2.6), "fat-guts" (29), "Sir John Paunch" (60), a "woolsack" (*IH4* 2.5.122) and "whorson round man" (2.5.127), he is an "oily rascal" who "sweats to death /And lards the earth as he walks" (*IH4* 2.3.16-17). In addition to the rhythms of nature and myth, Falstaff embodies the abundance of carnival as well as the spawn of its excesses. In the "play extempore" of the tavern in 2.5 of *1 Henry IV*, Hal (in the role of his own father) likens the "fat knight" to a ritual feast, but also a "trunk of humours," a "bolting batch of beastliness," a "swollen parcel of dropsies" and "stuffed cloak-bag of guts" (410-11).

The ritual of carnival epitomizes a Bakhtinian ‘grotesque’ (‘female reproductive’ or pregnant body),⁷⁸ exposing the border between eating and excretion, integration and abjection that exists between psychological and historical events as semiotic progressions within the imaginary. In his critique of Renaissance culture, Bakhtin maintains the civilizing forces of society banish a ‘prodigiously open body’: within the new canon, “the genital organs, the buttocks, belly, nose and mouth cease to play the leading role...sexual life, eating, drinking, defecating have radically changed their meaning: they have been transferred to the private and psychological level where their connotation becomes narrow and specific, torn away from the direct relation to the life of society and to the cosmic whole.”⁷⁹ While Bakhtin explores the fragmentation of the grotesque body into individual parts as it transfers from public to private domains, Kristeva explores the connection between the individual and the communal that maintains the messiness of semiotic energy. Although Kristeva engages the narratives of Freud and Lacan, she utilizes the dialogism of Bakhtin, especially his dynamic of two separate yet interacting “consciousnesses” that actively engage and inform the other.⁸⁰ Bakhtin’s depiction of the carnival as a transgression of the law, a doubling of both “One and Other,” represents an intersection of discourses that disrupts monologic reduction. Without an outside perspective or dialogic exchange, the freedom to resist authority would be bound within the oppressive “eye” of a monologic system. Ironically, Hal’s opening soliloquy in *1 Henry IV* plays upon Shakespeare’s ‘double-eyedness,’ a back and forth spatio-temporal progression between ‘what if’ or ‘if when’ that incorporates difference rather than division.

Abjection and carnival, like the imaginary father, sit on a ridge between two realms or ‘mappings,’ semiotic and symbolic dimensions. Of course, Eastcheap’s favorite offspring and unruly lord is Falstaff. In *1&2 Henry IV*, Shakespeare, however, takes time to portray early modern alehouses not only as sites of fun-loving pleasure but also as important sites of nourishment and

debate, “the commingling of matter and spirit.”⁸¹ The tavern or ‘victualling house’ became an alternative economic center for the middling and low classes, providing companionship as well as relief from the increase in the “machinery of surveillance” that surrounded London’s laboring classes during crises of economic dearth, notably the failed harvests from 1594 through 1597.⁸² During the summer of 1595 London was involved in 13 food riots, culminating in the Apprentice’s Riot in June of that year. Chris Fritter states that cheap food and ale offered “vital nutrients to the malnourished,” while the taverns themselves became places of “festive release and entertainment”: many sought refuge in the tavern setting it up as a “heartland of animated fellowship and restorative good will.”⁸³ In the *Henry IV* plays, Eastcheap, a model for the Boar’s Head Tavern of sixteenth-century London, offers Hal a much-needed holiday with a father of loving pleasure and play. While Hal may regard this site as vital to his political reformation, it is hard to disregard the voices of fellowship that permeate these scenes. Janet Clare tells us that “clowning and tavern time occupy more theatrical time than heroic action... it is the dominating presence of an Elizabethan underclass, which refuses to be marginalized, that creates a rupture of theatre and chronicle”⁸⁴ Shakespeare’s *Henry IV* plays are rich in commonplace expressions that would be lost to us today, which are marked instances of Falstaff’s ‘belly full of tongues.’

Falstaff and the Imaginary: Paternal Surrogate and Alma Mater

An early modern text published in 1641 combined the first two editions of Richard Brathwait’s *The English Gentleman* (1630) and *The English Gentlewoman* (1631) with a reconfigured frontispiece that fundamentally divides ‘portraits’ from the two separate editions on one page whereby the gentleman and his attributes are placed on the left of the page and the gentlewoman’s on the right.⁸⁵ An addition to the frontispiece (1641) placed atop the page represents the theme of education and learning through an image that is strikingly emblematic of breastfeeding

and the maternal nurse. Seated atop the page a woman holds a book in her lap; her bared breasts emit a stream of milk as she holds each nipple between her hands in preparation to feed her infant; however, the infant is absent from the picture. Instead the book in her lap has replaced the infant, and the woman thus “expresses milk” not into her child’s suckling mouth but instead onto the pages of the book. As such, milk replaces both infant and pen as it becomes fundamental to scripting (or impressing words on the page), the breast and its nourishing stream conflating oral and phallic images. Jacqueline T. Miller points out the “nourishing figure appears to be a presiding deity of the text: rather than nourishing a child she is filling the pages of her books with her milk.”⁸⁶ Miller links “language and lactation, nursing and nation” to England’s growing affiliation with the vernacular and the country’s increasing concern that infants learn the language of the mother as they suckle milk from her breast. In many early modern treatises, the child’s relationship to the nursing breast was viewed as primary to national identity: as the nursing infant takes in milk, he/she also assimilates the character and native language of the primary caregiver or wet-nurse.⁸⁷

Although the sack of Eastcheap provides nutriment to the body as well as to the spirit, Falstaff’s nourishment applies more to his belly than simply the maternal breast. In early modern faculty psychology, the belly was one of the three regions that mapped the body: the brain (in the head), the heart (in the chest) and the liver (in the belly), each of which corresponded to the intellectual, affective, and nutritive ‘powers’ of Aristotle’s tripartite soul. In Elizabeth’s address to the troops at Tilbury (1588), she stated “I know I have the body of a weak and feeble woman, but I have the heart and stomach of a king, and of a king of England too.” Shakespeare portrays the importance of the stomach (and digestion) in Menenius Agrippa’s “fable of the belly” which highlights the orators belly talk: “Sir, I shall tell you. With a kind of smile,/. . .I may make the belly smile/As well as speak” (*Cor.* 1.1.110-114).⁸⁸ Not only does Falstaff, embody a “school” of tongues

in his belly-like womb, he centers the various languages of Eastcheap that enrich Hal's connection with the people. Mentoring Hal through various experiences based on food, drink, and play, Falstaff takes on the role of a pedagogical guide, but also an alma mater, a nourishing mother, whose teachings will remain in memory. Located within the semiotic domain of an Eastcheap 'schoolroom,' Falstaff's doubleness outlines the rhythms of preverbal space while as knight of misrule he offers precepts of regulation even if they resist traditional venues of law and order.⁸⁹ Minions of the moon rather than masters of the sun, Falstaff and his vassals "doth ebb and flow like the sea, being governed as the sea is by the moon" (*IH4* 1.2.28-9). Embodying a feminine fluidity associated with the ebb and flow of the night's body, Falstaff provides the psychic attachment and material rejection that serves to bridge Hal's passage to kingship. While Hal boasts about his linguistic diversity, assimilating the various dialects and tongues of workaday speech, the audience too participates in a similar taking in and avowal.

