

November 27, 1967

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Carol Ruth McGinnis entitled "Such Fictitious Emulations: Dramatic Imagery in Shakespeare's Henry VI Trilogy." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in English.

Norman Sanders
Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

K. K. Tuccillo

Thomas Wheeler

Harold S. Fink

Accepted for the Council:

Hilton A. Smith
Vice President for
Graduate Studies and Research

"SUCH FACTIOUS EMULATIONS": DRAMATIC
IMAGERY IN SHAKESPEARE'S
HENRY VI TRILOGY

A Dissertation
Presented to
The Graduate Council of
The University of Tennessee

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
Carol Ruth McGinnis

December 1967

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is a pleasure to acknowledge my gratitude to the members of my graduate committee, all of whom offered judicious advice. To Professor Norman Sanders, the director, goes my appreciation for his help with problems of organization, his steady encouragement, and his unflagging enthusiasm for the subject. To Professor Thomas V. Wheeler I am grateful for his interest, his careful reading and his incisive suggestions. Also I thank Professors Kenneth L. Knickerbocker and Harold S. Fink for reading the manuscript and offering valuable suggestions for its improvement.

My lasting gratitude also goes to Mrs. Dorothy Walker, Birmingham, Alabama, who introduced me to the excitement of drama, and to Professor Miriam Locke, the University of Alabama, whose combination of gracious manner and scholarly work has long been an inspiring example to me. And to my parents I am lovingly indebted for their unwavering confidence and support.

King Henry: Good Lord, what madness
rules in brainsick men,
When for so slight and frivolous
a cause
Such factious emulations shall
arise!

[I Henry VI, iv, i, 111-113]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Critical Precedents	1
Approach and Method	24
II. DRAMATIC IMAGERY IN <u>PART I HENRY VI</u>	40
Minor Images	54
Battle and sexual	54
Light and dark	66
Blood, disease and death	71
School-boys	74
Acting	75
Anticipatory Images	78
Music and water	78
Garden	84
Major Images	87
Animal and enclosure	87
III. DRAMATIC IMAGERY IN <u>PART II HENRY VI</u>	122
Minor Images	125
Battle	125
Light vs. dark	128
School-boys	131
Acting	132
Shadow vs. substance	134

CHAPTER	PAGE
Major Images	136
Water	136
Animal	146
Garden	172
IV. DRAMATIC IMAGERY IN <u>PART III HENRY VI</u>	199
Minor Images	200
Battle	200
Light vs. dark	201
Blood, death and disease	205
Acting	205
Major Images	209
Animal	209
Water	223
V. CONCLUSIONS	241
BIBLIOGRAPHY	254

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I. CRITICAL PRECEDENTS

Fads, trends, and cycles are not limited to the world of fashion and art: literary criticism also undergoes readily discernible trends in taste and interests. Among these developments, few have been more spectacular than the growth of Shakespearean imagery study. This increasing interest in the images of Shakespeare's dramas has stimulated some of the most significant critical work of our century--that of Knight, Heilman, and others, and, at the same time, some of its most annoying claptrap.

With the exception of a little-known work by Walter Whiter in 1794,¹ the systematic study of Shakespeare's imagery by aesthetic critics² is primarily a product of the twentieth century. The critical trend has been marked by a move from general studies of poetic imagery, which feature passages from Shakespeare as examples, to concentration

¹The title explains the contents: A Specimen of a Commentary on Shakespeare Containing I. Notes on "As You Like It." II. An Attempt to Explain and Illustrate Various Passages, on a New Principle of Criticism Derived from Mr. Locke's Doctrine of the Association of Ideas (London).

²This is not to imply that the growth of Shakespearean imagery study was an isolated development: cf. Norman Friedman, "Imagery: From Sensation to Symbol," Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, XII (1953), 25-37, for a comprehensive survey of the turn-of-the-century surge of interest by psychologists in images and the parallel growth of psychological and aesthetic criticism of imagery.

on the imagery of Shakespeare alone, and finally to scholarship devoted to a single aspect of Shakespeare's images or their appearance in only one or two plays. Pioneer work in poetic imagery was done by T. Hilding Svartengren, whose Intensive Similes in English (1918)³ carried his examination of English proverbial similes to some questionable conclusions, such as the astonishing deduction that English folk do not like the sea. In the same year, another general but much more sane study was made by Henry W. Wells, whose survey, published in 1924 as Poetic Imagery: Illustrated from Elizabethan Literature,⁴ classifies and discusses the seven various types of images: decorative, sunken, violent, radical, intensive, expansive, and exuberant. Wells proposes "to trace the character and degree of imaginative activity in poetic metaphor"⁵ in order to increase "our appreciation of poetic metaphor and [to help us] become more effective in our own figures."⁶ Shakespeare is the only author chosen for special, albeit sketchy, analysis by Wells, who recognizes "an artistic unity" underlying "the metaphors in many of the plays."⁷ Other early critics whose general studies direct attention specifically to Shakespeare's imagery include J. Middleton Murry, George Rylands, Elizabeth Holmes, and G. Wilson Knight.

In 1931, J. Middleton Murry's excellent essay "Metaphor"⁸ was written. Murry explores the nature of imagery, i.e., metaphor, simile,

³London. ⁴New York. ⁵Wells, p. 2. ⁶Ibid., p. 3.

⁷Ibid., p. 238.

⁸Richard Rees, ed., J. Middleton Murry: Selected Criticism 1916-1957 (London, 1960), pp. 65-75; first published in The Countries of the Mind (1931).

and image, revealing it to be "the instinctive and necessary act of the mind exploring reality and ordering experience."⁹ Shakespeare is designated "the greatest of all masters of metaphor"¹⁰ and his works, especially Antony and Cleopatra, are constantly drawn upon by Murry for examples of the heights achieved by imagery. Murry is particularly concerned with demonstrating how seemingly mixed metaphors in Shakespeare actually are related by an inner harmony and subtle intensity. Written by a critic of insight and comprehension, "Metaphor" is a vital contribution to the understanding of imagery.

Devoting more than half of his study to Shakespeare's development as a poet, George Rylands, in Words and Poetry (1928),¹¹ draws several valid--and a few not so valid--conclusions in his analysis of poetic language. Rylands' interest is the single unit, the word, as the basis of poetry, for "the most elementary poetry lies . . . in the mere names of natural objects."¹² After making valuable observations about the general nature of poetic diction, "an emotional vocabulary, or code" of images and symbols "rich in association,"¹³ Rylands traces the evolution of Shakespeare's poetic style, pointing out his advance in the subtleties of metaphor and his increasing ability to endow his style with "a large proportion of abstract words"¹⁴ supported by concrete ones. While Rylands' contributions to an embryonic discipline are not to be

⁹Ibid., p. 66. ¹⁰Ibid., p. 68. ¹¹New York, 1928.

¹²George Rylands, Words and Poetry (New York, 1928), p. 55.

¹³Ibid., p. 49. ¹⁴Ibid., p. 238.

denied, several of his conclusions are indeed regrettable; for example, as "one small point" he ascribes "Shakespeare's tendency to repeat a word or image, rather weakly, in the same play" to "poverty of language and ideas"¹⁵ in the early work and to speed in the later.

Much more reliable is Elizabeth Holmes' Aspects of Elizabethan Imagery (1929),¹⁶ which includes a chapter on Shakespeare's imagery. Using examples from many of his plays, Miss Holmes urges "the grandeur and supremely metaphysical character of [Shakespeare's] . . . imagination";¹⁷ she discusses the development of Shakespeare's imagery from ornate to subtle, his "unusual sensitiveness to the latent associations of words and images,"¹⁸ the emergence of several images from a key word earlier in the dialogue, and his great skill in personification. Shakespeare's poetry, believes Miss Holmes, is surrounded by "the sense of the receding past and still more the farstretching future" which is "reflected in such large vague metaphors as are its only possible expression."¹⁹ This imagery guarantees the timelessness of Shakespeare's appeal.

Shakespeare's appeal has had perhaps no more sensitive response than that of G. Wilson Knight, whose early works--The Wheel of Fire (1930), The Imperial Theme (1931), and The Shakespearian Tempest (1932)²⁰--constitute Shakespearean criticism in many ways unsurpassed in our century. Knight's interest is not the 'temporal' but rather the 'spatial' aspect

¹⁵Ibid., p. 239. ¹⁶Oxford. ¹⁷Holmes, p. 37. ¹⁸Ibid., p. 43.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 58. ²⁰Oxford.

of a drama. As the critic explains in his introduction to The Wheel of Fire, which, like The Imperial Theme, is a collection of essays analyzing various Shakespearean plays, the 'spatial' portion of a drama is the "set of correspondences" throughout a play "which relate to each other independently of the time-sequence which is the story,"²¹ for example, the death and disease world of Hamlet. In order to understand a drama "we should regard each play as a visionary whole, closeknit in personification, atmospheric suggestion, and direct poetic symbolism: three modes of transmission, equal in their importance."²² Knight's method of seeing "the whole play laid out, so to speak, as an area, being simultaneously aware of these thickly-scattered correspondences in a single view of the whole"²³ comes to involve, of course, symbolism, setting, characterization, action, and imagery.

In The Shakespearian Tempest, Knight directs his 'spatial' approach to what he feels is the only "true Shakespearian unity"²⁴ -- the vital opposition of tempest, symbol of disorder, and music, symbol of order. This conflict unifies Shakespeare's works, making them all of one fabric. To illustrate and support his thesis, Knight explores the entire range of Shakespeare's poems and plays demonstrating the significance of literal and figurative tempests. From the tempest in King Lear ("the tempest on the heath and the tempest in Lear's mind . . .

²¹G. Wilson Knight, The Wheel of Fire (Oxford, 1930), p. 3.

²²Ibid., p. 11. ²³Ibid., p. 3.

²⁴G. Wilson Knight, The Shakespearian Tempest (Oxford, 1932), p. xxiii.

are one tempest; or rather facets of one tempest"²⁵) to the ducking of Falstaff in The Merry Wives of Windsor, the critic reveals the symbolic scheme of the tempest/disorder vs. music/order conflict. Whether the appearance is in actual staging or in verbal imagery, it is part of Knight's comprehensive theory. Interestingly, he notes several types of imagery in addition to tempest images which are frequently associated with disorder: comets and meteors, earthquakes, disease, bad weather of all kinds, winter, trees, and fierce animals. With order goes imagery of delicate air, flowers, gold, jewels and all rich stones, summer, light, warmth, and gentle beasts. Although Knight's analyses examine imagery only insofar as it pertains to the set of correspondences in a specific drama, his insight into the significance of imagery as an important part of poetic drama contributes much to the development of criticism.

G. Wilson Knight points out that he "may have" owed a hint or two²⁶ about disorder symbols in *Macbeth* to Monsignor F. C. Kolbe, whose brief Shakespeare's Way appeared in 1930.²⁷ The first study devoted exclusively to Shakespeare's imagery, Shakespeare's Way is a study of the playwright's "dramatic colouring,"²⁸ that is, how Shakespeare developed the theme of a play. Kolbe's thesis "is that Shakespeare secures the unity of each of his greater plays, not only by the plot, by linkage of characters, by the sweep of Nemesis, by the use of irony, and by appropriateness of style, but by deliberate repetition throughout the

²⁵Ibid., p. 7. ²⁶Ibid., Preface.

²⁷London. ²⁸Kolbe, p. ix.

play of at least one set of words or ideas in harmony with the plot."²⁹ This reinforcement of theme by imagery is demonstrated by Kolbe in such skillful analyses as those of dark, blood, and sleep in Macbeth. The image-motifs of several major dramas are thus revealed by Kolbe. With Kolbe's work the time was ripe for a development of the criticism of Shakespeare's imagery beyond monographs, single chapters, and incidental mention into major works of criticism devoted solely to images and attempting, in some manner, a comprehensive investigation of them. In the mid-thirties these long prepared-for words appeared, and the rush for imagery-hunting was on.

This recent enthusiasm for imagistic study is largely the result of two remarkable pieces of criticism: Caroline F. E. Spurgeon's Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us (1935),³⁰ and Wolfgang Clemen's Shakespeare's Bilder: Ihre Entwicklung and Ihre Functionen im Dramatischen Work (1936), which the author later revised slightly and translated as The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery (1951).³¹ These two works, appearing within a year of each other, marked the first critical attempts to collect, classify, and examine the imagery throughout Shakespeare's plays. Each eminently valuable for its own contribution to scholarship, the two differ in purpose and method so severely that subsequent students of imagery generally align themselves in either the pro-Spurgeon or the pro-Clemen camp--often with an intensity quite startling to those unfamiliar with literary squabbles.

²⁹Ibid., p. 2.

³⁰New York.

³¹Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Miss Spurgeon's Shakespeare's Imagery is the result of long hours spent in careful collection and classification of the images found in all of Shakespeare's plays and even in a few plays by his contemporaries.³² Assuming that 'image' is "the only available word to cover every kind of simile as well as every kind of what is really compressed simile-- metaphor,"³³ Miss Spurgeon categorizes every "little word-picture,"³⁴ according to its subject matter in hopes of providing "a new method of approach to Shakespeare."³⁵ What the author wishes to gain by her new method is light shed, first, on "Shakespeare's personality, temperament and thought," and, second, "on the themes and characters of the plays."³⁶

In Part I of Shakespeare's Imagery Miss Spurgeon charts the images appearing most frequently in the plays, citing examples at length. She finds that most of Shakespeare's images fall within one of two groups: (1) nature or (2) indoor life and customs, with others coming under the miscellaneous categories of war, law, music, art in general, theater, the classes of men, and simple personification. Of the two major divisions, says Miss Spurgeon, nature is the more significant both numerically and thematically, for the three most frequent images in all of Shakespeare's plays are those associated with (1) gardening, (2) weather, and (3) the sea. The image most often noted under the second division, indoor life and customs, is "that taken from the body and its

³²Cf. F. E. C. Habgood and W. S. Melsome, who in "Professor Spurgeon and Her Images," Baconiana, XXV (July, 1941), 213-235, object to Spurgeon's treatment of Bacon.

³³Spurgeon, p. 5. ³⁴Ibid., p. 7. ³⁵Ibid., Preface. ³⁶Ibid.

movements."³⁷ After observing that the quality peculiar to nearly every Shakespearean image is movement ("nature and natural objects in motion"),³⁸ Miss Spurgeon utilizes her classification findings to attempt the discovery of Shakespeare the man. The desire is understandable enough, for it is simply in the nature of man to be curious about the daily activities and human foibles of the great; however, the theory that appearance or absence of a certain subject in imagery indicates the personality and physical traits of the author is a questionable one,³⁹ and even if proven to be completely accurate, is of little worth in literary criticism.⁴⁰ Although Miss Spurgeon may be correct in her conclusions that Shakespeare disliked spaniels and was an excellent archer,⁴¹ such information scarcely resolves the problem of what a specific image is actually doing in a specific passage. Indeed, it is this very emphasis on the image-author relationship to the neglect of the image-play relationship which has so roused the ire of the majority of Miss Spurgeon's critics.

Miss Spurgeon does, however, touch upon the image-play relationships in Part II of Shakespeare's Imagery, a study of the histories,

³⁷Ibid., p. 49. ³⁸Ibid., p. 50.

³⁹Cf. Lillian Herlands Hornstein, "The Analysis of Imagery," PMLA, LVII (1942), 638-653. Although Miss Hornstein's understanding of imagery is unhappily narrow, she does use an interesting example to support her contention that absence or presence of a particular subject in an image does not indicate the author's personal interests: Walton has not a single fishing image in his Life of Donne. Cf. also Stanley Edgar Hyman, The Armed Vision (New York, 1948), pp. 216-218.

⁴⁰Cf. J. Dover Wilson's preface to Wolfgang Clemen's The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1951).

⁴¹Spurgeon, p. 204.

comedies, romances, and tragedies. The author presents some "recurrent images";⁴² for example, she finds the "most constant running metaphor" from I Henry VI to Richard II to be that of

growth as seen in a garden and orchard, with the deterioration, decay and destruction brought about by ignorance and carelessness on the part of the gardener, as shown by untended weeds, pests, lack of pruning and manuring, or on the other hand by the rash and untimely cutting or lopping of fine trees.⁴³

Other running images noted in the Henry VI plays are the contrast of light vs. dark, the heavenly bodies, the slaughter-house, animals, the sun-king analogy, and the sea. The key word here is 'noted,' for Miss Spurgeon's wide scope does not allow her to linger very long over a single image or cluster of images: she observes but she does not analyze.⁴⁴ Shakespeare's Imagery unquestionably marks a literary milestone but its major contribution to scholarship is the classification of imagery, while the analysis of imagery was left to others.

Response to Carolina Spurgeon's Shakespeare's Imagery was immediate and fervent.⁴⁵ While critics were quick to praise the value of Miss Spurgeon's contributions to scholarship, some urged caution against wholehearted acceptance of her systematic method.⁴⁶ Typical of her

⁴²Ibid., p. 213. ⁴³Ibid., p. 216.

⁴⁴It should be pointed out, however, that Miss Spurgeon recognized the need for analysis and hoped that she could produce later an additional volume for that purpose.

⁴⁵Cf. F. E. L. Habgood and W. S. Melsome.

⁴⁶Cf. Una Ellis-Fermor, Some Recent Research in Shakespeare's Imagery (Oxford, 1937) for an excellent survey of the early development of imagistic study and a sane look at the problems facing the student of

more violent detractors was William T. Hastings, whose article "Shakespeare's Imagery"⁴⁷ attacks the limitations of Miss Spurgeon's objective classification and finds it "full of both trivial and dubious inferences."⁴⁸ Of more significance, however, is the work of Wolfgang Clemen, whose Shakespeare's Bilder (1936), later translated as The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery (1951), proved to be the second major impetus in the growing enthusiasm for imagistic study. Clemen takes issue with Miss Spurgeon's concept that imagery study can reveal the personality of Shakespeare the man. "It seems evident," Clemen urges, "that Shakespeare's choice of an image or simile at a given moment in the play is determined far more by the dramatic issues arising out of that moment than by his individual sympathies."⁴⁹ In addition to his objections to Miss Spurgeon's purpose for imagistic study, Clemen believes her statistical approach may be "destructive and futile,"⁵⁰ for it often distorts or ignores the unity, richness, and depth of imagery's function in a play. Knowing the number of images in a particular scene is not the same as knowing their significance in that scene.

What Clemen wants to accomplish, then, is an examination of the organic function of imagery, an analysis of the image-play relationship.

imagery; and her "Shakespeare and His World: The Poet's Imagery," The Listener, XVII (July 28, 1949), 157-158; for another reasonable view of the various approaches made to imagery, see S. L. Bethell, "Shakespeare's Imagery: The Diabolic Images in Othello," Shakespeare Survey, 5 (1952), 62-80. Also helpful is Kenneth Muir's survey "Shakespeare's Imagery--Then and Now," Shakespeare Survey, 18 (1965), 46-58.

⁴⁷SAB, XL (July, 1936), 141. ⁴⁸Ibid., p. 131.

⁴⁹Clemen, Development, p. 15. ⁵⁰Ibid., p. 16.

He recognizes "imagery as expressive of a certain symbolism which . . . can disclose to us the meaning of a play better than anything else."⁵¹ In examining the connection between a play's imagery and its meaning, Clemen views an image not in isolation but in the immediate context of the play. For each image he asks:

How is the image . . . related to the train of thought?

Does form influence the image?

What motives are especially productive of images, out of what situations do most images grow? What is the relationship of the images to their occasion?

Is the use of imagery different for each character, can any relation be discerned between the nature of Shakespeare's men and women and the way they use imagery?

To what degree is the total effect of the play enhanced and coloured by images?⁵²

Although, like Miss Spurgeon, Clemen tries to cover every play by Shakespeare, thereby precluding a detailed and in-depth analysis of any single play, he accomplishes much in establishing the significant functions of imagery in poetic drama. His perceptive handling does not make imagery hunting an end in itself, but rather an effective tool in producing a clearer understanding of the plays. Shakespeare's mature dramas--King Lear, Macbeth, et. al.--quite rightly receive the most attention, but, as Clemen proposed to cover Shakespeare's development, the dramatist's early works are briefly discussed. Unlike his later plays, Shakespeare's early histories exhibited a "lack of organic relation of imagery to the play, the characters and the situation,"⁵³ according to

⁵¹Ibid., p. 16.

⁵²Ibid., pp. 3-4.

⁵³Ibid., p. 40.

Clemen. He believes that the key-note for Henry VI is "imagery for imagery's sake"; with few exceptions the imagery is "embroidery" inserted deliberately into the text for "decorative rather than expressive purpose."⁵⁴ The amplified style of Henry VI is characterized by artificial images of proverb-like "detailed elaboration."⁵⁵ Clemen's study, well-supported by numerous examinations of specific passages, thus concentrates on the area lightly touched upon by Miss Spurgeon: the function of the imagery in drama.

With Miss Spurgeon's classification of images and Clemen's analysis of them, imagery study had its ground rules established, and suddenly everyone wanted to play. The resultant outpouring of critical attention to Shakespearean imagery includes some of doubtful value,⁵⁶ but fortunately it also boasts worthwhile studies by such reliable scholars as Una Ellis-Fermor, Cleanth Brooks, Edward A. Armstrong, Mikhail M. Morozov, Robert B. Heilman, R. A. Foakes, Maurice Charney, and others.

In 1945, Una Ellis-Fermor devoted Chapter Five of The Frontiers of Drama⁵⁷ to a discussion of "The Functions of Imagery in Drama" with special emphasis on Shakespeare. Fundamentally a follower of Spurgeon in her definition of imagery and general acceptance of the systematic

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 40. ⁵⁵Ibid., p. 45.

⁵⁶Cf. Donald A. Stauffer, Shakespeare's World of Images (New York, 1949), for examples of unfortunate perversions of imagery study. At one point, Stauffer observes that Shakespeare liked deerhunting so well that "If we did not have the legend that Shakespeare had been driven from Stratford because of deer-stealing, it would be necessary to invent it" (p. 21).

⁵⁷London.

approach, Miss Ellis-Fermor is, however, concerned with the image-play rather than the image-author relationship. In examining the function of imagery in drama, the author states that imagery, prosody, symbolism, description, and setting all work together to deepen "the imaginative significance of a play without increasing its length or bulk."⁵⁸ Of these aspects, "the most single and the most powerful"⁵⁹ is imagery. In great drama, imagery is an integral part, impossible to remove without damaging the fabric of the play: imagery functions to give depth, scope, universality, and fullness to the drama.

A similar, though broader, understanding of Shakespearean imagery prompts Cleanth Brooks, whose excellent study of "Shakespeare as a Symbolist Poet"⁶⁰ also appeared in 1945. Brooks widens his view beyond the functions of metaphors and similes alone to include the interactions of imagery with recurrent themes and "iterative" words in a play. The majority of Brooks' article is a perceptive analysis of the recurrent clothing imagery and emphasis on actual clothes in Macbeth. Borrowed or ill-fitting clothing, appearing both literally and figuratively throughout the play, becomes symbolic of the hypocrisy of MacBeth the usurper. Thus, says Brooks, images can be "convenient points of entry into the larger symbols which dominate the play."⁶¹ Imagery is not merely important but it is essential to the play's meaning.

⁵⁸Ellis-Fermor, The Frontiers of Drama, p. 71. ⁵⁹Ibid.

⁶⁰Yale Review, XXXIV (1945), 642-665.

⁶¹Ibid., p. 650.

A return of concentration from the image-play relationship to the image-author relationship is shown in Edward A. Armstrong's Shakespeare's Imagination (1946),⁶² a work which owes much to Miss Spurgeon, just as Brooks' shares much with Clemen. This debt in no way lessens the unique nature of Armstrong's accomplishment, for his often fascinating account of image clusters brings to light a new area for scholarly scrutiny.⁶³ Limiting himself to bird and insect images, Armstrong analyzes the cluster of associations which repeatedly appear with certain images in an effort to explore the underlying psychological processes.⁶⁴ For example, he finds that kites and bedding frequently appear together, an incongruous combination made by Shakespeare probably because of "the connexion of both with death."⁶⁵ "An image in Shakespeare's mind," writes Armstrong, "tended to acquire associates which became, at least in some instances, almost inseparable from it."⁶⁶ In Henry VI, Armstrong discovers the initial appearance of one of Shakespeare's most intriguing image clusters: birds-wax-pride.⁶⁷

⁶²London.

⁶³Interestingly, Walter Whiter had previously noticed two clusters: dog-candy-flattery and love-books. J. Y. Liu, in "A Marlo-Shakespearian Image Cluster," Notes and Queries, 196 (1951), observes that the face-beauty-comment-volume-pen-eyes cluster appears in both Marlowe and Shakespeare.

⁶⁴Cf. fn. 2. Armstrong's study combines the parallel growth of psychological and aesthetic concern for imagery study. While the validity of examinations of images to discover psychological processes is not to be denied, it is an aim of imagistic study which will not be included in the present study.

⁶⁵Armstrong, p. 15. ⁶⁶Ibid., p. 16.

⁶⁷Cf. 1 HVI, IV, vi, 55 and vii, 16; 3 HVI, II, 1, 170 and V, vi, 21 and V, vi, 24.

The association which is made explicit in 3 Henry VI, V, vi, 18-29, derives from the story of Icarus and Daedalus, whose prideful attempt to fly with wings attached by wax ended in death when the sun melted the adhesive. After collecting the types of image clusters, proposing possible explanations for the combinations,⁶⁸ and tracing the associative activity, Armstrong says the "subliminal sprite"⁶⁹ directing these linked images is responsible for much of Shakespeare's appeal. Great poetry arouses a deep response because it makes available "relationships hitherto only dimly apprehended which satisfy profound and universal emotional demands."⁷⁰

With the exception of portions of Clemen's and Brooks' works, the studies of Shakespearean imagery previously discussed are primarily concerned with the image in isolation. The image's relationship to the author and to the play receive attention, and in many instances its essential function in a play's theme is noted; however, its partnership with action, characterization, setting, and description is but briefly noted and seldom explored. Only with the gradual maturation of imagery study has the vital thematic interdependence of imagery with the other elements of drama come to be recognized.

Typical of the critics demanding a more comprehensive approach to Shakespearean imagery are Alan S. Downer and R. A. Foakes. Both

⁶⁸Cf. E. E. Kellett, "Some Notes on a Feature of Shakespeare's Style," Suggestions (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1923), pp. 57-78. Although Kellett does not deal with imagery per se, he does explore the interlinking of word and idea throughout several passages in Shakespeare, an important characteristic of Shakespearean imagery.

⁶⁹Armstrong, p. 31. ⁷⁰Ibid., p. 127.

men⁷¹ urge a loosening of the scholarly 'strait-jacket' which has bound imagistic study. Downer regrets the traditional pattern of concentrating on either Shakespeare the poet or Shakespeare the dramatist. It must not be a question of "either . . . or," Downer insists, for Shakespeare is a dramatic poet and must be considered as such. If the critic of a play tries to isolate the imagery of Shakespeare the poet, the result can be only half truths and distortions. What must be studied is imagery as it functions within its context: the poetic drama. Imagery joins with setting, props, and action to form "the dramatic language."⁷² Downer's appeal for more attention to imagery as it functions with other parts of drama is seconded by R. A. Foakes, who also wants the boundaries of dramatic imagery extended. Since the ideas of Downer and Foakes will receive a detailed discussion in Part II of this chapter, a brief summary of Foakes' article must suffice here: poetic imagery, i.e., metaphors and similes, should be considered with iterative words, historical and geographical setting, descriptions, props, and proper names, and "together these constitute dramatic imagery."⁷³ Downer and Foakes are in basic agreement:⁷⁴ although Downer more strongly emphasizes the

⁷¹Downer, "The Life of Our Design: The Function of Imagery in the Poetry Drama," Hudson Review, II (1949), 242-263; Foakes, "Suggestions for a New Approach to Shakespeare's Imagery," Shakespeare Survey, 5 (1952), 81-92.

⁷²Downer, p. 243. ⁷³Foakes, p. 89.

⁷⁴Cf. John Lawlor, "Mind and Hand: Some Reflections on the Study of Shakespeare's Imagery," Shakespeare Quarterly, VIII (1957), 179-193, for another critic's view of Foakes ideas. Although Lawlor's cautions against Foakes' comprehensive view are perhaps too strong, his insistence that one must listen to the sound of the image as spoken by the actor is suggestive.

importance of plot and action, both men join in the demand that any element of drama which shares the function of poetic imagery must be considered as part of a drama's imagery.

Much of what Downer and Foakes hope to find in an imagistic study appears in the works of Robert B. Heilman, This Great Stage: Image and Structure in King Lear (1948)⁷⁵ and Magic in the Web: Action and Language in Othello (1956),⁷⁶ and Maurice Charney, Shakespeare's Roman Plays: The Function of Imagery in the Drama (1961).⁷⁷ For Heilman, a play is composed of two organically interdependent parts: "action drama" and "verbal drama."⁷⁸ The critic's concern is the "total statement made by all the dramatic devices,"⁷⁹ one of which is imagery. As does Clemen, Heilman believes that imagery expresses "symbolically [the] correspondences and inter-relations which underlie the real action and often contain the essential meaning of the play."⁸⁰ This argument is amply supported by Heilman's demonstration, in Magic in the Web, that Iago's "barnyard view of life"⁸¹ prompts repulsive images, usually of loathsome creatures engaged in unpleasant activities, whereas Othello's lofty images abound in romantic, exotic references of cosmic scope. As Iago's cunning gradually erodes Othello's character, the Moor's images take on the ugliness of the villain's speech. Iago's view of life becomes Othello's view, and the hero recovers his natural vision only at the play's conclusion. After reading Heilman's analyses of the

⁷⁵Baton Rouge. ⁷⁶Lexington. ⁷⁷Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1961.

⁷⁸Magic in the Web, p. 6. ⁷⁹Ibid., p. 10. ⁸⁰Ibid., p. 7.

⁸¹Ibid., p. 105.

interaction of several dramatic elements, one regrets only that this sensitive critic has not dealt with more Shakespearean plays. Similarly, one wishes Charney to turn his penetrating gaze to more of Shakespeare's plays. His critical study, Shakespeare's Roman Plays, is avowedly based on Foakes' theories but actually comes closer to those of Downer in its interest in "stage imagery,"⁸² e.g. the literal stage image produced by Cleopatra clasping the asp to her bosom. Like Heilman, he concerns himself with imagery as it functions thematically in relationship to the play as a whole.

Others who have extended the limits of imagery include W. H. Gardner, whose "Aspects of Shakespeare's Imagery"⁸³ draws attention to the complex linking of imagistic passages in their immediate context, and Mikhail M. Morozov, whose excellent study, "The Individualization of Shakespeare's Characters Through Imagery"⁸⁴ in Othello, Macbeth, and Hamlet, is the first focused exclusively on characterization by imagery. Morozov finds definite laws governing the imagery of individual characters, thereby confirming "the fact that Shakespeare's characters do not speak for the author but, so to say, 'for themselves,' i.e., are independent individuals," and the realization that "the particular figures of speech predominating in the role of any given character will provide us with a valuable key to that character's psychological makeup."⁸⁵ To support his thesis, Morozov offers illuminating discussions of the

⁸²Charney, p. 8. ⁸³The Month, X (1953), 41-51.

⁸⁴Shakespeare Survey, 2 (1949), 83-106. ⁸⁵Ibid., p. 84.

"lofty poetic imagery" of Othello, the predominantly "low images" of Iago, the poetic-domestic-militant imagery of Desdemona, the "distinctly magniloquent" imagery of Macbeth, the "dark demonic theme" of Lady Macbeth's imagery which becomes unexpectedly tender in her sleep-walking, the "peaceful, placid, idyllic" images of Banquo, the surprisingly "simple" and extremely prosaic images of Hamlet, the "very simple and clear" imagery of Ophelia, the "artificial" images of Laertes, the "concretely substantial images" of Horatio, and the "straightforward" imagery of Polonius.

While some scholars thus widen their scope, others restrict themselves to specific interests. For example, John Erskine Hankins ferrets out sources of images in Shakespeare's Derived Imagery;⁸⁶ Moody E. Prior questions the use of imagery as a test for authorship;⁸⁷ and W. Schrickx focuses on solar images in "Solar Symbolism and Related Imagery in Shakespeare."⁸⁸ More to the point of the present study is the specialized scholarship of Alvin B. Kernan, whose comparison of the imagery in 3 Henry VI and The True Tragedie of Richard Duke of York reveals that the quarto possesses fewer and less significant images than the folio.⁸⁹

⁸⁶Lawrence, 1953.

⁸⁷Prior, "Imagery as a Test of Authorship," Shakespeare Quarterly VI (1955), 381-386; and The Language of Tragedy (New York, 1947).

⁸⁸RBPH, XXIX (1951), 112-128.

⁸⁹For additional references to Shakespearean imagery, cf. B. Ifor Evans, The Language of Shakespeare's Plays (London, 1952); Lionel Charles Knights, Further Explorations (Stanford, 1965); B. E. Dayton, Animal

Kernan's attention to Henry VI is, unfortunately, rare in the development of Shakespearean imagery criticism. With the exception of occasional passages in general studies, there has been little attempt to explore the rich world of imagery in the Henry VI trilogy. Wells calls the imagery in Henry VI "startling yet comparatively conventional";⁹⁰ Kolbe ignores the plays entirely;⁹¹ Miss Spurgeon observes the recurrent garden metaphor in Henry VI; Knight dips only into the images pertaining to the tempest-music conflict; and Clemen finds imagery in the plays to be merely "embroidery,"⁹² a point with which several other critics concur. The scant attention that has been given to the

Similes and Metaphors in Shakespeare's Plays (DD, U. of Washington, 1937); Raymond J. Darius, The Coherence of Metaphor in Shakespeare's English History Plays (DD, Harvard, 1951); Una Ellis-Fermor, "Shakespeare and His World: The Poet's Imagery," The Listener, XVII (July 28, 1949), 157-158; Carl Fehrman, "The Study of Shakespeare's Imagery," Moderna Språk, LI (Stockholm, 1957), 7-20; J. Isaacs, "Shakespeare's Imagery," TLS (Sept. 12, 1936), 729; Sister Miriam Joseph, Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language (New York, 1947); Ishmu Nurooka, "Poetic Images in the Elizabethan Period," Bunka, XX, no. 3 (Tohoku U., Sendai, 1956); Toshiko Oyama, A Study of Shakespeare's Imagery (Tokyo, 1953); Boris Pasternak, "Shakespeare's Imagery and Rhythm," tr. Peter Meadows, Arena, I (1950), 33-37; Herman Pongs, Das Bild in der Dichtung (Marburg, 1927); Hereward T. Price, "Shakespeare's Imagery," Michigan Alumnus Quarterly Review, L (1944), 207-220; Balachandra Rajan, "Similes and Metaphors in Shakespeare," Paradise Lost and the Seventeenth-Century Reader (London, 1947), pp. 118-121; John Crowe Ransom, "Shakespeare at Sonnets," The World's Body (New York, 1938), pp. 270-303; Gladys D. Willcock, "Language and Poetry in Shakespeare's Early Plays," Proceedings of the British Academy, XL (1954), 103-117; D. A. Traversi, Approach to Shakespeare (London, 1938), ch. 1.

⁹⁰Wells, p. 224.

⁹¹Kolbe joins those critics who feel that Shakespeare did not write the Henry VI plays but "merely touched [them] up" (p. 54).

