

Greta Lynn
Prof. K. Benston
Senior Conference
20 March 2003

Introduction

Glendower speaks to her in Welsh, and she answers him in the same.

Glendower: She is desperate here.

A peevish self-willed harlotry, one that no persuasion can do good upon.

The Lady speaks in Welsh.

Mortimer: I understand thy looks. That pretty Welsh

Which thou pourest down from these swelling heavens

I am too perfect in; and, but for shame,

In such a parley should I answer thee.

1 Henry IV 3.1.196-203

Introduction

This passage from Shakespeare's 1 Henry IV represents one of the play's many scenes in which language, culture, or nation is problematized by coming into contact with rival languages, cultures, or nations; in the tension between Wales and England, English and Welsh, and men and women, this passage clearly outlines several of the thematic tensions of the play. Through a close reading of this passage, the reader will gain a better understanding of the way by which the notions of catachresis and translation can be used to interpret both 1 Henry IV and Henry V, forging a link between the texts that allows the latter to be read as both a response and a corrective measure to the former.

The first problematic aspect of this passage is the way by which it depicts the Welsh Lady. This scene is the first instance that the audience sees (rather than hears of) Welsh women, and the play presents them as a complex, even mystical presence.

The passage first depicts the Welsh Lady's lack of voice. In 1 Henry IV, Welsh women do not speak, and Welsh discourse as a whole exists on the periphery of the play. It is only the

stage directions that indicate that “the Lady speaks in Welsh,” or that “Glendower speaks...in Welsh, and she answers him in the same;” the Welsh Lady’s thoughts are understood through her father, Owen Glendower, who translates for her. 1 Henry IV allows Welsh women to express themselves only through men: Glendower translates his daughter’s words in this passage, and Westmoreland gives an account of the Welsh women’s castration of the English soldiers in the opening scene of the play. Though they may sing, enchant, or even castrate, Welsh women still cannot speak; it is only through translation that their words are understood. Translation thus appears, in this scene, as an assimilatory act; essentially, translation allows Glendower to make his daughter’s Welsh expression look and sound English.

Glendower’s daughter’s inability to speak English is what J. Hillis Miller would call a “catachrestic” moment: in presenting the fact that she is speaking but not allowing her to speak, 1 Henry IV evokes a Welsh, and specifically feminine dialogue that is suggested but never fully realized, creating “a break, a fissure dividing before and after” (Miller 73). This text is saturated with such moments of dissonance, most of which occur when images of the cultural, linguistic, or national margins of the play are depicted; the tension between the developing sense of English nationhood that we see in 1 Henry IV and that which poses a threat to the realization of this national development—Other(ed) languages, cultures, and nations—often creates these catachrestic “fissures” that “erupt” (Miller 73) the text. The linguistic catachresis of the Welsh Lady’s inability to speak is partially ameliorated by the fact that her father translates for her; however, in translating her words into English, Glendower assimilates the Welsh language into the English.

In this passage, Glendower’s words also present the Welsh woman as occupying an inherently more base or corporeal existence. Glendower translates the feelings of his daughter,

the Welsh Lady, for Mortimer, saying, “She is desperate here/ A peevish self-willed harlotry, one that no persuasion can do good upon” (3.1.197-199). The fact that Glendower describes his own daughter as having, “a peevish, self-willed harlotry” is an indication of the English perception of the Welsh woman. As one of only two images of Welsh women to appear in this play—the other being the castrating Welsh women in the first scene--Glendower’s daughter, and her “peevish self-willed harlotry” become representative of Welsh femininity: lascivious, desperate, willful, and somewhat masculine. Unlike the words of the Welsh Lady, these characteristics cannot be lost in translation, yet at the same time, they present the feminine image in a manner that is too textually disruptive, *too* transgressive to appear in the female characters Henry V’s English empire. As a result, female characters, and particularly Welsh women, must be translated, ameliorated or assimilated to create and sustain the cohesive and synthesized image of English nation that appears in Henry V.

The notion of linguistic, cultural, and national assimilation is crucial to an exploration of Shakespeare’s 1 Henry IV because of the fact that assimilation constitutes one of the many ways by which the play attempts to conceal these catachrestic fissures. In an effort to depict a development of a literary England that is both less problematic and more cohesive, the catachrestic moments, figures, and characters of 1 Henry IV are often hybridized, assimilated to Englishness, absorbed into Englishness, or translated into a form that the English can understand. This literary transformation of these eruptive moments, character, and images mirrors England’s slow transformation from nation to empire; by the opening scene of Henry V, the catachrestic figures have all been translated into Anglophone normalcy, and King Henry V presents himself as the leader of an English empire that is more expansive and encompassing than ever.

If the reader is to consider Shakespeare's historical plays to be exactly that—works that write the history of the English empire—he must also consider the role that the writing of history plays in the writing of nation. The Henriad as a whole, but particularly 1 Henry IV and Henry V, details the influence of the title characters not only as men, but as cultural historians, through which the audience can map the literary development of a national, linguistic, and cultural England. Equally important, through the fissures and dissonant moments—the untranslatability of the Welsh language, the “peevish self-willed harlotry” of the Welsh women, etc—these plays also allow the audience to distinguish that which England is *not*. In an effort to prepare and allow for the responsive, corrective move to Henry V, the assimilation, hybridization, absorption, and above all, translation inherent in the treatment of the marginal or liminal characters of 1 Henry IV, must be explored and understood as another catachrestic fissure that divides the plays into the “before and after” of developing literary nation and established English empire.

Shakespeare's 1 Henry IV presents a textual fissure most immediately in the form of cultural and gender difference or abnormality. Westmoreland opens the play by describing a battle in Wales between the English and the Welsh, in which the English suffer a serious loss. The description of this battle in the first scene of the play serves to distinguish for the audience the two distinct cultural entities into which this play can be divided: English and Welsh. Because this tension is being described by Westmoreland, the audience only has the English perspective of the battle, which serves to polarize the conflict into an ‘us/them,’ ‘here/there’ binary. Westmoreland's account of the defeat reduces it to a conflict between “noble Mortimer” (1.1.38) and “irregular and wild Glendower” (1.1.40); furthermore, his use of demonstrative pronouns when describing how “the men of Herefordshire...w[ere] by the rude hands of *that* Welshman taken” (1.1.39-41 *emphasis added*), whose bodies “*those* Welshwomen” (1.1.45 *emphasis added*)

castrated, also contributes to the sense of not only the separation, but the opposition of the English and the Welsh. The text immediately places the audience in an English context, one narrated and heard from an exclusively English point of view. The passage, in which the speaker has received,

A post from Wales, laden with heavy news
 Whose worst was that the noble Mortimer,
 Leading the men of Herefordshire to fight
 Against the irregular and wild Glendower,
 Was by the rude hands of that Welshman taken,
 A thousand of his people butchered;
 Upon whose dead corpse there was such misuse,
 Such beastly shameless transformation
 By those Welshwomen done, as may not be
 without much shame retold or spoken of. (1.1.37-46)

This passage clearly delineates who the “there” or the “them” in the here/there, us/them binary is: the Welsh, who are described with such words as “irregular,” “wild,” and “shameless.” It is not just Glendower, the rebellious and male Welsh leader, who poses such an open threat to the nation; it is the Welsh women as well, who have castrated the bodies of the dead English men. The real threat of the Welsh is suggested in this passage, inherent in the castration of the English soldiers: their bodies suffer “beastly shameless transformation,” suggesting the way by which the Welsh, and consequently, Wales, have the power to deform the English body, the body politic, and the form of their remembrance.