In *2 Henry IV*, it is notable that Rumor "painted full of tongues" introduces the play, retelling recent events surrounding the battle at Shrewsbury. "Open your ears; for which of you will stop / The vent of hearing when loud Rumor speaks?" Rumor, however, is an unruly tongue that repeats what it misreads. In 1.1, Lord Bardolph tells Northumberland, Hotspur's father, that the "King is almost wounded to the death / And in fortune of my lord, your son, / Prince Harry slain outright" (*2H4* 1.1.15-6). Rumor's appearance on stage manifests the theme Falstaff had touched on after the Gads Hill robbery, asking Hal "is not the truth the truth?" reminding the audience that 'truth' is not only perceived through the eye or received through the ear, but also shaped by the speaker who recounts the story. In *1 Henry IV*, Falstaff's men in buckram will increase from two to eleven as he retells the details of the robbery at Gads Hill; knowing his 'lies' likely to be misbelieved – Hal says "these lies are like their father that begets them" 2.5.208-09) – they continue to proliferate with

growing humor. Like carnival's misrule, rumor is presented as an ungovernable form of speech that challenges traditional rule. In the 1540s, rumor was also the language of populist revolt. Meredith Evans comments: "The antithesis of transparent political discourse, rumor is nevertheless consonant with a relatively broad, unfettered, and impersonal form of political relationship....Rumor challenges sovereign power by mimicking rather than simply disputing the sovereign's ability to speak something into being."⁹⁰ Rumor in *2 Henry IV* further dramatizes the growing fragmentation of civil war, the idealized garden now diseased – a nation in need of recovery and renewal.

Falstaff's verbal *copia* recalls the unruly female tongue as the site of corruption and disorder but also the mother tongue that confers national identity as a return to the vernacular linguistic richness of the land and its people. As Hal engages in "loose behavior" and ingests large quantities of ale, he also ingests various dialects and forms of speech, bragging "he can drink with any tinker in his own language" (*IH4* 2.4.15). Since K. B. McFarlane notes that "the king's English" is linked to the historical Henry V's reign, Hal's use of the vernacular suggests a deeper connection to his people and his mother country than can be ignored. Although I expect there are multiple reasons why Shakespeare's Falstaff is fat, one is surely to display the globe-like richness, the various soundings, textures, and 'birthings' that inhabit England. The myth of England as a maternal garden or nurse is memorably expressed in Gaunt's dying speech in *Richard II*: "this blessed plot, this earth, this realm, this England, /This nurse, this teeming womb of royal kings" (2.1.50-1). Although highly eloquent and rhetorically moving, Gaunt's 'nurse' is positioned within a classical frame of idealization, which suggests privilege as well as exclusion. England seems a rarefied garden more open to high than low. While Gaunt refers to England's fruitful realm, the 'nurse' herself was an ambivalent figure in early modern culture as illustrated in humanistic discourses, courtesy manuals, and medical treatises. Although the nurse's role was foundational as a "producer and educator" who

nourishes and transmits identity,⁹¹ she was also a source of masculine anxiety. The nurse as midwife, wet-nurse, or governess, was associated with the vernacular tongue, the liminal borders of class and female gossip that threatened the mastery of patriarchal order.

As noted earlier, Falstaff not only takes on the nourishing role of an alma mater, Eastcheap is the schoolroom where Falstaff imparts his lessons. If we compare Falstaff's 'fatness' to the fertile body of heterogeneous speech and his pedagogical play to a 'classroom' within the tavern, Falstaff offers a third space, a paternal/maternal function, in Hal's education and growth.⁹² While the boarding-schoolmaster often "became a substitute father to his students, the mother who frequently offered the first lesson in language, knowledge and skills to young children was often recognized as the preeminent exemplary teacher."⁹³ In "Of Studies," Francis Bacon states: "Some books are to be tasted, others to be swallowed and some few to be chewed and digested." As such, central metaphors of 'eating' one's lessons ('read, mark, learn and inwardly digest') not only focus on psychic assimilation, but also "emphasize the chain of imitation-integration-embodiment which was so important to humanist scholars."⁹⁴ In his pedagogical treatise *Positions* (1541), Richard Mulcaster offers reasons for learning the English vernacular as a return to the "true faith" of the English nation. Mulcaster comments: "Whilst our religion was restrained to the Latin, it was the onely principle to learn...But now that we are returned home to our English A B C as most natural to our soul and most proper to our faith, we are directed by nature to read that first which we speak first and to care for that which we ever use most."⁹⁵ Such a return to the 'true faith' of the Protestant Reformation corresponds to a return to the mother tongue as well as the maternal role in a child's education. As imaginary father within the maternal space of Eastcheap, Falstaff also takes on the role of the early modern midwife (or nurse) as a shaper of bodies and culture, a role that Caroline Bicks notes, "midwives subjects into being."⁹⁶ The birthing room was not only a special female domain, but

before it became a site for male practitioners, the early modern midwife was granted a great degree of power. As a “sanctioned shaper” of bodies, her cutting of the umbilical cord not only marked sexual as well as rhetorical virility, but also the ability to generate personal and national identity.⁹⁷ As such, the nurse too, like the imaginary father, is a threshold figure.

Remapping the Symbolic: Imaginary and Theatrical Space

For Kristeva, “transgression is the key moment in practice” where “practice is taken as meaning the acceptance of a symbolic law together with the transgression of that law for the purpose of renovating it.”⁹⁸ The popular stage not only mirrors but serves as one of the many cultural forces shaping the psychological, embodied, historical subject. At the end of 1.2 in *1 Henry IV*, Hal turns from the departure of his companions to assume a threshold position, disturbing the boundary between the observing and dramatic subject, stepping beyond the bounds of the text, then back again into the folds of the action, to cultivate a presymbolic eye. Not only does Hal’s speech evoke images of parturition, of one body separating from another, it draws on allusions to maternal abjection and amatory attraction, the risk as well as the idealization inherent in the process of rehearsing and creating one’s image. Garber equates Hal’s transformation into Henry V with “the making of a national icon...at once the making of a king and the making of a man.”⁹⁹ The various ‘roles’ that Hal plays are modeled on a three-tiered process of renovation: the mapping of the semiotic *chora*, the presymbolic disorder of Eastcheap, and the oedipal order of Henry IV’s court, embroiled in a civil war that divides territories from their linguistic and geographical base. Shakespeare centralizes Hal’s traversal of the courtly, popular, and martial worlds by rounding out a figure found in *The Famous Victories of Henry V*, Sir John (‘Jockey’) Oldcastle, the seedling or pretext of Shakespeare’s Falstaff – and Hal’s early mentor. Interestingly, Hal’s “I know you all” hints at foundational principles from pedagogical texts such as Thomas Elyot’s *The Gouvenor* and Roger Ascham’s *The*

Schoolmaster, which encourage self-knowledge as well as knowledge of others. In order to succeed in the public domain and to apply justice fairly, Elyot maintains: “Man is induced to understand two precepts...then in knowing the condition of his soul and body he knoweth himself, and consequently in the same thing, he knoweth every other man.”¹⁰⁰ As noted, Mulcaster regarded a return to English ABCs as vital to the spirit and the “true faith” of one’s common humanity. On holiday at Eastcheap, Hal has returned to his mother tongue, the nurturance of his ABCs restored through the various dialects of all those (Mistress Quigley, Poins, Bardolf) who frequent Eastcheap.