⁹²Clemen, p. 40.

subject has usually been cursory, merely pointing out a few of the major image patterns, or condemnatory, finding the plays of so little intrinsic value that their imagery need be noted only if it relates to subsequent plays. Without question the great plays of Shakespeare's maturity do merit the most intensive investigation and any foreshadowing of their greatness should be studied carefully; nonetheless, the early dramas are in themselves fruitful areas for examination. Certainly the three Henry VI plays are important because they are Shakespeare's first dramatic efforts⁹³ and contain promise of later achievements, but, as the present author hopes to illustrate, they need not be regarded simply as precursors in order to justify their examination. The Henry VI trilogy is itself rich in colorful action and language and offers many possibilities to the student of imagery and its effects.

⁹³Apparently the only statement with which all critics can agree is that the Henry VI trilogy is Shakespeare's first dramatic effort. The question of dating, order of composition, and multiple authorship are still subject to some debate. The only text of I Henry VI is the First Folio (1623), while II and III Henry VI appear in the First Folio and in Quarto versions: The First Part of the Contention Between York and Lancaster (1594), and the True Tragedie of Richard Duke of York (1595). In 1734 Theobald challenged Shakespeare's authorship, and the view, originated by Edmund Malone, became traditional that the Contention and True Tragedie are source plays from which Marlowe, Peele, or Greene wrote Henry VI, which was then revised by Shakespeare. (Cf. Edmund Malone, "Dissertation on the Three Parts of Henry VI," The Plays and Poems of Shakespeare, XVIII (London, 1821), 557-597). C. F. Tucker Brooke, Jane Lee, and Dover Wilson generally follow this traditional theory. (Cf. J. Dover Wilson, "Malone and the Upstart Crow," Shakespeare Survey, 4 (1951), 56-58; C. F. Tucker Brooke, "The Authorship of the Second and Third Parts of King Henry VI," Trans. Connecticut Acad. of Arts and Sciences, XVII (1912), 141-211; Jane Lee, "On the Authorship of the Second and Third Parts of Henry VI and Their Originals," Trans. New Sh. Soc. (1875-6), 219-279; C. T. Prouty, The Contention and Shakespeare's '2 Henry VI', 1954). But a more recent theory propounded by Peter Alexander, and now

In addition, it should be remembered that Shakespeare's legacy to art is not a single play or group of plays but over thirty dramas--the entire Shakespeare canon. Henry VI and Hamlet and The Tempest are all products of one great mind and the critical beam which is directed on one play thus sheds light on other plays as well. If one learns that Shakespeare uses a particular vehicle--for example, storm images--in a particular manner in one play, then he is more apt to recognize and appreciate a kindred appearance and usage in another play; thus, a study of Henry VI can conceivably be useful in approaching Hamlet, or Macbeth, or any of the more mature dramas of Shakespeare.

widely accepted by Courthope, Hereward Price, Ribner, Sen Gupta and others, is that all three Henry VI plays are the work of Shakespeare alone. (Cf. Survey of the authorship problem in Irving Ribner, The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare (Princeton, 1957), pp. 93-95, and Andrew S. Cairncross, ed., The First Part of King Henry VI (London, 1962), pp. xiv-xxviii). However, even if one grants that all plays are the work of Shakespeare alone, the questions of when and in what order he wrote them are still unsolved. The critics with the most adherents are Peter Alexander and Madeline Doran, who believe that the Contention and True Tragedie are 'bad quartos' of the Folio text. (Cf. Ribner, *Ibid.*; Madeline Doran, Henry VI, Parts II and III (University of Iowa Humanistic Studies, 1928). But even within this general agreement there is controversy: R. B. McKerrow, in "A Note on Henry VI, Part II and The Contention of York and Lancaster," *RES*, IX (1933), 157-169, argues that although the Contention is based on the Folio text, there was authorial revision between the two. (Cf. John E. Jordon, "The Reporter of Henry VI, Part 2," *PMLA*, 64 (1949), 1089-1113, for an analysis of which minor character might have done the reporting for the Folio text). Opposing the Alexander-Doran camp are C. F. Tucker Brooke and his followers, who assert that there is a lost text from which the Contention, the True Tragedie and the Folio texts of Henry VI all come separately or independently. (Cf. Clayton Alvis Greer, "The York and Lancaster Quarto-Folio Sequence," *PMLA*, 48 (1933), 655-704; C. F. Denny, "The Sources of I Henry IV as an Indication of Revision," *PQ*, XVI (1937), 225-248). In addition to the Quarto-Folio sequence controversy, the question of where Part I fits into the chronology is unsettled: many critics join Dover Wilson in believing Part I to have been written after Parts II and III

In an effort to rectify previous critical neglect, the present author hopes to explore the world of imagery in I, II, and III Henry IV. Prior scholarly theories, especially those of Downer, Foakes, and Charney, will be extremely influential but somewhat modified, as the statement of approach in Part II will indicate. Hopefully, this approach to the trilogy through its imagery will give additional insights into an important aspect of Shakespeare's style and, more significantly, will evolve a new appreciation of Shakespeare's overall dramatic and poetic impact on his first plays.

II. APPROACH AND METHOD

The question of what constitutes 'imagery' is an especially complex one. The more eager one becomes to establish clear cut lines of limitation, the more protean and nebulous the mass becomes in turn. As the seeker pursues the meaning of 'imagery' into the depths of its semantics, he may be somewhat dismayed to realize that his search for an ever narrower and more specific delineation leads, paradoxically, to the broadest and most general basic truths. In his eagerness to

(Chambers dates II and III in 1591 and I in 1592), while others follow Alexander in accepting the composition order as identical with the trilogy's chronology (Cairncross says the plays were written I, II, and III in 1590). Amid this critical tangle of theories and counter-theories a few statements about the present study's position are necessary: the Henry VI trilogy will be regarded as the work of Shakespeare (whether others had a hand or not, the fact remains that Shakespeare either wrote or revised the entire trilogy); the Contention and The True Tragedie will be considered reported versions of the Folio text, and as such will be cited when relevant to the point under discussion, and the three plays will be treated as though composed in chronological order, *i.e.*, Part I being written before Parts II and III.

understand the meaning of a single word, he stumbles near, as Murry aptly phrases it, "the genesis of thought"⁹⁴ itself.

For many seekers--Spurgeon, for example--the definition is deceptively easy: imagery is simile and metaphor. These tropes, familiar to poet and critic alike since classical Greece, are tidily explained in any sophomore literature text or reader's guide to poetry. According to Thrall, Hibbard, and Holman's handbook, a simile is

A figure of speech in which a similarity between two objects is directly expressed, as in Milton's

A dungeon horrible, on all sides round,
As one great furnace flamed;

Here the comparison between the dungeon (Hell) and the great furnace is directly expressed in the as which labels the comparison a simile. Most similes are introduced by as or like. In the illustration above, the similarity between Hell (the dungeon) and the furnace is based on the great heat of the two. So it is essentially with this figure of speech: the comparison of two things essentially unlike, on the basis of a resemblance in one aspect, forms a simile.⁹⁵

After simile is thus established as "an explicit comparison between two things of a different kind or quality,"⁹⁶ metaphor may then be neatly summarized as an "implied comparison"⁹⁷ or a "compressed simile."⁹⁸

⁹⁴J. Middleton Murry, "Metaphor," J. Middleton Murry: Selected Criticism 1916-1957. Richard Rees, ed. (London, 1960), p. 65.

⁹⁵William Flint Thrall and Addison Hibbard, A Handbook to Literature. Revised by C. Hugh Holman. (New York, 1960), p. 460.

⁹⁶John C. Hodges with Mary E. Whitten, Harbrace Handbook (New York, 1962), p. 238.

⁹⁷Ibid.

⁹⁸Caroline F. E. Spurgeon, Shakespeare's Imagery, and What It Tells Us (New York, 1935), p. 5.

Milton's simile might be stated metaphorically:⁹⁹ the dungeon was a flaming furnace.

The traditional meaning of metaphor (from Greek ~~meta~~ *μεταφerein* meaning 'to carry across') derives from Aristotle who wrote in the Poetics: "Metaphor is the transference of a name [from that which it usually denotes] to some other object."¹⁰⁰ Subsequent commentators from Quintilian to the authors of modern grammar handbooks, have accepted Aristotle's basic concept of a metaphor as "an intuitive perception of the similarity of dissimilars."¹⁰¹ J. Middleton Murry, for instance, understands metaphor to be "the means by which the less familiar is assimilated to the more familiar, the unknown to the known: it 'gives to airy nothing a local habitation and a name,' so that it ceases to be airy nothing."¹⁰²

Although Aristotle's view is in its essentials unchanged by modern criticism, part of the long-cherished trappings of metaphor have fallen into disfavor. Since the turn of the century, the work of numerous psychologists¹⁰³ and literary scholars has effectively discredited the notion that metaphor is "a grace or ornament or added power of language."¹⁰⁴

⁹⁹Since metaphor and simile are essentially alike, the following discussion of the nature and origin of metaphor should be considered applicable to the simile as well.

¹⁰⁰Philip Wheelwright, "Semantics and Ontology," Metaphor and Symbol, Lionel Charles Knights and Basil Cottle, eds. (London, 1960), p. 5.

¹⁰¹Ibid. ¹⁰²Murry, p. 66. ¹⁰³Cf. Chapter I, Part I, fn. 2.

¹⁰⁴I. A. Richards, The Philosophy of Rhetoric (London, 1936), p. 90.

Since the time of Aristotle, who felt that for a poet "the greatest thing by far is to have a command of metaphor,"¹⁰⁵ metaphoric language has been regarded as the special idiom of poetry; however, modern critics of literature and semantics have increasingly come to recognize the essentially metaphoric nature of all language. They have come to understand that, as Owen Barfield says, "every modern language . . . is apparently nothing, from beginning to end, but an unconscionable tissue of dead, or petrified, metaphors,"¹⁰⁶ or, as Murry states, "the most part of language is composed" of a "countless host of dead or dormant metaphors."¹⁰⁷ Likewise, I. A. Richards, whose Philosophy of Rhetoric (1936)¹⁰⁸ should join Murry's "Metaphor" in heading the list of required reading for the student of imagery, declares metaphor to be "the omnipresent principle of language."¹⁰⁹ If Barfield, Murry, and Richards are indeed correct, then certain 'how and why' queries are inescapable. Realization of metaphor as the essence of language leads inevitably to such questions: how do metaphors come into existence? and how do they die? "how can we account for the plethora of words now of current coinage which, upon etymological inspection, prove to be the worn-out husks of what were once full-blown metaphors?"¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁵Ibid., p. 89.

¹⁰⁶Owen Barfield, Poetic Diction (London, 1928), p. 63.

¹⁰⁷Murry, p. 66. ¹⁰⁸London. ¹⁰⁹Richards, p. 92.

¹¹⁰Norman Friedman, "Imagery: From Sensation to Symbol," Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, XII (1953), 27.

Basically, two explanations are given.¹¹¹ Max Mueller's pioneer work in the relationship of language and metaphor produced the conclusion that, during the early stages of language development, primitive man's growing mental capacities out-paced his vocabulary and he was forced to press "existing words for concrete things into service to do duty as vehicles for new, abstract meanings."¹¹² Thus we have the word 'spirit' deriving from the Latin root spiritus which originally meant 'wind' or 'breath.' Mueller's theory, which would have early man putting old concrete words to new more abstract use as the need arises, has been generally adapted by the more recent work of Gertrude Buck and her followers. Miss Buck's study of metaphor and language led her to revise Mueller's premise into the now widely accepted theory that "metaphors arise, not from any perception of difference between existing words and new concepts, but rather from a lack of discrimination thereof."¹¹³ In his morning hour, man thus called his inner essence 'spirit' because he perceived his soul and his breath as identical. The differentiation between the two is made by modern man, not by primitive man. The so-called 'dead' metaphor which forms much of language may, thus, appear to originate in the juxtaposition of two dissimilar things, but in actuality it owes its existence to the essential similarities of the two, a similarity perhaps only dimly perceived but

¹¹¹Cf. Friedman, pp. 25-37, for a good examination of the various critical theories concerning the origin of metaphor.

¹¹²Ibid., p. 27. ¹¹³Ibid., p. 28.

nonetheless real. Miss Spurgeon may indeed be correct that somewhere in analogy, in metaphor, lies "the very secret of the universe."¹¹⁴

This origin of metaphor as the basis of language "in the more primitive undifferentiated levels of our consciousness"¹¹⁵ accounts for much of the deep and often unexplainable appeal of living poetic metaphor in great literature, for a metaphor's touch can vibrate the inmost chords of our being. Our response is intense because the author has, as Edward Armstrong says of Shakespeare, energized "relationships hitherto only dimly apprehended which satisfy profound and universal emotional demands."¹¹⁶ This is not to say, however, that a poetic metaphor simply rediscovers some distantly recalled kinship between two objects; rather a metaphor is somewhat Hegelian in nature: the interaction of two components produces a result which is at the same time like and unlike its part. Great poetic metaphors are fertile; for example, the metaphor "Man is a reed" forces us not only to consider the properties common to both man and reed but also to re-evaluate the nature of manhood and reedhood.¹¹⁷ In this way the "truly creative" metaphor, writes Murry, "marks an advance, for the writer who perceives

¹¹⁴Caroline F. E. Spurgeon, Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us (New York, 1935), p. 6.

¹¹⁵Friedman, p. 28.

¹¹⁶Edward A. Armstrong, Shakespeare's Imagination (London, 1946), p. 127.

¹¹⁷Cf. Balachandra Rajan, "Similes and Metaphors in Shakespeare," Paradise Lost and the Seventeenth-Century Reader (London, 1947), pp. 118-121.

and the reader who receives it in the conquest of some reality."¹¹⁸ Through this mode of apprehension, author and reader alike reach into the recesses of their common identity as human beings and approach the meaning of life itself. The highest function of metaphor, in Murry's words, is "to define [the] indefinable."¹¹⁹ A study of the nature of metaphor thus lures its pursuer far beyond the quick poetic definitions --"compressed simile," or "implied comparison"--into labyrinthine mazes of the psychology of language and thought, and ultimately into metaphysical considerations of the meaning of the universe.

Such temptations to explore the essence of metaphor, living and dead, lead outside the boundaries of this study, however, and more than the previous short steps must be resisted. Caroline Spurgeon well understands the problem: "One could easily devote a volume to arriving at a definition of . . . what metaphor is and the philosophy which lies behind it."¹²⁰ Therefore, for the sake of economy and clarity, attention must be recalled to the original problem, that of defining imagery, but with the admonition--or confession--that an attempt to understand metaphor inevitably involves vague yet vital concepts: analogy, language, thought, meaning, and even life itself. To keep this mass from wriggling completely out of control, let us here agree that the traditional view of poetic metaphor (Aristotle's "intuitive perception of the similarity of dissimilars")¹²¹ as explained by J. Middleton Murry

¹¹⁸Murry, p. 67. ¹¹⁹Ibid., p. 70.

¹²⁰Spurgeon, p. 6. ¹²¹Wheelwright, p. 5.

and refined by I. A. Richards, will be accepted as the starting point of our definition of imagery. Richards extends metaphor

to cover all cases where a word, in Johnson's phrase, 'gives us two ideas for one,' where we compound different uses of the word into one, and speak of something as though it were another.¹²²

Richards insists on several crucial points in the study of metaphor:

(1) the image in a metaphor need not be, as many have mistakenly thought, visual, for it may be tactile, olfactory, or gustatory; (2) prose and poetic metaphors serve different ends and operate differently; and (3) to understand the effectiveness of a metaphor its two components must be recognized and their relationship revealed. This last point stimulates Richards to the development of two exceedingly useful terms, which will be adopted by the present study: 'vehicle' for the thing imagized and 'tenor' for the idea or thing signified via the image.¹²³ Richards illustrates his division of metaphor with Denham's lines:

O could I flow like thee, and make thy stream
My great example, as it is my theme!
Though deep, yet clear, though gentle, yet not dull,
Strong without rage, without ore-flowing full.¹²⁴

The vehicle in Denham's figure is the actual river Thames, and the tenor is the flow of the poet's mind. The total metaphor, that is, vehicle plus tenor, results in a meaning, insists Richards, "which is not to be

¹²²Richards, p. 116.

¹²³R. A. Foakes' terms 'subject matter' and 'object matter' represent the same concept as Richards' 'vehicle' and 'tenor' but, somewhat arbitrarily, this study will employ Richards'.

¹²⁴Quoted by Richards, p. 115.

taken as equivalent to the tenor alone, but which rather emerges from the interaction of both."¹²⁵

Richards' total metaphor, then, may be considered the cornerstone of imagery in poetic drama, but the concept of 'dramatic imagery,' as used in the present study, includes much more than this figurative language. Too many previous studies of imagery in Shakespeare's plays have been content to examine the metaphors and similes of a play as if they were self-contained oddities of language without kith or kin. And, frequently, as was the case with Miss Spurgeon, only the vehicle of a metaphor has received inspection, with the result being a sterile tabulation¹²⁶ of so many animal metaphors in Act I and so many sea images in Act II. Even the more penetrating critics, such as Clemen and Brooks, who reveal much about the vital relationship between imagery and theme have still limited their idea of imagery to figures of speech and so-called 'iterative' words, e.g., blood in Macbeth or disease in Hamlet. As the interest in Shakespearean imagery study has grown, as Part I has indicated, so has the awareness of the vital thematic functions of metaphoric language with the other parts of drama. And the definition of 'dramatic imagery' has had to be gradually extended far beyond the traditional idea of 'poetic imagery,' i.e., metaphor and simile.

Two of the most articulate pleas for a more comprehensive understanding of imagery in drama as distinguished from imagery in poetry

¹²⁵Quoted by Friedman, p. 30.

¹²⁶For example, cf. Emma Phipson, "The Natural History Similes in Henry VI," New Sh. Soc. Trans. 1877-9, pp. 354-385.

are made by Alan A. Downer and R. A. Foakes.¹²⁷ Both Foakes and Downer reassert the little emphasized point that metaphoric language functions differently in drama and in poetry: metaphors and similes in a Shakespearean play should not be regarded in the same light as those in the sonnets or The Rape of Lucrece. Downer urges the critics of Shakespeare as a poet and critics of Shakespeare as a dramatist to join forces instead of trying to ignore each other's camp, for he was a dramatic poet and must be studied as such. His plays are not merely long poems but rather poetic dramas, and they are full of dramatic imagery, whose unique nature as distinguished from poetic imagery should be established and constantly borne in mind.

The distinctive nature of poetic drama is summarized with perception by Downer: poetic drama is

a unique form of expression in that it employs living actors to tell its story; its other aspects--setting, characters, dialogue, action and theme--it shares with other forms of communication. But the fact that the dramatist is not dealing with characters merely, but with three-dimensional persons is paralleled by the fact that he is not dealing with a setting verbally described but three-dimensionally realized, with action that actually occurs in time and space, with dialogue which is spoken by human voices for the human ear. . . . One of the very real problems of the dramatist is just this, that he unlike the poet, must deal with the thingness of things; to him a mossy stone must be a mossy stone and a ship tossed on an ocean a ship tossed on an ocean, not a synonym for peace or turmoil. But the point is, surely, that for the poetic dramatist the stone is more

¹²⁷ Alan S. Downer, "The Life of Our Design: The Functions of Imagery in the Poetic Drama," Hudson Review, II (1949), 242-263. R. A. Foakes, "Suggestions for a New Approach to Shakespeare's Imagery," Shakespeare Survey, 5 (1952), 81-92.

than a stone without ever losing its stoniness, and the tempest may be a highly symbolic one without losing its reality.¹²⁸

Thus, Downer believes, in "the higher drama" a physical object or an individual action carries more than its single burden, for it is transmuted "into a symbol, gaining richer meaning without expression."¹²⁹

In turn, the dramatic symbol is linked to the "poetic image, intensifying the unity of the work, and gaining still greater richness without greater bulk, compression being the ever-present necessity of the form."¹³⁰

In an effective poetic drama, the verbal imagery of its poetry is realized and made visual in dramatic terms; for example, the blinding of Gloucester in King Lear is the dramatization of the blindness imagery throughout the play "which makes the meaning of the play evident."¹³¹

In short, the major characteristic of poetic drama is "imagery in action."¹³²

Downer's study of the interdependence of verbal imagery, "the language of poetry," and the dramatic devices, "the language of props, the language of setting, and the language of action,"¹³³ is much like Foakes' insistence that a new approach to dramatic imagery must be developed which takes cognizance of the intimate relationship between poetic imagery and the many other aspects of the play sharing its functions. In drama, the function of poetic imagery long noted by Clemen, Ellis-Fermor, and others are several: to reveal relationships

¹²⁸Downer, p. 243. ¹²⁹Ibid. ¹³⁰Ibid. ¹³¹Ibid., p. 257.

¹³²Ibid., p. 246. ¹³³Ibid., p. 258.

between the world of the play and the outside world, to knit together the plot by iteration, to underscore the dominant mood, to characterize, and to reinforce theme. These functions are, of course, not performed exclusively by poetic imagery; they are "shared by many other factors, the most notable perhaps being direct visual or auditory imagery provided by property or stage effect, for instance, the repeated display and talk of gold in Timon of Athens, of the repeated knocking in Macbeth."¹³⁴ According to Foakes, the other elements of drama sharing the function of poetic imagery are iterative words, historical and geographical setting, description and proper names. All of these elements, which share the same functions, Foakes asserts, should be considered together, not as isolated strands, for they constitute 'dramatic imagery.'

Notable by its near absence in Foakes' approach to dramatic imagery is Downer's emphasis on action itself being partner to poetic imagery. In effective poetic drama the plot and action, that is, actual movements and stage positions of actors, are closely linked to the poetic imagery and therefore should be considered part of dramatic imagery. Downer's illustrative examples include the stage positions of the fight scenes in I Henry IV, which become symbolic partners to the plays' poetic imagery. Maurice Charney,¹³⁵ whose Shakespeare's Roman Plays

¹³⁴Ibid., p. 8.

¹³⁵Maurice Charney, Shakespeare's Roman Plays: The Function of Imagery in the Drama (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1961).

embodies much that Downer and Foakes hope to find in dramatic imagery studies, illustrates this mutual reinforcing of action and poetic imagery, or, to use his terms, "verbal image" and "stage image," with Act V, scene ii, of Antony and Cleopatra:

Throughout the play the serpent image has suggested evil and death, but the serpent that Cleopatra now uses [to commit suicide] becomes a presentational image of life, or a kind of life-in-death, as she asks triumphantly: 'Dost thou not see my baby at my breast, / That sucks the nurse asleep?'¹³⁶

The serpent of the poetic imagery thus reaches its visualization in the stage image, in the actual presentation of Cleopatra holding an asp to her bosom. Poetic image is thereby realized in stage presentation. The important point to understand here is that each half of the image--verbal and presentational--strengthens the other: without the poetic imagery Cleopatra's action lacks much of its significance and depth, and without the stage image the verbal serpent imagery has no fulfillment, no culmination of meaning. Reinforcement of poetic imagery and presentational imagery is mutual.

With Charney's inclusion of such "presentational images"¹³⁷ as part of dramatic imagery, we have come a long way from Miss Spurgeon's "little word-pictures" but it is a fruitful journey. This gradually expanding critical approach to imagery in poetic drama seems to encroach increasingly upon every known dramatic device in existence; no element of the play escapes being tagged as part of imagery by someone. But this is precisely the point to be made. As the Downer-Foakes-Charney

¹³⁶Ibid., p. 8. ¹³⁷Ibid., p. 7.

method so rightly insists, poetic imagery in drama cannot be extracted from the direct imagery of description, props, setting, and action. What must be kept in mind is that not only does each part relate to the whole, but that also, and perhaps more significantly, each part relates to the other parts. So intimately do these elements of poetic drama support each other in successful poetic drama that the removal of any part would greatly cripple the remainder, thereby reducing the clarity or significance of the whole. Clearly, when one begins to pick the poetic imagery running through a play, he soon finds it strangely magnetized for it attracts more and more adherents. The effort to define 'dramatic imagery' with specific limits leads instead to the widest possible delineation.

'Dramatic imagery,' as this study will employ the term, may be understood, then, to be an exceedingly flexible term, capable of being stretched to cover almost any dramatic device. Dramatic imagery encompasses the traditional concept of poetic imagery, i.e., metaphor and simile, iterative words, names, allusion and direct reference, direct visual and auditory imagery, props, setting, and even stage positions, action and plot. In short, any dramatic device, whatever it may be, which functions in mutual reinforcement with poetic imagery should be considered as part of dramatic imagery in a play. Accordingly, to make an effective study of the dramatic imagery in a given play, the critic should recognize and probe this intimate interplay of all dramatic elements. The aim of such an analysis is obviously not a neat tabulation of metaphors and similes, but rather an understanding of how the

various imagistic aspects of drama work together to make a total statement. What will emerge, hopefully, from such an examination is a better appreciation of the author's achievements in characterization, mood, unity, and universality, and a clearer understanding of the play's theme(s). What should evolve from a study of dramatic imagery are a few answers to the essential questions of drama: what is the play about? what does it mean? what is the author trying to say? how and how well does he say it?

The purpose of the present study is to make such an intensive study of the dramatic imagery in Shakespeare's Henry VI trilogy. Using the New Arden Edition with variant readings from the so-called 'bad quartos'--The First Part of the Contention between the Two Famous Houses of York and The True Tragedie of Richard Duke of York--when pertinent, the author hopes to determine the over-all patterns in poetic imagery and their integral linkage with "primary patterns of word, idea . . . [and] the direct visual or auditory images provided by the stage and its effects."¹³⁸ As previous comments suggest, the organic nature of poetic drama prohibits the success of a study which attempts to isolate a single thread of the play; however, since some single strand has to be picked out of the play's fabric first, the present study will, with some reluctance on the author's part, be developed according to the subjects of vehicles in the poetic imagery of the three parts of Henry VI, e.g. animal, sea, and garden. Chapter II will be devoted to Part I Henry VI, discussing first the minor images; second, anticipatory ones; and finally, major image patterns. The same order

will be followed in Chapter III, a discussion of Part II Henry VI, and Chapter IV, a discussion of Part III Henry VI. Special attention will be given in each chapter to the trilogy's three major vehicles: garden, sea, and animal. The relationship of each category of images with the other dramatic devices and the functions of this kinship will then be explored in depth in an effort to reach some conclusions, summarized in Chapter V, about the trilogy's total statement. Taking apart an aesthetic creation is justified only when the operation renders the whole more meaningful. Such is the intention of the present study.

CHAPTER II

DRAMATIC IMAGERY IN PART I HENRY VI

No one can deny that Part I Henry VI exemplifies what John Richard Green calls the "drum and trumpet history"¹ play. The noise, color, and action of two powerful fifteenth-century nations at war--England and France--fill the stage with excitement and impressive pageantry. Kings at court, soldiers in battle, armies besieging walled cities, nobles plotting intrigues, participants in royal funerals and coronations--characters of moment march on and off stage to perform deeds of national importance. Indeed, the plays are often criticized for too much marching to the drums and trumpet and too little drama. For many critics, the term "drum and trumpet history" is one of derision; they feel that Henry VI may have a certain limited appeal in its show and pageantry, but it has little to offer the spectator in the way of plot, unity, or theme. However, Henry VI's detractors--W. D. Briggs, Virgil K. Whitaker, J. B. Henneman, and others²--have increasingly been taken to task by E. M. W. Tillyard, Irving Ribner, J. P. Brockbank, H. M. V. Matthews, and J. A. R. Marriott,³ who find a consistent philosophy of

¹J. A. R. Marriott, English History in Shakespeare (London, 1918), p. 13.

²Cf. Marriott, pp. 10-16 and Irving Ribner, The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare (Princeton, 1957), p. 102.

³Cf. E. M. W. Tillyard, Shakespeare's History Plays (New York, 1946); J. B. Henneman, "The Episodes in Shakespeare's I Henry VI,"

history rendered in dramatic terms in the trilogy. They find the plays far more sophisticated than the "series of inexplicable catastrophic processes"⁴ which Briggs would have one believe is Henry VI; instead, through careful plot development and manipulation of other dramatic elements, Shakespeare presents a cogent statement about man in war. For Shakespeare, as for his fellow Elizabethans who fervently adhered to the 'Tudor myth,'⁵ there was a frightening lesson to be learned from the bloody Wars of the Roses, a lesson which must be learned lest England be swept once again by dynastic conflict. Shakespeare's Henry VI effectively and graphically presents that lesson of history.

Much of Henry VI's statement of history can be demonstrated through an analysis of the verbal imagery as it interacts with other elements of the trilogy to form the dramatic imagery. If one can resist all inclinations to fall into such well-worn critical ruts as "They're the dramatist's first plays, so they're bound to be pretty crude," or "They're full of spectacle, so they can't have much else," and thereby

PMLA, XV (1900), 290-320; Irving Ribner, The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare (Princeton, 1957); J. P. Brockbank, "The Frame of Disorder--Henry VI," Stratford-on-Avon Studies 3, 1961; H. M. V. Matthews, Character and Symbol in Shakespeare's Plays (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1962); J. A. R. Marriott, English History in Shakespeare (London, 1918).

⁴Ribner, p. 102.

⁵The 'Tudor myth' was the orthodox Elizabethan view of history: England suffered the Wars of the Roses because Bolingbroke defied divine order by removing Richard II from the throne and divine order was restored to the nation by Henry Tudor's defeat of Richard III in 1485. For good discussions of Shakespeare and the Tudor myth, Cf. Ribner, pp. 103-106; S. C. Sen Gupta, Shakespeare's Historical Plays (Oxford, 1964), pp. 7-24.

make a fresh approach to the plays, the results may be rather startling. Certainly no one of discernment would then want to push Hamlet or King Lear out of the anthologies and propose Henry VI as the long-neglected masterpiece of Shakespeare; nonetheless, an unprejudiced examination of the trilogy's imagery and its relationships to other dramatic aspects does elicit a healthy regard for Shakespeare's more than substantial achievements in Henry VI. Instead of the formless gallimaufrey of battles which Briggs would have one believe is all there is to Henry VI, we find that the trilogy does have plot, unity, coherence, and a carefully developed theme. In short, the trilogy does 'say something' and, in many passages, says it exceedingly well.

A chronological analysis of the dramatic imagery, i.e., verbal poetic images as they relate to the rest of the play's elements, in each part of the trilogy discovers much of exactly what Shakespeare has to say and how well he says it. In addition to showing the function of imagery in each drama as an independent unit, such a play-by-play examination allows any pattern of development or changes in use of imagery through the trilogy to reveal itself.

The subject matter of Henry VI is the last phase of the Hundred Years' War between England and France and the English Wars of the Roses from the beginning to near their conclusion. The time spans from Henry V's funeral in 1422 to the Battle of Tewkesbury in 1471, with many events and characters telescoped for dramatic effect.⁶ Part I deals

⁶Cf. Andrew S. Cairncross, ed., The First Part of King Henry VI. Arden Edition (London, 1962), Introduction.

with the gradual loss of English territory and power in France and the infancy of the intercourt conflict which will grow into civil war of Lancastrians vs. Yorkists in Parts II and III. Part II shows the quarreling nobles mowing down the last opposition to their squabbles. Part III depicts the see-saw Wars of the Roses with Henry VI twice losing his crown to the Yorkist Edward IV. The trilogy closes with the Lancastrians defeated and the Yorkists holding complete power, but even then the final note sounded is not one of triumph or peace. Civil war will continue beyond this trilogy, for in the final scene of Part III the deformed figure of Richard, Duke of Gloucester and later Richard III, promises more mayhem to come as he plots to over-throw his own brother, Edward IV, and seize the crown for himself. Restoration of order with the victory of Henry VII and the house of Tudor over Richard III at Bosworth Field in 1485 remains but an unseen event of the future.

Part I Henry VI bustles with lively action as it switches back and forth between London and Paris and battle fields in France with dizzy swiftness. Such rapidity of scene change accounts in some measure for its lack of production during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when the picture-frame stage and the growing insistence upon historically accurate realistic staging made performance of such a play impossible without substantial reshuffling of scenes. But with modern rediscovery of the excellences of the Elizabethan stage, whose two levels and enormous apron gave fluidity and mobility, and whose paring of the non-essentials in staging permitted deeds of vast scope, has come a new ability to perform and appreciate such a play. The modern

theatre-goer, like his Elizabethan counterpart, is quite willing to accept one tree as the Forest of Arden without actually having every leaf and branch presented on the stage. Likewise, he does not demand the emphasis on historically correct detail in costuming and staging which so encumbered Charles Kean's productions in the mid-nineteenth century. Accustomed to all sorts of theatrical experiments--theatre-in-the-round, perfectly bare stages, period plays in contemporary dress, audience participation, and even blackened stages--the modern spectator can accept and appreciate the vast action, quick movement, and fast scene-changing of Part I with an enthusiasm previously enjoyed only by the Elizabethan viewer. Like its Renaissance predecessor, a contemporary audience can readily accept a few soldiers as an entire army, one wall as an entire city, and several men fighting as a battlefield: the essentials need only be represented, not every detail literally presented on the stage. Similarly, the Restoration and eighteenth-century penchant for their version of the Aristotteleian unities of time and place holds little sway over the twentieth-century audience who is more than willing to believe the stage to be Westminster Abbey in London at one moment and the French camp in Orleans in the next.

The spectator of Part I Henry VI certainly has this flexibility put to a real test as the play unfolds. Action moves from London to Orleans, back to London, to Orleans again, to London again, to Rouen, to Paris, to Bordeaux, back to London, to Anjou, and finally concludes in London. The locale is thus wide, with scenes taking place on both sides of the channel. The pace is swift and the action vast: in the

war between England and France the cities of Orleans, Rouen, and Bordeaux are besieged and the battles for them fought on stage. The characters are people of moment and color: Henry II, King of England; the Dauphin Charles, King of France; Joan Le Pucelle, French military leader; Lord Talbot, English military commander; the Duke of Gloucester, English Lord Protector; the Duke of Bedford, English Regent of France; the Bishop of Winchester; the Dukes of Exeter, Somerset, and York; and the Earls of Warwick, Salisbury, and Suffolk, all English nobles and court leaders; Reignier and his daughter Margaret; the Dukes of Burgundy and Alencon; and the Bastard of Orleans, all French nobles and leaders. These national figures lead their countries in an international war, a conflict which marks the gradual decline of English power in France. While this war between France and England is the subject matter of Part I Henry VI, it is not, however, the play's sole concern. After all, Part I is the opening of a three-part work, and the entire Henry VI trilogy depicts the slow but deliberate dissolution of English order and unity as the nation slips into the bloody dynastic Wars of the Roses. The trilogy's purpose is to show the devastating national chaos which is, in Marriott's words, "the natural consequence" of "administrative weakness and social disintegration."⁷ In this scheme Part I serves as an introduction to the chaos and disorder which prevail in Parts II and III. Part I is about the French-English War, but at the same time it uses this struggle as a background for the beginnings

⁷Marriott, p. 18.

of social and political disintegration. The opening play of the trilogy shows the newly planted seeds of disorder which will be nurtured in Part II and harvested in Part III.

Much of this imminent disruption of order is prepared for in the opening scene of Part I, the funeral of Henry V. The scene begins the trilogy in medias res, for England and France are already at war and the nobles have already begun their disastrous quarrels. The very nature of the scene itself reinforces the idea of the continuity of history: "The king is dead. Long live the king!" The continual flux of history, with its successive waves of rises and falls, defies limitations and labels; precise beginnings and endings are difficult to pin-point in the fluid scheme of man's history: Henry VI opens with the French-English War raging and the first inter-court squabbles which will lead to civil war already begun, and it concludes with the civil war near--but not at--its end. We spectators are allowed to witness neither the birth nor the death of civil war, only its highly destructive life. National order, peace and calm lie outside the scope of this trilogy.

Act I, scene i, of Part I Henry VI is a key scene. Since it is so important as a prognostication of the approaching disorder and since it utilizes many of the vehicles in Part I's imagery in a way typical of the rest of the play, a somewhat detailed examination of it is useful as a starting point in examining the dramatic imagery of Part I. As the discussion of Act I, scene i, progresses, each new vehicle of imagery will be noted as it appears for the first time and analyzed afterward.