The fact that Wales is able to successfully transform a part of England is significant because this battle is a manifestation of an English colonial enterprise, an attempt to transform and absorb Wales into the English empire. The Welsh, however, are not only able to effectively fend off the English attack, they are able to reverse it, and succeed in assimilating the English body—by means of castration—into their “wild” culture. An immediate affront to the English

sense of national masculinity, the castration of English men enacts the symbolic emasculation of England by Wales, an act carried out not by Welsh men, but Welsh women. The Welsh castration of the English,

...reverses ‘in part’ the colonial appropriation by now producing a partial vision of the colonizer’s presence; a gaze of otherness, that shares the acuity of the genealogical gaze which...liberates marginal elements and shatters the unity of man’s being through which he extends his sovereignty. (Bhabha ‘Mimicry’ 89)

By castrating the English men, the Welsh women transform and translate the body, from English into Welsh, just as the passage describes an English attempt to translate or appropriate the nation from Wales into England. This reversal of an English act of colonial appropriation is thus an act of mimicry; the Welsh women effectively mimic England when they castrate the dead English soldiers. This is the sort of mimicry, however, that “mimes the forms of authority at the point at which it deauthorizes them” (Bhabha ‘Mimicry’ 91), and instead of enforcing colonial power, it subverts it. The mimicry inherent in the castration of the English soldiers is thus a catachrestic mimicry; mocking colonial rule instead of empowering it, this catachrestic mimicry shows the “unity of [the English] man’s being” to be quite literally “shattered” by the Welsh women. Indeed, the unity of the English body is destroyed, deformed, dismembered. In an attempt to expand and make the English body politic *more* whole—through the assimilation of Wales into the empire—England is not only defeated, but also, ironically, made *less* whole through the dismemberment (castration) of the English soldiers.

The Oxford English Dictionary defines “catachresis” as the “improper use of words; application of a term to a thing which it does not properly denote; abuse or perversion of a trope or metaphor,” which, in many ways, resembles the description of the castration of the English soldiers. Relying heavily on the connotations of “improper,” “[mis]use,” “abuse,” and “perversion,” this definition suggests that castration can be read as a literally catachrestic

moment, in which the bodies of the English soldiers are “improper[ly] use[d],” abuse[d],” and “perver[ted].” An emasculating act—castration—is applied to the English body and the English body politic, in a way that is “inappropriate” (Bhabha ‘Mimicry’ 86), particularly given the masculinity inherent in the English empire and its attempts at colonization. Lines 37-46 also provide a nexus between castration, catachresis, and shame. The notion of shame is mentioned not once, but twice in ten lines: the Welsh women are “shameless” (1.1.44) in their “transformation” (1.1.44) of the bodies of the dead English men, an act that cannot “without much *shame* [be] retold or spoken of” (1.1.46 *emphasis added*). The evocation of shame, embarrassment, or humiliation is thus crucial to not only this passage, but also the play as a whole; shame is consistently invoked when English colonial discourse is not only broken down, but reversed. The catachrestic moment, then, in 1 Henry IV is the “shameful” moment, or the moment in which a character, language or nation is shamed; in Act One, Scene One, lines 37-48, this catachrestic shame is inherent in the Welsh translation of the English effort to appropriate Wales.

The Welsh capacity to not only resist English colonial appropriation, but reverse it, suggests a vision of Wales and the Welsh people as belonging to the realm of the supernatural or unnatural; Wales is envisioned as a nation outside ‘nature,’ an “irregular” Other on the periphery of the English conception of nation. The vision of Wales as Other to (English) nature is reinforced throughout the play; when the audience is finally introduced directly to Glendower, the Welsh leader, he insists on his supernatural existence, claiming,

I say the earth did shake when I was born...
 The heavens were all on fire, the earth did tremble....Give me leave
 to tell you once again that at my birth
 The front of heaven was full of fiery shapes...
 these signs have marked me as extraordinary,
 And all the courses of my life do show

I am not in the roll of common men. (3.1.23-42)

The play, rather than textually dismissing Glendower's convictions, seems to relish them; the larger part of Act Three, Scene One features an argument between Hotspur and Glendower over the circumstances of Glendower's birth. The audience is thus left with a lasting impression of the Welsh as the extra-ordinary, the outside-of-natural, heightening the opening scene's image of their violent exteriority to normative England.

This scene, set in the Welsh camp of rebels against the English crown, introduces the linguistic differences inherent in the English/Welsh tension, and the first reference we see to Welsh, as a language, is a mockery of it. Upon listening to Glendower's extravagant assertions of his supernatural birth, Hotspur, the English rebel, says, "I think there's no man speaks better Welsh" (3.1.49). This is not a reference to Glendower's eloquence or linguistic ability, but rather a contemporary colloquialism meaning either, "no man brags better," or "no man talks more unintelligibly."¹ The first understanding we have of Welsh is thus not of the language itself, but of the language as it is perceived by the English, in the English tongue; again, England is presented as the origin(al), and Welsh the transformation/mutilation thereof. This attitude seems to be reflected in both plays; in neither Henry the Fourth Part One nor Henry the Fifth do we hear the Welsh language itself spoken on stage. Even when the play indicates that Welsh is, indeed, being spoken, these outside-of-English words are not considered part of the play; they exist only in stage directions, placing them on the linguistic margins, removed from the sphere of "proper" or intelligible expression—they are not acted, they are indicated. We see this tension between presented versus indicated language in the relationship between Mortimer and his Welsh wife (Glendower's daughter); his "wife can speak no English, and [he] no Welsh" (3.1.191-92). Glendower is thus forced to translate between them, and the Welsh conversations

¹ Information provided in the notes to the play, in The Riverside Shakespeare, ed.

between him and his daughter are recorded only in directions such as, “Glendower speaks to her in Welsh, and she answers him in the same,” “Lady speaks in Welsh,” and “The Lady speaks again in Welsh” (3.1.pg 67). This nameless woman, who is identified only through her Welsh father (and mother tongue) and her English husband, therefore exists in a locus between nations and languages, a liminal space in which she is rendered completely incommunicable; she cannot speak English, and her Welsh cannot be represented within the linguistic limitations of the play. The language in which she communicates more effectively, however, is song, through the play again presents the audience with a vision of Welsh supernaturality. Glendower suggests that Mortimer,

rest [his] gentle head on her lap,
and she will sing the song that pleaseth [him]
and on [his] eyelids crown the god of sleep,
charming [his blood with pleasing heaviness,
making such difference ‘twixt wake and sleep
as is the difference between day and night
The hour before the heavenly-harnessed team
begins his golden progress in the east. (3.1.214-221)

Upon hearing her song, Hotspur proclaims that, “Now I perceive the devil understands Welsh” (3.1.231), implying not only that there is something supernatural inherent in Welsh existence, but that its nature is diabolic, not divine. Hotspur therefore refuses to listen, saying that he would “rather hear Lady...howl in Irish” (3.1.237); this statement creates a clear linguistic hierarchy, designating English as the highest, or purest form of language, next acknowledging Irish “howl[ing],” and finally, placing Welsh at the bottom, designating it literally and figuratively as a “low” language. Demonstrating the English response to the Welsh language, this statement bespeaks Hotspur’s belief in the incomprehensibility of Welsh, and belies his fear that what the Lady is singing/saying cannot be assimilated in a way that would allow it to be understood in

English, nor defined in Anglophone terms. Here, the audience sees Hotspur's fear that especially in song, there is not English origin(al) to which he can turn for authority.