As such, Hal represents the role of modern king. Historically Peter Saccio tells us during Henry V’s reign, “England was wholly loyal to her king.” Unlike his father, Henry V was never embroiled in Civil War, and “never as king did he have to meet a rebel Englishmen on the field of battle.”¹⁰¹ Henry V’s attempts to harmonize the kingdom, to put old quarrels to an end, to stabilize the economy and attend to his people, made him a highly popular king. He ceremoniously reburied Richard II at Westminster Abbey in a gesture of friendship and piety. He reinstated Edmund Mortimer to his estates,¹⁰² making friends with his cousin, the young Earl of March, whose claim to the throne (as the grandson of Edward III’s second son Lionel) rivaled Henry V’s own Lancastrian line. When conspirators attempted to assassinate Henry and replace him with Mortimer, it was the young earl himself who told the king of the conspiracy. Such a demonstration of friendship between Henry V and his cousin, the Earl of March, reveals a more responsive mandate that differs from Richard II or his father. Shakespeare’s *Henriad* retells the chronicles of Holinshed, Edward Hall, Samuel Daniel, and the folktales associated with the young prince through a poetic construction of kingship, a kingship that is neither perfect nor ideal, but one that draws on the minds and hearts of the people – and especially their popular voice.

Like Falstaff, Hal, of course, is not real, only realized in performance, simultaneously a historical person and a theatrical persona who reformulates a nation's identity. While Falstaff states "I am not a double man" (*IH4* 5.4.134), all the historical characters in the play are marked by a doubleness which differentiates yet connects them to the past and to the fictional worlds they inhabit: King Henry IV, Falstaff (alternatively Sir John Oldcastle, the Lollard martyr), the Percy family, Glyndŵr, Mortimer, all are fictions and ghosts of history. Falstaff's multiple natures, however, support Hal's ability to assimilate as well as learn from difference. Unlike Henry IV, and before him Richard II, Hal recognizes that not only borderlands such as Scotland and Wales, but also the narratives of tattered prodigals, tavern owners like Mistress Quickly and Francis the drawer, are all crucial voices of an emerging nation. Like the heterogeneity of the public theatre itself, which Anthony Dawson refers to as a "powerful, even greedily appropriative institution, ingesting and transforming a whole range of cultural phenomena and making them its own,"¹⁰³ Eastcheap sits on the border between maternal/material chaos (the threat of Wales) and King Henry IV's divided court. As 'intersubjective' matrix, Eastcheap (like Shakespeare's theatre) is also a 'pre-narrative' envelope, especially when considered through Kristeva's imaginary 'thirdness' as situated within the pre-objectal domain of the semiotic body.¹⁰⁴ Such a prenarrative envelope arises," as Daniel Stern tells us, "before the emergence of language or narrative-producing abilities." It is the locus, however, "from which narrative will emerge, transposed."¹⁰⁵ Owned by Mistress Quickly, whose malapropisms muddle linguistic order, the tavern is governed by Falstaff's corporeal disorder, mixing gender as well as class structures. A site of vernacular homecoming, the tavern offers a middling space of rehearsal and play that resists synthesis and prohibition yet offers togetherness and psychic healing.¹⁰⁶

Love and 'The Spoils of War': Harry and Kate

Before concluding this paper, I would like to shift momentarily to the last play in the *Henriad*. In 5.2 of *Henry V*, Shakespeare scripts a scene between King Harry and the French princess, Catherine, after the battle of Agincourt. Although it is clear their marriage will consolidate the English king's power and legitimize English bloodlines in France, the scene harkens back to Hal's earlier (and archaic) language lessons in the previous two plays, and as such returns us to Falstaff's absent presence. Although many critics view Henry's imposition of English on Kate as representative of a mastery that subjugates both nation and feminine subject to the king's demand, ironically King Harry seems to hesitate in more intimate space, meeting his match in Kate's quick wit and independent charm. When he asks "Canst thou love me?" Kate quickly replies, "I cannot tell" (5.2.183-4), a response through which we glimpse an inherent sense of female agency and 'will' rather than passive submission. Ewan Fernie suggests Hal's "insistency here is bent not on just taking his bride. He wants her to want him"¹⁰⁷ Unlike Hotspur's reprimand to his wife (another Kate), "This is no world / To play with maumets and to tilt with lips" (*IH4* 2.4.83-4), Harry tells Catherine, "You have witchcraft in your lips Kate. There is more eloquence in a sugar touch of them than in the tongues of the French Council, and they should sooner persuade Harry of England than a general petition of monarchs" (*H5* 5.2.256-59). While Harry's words suggest Kate's personal and political influence, they imply an aura that renders her attractiveness beyond a mere image. Although some critics suggest "witchcraft" represents a misogynistic categorization of the feminine, it is possible to read such a mysterious and beguiling force as Caliban reads the natural music of the isle, for its renovating attraction, sensitivity, and power. Such a reading, however, resists symbolic mastery and engages the imaginary as a process of indirect address through which Shakespeare asks us, his audience, not only to engage the metaphorical splitting at the very heart of being but to participate in his play unfolding before us on stage.

“O Kate,” King Harry tells her, “nice customs curtsy to great kings. Dear Kate, you and I cannot be confined within the weak list of a country’s fashion. We are the makers of manners Kate” (*H5.2. 250-53*). Although both are aware of the political dimension involved in their romance, one might ask whether King Harry’s lines are restricted to a monarch’s authoritative voice or might such a speech insinuate an instability of the ‘I’ engaging the very effort and risk which Hannah Arendt along with Kristeva might suggest make us human? Rather than regarding Hal’s speech through a symbolic lens, Harry’s exchange with Kate might be said to resemble a *petits récits*, what Lyotard refers to as a “little story,” a ‘local’ rather than totalizing narrative within an epic of war.¹⁰⁸ For while “nice customs curtsy to great kings,” it is possible that even ‘kings’ curtsy to another person’s liking. Such an exchange highlights a space of psychic reciprocity and affectionate exchange within an epic of war. Ironically the play’s title identifies *Henry V* while the narrative identifies King Harry. If Harry’s wooing of Kate is read through Kristeva’s imaginary, it is likely that Falstaff’s great belly of ‘unruly’ tongues has not only enabled Hal to love but also to envision new forms and customs of being. As such, Falstaff is psychically present in this scene: he is after all, Hal’s imaginary father.