With its interrupted pomp and bold contrasts of mourning black, crimson blood and glittering comets, the initial scene of Part I Henry VI is a vivid one. To the sounds of a "Dead March" [s.d.] the funeral procession of Henry V enters Westminster Abbey. The attendants include the Duke of Bedford, Regent of France; Humphrey, the Duke of Gloucester and Lord Protector; the Dukes of Exeter and Somerset; the Earl of Warwick; and the Bishop of Winchester. Bedford speaks first, sounding a note of cosmic combat appropriate to the trilogy: "Hung be the heavens with black, yield day to night!" Not only is the projecting roof of the Elizabethan stage probably draped in black, as Hodges asserts was usual for tragedy,⁸ but the entire heavens above the earth are figuratively draped in mourning for the Henry's death. Against this background of deepest black, Bedford, introducing the sun/star vehicle, urges:

Comets, imparting change of times and states,
Brandish your crystal tresses in the sky,
And with them scourge the vast revolting stars,
 That have consented unto Henry's death--
 Henry the Fifth, too famous to live long!
 England ne'er lost a king of so much worth.

[2-7]

Gloucester joins the wailing chorus and picks up Bedford's images of light and introduces the animal imagery in attributing supra-human powers to Henry:

His brandish'd sword did blind men with his beams:
His arms spread wider than a dragon's wings:
His sparkling eyes, replete with wrathful fire,

⁸ Cairncross, p. 1.

More dazzled and drove back his enemies
Than mid-day sun fierce bent against their faces.
 [10-14]

Exeter, annoyed with all talk and no action, demands, "We mourn in black: why mourn we not in blood?" [17], a call for blood revenge which is constantly echoed in the trilogy. Henry is dead and instead of glorifying "death's dishonourable victory" [20] by standing "like captives bound to a triumphant car" [22] and blaming some distant "planets of mishap" [23], the English should be fighting the French who must have used magic to contrive the king's death. To Exeter's personification of Death, Winchester adds his hypocritical laments, couched in Biblical terms, for the "king bless'd of the King of kings" [28]. He fought "the battles of the Lord of Hosts" [31] and "the Church's prayers made him so prosperous" [32].

But Winchester's words provoke Gloucester's indignation and anger. And suddenly the funeral ceremony for a dead monarch is shattered by the personal animosity of two nobles attending the coffin. Introducing school boy images, Gloucester turns on Winchester:

The Church! Where is it? Had not churchmen pray'd,
 His thread of life had not so soon decay'd.
 None do you like but an effeminate prince,
 Whom like a school-boy you may overawe.
 [33-36]

In turn, Winchester snaps that Gloucester has no room to talk because his wife, Eleanor Cobham, completely controls him. The petty exchange is halted by Bedford who, in music imagery, urges the two to "cease these jars" [44] and return to the matter at hand--Henry's funeral.

Bedford directs the procession to move on to the altar and invokes the spirit of Henry V to

Prosper this realm, keep it from civil broils,
Combat with adverse planets in the heavens.
A far more glorious star thy soul will make
Than Julius Caesar or bright--

[53-56]

Bedford's fervent wish for national peace and for the king's soul to shine brightly in the heavens is rudely and significantly interrupted by a messenger with "sad tidings" from France [58] of "loss of slaughter, and discomfiture" [59]. The characters on stage and spectators in the audience are quickly made aware that Bedford's hopes for the kingdom's prosperity and peace will be dashed to the ground, for eight cities in France have been "all quite lost" [61]. They were lost because, so the soldiers say, the nobles of the court have split into several factions, each unwilling to support or aid the other: one wishes war but at little cost, another "would fly swift, but wanteth wings" [75], and another desires peace through negotiation. The messenger urges the gathered nobles to unite in sending men and money to fight the French; continuing the earlier light-dark contrasts, he cries:

Awake, awake English nobility!
 Let not sloth dim your honours new begot.
 Cropp'd are the flower-de-luces in your arms,
 of England's coat one half is cut away.

[78-81]

In responding to this exhortation Exeter also introduces a new image--the sea: "Were our tears wanting to this funeral,/ These tidings would call forth her flowing tides" [82-83].

Henry V's funeral ceremony is further interrupted by a second messenger who brings letters of the complete revolt of France and the crowning of Charles the Dauphin as king. The English nobles are understandably shocked and angry. Exeter cries: "The Dauphin crowned king! All fly to him! / O, whither shall all fly from this reproach?" [96-97]. Gloucester, introducing the bird of prey image, replies, "We will not fly but to our enemies' throats" [98]. Stung by the hint of reproach, Bedford assures Gloucester that he is completely ready to attack France, but his words are halted by yet a third messenger come "to add to your laments, / Wherewith you now bedew King Henry's hearse" [103-104]. The English leader, Lord Talbot, has been captured by the French, who, at the siege of Orleans, "round encompassed" [114] him when Sir John Falstaff, in an acting image, "play'd the coward" [131] and fled, taking his support. Talbot's men were all either "slaughter'd, or took likewise" [147].

The news prompts immediate action and the funeral is quickly forgotten. Bedford plans to leave for France with ten thousand soldiers "Whose bloody deeds shall make all Europe quake" [156]. Exeter reminds the men of their oaths to Henry to "quell the Dauphin utterly / Or bring him to obedience to your yoke" [163-164], and he leaves for Eltham to protect young King Henry VI. Gloucester leaves for the Tower of London to examine the ammunition and proclaim the new king. Left alone on the stage, the only man with no "function to attend" [173], Winchester concludes the scene and reveals his ambition for power with a sea-ship image:

But long I will not be Jack out of office.
 The king from Eltham I intend to steal,
 And sit at chiefest stern of public weal.
 [175-177]

The scene which has begun in a static chorus of somber mourning ends in decisive action and promise of far-reaching conflict in the future. Act I, scene i, opens in sadness--the king is dead, the brightness of the past day has come to an end. Yet this is, after all, in the natural order of things. The monarch, who was, as popular analogy envisioned him, a kind of sun who shone glory on his people, has ended his earthly reign and will now shine star-like in the heavens. Such an event is sad but it is simply part of the scheme of life and is to be observed with all due ceremony, pomp and ritual. To the doleful sounds of a funeral march, the members of Henry VI's court in procession enter hallowed Westminster Abbey and begin their choric laments. But it is significant that this ceremony of state, this observance of natural order, is quite unceremoniously disturbed, first by a squabble among the nobles themselves and, second, by news of disaster abroad. Order is thus disrupted first by internal strife, by the petty bickering small men fall into when the great man around whom they gathered is removed. The sequence is important: it should be carefully noted that England's encroaching evil begins from within, not from without. Not only do Gloucester and Winchester fall to childish name-calling in the middle of Henry V's funeral ceremony, but when the first messenger from France arrives, we learn that all the court has even earlier been torn by disagreements over the War with France. The nobles have not been able to

find common ground even for national defense of their position in France. Therefore, English holdings begin to crumble and three messengers bring news of French losses. Again the sequence of interruptions is important: first, the cities of Guienne, Champagne, Rheims, Rouen, Orleans, Paris, Guysors, and Poitiers are lost; then, all of France revolts and the Dauphin Charles is crowned king; and finally, Talbot and other lords are captured by the French. The fact that Talbot's capture holds the prominent place in the climactic order of news and is the final stimulus to action is significant. At first glance, the sequential order of messages seems wrong, for one would expect the rebellion of an entire nation to loom more ominously than the capture of a single military leader, yet this is not the case. In Part I Henry VI Talbot is more than an effective army commander whose name alone can bring terror to the enemy; he is the embodiment of all the ceremony, order and degree so rightly observed in the previous age of Henry V's glory and so disastrously interrupted at Henry's funeral. This is the man who later, in full "duty to [his] sovereign" [III, iv, 4], gives to Henry VI "fifty fortresses,/Twelve cities, and seven walled towns of strength,/Beside five hundred prisoners of esteem" [6-8], all claimed in England's name. Talbot staunchly maintains his proper place in the Great Chain of Being: he holds himself accountable first to God, next, to the king, and he fights selflessly to defend both. He places God, the king, and himself in their due degrees, as he kneels before Henry VI and "ascribes the glory of his conquest got/First to my God, and next unto your Grace" [11-12]. Talbot is the idea of national patriotism

rendered in flesh-and-blood terms, and, as such, he is the lone representative of the past age of Henry V when England's glory took precedence over personal aims. While the nobles allow their personal interests to widen the gaps between them and eventually to divide the entire nation, it is only Talbot who remembers that observance of degree and place is an inherent part of an ordered world and subordinates his own interest to that of his nation and his king. Therefore, when news of Talbot's capture in Act I, scene i, appears to have more prominence than the revolt of the entire French nation, the effect is deliberate. After all, a rebellion can be dealt with. Although the cost may be high in terms of men, money and blood, one nation can resubdue another on the battlefield. But Talbot's capture is quite a different matter. If Talbot, the epitome of England's moral and political order, falls, then the entire system which he embodies falls with him, and national order and unity may thus be destroyed. And, in fact, when Talbot is later killed, in Act IV, scene vi, his death does prove to be the final blow which shatters the already cracked vessel of English order and whirls its fragments into chaos. Indeed this is the point of Part I: little by little the nobles' quarrels chip away at English unity and order and with Talbot's death the last hope of preservation is gone. When Part I concludes, national order lies in bits and pieces at the characters' feet, ready to be trampled into the dirt and blood of Part II.

Some of the approaching chaos is thus foreshadowed in the opening scene of the trilogy with its funeral four times disrupted. The fact that a state ceremony is interrupted is itself revealing, for it

suggests more ominous flaws in state order and hints of still wider breaches of peace and degree in the future. Further, the nature of those interruptions indicates the nature of those approaching turmoils: petty personal quarrels will be allowed to assume national proportion, the national wealth will be drained and the kingdom will be devoured from within itself. The trilogy's opening scene is indeed a key scene, for it gives the spectator a glimpse of England's past brightness, her present dim confusion, and her future dark disasters.

In addition, Act I, scene i, is notable in its introduction of the vehicles of imagery for not only Part I, but also Parts II and III of the trilogy. This scene marks the initial appearance of several vehicles which will prove to be only minor; that is, they will appear consistently throughout the trilogy but without significant numerical or thematic value. These minor images are battle and sexual, light and dark, blood, disease, death, school-boys, and acting. Other vehicles are anticipatory; that is, they are minor in Part I but will become major images later in the trilogy; these anticipatory images are music and water. Still other vehicles introduced in Act I, scene i, are major to the play's--indeed the whole trilogy's--theme and development. These major vehicles are animals and enclosures. An examination of each of these categories--minor, anticipatory, and major--should prove revealing.

I. MINOR IMAGES

Battle and sexual. The first poetic images in Part I appear in the play's opening line: "Hung be the heavens with black, yield day

to night." In Bedford's declaration that bright day give way to dark night are a battle image and a contrast between light and dark, two images which are appropriate to the trilogy's subject and which appear throughout the three plays. In a play about war, battle images are to be expected, and Part I fulfills those expectations with over thirty passages containing metaphorical references to combat in addition to the necessary attention to actual battles at hand--the sieges of Orleans, Rouen, and Bordeaux. Bedford also indicates the vastness of these future wars: he urges day to yield to night and the glittering comets to "brandish [their] crystal tresses" [3] and "with them scourge the bad revolting stars,/That have consented unto Henry's death!" [4-5] Gloucester, picking up a key word in Bedford's speech, recalls that Henry V was so great that his "brandish'd sword did blind men with his beams" [10]. The attention to weapons continues throughout the play, as do images of battle in general. These passages of battle imagery are usually brief, usually a phrase and only three or four lines at most, and have little function beyond underscoring the actual war being waged. In general, the battle imagery is scarcely remarkable and merits little note besides the fact that it does exist⁹ and is appropriate to the play's subject--war. For example, Talbot cries that the cowardly deeds of "the treacherous Falstaff wound . . . my heart" [I, iv, 34].

⁹Cf. I, i, 1-5, 10, 20-24, 44, 46-47, 53-56, 65-67; ii, 113-116, iii, 69; iv, 34; II, i, 78-80; II, ii, 42-43; V, 107-110; III, i, 117, 137-139, ii, 1-2, 49, 50-51; iii, 78-80, IV, vi, 41-49; vii, 79-84; V, i, 11-14; iii, 153-155; v. 80-85.

However, intense emotion does provoke two battle images that are startling in their vividness. When Sir William Lucy finds the bodies of Talbot and his son with the gloating French leaders standing by, he is filled with sorrow and anger. Lucy wishes, "O, were mine eye-balls into bullets turn'd, / That I in rage might shoot them at your faces!" [IV, vii, 79-80]. The image is grotesque but that very quality could give it a certain impressiveness if spoken by a character from whom we spectators could believe such language. Unfortunately, Lucy has not shown himself to be such; instead, he has been a perceptive observer and commentator, a kind of military one-man chorus, and even his deep devotion to Talbot will not enable us to accept such a tortured, violent image from him. Although the image is incongruous to its speaker, it is, however, credible in its context, for the elaborate, ornate language of the entire scene of Talbot's death is harsh and repulsive. When Joan and her followers find the bodies of Talbot and his son, they disrespectfully jeer the "stinking and fly-blown" [IV, vii, 76] carcasses. Lucy's angry 'eyeballs into bullets' image is thus in keeping with intensity and harshness of the rest of the scene's speeches but it does not suit the nature of its speaker. As is the case with many passages of imagery in Henry VI, the language is of the play or of the scene rather than of the character.

The second vivid battle image occurs in Act III, scene iii. Joan speaks eloquently of love of country in order to persuade Burgundy, a Frenchman on the English side, to return to the French camp. He is deeply moved:

I am vanquished; these haughty words of hers
 Have batter'd me like roaring cannon-shot
And made me almost yield upon my knees.

[III, iii, 78-80]

In this instance, a startling image is quite effective, for, unlike Lucy's more tortured image, Burgundy's speech is appropriate both to the speaker and to the person spoken about. Burgundy is a hardened, experienced fighter to whom such an image might easily occur, and it is equally appropriate that Joan's words should be as militarily overwhelming as are her deeds on the battlefield.

Yet, throughout the remainder of the play, similar references to the military nature of Joan's language are curiously absent. In a play about war, one might expect many of the battle images to issue from or to surround military commanders; in this case Talbot, the English leader, or Joan, the French leader. But the language of Talbot and Joan is no more military than any other character's speech, for almost every major figure uses battle images at least once or twice, with scant pattern for either thematic development or characterization. Certainly the soldier in Act II, scene i, who uses Talbot's name as a weapon adds to the characterization of Talbot as a great fighter: a battlefield scavenger explains that he makes people flee and leave their valuables merely by shouting the name of Talbot. He says:

The cry of 'Talbot' serves me for a sword:
 For I have loaden me with many spoils,
Using no other weapon but his name.

[78-80]

The soldier's words are perhaps truer than he realizes, for Talbot, the embodiment of national unity, is indeed the Sword of England, a weapon

which the nobles unfortunately do not use expeditiously. However, this example of a battle image being used to characterize Talbot is a unique passage. No similar examples can be isolated. Instead, the spectator knows that Talbot is a great military leader in two ways: the other characters frequently say so in literal, not metaphoric, language and Talbot performs brave deeds on stage. Talbot himself infrequently uses specific battle images, but his language is appropriate to a fighter. His images are often hard, even cruel, for Talbot is capable of deep anger. When the French kill his father, Salisbury, he vows to the enemy, "Your hearts I'll stamp out with my horse's heels/And make a quagmire of your mingled brains" [I, iv, 107-108]. Talbot's images are usually full of action: when Joan wins Orleans, Talbot is weary and confused. He says, "My thoughts are whirled like a potter's wheel" [I, v, 19]. As will be discussed later, Talbot uses animal images frequently and effectively, particularly when he faces death in Act IV. And as do other characters, Talbot speaks in Biblical terms: as the English prepare to take Orleans, he says, "God is our fortress, in whose conquering name/Let us resolve to scale their flinty bulwarks" [II, i, 26-27]. While certain characteristics of Talbot's imagery--action and hardness--can be distinguished, it is difficult to locate any which dominate his speech. And most of the vehicles--Biblical and animal, for example--are used in the same way by other characters. It is difficult, therefore, to discover any dominant pattern of imagery that is uniquely Talbot's.

In contrast, the void left in Joan's metaphoric language by absence of military images is amply filled by a dominant image pattern. Like Talbot, Joan is talked about as a great fighter by the other characters and we spectators actually see her perform extraordinarily effective deeds, such as leading the French in battle or using disguise to enter Rouen. Just as Talbot is "the Scourge of France" [III, iii, 14], "their bloody scourge" [IV, ii, 16] and "the Frenchman's only scourge" [IV, vii, 77], so Joan is "the English scourge" [I, ii, 129]. As such she uses some five or six battle images; for example, she taunts ill, elderly Bedford who sits outside Rouen: "What will you do, good grey-beard? Break a lance/And run a tilt at Death within a chair?" [III, ii, 50-51]. It is Joan's initial battle image which is, however, more significant, for it also introduces the network of images which dominate her characterization. When Joan is presented to the Dauphin Charles in Act I, scene ii, he tries her in combat and is conquered in body and heart. Charles pleads, "Impatiently, I burn with the desire" [I, ii, 108]. "Let me thy servant and not sovereign be" [I, ii, 111]. Joan refuses, "I must not yield to any rites of love" [113]. From this point on, Joan is surrounded by, and she herself uses, direct and indirect images of a sexual nature. These tender-hearted critics who find Joan's debasement in her trial scene (Act V, scene iv) too sudden or too crude simply have not been paying attention to Shakespeare's careful characterization of Joan throughout the play. Joan may have been a saint from heaven to her fellow Frenchmen, but to the Renaissance Englishman she was a strumpet, a witch, and a fiend from Hell. This latter half

of her nature is consistently emphasized by the play's characters, even by the French themselves. A network of sexual or coarse language, both literal and figurative, surrounds Joan. This build-up of the vulgarity of Joan's nature begins in her first scene when she is presented to the Dauphin Charles. She tells him of her simple chaste life before being divinely chosen to lead the French armies, but she concludes her offer of leadership as if it were one of love or lust: "Thou shalt be fortunate/If thou receive me for thy warlike mate" [I, ii, 91-92]. Charles tests her valor: "In single combat thou shalt buckle with me" [95], a phrase which Eric Partridge indicates has sexual implications.¹⁰ When Joan wins the trial, Charles says he "burn[s] with . . . desire" [108] but Joan will "not yield to any rites of love" [113] until she has vanquished the enemy. Charles willingly accepts her as his military leader but praises her as the "bright star of Venus"¹¹ [I, ii, 144]. Meanwhile, Alençon and Reignier watch Charles and Joan in their close conversation and make snickering suggestions about the nature of their communication. When Reignier observes that "My lord, methinks, is very long in talk" [118], Alençon replies, "Doubtless he shrives this woman to her smock" [119]. Reignier asks, "Shall we disturb him, since he keeps no mean?" [121]. And Alençon quips, "He may mean more than we poor men

¹⁰Eric Partridge, Shakespeare's Bawdy (New York, 1960), p. 199.

¹¹Significantly, the only royal light source in I Henry VI is the late King Henry V. No light radiates from Henry VI; however, Joan is occasionally associated with light as in this passage quoted. But she is still associated with lust, for she is presented as a star of Venus, the astrological sign of love and the Greek goddess of love.

do know;/These women are shrewd tempters with their tongues" [122-123]. Although the suggestions made by Alençon and Reignier in Act I, scene ii, that Charles and Joan are lovers is not true in this instance, for Joan refuses to become Charles' paramour, an atmosphere of furtive but heated sexuality clings to Joan from her first appearance on the stage. The suggestion that her relationship with the French nobles is sexual continues throughout the play. Talbot calls her "that witch, that damn'd sorceress" [III, ii, 38] and a "high-minded strumpet" [I, v, 12]. When Burgundy asks "what's that Pucelle whom they term so pure?" [II, i, 20], Talbot replies, "A maid" [II, i, 21] but adds that small phrase which never fails to excite suspicion--"they say."

Even the French themselves have coarse epithets for Joan when they think she has failed them. When they lose Orleans to the English, Charles greets Joan with, "Is this thy cunning, thou deceitful dame?" [II, i, 50] Meanwhile the English are celebrating their victory, and Burgundy, himself a Frenchman, speaks of seeing Charles and Joan flee together:

I am sure I scar'd the Dauphin and his trull,
When arm in arm they both came swiftly running,
Like a pair of loving turtle-doves
That could not live asunder day or night.

[II, ii, 28-31]

Even the fact that Joan and Charles are together at all is highly suspicious, for it is repeatedly stated that the English attack was so unexpected that the French were "rous'd on the sudden from their drowsy beds" [II, ii, 23] and were forced to retreat in their night-shirts. It does seem a little late for Joan and Charles to be merely

planning battle tactics, especially with Charles addressing her as "sweeting" [III, ii, 21].

Joan herself frequently uses sexual or physical images quite inappropriate to an alleged saint. When she is successful in entering Rouen, she signals to her men with a burning torch the best passage into the city and says:

Behold, this is the happy wedding torch
That joineth Rouen unto her countrymen
But burning fatal to the Talbonites.
[III, ii, 26-28]

After the French enter and capture Rouen, she and the French leaders stand on the city walls, throwing down taunts to the defeated English. Talbot challenges this "railing Hecate" [64], this "foul fiend of France and hag of all despite,/Encompass'd with thy lustful paramours" [52-53] to come out and fight. Joan is untempted; she replies only, "Are ye so hot, sir?" [58], a double entendre in that question superficially refers to Talbot's hot temper but the connotation of heated passion is undeniably present. It is significant also that Joan's persuasion of Burgundy in Act III, scene iii, is couched in physical images; she urges him to remember that he is a Frenchman and that, as such, he must deplore the English devastation of his native land. Curiously enough, the play's only speech about love of country is this one given by Joan. In images of fertility, childbirth, and woman, she urges Burgundy to

Look on thy country, look on fertile France
And see the cities and the towns defac'd . . .
As looks the mother on her lowly babe
When death doth close his tender dying eyes,
See, see the pining malady of France;

Behold the wounds, the most unnatural wounds
Which thou thyself has given her woeful breast.

. . . One drop of blood drawn from thy country's bosom
 Should grieve thee more than streams of foreign gore
 [III, iii, 44-45, 47-51, 54-55]

This is not to suggest that Joan's plea is coarse, for such is assuredly not the case, but simply that it is expressed in physical terms inappropriate to a saint. Joan's speech later loses all trace of the moving eloquence she used on Burgundy and becomes repulsive and vulgar when she, Charles, Alençon, Burgundy and the Bastard find the bodies of Talbot and his son. They grudgingly praise the fighting ability of young Talbot who at one time refused to battle Joan with the words, "Young Talbot was not born/To be the pillage of a giglot [wanton] wench" [IV, vii, 40-41], but they waste precious little time in eulogizing their fallen enemies. Instead they glory in the death of the two Talbots, who, says Joan, "stinking and fly-blown lie . . . here at our feet" [76] like the rotting carcasses of some animals. When Sir William Lucy comes to ask of prisoners and the dead, Joan tells her followers to allow him to take away the Talbot's bodies: "For God's sake, let him have them; to keep them here,/They would but stink and putrify the air" [IV, vii, 89-90]. Joan's distasteful language about the body of a defeated enemy would be a breach of decorum even if spoken by a man, but spoken by a woman who is alleged to be a saint, this vulgarity is an unforgivable degradation of all the religious and military honour that she is supposed to manifest.

Joan's debasement goes a step further in Act V, scene iii, in which she openly displays her witchcraft by conjuring fiends from Hell

to aid her in battle. They appear but refuse to help her. Realizing that they must want more than their usual payment of her blood, she offers in vain to "lop a member off and give it you/In earnest of a further benefit" [V, iii, 15-16]. She next offers her body in lustful recompense [17-18] and finally even her soul [20-24]. But the fiends desert her and she knows that all is lost. York enters and captures "the devil's grace" [33], who like an "ugly witch doth bend her brows./ As if, with Circe, she would change my shape!" [34-35] Joan retorts, "chang'd to a worser shape thou canst not be" [36]. York reiterates the idea of illicit love between Joan and her king: "O, Charles the Dauphin is a proper man:/No shape but his can please your dainty eye" [37-38]. When Joan begins cursing both him and Charles, York orders: "Fell banning hag, enchantress hold thy tongue!" [42] and Joan is led away.

Thus, when Joan in her trial scene [V, iv] falls into vile epithets for the old shepherd claiming to be her father and contradicts her statement of virginity with assertions that she is with child in order to escape execution, such vulgarities and lies are in keeping with the characterization previously built up. Her degradation does not suddenly come about at her trial; rather, she simply demonstrates what a wicked creature she has constantly been throughout the play. It is not surprising that the woman who could look down on the body of fallen foe and call it "Stinking and fly-blown" would also call a shepherd claiming to be her father a "Decrepit miser! base ignoble wretch!/. . . Thou art no father nor no friend of mine" [V, iv, 7-9]. Likewise,

it is not surprising that the witch who offered her body and soul to fiends from Hell would go to any length at her trial in order to save herself. When Joan realizes that her claims of chastity and virtue will do her no good in escaping the fire, she resorts to pleading her belly. York mockingly cries, "Now heaven forfend! The holy maid with child!" [65] He suggests that "she and the Dauphin have been juggling:/ I did imagine what would be her refuge" [68-69]. When the Englishmen are unmoved by Joan's insistence of pregnancy because they would not allow a bastard by Charles to live, she suggests that the father is Alencon instead. "That notorious Machiavel" [74] is even more odious to the English, and Joan offers the name Reignier. But since he is married, his child is equally unacceptable as an excuse. York points out that there have been so many lovers she can accuse almost anyone of fathering her unborn child and he dismisses her with finality: "Strumpet, thy words condemn thy brat and thee:/Use no entreaty, for it is in vain" [84-85]. And Joan is led away to be burned at the stake for witchcraft, for being a "foul accursed minister of hell!" [93]

Thus the witch who is disgraced at her trial in Act V, scene iv, as a wanton, vile-mouthed liar does not suddenly materialize out of thin air; rather, from her initial appearance, she is carefully characterized as a vulgar witch by those around her and, as York points out, by her own words. Around the half-witch, half-miracle that is Joan La Pucelle is woven a network of dominant imagery and language which effectively characterizes her as a cheap, brassy wanton addicted to witchcraft and power. While Talbot has little characterization through

what he himself says metaphorically or what others say about him, Joan is clearly characterized by the play's imagery: the pattern of sexual and physical language--both literal and figurative--which surrounds Joan must be added to her military prowess demonstrated on stage in order to form a complete picture of this enigma who was a saint to the French and a witch to the English. The lusty, foul-mouthed Joan who strides through Part I Henry VI must have delighted her English audience, for she fulfills their every concept of her.

Light and dark. Bedford's opening line in Part I: "Hung be the heavens with black, yield day to night," introduces not only military images but also a contrast between light and dark which appears infrequently throughout the play. The contrast occurs in only twelve passages and conforms to the traditional association of light with good and life and dark with evil and death. Throughout the first scene of Part I the former glory of Henry V is spoken of in terms of light:

His sword did blind men with his beams,

 His sparkling eyes, replete with wrathful fire
More dazzled and drove back his enemies
Than mid-day sun fierce bent against their faces.
 [10, 12-14]

Now that the light of Henry V is taken from earth the nobles hope that it will shine star-like in the heavens, an idea inherited from Ovid's Metamorphosis. Bedford says, "A far more glorious star thy soul will make, / Than Julius Caesar or bright--" [55-56]. The good that Henry embodied is thus described in terms of light, while the evil approaching is seen as darkness. The first messenger brings news of the loss of

eight cities in France; he reproaches the nobles for their disunion and cries, "Let not sloth dim your honours new-begot" [79].

An important aspect of the light/dark contrast in this scene is the star/sun imagery, particularly the sun/king analogy. Since Renaissance man believed the behavior of heavenly bodies to be full of portent and even influence for man's future and since his understanding of the Great Chain of Being placed a king on earth analogous to the sun in the sky, the presence of sun/star imagery in Henry VI is scarcely surprising. And its occurrence in Part I reflects the typical Renaissance ideas of the world: in scene i, Bedford addresses the "comets, imparting changes of times and states" [2] who flash in the black night.

Brandish your crystal tresses in the sky,
And with them scourge the bad revolting stars,
 That have consented unto Henry's death!

[3-5]

And he asks the soul of Henry to protect this realm, to "combat with adverse planets in the heavens!" [54] Later in the same scene, Exeter reproaches the nobles for doing nothing besides cursing "the planets of mishap/That plotted thus our glory's overthrow" [23-24].

This emphasis on planets not only predicting future events but in some way governing them is typical of the popular concept of the universe in Shakespeare's England. Not only did the Elizabethan view of the world see a "correspondence between disorder in the heavens and civil disorder in the state,"¹² but, according to the Elizabethan world picture,

¹²E. M. W. Tillyard, The Elizabethan World Picture, (New York, 1944), p. 90.

the stars could themselves influence fate. The Elizabethans accepted the medieval belief that the stars, themselves a part of divine order, "dictated the general mutability of sublunary"¹³ realms. Although the attention to stars and comets as portents and directors is not so marked in later scenes as in scene i, it does appear again. As Talbot holds his dead father and promises revenge at Orleans, suddenly there is an alarum, thunder and lightning [I, iv, s.d. 96-97]. Talbot connects the earthly turmoil with the heavenly: "What stir is this? What tumults in the heavens? Whence cometh this alarum, and the noise?" [97-98] The earthly battles correspond to heavenly tumult.

Tillyard notes "the roi soleil . . . [as] one of the most persistent of all Elizabethan commonplaces."¹⁴ This correspondence between the sun, ruler of the heavens, and the king, ruler of the state, is made clear in scene i: Henry V, with his blinding sword and

. . . sparkling eyes, replete with wrathful fire [,]
More dazzled and drive back his enemies
Than mid-day sun fierce bent against their faces.
[12-14]

It is significant that the correspondence between the sun ruling the sky and the king ruling men is emphasized only in this one scene, only with reference to Henry V and not to Henry VI.¹⁵ Henry VI is an ineffective king, strong in saintly virtues but weak in royal action. From his entrance in Act III, scene i, onward, it is quite obvious that none of the beneficent glory that shone from Henry V will radiate from his

¹³Ibid., p. 53. ¹⁴Ibid., p. 89. ¹⁵Cf. fn. 11.

successor. What happens to the sun/king analogy as it changes in Parts II and III will be discussed in Chapters III and IV.

In addition to these rather conventional uses of the light/dark contrast, it also seems both natural and conventional as it concerns dying Mortimer in the Tower of London. His life is coming to an end and the comparison between his fading life and the fading light of a flame is appropriate. Mortimer, seated in a chair and brought onstage by his jailers, regrets his coming death. He knows that "these grey locks" are "pursuivants of Death" [II, v, 5]. Those eyes, "like lamps whose wasting oil is spent, / Wax dim, as drawing to their exigent" [8-9]. He laments his imprisonment for attempting to claim the throne from Henry IV and he regrets that his actions have stripped his family, especially his nephew Richard Plantagenet, of their rightful title and lands: "even since then hath Richard been obscur'd" [II, v, 26]. With his last "fading breath"[61] Mortimer tells the story to Richard, who promises to reclaim his family's losses. The old man dies and Richard sees his life snuffed out by ill-founded ambition: "Here lies the dusky touch of Mortimer, / Chok'd with ambition of the meaner sort" [II, v, 122-123].

While light is thus associated with life and/or goodness in several passages of Part I, it does in one or two instances have unsavory significance. Light has no more intense manifestation than fire, a force which can be destructive yet purgative. In Part I, only the destructive aspect is emphasized; the present discord which will later break out again as civil war is described as a slow-burning fire. In

Act III, scene i, after Henry VI has been unable to quell the disquiet between his nobles, Exeter soliloquizes:

This late dissension grown betwixt the peers
Burns under feigned ashes of forg'd love,
And will at last break out into a flame.

[III, i, 189-191]

This apt image may have been suggested to Shakespeare by the numerous passages in Hall's chronicle which picture the Wars of the Roses as a "greate fire."¹⁶ The nobles' quarrel, says Hall, was "a sparcle . . . like to growe to a greate flame."¹⁷ It was "such a flame, that it never wente oute, till bothe the parties with many other were consumed and slain."¹⁸ In any event, the image is appropriate to the complete devastation and hot nature of the wars but it is not reinforced by similar images in Part I, or, indeed, in the remainder of the trilogy. The image which dominates Hall's account receives but scant mention in Shakespeare's version.

Fire does play an incidental but rather interesting part in the staging of Part I. In Act III, scene ii, Joan uses disguise and trickery to enter the English-held city of Rouen. Once inside, she signals the best passage in to her waiting army outside "by thrusting out a torch from yonder tower" [III, ii, 23]. According to the Folio stage directions, "Enter Pucelle on the top, thrusting out a torch burning." She sees the flaming torch as a symbol of good for France and disaster for England:

¹⁶Quoted in Cairncross, p. 138. ¹⁷Ibid., p. 136. ¹⁸Ibid., p. 160.

Behold, this is the happy wedding torch
 That joineth Rouen unto her countrymen,
 But burning fatal to the Talbonites.

[26-28]

Her followers see the signal and take courage from the flame. Charles cries, "Now shine it like a comet of revenge,/A prophet to the fall of all our foes!" [31-32] And the French attack and capture Rouen.

But the French victory is short-lived and the happy prognostications about Joan's flaming torch prove to be highly ironic. The torch does shine as "a comet of revenge" but Charles must feel a little like Croesus of Lydia, for it portends English, not French, revenge: the English regroup their forces and recover Rouen, completely routing Joan and her army. Likewise, Joan's hope that her torch is "burning fatal to the Talbonites" proves ironic when, in Act V, she, herself, is condemned to burn at the stake for witchcraft. The death by fire she wishes upon the English becomes hers instead.

Blood, disease and death. Although the scourge of fire is not emphasized in Part I Henry VI, other familiar scourges are: the specters of death, disease and blood stalk man relentlessly. The constant reiteration of these three casts a grim shadow across the stage, a shadow which deepens with each part of the trilogy, a shadow from which there is no escape.

In Act I, scene i, Exeter first sounds the call which will echo through the trilogy: "We mourn in black: why mourn we not in blood?" [17] From this initial appearance, the word 'blood' occurs with increasing emphasis to become an important part of the slaughter imagery

which dominates Part II. In Part I Bedford promises "bloody deeds" in France [I, i, 156]; the Countess of Auvergne calls Talbot a "blood-thirsty lord" [II, iii, 33]; Plantagenet refers to his family cause as one of blood and he must be "restored to his blood" [III, i, 159-160 ff.]. Peace is "bought with blood" [IV, i, 150]; Joan pleads with Burgundy to wash away the blood from "the most unnatural wounds" [III, iii, 50] of his mother country. Talbot refers to his army as "my bloody power" [IV, ii, 8] and he is himself the "bloody scourge" [IV, ii, 16] of France, "bloody Talbot" [IV, vii, 96] who "drops bloody sweat from his war-wearied limbs" [IV, iv, 18]. The Bastard of Orleans is the first to draw blood from Talbot's son in battle and thus, says Talbot, "had the maidenhood/of [his] first fight" [IV, vi, 17-18]. But Talbot in turn sheds Orleans' "bastard blood" [IV, vi, 20], "misbegotten blood" [22]. Young Talbot's sword is "bloody" [IV, vii, 6] and he dies in a "sea of blood" [IV, vii, 14]. He is then held by dying Talbot, called by the French "the bloody nurser of his harms" [46]. "Battles are fought in a bloody day" [IV, vii, 34]. Joan offers her uncooperative fiends blood-sacrifices [V, iii] and curses Charles and York that they may "be suddenly surpris'd/By bloody hands, in sleeping on your beds!" [V, iii, 40-41], while her own "maiden blood, thus rigourously effus'd,/Will cry for vengeance at the gates of heaven" [52-53]. In the temple garden scene when Plantagenet (later Duke of York) quarrels with Somerset, they pick roses as symbols of their differences; the red rose picked by Somerset is said to be the color of blood and the thorns on both sides can draw blood. Warwick predicts that this quarrel "will drink blood

another day" [II, iv, 134]. Blood appears in the staging, when, in Act III, scene i, skirmishing serving men enter "with bloody pates" [s.d.] from a stone-throwing incident in the streets of London, as the Gloucester-Winchester quarrel moves down to the lower ranks and widens in number of participants.