The treatment of the Welsh as a whole in this text suggests an untranslatability, a state in which transformation or assimilation is simply not possible. Welsh, it is suggested, cannot become English, and Welsh women cannot be like English women. We are presented with a literary perspective into "nation as narration, [which] will establish the cultural boundaries of the nation so that they may be acknowledged as 'containing' thresholds of meaning that must be crossed, erased, and translated in the process of cultural production" (Bhabha 4). Welsh is not only defined in this play, it is also established as an entity that demands--but cannot fully accommodate-- conquest, assimilation, or colonization. Too untranslatable to allow it an existence independent of the English cultural and linguistic domain, 1 Henry IV presents a Wales that is not actually Wales, but a nation standing in need of English colonization.

In its treatment of Welsh language, Shakespeare's play establishes a boundary between English and Welsh cultures, nations, and languages, making a clear declaration of difference. Through Welsh speech and a suspiciously alluring song, this text presents the audience with a national identity that is defined through "moments of disavowal, displacement, exclusion, and cultural contestation" (Bhabha 'Introduction' 5); English is defined by the way it is *not* Welsh, and vice versa. As much as this play seems to demand the elimination of the Welsh 'threat' and the assimilation of Wales into England, it also relies heavily upon the literary configuration of Wales and Welsh to provide an entity that England can disavow, displace, exclude, and contest in the process of its own national development.

The act of speaking Welsh and singing this intellectually unintelligible, yet nonetheless convincing song establishes not only the Welsh culture, but its *threat*, a "rude" inability or

unwillingness to assimilate; as in the opening scene, we see here an English man fall victim to the Welsh resistance to assimilation, figured by “wild” and feminine expression. Mortimer agrees to listen to the Welsh Lady’s song, and thus submits himself to subjection to her linguistic and cultural differences; he does the same in marrying her, and in agreeing to learn Welsh, saying, “I will never be a truant, love/ Till I have learnt thy language; for thy tongue/ Makes Welsh as sweet as ditties highly penned/ Sung by a fair queen in a summer bow’r/ with ravishing division, to her lute” (3.1.206-210). The audience witnesses the capacity of the Welsh Lady’s voice for “ravishing division” in the effect of her song on the relationship between Mortimer and Hotspur; her song lures Mortimer away, violates and severs the national ties that bind them. Her voice has the power to separate and transport, and the text therefore draws a parallel between Mortimer and the castrated English soldiers of the opening scene; this linguistic “ravishment” is akin to castration, and as a result, both Hotspur and the audience perceive Mortimer to be emasculated by this linguistic seduction. Watching as Mortimer is drawn past the cultural and linguistic boundaries that separate the English and the Welsh, into the realm of the untranslatable, the outside, the Other, Hotspur understands that Mortimer is submitting himself to Welsh influence, conceding that the origin(al) is not necessarily English.

Hotspur attempts to reassert the power of his national authority--as we see the Welsh Lady singing to Mortimer, we then see Hotspur asking his English wife, “Come Kate, I’ll have your song too” (3.1.247)—but his wife refuses, stating, “I will not sing” (3.1.260). Bhabha’s discussion of mimicry illuminates this exchange, in his contention that, “colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, *as a subject of difference that is almost the same, but not quite* (Bhabha ‘Mimicry’ 86 emphasis original). Because this mystical Welsh song is not a manifestation of either a “reformed” or “recognizable Other,” Hotspur encourages his wife to

sing as well, in an effort to contrive the English “original” song, therefore rendering that which the Welsh Lady is singing a mimicry. Reducing the Welsh song from original to mimicry would restore the colonial dynamic between England and Wales, limiting the Welsh to the status of “almost [English] but not quite,” and permitting an English absorption of the Welsh song.

Hotspur’s wife, however, refuses to sing.

In Kate’s refusal to sing, we see the “disavowal, displacement, exclusion” that Bhabha describes, in Kate herself, Hotspur, and Mortimer, because in such a charged and polarized scene, the audience understands the characters can only be one or the Other; this scene “turns out to be as much about acts of affiliation and establishment as they are moments of disavowal, displacement, exclusion, and cultural contestation” (Bhabha ‘Introduction’ 5). Kate refuses to mimic the Welsh, and thus facilitate their absorption; “mimicry is also the sign of the inappropriate” (Bhabha ‘Mimicry’ 86) and it thus seems as if “the inappropriate” is what Kate is trying to avoid. She is suggesting, in this refusal, that the Welsh “nation is no longer naturalizable” (Bhabha ‘Mimicry’ 87); like Mortimer, in refusing to sing, she is accepting that the origin(al) of this supernatural song is not English, but something else. Her refusal constitutes an “act of affiliation and establishment” as well, because in refusing she is, ironically, firmly aligning herself with Englishness. As part of a group rebelling against the English crown, however, Kate’s refusal is simultaneously “affiliating” and “establishing” herself in Englishness, even as she is “disavowing” and “excluding” herself from it. This scene describes a series of interchanges that represent a complex continuum of othering and Otherness; while all of the characters in this scene are on the margins of the literary nation, they nonetheless continue to “establish” themselves within the hierarchy of that margin, in which hegemonic national, cultural, and linguistic prejudices remain intact.

Though this scene does not allow for affiliation or establishment within the liminal or in-between, certain characters are nonetheless permitted to exist between the national and linguistic poles of English and Welsh through translation. In this scene, Owen Glendower plays the role of translator, and in this role he is able to affiliate himself with *both* English and Welsh, establishing himself in between the two national and linguistic poles rather than within one of them. Throughout the play, Glendower is presented as one of the gravest threats to English sovereignty, due to his fierce belief in his nation and his nearly supernatural powers of war. In Act Three, Scene One, however, we see him in a different form, that which Bhabha might call a “hybrid” of the two nations, cultures, and languages. In this scene, he translates the words of his daughter for Mortimer and the words of Mortimer for his daughter, and through this translational performance, the play reveals both the more complex development of Glendower’s character, as well as the Welsh perspective on English language and culture.

Earlier in the scene, before starting to translate between Mortimer and his wife, Glendower defends his English skills, saying,

I can speak English, lord, as well as you;
 For I was trained up in the English court,
 Where, being but young, I framèd to the harp
 Many an English ditty lovely well,
 And gave the tongue a helpful ornament—
 A virtue that was never seen in you. (3.1.121-126)

In the first line of this passage, Glendower compares himself to Hotspur: “as well as you.” Through this comparative statement, it is clear that Glendower is not aligned in the polarized, English/Welsh system with which Mortimer and Hotspur are affiliated; Glendower exists in-between, allowing him to occupy space in both English and Welsh domains. The above passage describes how Glendower acquired his skills in English; he was “trained up in the English court,” a statement in the passive voice that betrays an unwillingness or lack of agency. He leaves the

passive voice when discussing his music, as he tells Hotspur that he “framèd to the harp/ Many an English ditty lovely well,” demonstrating again that rather than assimilating his Welsh sense of self to English, he assimilates English “ditties” to the music he creates, asserting himself in that mode associated with Welsh supernaturalism and linguistic otherness. Glendower is demonstrating to the audience his ability to assimilate the English language to his culture’s defining idiom; he continues, telling Hotspur that he “gave the [English] tongue many a helpful ornament,” implying that rather than speaking English *like* Hotspur (which would be mimicry), through giving “the tongue many a helpful ornament,” he has improved it. By “ornamenting” the English language, Glendower implies that he is infusing it with his Welshness, an act of assimilation.