Endnotes

¹Robert Greene, *Greene’s Groats-worth of Wit*, London, Imprinted for William Wright, 1592. Green’s pamphlet offers the first reference to Shakespeare as either a playwright or actor, referring to him as ‘an vpstart Crow, beautified with our feathers.....’ Unless otherwise noted, Shakespearean quotes are taken from *The Norton Shakespeare*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, and Katherine Eisaman Maus. 2nd edition. New York: W. W. Norton, 2008.

² Robert Weimann, *Shakespeare and the Popular Tradition in the Theater*, ed. Robert Schwartz (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1978). Weimann correlates *locus* with a ‘topically fixed locality’ or ‘self-contained’ space on stage whereby actors/characters are placed within illusion (representation) while the *platea* relates to the liminal position between fiction and world, the place where the illusion is questioned and broken.

³ Chris Fritter, “‘The Devil Take Such Cozeners!’: *1 Henry IV*,” in *1 Henry IV: A Critical Guide*, ed. Stephen Longstaffe (London: Continuum, 2011), 99-121; 100. Such Marshalls were also given authority to execute “without delay” those guilty of inciting a disturbance or popular rebellion.

⁴ Mihoko Suzuki, “The London Apprentice Riots of the 1590s and the Fiction of Thomas Deloney,” *Criticism* 38, No. 2 (Spring 1996): 181-217, esp. 191.

⁵ In relation to Aristotle's tripartite soul (i.e. vegetative, sensitive, intellectual,) Galen's view of *pneuma* took three forms and types of movement (i.e. *pneuma physicon*, the natural spirit in the liver, the center of nutrition, the *pneuma zoticon*, the vital spirit in the heart, the seat of the passions and the animal spirit in the brain, *the pneuma psychicon*, the *anima* or soul). While current references to psyche, soul, or spirit are often used interchangeably, such meanings were more distinct in the early modern period, especially regarding variations in Galenic theories of medicine. For an excellent discussion of the middle spirits, 'thresholds of being'. as intrapsychic activities and 'deep movements with the psyche' in relation to the Freudian unconscious, see Elizabeth D. Harvey's "Passionate Spirits" animism and embodiment in *Cymbeline* and *The Tempest*" in *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare and Embodiment*, ed. Valerie Traub...

⁶ An overview of the 'imaginary father' as well as the semiotic dimension will be discussed in the section, "Kristeva, or 'Why is Falstaff Fat?'"

⁷ Gail Kern Paster, "Seeing the Spider: Cognitive Ecologies in *The Winter's Tale*," in *Embodied Cognition and Shakespeare's Theatre*, eds. Laurie Johnson, John Sutton, and Evelyn Tribble (New York and London: Routledge, 2014), 149-153, esp. 151. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, *turning* was not only linked with digestion but also with alchemy as a process of transformation converting base matter into a new expression of form (play upon 'metal'/'mettle'), a process strongly aligned with the mysterious yet potent shaping power of the imagination. 'Ben Jonson used the motion of *turning* as a means of "conveying the energy and animation...not only the root meaning of 'transform,' but the sense of movement implicit in the English word 'verse' itself (from the Latin *versere*, to turn or turn around)." See Mary Thomas Crane, "What Was Performance?" *Criticism* 43 No. 2 (Spring 2001): 169-87, esp. 179.

⁸ Julia Kristeva, *Tales of Love*, trans. Leon S Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987, 44.

⁹ Kristeva borrows the term *chora* from Plato's *Timaeus*, which she posits as fluid receptacle without position or thesis yet marked by pulsions and scissions of matter that inform language. For Kristeva, semiotic drives are always checked by biological and social constraints. Kristeva emphasizes the heterogeneous drive-affected dimension of language, semiotic and symbolic, using semiotic in the "Greek sense" as a "distinctive mark" or "precursory sign," for example ruptures, *echolalias*, rhythms within the maternal *chora* that not only prefigure representation but linger within, permeate, and challenge symbolic order.

¹⁰ For Lacan, the mirror stage marks the subject's identification with its specular image, an identification between 6 and 18 months based on a misrecognition between the idealized wholeness of the image and the fragmented experience of the subject's body. Although Lacan places the imaginary within the symbolic, he regards the imaginary dyad as an illusionary and narcissistic enclosure that disables the 'otherness' of desire and the transference proper necessary for analytical treatment.¹⁰ Unlike Lacan, who believes the symbolic image or 'I' originates in absence and loss, Kristeva believes Lacan misses something in the nature of transference by excluding idealization and the affective nature of the material drives from the imaginary, which she revises as a third site within the domain of primary narcissism.

¹¹ As Freud notes in *The Ego and the Id* "primal identification" with the "Father of individual prehistory" is "direct and immediate," prior to all object relations or "definite knowledge of sexual difference" (26). While maternal abjection corresponds to what Andre Green refers to as "the work of the negative," a repression of what is unacceptable or threatening, such repression unfurls archaic space, the corporeal distinction of bodies (i.e. where the mother's body begins and the child's body ends). Kristeva makes clear the risk and creative labor involved in such an 'intimate revolt': the shaping of psychic space opens a threatening abyss, a screen over emptiness, supported by a loving presence who supplies the metaphorical site around which the psyche can organize itself. Freud *The Ego and the Id*. (*The Standard Edition* (Norton) 1990. Kristeva maintains while Oedipus is father of the law, Narcissus is the "obliged creator of the world" whose inability to traverse emptiness needs attention and reassessment.

¹² John McLeod. *Beginning Postcolonialism* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 217.

¹³ While interpretive gaps relate to higher order thinking (reflection and insight), primordial or spatial gaps are embodied, either as image schemas or movements through space that ground conceptual knowledge. Although phenomenology or embodied cognition consider unconscious processes by means of kinesthetic, sensorimotor, or neural systems, they most often do not correlate their findings with literary, psychological, poststructural, or new historical discourses/practices of power that shape (and circulate between) various subjectivities, bodies, and nations. Kristeva's theories posit a bridge between the biological and the social evocative of early modern thought. Although this paper presents psychic space as the interface between body-mind-world, enabling selfhood and communal '*response – ability*', it is at once a bodily space brought about by processes which enrich difference.

¹⁴ See Steven Mullaney, *The Place of the Stage* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1988), 86.