Emphasis on blood in Part I seems pronounced enough, yet, as Chapters III and IV will indicate, it increases as it becomes an integral part of the trilogy's slaughter imagery. Meanwhile, death and disease images are less frequent but nonetheless increasingly important to the trilogy's atmosphere of destruction and mayhem. Death is often personified in Part I. The resultant images are some of the play's most effective in their vividness and impact. Act I, scene i, presents the first personification; Exeter dislikes the fact that the nobles are doing nothing to avenge Henry V's death: "Death's dishonourable victory/
We with our stately presence glorify,/Like captives bound to a triumphant car" [20-22]. A similar image based on man's constant fight with death appears in Talbot's address: "Triumphant Death, smear'd with captivity,/
Young Talbot's valour makes me smile at thee" [IV, vii, 3-4]. Dying Mortimer calls death "the arbitrator of despairs" [II, v, 28] and the "kind umpire of man's miseries" [29]. And Joan taunts the sick Bedford, seated in a chair, with: "What will you do, good grey-beard? Break a lance/And run a tilt at Death within a chair?" [III, ii, 50-51]. These images prompted by the nearness of death contain a spark of intensity often missing from other images. And literal attention to death appears throughout the trilogy as various characters comment upon its

inevitability. For example, Talbot gives Bedford a simple but touching tribute.

A braver soldier never couched lance,
A gentler heart did never sway in court;
But kings and mightiest potentates must die,
For that's the end of human misery.

[III, ii, 134-137]

Disease images are less frequent than death images, appearing in only five or six passages. Somewhat conventionally and appropriately, the growing court conflict is portrayed as a disease which will destroy the nation. Exeter, who, like Bedford and Lucy, often has a chorus-like monologue which summarizes the situation on stage, comments at the end of Act III, scene i: "As fester'd members rot but by degree/Till bones and flesh and sinews fall away,/So will this base and envious discord breed" [192-194]. And Joan sententiously observes, "Care is no cure, but rather corrosive/For things that are not to be remedied" [III, iii, 3-4].

School-boys. Another minor vehicle of imagery in Part I which had its first appearance in Act I, scene i, is school-boys. Gloucester's accusation that Winchester likes none "but an effeminate prince,/Whom like a school-boy . . . [he] may over-awe" [35-36] is notable primarily because it will be directed against himself in Part II--an ironic reversal of images. As will be discussed in Chapter III, Queen Margaret uses similar language to show Henry VI that he is now too mature to need Gloucester as Lord Protector. Although rude young boys appear as school-boys in no other passages in Part I, they do appear as peasant boys with

much the same effect. Twice the French are insulted with such terms: when Joan and her army refuse to leave the walls of Rouen and fight, Talbot cries: "Like peasant foot-boys do they keep the walls,/And dare not take up arms like gentlemen" [III, ii, 69-70]. And when Talbot urges his son to flee the scene of battle at Bordeaux, John is offended and says his father's words "like me to the peasant boys of France/ To be shame's scorn and subject of mischance!" [IV, vi, 48-49] Such comparisons appear in fewer than five passages in Part I and serve no function beyond embellishment of their immediate context.

Acting. Likewise, images of acting appear infrequently in Part I. From no more than five occurrences in the first play, they develop into more prominence in the two later plays. As Anne Righter points out in Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play,¹⁹ the Elizabethan world exhibited fondness for the 'world as a stage' metaphor; the play metaphors in a drama "represent moments of time which belong quite naturally to the context of the drama, and yet seem to reach out in the direction of the world beyond."²⁰ They remind the audience "that between the world and the stage there exists a complicated interplay of resemblance that is part of the perfection and nobility of the drama itself as a form."²¹ From the first, Shakespeare takes advantage of the play metaphors inherent in the nature of the English language itself--'act,' 'scene,' 'tragedy,' 'perform,' 'poet,' and 'play.' For example, in Part I

¹⁹London, 1964. ²⁰Righter, p. 75. ²¹Ibid., p. 86.

Talbot is "for his acts/So much applauded" [II, ii, 35-36]. Alençon glories in "how we have play'd the men" [I, vi, 16]. Similarly, when Plantagenet and Somerset each accuse the other's cheeks of 'counterfeiting' his roses, the characters' words suggest their latent theatrical connotation.

Anne Richter observes that the play metaphor operates "most powerfully"²² in the relationship between the player and the king: in his coronation, the ruler assumes "a kind of dramatic role, a specific part which he must interpret, but which he may not, in its fundamental respects, change."²³ At best, a king is but an imperfect substitute or embodiment of the external idea of kingship. Thus, the player who assumes a role bears a real resemblance to the ruler who assumes his kingship at a coronation and discards it at death. Although the player-king motif appears significantly later in the trilogy, particularly in the mock crowning of York [III Henry VI, I, iv], it does begin in Part I. After Henry VI has pleaded for peace between Somerset and York, Warwick muses, "the King/Prettily, methought, did play the orator" [IV, i, 174-175]. Warwick's comment carries an unsavory connotation, for to the Elizabethan mind such behavior smacked of Machiavellian deceit. It additionally indicates part of the trouble with Henry's reign, for the king should not stoop to playing an orator. His role is that of a king and it is his only role. But Henry VI fails to deliver the lines and perform the deeds called for in such a role. When he fails,

²²Ibid., p. 113. ²³Ibid.

his fellow actors in the drama of state have no cues for their own lines and the play collapses.

An important part of the acting imagery of Part I is the staging of three scenes. In Act I, scene ii, when the Bastard of Orleans presents Joan, the Dauphin tells Reignier to assume his role in order to test her ability. She immediately penetrates the little play they have devised for her and directs herself to the real Dauphin, Charles. As she presents her credentials to Charles, Reignier and Alençon watch the two in private conversation and they make suggestive remarks about the perhaps amorous nature of the talk. With the two nobles standing to one side observing and commenting upon the actions of Joan and Charles, a kind of scene within a scene is thus formed. Alençon and Reignier become spectators to the action, much like the real audience. Similar scenes appear in Act III, scene ii, when ill Bedford refuses to leave the battle for Rouen and sits "before the walls of Rouen" [91] watching the fight, and in Act III, scene iii, when Joan persuades Burgundy to return to the French side. She pleads love of country with such eloquence that Burgundy switches his loyalty. Charles, Alençon, and the Bastard watch Joan perform, and after she is successful, Alençon concludes: "Pucelle hath bravely play'd her part in this/And doth deserve a coronet of gold" [88-89]. These three scenes-within-a-scene are a representational dramatic image, in that they present the play metaphor in three-dimensional terms.

II. ANTICIPATORY IMAGES

Music and water. Music images are also infrequent in Part I, but G. Wilson Knight has demonstrated that in order to be understood properly they should be considered in relationship to the more frequent vehicle--the sea. In The Shakespearian Tempest,²⁴ Knight analyzes the order vs. disorder struggle which appears in every Shakespearean drama as a conflict between music and tempest. This music/order vs. tempest/disorder struggle is the one characteristic, according to Knight, which unifies the whole of the Shakespeare canon. The comparisons between storms in nature and storms in the body politic on one hand and harmony in music and harmony in the state are commonplace ones, but Knight's point is that the Shakespearean use of conflict between the two images is unique. Knight's excellent examination of this unifying element naturally includes examples from the Henry VI trilogy, but since his work deals with the entire expanse of Shakespearean drama, he is able only to note some of the more obvious passages. A study of all the passages of sea imagery in Henry VI and its relationship to other vehicles--music, weeping, animal, and sun--proves illuminating.

Water imagery in the trilogy includes a wide range of natural phenomena: metaphorical and literal references to seas, oceans, and any other body of water--lakes, ponds, marshes, etc.; tides and waves; shore lines and rocks; ships and boats; any activity pursued in or by water--boating, swimming, drowning, flooding, and drenching; and storms,

²⁴Oxford, 1932.

both at sea and inland, with their accompaniments--clouds, rain, dew, thunder, lightning, darkening skies, and wind. Although only a few of these vehicles appear in Part I, it is important to note their existence and function, for water imagery changes, increases, and develops through the three plays to become the dominant metaphor of Part III. It is therefore helpful in understanding the overwhelming impact of sea/storm imagery in the third play to observe its introduction in the first.

Water images are infrequent in Part I, occurring in only twenty passages. But they occur regularly throughout the play, and when they do make an appearance, it is often in a significant passage. Usually brief, they seldom involve more than one or two lines of poetry. Usually calm, they only hint of the storms and tempests to come in Parts II and III. The vehicles in Part I include tides, ships and boats, thunder, rain, dew, a quagmire, seas and water in general.

Only the opening scene of the play utilizes water imagery in more than a single passage. The image in this instance joins with an emphasis on tears and weeping, an association which Gladys D. Willcock tells us was not uncommon during the Elizabethan period.²⁵ Displaying a typical Shakespearean fondness for puns in a time of stress, the scene plays on the words 'tides' and 'tidings.' And music imagery also makes its first appearance in this scene.

When Gloucester and Winchester fall to quarreling in the middle of Henry V's funeral, Bedford tries to smooth the ruffled tempers.

²⁵Gladys D. Willcock, "Language and Poetry in Shakespeare's Early Plays," Proceedings of the British Academy, XL (London, 1954), 109.

He tells them: "Cease, cease these jars, and rest your minds in peace" [44]. He thus speaks of a dispute between the kingdom's nobles as a harsh or discordant sound, a disruption of harmony, a break in the rhythm. The harmony of state order is thus broken by quarrels, the strident noise of which annoys the ears and hearts to those loving quiet peace. Henry VI cries "O, how this discord doth afflict my soul!" [III, i, 106] And Exeter understands clearly the unfortunate situation of his land. As the rancor grows between York and Somerset, he observes: "This base and envious discord" [III, i, 194], "This jarring discord of nobility/. . . doth presage some ill event" [IV, i, 188, 197]. From the first scene of Part I we spectators hear no harmony from the stage--that belongs to the past and future. The age of Henry V enjoyed the sunshine and the harmonious order, but at his funeral and, so the first messenger tells us, even before his funeral, harsh discord has begun. Instead of harmony we hear only cacophony. The first discordant notes jar the strings in Act I and all hope of recovering the lost concord is gone by Part II.

In this context it should be noted that the staging of Part I does call for actual music, but, significantly, it is somber and without harmony. We hear "dead marches" [s.d.] at Henry's and Salisbury's funerals [I, i, and I, iv], trumpet fanfares to introduce major characters [I, ii, vi; III, i, iv; IV, i, iii; V, i, iii]. Yet here is no harmony, for the drum has no pitch and the trumpet is blaring and rasping. A French general's warning to Talbot at Bordeaux is typical of the musical atmosphere; he says that the approaching drums of the

Dauphin's army are "a warning bell,/ [which] Sings heavy music to thy timorous soul,/ And mine shall ring thy dire departure out" [IV, ii, 39-41]. Many of the sound effects in Part I are indeed "heavy music," for the only 'music' we hear is the necessary trumpetry of royal processions and the ominous drum beat of death, war, and counsels of war. No pleasant songs, no harmonious melodies--only rasping trumpet volleys and dry drum-rolls.

The harmony of state is jarred in scene i, disrupted by its opposite--disharmony, or, stated in other terms, the euphony of order and calm is destroyed by the cacophony of disorder and tempests. With the disintegration of harmony comes the advent of sea imagery which becomes increasingly destructive in nature. Although the struggle is not emphasized at first, the conflict between order/harmony vs. disorder/tempests becomes clear in Parts II and III.

In scene i, Bedford urges Gloucester and Winchester to "cease these jars" and return to the important matter at hand--Henry V's funeral. This sad ceremony, he fears, is a prologue to many

. . . wretched years,
When at their mothers' moist eyes babes shall suck,
Our isle be made a nourish of salt tears
And none but women left to wail the dead.
[48-51]

The lament is interrupted by the first messenger who brings "bad tidings . . . out of France" [58]: several cities have been lost. Exeter receives the news with heavy heart and uses a 'tide-tidings' pun: "Were our tears wanting to this funeral/ These tidings would call forth her flowing tides" [82-83]. Bedford demands action:

Me they concern; Regent I am of France;
 Give me my steeled coat; I'll fight for France.
 Away with these disgraceful wailing robes!
Wounds will I lend the French instead of eyes,
To weep their intermissive miseries.

[84-88]

Although the point is not made explicit in scene i, the attention to eyes, tears, and tides hints at a kind of underlying eternalness of recurrence. Just as tides dictate a continual return of the ocean to the shore, there is a constant pattern governing human suffering and weeping. The French endure "intermissive miseries," i.e., misery which, like the tide, may withdraw but will inevitably return to batter man's shores.

When the last of the three interruptive messengers brings word of Talbot's capture, he continues the sea metaphor, for he regrets that he must "add to your laments,/Wherewith you now bedew King Henry's hearse" [103-104]. And the last lines of the scene utilize the traditional image of the ship of state; Winchester, determined not to "be Jack out of office" [175] for long, decides: "The King from Eltham I intend to steal,/And sit at chiefest stern of public weal!" [176-177].

The sea image continues in scene ii. Charles orders Joan La Pucelle to be brought in, but in order to test her, he first swaps places with Reignier. He plans to thus "sound what skill she hath [63], that is, he wishes to probe the depths of her ability just as a sailor ascertains water depth with a line and plummet. The image may have been suggested by the word 'stern' in the previous line. Joan participates in the ship and sea imagery several lines later with one of the few lengthy sea images in the play:

Glory is like a circle in the water,
Which never ceaseth to enlarge itself
Till by broad spreading it disperse to nought,
With Henry's death the English circle ends;
Dispersed are the glories it included.
Now am I like that proud insulting ship
Which Caesar and his fortune bare at once.

[133-139]

Joan's peaceful images of an ever-increasing circle of rippling water and a ship bearing Caesar and his fortune are purely decorative devices for the passage. Likewise, Suffolk praises his beautiful captive, Margaret, with a pleasant but artificial, purely decorative water image:

As plays the sun upon the glossy streams
Twinkling another counterfeited beam,
So seems this gorgeous beauty to mine eyes.

[V, iii, 62-63]

Scattered sea images of a less pleasant nature occur casually and briefly throughout the remainder of the play. Talbot threatens the French with: "Your hearts I'll stamp out with my horse's heels/And make a quagmire of your mingled brains" [I, iv, 107-108]. Winchester tells the other nobles that Gloucester resents anyone besides himself trying to influence the king. If someone does try, "that engenders thunder in his breast/And makes him roar these accusations forth" [III, i, 39-40]. Joan asks Talbot if he is "so hot" [III, ii, 58] to fight and observes that "if Talbot do but thunder rain will follow" [59]. Talbot urges his son to leave the battle so that he may carry on the family honor; if he stays and is killed with his father, all is lost. "Folly is it," says Talbot, "To hazard all our lives in one small boat!" [IV, vi, 32-33]. The risk proves real and Talbot's son is killed in a "sea of blood" [IV, vii, 14] where he "did drench/His overmounting spirit" [15].

These images are not pleasant: they involve thunder and risks and drowning, but they are not yet really violent or evil. The metaphoric sea in Part I offers some danger, but it has not yet become the tempest-tossed chaos it will be in Part II

The last sea image of the play is probably the most significant. While the previous images have little pattern or thematic value beyond their immediate context, the last sea image foreshadows much of the tempest to come in Parts II and III. In the final scene of Part I, Henry VI tells Suffolk that his descriptions of Margaret's beauty and virtue

Do breed love's settled passion in my heart:
 And like as rigour of tempestuous gusto
Provokes the mightiest hulk against the tide,
 So am I driven by breath of her renown
Either to suffer shipwreck, or arrive
 Where I may have fruition of her love.
 [V, v, 4-9]

Significantly, this is one of the storms and passion, a strong hint of the approaching national and personal chaos which will be reflected in the violent storm images of Parts II and III.

Garden. A second important anticipatory image in Part I is the garden metaphor. Not one of the images introduced in Act I, scene i, this vehicle makes its initial appearance in Act II, scene iv, a fanciful account of the origin of the Wars of the Roses, so named because of the participants' badges. Among the several quarrels which shatter Henry VI's court in Part I is the dispute between Richard Plantagenet, later Duke of York, and the Duke of Somerset, of the Lancastrian house, which begins in this scene in the Temple Garden. Having no known

source in either historical fact or literature, the scene serves as a starting point for the devastating conflict between the houses of York, whose emblem was the white rose, and Lancaster, whose emblem was the red rose. Not until the latter portion of Part II will the Wars of the Roses break into actual battle, but the initial impetus to the conflict is given in Part I, Act II, scene iv, often noted for the most typically Shakespearean scene in Part I for its play on words and brisk repartee.

Act II, scene iv, takes place in the Temple Garden. Plantagenet and Somerset have apparently been quarreling within the Temple, one of the Inns of Court, about an unspecified point of law, and they, with their listeners--Suffolk, Warwick, Vernon and a lawyer--have moved out into the garden in order to continue the dispute in private. It is significant that the impetus and subject of the disagreement remains undisclosed: what is important here is not the rightness or wrongness of any cause, but rather the ease with which a slight dispute between two individuals can unexpectedly grow into civil war. Into a garden, obviously a pleasant place with roses in full bloom, walks a group of men, who, delighting in their intellectual prowess, divide into two opposing forces, and the conflict which almost casually separates these men comes eventually to split apart an entire nation.

Since Plantagenet and Somerset come no closer to agreement in the garden than they had inside, Richard Plantagenet urges anyone who supports him to signify thus by plucking "a white rose with me" [30] from one of the garden's bushes. In ritualistic response, Somerset asks his allies to "pluck a red rose from off this thorn with me" [33]. This

fanciful account of the original quarrel initiating the Wars of the Roses continues to be dominated by word play built around roses as each man signifies his chosen side by picking a red or white rose. Verbal wit is tossed back and forth as Somerset warns Vernon, one of Plantagenet's allies:

Prick not your finger as you pluck it off
Lest bleeding you paint the white rose red
 And fall on my side so, against your will.
 [49-51]

And Plantagenet accuses Somerset's cheeks of "counterfeiting our roses;/ For pale they look with a fear as witnessing/The truth on our side" [62-64]. When Somerset quips back that it is Plantagenet's cheeks which "blush for pure shame to counterfeit our roses" [66], Plantagenet thrusts again with, "Hath not thy rose a canker, Somerset?" [68] The verbal fencing of these nobles ends indecisively, with both the Yorkists and Lancastrians determined to be victorious. Warwick, foreseeing the vast destruction to result from this apparently small quarrel, concludes the scene with one of the numerous dire prophecies in Henry VI:

. . . this brawl to-day,
 Grown to this faction in the Temple-garden,
Shall send between the Red Rose and the White
 A thousand souls to death and deadly night.
 [124-127]

The Temple Garden scene with its ritualistic plucking of roses makes the introduction of the garden metaphor in Henry VI one of the trilogy's three major images. Like water imagery, garden images are more significant, both numerically and thematically in the two later plays than in Part I. However, garden imagery behaves unlike the sea

imagery in that it does not develop throughout the trilogy: garden imagery functions in Part I just the same as in Parts II and III. Unfortunately, discussing the garden metaphor as it appears in Part I and then adding "And the same is true of Parts II and III" robs the study of some of the most effective passages of garden imagery, and if we tried to discuss the metaphor in Part I with the intention of giving those examples in later chapters, the study would become hopelessly repetitious. Therefore, for the sake of clarity and economy, the present examination will reserve its analysis of the garden metaphor until the conclusion of Chapter III, at which point the image will be discussed as it functions throughout the trilogy as a whole.

III. MAJOR IMAGES

Animal and enclosure. The most frequent vehicle in Part I is that concerning animals. The metaphoric world of animals in Henry VI is a populous one indeed: animal images appear in more than seventy passages. In Act I, scene i, the first and third messengers, Exeter, and Gloucester all employ the vehicle of animal imagery most frequently used in Part I: birds. Others in Part I include dragons, bears, wolves, deer, lions, sheep, horses, worms, mules, mice, dogs, rabbits, oxen, bees, and fish.²⁶ Use of an animal image may be brief and seemingly

²⁶Cf. I, i, 11, 75, 95-98, 124; ii, 9-12, 21, 23-24, 27-28, 37-40, 131-137, 140-145; iii, 14, 55; II, iv, 11-18; v, 13-15, 107-110; III, i, 37-40, 65-73, 89, 189-194; ii, 75-78; iii, 5-7, 47-53; iv, 34-37; IV, v, 9-11; vii, 5-15, 35-36, 91-93; V, iii, 54-64.

casual; such is the initial occurrence of the vehicle: Gloucester's choric lament for Henry V reminds his fellow nobles that the dead monarch's "arms spread wider than a dragon's wings" [11]. Although the fantastic nature of the animal referred to is helpful in establishing the suprahuman greatness of Henry V, the image has little function beyond its own brief existence as embellishment of an idea. Similarly, animal images may occur in more lengthy passages which do little besides elaborate or decorate an idea in normal Euphuistic style with careful balance, antithesis, amplification and variation. Inheritors of the rhetorical tradition, the Elizabethans enjoyed a fondness for deliberate amplification of ideas just for the pleasure of amplification. Although Part I does not display as many such passages as do Parts II and III, the first play has several examples of expanded imagery. Typical is Warwick's refusal to referee the Plantagenet-Somerset quarrel in the Temple Garden:

Between two hawks, which flies the higher pitch;
Between two dogs, which hath the deeper mouth;
Between two blades, which bears the better temper;
Between two horses, which doth bear him best,
 Between two girls, which hath the merriest eye--
 I have perhaps some shallow spirit of judgment;
 But in these nice sharp quilllets of the law,
 --Good faith, I am no wiser than a daw.

[II, iv, 11-18]

Image is piled on image by Warwick and for the space of the speech, action is halted and the passage becomes a self-conscious, sonorous elaboration which could be deleted from the play without serious damage to either the drama or the scene. There is no development in the figure, only enumeration; one image does not modify or enlarge, but

simply rephrases another. The anaphora of Warwick's speech (i.e., each line beginning with the same word) is one of numerous devices of classical rhetoric found throughout the trilogy and is typical of much of the balanced language of the characters in Henry VI.²⁷

Owing much to Lyly's Euphues in frequency of balanced phrases, antithesis, alliteration, symmetry, parallelism, and artificial, formal patterning in general, Part I also, like Euphues, employs frequent allusions and digressions. Biblical paraphrases and classical allusions are numerous. From the first scene of the play, with Winchester's pious mouthings about Henry V as "a king bless'd of the King of kings" [28] and Bedford's hope that Henry's soul will shine brighter than Julius Caesar's, such references abound.²⁸

Wolfgang Clemen correctly labels such artificial passages as Warwick's "Between . . ." speech as "embroidery" or "imagery for imagery's sake."²⁹ The imagery does not grow spontaneously out of the dramatic situation; instead, it is deliberately inserted into the drama, tacked onto the idea by "as," "like," and "like to." More than slightly irritating to the modern reader whose taste has been trained to appreciate the terseness of a Hemingway, these ornate passages were nonetheless

²⁷Cf. Molly Maureen Mahood, Shakespeare's Word Play (London, 1957), and Sister Miriam Joseph, Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language (New York, 1947).

²⁸Cf. I, i, 28-32; ii, 29-34, 104-105, 138-139, 140-145; iii, 39-40; iv, 94-96; v, 19-26; vi, 4-7; II, v, 116-117; III, iii, 14-16; IV, vi, 54-55; vii, 60-61, 76-77, 91-93; V, iii, 187-189; v, 103-106.

²⁹Wolfgang Clemen, The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery (London, 1951), p. 220.

typical of the popular taste of the Elizabethan period, when men were coming to find real delight in language for its own sake. Certainly a man for all times, Shakespeare was nonetheless a man of his own time as well, and his early work reflects much of the popular fondness for formal and elaborate rhetoric. Henry VI draws on the conventional methods and subjects of rhetoric so extensively that Frank P. Wilson, in "Shakespeare and the Diction of Common Life," was prompted to observe: "An Elizabethan school master might have set his boys many a speech in Shakespeare's early plays as an exercise in the identification of schemes and tropes."³⁰ Critical common-places usually become such because of their validity and few have more truth than the observation that the Shakespeare canon shows a development in imagery from ornate to subtle. Imagery in Henry VI is often so ornate and elaborate that the spectator may be forgiven a slight yawn as he waits for the dramatist to finish flexing his poetic muscles.

While the ornate, artificial, formal euphuistic style characterizes many passages of animal imagery--indeed any imagery--in Henry VI, much of the imagery is not just decorative but is functional and arises not out of the author's desire to display his learning but out of the dramatic intensity of the moment. In fact, most of the images have a significant function beyond that of mere embellishment and have a relationship to the theme, characters, staging and plot. It is this development of dominant images as they interact with the other aspects of the

³⁰ Frank P. Wilson, "Shakespeare and the Diction of Common Life," Proceedings of the British Academy, XXVI (1941), 9.

drama which has real value for the student of imagery and its effects in Henry VI. Although the play's imagery offers many treasures to the student of classical rhetoric who examines each figure as a separate unit, it is another aspect of the imagery which is important to the student of poetic drama, namely, the interaction of verbal imagery with other elements of drama to develop the theme and to delineate the characters.

Of the many animal images in Part I, the most frequent are those involving birds of various kinds. Some are specifically named: a French general addresses Talbot as an "ominous and fearful owl of death" [IV, ii, 15], combining the Renaissance concept of the owl as a harbinger of doom with Talbot's destructive power as "the scourge of France." Sir William Lucy, angry at York's and Somerset's selfish refusals to aid Talbot, mutters against "the vulture of sedition" [IV, iii, 47], for the threat of civil disorder to hovering over England ready to swoop down at any moment and devour the kingdom. As Lucy later carries away the bodies of Talbot and his son for burial, he warns the French that "from their ashes shall be rear'd/A phoenix that shall make all France afeard" [IV, vii, 92-93]. One of the few functional classical allusions in Part I, this passage refers to the mythological bird supposed to die in flames and be reborn every 100 years from his own ashes. The phoenix is alluded to on several later occasions in the trilogy, such as York's threat to his captors and murderers in Part III: "My ashes, like the phoenix, may bring forth/A bird that will revenge upon you all" [I, iv, 35-36]. The latter appearance proves to be the more prophetically

accurate, for York's ashes in the form of his three sons do rise up to destroy Queen Margaret and her forces. But both occurrences may be accounted as appropriate to the trilogy in the idea of the destroyed becoming the destroyer, an ironic twist of fate which occurs several times in the trilogy's narrative.

Other birds specifically named appear in the Dauphin Charles' praise of Joan La Pucelle that if "Mohamet [were] inspired with a dove" [I, ii, 140], traditionally associated with gentleness and peace, she must surely be inspired "with an eagle" [141], associated in the Elizabethan mind with kingship and power. Joan herself employs one of the more famous animal images in the plays; she tells Charles to

Expect Saint Martin's summer, halcyon's days,
 Since I have entered into these wars;
 Glory is like a circle in the water,
 Which never ceaseth to enlarge itself
 Till by broad spreading it disperse to nought.
 [I, ii, 131-135]

The image of glory as a circle in the water is probably suggested by the earlier halcyon reference, for the bird was thought to breed in a nest on the sea during the winter solstice. Joan later builds on the 'proud-as-a-peacock' cliché to assure Charles that a temporary win by the English does not necessarily mean ultimate victory:

Let frantic Talbot triumph for a while
 And like a peacock sweep along his tail;
We'll pull his plumes and take away his train,
 If Dauphin and the rest will be but rul'd.
 [III, iii, 5-8]

Those tender-hearted critics who decry Shakespeare's 'sudden' disgracing of Joan in her trial scene without observing the author's careful

establishment of her vulgar side should take note of such early images as the statement of Burgundy, himself a Frenchman:

. . . I scar'd the Dauphin and his trull,
When arm in arm they both came swiftly running,
Like to a pair of loving turtle-doves
That could not live asunder day or night.

[II, ii, 28-31]

And in Suffolk's capture of Margaret, later Queen to Henry VI, he refers to a specific bird in his imagery. He urges her not to be upset with her imprisonment, because it is only a kind of protectorate: "So doth the swan her downy cygnets save, / Keeping them prisoner underneath her wings" [V, iii, 56-57].

The birds named in these passages appear only in the specific instances cited in Part I and are utilized in a wholly conventional manner; that is, they appear because of the qualities traditionally associated with them--the dove for gentleness, the peacock for pride. And the images, like Warwick's long refusal to Plantagenet and Somerset in the Temple Garden, seem to function merely as embellishments of an idea and are significant only in their immediate context. They appear only once and are seen no more.

What receives more attention in the bird imagery and what appears more important in forming a pattern are characteristics common to the entire species. Significantly, those qualities which might be termed the pleasant ones, i.e., color, beauty, singing, nest-building, make no appearance at all in the animal imagery of Henry VI. Instead, the aspects which receive emphasis are wings and flying. The initial bird image of the play is typical: the first messenger to interrupt Henry V's

funeral reports that one leader involved "would fly swift, but wanteth wings" [I, i, 75]. The second messenger brings word that the Dauphin Charles is crowned King and all the French nobles are flocking to him:

<u>Sec. Mess.</u>	The Duke of Alençon <u>flieth</u> to his side.
<u>Exeter</u>	The Dauphin crowned King! <u>all fly to him!</u>
	O whither shall <u>we fly from this reproach?</u>
<u>Gloucester</u>	<u>We will not fly but to our enemies' throats.</u>

[I, i, 95-98]

And the third messenger, bringing news of Talbot's capture by the French, describes the English leader's fighting ability: "Here, there, and everywhere enrag'd he flew" [I, i, 124]. Subsequent scenes have frequent references to flight, particularly from battle, such as Charles' declaration before Orleans: "Him I forgive my death that killeth me/When he sees me go back one foot or fly" [I, ii, 20-21]. Or Lucy's observation of Talbot's unwavering valor: "Fly he could not if he would have fled;/ And fly would Talbot never though he might" [IV, iv, 43-44]. And in the pre-battle exchanges between Talbot and his young son, John, the idea of flight is constantly emphasized. Talbot urges his son, the only hope for future family glory, to "escape/By sudden flight" [IV, v, 10-11], to "fly, to revenge my death if I be slain" [18]. But John refuses to fly from the battlefield and Talbot submits to his decision: "Come, side by side, together live and die,/And soul with soul from France to heaven fly" [54-55]. In the following scene, when John is rescued by his father and refuses a second chance to "leave the battle . . . and fly" [IV, vi, 28], Talbot uses imagery from the classical story of Daedalus and Icarus, whose attempt to escape from Minos with wings fashioned from feathers ended in failure when the son flew too close

to the sun and melted the wax adhesive:

Then follow thou thy desperate sire of Crete,
 Thou Icarus, thy life to me is sweet:
 If thou wilt fight, fight by thy father's side,
 And, commendable prov'd, let's die in pride.
 [IV, vi, 54-57]

Instead of flying from battle, Talbot's son twice chooses to stay and fight. Finally, Talbot recognizes his firmness and acquiesces.

It should be noted that the image develops subtly in this father-son exchange: Talbot first asks his son to escape battle by flying away like a bird, but he ends by joining him in a flight like an earlier father-son flight which was, in turn, like a bird's flight. Talbot thus concludes with a kind of image of an image. Daedalus and Icarus had earlier compared themselves to birds by becoming their literal image with wings and flying in the sky. Now Talbot compares himself and his son to this previous father and son, who compared themselves with birds.

Apparently Shakespeare felt that the story of Daedalus and Icarus has appropriate significance for the Henry VI trilogy, for allusions to it are numerous. The prideful attempts of fathers and sons to soar high are abundant in the trilogy. While the only entire family unit appearing on the stage is King Henry VI, Queen Margaret, and their son, Prince Edward (in Parts II and III), there is a curious overflow of fathers and sons: the master-gunner and his son [I, iv]; Talbot and his son, John [IV, v, vi, vii] in Part I; Salisbury and his son, Warwick [I, i] in Part II; York and his sons, Edward, Richard, George and Rutland in Parts II and III; old Clifford and his son, Clifford; Buckingham and his son [I, i]; Northumberland and his father [I, i];

in Part III the unnamed sons and fathers of II, v; and King Edward and his infant son [V, vii]. The effect is an endless succession of induced and inherited quarrels. Father and son soar together and if one falls, the other carries on the fight. Clifford's cry to Rutland in Part III, "Thy father slew my father" [I, iii, 47], resounds throughout the three dramas, causing the wars to be intensely personal, yet, at the same time, universal. Blood calls for blood and the Wars of the Roses have much to do with blood lines, family quarrels and blood revenges; yet this very fact takes them beyond the individual realm into the universal world of 'any son' and 'any father.' The continuity and flux of life are stressed. In addition, the Daedalus-Icarus legend's non-animate elements--the sun and the sea--have special meaning, particularly in Part III, and will be discussed in Chapter IV.

The aspect of Talbot's Daedalus-Icarus story which is immediately significant for our discussion of bird images is the flight itself. The words 'fly' and 'flight' occur eighteen times in the 112 lines of scenes v and vi. Wings and flight are apparently the important qualities of birds in Part I. Birds, the most numerous inhabitants of Part I's animal world, are usually imagined in the midst of flight. They are momentarily frozen in the act of either escape or attack, most often the former, e.g., Gloucester's eagerness to fly from the bad news in Act I, scene i, or Talbot's urgent pleas for his son to fly from battle in Act IV, scenes v and vi.

Both actions, escape and attack, are frequent, for the animal world--and man's world--in Henry VI are filled with many threats to life

and liberty. Birds of prey, eager to devour the weak, offer perils and danger. For example, Talbot encourages the English to renewed vigor with artificial rhetoric:

Hark, countrymen! either renew the fight
Or tear the lions out of England's coat;
Renounce your style, give sheep in lions stead;
Sheep run not half so treacherous from the wolf,
Or horse or oxen from the leopard,
As you fly from your oft-subdued slaves.

[I, v, 27-32]

And Talbot proudly recalls his son's bravery as he "like a hungry lion did commence/Rough deeds of rage and stern impatience" [IV, vii, 7-8].

Interestingly, Talbot's characterization of his son as a hungry lion echoes the mention of hunger in several other passages of Part I. The initial mention of hunger occurs in Act I, scene 1, in which the third messenger emphasizes the Earl of Salisbury's need for supplies in France because "the English army is grown weak and faint" [158]. The point is reiterated in the play's next scene which takes us to the French leaders before Orleans, presently under English siege. The Dauphin Charles is pleased that they sit victorious near the city "whiles the famish'd English, like pale ghosts/Faintly besiege us one hour in a month" [I, ii, 7-8]. Alençon sneers:

They want their porridge and their fat bull-beeves:
Either they must be dieted like mules
And have their provender tied to their mouths,
Or piteous they will look, like drowned mice.