Glendower’s defense of his skills in English leaves the audience with a continual sense of what Bhabha describes as, “almost the same, but not quite,” because of the fact that it is unclear as to whether Glendower is, in fact, defending himself, and consequently, his Welshness, by claiming to speak English as well as Hotspur. However, the claim that he “ornamented” the English language may also be a more aggressive statement, declaring his desire to assimilate the English language in order to prove the power of Welsh. Bhabha would perhaps describe this difficult question as one concerning “ambivalence;” according to Bhabha, “the discourse of mimicry is constructed around an ambivalence; in order to be effective, mimicry must continually produce its slippage” (Bhabha ‘Mimicry’ 86). It would be difficult to state, for example, that Glendower’s skilled acquisition of English is merely evidence of Glendower’s mimicry of the language, because “mimicry repeats rather than re-presents” (Bhabha ‘Mimicry’ 88); Glendower clearly states that by giving “the tongue many a helpful ornament,” he is re-presenting the language, adorning it with what he considers a necessary supplement. The notion

of supplementation implies that English necessitated completion, and that without the ornamentation of Welsh, it would be incomplete, further supporting the claim that Glendower's defense of his skills in English is perhaps not a defense at all, but rather an aggressive statement concerning English's need for assimilation.

Glendower's Welsh accent, to which Hotspur refers, also suggests that his use of English is re-presentation rather than repetition. His English sounds "almost the same [as English] but not quite;" according to Hotspur, Glendower's accent sounds "like the forced gait of a shuffling nag" (3.1.134). However, Glendower's still seems to "desire to emerge as 'authentic' through mimicry—through a process of...repetition—[which] is the final irony of partial representation" (Bhabha 'Mimicry' 88). This desire, while subversive, is nonetheless inherent in the colonial existence; the fact that Glendower desires to seem authentic in his English reveals two important facts: first, that being English, at least in a sense, is what he wants; and second, that Glendower can never be English. In this passage, we see that "the menace of mimicry is its double vision which in disclosing the ambivalence of colonial discourse also disrupts its authority" (Bhabha 'Mimicry' 88).

Glendower should perhaps be examined through the lens of Mikhail Bakhtin's definition of the concept of hybridity, the "mixture of two social languages within the limits of a single utterance, an encounter, within the arena of an utterance, between two different linguistic consciousnesses, separated from one another by an epoch, by social differentiation, or by some other factor" (Bakhtin 358). Indeed, in the play, Glendower finds himself in between "two social languages": speaking with a Welsh accent, he is talking about English culture through the lens of its Welsh assimilation. Moreover, he is speaking with an English man, "separated from [him] by...social differentiation." The translator therefore occupies the space of the hybrid, a liminal

space that exists between two clearly defined national and linguistic entities. The fact that the lines designating that which is English and that which is Welsh are so clearly drawn makes Glendower's transgression of these categories all the more apparent, and thus significant; yet if he is *significant*, if his presence does serve as a "sign" for something that "marks [him] as extraordinary," what does he signify? Henry the Fourth is full of signs that represent English (as a concept) or Welsh (as a concept), but what of signs that signify something that exists between the two?

I would argue that Glendower, in many ways, is a representation of nation, something of which both the Welsh and the English are a part, yet something that is not particularly well-defined:

If the ambivalent figure of the nation is a problem of its transitional history, its conceptual indeterminacy, its wavering between vocabularies, then what effect does this have on narratives and discourses that signify a sense of 'nationness': the Heimlich pleasures of the earth, the unheimlich terror of the space or race of the Other; the comfort of social belonging, the hidden injuries of class; the customs of taste, the powers of political affiliation; the sense of social order, the sensibility of sexuality; the blindness of bureaucracy, the strait insight of institutions; the quality of justice, the common sense of injustice; the *langue* of the law and the *parole* of the people. (Bhabha 'Introduction' 2).

In 1 Henry IV, nation represents an "ambivalent" entity that occupies, specifically, that liminal space between that which is distinctly English and that which is distinctly Welsh. Nation "waver[s] between [the] vocabularies" of Welsh and English; as it cannot exist in either language, for either nation, it therefore cannot be translated. Nation appears in 1 Henry IV through the medium of a series of incomplete and uncorrected images and scenarios in which English and Welsh clash: the castration of the English soldiers, the unintelligible song of the Welsh Lady and her marriage to an English man, the act of translation. These dissonant moments, in which a great deal of both ambiguity and ambivalence exists in relation to the lines that distinguish the two entities, are also the moments in which one can see the development of the literary nation:

what England is, and what England is not. 1 Henry IV depicts an unrealized, catachrestic nation, an entity that is “almost [a nation]...but not quite,” that must be realized and translated in order to provide the foundation for the nationalist ideals of Henry V.

This liminality, this ambivalence is visible even within the strictly “English” domains that Shakespeare presents within the play. Most notably, 1 Henry IV features several scenes in a boisterous tavern, a realm that, like the concept of nation or the role of the translator, allows noble characters to experience “low” culture—drinking, swearing, robbery—without giving up their royal status. Like Glendower’s accented English, they can participate in the world of the “common,” man, but they will never be fully assimilated by this world; Prince Henry in particular does not belong in this arena, a fact of which his companions consistently make mention. The viewer is introduced to the tavern culture immediately—the second scene of Act Two presents Falstaff and Poins, two of Henry’s companions—but he is simultaneously informed of the fact that Henry does not belong within it, as demonstrated by Falstaff’s repetitive commands, “When thou art a king...” (1.2.17,64). An almost-exclusively male domain in which “low,” spectacular behavior is not only condoned, but encouraged, 1 Henry IV juxtaposes the hedonism of the tavern with the thematic nobility of the play—noble wars, noble characters, noble speeches—which betrays an unexpectedly unassimilable facet of Prince Henry’s character that demands translation.