¹⁵ Cognitive linguists/scientists, George Lakoff and Mark Johnson point out everyday metaphors (for example 'happy is up; sadness is down') are characterized by cross domain mappings. Orientational metaphors such as 'up' and 'down,' 'front' and 'back,' and container metaphors such as 'move into' or 'occlusion' draw on spatial dimensions foundational to cognitive development, moving through space, enabling the evolution of more complex concepts. Hal's speech draws on image schemas and outlines the 'skeleton' of an emerging event. George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* and *Philosophy in the Flesh*. Also see Mark Turner and George Lakoff, *More than Cool Reason* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1989).

¹⁶ I take this configuration of "Hal/Harry/Henry" from Jonathan Gil Harris, *Untimely Matter* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008), p. 72.

¹⁷ Such an oscillation of borders between body, actor, and audience within the stage-world of the theatre enacts what Mark Turner and Gilles Fauconnier might refer to as a "blended" or third space between target (tenor/world) and source (vehicle/stage) that activates a cross-domain mapping of selected 'parts,' each overlapping, altering spaces whereby something 'other' emerges. *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities* (New York: Basic Books, 2003), Reprint edition. An area I hope in the future is conceptual integration theory as a third blended space that compresses time as well as space into what might be considered the composite figure of Hal. Referring to Hal's 'arrival' I also extend Nicholas Luke's reference to "moments of birth-time" through which a tragic character arrives, becoming "something more than a role or a mouthpiece for cultural and ideological discourses.... This is not to simply say that Shakespeare's characters change"; rather that through Shakespeare's staging, of the radical intrusion of the new they become something other than what they were. They become 'themselves.' Or at least the selves we know. They arrive as subjects" (4-5). Nicolas Luke, *Shakespeare Arrivals: The Birth of Character* (Cambridge, England and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2018).

¹⁸ As we know, critical approaches to Hal/Harry/Henry depend upon the time period in which they were written. Various interpretations are dramatized in play productions as well as film adaptations that reflect events in particular historical and political periods. Laurence Olivier's *Henry V* dramatizes a patriotic rendition in response to World War II while Kenneth Branagh's film offers a more complex view regarding the horrors of war. Orson Welles's *Chimes at Midnight* centers around Falstaff (more typical of earlier criticism). The more recent *Hollow Crown* production of the *Henriad* is similar to Branagh's perspective yet provides a fuller context of Shakespeare's second tetralogy. Given the nature of film, Tom Hiddleston narrates Hal's soliloquy by means of a melancholy voiceover as he walks through the tavern surroundings, offering a more empathic, ultimately less cynical, view of Hal.

¹⁹ Rob Carson, "Digesting the Third: Reconfiguring Binaries in Shakespeare and Early Modern Thought" (PhD diss. University of Toronto, 2009). Carson points out that "ideas in early modern literature often...rely upon a binary philosophical vocabulary," whereby critics "tend to notice only two aspects at a time, thereby 'digesting' the third," iii.

²⁰ Norman Rabkin's "Rabbits, Ducks, and *Henry V*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 28, No. 3 (Summer 1977: 279-296. Rabkin challenges readers to 'choose one of the two opposed interpretations.'. Ultimately Rabkin claims, King Henry is an ambiguous rabbit-duck who leaves audiences in uncertainty. Garrett Sullivan uses 'Aristotelian vitality' to denote what is especially lost in Descartes mind-body divide. See *Sleep, Romance...*, 2.

²¹ Nicolas Luke, *Shakespeare Arrivals: The Birth of Character* (Cambridge, England and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2018). I extend Luke's reference to "moments of birth-time" through which a tragic character arrives, becoming "something more than a role or a mouthpiece for cultural and ideological discourses.... This is not to simply say that Shakespeare's characters change"; rather that through Shakespeare's staging, of the radical intrusion of the new they become something other than what they were. They become 'themselves.' Or at least the selves we know. They arrive as subjects" (4-5).

²² Julia Reinhard Lupton "OOO + HHH= Any, Interesting, and Cute" in *Object Oriented Environs*, eds. Jeffrey Jerome Cohen and Julian Yates (punctum books, earth: 2016), 176-77.

²³ Linda Boose, "The Father and the Bride in Shakespeare," *PMLA* 97 No. 33 (1982), 325; 34. *JSTOR*.

²⁴ Ralf Hertel, "Mapping the Globe: The Cartographic Gaze and Shakespeare's *Henry IV Part I*" in *Shakespeare Survey 63: Shakespeare's English Histories and their Afterlives*, ed. Peter Holland (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 49-62.

Unlike Shakespeare's earlier histories which centralize monarchal law, Hertel notes the center "has exploded" in *1 Henry IV*" (52). While the monarch's body had previously been mapped (embedded and embodied) in correlation with the land "the court is no longer the center of gravity – just as Henry IV, the usurper on the throne is no longer the center of authority. The conceptual shift away from England as the property of kings towards England as a vast, highly varied geography claimed by a socially diverse nation" makes manifest the "emergence of a national self-awareness" embodied as well in the rise of vernacular literature and the popular voice (55).

²⁵ Neuroscientists, phenomenologists and theorists of embodied cognition refer to the perception-action systems of the body to emphasize that the sensorimotor experience of performance, the practice of play, alters cognition and higher order thinking. "We do not simply inhabit our bodies, we literally use them to think with," Jay Seitz, "The Bodily Basis of Thought," *New Ideas in Psychology* 18.1 (200): 23-40. Such theorists consider how shifts in attention or perceptual regard disrupt the 'flow' experience that occurs when a person is absorbed in a task or transported to a fictional world of the theatre, causing changes in the thalamus, the primal brain, which serves as the gateway (or middleman of the brain) for sending sensory information on its way to the cortex, affecting what humans hear, see, and feel. "It is not surprising," Mark Johnson tells us, "that all our perceptual, spatial relations, and bodily movement concepts are intimately tied to our embodiment," all of which shape and are shaped by the lived body within the interfoldings of place and space. See Johnson, "The Meaning of the Body" in *Developmental Perspectives on Embodiment and Consciousness*, edited by Willis F. Overton, Ulrich Muller, and Judith L. Newman (New York and London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2008), 19-43, 29.

²⁶ Kristeva maintains the logic of material excess sets up the beginnings of language through movement and sound, physical activity as well as symbolic replacement. She uses Freud's analysis of the *fort/da* (gone/here) game: Unlike Lacan, Kristeva notes the drive energy in this repeated rejection constitutes "a signifying space and/or a space of practice" engaging primary vocalic gestures. See *Revolution in Poetic Language* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), 170..

²⁷ Kristeva, *Tales*, 28, 37. Although a posthumanist approach, Karen Barad's notion of 'intra-action' as a 'pre-Cartesian cut' (unlike a Cartesian cut) which effects "a separation between 'subject' and 'object' *within* the phenomenon...the condition of exteriority-within-difference-within phenomena" relates to imaginary activities (exteriority-within-difference) within the phenomenon of primary narcissism. While interaction presupposes two individual existing entities, Barad's notion of intra-action, does not assume "individuals do not preexist as such, rather materialize in intra-action" (76), Adam Klein, "Intra-actions," interview with Karen Barad, *Mousse* 34. The bodily turnings within transferential processes also apply to Stacy Alaimo's *transcorporeality*.