[I, ii, 9-12]

Allusions to hunger and animals continue throughout the scene, forming its dominant images. The French decide to attack the English instead of just waiting to be attacked, and they rush out with Charles crying:

"Him I forgive my death that killeth me/When he sees me go back one foot or fly" [20-21]. According to the stage directions, the French "are beaten back by the English with great loss." Charles, Alençon and Reignier enter exclaiming over the unexpected and decisive defeat. Charles' cowardly entrance lines recall his blustering exit:

Who ever saw the like? What men have I!
Dogs! Cowards! "dastards!" I would ne'er have fled
 But that they left me 'midst my enemies.
 [22-24]

Begrudgingly, the French must admit the exceptional bravery of those "lean raw-bon'd rascals" [35] in the English army. Reignier says the English "lords, like lions wanting food,/Do rush upon us as their hungry prey" [27-28]. Charles is quite convinced by his defeat and is ready to leave the city to those hungry animals:

Let's leave this town; for they are hare-brain'd slaves,
 And hunger will enforce them be more eager:
 Of old I know them; rather with their teeth
The walls they'll tear down than forsake the siege.
 [37-40]

The emphasis on hunger in Act I, scenes i and ii, is important because it justifies in a very real way the animal-like behavior of both man and beast. The English army is not on a senseless rampage of bloodletting; it is not the well-cared-for housecat which toys with and maims a mouse just for the fun of the game. Rather, the English force, like a lion (traditionally associated with royalty) nearly mad from starvation, attacks only to preserve its own life. These men attack like beasts of prey for their own survival, not for the delight of killing. The emphasis is reiterated in later scenes: Joan tells Talbot to "cheer up thy hunger-starved men" [I, v, 16]. And Talbot

refers to his "three attendants,/Lean Famine, quartering Steel, and climbing Fire? [IV, ii, 10-11].

In short, the beasts of prey in Part I's imagery and the men who act like these beasts are given the justification of being hungry. The motive gives reasonable cause for the English army to attack with animal-like viciousness and makes such behavior less black than it might otherwise be. Such justification is particularly important when the point is realized that it is singularly absent from Parts II and III. As will be made clear in the chapters dealing with those plays, during the remainder of the trilogy the beasts of prey and the men who emulate them have no such justification as they do in Part I; they become, instead, fiendish butchers and slaughterers who delight in blood for its own sake. They shatter the code governing hunters through the ages by killing more than they need for food; they are not killing others to save themselves but destroying others for the sheer thrill of murder and death. The beasts of prey in Part I react to hunger, but in Parts II and III they are merely drawn by the smell of blood.

While these hungry beasts of prey do prowl the poetic landscape of Part I, their presence should not be exaggerated. The threat offered by such creatures is not overwhelming in Part I as it is in Part II. The beast of prey part of the animal world is constantly lurking behind the scenes but it seldom dominates a scene, with the possible exception of Act I, scene ii, as has been discussed.

Instead, the most constant and most emphasized threat to the weaker animals in Part I is the endless harassment of traps, snares,

chains, cages, and hunts--all sorts of man-made devices of enclosure, used in a deliberate effort, primarily to curtail liberty, or, secondarily, to destroy life. Beginning with the third messenger's report in Act I, scene i, that Talbot has been "round encompassed and set upon" and captured [114], limitations and restrictions of all kinds encroach from every side in Part I. Significantly, these enclosures are not a natural threat, an uncontrollable force, but man-made artificial barriers which can be controlled. Talbot later describes his treatment as a French captive; he was led like an animal and made an object of public entertainment. He was the bear in a game of bear-baiting:

In open market-place produced they me
 To be a public spectacle to all;
 Here, said they, is the Terror of the French,
 The scarecrow that affrights our children so.
 Then broke I from the officers that led me,
 And with my nails digg'd stones out of the ground
 To hurl at the beholders of my shame.
 My grisly countenance made others fly;
 None durst come near for fear of sudden death.
 [I, iv, 39-47]

Having once been captured by the French, who reluctantly agree to exchange him for their English-held leader, Lord Ponton de Santrailles, Talbot remains the eagerly-sought object of their chase. Indeed, much of the significance of Part I lies in this very entrapment of the brave English leader, who, as was previously noted, embodies the entire system of degree and order. From the first scene of the play Talbot is trapped, by the relentless French army on the one hand, and by English disunion on the other. The first mention of Talbot is that he has been "round encompassed and set upon" [I, i, 114] by the French; he is captured,

led through the streets like an animal and released only to be hunted down again. Talbot returns to the English camp at Orleans where he tells his father, Salisbury, of his treatment only moments before Salisbury is shot down by the French. Talbot then leads the battle and gives a good account of himself in avenging his father's death, but cannot give the English a victory in the first battle. In Act II, scene i, Talbot leads the English in scaling the walls and capturing the city.

The play's second funeral takes place within Orleans, as Talbot directs the procession of mourning for his father, Salisbury. Although the scene is brief, it is significant in that Talbot is presented observing proper ceremony, whereas the other English nobles in a similar situation had not. To the doleful sound of a dead march, the body of Salisbury is carried in a funeral procession with Talbot mourning his father's death but grateful that he has been able to avenge that dying: "For every drop of blood was drawn from him/There hath at least five Frenchmen died to-night" [II, ii, 8-9]. Talbot has behaved as a proper son should; he has taken the vengeance he vowed and now he is observing the proper ritualistic tribute to the dead. Revenge and ceremony--the two actions not observed by the nobles at Henry V's funeral--are performed by Talbot.

After Salisbury's funeral procession leaves, a messenger comes with an unusual invitation: in the midst of war, the Countess of Auvergne is issuing a dinner invitation to Talbot. The request seems incongruous in the middle of the war, even if the hunger of Talbot and his men has

been emphasized. Suspecting a trap, Talbot whispers some arrangements to his captain, the exact nature of which is revealed in the next scene, Act II, scene iii. The locale is the castle of the Countess. As she and her porter enter, the Countess has apparently been giving directions of some sort, for she says: "Porter, remember what I gave in charge;/ And when you have done so, bring the keys to me" [II, iii, 1-2]. She says, "The plot is laid" [4], whereby she will become famous.

The plot is quickly revealed when Talbot enters; she taunts his appearance as being far below his reputation. She is extremely disappointed: "It cannot be this weak and writhled shrimp/Should strike such terror to his enemies" [22-23]. Talbot quickly moves to leave, but the Porter enters with the keys, and the Countess triumphantly announces that Talbot is her prisoner. He is trapped:

Longtime thy shadow hath been thrall to me,
For in my gallery thy picture hangs;
And now the substance shall endure the like,
And I will chain these legs and arms of thine.

[35-38]

The idea of shadow vs. substance becomes the basis of their argument. The countess believes that she has now trapped the substance as she already holds the shadow of Talbot; however, Talbot says that once again she has "aught but Talbot's shadow" [45].

The countess is startled:

	Why, art not thou the man?
<u>Tal.</u>	I am indeed.
<u>Count.</u>	Then have I <u>substance</u> too.
<u>Tal.</u>	No, no, I am <u>but shadow of myself</u> .
	You are deceiv'd, my <u>substance</u> is not here;
	For what you see is but the smallest part
	And least proportion of humanity:

I tell you, madam, were the whole frame here,
 It is of such a spacious lofty pitch
 Your roof were not sufficient to contain't.
 [47-55]

When the Countess demands an explanation of such riddling talk, Talbot
"winds his horn; drums strike up; a peal of ordnance. Enter Soldiers"
 [Folio s.d.]. Talbot's whispered order to his captain in the previous
 scene was obviously to have the army stand by if needed; when Talbot
 sounds a horn, the soldiers break into the castle. Talbot stands before
 his army of English soldiers and asks:

. . . are you now persuaded
 That Talbot is but shadow of himself?
 These are his substance, sinews, arms, and strength.
 With which he yoketh your rebellious necks,
 Razeth your cities, and subverts your towns.
 [60-64]

The Countess submits. She apologizes and begs Talbot and his men
 to honor her by staying to feast with her.

This Talbot-Countess incident is often criticized for its 'intrusion' into the plot line of the play. Admittedly, it does have little connection with the rest of the action; the Countess never appears again and the incident is neither the result nor the cause of any other scene's action. Nonetheless, the scene is important in establishing the character of Talbot and the vital place he holds in his nation. Of course, Talbot's well-mannered behavior toward a lady, even an enemy, prompts respect for him as a gentleman as well as a fighter, and by the same say of contrast, blackens the character of Joan. Talbot is polite to a lady regardless of political loyalties, but he insults Joan at every opportunity. He remains courteous when the Countess insults and taunts

him, and even when she tries to capture him. Yet the fact that Talbot is polite hardly merits an entire scene to itself; what is significant in the scene are the ideas of shadow vs. substance and trapping.

Talbot's explanation that both his picture in the Countess' gallery and his physical body before her are but shadows while his real substance is his army is important. Stated in other terms, the conflict is that of appearance vs. reality. Outer show and inner essence may not always correspond. Talbot's statements indicate his own awareness that his position is somewhat like a king's, for both Talbot and a monarch are but imperfect representations, or substitutes, of ideals--military order for one, kingship for the other. Like the king, Talbot assumes a role which imposes certain obligations and duties. But unlike Henry VI, Talbot performs his role well. Talbot realizes that his appearance is but the trappings of his role, while reality lies in the entire scheme of military order and force.

The conflict between substance and shadow continues in the trilogy, with very few characters able to distinguish between appearance and reality. When the English suggest peace terms to Charles on the condition that he serve as viceroy under Henry, that is, remain the King in name only, Alençon understands and is incensed:

Must he be then as shadow of himself?
Adorn his temples with a coronet,
And yet, in substance and authority,
Retain but the privilege of a private man.
[V, iv, 133-136]

Charles will thus become an actor indeed; he will have the appearance of a king but none of the reality.

The second important aspect of the Talbot-Countess of Auvergne incident is her foiled attempt to trap Talbot. From the first of the play, Talbot is caught, released and hunted down by the French who finally succeed in trapping him like an animal when his own nobles fail to support him. In the Countess episode, we spectators look on as Talbot uses his wits to escape still another snare. When the invitation arrives, Talbot makes plans for his men to be nearby if he needs them; as indeed he does. The Countess's desire to win fame by locking Talbot in her castle and chaining his arms and legs is thwarted by Talbot's quick perceptions. Instead of capturing Talbot, she herself is captured. The hunter becomes the victim. Sincerity rings in her apology to Talbot; nonetheless, when one lone woman and a porter face an entire army, what else can the woman do but apologize?

After this episode, little is seen of Talbot except in III, iv, when he hands over his booty and captured cities to Henry VI and is in turn knighted for his services, until the fateful battle of Bordeaux in Act IV, when Talbot is finally trapped and killed. Meanwhile, court dissensions have been growing. When, in Act IV, scene i, Henry VI sends Talbot to chastise Burgundy for his treacherous return to the French side, he also creates York Regent of France and Somerset Commander of the Cavalry, hoping they will unify at least in support of Talbot. In the following scene, Talbot stands before the walls of Bordeaux demanding French surrender. A general appears on the wall and warns Talbot that he has no chance for victory because the Dauphin will soon arrive with his powerful forces. Once again he is going to be trapped

like an animal by the enemy:

The Dauphin well appointed,
 Stands with the snares of war to tangle thee;
 On either hand of thee there are squadrons pitch'd
To wall thee from the liberty of flight;
 And no way canst thou turn thee for redress
 But death doth front thee with apparent spoil,
 And pale Destruction meets thee in the face.

[IV, ii, 21-27]

After the general's boastful exit, Talbot hears the approaching drums and realizes that he and his men are indeed trapped like English deer in a park by those French dogs:

How are we park'd and bounded in a pale--
A little herd of England's timorous deer,
 Maz'd with a yelping kennel of French curs!

[IV, ii, 45-47]

But he refuses even then to be a victim; as he had done with the Countess, he will make victims of his attackers instead. Just as Lucy later uses the phoenix image to say that Talbot, the destroyed, will one day rise from his ashes to become the destroyer, Talbot here determines that the trapped will turn on the trapper:

If we be English deer, be then in blood;
Not rascal-like to fall down with a pinch,
But rather moody-mad and desperate stags,
Turn on the bloody hounds with hearts of steel
And make the coward stand aloof at bay;
 Sell every man his life as dear as mine,
 And they shall find dear deer of us, my friends.

[IV, ii, 48-54]

Although the passage of trapped animal images seems rather long, it is appropriate to the dramatic situation Talbot faces and it is held together by Talbot's intensity and fire. The speech is but two lines longer than Warwick's "Between two hawks . . ." [II, iv, 18] in the

Temple Garden, previously noted as an example of the play's euphuistic style, yet a real difference exists between the two. Warwick simply says "no" to Plantagenet and Somerset, but to do so, he embroiders image on top of image. The images are a bill added up by the master: he can judge "Between two hawks . . ./Between two dogs . . ./Between two blades . . ./Between two horses . . ./Between two girls . . ." [11-15] but not in questions of law. This artificial listing is a static embellishment of the single idea that Warwick considers himself a competent judge of small pleasantries but not legal matters, and its effect, even if delivered lightly in a tongue-in-cheek manner, is that of non-organic, unspontaneous decoration. In contrast, Talbot's imagery does not ornament an idea--it is the idea. Talbot and his men are trapped; when he fully recognizes the hopelessness of their military position, he can express the intensity of his feelings only in metaphoric terms: the English are timorous deer surrounded by yelping French curs. The image is the idea, for in no literal language could such nostril-widening terror or base fierceness be conveyed. A sensory appeal lacking in Warwick's words should also be noted: the sight of fearful deer covered in blood, turning on their bloodied tormentors, the sound of yelping dogs, the smell and taste of blood, and the fear of the dogs' "pinch"--the image is full of movement and excitement. And the passage is not one image added to another; rather, the imagery moves and develops. Talbot's initial reaction is that his men are "timorous deer," "park'd and bounded," but he quickly determines that if they must be deer they will at least be "moody-mad and desperate stags," who rend

their tormentors before inevitable death. Through the images themselves, Talbot comes to a new bravery and a grim determination. The speech begins in defeat and ends in a kind of triumph.

Talbot's grim determination is underscored by his use of a frequent Shakespearean pun: deer-dear. It is a device which Molly Mahood reminds us in the twentieth century, who are inheritors of the eighteenth-century distaste for paranomasia as low humor, was recognized as something besides a means of amusement by the Elizabethans.³¹ Puns were often a method of emotional release in stress, a release recognized as common by Freud, who explained that moments too frightening for the individual to face or too horrible to be immediately comprehended often evoke such word-play as a kind of emotional safety valve.³² Such statements help to temper the modern mind in its view of the pun only as a form of humor and aid in understanding Talbot's final words to his men as a way of gritting his teeth in emotional rather than physical terms.

While Talbot prepares to face the enemy with unselfish nobility, selfish York and Somerset are off behaving in a most un noble fashion. Henry's hope that the two could submerge their personal feuds in order to fight France proves ill-founded; both men sit, Achilles-like, sulking in their separate camps, each refusing to be the first to send aid to Talbot, each pouting because the other will not go first. And Talbot's entrapment is emphasized by new images of encirclement. Sir William Lucy pleads with York to send help to "noble Talbot,/Who now is girdled with

³¹Mahood, pp. 9-10.

³²Ibid., p. 29.

a waist of iron,/And hemm'd about with grim destruction" [IV, iii, 19-21]. Lucy then turns to Somerset for help because Talbot is "ring'd about with bold adversity" [IV, iv, 14]; he cries "for noble York and Somerset/To beat assailing Death from his weak legions" [IV, iv, 15-16]. Even at this moment, "Orleans the Bastard, Charles, Burgundy,/Alençon, Reignier, compass him about" [IV, iv, 26-27].

Somerset finally agrees to send his horses and men to Talbot without waiting for York to ask him to, but Lucy knows that aid will arrive too late. The image of Talbot entrapped takes on a new dimension as Lucy realizes that Talbot has not been caught just by the French army but also by English dissension in the court. Lucy perceives the situation clearly and angrily tells Somerset: "The fraud of England, not the force of France,/Hath now entrapp'd the noble-minded Talbot" [IV, iv, 36-37]. The adjective for Talbot is significant, for it is indeed Talbot whose mind and heart are noble, while the so-called "noble York and Somerset" [IV, iv, 15] are but petulant children.

The stage directions opening Act IV, scene vi, realize the network of trapping images in dramatic terms: "Alarum: excursions, wherein Talbot's son is hemmed about, and Talbot rescues him." Talbot's son is in stage actuality entrapped by precisely the same predicament that the spectator has been told Talbot's entire army faces and he is saved by precisely the same kind of help from another that would save Talbot's army. We see Talbot perform on an individual basis what York and Somerset should be doing on a national level. Because York and Somerset will not stop their bickering to send support to Talbot in time,

the English military leader, the flesh-and-blood manifestation of all that England might be, is trapped and killed in battle at Bordeaux.

In scene ii, Talbot realizes he is trapped; in scenes ii and iv, Lucy pleads vainly with first York, then Somerset to help Talbot, and the last three scenes depict the gallant death of Talbot and his son.

After repeatedly refusing to flee the battle, Talbot's son fights bravely and is slain off-stage in battle. His body is carried on stage by a soldier and Talbot, wounded in the same battle, dies cradling his son in his arms.³³

The animal traps which catch Talbot, his men and his son in Act IV are not the only enclosing devices in Part I. In fact, the first play of the Henry VI trilogy seems curiously packed with such devices: city walls, doors, gates, towers, prisons, chains, pyramids, urns, and even jewel-boxes receive both literal and metaphorical attention. It seems as if throughout the play someone is constantly trying to keep someone else either in or out of somewhere. Barriers between men are deliberately erected by one man or a group and then the opponent(s) must decide whether or not to break that barrier.

Typical of the clashes of will and wall is Act I, scene iii, in which Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester and Lord Protector, appears at the Tower of London demanding entrance. When the nobles left Henry V's funeral to prepare for battle with the French, Gloucester spoke of going

³³Note the several fathers who cradle the bodies of their sons and sons who likewise hold their fathers: IHVI, I, iv, 2HVI, V, ii; 3HVI, II, v.

to the Tower to check ammunition and then to proclaim young Henry the new king. But when he arrives at the Tower in scene iii, much to his surprise and annoyance he is refused admittance by Lieutenant Woodville. His repeated knocks on the doors and demands that they be opened are not heeded. According to the stage directions, Gloucester's men then "rush at the Tower gates" and threaten to "burst them open" [28]. With that, "Enter to the Protector at the Tower gates Winchester and his men in tawny coats" [s.d.]. After their leaders swap insults (Gloucester calls Winchester "a wolf in sheep's clothing"), Gloucester's and Winchester's followers skirmish, with Gloucester's briefly victorious before all fighting is halted by the Mayor of London. Curiously enough, neither man makes any reference to why Gloucester wants to get in or why Winchester wants to keep him out. The spectator knows because he has heard at Henry V's funeral Gloucester's plan to inspect the ammunition and Winchester's bitter ambition to destroy Gloucester if he can. But neither reason is repeated at the Tower. Instead, the important thing is the clash itself: Gloucester wants to enter the Tower but Winchester wants him kept out. And each is determined to have his way.

The Tower of London also figures as an important enclosure in Act II, scene v, in which Richard Plantagenet visits his dying uncle, Mortimer, a political prisoner in the Tower. This time the situation is reversed: Gloucester wanted to enter the Tower but was prevented; now Mortimer wants to leave but is prevented. Mortimer, seated in a chair, is brought on stage by his jailers. Plantagenet enters and in the ensuing uncle-nephew farewell, Mortimer relates his part in an early attempt to

claim the English crown from Henry VI and urges his nephew to take up the family cause. Mortimer is enclosed by his chair, by the Tower and its keepers, and by his own "ambition of the meaner sort" [II, v, 123]. The staging of Mortimer as seated in a chair is an effective touch, for while it is, of course, quite natural for a sick man to be carried, the chair at the same time functions as but another manifestation of the man-made enclosures so frequent in Part I. Just as the Tower gates are meant to be deliberately and consciously entered, chairs are artificial things intended to be deliberately and consciously sat in and risen from. Similarly, the mention of clothing in Gloucester's encounter with Winchester at the Tower and the stage directions about blue and tawny coats serve as subtle reminder of the deliberate nature of the action. Like doors and towers and chairs, clothes are non-natural, man-made devices to be used consciously. The stage spectacle of tawny coats vs. blue is colorful and impressive pageantry, but at the same time it renders the decisive character of the quarrel in tangible three-dimensional terms. The point is perhaps a small one, but when one notes the mention of chairs and clothing in several scenes of Part I and their slow but definite disappearance through the remainder of the trilogy, it is clear that their presence is part of some larger pattern of significance--part of the enclosure motif of Part I Henry VI.

Both actual and metaphorical enclosures of all kinds abound in Part I. The barriers provided by city walls and towers are--as might be expected in a play about an international war--numerous. Certainly the subject matter itself as taken from the chronicles involves cities under

siege. Granted also that the beginning Shakespeare, still learning his craft, is careful to have his characters establish the setting with such remarks as Joan's "Advance our waving colours on the walls" [I, vi, 1]; nonetheless, the emphasis on walls becomes too excessive to be mere setting identification.

Through the frequent appearance of enclosures in Part I and subsequent decline of them in Parts II and III as other images move into prominence, much can be learned of the nature of the conflicts in the trilogy. A look at each act in Part I indicates the vital significance of enclosures: four of the six scenes in Act I concern the English siege of Orleans; the first two scenes of Act II continue the Orleans struggle; the second and third scenes concern the Countess of Auvergne's attempt to trap Talbot and in the fifth scene Richard visits Mortimer imprisoned in the Tower; two of the four scenes in Act III concern the battle for Rouen, six of the seven scenes in Act IV involve the entrapment of Talbot on the field of battle near Bordeaux, and Act V includes the captures of Joan and Margaret.

A look at some of these barriers not yet discussed is helpful. In the sieges of the three cities, walls and towers are emphasized. In Act I, scene ii, the French leaders--the Dauphin Charles, Alençon, Reignier, and the Bastard of Orleans--are introduced in their camp at Orleans, now under English siege. After scene iii flashes back to London for the Gloucester-Winchester clash at the Tower, scene iv returns to the city of Orleans. According to the opening stage directions, the master-gunner and his son "enter on the walls." The father advises his

son that since the English have won much of the surrounding area and are closing in fast, he must keep a careful watch for them. He indicates that the English are "wont, through a secrete grate of iron bars/In yonder tower to overpeer our city" [I, iv, 10-11]; that is, one man-made barrier is used to break through another as the English spy on the French. Then the stage directions order: "Enter Salisbury and Talbot [and Gargrave and others] on the turrets," i.e., the "yonder tower" of the master-gunner's speech. Salisbury, pleased with his son's recent release from French captivity, urges Talbot to tell about his treatment as a prisoner, to "discourse, I prithee, on this turret's top" [25]. Talbot responds with the previously mentioned description of his being led like a chained bear into the market-place. He says that even "in iron walls they deemed me not secure" [48] because his reputation was so great "that they supposed I could rend bars of steel" [50]. Salisbury and Gargrave are killed by shots from the distance and Talbot swears revenge for his father's death. Scene v opens with Talbot pursuing the Dauphin, then Joan after Englishmen. The French are victorious and scene iv concludes the first act of Part I with the triumphant French celebrating on the city walls.

The French victory, however, is not final: as Act II opens, a French sergeant and two sentinels pace the walls while Talbot, Bedford, Burgundy and their forces enter "with scaling ladders, their drums beating a dead march" [s.d.]. The English scale the city walls in a surprise attack so effective that "the French leap over the Walls in their Shirts," as from bed. Joan and the Dauphin are soundly defeated

and scene ii finds the victorious English army safely entrenched "within the city" [s.d.].

As in the first two acts, city walls prove to be formidable barriers in Act III, scene ii, when Rouen becomes the object of battle between French and English armies. Just as the English at Orleans had the tower to use as a tool for spying into the city for the best way to enter, the French also have surprise strategy for breaking into English-held Rouen. As scene ii opens, Joan and four soldiers, disguised as "poor market folks . . . come to sell their corn" [15], knock on the city gates of Rouen to request entrance. "This happy strategem" [18], as Charles calls Joan's trick, succeeds; Joan enters the city and then signals the best way into the city "by thrusting out a torch from yonder tower" [23]. The French enter the city walls and win the fray. Talbot and his associates gather outside while Joan and her forces gleefully toss down vicious taunts from their newly-captured city walls.

Talbot repeatedly challenges the French to come out and fight, but "like peasant foot-boys do they keep the walls" [69]. Talbot swears to recover Rouen or die in the attempt and the English prepare for the attack. Bedford, ill and seated in a chair, refuses to leave the scene; he tells Talbot, "Here will I sit, before the walls of Rouen,/And will be partner of your weal or woe" [91-92]. Bedford is, like Mortimer, seated in a chair, and his attendants become silent spectators to the ensuing battle which is handily won by the English. This scene within a scene is, as previously noted, part of the play's acting imagery. Yet at the same time it is part of the enclosure motif in that the spectators

on stage in such a scene form a frame for the action. The spectators are an artificial barrier set up between audience and actors.

The important point about these enclosures--the walls of Orleans and Rouen, the Tower of London, the Castle of the Countess of Auvergne, the snares of war which catch noble Talbot in a park--is that these devices form a pattern which dominates the entire play. This enclosure motif is the major characteristic of Part I Henry VI.

The motif is subtly reinforced by brief images of all sorts of enclosing devices, pleasant and unpleasant: happy with Joan's victories, Charles wants to rear "a statelier pyramid to her . . . /Then Rhodope's of Memphis ever was" [I, vi, 21-22]. And her ashes will be carried at high festivals in "an urn more precious/Than the rich jewel-coffer of Darius" [24-25]. Plantagenet says Somerset's accusations "set bars before my tongue" [II, v, 49] and as he leaves his uncle, Mortimer, Plantagenet determines, "I will lock his counsel in my breast" [II, v, 118]. And characters speak on several occasions of the "knot of amity" [V, i, 16] and "binding" reasons for action [V, v, 59-61]. These images join the verbal imagery of animal traps, snares, and escapes, and in the non-verbal images involving city walls, towers, captures and imprisonment to create a sometimes subtle, sometimes obvious pattern--the enclosure motif, the distinctive characteristic of Part I.

What should be kept in mind is that each of these enclosing devices, whether it is a city wall or an urn for Joan's ashes or a snare for a bird, is a man-made contrivance, constructed deliberately to restrict, inhibit or maim, and used with full consciousness on the user's

part. These are no natural barriers which plague man and animal; they are artificial lines of restriction and encirclement made by man to impose some kind of order on that landscape. Some degree of sophistication is required for their construction and destruction alike.

Part I Henry VI is a difficult world--war rages between England and France, treachery sways many men, and the nobles' present quarrels will later burst into the Wars of the Roses. But, significantly, it is a world where choice can still determine destiny. No one is swept along by some uncontrollable force of events or by a fate predetermined by Fortune. Civil war comes because men make choices which make war inevitable. If the enclosure motif is the major characteristic of Part I, its dominant characteristic, in turn, is the key-word, choice.

The action in Part I results from deliberate choices made by the characters; choices which release certain forces and have certain consequences. Those forces and consequences will shape the action in Parts II and III. In the two later plays we see the effects of which decisions made in Part I are the cause. The increasing disorder and chaos of Parts II and III are the inevitable fulfillment of the forces set in motion by the choices made in Part I.

At the beginning of the play, we on-lookers watch the funeral of Henry V, a monarch whose bright circle of glory has ended for England. The kingdom, earlier bound by observance of order, degree and place, has already begun to crack, not from any buffets of nature but because the nobles cannot, or will not, agree on how to wage the war with France. Destruction is approaching the vessel of English unity and order, not

in the form of natural phenomenon but as quarrels knowingly pursued by rational beings. The first messenger alludes to the rumors of inner strife in the court and begs the nobles to awaken to their duty, to find unity for the sake of national defense. But the nobles do not choose to band together. They could if they would, but they won't. Instead, Winchester and Gloucester squabble over petty grievances even at a state funeral and later before the King's very face. Act I, scene i ends with Winchester offended because he has no state office (historically, both he and Exeter had charge of young Henry VI), determining to steal young King Henry VI from Exeter's protection and to rule the kingdom himself. Thus, in the very first scene of the play, the lines of demarcation are beginning to appear, with the characters stepping on one side or the other.

The Winchester-Gloucester quarrel is developed in Act I, scene iii, when Winchester refuses to allow Gloucester into the Tower of London to examine the needed ammunition for the war with France. As previously discussed, the reasons for both men's actions are omitted from the scene; instead, what is important is that Gloucester wants into the tower and Winchester wants him kept out. The scene is an excellent representative of many scenes in Part I; in Act I, scenes iv, v and vi, both the English and French want into Orleans, and the French are successful and enter. In Act II, scenes i and ii, the English throw the French out of Orleans. In scene v. Mortimer wants to get out of his prison, the Tower of London. In Act III, scene ii, the English hold Rouen and try to keep the French outside the city but they fail: the French come in and the English go out again, and at Bordeaux, Act IV, the French surround Talbot. He

wants to get out of his park about him, but the French keep him inside. In short, someone always seems to want to enter or leave someplace but is opposed by someone else. In none of these scenes is the rightness or wrongness of either side debated, indeed, it is scarcely mentioned. Somewhere the point of the war has been lost. All that is left is the child-like dare: one little boy draws a line in the dust and dares another to step across it. But one should keep in mind the fact that the line must be drawn by a somewhat rational being who knows that he is drawing a line even if he does forget the reasons and remembers only the barrier itself.

When Winchester and Gloucester, Plantagenet (later York), and Somerset fall to quarreling, they do so because they choose to do so. They are not driven to it by prior actions or by governing planets. Indeed all of the action in Part I is a result of deliberate choice: Gloucester chooses to enter the tower; Winchester determines to seize the kingdom; Bedford decides to sit outside Rouen and watch the fight; Suffolk determines that Margaret will be his lover and the king's wife; Margaret decides to accept Suffolk's plan; York and Somerset both decide not to help Talbot until it is too late for aid, and so the choices continue. No character is forced into a situation beyond control; each has choices available and he decides for one of the other. Although Henry VI is too young to have much real governing power when the play opens, by the time we actually see him in Act III when he has matured, he too has choices. The critics who insist that Henry VI shows the divine punishment of Henry IV's unlawful seizing of the crown

from Richard II distort the meaning of the trilogy. Certainly his grandfather's usurpation of the throne is relevant; Henry VI himself admits that his claim to the throne is inadequate. But the evil that plagues England does not descend because Henry V's claim is poor but because Henry VI does not play his role; he does not observe his place; he has the crown but fails to live up to the obligations of action and firmness which the golden circuit imposes. The civil chaos that runs rampant in Henry VI is not just the result of sins of the father being visited on the sons; it is rather the direct result of decisions made in Part I. Just as the nobles have the opportunity to bury petty differences for the national good but choose to advance personal ambitions instead, so Henry VI has the opportunity to rule his nobles and countrymen with firmness and wisdom but chooses instead to do nothing. When the nobles spat even in front of him, all he does is offer an effectual, unkingly plea for unity. These two decisions--one for action, the other for inaction--set in motion forces which will destroy the entire kingdom. The three sub-plots of Part I, the Gloucester-Winchester quarrel, the York-Somerset conflict and the Suffolk-Margaret alliance, are wedges driven between the nobles in Henry's court. He decides not to take action himself, seemingly hoping the wedges will disappear. Instead, the chasm widens irrevocably and when the decisions of York and Somerset cause the entrapment and death of Talbot, the embodiment of order and degree, all hope for English stability is gone. The three sub-plots remain unresolved, for it is the result of their principals' choices which necessitate the action of Parts II and III.

In a sense, the enclosures of Part I can be considered signs of order. Granted, some, such as snares and burial urns, are not pleasant, but they do signify the presence of some degree of civilization. Walls, towers, and traps indicate effort made by rational, ordered, thinking beings who want each element of the universe in its proper place. These enclosures are part and parcel of the world view which in Henry V's glorious reign observed each thing, each link in the Great Chain of Being, in its proper place. When man tried to impose some type of order on the natural landscape, these enclosures were the result. In Part I man has a chance to control his fate: he can erect a wall or he can tear one down. He can accept or reject several choices of action available. In short, man in Part I is a rational being, capable of decision and action. But what happens when he makes the wrong choices? Parts II and III Henry IV show us.

CHAPTER III

DRAMATIC IMAGERY IN PART II HENRY VI

The civil dissensions begun in Part I Henry VI grow rapidly in Part II and the play's interaction of verbal with non-verbal imagery effectively underscores this disintegration of civilization and order. Like Part I, the trilogy's second play is full of flash and color as the Wars of the Roses develop their battle lines with the Yorkists, led by the Duke of York, whose badge was the white rose, fiercely determined to take the throne of England from Henry VI and his Lancastrian supporters, who wore the red rose. Since the war with France was concluded in Part I, the locale of Part II is always within England, but it still moves across a wide area: from the palace in London to private gardens to abbeys to battlefields to public streets. Part II opens with Suffolk's delivery of Henry's bride, Margaret, and quickly moves to the Suffolk-Margaret-Beaufort plot to remove Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, so that he cannot block their grab for power. At the same time, York plans his own revolt against Henry VI and secures the aid of Salisbury and Warwick. Scarcely is Gloucester disgraced and killed before York makes his own move to seize the throne and hires a rabble-rouser, Jack Cade, to lead a popular revolt against Henry. Although Cade is suppressed by two of Henry's followers, Buckingham and Clifford, York and his own army are not stopped so easily. The inevitable clash takes place: the Yorkists and the Lancastrians engage in battle at Saint Albans and the Wars of the

Roses have begun. The Yorkists are victorious: Part II concludes with York and his exultant followers preparing to pursue fleeing Henry and his court into London for ultimate victory.

Most of the characters in Part II are familiar to the spectator of Part I: saintly, inactive Henry VI; quarreling Winchester, now Cardinal Beaufort; ambitious Richard Plantagenet, Duke of York, and his antagonist, the Duke of Somerset; the treacherous Duke of Suffolk; and the Earls of Warwick and Salisbury. Two characters, however, who continue from Part I may be somewhat difficult to recognize at first: Queen Margaret, who has changed from a flirtatious girl into a determined fiery woman of ambition, and Humphrey, the Duke of Gloucester, who has suddenly switched from being one of the destructive forces in Henry's court to its only hope of preservation. Such a change in Margaret is a development both justifiable and gradual; from her single appearance late in Part I the audience knows that she is a self-centered woman, and when she arrives in England, eagerly anticipating the grand and luxurious life of being England's queen, she meets sharp disappointments. Not only is her husband a pious, gentle man completely unlike her brave lover, Suffolk, but even a mere duchess (Eleanor, wife of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester) has better clothes than she, the Queen of England! Bitterly rankled, Margaret is not the type of woman to accept such a lot quietly: if Henry VI will not be a ruler in fact as well as name, then she can and will. Margaret's change in character is thus reasonable and, as she becomes increasingly hardened to the point of inhuman cruelty in Part III, quite effective. In contrast, the change in Gloucester's

character is a jolt to the audience because of its suddenness and its inexplicability; it is not a development but a switch in the role. In Part I Gloucester was just another spiteful, quarreling noble who could not seem to control his bickering with Winchester, but in Part II he is suddenly "the good duke Humphrey" of Hall's Chronicles,¹ the only protection for Henry VI against the circling pack of wolves which form the monarch's court, and the champion of the common people. Gloucester has become the Talbot-figure of Part II: with Talbot's death in Part I the English system of order and degree is shattered, and with Gloucester's death all hope of restoring the destroyed vessel is gone. Just as Talbot had been neglected by English nobles and trapped by French 'curs,' so also is Gloucester and killed by a nobles' trap and a king's neglect. Both men are caught and murdered by the deceit, cunning and/or neglect of the very people who should be their allies. After Gloucester's death there is no turning back for England; the only road open leads to the Wars of the Roses and chaos. But, regardless of the importance of Gloucester's role in Part II, the fact remains that his awkward switch from destroyer to preserver is an artistic flaw in the continuity of the trilogy's narrative. The only major figures in Part II not introduced in Part I are Eleanor, Gloucester's Lady Macbeth, and York's sons, Edward and Richard.