Prince Henry’s exists within the tavern life as an anomaly, understanding that his self-translation is not only a possible, but a necessary ends. Though he participates in the drinking, the mockery, the theatricality of the tavern space, he does so knowing—and informing both the audience and his companions-- that he will one day assume the role of king. Prince Henry asserts, at the end of Act One, Scene Two: “I know you all, and will awhile uphold,/ The unyoked humor

of your idleness,/ Yet herein will I imitate the sun..." (1.2.199-201), demonstrating to the audience that Prince Henry's tavern existence will soon no longer be an option, because he will translate himself out of it. Prince Henry contends that he, "can drink with any tinker in his own language during [his] life" (2.4.18-19), and in this statement he identifies the underworld culture of drinking and debauchery as a cultural language; like Welsh, it exists completely outside the domain from whence he comes and towards which he heads. Just as Welsh is the language of the supernatural, that which cannot exist in "real life," the tavern is the language of the carnivalesque, a unique domain in which all is possible: "...carnival celebrates temporary liberation from the prevailing truth of the established order; it marks the suspension of all hierarchical rank, privileges, norms and prohibitions" (Bahktin 109). This anarchic language serves to disguise Prince Henry's identity, permits him to perform a different one, and allows him to temporarily reconceptualize or translate his royal status, from the vision that his father forces upon him, to his own. The language of the carnivalesque includes:

...comic verbal compositions (oral and written) such as parodies, travesties, and vulgar farce; and it include[s] various...curses, oaths, slang, humour, popular tricks and jokes, scatological forms, in fact all the 'low' and 'dirty' sorts of folk humor. Carnival is presented...as a world of topsy-turvy, of heteroglot exuberance, of ceaseless overrunning and excess where all is mixed, hybrid, ritually degraded and defiled. (Stallybrass and White 280)

Within the concept of carnival we return again to a consideration of the hybrid; and indeed, the language and culture of the tavern culture, the carnivalesque, allows Henry to be hybridized. Like Glendower, the carnivalesque allows Henry to be simultaneously noble and "vulgar," to be recognized as Prince without his father's expectations that are intrinsic to the role, to exist in both high and "low" society. The language of the carnivalesque exemplifies Bahktin's definition of hybridity, in that it is clearly a mixture of "two social languages within the limits of a single

utterance;” indeed, carnivalesque speech, particularly Falstaff’s, often infuses the style of “high” rhetorical forms with “low” content: “curses, oaths, slang,” etc.

The space of the tavern, like the arena occupied by the translator and the not-yet-nation in Wales, is a liminal territory lying between (or under) the binaries of noble/common, rich/poor, proper/vulgar. Like the England/Wales, here/there, us/them binary, the nobility of Prince Henry and the vulgarity of his comrades, Falstaff in particular, stand in such polar contrast that their coming together in a common space highlights the difference between the two terms that yet coexist in a single system. The tavern’s carnivalesque action thus brings into focus “the *relational* nature of festivity, its structural inversion of, and ambivalent dependence upon, ‘official culture’” (Stallybrass and White 284). As with Glendower in his role as translator, however, Prince Henry can step in and out of his spaces in both the tavern and the court, bringing us to the “realization that established authority and truth are relative” (Bahktin 10) within the spaces in which they are presented. Prince Henry’s role in the tavern is also one of ambivalence; he enjoys ties to both the vulgar and the high. The carnival space, however, is ambivalent as well, in that it prompts “the laughter of all the people: it is gay, triumphant, and at the same time mocking, deriding. It asserts and denies, it buries and revives. Such is the laughter of the carnival” (Bahktin 11-12). This laughter demonstrates to the audience one of the reasons that Prince Henry must eventually extricate himself from the world of the tavern; a certain equality exists in the laughter of the carnivalesque. While Henry’s future authority is perceived, the carnivalesque does not allow it to be exercised, and as the next king of England, this authoritative ambivalence necessitates translation; the unassimilable nature of the carnivalesque cannot reappear in Henry the Fifth.

Central to the play's development of the carnivalesque is Sir John Falstaff, who is introduced while trying to convince Prince Henry to commit a robbery (1.2). Falstaff exists in the realm of the tavern, similar to the way that Glendower exists in the realm of the Welsh; Falstaff literally incarnates his domain, performs its bawdiness, comedy, and "low" speech—the language of the tavern—in the same way that Glendower embodies Wales and performs Welsh. While Prince Henry can separate himself and his actions from the realm of the tavern, the carnivalesque, Falstaff is incapable of even adopting the serious, nationalistic rhetoric that Prince Henry frequently assumes in this play. He seems, in fact, incapable of adopting or displaying seriousness at all. Rather, he embodies parody, burlesque, excess; when describing his life, he tells his audience grandiosely,

I was virtuously given as a gentleman need to be, virtuous enough; swore little, dined not above seven times a week, went to a bawdy house not above once in a quarter of an hour, paid money that I borrowed three or four times, lived well, and in good compass; and now I live out of all order, out of all compass. (3.3.15-21)

Falstaff is well aware of the fact that he "live[s] out of all order, out of all compass," confessing not only the untranslatable elements of his character, but an awareness of his own untranslatability, his overflow of defining boundaries. From the very beginning of the play, it is as if he recognizes the fact that his character cannot be "transformed" to fit that which is necessary in the play's proper discourse. Though it is clear that Falstaff can never exist beyond the tavern world, he seems, ironically, to yearn for this translation. In Act Two, Scene Four, Falstaff pleads Prince Henry in a seemingly mocking rhetoric,

No, my good lord: banish Peto, banish Bardolph, banish Poins; but for sweet Jack Falstaff, kind Jack Falstaff, true Jack Falstaff, valiant Jack Falstaff, and therefore more valiant being, as he is, old Jack Falstaff, banish not him thy Harry's company, banish not him thy Harry's company, banish plump Jack, and banish all the world! (2.4.474-480).

What Falstaff says here is true; to banish him would be to “banish all the world:” the world of the carnivalesque, the world that Harry cannot bring with him to the throne. Thus, Jack Falstaff *must* be banished, as Prince Henry affirms this with cold precision: “I do, I will” (2.4.481). In Prince Henry’s terse self-translation from tavern sojourner to royal authority, Falstaff’s fate is sealed; his nature and environment (the tavern) will prove too untranslatable to appear in Henry the Fifth, when Prince Henry (who is referred to as “Hal” in 1 Henry IV) translates to King Henry, the liminal prince to commanding sovereign.

The fact that Falstaff manages to survive the end of Henry the Fourth Part One is unexpected, and thus important; as an untranslatable character, the audience might have expected his demise, or, like Glendower, his disappearance. Falstaff survives the play through the physical manifestation of mimicry; he pretends to be dead as those around him fight and are killed. When Prince Henry finds Falstaff alive, Falstaff exclaims,

“‘Sblood, ‘twas time to counterfeit, or that hot termagant Scot had paid me scot and lot, too. Counterfeit? I lie; I am not counterfeit. To die is to be a counterfeit, for he is but the counterfeit of a man who hath not the life of a man; but to counterfeit dying when a man thereby liveth is to be no counterfeit, but the true and perfect image of life indeed” (5.4.112-119).

A translation is similar to a counterfeit: while it often appears the same, it is not the “original,” and in Falstaff’s contempt for counterfeit—“Counterfeit? I lie; I am not counterfeit”—the audience understands the reason that he cannot be translated into Henry V, as are several of Henry’s companions. Henry “Hotspur” Percy, in this sense, also appears as a counterfeit; he is another Henry, who is married to another Katherine, and it is for his counterfeit appearance in the play that Falstaff stabs him. It is an act of contempt—Falstaff stabs him to assure that he is dead, and not a “counterfeit” of dead—but also an emasculating act, giving Hotspur a posthumous, “new wound in [his] thigh” (5.4.127-128), suggesting castration. This offers a

striking parallel to the play's first scene, in which we hear of the Welsh women's castration of the dead English soldiers; again, we see the parallel between the untranslatable Welsh and the English carnivalesque: neither the Welsh women nor Falstaff can be translated into Henry V. Falstaff's femininity, which parallels the inappropriate masculinity of the Welsh women, further prevents him from being transformed and allowed to participate in Henry the Fifth. His body, we are told, is not that of a warrior or a prince; Falstaff is "so fat...that [he] must needs be out of all compass" (3.3.22-23), and he has, "more flesh than another man, and therefore more frailty" (3.3.171-173). At the end of the play, the audience's impression of Falstaff is not unlike his/her impression of the dead, castrated English soldiers with which the play opens: prostrate and static, there is no possibility for his appearance in Henry V; refusing an impossible translation, 2 Henry IV must somehow leave Falstaff behind in order for the play to continue. The threat of the resurrection of catachrestic figures, however, looms over the end of the play, as neither the untranslatable Welsh nor the English carnivalesque disappears or is translated by the end of 1 Henry IV.