²⁸ Kristeva builds on Freud's new psychological action in order to bring about primary narcissism. Sara Beardsworth *Julia Kristeva: Psychoanalysis and Modernity*. (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2004). For Kristeva some kind of thirdness is present prior to object love that is not the "breakup of the bodily exchange between mother and child, but brought about within it, and thanks to it." (66).

²⁹ Kristeva, *Tales*, 40.

³⁰ Significantly, the site of maternal desire is not necessarily a 'father,' but an 'other' or 'elsewhere' that reinforces the importance of the distancing function of this role. For Kristeva, the imaginary site offers a position in psychoanalysis to treat seriously disturbed or borderline patients, returning to an earlier trauma or loss that Freud and Lacan maintain are not treatable; however, such listening to the semiotic dimension is fleeting, ultimately helping transition the patient into symbolic order as a subject who has recovered the enrichment of psychic space.

³¹ Mary Thomas Crane, *Losing Touch with Nature* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2014), 16-17; 33. One of the meanings of zero is that of cipher, Shakespeare's 'Wooden O.' Shakespeare alludes to the new-found "power of abstraction" in the notion of zero, the mathematical symbol in Arabic numerals which represents the absence of quantity while increasing or decreasing the value of a number next to it. Shakespeare uses and alters the concept of 'nothingness' throughout his work often giving, as Theseus comments, to "airy nothing /A local habitation and a name" (*MND* 5.1.15-17). Notably in *King Lear*, the word 'nothing' is used more than 20 times.

³² Antonio Damasio, *The Feeling of What Happens: Body and Emotion in the Making of Consciousness* (San Diego, New York, and London: A Harvest Book Harcourt, Inc., 1999, 3.

³³ See Brian Walsh, "By Shrewsbury's Clock?: The Time of Day and the Death of Hotspur in *1 Henry IV*," Longstaffe, *Continuum*, 142-159, 148.

³⁴ Garrett Sullivan Jr. and Patricia Parker correlate romance temptresses such as Circe and Acrasia with Falstaff.

³⁵ Hal refers obliquely to his mother in 2.5 *1 Henry IV* in response to a messenger who has come to the tavern to deliver a message from his father. Hal tells Hostess Quickly: "Give him as much as will make him a royal man, and send him back to my mother" (266-67). Since Hal's mother died when the historical Prince was around seven or eight, this line is often scanned in reference to the womb/tomb analogy.

³⁶ John Earle, *Micr-cosmographie* (London 1628).

³⁷ Ros King. "Plays, Playing and Make Believe," in *Embodied Cognition in Shakespeare's Theatre*, eds. Laurie Johnson, John Sutton, and Evelyn Tribble (New York and London: Routledge, 2014), 27-45, esp. 33

³⁸ See Michael Witmore, *Shakespeare Metaphysics* (London: Continuum, 2008). Witmore uses Cymbeline's quote to reveal the "wondrous [and inclusive] exchange of glances" in the "final recognition scene" whereby Shakespeare stages "memories re-possessed" and "shared by all": "The glance of each person, reciprocally shared as it is with others, is itself in all the others" (40).

³⁹ See Froma Zeitlin, *Playing the Other*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996). Zeitlin points to this as an imitation of pregnancy. Zeus incorporates the female principle into himself when, after violating and impregnating Metis (Wisdom), he swallows the goddess, thus controlling parthenogenesis and preventing birth of a son who will replace him while giving birth to their daughter Athena through his head. Such myths formed around violation give fix the supremacy of Zeus as well the symbolic status of the 'I' achieved through oedipal crisis. In the agon between father and son, the mother's role is occluded, replaced and usurped. Kristeva points to preoedipal mother/father and their mutual interaction in shaping psychic space, the emergence of thirdness inherent in the poetic (rather than binary) eye that will serve as a leitmotif throughout identity.

⁴⁰ E.M. Tillyard, *Shakespeare's History Plays* (New York: Penguin, 199), 269.

⁴¹ Stephen Greenblatt, "Invisible Bullets," in *Shakespeare Negotiations* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press), 41.

⁴² Hugh Grady *Shakespeare, Machiavelli, and Montaigne: Power and Subjectivity from Richard II to Hamlet*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 46.

⁴³ Caldwell, Ellen. M. "'Banish All the World': Falstaff's Iconoclastic Threat to Kingship in *1 Henry IV*," *Renascence* 59.4 (2007): 219-46, esp. 219.

⁴⁴ David Scott Kastan, *Shakespeare After Theory* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 334, 341.

⁴⁵ Marjorie Garber, *Shakespeare After All* (New York: Anchor Books, 2004), 332.

⁴⁶ Janet Adelman, *Suffocating Mothers: Fantasies of Maternal Origin in Shakespeare's Plays, "Hamlet" to "The Tempest."* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 1.

⁴⁷ Grossman, Mark. "The Adolescent and the Strangest Fellow: Comic and Morally Serious Perspectives in *1 Henry IV*." *Essays in Literature* 23.2 (1995): 170-190, 8. *Humanities Source*.

⁴⁸ See Samuel Bakhtin, *Johnson on Shakespeare*, ed. Sir Walter Raleigh (London: Henry Frowde, 1908), 114. Also quoted in Fred B. Tromly, *Fathers and Sons in Shakespeare*, 99.

⁴⁹ Daniel Seltzer, "Prince Hal and Tragic Style," *Shakespeare Survey 30: 'Henry IV' to 'Hamlet'*, ed. Kenneth Muir (London: Cambridge University Press, 1977) 13-26; 14, 26.

⁵⁰ Garret Sullivan Jr. *Sleep Romance and Human Embodiment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 84.

⁵¹ Emma Firestone, "Warmth and Affection in Henry IV," in *Embodied Cognition and Shakespeare's Theatre*, eds. Laurie Johnson, John Sutton, and Evelyn Tribble (New York and London: Routledge, 2014), 47-65, esp. 52.

⁵² In addition to historical references, there is nothing in *The Famous Victories* to suggest that Jockey (Sir John) is 'fat.' Many in Shakespeare's audience, however, would have been familiar with the figure of Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham (c. 1370-1417), a name Shakespeare later changed to Falstaff likely in response to pressure from the contemporary Lord Cobham, Sir William Brooke, who held the post of Lord Chamberlain from 1596 until 1597 and whose predecessor bore his title.⁵² Falstaff's 'history' correlates with the earlier Lollard rebel, a friend of Henry V, who was executed by hanging as a traitor near St. Giles' Field in 1417.

⁵³ David Womersley, "Why Is Falstaff Fat," *The Review of English Studies*, 47. No. 185 (February 1996): 1-22, 21. JSTOR.