Just as most of the characters in Part II are familiar to the spectators of Part I, so also are the vehicles of verbal images. In Part II

¹Andrew Cairncross, ed., The Second Part of King Henry VI. New Arden Edition (London, 1962), p. 167.

imagery continues the same functions it performs in the trilogy's initial play: images occasionally characterize, serve as decoration, create atmosphere, and reinforce theme. But, in performing these functions, imagery in Parts II and III shows a marked increase in frequency and development and a definite shift in emphasis. In general, the same vehicles appear--indeed, there is scarcely a vehicle occurring in Parts II and III which has not been introduced in Part I--but they receive more detailed elaboration than before. Frequent are lengthy passages of imagery, both inorganic, like Warwick's "Between two hawks" speech in the Temple Garden in Part I (11, iv), and organic, like Talbot's "How are we park'd and bounded in a pale . . ." passage in Part I (IV, ii). While Warwick's and Talbot's long passages of imagery had but few fellows in Part I, similar speeches of even greater length are numerous in Part II. Despite the increase in detail and number, Part II's imagery is much like its predecessor in Part I, as an examination of the play's minor images indicates.

I. MINOR IMAGES

Battle. The minor images of Part I continue with little change in Part II. Battle imagery still serves as verbal reinforcement for the actual war being waged. The play's atmosphere of destruction and mayhem is emphasized through the appearance of images concentrating on the weapons, blood, confusion and death of war. For example, Warwick says that if there were any hope at all of regaining Anjou and Maine, "My sword should shed hot blood, mine eyes no tears" [I, i, 117]. Margaret

warns her distraught lover that these "dread curses . . . like an over-charged gun, [may] recoil/And turn the force of them upon thyself" [III, ii, 329-331]. And the guilty Cardinal Beaufort suffers from an "overcharged soul" [III, ii, 375]. Words and emotions are frequently spoken of as though they were weapons: Queen Margaret responds to the commoners' insistence that Suffolk is responsible for Gloucester's death, "So shall my name with Slander's tongue be wounded" [III, ii, 67]. When news of Duchess Eleanor's arrest arrives, the Cardinal turns to her husband, Humphrey: "This news, I think, hath turn'd your weapon's edge" [II, i, 172]. The Duke of Gloucester replies: "Sorrow and grief have vanguish'd all my powers;/And, vanguish'd as I am, I yield to thee" [II, i, 175-176]. When Walter Whitmore asks his captain if he may "stab the forlorn swain," i.e., Suffolk [IV, i, 65], they hold captive, the man replies, "First let my words stab him" [66].

Only once does a battle image serve any function beyond decorating its immediate context or adding to the general atmosphere of destruction. Queen Margaret, the woman whom, in Part I, Suffolk had persuaded Henry to marry, is quickly disappointed with her meek husband, particularly when compared with Suffolk. In Act I, scene iii, Margaret tells her lover that before her marriage she had hoped Henry would resemble him "when in the city of Tours/Thou ran'st a tilt in honour of my love" [50-51]. Herself a greedy fighter for earthly power, Margaret has little patience with a man who prefers to lay up spiritual treasures in heaven. She speaks patronizingly of Henry:

. . . all his mind is bent to holiness,
 To number Ave-Maries on his beads;
His champions are the prophets and apostles,
His weapons holy saws of sacred writ,
His study is his tilt-yard, and his loves
 Are brazen images of canoniz'd saints.

[55-60]

Granted, Margaret's ambition for power and her fiery nature lead her to play an unsympathetic part in destroying Henry's court; nonetheless, at this point in the trilogy, her opinion of Henry VI seems undeniably valid. We spectators may lose regard for her as she increasingly betrays Henry both as a husband and as a king, but for the moment we cannot but agree with her portrait of Henry as a man more devoted to spiritual than to the temporal kingdom, a devotion which may be admirable in a private man but is disastrous in a public one. The role of king requires the skill of a pragmatic man able to manage practical affairs of state and capable of evoking loyalty from his court and subjects. Henry VI is not such a man. First, he seems to lack the insight to realize that his court is being split asunder by factions among the nobility. Second, even if credited with perception enough to understand his nation's peril, he does absolutely nothing to stop the growing conflict. As in Part I, Henry's only action is inaction: he meekly begs for unity, but he does nothing to restore order in his kingdom. Instead he wistfully laments "my wretched reign" [IV, ix, 48].

At the same time that Margaret's sneering words characterize Henry VI, they also reveal something of the speaker herself. The warrior in his royal family is obviously Margaret, who admires battle bravery in Suffolk, later decries Henry's unwillingness to fight the Yorkists in

combat, and finally dons armor herself to do battle in Part III. In her disgust for non-soldierly virtues, Margaret bares her own marital nature. Thus, the passage characterizes both the speaker and the person spoken of.

Light vs. dark. Although light/dark images are less numerous in Part II than in either of the other plays of the trilogy, they are much like their antecedents in Part I. There are images in which darkness is associated with evil or death and light with good or life: York curses him who "dims the honour of this warlike isle!" [I, v. 124] Blackness and night are also the traditional companions of evil magic. Therefore, when Duchess Eleanor wants to practice her witchcraft, the time chosen must be night, as Bolingbroke tells her:

Deep night, dark night, the silent of the night,
The time of night where Troy was set on fire.
 The time when screech-owls cry, and ban-dogs howl,
 And spirits walk, and ghosts break up their graves.
 [I, iv, 16-19]

And the fiends subsequently conjured up are from "darkness and the burning lake" [38]. The contrast between black night and crimson flames recalls the vivid contrast between the dark night and glittering comets of Part I, Act I, scene i. Henry, in his usual Biblical idiom, speaks of God giving light in the darkness: "God shall be my hope,/My stay, my guide, and lantern to my feet" [II, 111, 24-25]. Another time he intones, "God be prais'd, that to believing souls/Gives light in darkness, comfort in despair! [II, i, 66-67].

As in Part I there are sun/star images which reflect the Renaissance idea of the planets having some control over man's fate. Queen Margaret

holds the head of her dead lover and says, "this lovely face/Rul'd like a wandering planet over me" [IV, iv, 15-16]. And Henry addresses hapless Gloucester:

What low'ring star now envies thy estate,
That these great lords, and Margaret our Queen,
Do seek subversion of thy harmless life?
[III, i, 206-208]

As in Part I, there are also images based on the sun/king analogy, such as York's statement that the "golden circuit" [III, i, 352] he so desires is "like to the glorious sun's transparent beams" [353]. But no sun/king images revolve around any figure as they did around Henry V in Part I. Also, as in Part I, there are a few images of war as a fire, such as a Lieutenant's image that "now the house of York . . ./Burns with revenging fire" [IV, i, 94-96].

In general, the light/dark images are fewer in number and briefer in length and less notable than in Part I, with one obvious exception. The first seven lines of Act IV, scene i, contain some of the most memorable images of the play. A Lieutenant speaks:

The gaudy, blabbing, and remorseful day
Is crept into the bosom of the sea.
And now loud-howling wolves arouse the jades
That drag the tragic melancholy night;
Who with their drowsy, slow, and flagging wings
Clip dead men's graves, and from their misty jaws
Breathe foul contagious darkness in the air.
[IV, i, 1-7]

Such a passage effectively reveals the inherent weakness of merely labeling images according to their subject matter or vehicle: is this speech sea imagery? animal? supernatural? disease? light/dark? The Lieutenant's speech smoothly blends all of these vehicles into one of the

finest imagistic passages in the play, with its contrast of "blabbing . . . day" vs. "melancholy night" and its skillful appeal to the senses. The passage moves almost like a slow-motion film: the day creeps into the sea and the jades drag the night with "drowsy, slow and flagging wings." In the latter line the long 'o' and 's' sounds emphasize the mournful lethargy of the action. The passage also moves from life to death as it notes that "gaudy, blabbing" day, like a child, creeps to the life-giving mother, to "the bosom of the sea," while night and death take over the world and the world becomes a place of dead men's graves and "contagious darkness." The contrasting sounds of the passage are also vivid: the "blabbing . . . day" gives way as "loud-howling wolves" awaken the jades whose "drowsy . . . wings" fill the night. In short, sound and sense unite in the Lieutenant's speech to present an impressive piece of poetry.

Despite the excellence of the Lieutenant's speech, it is, at the same time, unfortunately typical of much of the imagery in Part II and, indeed, the other plays as well; that is, this seven-line passage has little relationship to either the scene or its speaker. Act IV, scene i, presents the death of Suffolk by his captors, one of whom is the Lieutenant who speaks this passage and than abruptly changes the subject with an awkward transition: "Therefore bring forth the soldiers of our prize" [8]. The Lieutenant, a minor figure indeed, appears only in this scene and yet Shakespeare gives him one of the play's best speeches. The passage has little connection to the scene beyond the tenuous fact that it is an ominous image and England has fallen into ominous times.

Certainly, it adds to the play's atmosphere of death and destruction, but it could just as successfully perform such a function in almost any other scene of the play. In short, the Lieutenant's speech is a good example of the often decried 'purple patches' of Henry VI, easily lifted out of the play and admired for its own value without any damage to the play or the scene.

School-boys. As indicated in Chapter II, images of school-boys, which appear less than five times in Part I and then only as decoration, serve a more vital function in Part II. Although they are numerically no more significant, school-boys' images do play an important part in Queen Margaret's verbal attack on Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester and Henry VI's Lord Protector. Ironically, Gloucester's accusation of Winchester in Part I ("none do you like but an effeminate prince/Whom, like a school-boy, you may over-awe," I, i, 35-36) now becomes the charge directed against himself. Ambitious for power herself, Queen Margaret dislikes the idea of Gloucester having any control at all over his nephew, the king. She angrily asks Suffolk:

What! shall King Henry be a pupil still
Under the surly Gloucester's governance?
 Am I a queen in title and in style,
 And must be made a subject to a duke?

[I, iii, 46-49]

At the trial and banishment of Gloucester's wife, Eleanor, Queen Margaret faces Gloucester himself with these words:

I see no reason why a king of years
Should be to be protected like a child.
 God and King Henry govern England's helm!
 Give up your staff, sir.

[II, iii, 28-31]

Of course, what Margaret wants is for Gloucester to stop treating Henry like a child so that she, instead, could treat him like one. Queen Margaret, a cute little thing in Part I, has become a hardened woman of fire and ambition by the time Part II is under way, and she will overpower anything or anyone in her path. For such a woman, the gentleness and child-like simplicity of a man like Henry are but weaknesses to be sneered at and played upon in order to further her own aims. That Queen Margaret will indeed treat the King of England like a slow-witted child is recognized by Duchess Eleanor, herself a domineering wife. In Act I, scene iii, the queen drops her fan and, allegedly mistaking Eleanor for one of her lesser attendants, boxes Eleanor on the ear for failing to retrieve the fan immediately. Eleanor is understandably outraged, but Henry tries, as usual, to placate the two spit-fires. As is so often the case in an interrupted argument, the self-styled mediator himself is attacked; the Duchess warns Henry: "Look to't in time;/ She'll hamper thee and dandle thee like a baby" [I, iii, 144-145].

Acting. As Chapter II indicated, the 'world-as-a-stage' metaphor was familiar to Elizabethan audiences and Shakespeare makes use of it in Henry VI. While Part I has several acting metaphors which revolve about Henry VI as a player-king, similar images do not appear in Part II. Instead, the theatrical imagery seems to center about the idea of acting as a form of deception. A few obvious acting images appear to be merely appropriate decoration for their passages; for example, Gloucester, arrested and made to realize the coming disasters for his king and country, warns Henry VI of his enemies: "Mine [death] is made the prologue to

their play" [III, i, 151]. And Duchess Eleanor, eager to push her husband onto the throne, vows, "I will not be slack/To play my part in Fortune's pageant" [I, ii, 66-67]. Like so many in the trilogy, Eleanor's remarks are ironic, for her part in Fortune's pageant proves to be a far cry from the one she hopes for: the Wheel of Fortune carries her almost to the top only to plummet her suddenly to the bottom, to permanent disgrace and exile. As in Part I, Shakespeare utilizes numerous words with inherent theatrical connotations: for example, Henry VI angrily asks Salisbury, "Wilt thou on thy death-bed play the ruffian" [V, i, 164]

Most of the acting images, however, emphasize the deceit implicit in an actor assuming the garb and personality of someone else. The image is appropriate to the play with its many characters adept at pretending one interest in order to hide another. For instance, York is determined to mow down all opposition and seize the throne for himself, but in order to stall for time and advantage he decides "I will take the Nevils' parts/And make a show of love to proud Duke Humphrey" [I, i, 240-241]. On the other side of the court split, Queen Margaret and Suffolk are equally determined to clear the way for their seizure of power and equally ready to seek protection behind a false emotion: Margaret and Suffolk pretend that their only interest is to protect King Henry from, of all things, the deceit of Gloucester. In the key scene, Act III, scene i, in which the plot against Gloucester is laid, the queen and her lover assume utmost concern for their king as the unsuspecting pawn of that wicked Gloucester. When reminded that

Gloucester seems spotless of any treachery, Suffolk replies:

Smooth runs the water where the brook is deep,
 And in his simple show he harbours treason.
 . . . Gloucester is a man
 Unsounded yet, and full of deep deceit.
 [III, i, 53-54, 56-57]

Queen Margaret supports her lover's views:

Seems he a dove? His feathers are but borrow'd,
 For he's disposed as the hateful raven:
 Is he a lamb? His skin is surely lent him,
 For he's inclin'd as is the ravenous wolves.
Who cannot steal a shape that means deceit?
 [III, i, 75-79]

When Gloucester is led away, still protesting his innocence of any treachery to either king or kingdom, Henry VI weeps and Queen Margaret is disgusted. She says her husband is

Too full of foolish pity; and Gloucester's show
 Beguiles him as the mournful crocodile
 With sorrow snares relenting passengers;
 Or as the snake, roll'd in a flow'ring bank,
 With shining checker'd slough, doth sting a child
 That for beauty thinks it excellent.
 [III, i, 225-230]

These passages will, of course, be discussed under animal imagery; nonetheless, the fact that their emphasis is on deceit and role-switching makes them at the same time undeniably images of the theatre.

Shadow vs. substance. Similarly, the image of shadow vs. substance, which continues from Part I, has a kinship with the acting metaphor in their common characteristic of appearance vs. reality. Examples of the shadow vs. substance motif include Suffolk's delivery of the new queen to Henry, "To your most gracious hands that are substance/Of that great shadow I did represent" [I, i, 13-14]. The question of appearance vs.

reality is the basis of the Simpcox incident in Act II, scene i, in which Gloucester unmasks the trickery of Saunder Simpcox, a blind cripple who claims a miraculous gift of sight. King Henry and Queen Margaret have just come in from hawking with several of the nobles, and as usual, the court has fallen into bickering when they are interrupted by the arrival of the Mayor of Saint Albans with several townsmen and Simpcox. The crowd clamors to tell their king of the marvelous restoration of sight for Simpcox who came to the shrine of Saint Albans for help. While commoners and king are thrilled by the supposed miracle, it is Gloucester alone who penetrates the false appearance of the situation and recognizes the "subtle knave's" [104] trickery. The scene effectively demonstrates the naive blindness of Henry as contrasted with the incisive judgment of Gloucester. Henry only mouths his usual pious comments, such as:

Poor soul! God's goodness hath been great to thee:
Let never day nor night unhallow'd pass.
But still remember what the Lord hath done.

[84-86]

But Gloucester finds the reality behind appearance and slyly sets a trap for Simpcox, who claims to have been blind from birth, by asking, "What colour is this cloak of?" [108] When the man unhesitatingly replies, "red as blood" [109] and says Gloucester's gown is "coal-black as jet" [111]. Gloucester wonders aloud how such a man would be able to know the colors of blood and jet. "Sight may distinguish of colours, but suddenly/To nominate them all, it is impossible" [128-129]. Gloucester then suggests that it would be another miracle to "restore this cripple to his legs" [132] and sends for a Beadle with whips to

"whip him till he leap over" [144] the stool. After the first hit, 'crippled' Simpcox "leaps over the stool and runs away" [Folio s.d.], with the people following after and crying, "A miracle!" Thus, it is only Gloucester who sees beneath the appearance of Simpcox to his reality.

II. MAJOR IMAGES

Water. The final water image in Part I, Henry's admission that Suffolk's description of Margaret's beauty has stimulated a storm within his breast [V, v, 1-9], has been noted in Chapter II as anticipatory of the water imagery in Part II. As was discussed in the previous chapter, most of the water images in Part I are both brief and peaceful in nature, with the single exception of Henry's speech in Act V, scene v. In contrast, the storms foreshadowed by Henry's words begin to rage in literal and metaphorical earnest over land and sea in Part II; in general, Part II's water imagery is much more detailed and violent than its predecessor in Part I, and it becomes one of the three dominant metaphors of the play and the trilogy as a whole (animal and garden being the other two). This is not to say that every water image in Part II is violent in nature; as does Part I, Part II employs scattered peaceful water images, such as Suffolk's promise to Margaret that they will remove all enemies and "you yourself shall steer the happy helm" [I, iii, 100]. And the traditional ship of state image also occurs in Queen Margaret's hypocritical declaration, "God and King Henry govern England's helm!" [II, iii, 30]

But even with these apparently pleasant images, a hint of chaos and evil is present, for in an ordered world it is Henry, not Margaret, who should "steer the happy helm of the ship of state. Unfortunately Henry simply is not the firm helmsman England so desperately needs, and when Margaret should "govern England's helm!" we spectators painfully recall Suffolk's promise to Margaret that she herself will steer the ship, and we know that England is headed straight into raging storms and possible shipwreck.

Storms of all sorts threaten the stability of the English ship in Part II. These are reflected in the violent and/or unpleasant nature of even the primarily decorative sea images: they show wind and water in agitation and ships floundering far from port. As in Part I, several of the images are still brief: Gloucester refers to his "choler being overblown" [I, iii, 152] after a short walk; "Suffolk's cloudy brow" reveals "his stormy hate" [III, i, 155]; Warwick asks Henry VI to note the disarray of Gloucester's body, particularly his rough beard "like to the summer's corn by tempest logd'd" [III, ii, 175]. Henry VI would gladly "drain/Upon [Gloucester's] face an ocean of salt tears" [III, ii, 142]. Lord Say tries to convince Cade that his breast is free "from harbouring foul deceitful thoughts" [IV, vii, 98]; Henry VI, disillusioned by Warwick's and Salisbury's betrayals, asks where faith and loyalty shall "find a harbour in the earth?" [V, i, 168]; York insists that fear will "find no harbour in a royal heart"[III, i, 336]. Suffolk uses proverbial language in his hypocritical efforts to persuade Henry VI of Gloucester's threatening ambition: "Smooth runs the water where the

brook is deep,/And in his simple show he harbours treason" [III, i, 53-54]. Gloucester "is a man/Unsounded yet, and full of deep deceit" [III, i, 56-57].

The major storm which threatens to capsize England is civil war, and the storm-war comparison is frequently made by Part II's characters. This image of war as a storm is scarcely original with Shakespeare, for Renaissance man considered war in the political structure obviously analogous to war in the natural elements; nonetheless, lack of uniqueness in no way precludes lack of appropriateness. Widespread, useless destruction, unpredictability, rampant death and chaos--the two forces share many characteristics. Sea-storm imagery, which will become the dominant metaphor of Part III, occurs consistently and appropriately throughout Part II. The first example is the longest: in Act III, scene i, York reveals, in soliloquy, his plans to seize the crown by hiring Jack Cade to lead a rebellion in England while he goes to quell the Irish revolt:

While I in Ireland nourish a mighty band,
I will stir up in England some black storm
Shall blow ten thousand souls to heaven, or hell;
And this fell tempest shall not cease to rage
Until the golden circuit on my head,
Like to the glorious sun's transparent beams,
Do calm the fury of this mad-bred flaw.

[III, i, 348-354]

York's words begin the play's emphasis on war as a storm and, at the same time, point up the place of the sun-king as a beneficent bringer of peace, a role which Henry VI is not fulfilling.

It is significant that the play's storm imagery receives its impetus in the same scene in which the beasts of prey and slaughter images reach their full force. As will be discussed later in this

chapter, these animal images are the major motif of Part II, and the releasing of these raging animals in Act III, scene i, is obviously reinforced by the parallel releasing of the natural destructive elements of wind and water. The two images have the same function: natural forces are unleashed to rain havoc on man.

The plans of York progress as hoped for: Gloucester is removed, Suffolk banished, and Cade stirs up a rebellion against Henry. Civil war has begun. Jack Cade's rebellion rains terror until old Clifford manages to sway the mob to return to the king. Scarcely has this lull been established before a messenger comes with news of the approach of treachery, but coming actually to seize the crown. The king receives the message with apt sea imagery:

Thus stands my state, 'twixt Cade and York distress'd;
Like to a ship that, having scap'd a tempest,
Is straightway calm'd and boarded with a pirate.

[IV, ix, 31-33]

In turn, York also understands this situation clearly: he realizes that he must conceal his real purpose in leading an army to Henry VI, for the king still has more power and men than he. York says, "I must make fair weather yet awhile/Till Henry be more weak, and I more strong" [V, i, 30-31]. In the heated name-calling which quickly develops between the Yorkist faction and those loyal to the king, Warwick warns royalist Clifford to keep away "from the tempest on the field" [V, i, 198]. Clifford replies, "I am resolv'd to bear a greater storm/Than any thou canst conjure up to-day" [V, i, 199-200]. Unimpressed, Warwick responds:

This day, I'll wear aloft my burgonet,--
As on a mountain top the cedar shows
That keeps his leaves in spite of any storm.

[V, i, 205-207]

The storm of civil war which thus begins to rage in Part II develops gigantic proportions in Part III as it tosses England on a sea of destruction. While sea-storm images come to dominate the metaphorical landscape of the last play of the trilogy and will be discussed in Chapter IV, it is important to note at this point that the image of war as a storm was foreshadowed by a single image in Part I and is emphasized by several images in Part II. The chaos which destroys the English vessel of state in Part III is clearly prepared for in Parts I and II, particularly the latter in which nearly every major figure speaks of civil dissension as a storm or England as a ship or the monarch as a helmsman.

Only once in Part II is the sea involved in the actual staging of the play; in Act IV, scene i, which takes place on the coast of Kent, the opening Folio stage directions are: "Alarum. Fight at sea. Ordnance goes off. Enter a Lieutenant, a Master, a Master's mate, Walter Whitmore, & soldiers; with Suffolk disguised, and two gentlemen prisoners." Yet the sea fight and the scene's being located on "this discolour'd shore" [11] seem to have little significance beyond emphasizing the accurate fulfillment of the spirits' second prophecy in Duchess Eleanor's garden: "By water shall he [Suffolk] die and take his end" [I, iv, 32]. The captured Suffolk is startled when he learns the name of his captor, Walter Whitmore, for the 'l' was silent in Renaissance pronunciation and the name was thus "Water." And, in fact, the Quarto version simply spells the name as "Water" throughout the scene. Thus, when Suffolk is unsuccessful in pleading for his life and Walter kills him, the prophesy

proves doubly accurate; for Suffolk dies by water in two senses: he is on a sea shore and his killer's name is 'Water.' However, the sea in this scene appears to have little relationship with the play's sea or storm imagery; it seems to be important only as a necessary tool in accomplishing a witch's prediction.

In contrast, an actual sea storm which takes place off-stage and is discussed on-stage appears to have close connections with the play's verbal imagery. In Act III, scene ii, when false-hearted Suffolk brings news that Gloucester is dead, Henry VI sorrowfully refuses to speak to either his queen or Suffolk. Queen Margaret, full of feminine guile, tries to regain Henry's attention and sympathy with the timeless 'Is-this-what-I-get-for-my-pains?' rhetoric. Recalling her troubled voyage from her native France to England and Henry, she demands:

Was I for this nigh wreck'd upon the sea,
And twice by awkward wind from England's bank
Drove back again onto my native clime?

[III, ii, 81-83]

Lest one say "Poor Margaret" too quickly, it should be kept in mind that we are watching and listening to a clever piece of deliberate acting by the queen. Margaret is eager to present herself as a helpless woman, threatened by the destructive forces of nature, while she, like a good, faithful wife, was trying to reach her new husband and adopted land. We in the audience know better. This French nemesis from across the sea may have weathered a storm on the way to England, but what is more important is that she has brought the storm with her. Critical attempts to exonerate Margaret as the devoted mother who does not want her son

removed from the line of succession inevitably fall short of the real Queen Margaret and her part in the trilogy: Margaret moves in Part II to take over the kingdom, long before she has the justification of Henry's unfatherly disinheriting of their son from the throne in Part III. From the first instant Margaret sets foot on English soil, she is a destructive force; while it would be too strong to blame the dissolution of Henry's Camelot on this fifteenth-century Guinevere and her Lancelot, the sexual and political alliance between Margaret and Suffolk does have a major part in the collapse of Henry VI's kingdom. Margaret's breach of her place as wife and queen and her failure to act the dual roles assigned her are major contributions to the storm which inundates England. As the verbal imagery indicates, the storm which lashes England in Part III is obviously brewing in Part II. Thus, while we listen to Queen Margaret for over forty lines about the sea storm which earlier threatened her life, we recall York's ugly promise in the previous scene to "stir up in England some black storm/[which] shall blow ten thousand souls to heaven, or hell" [III, i, 349-350]. And we realize that Margaret's storm with its "splitting rocks" [96] with their "ragged sides" [97], "sinking sands" [96], harsh winds and tossing waves is, at the same time, England's storm. The tempest which Margaret tried to escape is instead one she brought with her to destroy England.

Margaret's description of the storm which threatened her life is vivid, and, although perhaps too long to maintain the audience's complete absorption, quite impressive. Much could be said about the poetic impact of Margaret's speech and its blending of sound and sense. The

passage's alliteration and onomatopoeia produce an effective impression of winds, waves, and rocks; for example, the whistling wind is clearly echoed in the 's,' 'z,' and 'b' sounds of

What did I then, but curs'd the gentle gusts
 And he that loos'd them forth from their brazen caves;
 And bid them blow towards England's blessed shore.
 [87-89]

Of more relevance to the present discussion, however, is Margaret's action during the storm. Queen Margaret tells Henry that "the pretty vaulting sea refus'd to drown me" [93] because it knew that "thy flinty heart, more hard than" [98] the shore rocks would kill her. Margaret's accusation, meant to sting Henry into paying heed to her, is ironic, for Henry is nothing if not tender-hearted. His problem is not lack of heart but lack of decisiveness and follow-through. In fact, at the very moment of Margaret's tirade, Henry is weeping for the death of his innocent uncle, Gloucester, a death for which he is grieved but which he did nothing to prevent. No, Henry may be a wretched monarch, but he is not hard-hearted. We in the audience know who actually has the "flinty heart"--Margaret herself. And she, perhaps unwittingly, reveals what happened to substitute a heart of flint for her human one: immediately after accusing Henry of possessing a heart of stone, Margaret relates that the storm became increasingly fierce. She says that when the tempest beat her ship back and robbed her of sight of England:

I took a costly jewel from my neck--
 A heart it was, bound in with diamonds--
 And threw it towards thy land. The sea receiv'd it.
 [105-107]

Just as Joan in Part I had offered to "lop a member off" [V, iii, 15] in blood sacrifice to her fiends from Hell, so Margaret offers a sacrifice to the gods of the storm and sea. What she tosses to the forces of dark destruction as a bribe is her very humanity: her own heart, "a costly jewel" [105] indeed. With this action she becomes a compatriot of the forces of chaos and brings the storm to England with her.

Although Queen Margaret does not refer to this particular storm again after her forty-line bombast, she does use occasional sea-storm images later. For example, when she and Suffolk must part, Margaret says to him:

Give me thy hand,
That I may dew it with my mournful tears;
Nor let the rain of heaven wet this place,
To wash away my woeful monuments.

[III, ii, 338-341]

Henceforth, she will "with the southern clouds contend in tears, / Theirs for the earth's increase, mine for my sorrows" [III, ii, 383-384].

In addition to the danger Part II's metaphorical sea faces from storms, in-land waters are threatened by their own troubles: mud and pollution. When Gloucester faces imprisonment on false charges, he shows no fear because

A heart unspotted is not easily daunted,
The purest spring is not so free from mud
As I am clear from treason to my sovereign.

[III, i, 100-102]

And the Lieutenant who captures Suffolk toys with his family name, Poole:

Ay, kennel, puddle, sink, whose filth
Troubles the silver spring where England drinks;
 Now will I dam up this thy yawning mouth,
 For swallowing the treasure of the realm.

[IV, i, 70-73]

This idea of pure water spoiled by mud and filth is supported by other images of stains in the play. For example, when Gloucester's Duchess is arrested, he declares

Noble she is, but if she have forgot
Honour and virtue, and convers'd with such
As like to pitch, defile nobility,
I banish her my bed and company.

[II, i, 186-189]

Gloucester later says he does not wish to "be attainted" [II, iv, 59] by her evil ambitions and she regrets her "scandal were not wip'd away" [II, iv, 65]. Walter Whitmore observes that "never yet did base dishonour blur our name/But with our sword we wip'd away the blot" [IV, i, 39-40]. And Henry VI sententiously pronounces, "What stronger breastplate than a heart untainted!" [III, ii, 231] The tacit assumption behind each of these images is that evil produces a visible sign of its presence, that shame and dishonor show themselves in physical terms and reveal hidden corruptions. Corruption--that is the key word behind both the images of Gloucester's mud-polluted springs and Eleanor's pitch-defiled virtue: something pure has been stained by impurity.

In short, the sea images of Part II, longer and more numerous than their predecessors in Part II, are usually violent or unpleasant in nature. They generally concern storms--both on land and sea; wind; rain; tears; mud and filth; jagged rocks; dark clouds; and ships barely escaping destruction by the elements. The forces inherent in nature in Part I make themselves keenly felt in Part II; however, the full fury of the gale does not rage until Part III Henry VI where storm imagery becomes the dominant metaphor of the drama.

Animal. Significantly, the enclosure motif which so dominated Part I nearly disappears in Part II. If one keeps in mind its thematic function as underlining the basic rationality of life, then this marked decrease is particularly important for what it indicates about Shakespeare's concept of man in war. As discussed in Chapter II, the enclosures of Part I reflect the desire for order on the part of somewhat civilized, thinking beings; man has choices open to him and he can control his decisions, thereby determining, to some extent at least, his own fate. But what does the gradual decline of this enclosure motif indicate about man? What image, if any, develops into prominence in its stead? And what does that new image tell us about man in war?

The answers to these questions lie in Part II's animal imagery, the play's dominant image. While the number and length of passages employing animal imagery increase over Part I,² there is a more significant difference in the nature of the images, a development which may not be obvious at first glance. Many of the same animals appear in Part II's metaphoric languages: birds of various kinds, dogs, horses, lions, deer, bees, wolves, and sheep. Although bird images are less frequent than in Part I where they dominate the animal imagery, they are little changed: still threatened by traps and snares, the birds

²Cf. I, i, 123-126, 200-203; ii, 93; iii, 36-38, 88-91, 148-151, 193, 206; II, i, 13-14, 155-156, 180-181, 186-189; ii, 72-73; iv, 31, 53-57; III, i, 18-20, 53-57, 69-73, 74-79, 158-160, 170-171, 191-194, 210-219, 223-230, 247-251, 252-259, 339-344, 362-363; ii, 15-16, 39-43, 75-77, 84-86, 124-126, 185-199, 258-268, 308-326; IV, i, 1-7, 51-52, 59-64, 105, 108-111; ii, 25-29, 77-78, 116; iii, 3-5; iv, 31-32, 35-36, 50-52; vii, 70-73, 100-101; viii, 55; x, 26-29; V, i, 141, 142-146, 148-155, 203-211; ii, 1-5, 9-12, 14-15; iii, 1-7.

struggle to escape. However, escape by flight does not seem to be as easy or as frequent as in Part II and several characters are not only threatened but also caught like birds in a snare. Typical is Suffolk's assurance to his paramour, Queen Margaret, that his plans will eliminate Duchess Eleanor as an annoyance:

Madam, myself have lim'd a bush for her,
And plac'd a quire of such enticing birds
That she will light to listen to their lays,
And never mount to trouble you again.³

[I, iii, 88-91]

Suffolk's scheme to catch Eleanor in the midst of ceremonies of magic and then have her tried for using witchcraft to further her treasonous ambitions proves successful. In Act I, scene iv, the ill-tempered woman is caught participating in magical practices in her own garden (according to the Folio stage directions) or orchard (according to the Quarto stage directions), both appropriate places to lime a bush for a bird. Interestingly, Eleanor does actually "mount" for the last time in this scene and listens to the birds below: according to the Quarto stage directions, "She goes up to the tower" [12-13] in order to overlook the conjuring up of prophetic spirits by Margery Jourdain, Southwell, and Bolingbroke. Or as the Folio stage directions read: "Enter Duchess aloft." As she looks down on the magic rites, York and Buckingham "break in" [Folio s.d.] and arrest her for treason. This combination of increasing animal imagery with decreasing enclosure motif should

³ Note the trilogy's use of the ascent-descent motif: Cf. Part I, IV, v, vi, vii; Part II, I, ii, 13-16, 63-65, 45-49; II, i, 10-15, 98-100; III, i, 20-22; Part III, V, vi, 61-67.

be noted as Eleanor, caught like a bird in a snare, so says Suffolk, is in stage actuality caught in a real tower in a real garden, broken into by York and Buckingham. One enclosure parallels another.

Eleanor understands her own situation; she realizes that she has been cleverly trapped by Suffolk and the other nobles. And after her trial and banishment, Eleanor tries to warn her unsuspecting husband, Humphrey, of the similar fate awaiting him:

And York, and impious Beaufort, that false priest,
Have all lim'd bushes to betray thy wings;
And, fly thou how thou canst; they'll tangle thee:
But fear not thou, until thy foot be snar'd,
Nor never seek prevention of thy foes.

[II, iv, 53-57]

The enemies of the "good duke Humphrey" prove as skillful with husband as with wife, and Gloucester is also ensnared like a bird. Duchess Eleanor is a memorable but rather unsympathetic character: although the spectator may share her annoyance with the arrogant new queen from France, particularly in the incident of the dropped fan in Act I, scene iii, he probably finds her eagerness for Gloucester to be king so that she may be queen both credible and human but nonetheless distasteful. Eleanor's role in Part II is relatively small--she appears in only six scenes--but she is one of the best-drawn individuals in a trilogy in which it is often difficult to tell one character from another. She is ambitious, ruthless, and perceptive, but she unfortunately seems to have too much of Lady Macbeth's shrewishness without enough of her stature. Although her husband is also a memorable figure, his characterization is less effective because of its awkward switch in Part II; suddenly in the middle of the trilogy's second

drama Gloucester is the "good duke Humphrey" of Hall's Chronicles, the last hope for restoring order in England, the only defender left for unity in Henry's court. But this figure is a far different one from the Gloucester of Part I, who fought with Winchester at Henry V's funeral and insulted him even before Henry VI's very face. Unfortunately, one of the trilogy's grave flaws lies here: there is simply no preparation in Part I for the place Gloucester holds in Part II. In neither action nor language--both his own and that of others about him--is the good Duke Humphrey of Part II the same man as the quarreling Gloucester of Part I. In the initial play, Gloucester is an important part of the beginning disorder but in Act III of the second play he is unexpectedly thrust into the role of order's last defender. As such his presence poses an obstacle to the other nobles--Suffolk, Cardinal Beaufort (Winchester), and York--who fight among themselves, each hoping to gain control over the kingdom. Gloucester must be removed from the national scene. Just as Talbot's death is highly significant in allowing the chaos to begin in Part I, Gloucester's death is extremely important in allowing that chaos to grow in Part II.