However, these figures are not resurrected in Henry V, a work that describes a fully-realized and cohesive vision of the English empire. The "untranslatable" Welsh are fully assimilated into the story and text of the play, the tavern is only depicted when Henry's former drinking buddies—now soldiers—meet to settle a debt, and Falstaff was banished in 2 Henry IV. The England of Henry V is a proud, synthesized nation into which much has been assimilated, including the catachrestic problems of 1 Henry IV concerning marginal languages, cultures, and nations, carnivalesque language, and untranslatability.

The translation of femininity between the two plays is successful, and the first translation we see is that of Hostess Quickly, the same hostess that appears in 1 Henry IV. Henry V does

not contain nearly the number of tavern scenes as does its predecessor; there is only one scene in which the tavern is featured, and it is no longer a space of drunkenness, debauchery, or even carnivalesque inversion. It is fascinating in that it is the same space, in which the same characters are gathered: the hostess, and former companions of Henry, Nym, Bardolph, and Pistol, all of whom appear in the previous play as drunken, immoral, and common men. They are all translated, however, and in Henry V appear as sober, loyal soldiers of the king. Though the tavern space represents a comic space, it no longer contains the excess of the carnivalesque; Henry V effects a translatory reduction of the carnivalesque into the comic, the hostess into a unifying force, Henry's drunken companions into Henry's loyal soldiers, Henry from prince to king.

The Welsh women, both the castrating female warriors and Mortimer's wife who cannot speak English, do not appear in this play. In their place, however, we find other women who are, again, of a nation defined as 'other' to England: the French princess, Katherine, and her servant, Alice. These women appear in the domain that they should; the play confines them either to Katherine's private quarters, a specifically feminine space, or to a common room in the French king's castle, as the French court negotiates the terms of surrender to Henry V. The French women only appear alone when in Katherine's private quarters; when in public, Katherine and Alice emerge, with permission, as entities that are owned: Katherine, as one of the terms of surrender, and Alice, as Katherine's servant. They are not allowed the agency that either of the Welsh women in 1 Henry IV display; they are not able to translate the bodies of men, or to use language or song to overpower those to whom they 'belong.' They do, however, possess more linguistic agency than do the Welsh women in 1 Henry IV; their language, though it is not English, is visible, intelligible, understandable, and even translatable within the space of the play.

Indeed, Act Three, Scene Four is entirely in French and is performed as such, a luxury that the Welsh women were not allowed.

In this scene, Katherine asks Alice to teach her several words in English, for reasons that she does not explain. The women start by working with the words for the body, and body parts, such as “hand,” “chin,” “fingers,” “nails,” “arm,” “elbow,” “neck.” What is most interesting about this scene is that the women are ‘butchering’ the language (a term that I will explore further later); the play clearly demonstrates their linguistic inability in the way that Katherine’s pronunciations of these English words are spelled: “de hand,” “le sin,” “les fingers,” “les nailes,” “l’arma,” “le bilbow,” and “nick,” respectively. The scene thus presents an ambivalent treatment of linguistic exchange, at once mocking the English, full of “mots de son mauvais, corruptible, gros, et impudique,¹” and mocking the French, who cannot pronounce words that an English-speaking audience would find among the most simple. The play also presents us, finally, with an open vision of translation, the way by which meaning is transferred from one language to another, and the misunderstandings and untranslatabilities (ie ‘robe’ is translated to ‘count’) that can arise in the process.

The words that are being translated, with the exception of the French word, “robe” (dress), are all words that describe body parts. One can see an almost literal translation of the castrating, Welsh women in this scene between Katherine and Alice; the Welsh women are cutting off body parts, and the French women are cutting the body into sections by linguistically reducing the body to its parts. Katherine, for example, does not ask Alice to translate the word “corps” (body); she is content knowing the words that represent the different parts of the whole. Furthermore, the French women are mispronouncing, or “butchering” (as it is often said colloquially) the English language, cutting, dismembering, and reducing it to incomplete parts. The act of

¹ “ill-sounding, contemptible, foul and lewd words”

translating is itself a “butchering” of a language; one takes a specific language, breaks it up or dismembers it into the parts that constitute it. This simple conversation between Katherine and Alice, paralleling closely the foreign women’s dismembering of male, English bodies at the opening of 1 Henry IV, effects a translation of the violently threatening Welsh women, a transformation that makes the feminine Other an acceptable and assimilable part of Henry V.

Katherine and Alice’s conversation is also a translation of another unassimilable aspect of 1 Henry IV, that of tavern life and the carnivalesque. 1 Henry IV made much of the position of women; the play immediately introduces the audience to the castrating, Welsh women who affected such “shameless transformation” on the dead bodies of English soldiers. Within the tavern scenes, we occasionally also view the hostess, a woman who lives in this liminal, vulgar, ambivalent space. Finally, the play depicts the wives of Hotspur and Mortimer, one English and the other Welsh, one named Kate, the other nameless. These characters exhaust the play’s consideration of women, and in most cases, they are untranslatable: the actions of the castrating Welsh women are so abhorrent that they cannot be ameliorated, the hostess is relegated to the “low” world of the tavern, Mortimer’s wife is confined to the limits of Welsh language and song, and Hotspur’s Kate is so aggressive, threatening to “break [his] little finger” (2.3.86-87) if he does not give her information about the war, that she is depicted as a comic analogue to the castrating Welsh women. If we are to regard Henry V as a translation and amelioration of the unassimilable threats to English sovereignty depicted in 1 Henry IV--many of which are inherent in the presence and presentation of the female characters-- then they must either be deleted or translated to suit the next play.

In Henry V, carnival does not appear in an overt form; rather, it is translated into a more gentle and proper humor. The carnivalesque does briefly appear, however, during the scene of

Katherine's English lesson with Alice in the form of the bawdy jokes that arise in the act of translation. Alice's English translation is, in general, quite good, though her accent often makes the words unrecognizable to the English-speaking audience; this misrecognition occurs when she tries to teach Katherine the words, "foot" and "robe" (which in English, she translates to "count"²). The word, "foot," when pronounced with a French accent, sounds very much like the French "foutre" (to fuck), and "count" (which Alice tells Katherine is the word for "robe"), when pronounced with a French accent, sounds like the French word "cunt" (cognate). These words prompt Katherine to exclaim, "Ils sont les mots de son mauvais, et non pour les dames d'honneur d'user. Je ne voudrais prononcer ces mots devant les seigneurs de France, pour tout le monde. Foh!"³ (3.4.50-54). In the act of cautiously playing with these "dirty" words, the remains of the translated carnivalesque of 1 Henry IV appear. The carnivalesque remains, however, are barely audible, present just for those who "get" the joke, but present just enough to be suppressed, as Katherine's retreat from "lewd" to "honorable" French makes clear. It is not "the 'low' and 'dirty' sort of folk humor" (White and Stallybrass 280) that we see in the tavern scenes of the previous play, but a subtle *double entendre*, not at all excessive and ultimately neutralized, that plays safely within the bounds of the process of translation.