⁵⁴ See also Phyllis Rackin, *Shakespeare & Women* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006); Jean E. Howard and Phyllis Rackin, *Engendering a Nation: A Feminist Account of Shakespeare's English Histories*. London: Routledge, 1997, Mary Beth Rose, "Where are the Mothers in Shakespeare?" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 42.3 (Autumn 1991): 291-31 and *Plotting Motherhood in Medieval, Early Modern, and Modern Literature* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2017); Sara Mendelson and Patricia Crawford, editors, *Women in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998), Helen Berry and Elizabeth Foyster, editors, *The Family in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007; Michelle M. Dowd, (Palgrave Macmillan, 2009); *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare and Embodiment: Gender, Sexuality, and Race* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016); *Women's Work in Early Modern English Literature and Culture*, Valerie Wayne, editor, *Women's Labour and the History of the Book in Early Modern England* (New York and London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2020); 6.

⁵⁵ Jennifer Munroe, "It's all about the gillyvors: Engendering Art and Nature in *The Winter's Tale*," *Ecocritical Shakespeare*, eds. Lynne Bruckner and Dan Brayton (Surrey, England and Burlington: Ashgate, 2011), 139-154, esp. 139.

⁵⁶ Kristeva, *Tales*, 20. Kristeva comments the imaginary father resists two major distinctions in psychoanalytic, linguistic, or gender theory that negate either the biological or cultural realm: the first "which seeks to thrust psychic space into biology," and the second which considers psychic space to be a sole product of language and disregards the "gestures emitted by the body." Ross Mitchell Guberman, *Julia Kristeva Interviews* (New York Columbia UP, 1996), 86.

⁵⁷ As noted, failure to undergo this process has serious implications for individual, social, environmental integrity: without the archaic inscription of 'otherness' within the dimension of drives, primal repression of 'abjection' leads to its social 'appearance' when transferred and enacted in the social order as dogmatic exclusion rather than integrated within the dialogic exchange of early psychic and somatic functions.

⁵⁸ Pleshette DeArmitt, *The Right to Narcissism: A Case for an Im-possible Self-Love*. (New York: Fordham University Press, 2014), 14.

⁵⁹ *Tales*, 29.

⁶⁰ Ibid, 24-25. Kristeva relates transference/countertransference to "amatory identification, *Einfühlung* (the assimilation of other people's feelings)." Within the symbolic dimension such attraction can lead to "collective hysteria in which crowds abdicate their judgment," similar to hypnosis where the object...devours or absorbs ego" (24-25). Such an energy-laden transference within the imaginary dimension, however, enables energetic attraction to the other through which the subject comes into being by means of co-habiting with strangeness, with the other, embedded at once within the body, mind, and world.

⁶¹ Nancy Selleck *The Interpersonal Idiom in Shakespeare, Donne, and Early Modern Culture* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 3.

⁶² Paster, *Humoring the Body* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 28, 26.

⁶³ W. H. Auden, W. H. "The Prince's Dog," *The Dyer's Hand* (London: Faber, 1975), 136.

⁶⁴ Patricia Parker, *Literary Fat Ladies: Rhetoric, Gender, Property*. (London: Methuen, 1987), 20.

-
- ⁶⁵ Coppelia Kahn, *Man's Estate: Masculine Identity in Shakespeare* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1981), 72.
- ⁶⁶ Rackin, *Shakespeare and Women*, 68.
- ⁶⁷ Valerie Traub, "Prince Hal's Falstaff: Positioning Psychoanalysis and the Female Reproductive Body," *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 40 No. 4 (Winter 1989): 456-474, esp. 3. *JTOR*.
- ⁶⁸ Parker, *Literary Fat Ladies*, 22.
- ⁶⁹ Janet Hill, *Stages and Playgoers: From Guild Plays to Shakespeare* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's Publisher, 2002), 125.
- ⁷⁰ In 1.2 of *Julius Caesar*, Shakespeare makes clear leanness is untrustworthy: Caesar states: "Yon Cassius has a lean and hungry look./He thinks too much: such men are dangerous" (195-6).
- ⁷¹ Nicholas Shane Johnson, "Jovial Pregnancies: Couvade and Cultural Covade from Shakespeare to Milton" (PhD diss., University of Arizona, 2009). Johnson explores several early modern texts by Francis Bacon, Philip Sidney, Henry Peacham, in relation to literary couvade, noting also that Melanie Klein's apparent privilege of the Greek *Orestia* conceals the maternal body in her recognition of Freud, that like Athena, she too is 'her father's daughter.'
- ⁷² Quoted in Johnson, 30.
- ⁷³ Johnson, "Jovial," 177.
- ⁷⁴ Robert Shaughnessy, "Falstaff's Belly," *Shakespeare Survey* 63, ed. Peter Holland (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010): 63-77, 70-1; 72-76.
- ⁷⁵ For Kristeva, the imaginary father resists two major distinctions in critical theories that negate either the biological or cultural realm: the first "which seeks to thrust psychic space into biology," and the second which considers psychic space to be a sole product of language and disregards the "gestures emitted by the body." Ross Mitchell Guberman, *Julia Kristeva Interviews* (New York Columbia University Press, 1996), 86.
- ⁷⁶ Bruce Smith, *The Key of Green* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2008). Rather than our current conviction of "emotion as an energy that acts on the material body," Smith states for early modern individuals "passion was a biochemical state that arises from the material body"; rather than a "response to an act of cognition...passion was the *impetus* for an act of cognition" (4). In relation to the humoral body, knowledge is 'physiological.'
- ⁷⁷ David Hillman, *Shakespeare's Entrails: Belief, Skepticism and the Interior of the Body* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 4.
- ⁷⁸ Traub, "Prince Hal's Falstaff," 456-57. Traub notes that Shakespeare and Renaissance drama associate the "female reproductive body as a Bakhtinian 'grotesque body,' and as such "repress this figure in their narratives of psychic development." Ironically Falstaff – although gendered male – plays upon an anamorphic perspective.
- ⁷⁹ Nicholas Shane Johnson refers to Bakhtinian views of carnival as it relates to the body and to order, 19-21.
- ⁸⁰ Kristeva was among the first to bring Bakhtin's ideas to a Western audience; her definition of intertextuality develops from polyphonic voice dimensions within dialogism as do her psycholinguistic views that link her notion of the abject with carnival.
- ⁸¹ Caldwell uses this phrase in note 7, p. 338.
- ⁸² Fitter, 104-105. In response to Falstaff's accusation of Mistress Quickly serving flesh, "contrary to the law," Mistress Quickly responds, "All vittallers do. What's a joint of mutton or two in whole Lent?" (2.4.315-6). Fitter comments alehouses became associated with brothels and were often run by women, "political news and gossip were exchanged in the alehouse, and irreligious jesting," so that it became "a bulwark against officialdom" (104).
- ⁸³ *Ibid*, 103-106.