When Humphrey's foes are successful in ensnaring him just as they earlier trapped his wife, Henry VI makes no effort to help him and Humphrey is murdered by assassins hired by Suffolk and Cardinal Beaufort. The Cardinal, however, becomes conscience-stricken and dies in anguish and torment for his deed. Interestingly, the same snare image is picked up by the dying man as he is tortured by visions of Gloucester's body with its rumpled hair standing "upright, Like lime twigs to catch my

winged soul" [III, iii, 15-16]. Like Part I's phoenix image, or Talbot's "moody-mad stag" image, or the Countess of Auvergne's entrapment, the emphasis in the Cardinal's words is on an ironic reversal of events: the trapped becomes the trapper. The good, innocent Humphrey, trapped and killed by Suffolk and Beaufort, in turn traps the guilty Cardinal Beaufort's soul. Ironically, the good now ensnares the wicked.

Traps and snares are obviously still a threat to the animal population of Part II's metaphoric world; nonetheless, as indicated, a significant difference between the animal imagery of Part I and that of Part II does exist. While traps and snares are still present, they are not so prominent as before. Instead, the beasts of prey, only briefly appearing in Part I, have new prominence and Part I's emphasis on traps and other liberty-inhibiting devices gives way to a new emphasis on killing, blood, and violence. The enclosure motif is gradually but definitely replaced by slaughter imagery. From early brief images, such as Humphrey's exile of his plotting wife "as a prey to law and shame" [II, i, 190], the slaughter image increases, finally becoming the major mode of expression in Part II Henry VI.

A transitional scene important in the development of animal imagery is the first scene of Act II, in which imagery, staging, and action are all of a single piece. The setting is Saint Albans. Henry VI, his queen, Gloucester, Cardinal Beaufort, Suffolk and various Falconers enter the stage "as if they came from hawking," according to the Quarto stage directions. The haughty queen carries "her Hawke on her fist" [Quarto s.d.] and the Folio stage directions indicate that the Falconers

are "hallooing." The first part of this scene basically serves the same function in Act I, scene i; Act I, scene iii, or Act III, scene i in Part I; that is, it demonstrates another step taken toward disorder by showing the nobles of Henry's court bickering again, seizing another opportunity to attack each other rather than draw together. Significantly, this is the first such scene to be built around the animal imagery. As the royal hunting party enters, Queen Margaret is, as might be expected from one of her spirit, full of excited praise for the day's hunt. To Gloucester, King Henry says: "what a point, my lord, your falcon made/And what a pitch she flew above the rest!" [II, i, 5-6] Henry's remark and the nobles' subsequent sarcasms directed against Gloucester have more pointed aptness when one keeps in mind the fact that Gloucester's badge was a falcon with a maiden's head. Revealing his usual penchant for the pious phrase and the moral epigram, Henry VI continues: "To see how God in all his creatures works!/Yea, man and birds are fain of climbing high" [II, i, 7-8]. Gloucester, like his wife, is thus portrayed in this scene as a bird who flies too high to suit the others of the flock. Just as Suffolk has prevented Eleanor from ever mounting again by ensnaring her in the midst of witchcraft, Suffolk now gathers the nobles to attack Gloucester before his threat proves too great. The phoenix image and Talbot's extended use of the Daedalus-Icarus legend in Part I make the scene's imagery even more poignant, for here we have a continuation of the idea that birds--and men--who soar too far above the others will, either through their own indiscretions or actions of jealous companions, fall to the earth.

Gloucester's jealous peers, Suffolk and Cardinal Beaufort, delightedly seize their opportunity to attack the Protector under the guise of discussing the day's hawking. Henry's words about men and birds climbing high give Suffolk his opportunity:

No marvel, and it like your Majesty,
My Lord Protector's hawks do tower so well;
They know their master loves to be aloft,
And bears his thoughts above his falcon's pitch.
 [II, i, 9-12]

Gloucester, willing to play the word game, replies:

My lord, 'tis but a base ignoble mind
That mounts no higher than a bird can soar:
Car. I thought as much; he'd be above the clouds.
 [II, i, 13-15]

But the light banter quickly becomes an ominous quarrel pregnant with physical violence. Gloucester, attacked by Suffolk on the one hand and the Cardinal on the other, refuses to be subdued. He turns to his first critic: "Why, Suffolk, England knows thy insolence" [II, i, 31]. For the first time, Queen Margaret joins the quarrel, siding, of course, with her lover: "And thy ambition, Gloucester" [32]. As in Part I, Act III, scene i, when Gloucester and Beaufort, then Bishop of Winchester, had fallen into a squabble at parliament, Henry VI ineffectively begs for peace in his typically Biblical intonation:

I prithee, peace,
 Good queen, and whet not on these furious peers;
 For blessed are the peacemakers on earth.
 [II, i, 32-34]

Henry's pleas for unity merely cause the nobles to hide the quarrel from their sovereign. While disguising their real conversation under loud statements about "put[ting] up the fowl" [48], proud Gloucester and the

Cardinal privately swap insults and agree to 'fight it out' later to settle their differences once and for all. When Henry wants to know what the men are discussing, Gloucester replies, "Talking of hawking; nothing else, my lord" [52]. Gloucester's response may reveal more than he realizes for he and the Cardinal are indeed "talking of hawking": each of the nobles, released from the restraining bonds of Henry V's world of unity and order, is determined to soar above the others even if it means destroying the opposition. Gloucester becomes the sole defender of order in Act III of the play, but in this scene he is still the Gloucester of Part I--just another quarreling noble. The hawks are soaring upward with Suffolk and the Cardinal fiercely determined to stop Gloucester from flying above them. It is obvious that many beaks will be bloodied in the future fray.

The bloody conflict foreshadowed in the hawking scene reaches its inevitable climax in the opening scenes of Act III, perhaps the most important two scenes of the play. The first scene is long (383 lines) and its action is a turning point in Henry VI's reign: Gloucester is seized by Suffolk's treacherous cohorts and led away to prison and, unknowingly, to his death, while the meek king only stands by, hoping for Humphrey's deliverance. Up to this point the nobles' quarrels have been just that--verbal quarrels, exchanges of venomous insults, court spats--but with the bodily seizure of Gloucester the disunion of Henry's court takes on a deadlier aspect. With this final removal of order's last remnant the irrevocable step towards chaos is finally taken. The nobles have come to the edge of a precipice beyond which

lies national destruction; rejecting their opportunities to turn back, they now take that one fatal step forward--they plot the murder of a peer. Afterwards, the swift fall to the rocks of dynastic war below is inevitable. Thus, Act III, scene i, is a key scene: with Gloucester out of the way, England lies ready to be split asunder by civil war. With the plotting of murder, Henry's nobles set themselves on an inescapable path to national blood-shed and civil disintegration.

Significantly, Act III, scene i, presents the dissolution of much of Henry VI's kingdom: early in the scene Somerset brings news that "all is lost" [85] in France, every territory gone, news which Henry receives in his usual fashion: "Cold news, Lord Somerset: but God's will be done!" [86] Later in the scene, a post arrives with word of a rebellion in Ireland which York is sent to quell. But, left alone at the scene's conclusion, York reveals his plan to "stir up in England some black storm" [349] and seize the crown from Henry's head. Thus, in the very same scene in which Gloucester is removed, the entire kingdom reveals its thorough crumbling: France is lost completely; Ireland is rebelling; and York plans the revolt which opens the Wars of the Roses.

Act III, scene i, is dominated by its verbal imagery. Indeed, like Talbot's "moody-mad stags" speech in Part I, the imagery of this scene is its very point: the imagery is the idea. Of the scene's many images (including garden and sea), the animal imagery is the most important, both numerically and thematically. The dominant metaphor of the entire drama enjoys its most elaborate appearances in this and the following scene. As has been indicated, animal imagery changes

from an emphasis in Part I on traps, snares, and escape to an emphasis on slaughter and beasts of prey in Part II. The first few lines of Act III, scene i, hint of the viciousness of the jungle and the slaughter-house soon to reach a holocaust of blood fury. The King and Queen, Cardinal Beaufort, Suffolk, York, Buckingham, Salisbury, and Warwick enter Parliament, gathered at the Abbey at Bury St. Edmunds. Henry muses aloud that Gloucester should be here and Queen Margaret swiftly utilizes the opportunity to turn Henry against his protector. In the proverbial manner characteristic of nearly every speaker in the trilogy, she tries to persuade Henry that Gloucester is too ambitious, that for his own sake Henry must remove Gloucester:

Small curs are not regarded when they grin,
But great men tremble when the lion roars;
And Humphrey is no little man in England.

[III, i, 18-20]

He has become "insolent of late" [7], "proud . . . [and] peremptory" [8] and must be stripped of power before his flattering ways lead him to the throne itself, says Margaret. Suffolk joins Queen Margaret's arguments to explain that Gloucester's apparent innocence is but a surface mask hiding inner evil: "The fox barks not when he would steal the lamb" [55]. But Henry VI insists that Gloucester intends no harm "to our royal person" [70]; he is as blameless "as is the sucking lamb or harmless dove" [71]. Queen Margaret cannot let this remark pass:

Seems he a dove? His feathers are but borrow'd
For he's disposed as the hateful raven:
Is he a lamb? His skin is surely lent him,
For he's inclin'd as is the ravenous wolves.
Who cannot steal a shape that means deceit?

[75-79]

Henry VI's protestations beat but feebly against the unrelenting trap sprung by Suffolk and Queen Margaret. Gloucester enters and is immediately arrested by Suffolk on charges of high treason, of robbing the soldiers of their pay, and of devising strange unheard-of tortures for offenders. In the proper civil order of things, Henry should be like a shepherd to his flock in the kingdom, but as Gloucester is led away it is he who is the shepherd and Henry who is vulnerable, helpless sheep. Once again Henry fails to fulfill his national role. He also fails in his Christian role as the good shepherd who should be out in the pasture protecting his flock but he cannot fulfill his task: instead of protecting his people, Henry must himself be protected. Now aware of the accuracy of his wife's warnings, Gloucester in turn tries to warn Henry of his danger; as he is led away, Gloucester tells his monarch:

Thus is the shepherd beaten from thy side,
And wolves are gnarling who shall gnaw thee first.
 . . . good King Henry, thy decay I fear.
 [191-192; 194]

The slaughter imagery which centers around Gloucester in scenes i and ii of Act III is the primary method of creating the figure of "good duke Humphrey." Prior to Act III Gloucester is just another bickering noble, but with the image of Gloucester as a good shepherd a new characterization is begun. The abrupt switch in Gloucester's character previously discussed takes place at this point--the first scene of Act III. Suddenly a cluster of slaughter-house images creates the figure of Gloucester as the sole protective innocent left in Henry's court.

Henry VI continues the image as he bemoans hapless Gloucester's fate:

And as the butcher takes away the calf
And binds the wretch, and beats it when it strains,
Bearing it to the bloody slaughter-house;
 Even so, remorseless have they born him hence;
And as the dam runs lowing up and down,
Looking the way her harmless young one went
And can do nought but wail her darling's loss;
 Even so myself be wails good Gloucester's case
 With sad unhelpful tears, and with dimm'd eyes
 Look after him, and cannot do him good.

[210-219]

The royal saint, who thus envisions himself fast in a helpless feminine role feels that he can do nothing to save Gloucester, and, weeping, he leaves the stage. It is still not too late to save England if Henry will but act to stop his feuding nobles, but he does nothing. His neglect of the kingly power--indeed the obligation--to act permits Suffolk, Queen Margaret, Cardinal Beaufort and York to plot Gloucester's murder, after which deed there is no turning back from the destructive path England is on. Left free to plan Humphrey's death, the queen ridicules her husband who is "too full of foolish pity" [225]. Still pretending that her concern is for Gloucester's danger to naive Henry rather than his blocking her own way to power, Queen Margaret declares:

Gloucester's show
Beguiles him as the mournful crocodile
With sorrow snares relenting passengers;
Or as the snake, roll'd in a flow'ring bank,
With shining checker'd slough, doth sting a child
That for beauty thinks it excellent.

[225-230]

Queen Margaret's image introduces two new creatures to the animal world of Henry VI--the deceptive crocodile and the wily snake, both beings with evil connotations. It should also be noted that the snare threatening Henry is not just that of a human being trying to trap an animal but of

an animal trapping a human being. The trapping images have changed from the first play to the second: in Part I Talbot and his men were animals trapped by men; they were English deer caught in a closed man-made park, but in Part II man has become a trapping animal himself. Man no longer sets snares for animal; instead, he has become a trapping animal himself--a sly crocodile or venomous snake lying in wait to trap and slay the innocent. Equally prepared to claim that his sole interest is the safety of Henry in order to disguise his own ambition. York also urges the elimination of Gloucester:

Were't not all one an empty eagle were set
To guard the chicken from a hungry kite,
 As place Duke Humphrey for the king's Protector?
 [248-250]

The queen agrees that "the poor chicken should be sure of death" [251].

Suffolk concurs, switching the image to "were't not madness then/To make the fox surveyor of the fold?" [252-253] Gloucester must die

because "he is a fox,/By nature prov'd an enemy to the flock,/Before his chaps be stain'd with crimson blood" [257-259]. After all, the only

good fox is a dead fox. And the plotters cannot afford to quibble over

the best method: "Be it by gins, by snares, by subtlety,/Sleeping or waking, 'tis no matter how,/So he be dead" [262-264]. The traitorous

band, interrupted by news of the Irish rebellion, appoints York head of an army to be sent to quell that revolt, and the Cardinal ends the meeting by assuming the responsibility of Humphrey's death. Left alone on the stage, York rejoices over the good fortune his momentary allies have handed him in his climb to the throne:

My brain, more busy than the labouring spider,
Weaves tedious snares to trap mine enemies.
 Well, nobles, well; 'tis politicly done,
 To send me packing with an host of men:
 I fear me you but warm the starved snake,
Who, cherish'd in your breasts, will sting your hearts.
 [339-344]

Again York's words remind us that man himself has become either a trapping insect or a concealed viper in Part II. He is no longer a part of the world threatened by traps; rather he has become part of the threat itself. And it should be kept in mind that the beasts of prey prowling the metaphorical landscape of Part II do not have the justification given to their predecessors in Part I. As has been noted in Chapter II, in the initial play of the trilogy emphasis was placed on the hunger which prompted animals to attack. Such motivation is completely absent from the trilogy's second play, in which the beasts react not to hunger but simply to the smell of blood. It is not self-preservation but blood-lust which causes the animal to spring in Part II.

The good Duke Humphrey's enemies are successful: in the next scene, Act III, scene ii, two hired killers run on stage from their murder of the duke and report to Suffolk. After their departure, the King and Queen, the Cardinal and Somerset enter with attendants in order to hold Gloucester's trial for treason. Suffolk, sent to bring Gloucester to court, bursts in with word of Gloucester's death and, true to his pattern of behavior, Henry promptly swoons. When revived, the King lashes out at Suffolk, who has come "not to sing a raven's note" [39] of death, and whose futile words of comfort are like "the chirping of a wren" [41]

trying to "chase away the first-conceived sound" [43]. With atypical insight, Henry VI refuses to let Suffolk even come near him, for his touch "affrights as a serpent's sting" [46]; Suffolk is a "basilisk, / [who can] kill the innocent gazer with [his] sight" [51-52]. When Henry also turns away from his queen, she attempts to regain his attention and sympathy: "What! art thou, like the adder, waxen deaf? / Be poisonous too, and kill thy forlorn Queen" [75-76]. At length she asks if she made the difficult sea journey from her native France only to be ill-treated so. She should have heeded the "forewarning wind" [84] on the voyage, which seemed to say, "Seek not a scorpion's nest, / Nor set no footing on this unkind shore" [85-86].

As Margaret finishes her tirade (she would never win a contest that demanded an answer of twenty-five words or less), Warwick, Salisbury and many commoners enter, demanding justice for Gloucester's murder. Warwick tells the King:

The Commons, like an angry hive of bees
That want their leader, scatter up and down
And care not who they sting in his revenge.
 [124-126]

Warwick then shows Henry the sad spectacle of Gloucester's body with its signs of a violent struggle: darkened face full of blood, "hair uprear'd" [170], nostrils distended, and so on. Suffolk pretends startled innocence of such a murder, but Warwick reminds Henry VI that since Suffolk and Cardinal Beaufort had custody of the Duke, they must be guilty of his death. The earlier images of slaughter, butchery, and blood are picked up as Warwick says:

Who finds the heifer dead, and bleeding fresh,
And sees fast by a butcher with an axe,
But will suspect 'twas he that made the slaughter?
Who finds the partridge in the puttock's nest,
But may imagine how the bird was dead,
Although the kite soar with unbloodied beak?
 Even so suspicious is this tragedy.

[187-193]

Gloucester's and Henry's images of Gloucester as the shepherd led away from his flock or as the innocent lamb taken to slaughter are thus continued in this scene. Similarly, the bird images in Warwick's speech recall the hawking incident of Act II, scene i, in which the nobles showed their fierce envy of Gloucester who soared above them. The bloody beaks foreshadowed in the hawking scene are realized in this scene which discovers Gloucester's murderer. The butchery and bird of prey images continue as Queen Margaret joins the emotional scene by attempting to make Warwick's accusations appear foolish:

Are you the butcher, Suffolk? Where's your knife?
If Beaufort terms a kite? Where are his talons?
Suffolk. I wear no knife to slaughter sleeping men;
 But here's a vengeful sword, rusted with ease.
 That shall be scoured in his rancorous heart
 That slanders me with murder's crimson badge.

[194-195]

Suffolk, however, cannot escape the crimson badge of murder. Salisbury enters with word from the commoners that unless Suffolk is justly sentenced for Gloucester's murder, they will destroy the palace and torture him to death. If Henry VI cannot--or will not--protect himself, the people will. The same serpent imagery that Margaret had used about Gloucester and York about himself is now accurately employed to characterize treacherous Suffolk:

Were there a serpent seen, with forked tongue,
That slily glided towards your Majesty,
 It were but necessary you were wak'd,
 Lest, being suffer'd, in that harmful slumber,
The mortal worm might make the sleep eternal:
 And therefore do they cry, though you forbid,
 That they will guard you, whe'r you will or no,
From such fell serpents as false Suffolk is;
With whose envenomed and fatal sting,
 Your loving uncle, twenty times his worth,
 They say, is shamefully bereft of life.
 [258-268]

Salisbury and the people have their way; for once Henry VI is forced into action: equally convinced of Suffolk's treachery, he banishes the guilty duke from England.

Denied his ambitions and his mistress, Suffolk says farewell to Queen Margaret with tender signs for her and venomous curses for their enemies:

Poison be their drink!
 Gall, worse than gall, the daintiest that they taste!
 Their sweetest shade a grove of cypress trees!
 Their chiefest prospect murd'ring basilisks!
Their softest touch as smart as lizards' stings!
Their music, frightful as the serpent's hiss
And boding screech-owls make the consort full.
 [320-326]

Not only is Suffolk's speech typical of ritualistic curses frequent in the Henry VI trilogy but also the nature of Suffolk's word reflects Part II and III's concern for stings, bites, poisons, and diseases of all kinds. The characters are constantly threatened by stinging bees, serpents, and lizards and by loathsome diseases. Disease imagery, which makes an occasional appearance in Part I, adding to the oppressive atmosphere of chaos and death, increases noticeably in Part II, again supporting the pestilent-laden atmosphere. The images

are usually brief and are not concentrated about any one character or scene; the only idea reiterated is that civil war is a disease of the body politic. Examples include Humphrey's becoming "so choleric" over his wife's dream [I, ii, 51-52] and a messenger's request that the nobles stop the Irish rebellion "before the wound do grow uncurable" [III, i, 286]. Henry VI exiles Suffolk with: "He shall not breathe infection in this air/But three days longer on the pain of death" [III, ii, 286-287]. As Suffolk and Margaret separate, she tells him: "Though parting be a fretful corrosive, / It is applied to a deathful wound" [III, ii, 402-403]. And characters commonly speak of 'remedying' problems and 'purging' evil.

Deathful wounds, stinging snakes and bees, poisonous adders and scorpions, blood-stained foxes, kites with bloody beaks, dead and bleeding heifers, snare-weaving spiders, beaten and slaughtered calves, innocent lambs threatened by snarling wolves, butchers with knives and axes, good shepherds unable to save their flocks, and blood-spattered murderers--the actual and metaphoric world of Part II Henry VI is a terrifying one. It is as if the enclosure motif of Part I has been shattered and those creatures and emotions and ambitions held in confinement in the earlier play have been released to rain havoc on man in Part II. The bonds are broken; the thin covering of civilization which built the enclosures (i.e., city walls, towers, traps, snares, chains, and parks) has been scratched, and the primitive forces underneath have been let loose. This is not to say, however, that the enclosure motif of Part I, i.e., the choices available to man as an intelligent being,

has completely disappeared. Horner's fight with Peter [II, iii] can be viewed as a kind of scene within a scene; Duchess Eleanor is trapped by her enemies on a tower in Act I, scene iv, and Lord Scales appears in Act IV, scene v, talking "upon the tower" [of London] [Quarto s.d.]. It should be noted in this connection that only one such scene within a scene appears (in contrast with four in Part I) and that in neither tower scene does the turret constitute an obstacle or barrier. Eleanor is captured in a tower above her garden but the edifice is not the issue for contention as it was for Gloucester and Winchester in Part I, I, iii; it is merely the location from which Eleanor is observing the witchcraft below. Similarly, Scales is simply walking on the tower walls when he receives word of Cade's approaching rebels. Granted, the rag-tag band wants to seize the tower and Scales has been ordered to defend it, but the spectator never actually sees such a battle come to pass. Thus, the man-made enclosure motif still exists in Part II, but it is barely visible to both audience and characters. When Part II opens, the characters have already reached their fate-determining decisions: Suffolk and Queen Margaret are lovers, ambitious for control of the government; York burns with desire to be king; Henry VI wants only the chance to enjoy the peace of private virtue; and the nobles are split by bitter personal animosity with temporary alliances being made by Suffolk, Winchester, Somerset and Buckingham in order to check Gloucester's power, and by Salisbury, Warwick and York in order to oppose Suffolk's faction. Thus, at the first of the play, battle lines are drawn up according to the decisions already made in Part II; the action of Part II

is merely the unfolding of fate as determined by the earlier choices, choices which release animal passions to run riot, destroying the last vestiges of man-made order. This is not to say that all of Part II is without hope for England's salvation; up until Gloucester's murder there is indeed hope, for a reversal by almost any major figure could return England to the right course. Until Suffolk, Queen Margaret and Beaufort plan and execute Gloucester's violent murder, there is still a chance that order can be restored. It is the old 'if' story--England could be saved if Henry VI would take action to control his nobles; if Queen Margaret would discard her lover and turn her ambitions toward becoming a proper wife; if Gloucester would recognize England's danger in time to protect his king; if York and Suffolk would subordinate selfish aims to the cause of national unity, and so the story goes. Every character is free to change his mind until Gloucester's murder in Act III. With this first deed of blood the characters are set in a path from which there is no turning back and no stepping aside. Man continues on the path he has chosen until he reaches the point from which there is no return and no escape. Man's decisions in Part I release forces over which, after Gloucester's murder, he has no control; he becomes the victim of the forces he himself set into motion. In Part II man is no longer a setter of traps and builder of barriers to keep others in or out; rather he is a senseless butcher or a bloody victim of butchery. The enclosure motif of Part I gives way to the slaughter-house motif of Part II: opportunities for deliberate choice lessen as primitive forces take over. Man is no longer in control: he slowly falls

prey to the animal within himself, the savage elemental creature he has set free and cannot restrain. Decisions made prior to Part II release forces which run wild, transforming an ordered nation into a slaughter-house, a scorpion's nest, a place of vipers and wolves.

The crimson edge of slaughter flashes many times in Part II Henry VI. The slaughtering and butchering images which build to become the dominant mode of expression in Act III, scenes i and ii, and many subsequent scenes are vividly realized in the action and staging of the play. Unlike Part I which possesses only six deaths, Part II presents thirteen deaths. Number alone, of course, is not necessarily meaningful; what is illuminating is the difference in manner of dying. Deaths in Part I are not repulsive in nature; they are--if such terms can be used with any death--fairly neat and clean. Mortimer dies of old age; Bedford and Gargrave are shot; Talbot and his son fall as a result of battle wounds. We see every death except that of Talbot's son, John. No death is violent or unnatural; even the men killed in war--Salisbury, Gargrave, Talbot and his son, are either shot from a distance or wounded off-stage, and they give little attention to their wounds or pain or fear. Of all the deaths in Part I only Salisbury and Gargrave have their fatal wounds even mentioned by the other characters.

In contrast, the stage of Part II grows slippery with the gore of decapitated bodies and impaled heads gloried over by their killers. Deaths are violent, bloody and exceedingly unpleasant, and in order to rub the spectator's nose in as much horror as possible, Shakespeare has his characters linger over the killings and/or discuss them at

length. In all, thirteen deaths occur in Part II; Horner, an armourer, is killed by Peter in a trial by combat [II, iii]; Duke Humphrey is murdered by killers hired by ambitious nobles and his body is displayed and discussed at length by Warwick in an effort to convince Henry VI of the unnaturalness of the death [III, ii]; Cardinal Beaufort, guilt-stricken for his complicity in Humphrey's murder, dies in mental torment [III, iii]; Suffolk is stabbed and decapitated by pirates [IV, ii] and throughout scene iv, Queen Margaret clutches his bloody head to her bosom in deep grief; the two Stafford brothers are slain by Jack Cade's army [IV, iii] and their bodies dragged to London; Matthew Goffe and his entire company are slain by Cade's rebels at Smithfield [IV, vii]; a soldier running on stage with news is instantly killed by Cade because he fails to call him "Lord Mortimer" [IV, vii]; Lord Say and Sir James Cromer are just as purposelessly slain by Cade and their heads carried on pikes through the streets [IV, vii]; the rebel Jack Cade is killed and decapitated by Alexander Iden [IV, x]; at the battle of Saint Albans old Clifford is killed by York and Somerset by Richard [V, ii].

The distasteful nature of most of these deaths is apparent; here are no natural deaths of old age such as Mortimer's, or neat gun shots from a distance such as the ones which felled Salisbury and Gargrave. Instead, we witness senseless carnage, violence and dismemberment. Bloody bodies are carried on stage in various states of mutilation. The emotional impact of Queen Margaret hugging to her bosom the crimson stained head of Suffolk, like a mother nursing her child (another ironic reversal in the trilogy, for in Part I, V, Suffolk had wanted to

protect her as does a swan her downy cygnets), throughout an entire scene is similar to that of such modern pieces of shock drama as Marat/Sade. The King and Buckingham discuss the approach of Jack Cade and his pitiful head of her beloved whose "lovely face/Rul'd like a wandering planet over me" [IV, iv, 15-16]. While the men talk of war and politics, she hovers hearby, murmuring to her 'baby,' a grotesque reminder of the cruel excesses into which England has fallen.

Several excessively repulsive mutilations are promised on-stage and realized off-stage. Jack Cade orders the bodies of the two Staffords slain in battle with Cade's rebels to be "dragg'd at my horse heels till I do come to London" [IV, iii, 11-12]. Cade later orders Lord Say and Sir James Cromer decapitated and their heads placed on pikes; when one of the rebel band returns with the impaled heads Cade orders them carried through the streets of London "instead of maces" [IV, vii, 129] and they suffer the additional indignity of being made to kiss "at every corner" [IV, ii, 130]. When Jack Cade is caught and killed by Alexander Iden in Iden's garden, he too faces violent and ignoble treatment; Iden addresses the body:

Hence will I drag thee headlong by the heels
 Unto a dunghill, which shall be thy grave,
 And there cut off thy most ungracious head;
 Which I will bear in triumph to the King,
 Leaving thy trunk for crows to feed upon.
 [IV, x, 79-83]

These frequent decapitations, bloody heads, bodies dragged by horses, impaled heads and headless bodies buried in dung and eaten by crows are a far cry from the simple deaths of Mortimer and Bedford while sitting

quietly in their chairs. Death in Part II wears a repulsive, bloody visage and he cuts a wide swath indeed.

Both actual and metaphorical blood flows freely in Part II. Of course, when war rages, one expects blood to be shed, but in the Henry VI trilogy the word 'blood' is so constantly reiterated that a grim visage of destruction leers behind almost every scene whether or not it involves an actual battle. As has been noted in Chapter II, blood imagery appears in Part I from the very first scene of the play in which Exeter demands, "We mourn in black: Why mourn we not in blood?" [17] But it is significant that as the enclosure motif decreases and the slaughter and beasts of prey images increases, a parallel growth may be noted in the frequency of references to blood. Attention to blood may be briefly casual, such as Simpcox's identification of a scarlet cloak as "red as blood" [II, i, 109]. Or it may permeate the very atmosphere as in Act V, scene ii, in which young Clifford discovers the body of his father, Clifford, killed in battle by York. Young Clifford's shouts of bloody revenge fill the air and we are once again reminded that the Wars of the Roses are, after all, a quarrel of blood lines and blood feuds:

York not our old men spares;
No more will I their babes:
.....
Meet I an infant of the house of York,
Into as many gobbets will I cut it
As wild Medea young Absyrtus did:
In cruelty will I seek out my fame.

[V, ii, 51-52; 57-60]

The blood which actually appears on the stage in crimson swords, bloody heads and mutilated bodies is constantly called to mind by endless talk

of "murder's crimson badge" [III, ii, 199]; "bloody-minded" villains [IV, i, 36]; "the honourable blood of Lancaster" [IV, i, 51]; "bloody war" [IV, iv, 12]; "blood-shedding" [IV, vii, 97]; "blood-consuming" and "blood-drinking" sighs [III, ii, 60, 62]; "crimson blood" on a fox's jaws [III, i, 259]; "bloody murderer[s]" [III, i, 128]; "that bloody sin"--murder [III, i, 131]; and "hot blood" shed by swords in battle [I, i, 117]. York's claim to the throne is one through blood line and he says he will not rest until his "sword be stain'd/With heart-blood of the house of Lancaster" [II, ii, 64-65]. And Cardinal Beaufort fears Gloucester, Henry's uncle and Lord Protector, because "he is the next of blood/And heir apparent to the English Crown" [I, i, 150-151]. In short, the stage of Part II--as will Part III--reeks of actual and figurative blood.

Constant reiteration of blood, brief but continual allusions to disease, images of slaughter, butchery, and beasts of prey, repulsive murders and mutilation--all combine in Part II Henry VI to present a grimly glittering whirl of passion and death. Through the interaction of verbal and non-verbal images, the point is clearly made by Shakespeare: man has broken the bonds of order and is losing all control of the primitive forces within himself. The point is perhaps most strongly emphasized in the definite increase of slaughter and butchery verbal images to their dominant presence in the scene of Gloucester's murder, Act III, scene i. The animal within man becomes more and more powerful, until, with Gloucester's murder, the beast has shed all his shackles and is at liberty to pillage the world unrestrained. From the scenes of

Gloucester's killing and discovery of the body onward, slaughter and butchery images continue throughout the remainder of the play, still dominant but in somewhat less detail. For example, when Clifford discovers Warwick and York in conversation during the battle of Saint Albans, York prevents Warwick from fighting: "Hold, Warwick: seek out some other chase, / For I myself must hunt this deer to death" [V, ii, 14-15]. As might be expected, Jack Cade's rabble band participates in the imagery. Cade, the embodiment of the disorder released in Part I, appropriately numbers an actual butcher among his followers. In one of the play's few light scenes, Act IV, scene ii, two of the rebels bandy images back and forth in their conversation about Cade and his followers; when one brings up the name "Dick the butcher" [25], the other quips, "Then is Sin struck down like an ox, and Iniquity's throat cut like a calf" [26]. Dick obviously executes his duties effectively, because in the next scene, when many royalist soldiers are slain, Cade praises the butcher: "They fell before thee like sheep and oxen, and thou behaved'st thyself as if thou hadst been in thine own slaughter-house" [3-5]. Cade's words ring truer than he realizes, for England has become just that--a slaughter-house where men butcher each other senselessly and crudely. At the same time the nation is also a jungle of released savagery, where the animal instincts within man rend and tear the last signs of civilized order. Significantly, the forces loyal to the crown view Cade's rebels as destructive beasts; in the words of a messenger, the motley army is "a ragged multitude / Of hinds"

[IV, iv, 31-32] which approaches London "thirsting after prey" [IV, iv, 52]. Man is thus become an animal in Part II Henry VI.

Garden. As Chapter II indicated, garden imagery, one of the three major vehicles in the Henry VI trilogy, is all of a piece and is therefore revealed more clearly by an examination of the trilogy as a whole than play by separate play as the other metaphors are presented. Thus, the analysis of Part I's garden imagery was held in reserve until this point at which the metaphor as it functions throughout the trilogy as a single unit can be analyzed and thus be more meaningful than a partial examination would have been earlier.

Like so many metaphors--the sun/king analogy or the war/storm image, for instance--the garden metaphor was a traditional image, already familiar to his Renaissance audience, which Shakespeare absorbed and adapted for his own uses. It was a readily accepted part of the Elizabethan body of thought. For Shakespeare's play-goers the phrase 'family tree' was more meaningful than its pleasant, albeit shallow, American twin in the twentieth-century which merely conjures up amusingly irritating visions of the DAR in crisp white gloves. For Shakespeare's audience the phrase meant precisely what it implies: families were thought of as growing things--as trees or flowers. They were planted: they grew buds which gradually became blossoms and reached a fruition and beauty. As Alice S. Venezky points out in her Pageantry on the Shakespearean Stage,⁴ the English people were indeed accustomed to

⁴New York, 1951.

seeing families symbolized by flowers and trees: pageantry, processions, coronations and celebrations of all kinds featured ornate decorations displaying the 'family tree' of the monarch or a nobleman. Tudor coronations, for instance, featured lavish use of the intertwined red and white rose. The reason for the extreme popularity of such representation lies in the 'Tudor myth' which so dominated English thought in Shakespeare's day, for the victory of Elizabeth's grandfather, Henry Tudor (Henry VII), over Richard III at Bosworth Field in 1485 had ended the dreadful Wars of the Roses, a dynastic conflict which had almost demolished England. The civil war received its name from the badges of the two combatant houses: the white rose for York and the red for Lancaster. With the Tudor ascendancy at Bosworth Field, the two warring roses were finally united in peace, for Henry VII, who descended from John of Gaunt, the Duke of Lancaster, married Elizabeth, the daughter of Edward IV of the house of York. Peace and order were restored to England and, as her prosperity grew, so did the 'Tudor myth,' the idea of divine order being enacted with the victory of Henry Tudor at Bosworth Field. Naturally, the uniting of the red rose with the white rose increasingly became the decorative motif for state and private celebrations alike, for it was the symbol of England's unity and peace. In addition, the analogy between a garden filled with growing things carefully tended by a gardener and the political state tended by the king was a common one during the Renaissance. King and gardener alike were responsible for the well-being and protection of their realms and their clearly

similar duties rendered their offices parallel in the Elizabethan understanding of the Great Chain of Being.