This translation of the carnivalesque is completed in the last scene of Henry V, where we see Henry's courtship of Katherine, the French princess. Until this point in the play, we see King Henry V only in his role as leader, king and soldier, never in the role of lover or courtier, and the courtship scene highlights the only instance in the play in which Henry's language must be

² I have researched, in older version of this text, the word that Alice chooses for the translation of the French, "robe" (dress). Though I have most often found "count," occasionally it appears as "coun," which suggests that she was perhaps mispronouncing "gown."

³ They are ill-sounding, contemptible, foul and lewd words, not for ladies of honor to use. I not pronounce these words in front of the leaders of France for anything in the world. Foh! Katherine's shocked expression in this passage is precisely anti-carnivalesque.

assimilated. The vocabulary of Henry V's language is the terminology of law and order, specifically the law of inheritance; the play opens with the Bishop of Canterbury's rather lengthy presentation on inheritance law, concluding that,

...there is no bar
to make against your Highness' claim to France
But this, which they produce from Pharamond:
In terram Salicam milieres ne succedant
(No woman shall succeed in Salic land)
Which Salic land the French unjustly gloze
To be the realm of France, and Pharamond
The founder of this law and female bar. (1.2.39-46)

The inclusion of the Latin version of Salic law demonstrates that Henry's speech is grounded in the language of 'high' authority and politics. Henry V is also famous for his battle speeches—the language of war—one of which Shakespeare attempts to recreate in Act Four, Scene Three, just before he leads his soldiers into battle. That crucial speech directly precedes the final battle of the war, and the success of this speech demonstrates that the language of Henry the Fifth is that of war, politics, and law—in short, a language of contemporary masculinity. Even his “courtship” of Katherine, his attempt to appropriate a more “feminine” language, is preceded by a legal, war contract forged in the language of political and economic exchange: the King of France “doth offer [King Henry]/ Katherine his daughter” (3.1.31-32) as part of that which England gains from winning the war. Long before the actual courtship scene, the audience knows that Katherine's father has promised her to Henry, even though Katherine does not. Henry thus appropriates the feminine language, that of love, but he is doing so at no risk, and only in the spirit of self-performance. He knows that she will marry him, but he performs the role of the lover, perhaps because as king, it is Henry V's responsibility to play the appropriate role in every situation. Even when he does use this language of love, the language of politics and possession

still clings to him; when Katherine asks, in English, “Is it possible dat I sould love de enemy of France?” (5.2.176), Henry responds,

No, it is not possible that you should love the enemy of France, Kate. But, in loving me, you should love the friend of France, for I love France so well that I will not part with a village of it. I will have it all mine. And Kate, when France is mine and I am yours, then yours is France and you are mine. (5.2.178-184)

Henry’s language of love is still primarily a language of ‘claims’ and ownership, and he expects Kate to accept translation into its terms. In Henry V’s translation of his language, we see his “desire to emerge as ‘authentic’ through mimicry” (Bhabha ‘Mimicry’ 88), but Henry’s mimicry of the language of the feminine is not an act of bowing to an unassimilable force, but rather an attempt to absorb the language of love and courtship into the language of law and order. Appropriately enough, his use of love words also reshapes the carnivalesque in a self-mocking performance that is shared between the audience and Henry, crafting a privileged relationship used to mock Katherine’s ignorance. We again see a vision of the carnivalesque that is translated, and above all, tamed; far from the lewd jokes and drunken revelry of the tavern, this refined, calm, and more private comedy is an acceptable translation of the outrageous humor of 1 Henry IV.

One aspect of 1 Henry IV that is not, however, effaced through translational appropriation is the problematic process of mimicry inherent in the act of conquest. Though the courtship scene is certainly a comic moment that mocks both the English and French languages and cultures, mimicry is still undeniably present, “emerging as the representation of a difference that is in itself a process of disavowal” (Bhabha ‘DissemiNation’ 86). Reminiscent of Glendower’s insistence upon his ability to speak English as well as Hotspur, the wooing of Katherine simultaneously marks the linguistic differences and similarities between the English

and the French. The significant difference, however, is that where in the earlier play the Welsh, and particularly Welsh women, are depicted as untranslatable, unassimilable into the English nation, in Henry V the French, and particularly French women, are depicted as easily assimilated, to the point that not only are Kate and Alice trying to learn English, they are doing it of their own volition, their self-imposed “process of disavowal.”

The Welsh people, language, or presence is nearly non-existent in King Henry the Fifth; the nation, culture, and language seem to have been lost in the translation, leaving them permanently lost in the transitional space between the two plays. There are hints of Welsh in various parts of the story of Henry V, but only in brief and significantly transformed instances. The most obvious Welsh presence is embodied in Captain Fluellen, who does not speak Welsh, but rather a Welsh-accented English. His accent, like that of Katherine or Alice when they attempt to speak English, is demonstrated textually through the incorrect spelling of his words, and performatively by such vocal misprisions as the mis-translation of “b” by “p.” His accent constitutes an “inappropriate signifier of colonial discourse—the difference between being English and being Anglicized” (Bhabha ‘Mimicry’ 90), which serves to mark him simultaneously as one of the English (he is fighting with them), and as not English. It creates a system in which he is not only hybridized, but assimilated, for in this play, Wales and Welsh as a whole have been absorbed into England and English. We do not see Wales as a separate entity, but rather as a metonymic example of English nationality fighting against the French nation; there is no consideration of Welsh as separate or autonomous. In his treatment of the Welsh, Henry does something similar to that which he does when translating his political language into Katherine’s emotional language: he claims himself as Welsh in agreeing to wear a leek in his Monmouth cap, after having won the war against France (“I wear it for a memorable honor/ for I

am Welsh, you know, good countryman” [4.7.110-111]). Even Fluellen’s linguistic *Welshness* is made acceptable by the end of the play; defending Fluellen’s actions in the battle, Gower declares: “You thought because he could not speak English in the native garb, he could not therefore handle an English cudgel. You find it otherwise, and henceforth let a Welsh correction teach you a good English condition” (5.2.79-83).

Suggestively, this passage echoes that in which Glendower, the Welsh rebel in Henry the Fourth Part One, describes his fluency in English, that he “gave the [English] tongue many a helpful ornament.” The name “Gower,” interestingly, appears as almost a contracted anagram of the name, “Owen Glendower,” proposing an almost literal form of catachresis, a translation of Glendower that is “almost the same but not quite.” As a character, however, Gower *is* appropriate for the nationalist rhetoric of Henry V; his defense of Fluellen, and consequently, Welshness, evokes the character of Glendower. Unlike Glendower, however, Gower is firmly “affiliated” and “established” within the English empire, to the point that not only is he fighting for the English, he is fighting to support English imperialism.