⁸⁴ Janet Clare, “Medley History: *The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth to Henry V.*” *Shakespeare Survey* 63, ed. Peter Holland (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010): 102-113.

⁸⁵ Jacqueline T. Miller, “Mother-Tongues: Language and Lactation in Early Modern Literature.” *English Literary Renaissance* 27.2 (1997): 177-96. This paragraph closely follows Miller’s very effective description of the frontispiece in her article.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 178.

⁸⁷ Writers such as Spenser were concerned about the number of children being fostered for the first two to three years by Irish wet-nurses, a more common practice for the upper classes.

⁸⁸ Jan Purnis, “The Body-Mind Relationship in Early Modern Culture,” in *Embodied Cognition in Shakespeare’s Theatre*, eds. Laurie Johnson, John Sutton, and Evelyn Tribble (New York and London: Routledge, 2014), 235-252, esp. 237.

⁸⁹ Both the map and mapping are important in *1 Henry IV*. As Hal’s soliloquy maps out his own personal space in between Eastcheap and the court, the rebels’ three-way division of the map in 3.1 (notably Hotspur’s alteration of the River Trent) is further revealed in the opposing positions between Hotspur and Glendywr.

⁹⁰ See Meredith Evan, “Rumor, the Breath of Kings, and the Body of Law in *2 Henry IV*,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 60 No. 1 (Spring 2009):1-24.

⁹¹ Elizabeth and James used references to ‘nursing’ in relation to the “king’s two bodies,” Elizabeth gendering her body male (“the stomach of a king”) but also performing the role of nurturing mother to her kingdom. James refers to himself as a “loving nourish father” offering his people “nourish milk” Suzanne Penuel, “Male Mothering and *The Tempest*” in *Performing Maternity*, ed. Kathryn M. Moncrief and Kathryn R. McPherson, *Performing Maternity in Early Modern England*. (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 127

⁹² The political metaphor of the King’s two bodies, one public (sacred and transcendent), the other mortal and vulnerable to decay seem an anomaly in relation to Elizabeth I, who engenders a more complex notion of the body and her representation as female monarch. Elizabeth is craftily aware of her image – and like a playwright who scripts her own performance, realizes that her image is shaped by the regard of her people as much her image shapes their regard. *1 Henry IV* not only dramatizes the resistance to a one-dimensional view of authority that provides the central focus in Shakespeare’s *Richard II*, it displays the effort at unity in the multiple guises of Elizabeth, the Rose of the Tudor State, the Virginal Diana, Cynthia, at once Shepherd and Shepherdess of her people. In many ways, Falstaff would seem a parody of these excessive metaphors applied to the Queen.

⁹³ Elizabeth Hodgson, “Alma Mater” in *Performing Maternity*, ed. Kathryn M. Moncrief and Kathryn R. McPherson, *Performing Maternity in Early Modern England*. (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007),159-176, esp. 160-161

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, Hodgson 160.

⁹⁵ Richard Mulcaster, *Positions* (1581), ed. William Barker. http://members.tripod.com/bible_study/courses/training/positions.html

⁹⁶ Caroline Bicks, *Midwiving Subjects in Shakespeare’s England*. (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 12.

⁹⁷ Bicks comments: “What distinguishes the early modern midwife from the other women of the birthroom, however, is the fact that she was recognized as a sanctioned shaper of men’s, women’s and children’s bodies,” not only accessing secrets of the interior but also with the power to fashion two wayward organs of the body, the tongue and the penis, associated in the period with rhetorical and sexual virility (12). During the middle ages, it was believed that the virile wand, the *virga virilis*, was “made greater or smaller depending upon the length of the umbilical cord after it was cut” (43). During the sixteenth century, new tales began to circulate with the publication of *The Byrth of Mankeynde* (1541), the first English manual for midwives and pregnant mothers. “Some say that of what length the reste of the navel is lefte of the same length shall the chylde tongue be yf it be a man chylde” (qtd. in Bicks 43).

⁹⁸ Quoted in Toril Moi, *The Kristeva Reader*. New York: Columbia University Press), 1986, 28-30 In “The System and the Speaking Subject,” Kristeva states: The moment of transgression is the key moment of practice.... By that I mean that these operations are *pre-meaning* and *pre-sign* (or *trans-meaning*, *trans-sign*) and that they bring us back to processes of division in the

living matter of an organism subject to biological constraints as well as social norms.... Semiotics can do no more that postulate this heterogeneity: as soon as it speaks about it, it homogenizes the phenomenon, links it with a system, loses hold of it. Its specificity can only be preserved in the signifying practices which set off heterogeneity at issue....”

⁹⁹ Garber, *Shakespeare After All* (New York: Pantheon Books, 2004), 314.

¹⁰⁰ Thomas Elyot, *The boke named the governour* (University of Michigan Library, 1907), 175.

¹⁰¹ Peter Saccio, *Shakespeare English Kings* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977, 2000), 65, 68.

¹⁰³ Anthony Dawson, “Participation and Performance” in *The Culture of Playgoing in Shakespeare’s England*, ed. Anthony Dawson and Paul Yachnin (Cambridge, London: Cambridge UP, 2001), 29.

¹⁰⁴ By placing transference and countertransference within the ‘thirdness’ of primary narcissism, Kristeva locates the shaping of psychic space prior to Lacan’s mirror image or Descartes’s mind-body divide. Kristeva focuses on countertransference as a site of empathic listening (“assimilation and osmosis”) that render borders more flexible and open to archaic states.

¹⁰⁵ Daniel Stern, “The ‘Pre-narrative Envelope’; An Alternate View of ‘Unconscious Phantasy in Infancy’” in *The Psychoanalytic Muse*. <<http://psychoanalyticmuse.blogspot.com/2012/11/daniel-stern-pre-narrative-envelope.html>>

¹⁰⁶These voices will ultimately culminate in the inclusion of Wales and Scotland as essential parts of Henry V’s England, which represent, Garber maintains, an ethical response that resists exclusion. This does not imply, however, that Henry V’s success as king or his passionate and at times ruthless will is without stain. Although highly patriotic, *Henry V* is always framed by the double-view of the Chorus that disturbs any idealization or sentimentalization of events. The double-edged complexities in the play that elicit a nation’s identity also reveal a brutality and fierceness of will, whereby Hal’s war with France offers an imperfect option to civil war (See Erwan Fernie below).

¹⁰⁷ Erwan Fernie *Shame in Shakespeare* (London: Routledge, 2005), 114.

¹⁰⁸ Kristeva’s *Tales of Love* present mythic and personal (*petits récits*) stories of love, which include local narratives and ‘histories’ of her patients. Such stories in turn recover hidden voices from the past, which often exist upon the margins or in ‘little stories.’ Louis Montrose tells us competing discourses are not only realigned by a dominant discourse, they in turn alter and transform the dominant narrative.