The only remaining untranslatable element in Henry V, is the presence and indignant words of the Irish soldier, Macmorris. Like Fluellen, Macmorris is represented linguistically as not speaking English “correctly”; his speeches, too, are marked with misspelled words. In Act Three, Scene Two, an argument erupts between the assimilated Captain Fluellen and the perhaps unassimilable Captain Macmorris:

FLEULLEN: Macmorris, I think, look you, under your correction, there is not many of your nation—

MACMORRIS: Of my nation? What ish my nation? Ish a villain and a basterd and a knave and a rascal. What ish my nation? Who talks of my nation? (3.2.122-127)

We witness here the painful confrontation of the assimilated and the unassimilable, the translated and the untranslatable. Though both men come from countries assimilated into the English

empire, Fluellen nonetheless separates himself from Macmorris, telling him, “there is not many of *your* nation” (emphasis added). The use of the demonstrative pronoun here creates a particularly problematic moment, as the catachrestic fissure that the pronoun creates is a fissure that divides two men that the audience sees as fundamentally similar. Apart from the fact that both Fluellen and Macmorris come from colonized nations, and the fact that the text marks both as speaking in accented English, these characters mirror each other: both men are fighting for England, both are captains in Henry’s army, and the text consistently defines both of them by their nationality (Fluellen 4.7.103-109, Macmorris 3.2.69-70). Fluellen and Macmorris’ tense exchange thus marks the “ravishing division” of an almost textual mirror image, provoking more of a catachrestic chasm than a fissure.

The reappearance of the catachrestic moment in Henry V that we see through Fluellen and Macmorris’ exchange demonstrates that the attempt to translate Other(ed) cultures, language, and nations into a larger, literary English empire was not successful, and it calls into question the ethics of translation as a whole. When translating, nothing is more difficult or more valuable than a “faithful” translation, which is the ultimate goal of the responsive, corrective move from 1 Henry IV to Henry V. The fact that catachrestic moments still exist *after* the translation of 1 Henry IV into Henry V suggests that a “faithful” translation of marginal cultures, languages, and nations is not possible. Macmorris seems a likely translation of the character of Glendower from 1 Henry IV; though this translation did, perhaps, render Macmorris slightly less problematic—he is fighting for the English, after all—his translation as a whole is still enough to create a catachrestic fissure in the play.

This exchange should be read as not only a significant, but a defining moment in the discussion of textual catachresis as it appears in 1 Henry IV and is “resolved” in Henry V; this

moment is exemplary of J. Hillis Miller's definition of catachresis in that it creates a textual "fissure dividing before and after" (74). The "before" that Hillis describes, in this case, is the vision of a unified, cohesive English empire that is portrayed in the beginning of the play; Henry V depicts an empire defined by the notion of "God for Harry, England, and St. George!" (3.2.37). A synthesized English empire is also what the audience expects of Henry V after the tumultuous, nationally developmental drama of 1 Henry IV, and until Macmorris' outburst in Act 3, Scene 2, the perfected vision of the literary English empire is what the audience sees. Macmorris' outburst, however, provokes the "after" that J. Hillis Miller describes, an 'after' that exposes the cracks in this image of the corrected, cohesive English empire, cracks that we see in Macmorris' discontent with England, who he sees as "a villain and a basterd and a knave and a rascal" (3.2.121). Still more cracks, however, are inherent in England's imperialistic desire that Macmorris forces the audience to confront; in the desire to continue to assimilate, hybridize, absorb, and translation in the act of colonization, we see a vision of an England that presents itself as 'incomplete' as it was in 1 Henry IV. Similar to Glendower describing his need to "ornament" and thus complete the English tongue through the inclusion of his Welshness, so too does England show herself to be incomplete without imperialism, in King Henry's conviction that he will be "no king of England, if not King of France" (2.3.202). In Henry V, imperialist desire presents itself as the most inevitable and uncorrectable of the text's catachrestic moments, making the depiction of a cohesive English empire not only difficult, but impossible to sustain.

Henry V contains far fewer catachrestic moments than its predecessor, 1 Henry IV, but the tense conversation between Fluellen and Macmorris is eruptive enough to demonstrate to the audience that such moments still exist, occurring only in moments in which a

catachrestic image, character, or problem from 1 Henry IV is translated or “re-present[ed]” (Bhabha ‘Mimicry’ 88). The initial translation—of problematic images, characters, or problems of 1 Henry V—thus perpetuates the catachrestic moment in the following play, rather than eliminating or ameliorating it, and we see that translation itself, though intended to be a corrective measure, reproduces catachrestic moments as it corrects them. In the rise and growth of the English empire that the audience sees in Henry V, we also understand that translation is inherent in the figure of the empire in general; any empire is founded on the absorption, assimilation, hybridization, and above all, translation of other nations into it. A cyclic system is thus created: the more that the catachrestic images, characters, and problems of 1 Henry IV are translated (in order to ameliorate them), the larger and more corrected the literary depiction of the English empire of Henry V grows; and the larger the literary empire grows, the more assimilated characters exist to problematize the development of this empire, thus creating more catachrestic fissures centered around linguistic, cultural, and national translation. Translation thus becomes what Homi Bhabha would label an “ambivalent” figure; it at once corrects and problematizes, demonstrating to the audience that the underlying catachrestic catalyst *is* the act of translation, the act of unnecessarily, unfairly, or violently transforming the image of the cultural or linguistic other, and forcing it to conform to an anglicized paradigm, while simultaneously forcing it to maintain its Otherness, its distance.

Works Cited

- Bhabha, Homi K. "DissemiNation: time, narrative, the margins of the modern nation," *from* Nation and Narration, ed. Bhabha, Homi K. Routledge; London and New York: 1990.
- . "In a Spirit of Calm Violence," *from* After Colonialism by Prakesh, Gyan. Princeton University Press; Princeton: 1995.
- . "Introduction: narrating the nation," *from* Nation and Narration, ed. Bhabha, Homi K. Routledge; London and New York: 1990.
- . "Of Mimicry and Man," *from* The Location of Culture. Routledge; London and New York: 1994.
- Bahktin, Mikhail. Rabelais and His World, trans. H. Iswolsky. MIT Press; Cambridge: 1968.
- Miller, J. Hillis. The Ethics of Reading. Columbia University Press; New York: 1987.
- Shakespeare, William. 1 Henry IV, *from* The Riverside Shakespeare, ed. Tobin, J. J. M. Houghton Mifflin; New York: 1997.
- . Henry V, *from* The Riverside Shakespeare, ed. Tobin, J.J.M. Houghton Mifflin; New York: 1997.
- Stallybrass, Peter, and White, Allon. "The Politics and Poetics of Transgression," *from* A Reader in the Anthropology of Religion, ed. Lambek, Michael. Cornell University Press; Ithaca: 1986.

Works Consulted

- Kristeva, Julia. Revolution in Poetic Language. Columbia University Press; New York: 1984.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "The Politics of Translation," *from* A Translation Studies Reader, ed. Lawrence Venuti. Routledge; London and New York: 2000.
- Turner, Victor. "Liminality and Communitas," *from* A Reader in the Anthropology of Religion, ed. Lambek, Michael. Cornell University Press; Ithaca: 1986.
- Zizek, Slavoj. The Sublime Object of Ideology. 1997. Verso Publishers; London and New York: 1989.