Thus, when Shakespeare came to write three dramas about the Wars of the Roses, he had an impressive body of flower images ready and waiting. But, the point is: how does he use those images in his plays? That the family tree and garden/stage metaphors were traditional is undeniable but the question is: how do they function within this specific trilogy?

As was indicated in Chapter II, the garden metaphor is introduced in Part I's Temple Garden scene with its ritualistic plucking of white and red roses by Richard Plantagenet, later the Duke of York, and the Duke of Somerset. The verbal fencing match between Yorkists and Lancastrians offers a fanciful explanation of the origin of England's devastating civil war and initiates Shakespeare's use of gardens and garden metaphors in the trilogy. Significantly, this key scene reveals much of the nature of civil war as presented in the trilogy: surrounded by the luxuriant, albeit fragile, ripeness of nature, man chooses to squabble over unknown--or quickly forgotten--pettiness, and he divides a nation with the same thoughtlessness with which he picks a rose from a bush. His actions are casual but deliberate and far reaching.

From this important Temple Garden scene, the garden metaphor is developed throughout the trilogy. Whether or not the scene was deliberately inserted into an already completed Part I, as some critics believe, or whether Part I was written after II and III, as others

believe,⁵ is irrelevant to this discussion, for regardless of the sequence of composition, the fact remains that all of the imagery throughout the three plays is closely connected, as if it were cut from the same piece of cloth, and it makes its first appearance in Part I, Act II, scene iv. Whether the garden metaphor develops from the Temple Garden scene or the Temple Garden scene was added later to fit the garden imagery simply does not affect the discussion of garden imagery's appearance and function in Henry VI.

The first aspect of the garden metaphor whose origin may be noted in the Temple Garden is the obvious one of comparing the member of the Lancastrian or Yorkist house to a rose. The roses of Plantagenet and Somerset become something more than a family crest to be embroidered on their servants' livery: men are not only wearers of flowers as symbols, they are flowers. Dying Mortimer welcomes Richard Plantagenet as the "sweet stem from York's great stock" [I HVI, II, v, 41]. Likewise, men are frequently referred to as trees or plants with their arms corresponding to branches. From Warwick's query about Plantagenet in the Temple Garden, "Spring crestless yeomen from so deep a root?" [85], with its play on the two meanings of 'crest'--a family badge and the top of a tree or plant, the metaphor develops extensively. Mortimer regrets his old age, in which his

Pithless arms, [are] like to a wither'd vine
That droops his sapless branches to the ground.
 [I HVI, II, v, 11-12]

⁵Cf. Chapter I, fn. 92.

The messenger describes the murder of Richard, Duke of York, in terms of the tree image:

And many strokes, though with a little axe,
Hews down and fells the hardest timber'd oak.⁶
 [3 HVI, II, i, 54-55]

George, Duke of Clarence, warns Queen Margaret that she has little time left, for "we [the Yorkists] set the axe to thy usurping root" and "we'll never leave till we have hewn thee down" [3 HVI, II, ii, 165-166]. And Warwick, the king-maker and unmaker, twice compares himself to a lordly cedar tree.⁷ He warns Clifford that he will henceforth wear aloft his burgonet "as on a mountain top the cedar shows/That keeps his leaves in spite of any storm" [2 HVI, V, i, 206-207]. In his last speech, the dying Warwick regrets his fate:

Thus yields the cedar to the axe's edge
Whose arms gave shelter to the princely eagle,
Under whose shade the ramping lion slept,
Whose top-branch over-peer'd Jove's spreading tree
And kept low shrubs from winter's powerful wind.
 [3 HVI, V, ii, 11-15]

Warwick's image of himself as a protective cedar also contains appropriate animal images in "the princely eagle" and "the ramping lion," both traditionally associated with royalty and thus symbolic of Warwick's championship first of the Duke of York and then of Henry VI. Suffolk too speaks of himself as a tree; he is like the "lofty pine" which "droops" and "hangs his sprays" [2HVI, II, iii, 45], an especially apt image,

⁶To the Elizabethans, the reference to York as an oak tree was highly appropriate: the oak was traditionally a regal tree. Cf. E. M. W. Tillyard, The Elizabethan World Picture (New York, 1944), pp. 25-37.

⁷Cf. fn. 5. In the Elizabethan World Picture the cedar was a lordly protective tree.

since Suffolk's badge displayed the stock of a tree. Queen Margaret also participates in the image of man as a tree. When Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, is stripped of his Protectorship and his wife Eleanor is banished, the queen gloats: he "bears so shrewd a maim: two pulls at once;/His lady banish'd, and a limb lopp'd off" [2 HVI, II, iii, 41-42]. King Henry VI continues the image in wanting to tell of his love the "dumb deaf trunk" [2 HVI, III, ii, 143] of Humphrey's murdered body. Richard, Duke of Gloucester, and later King Richard III, does not hesitate to detail his physical deformities heralded by an unnatural birth: Love forswore him in his mother's womb and corrupted "frail Nature with some bribe,/ To shrink mine arm up like a wither'd shrub" [3 HVI, III, ii, 155-156]. And he detests his "mis-shap'd trunk" [3 HVI, III, ii, 170].

From the Temple Garden scene, then, develops an extensive use of the garden metaphor. The recognition of man as a tree or a flower begins in the plucking of red and white roses by Plantagenet and Somerset and continues throughout the trilogy with almost every major figure making use of the image. Of special interest in the Temple Garden is the color description of the roses. The white rose of York is called a "pale and maiden blossom [75], and "this pale and angry rose" [107], and Somerset insists that the paleness of his cheeks counterfeits Plantagenet's white rose, not in fear but in anger. The point to note here is the reversal made by Shakespeare in the garden imagery: instead of comparing man to an imaginary flower, the author compares an actual flower to an imaginary human being. The rose is humanized; it possesses the human characteristics of being pale and angry, pale and innocent, or pale and

fearful. Throughout the plays, actual roses as symbols of the opposing forces appear on the stage: much to the dismay of the Yorkists, Henry VI puts on a red rose in I Henry VI, IV, i; and in the opening scene of Part III, the Yorkist faction enters with, as the Quarto stage direction reads, "white roses in their hats"; then the Lancastrians enter "with red roses in their hats" [Folio s.d.]. In addition, frequent reference is made to the symbols of the opposing factions in this civil war, such as York's promise to "raise aloft the milk-white rose" [2 HVI, I, i, 255]. With the continuing presence of roses also continue the qualities associated with them in the Temple Garden scene. Throughout the plays, the paleness of characters' faces seems to indicate the same anger, innocence or fear attributed to Plantagenet's white rose. Queen Margaret offers to "look pale as primrose with blood-drinking sighs" [2 HVI, III, ii, 62], if that would bring Suffolk back to life; Vernon denies that the "pale-ness of his flower" betrays the "faintness of my master's heart" [1 HVI, IV, i, 107]; York refuses to succumb to "pale-fac'd fear" [2 HVI, III, i, 335], and Henry VI asks the trembling frightened Suffolk why he looks so pale [2 HVI, III, ii, 26].

While the paleness of the Yorkist white rose is thus connected with the colder human emotions of anger and fear, the redness of the Lancastrian rose is associated with blood and man's heated passions. In the Temple Garden Somerset warns Vernon not to prick his finger "lest bleeding you paint the white rose red" [50]; he threatens to dye Plantagenet's "white rose in a bloody red" [61], and he speaks of "my bleeding roses" [72]; he accuses Plantagenet's cheeks of blushing "for

pure shame to counterfeit our roses" [67]. If Plantagenet chooses his "pale and angry rose/As cognizance of [his] blood-drinking hate" [107-108], it is the blood association with Somerset's red roses which will be consumed. The association of blood with the Lancastrian rose continues throughout the trilogy; in the significant 'mole-hill' scene at Towton, Henry VI looks on the body of a young soldier:

The red rose and the white are on his face,
The fatal colours of our striving houses:
The one his purple blood right well resemble;
The other his pale cheeks, methinks, presenteth,
Wither one rose, and let the other flourish!
If you contend, a thousand lives must wither.
 [3 HVI, II, v, 97-102]

In Henry's words we find a reversal of the descriptive process in the Temple Garden scene: in the quarrel between Plantagenet and Somerset, the roses are "humanized" but in Henry's sad speech the symbolic victim of the Wars of the Roses is 'floralized.' Plantagenet and Somerset plucked roses in the Temple Garden as symbols of their differences, thus almost carelessly starting a civil war which kills thousands. The appalling thoughtlessness of such an act is poignantly emphasized in Henry's speech as he looks on the body of one of the war's victims. This young man, wept over by his father and his king, is dehumanized; he is become no more than another rose to be snipped off by any passerby. Such is the nature of war.

The bloody rose and the pale, angry rose are indeed appropriate symbols for the conflict in Henry VI, for seldom has more bloody or bitter destruction been dramatized. On-stage battles are frequent and violent; murders, stranglings, stabbings, including the brutal killing

of children, abound; impaled heads and decapitated bodies are brought onto the stage; vivid descriptions of bodies are abundant, and horrible threats are not uncommon, even in the mouths of women and children. And as has been shown, blood, disease and death receive constant reiteration by the characters. Much of the blood shed in the plays is thus prepared for in Temple Garden quarrel and is carefully underlined by the continual presence of, or reference to, Somerset's "bleeding roses" [72] and the roses' capacity to prick and draw blood.

Closely related to Shakespeare's visualization of men as trees and flowers is the employment of children as the blooms, blossoms, fruit, or branches of those flowers or trees.⁸ Richard of York uses an extended metaphor of his slain father as a tree and his previously killed brother, Rutland, as a branch of that tree, when he laments that Clifford was

. . . not contented that he lopp'd the branch
In hewing Rutland when his leaves put forth,
But set his murdering knife unto the root
From whence that tender spray did sweetly spring.
 [3 HVI, II, vi, 47-50]

In similar terms, Queen Margaret turns to the murderer of her son:

How sweet a plant have you untimely cropped!
 . . . if you ever chance to have a child,
 Look in his youth to have him so cut off
 As, deathsmen, you have rid this sweet young prince!
 [3 HVI, V, v, 60-65]

Talbot weeps for the death of his brave son, his "blossom" [1 HVI, IV, vii, 16]; Warwick praises York's sons as "fair slips of such a stock" [2 HVI, II, ii, 57]. Richard, Duke of Gloucester, malevolently wishes

⁸ The trilogy's large number of fathers and sons, i.e., visual representations of the tree-limb idea, has already been noted.

that from King Edward "no hopeful branch may spring" [3 HVI, III, ii, 126], and when Edward's wife, Queen Elizabeth, does become pregnant, she thinks of her unborn child as "King Edward's fruit" [3 HVI, IV, iv, 24]; Joan La Pucelle, turning to lies in her desperate plight, pleads with her captors not to destroy "the fruit within my womb" [1 HVI, V, iv, 63]; and Joan is called by her shepherd father "the first fruit of my bachelorship" [1 HVI, V, iv, 13]. King Henry VI regrets that Richard of Gloucester is "not like the fruit of such a goodly tree" [3 HVI, V, vi, 52]. Gloucester, in turn, uses the image in his hypocritical speech to his unwelcome nephew:

And that I love the tree from whence thou sprang'st,
Witness the loving kiss I give the fruit.
[3 HVI, V, vii, 31-32]

The idea that a vicious child coming from a good parent is like the branch of an ugly tree being grafted onto a sturdy one appears in Suffolk's taunts to Warwick:

Thy mother took into her blameful bed
Some stern untutor'd churl, and noble stock
Was grafted with crab-tree slip, whose fruit thou art.
[2 HVI, III, ii, 211-213]

The point of comparison between man and plant emphasized by Shakespeare is the natural process of growth and decay. From Plantagenet's declaration to Somerset in the Temple Garden that he will prove his merit "were growing-time once ripen'd to my will" [1 HVI, II, iv, 99] develops an important series of metaphors based upon the cycle of planting, growing, ripening, harvesting, and withering. Man and plant alike are subject to the dictates of nature: they develop into a brief moment of glory followed by decay.

the few examples of garden imagery being used to characterize; for the image is not one of natural growth but supra-natural, thus emphasizing the unreal quality of Joan, the witch from hell. The initial appearance of the image of ripening has been noted as Plantagenet's desire for growing-time "ripened to my will": the image is also employed by Queen Margaret, who goads a weak ally: "What, weeping-ripe, my Lord Northumberland?" [3 HVI, I, iv, 172] And Eleanor asks her husband, Duke Humphrey, "Why droops my lord, like over-ripen'd corn,/Hanging the head at Ceres' plenteous load?" [2 HVI, I, ii, 1-2] The image of an over-ripened shaft of wheat or grain drooping its head is used by the Duke of York to convey the weariness of his over-worked soldiers, as he refers to his "drooping army" [3 HVI, I, i, 6]. Likewise, Queen Margaret, exhausted by her efforts to regain the English throne speaks of her "drooping thoughts" [3 HVI, III, iii, 21]. And Charles hopes for news to cheer the nobles' "drooping spirits" [1 HVI, V, ii, 1].

With ripening comes the harvest, and Shakespeare's characters indeed reap what they have sown. Man's actions increase and develop to an inevitable culmination or harvest; thus the Duke of York prepares to "reap the harvest" of rebellion which Jack Cade has "sow'd" [2 HVI, III, i, 381]. Unfortunately for him, the harvest he hopes to make fails to materialize and he is given instead a bitter crop of death and mayhem. Humiliated by defeat and taunted with his son's bloody murder, he submits to Queen Margaret as she stands ready to kill him: "And in thy need such comfort come to thee/As now I reap at thy too cruel hand!" [3 HVI, I, iv, 165-166] And, in the last scene of the trilogy, King Edward

tells his infant son that men have suffered greatly so that "thou shalt reap the gain" [3 HVI, V, vii, 20], a statement which prompts Gloucester to mutter prophetically: "I'll blast his harvest" [21]. Throughout the three plays, soldiers speak of enemies falling like harvested grain. For example, King Edward boasts: "What valiant foemen, like to autumn's corn,/Have we mowed down in tops of all their pride!" [3 HVI, V, vii, 3-4] In like manner, Warwick complains that his soldiers fall almost gently, as if struck by "an idle thresher with a flail" [3 HVI, II, i, 131].

And, of course, the final step in the growth process-decay--is a common image in Henry VI. Mortimer bemoans his "weak decaying age" [1 HVI, II, v, 1], his "pithless arms" [11], and his "fading breath" [61]; he is only a "withered vine" [11] dropping "his sapless branches to the ground" [12]. Talbot speaks of his own "sapless age and weak unable limbs" which bring him to his "drooping chair" [1 HVI, IV, v, 4-5]; and a French general longs to see Talbot completely "wither'd" [1 HVI, IV, ii, 38]. Gloucester's deformed arm is a "wither'd shrub" [3 HVI, III, ii, 156]. And Henry VI, contemplating the Wars of the Roses, foresees tragedy: "Wither one rose, and let the other flourish!/
If you contend, a thousand lives must wither" [3 HVI, II, v, 101-102].

Withering, death, and decay are inevitable to man and flower alike; however, circumstances occasionally hurry the process. Good weather is necessary in order to produce successful growth and fruition. If winter comes too soon or the summer is too stormy, the result is untimely destruction. Just so, man and his hopes may be, as York says

of his ambitions, "blasted in the bud" [2 HVI, III, i, 89]. In the first flush of victory, King Edward wants to press defeated Henry's supporters to the limit: "The sun shines hot; and if we use delay,/Cold biting winter mars our hop'd-for hay" [3 HVI, IV, viii, 60-61]. Richard, in momentary defeat, tells his brother, Edward, and Warwick: "I, that did never weep, now melt with woe/That winter should cut off our spring-time so" [3 HVI, II, iii, 46-47]. In the same vein, Warwick observes that the murdered Duke Humphrey's body shows signs of violent struggle; his beard is "made rough and rugged,/Like to the summer's corn by tempests lodg'd" [2 HVI, III, ii, 174-175].

In addition to the dangers of inclement weather which beset flowers and trees, other unpleasant forces threaten them. Caterpillars may devour them; cankers damage their growth, and weeds often choke them out. Many plants in danger of being plucked or picked may have thorns for self-protection. Shakespeare's characters frequently speak of evil passion as a canker, for both eat away healthy growth. For example, Duke Humphrey urges his wife, Eleanor, to "banish the canker of ambitious thoughts!" [2 HVI, I, ii, 18] Evil passions can also be thought of as weeds choking a man's or even a nation's growth. Suffolk's parting words to Plantagenet in the Temple Garden, "go forward, and be chok'd with thy ambition!" [1 HVI, II, iv, 112], may, of course, be understood as the image of a man gagging on something in his throat; however, when considered in the light of the other appearances of the word 'choke' and the numerous garden images, the suggestion is more likely that of an untended garden being over-run with weeds. This interpretation is

supported by Queen Margaret's urgent speech to her indecisive husband:

Now 'tis the spring, and weeds are shallow-rooted;
Suffer them now, and they'll o'ergrow the garden,
And choke the herbs for want of husbandry,
The reverent care I bear unto my lord
Made me collect these dangers in the Duke.
 [2 HVI, III, i, 31-35]

Here the traditional garden/state analogy is detailed: the "weeds" are Gloucester's followers who are not yet strong but "shallow-rooted." If unchecked, these weeds will "o'ergrow the garden," or take over the kingdom, and "choke the herbs," or destroy the men in power. Rebels are also called weeds in Clifford's question, "For what doth cherish weeds but gentle air?" [3 HVI, II, vi, 21] If these uses of evil as a weed are kept in mind, Suffolk's hope that Plantagenet be "chok'd with his ambition" may be properly interpreted as the image of an untended garden being overgrown with weeds. This image is maintained throughout the three plays, with rebels being called weeds and with ambition--the usual motive of rebels--also being called weeds. For example, Suffolk reassures Queen Margaret that they will be successful in defeating their enemies: So, one by one, we'll weed them all at last" [2 HVI, I, iii, 99]. And Duke Humphrey warns his king, Henry VI, that "these days are dangerous./Virtue is chok'd with foul Ambition" [2 HVI, i, 142-143],

If a flower escapes the attacks of cankers or caterpillars and withstands the encroaching weeds, it still faces the risk of being picked. As easily as the nobles in the Temple Garden scene pluck either a red rose or a white to indicate their loyalty, Henry's nobles attempt the

apparently kindred act of seizing the throne of England. One can reach out and grasp the crown or even the king himself just as easily and as overtly as one picks a piece of fruit or a blossom. Warwick says that his right hand can "pluck the diadem from faint Henry's head" [3 HVI, II, i, 153]; he later urges King Edward to confess who "set thee up and pluck'd thee down" [3 HVI, V, i, 26]. And Queen Margaret addresses him as the "proud . . . puller down of kings!" [3 HVI, III, iii, 157] Gloucester enumerates his plans to seize the kingdom and concludes: "Can I do this, and cannot get a crown?/Tut, were it farther off, I'll pluck it down" [3 HVI, III, ii, 194-195]. Upon seeing York traitorously seated upon England's throne, Westmoreland cries: "What! shall we suffer this? let's pluck him down" [3 HVI, I, i, 59]. If the desired blossom or fruit cannot be easily reached, one may have to climb the tree in order to obtain it or the tree may be shaken until the fruit falls. Accordingly, Gloucester observes that "fearless minds climb soonest unto crowns" [3 HVI, IV, vii, 62], while King Henry is pleased "that God and friends/Have shaken Edward from the regal seat" [3 HVI, IV, vi, 1-2].

In order to give plants protection from such seizures, nature endows some with thorns and stickers. Just as a gardener may be hindered in cutting a rose because of the thorns, so man may be hindered in attaining his desired goals because of obstacles. These unwanted hindrances or thorns prove troublesome to many of Shakespeare's characters. Gloucester, full of eager ambition to be king, sees himself surrounded by barriers:

And I,--like one lost in a thorny wood,
That rents the thorns and is rent with the thorns,
Seeking a way, and straying from the way;
Not knowing how to find the open air,
But toiling desperately to find it out--
 Torment myself to catch the English crown:
 And from that torment I will free myself,
 Or hew my way out with a bloody axe.

[3 HVI, III, ii, 174-181]

In a similar manner, King Edward, glaring at his enemy, the former queen, says to his men:

. . . yonder stands the thorny wood,
Which, by the heavens' assistance and your strength
Must by the roots be hewn up yet ere night.

[3 HVI, V, iv, 67-69]

Soon after, King Edward asks of young Edward, son of the former king and queen: "What, can so young a thorn begin to prick?" [3 HVI, V, v, 13]

And King Henry thanks his nobles for their care "to mow down thorns that would annoy our foot" [2 HVI, III, i, 67].

Thorns, being picked, storms, cankers, caterpillars, withering, and decay--dangers beset the tree on every side. It is significant to note that the frequently remarked characteristics of flowers are absent in Henry VI. Just as the bird imagery ignores the pleasant qualities of birds and emphasizes only the dangers they face, so also the pleasures aroused by seeing, touching or smelling a beautiful flower or admiring the sturdy ruggedness of a tree receive no recognition at all by Shakespeare's men and women. Neither do the characters of Henry VI have time to waste on the symbolic qualities traditionally associated with various flowers; Ophelia scattering her rosemary for remembrance and rue for sorrow or Perdita handing out her

"hot lavender mints, savory" and "violets dim" would have absolutely no place in the violent world of Henry VI. Rather the emphasis throughout the three plays is on the basic life-death struggle within the superficially placid garden.

Henry VI's garden world is a fragile one. Specific flowers and trees are not of paramount importance; what is important is the natural growth process and the unnatural threats to that development. Life is frail: at best, the beauty of maturity is but brief and decay is inevitable; at worst, maturity is never reached or is rudely shortened by destructive forces. Withering comes quickly and destruction easily. Gardens must be constantly tended, but even then death and decay are the ultimate rulers.

The trilogy's garden imagery, unchanged in appearance and function throughout the three plays, serves as a poetic context in which the drama may unfold. Of course, a parallel may be drawn between England as a garden with Henry as its inadequate gardener and the trilogy's verbal images about gardens not properly cared for; however, the metaphor seems less specific than this. Granted, the garden metaphor is another method by which Henry's failure as a monarch is illuminated: Henry IV, who should be tending his garden, does nothing to save his flowers from premature harvesting, inclement weather, worms and cankers. Once again he does not fulfill his assigned role. This, however does not appear to be the primary function of garden imagery in Henry VI; instead the metaphor's constant emphasis on the life-death struggle within a garden, on the natural frailty of a living thing, serves as a poetic framework

for this tripart drama about man's frailty as he participates in the life-death struggle within a state.

The emphasis of garden imagery on the frangibility of flowers and their kin serves the reader or viewer as constant reminder of the natural frailty of man. Death can destroy the beauty of a flower or a man in an instant. Seldom has death made so wide or so apparently effortless a swath as on the stage of Henry VI: from individual fights to civil war to battles between nations, men and entire armies are cut down with the ease of wheat falling at harvest. Heads are chopped off with the same thoughtlessness prompting the snipping of a blossom. And frequently death or destruction comes just as the individual reaches, or is about to reach, that brief flower-like peak of glory. Throughout Henry VI many men rise to success or near success only to be "untimely cropp'd" [3 HVI, V, v, 60]. For example, Humphrey, the Duke of Gloucester, serves the king as Protector and his power and position are increasing, but before he can pose too strong a threat to the Queen Margaret-Suffolk faction, he is cut down. His wife, Eleanor, is caught practicing witch-craft in an effort to become queen, and he, stripped of position and accused of treason, is imprisoned. As he is led away, Queen Margaret gloats over his suffering: "so shrewd a maim: two pulls at once;/His lady banish'd, and a limb lopp'd off" [2 HVI, II, iii, 41-42]. Similarly, Suffolk, the Queen's lover and a leader of the nobles' ambitions to control the government, grows in power. Pleased that a major obstacle is removed when assassins are hired to kill Gloucester, Suffolk sees himself approaching success. He has the Queen's love and

is within inches of ruling the entire kingdom, only to have all hopes crushed by Warwick and Salisbury, who manage to convince Henry VI of Suffolk's part in Gloucester's murder. Confident of victory, Suffolk is instead suddenly exiled, and he and Queen Margaret must part like "a splitted bark" [2 HVI, III, ii, 410]. He knows that he falls "this way . . . to death" [411]. Death and decapitation quickly follow.

It should also be kept in mind how exceedingly close Richard, the Duke of York, comes to being King of England before being killed. Even the victors, the Yorkists who hold the throne at the conclusion of Part III in apparent success, will soon be struck down. The Lancastrians are defeated, Henry VI is dead, and Edward of York is King of England, but lurking destruction in the form of Richard, the Duke of Gloucester, casts a prophetic shadow over the brightness of the celebration. King Edward may have been allowed to reach maturation, but the spectator knows that his son, "King Edward's fruit" [3 HVI, IV, iv, 24], will never enjoy that privilege when Gloucester mutters, "I'll blast his harvest" [3 HVI, V, vii, 21].

Thus, in Henry VI, man's world--like the world of the garden--is constantly threatened by devastation. Hopes and men are killed with an ease and frequency that makes life a dangerous and fragile gift indeed. A look at a few representations of the almost thirty on-stage deaths illuminates this parallel between the two worlds. The first men to die on the stage of Henry VI are Salisbury and Gargrave, who, in I Henry VI, I, iv, welcome the return of formerly captured Talbot, "the Scourge of France" [II, iii, 14]. Salisbury, Talbot's father, is

naturally grieved over the torments suffered by his son while held by the French, but his present delight for Talbot's return salves much. With Talbot once again leading the English forces, hope for English victory rides high, and Salisbury turns to ask Gargrave and Glansdale their opinions for the best position for the battery. Suddenly, in this early flush of hope, Salisbury and Gargrave are shot; they fall, killed just before the moment of success by what Talbot calls a "chance . . . that suddenly hath cross'd us" [I, iv, 71]. Later in the fighting between England and France, Talbot's son, John, is struck down precisely at the moment of maturity. In I Henry VI, IV, v, Talbot recognizes the fast approach of his own decay, for "sapless age and weak unable limbs" [4] bring him "to his drooping chair" [5], and he urges his son to leave him in order to bring honor to the family later. John refuses twice to leave, and he goes into battle with his father. In scene vii, Talbot comes on stage led by a servant, and soldiers bear in the body of his young son, slain in battle. Old Talbot praises the valor of John, who today became a man and reached his moment of beauty, only to be immediately swallowed up "in that sea of blood" [14]. In his "sapless age," Talbot weeps for the untimely death of his son, his "blossom" [16], young John Talbot.

Other young blossoms are not so fortunate as John, for they fail to reach maturity; they are cut off before they have a chance to ripen into greatness. Young Rutland, the son of Richard, Duke of York, is cruelly killed by Clifford in revenge for York's slaying of Clifford's

father. Rutland's brother, Richard, later reminds their brother, Edward, that Clifford has also killed York:

. . . 'tis Clifford,
 Who, not contented that he lopp'd the branch
In hewing Rutland when his leaves put forth,
But set his murdering knife unto the root
From whence that tender spray did sweetly spring--
 I mean our princely father, Duke of York.
 [3 HVI, II, vi, 46-51]

Similarly, Prince Edward, young son of Henry VI, is killed by King Edward, Gloucester and Clarence before he has an opportunity to mature. In agony, Queen Margaret is forced to watch the three men stab her child; enraged, she curses them for their "untimely" cropping of so "sweet a plant" [3 HVI, V, v, 60] and warns them to beware lest their own children might be "so cut off" in their "youth" [64] as was her son.

Many men indeed are "cut off" in the three plays of Henry VI: although not all are actually killed before the audience, twenty-seven bodies are brought onto the stage in various stages of mutilation. Salisbury and Gargrave are shot [1 HVI, I, iv]; Mortimer dies a natural death in his "weak decaying age" [1 HVI, I, v, i]; Bedford, "sick in a chair" [s.d. 1 HVI, III, ii], dies in satisfaction over the rewinning of Rouen; Talbot and his son die from battle wounds [1 HVI, IV, vi]. As was indicated in the section on animal images, thirteen people die in Part II: Horner, Gloucester, Beaufort, Suffolk, the two Staffords, Goffe, Say, Cromer, Cade, Clifford, Somerset, and soldiers. The Duke of Somerset is killed in a fight with Richard, Duke of Gloucester, who proudly throws down Somerset's head at the feet of York [3 HVI, I, i]; after much humiliation, York is brutally stabbed to death by young

Clifford and Queen Margaret [3 HVI, I, iv]; an unnamed son drags on stage the body of his father whom he has unwittingly slain in battle, and a father in the same circumstances brings on his son [3 HVI, II, v]; young Clifford, wounded in battle against the Yorkist faction, comes on stage "with an arrow in his neck" [3 HVI, II, vi, s.d.] and dies there, unaware of the ritualistic taunts to be given over his body by his enemies; Warwick, wounded in battle with the Lancastrians, laments his fate and dies in III Henry IV, V, ii; and Henry VI, defeated and imprisoned by the Yorkists, is stabbed to death by Gloucester, who carelessly throws the body into another room and moves ahead in his plans to be king someday [3 HVI, V, vi]. In short, death is, as the present study's section on animal imagery indicates, an ever threatening presence; blood, death and disease are constantly reiterated. Many of the trilogy's characters recognize the inevitability of death: dying Warwick says, "live we how we can, yet die we must" [3 HVI, V, ii, 28]; and Talbot observes, "kings and mightiest potentates must die,/For that's the end of human misery" [1 HVI, III, ii, 136-137]. Talbot's statement is indeed the conclusion to be reached from the trilogy's garden imagery and, consequently, from the entire trilogy: flowers and men must sometime die.

Several actual gardens appear in the staging of Parts I and II Henry VI. The importance of the Temple Garden scene has already been noted; the second garden scene takes place in Act I of Part II. In scene iv, Duchess Eleanor's witchcraft activities take place in her garden; however, the locale does not appear to have any significance

or real relationship to the trilogy's verbal imagery. That it is a garden appears to be merely chance and the setting receives no emphasis by the characters. In contrast, two other on-stage gardens are noticeably significant in the pattern of garden imagery. In Part II, Act II, scene ii, the Duke of York invites his dinner guests, Salisbury and Warwick, to enjoy a stroll about his garden with him in order

to satisfy myself,
In craving your opinion of my title,
Which is infallible, to England's crown.
[3-5]

Whereby, York recites at length--indeed to the point of tedium--his claim to the English throne. It is appropriate that York should be rehashing the claim he will use to justify civil war in the same setting in which he and Somerset had the petty quarrel which started that war.

The fourth and final on-stage garden is the setting for Jack Cade's death. In II Henry VI, IV, x, Cade, the epitome of rebellion run rampant, enters the garden of Alexander Iden, looking for some "sallet" to appease his hunger. An illiterate hired by York to stir up rebellion against Henry VI, Jack Cade is the chaotic force unleashed by the Plantagenet-Somerset quarrel in the first garden scene of the trilogy. The personal dispute begun so casually in the Temple Garden with the ritualistic picking of red and white roses has gradually widened to the extent of turning a nation topsy-turvy. As the quarrel widens, its participants move down in social rank: from the nobles to Vernon, defender of his master, York, vs. Basset, defender of the Lancastrians, and finally to the social dregs, Cade and his rabble. With Cade, the ultimate in disorder is reached; all bonds of rationality and stability

are shattered and on his directions, the "pissing-conduit [will] run nothing but claret wine" for one full year [2 HVI, IV, vi, 4]. This rebel leader, who can kill a man for not addressing him with what he feels to be his proper title and can destroy centuries of national law with the same uncomprehending casualness, is the final result of the Temple Garden quarrel. What began as an apparently private disagreement among nobles has become a public war involving every level of national life. And Cade himself is the embodiment of all these destructive forces let loose on the world by Plantagenet and Somerset.

It is appropriate that the death of Jack Cade, the embodiment of disorder, should take place in a garden, in the same place in which those destructive forces were released. Civil order was given a shattering blow in the Temple Garden and an attempt is made to restore that order in Iden's garden. Admittedly, the restoration proves only momentary; for the Wars of the Roses continue to rage throughout the remainder of the trilogy; nonetheless, order is clearly, albeit briefly, triumphant.

Like Talbot in Part I, Alexander Iden functions as the single representative of order in Part II Henry VI. While nobles and peasants alike step outside natural and man-made bounds, destroying the order of the universe, Iden alone maintains his place in the scheme of things. Iden is the sound limb of a sound tree. He lives quietly, enjoying the tranquility and peace of his simple life, without envy for others:

This small inheritance my father left me
Contenteth me, and worth a monarchy.
I seek not to wax great by others' waning,

Or gather wealth I care not with what envy;
 Sufficeth, that I have maintains my state,
 And sends the poor well pleased from my gate.

[2 HVI, IV, x, 18-25]

Iden is the good gardener; in his little kingdom he is precisely what Henry VI is not in his. He prunes and maintains and cares for his garden while Henry allows his own garden, the state, to grow into a wild jungle. His meditations are disturbed by his discovery of Jack Cade come "like a thief . . . to rob [his] grounds" [33] for something to eat. Cade and Iden exchange insults, and in the fight that ensues Cade is killed. When his dying words reveal his identity, Iden delights in his slaying "that monstrous traitor" [65]. Iden thus trims his king's garden when the king refuses to. Iden glories in killing Cade:

Die, damned wretch, the curse of her that bare thee!
 And as I thrust thy body in with my sword,
 So wish I I might thrust thy soul to hell.
 Hence will I drag thee headlong by the heels
 Unto a dunghill, which shall be thy grave,
 And there cut off thy most ungracious head;
 Which I will bear in triumph to the King,
 Leaving thy trunk for crows to feed upon.

[2 HVI, IV, x, 76-93]

The repulsive nature of these boasts of mutilation points up an important characteristic of the two major garden scenes. Paradoxically, the Temple Garden scene which initiates one of the bloodiest wars known in the Western world is itself almost pleasant: clever verbal thrusts and the snipping of a few flowers are the extent of its violence. The paradox reverses itself in Iden's garden, where the brief restoration of order is accomplished by an on-stage act of blood and violence with promise of more to come.

Always present in the Henry VI trilogy is the 'more to come' quality; no matter how many men and plans are killed in a scene, the spectator knows that he has not seen the last of murder and mayhem. Life is a dangerous business; it may be cut off at any time and even if a being is allowed to mature undisturbed, the laws of nature dictate inescapable destruction. The garden imagery recurring throughout the three plays is an effective means of underlining this frailty of man's life and it serves as frequent reminder of the constant presence of death--both natural and unnatural. The garden metaphor does not develop or change in the trilogy; it does not characterize any figure in the drama, and it is not a reinforcement of the play's themes. Rather, it serves as a poetic context in which the play may unfold: the frailty of life in the garden constantly reminds the spectator of man's frailty. Through the garden metaphor, the senselessness of destruction is made even more shocking: killing a man, starting a rebellion, and seizing a kingdom are carried out with apparently no more thought or effort than a flower is picked from its stem. Although Shakespeare does not give the imagery a uniform pattern--man is sometimes presented as a flower and at other times like the gardener tending a flower--the emphasis of the imagery remains constant: in the garden world of Henry VI decay is the ultimate victor.

CHAPTER IV

DRAMATIC IMAGERY IN PART III HENRY VI

For a spectator unfamiliar with the first two plays of the Henry VI trilogy, Part III may seem to be just a series of inconclusive battles, but for a spectator acquainted with Parts I and II, the action of the third play seems the inevitable result of previous action. The Wars of the Roses which have grown steadily through the first two plays now reach a climax: England is swept by the chaos of dynastic civil war. The Yorkists persuade Henry VI to accept the proposal that he reign for the remainder of his life, but at his death the crown will go to York and his heirs. York's sons, Edward and Richard (later Richard III), persuade their father to break his oath and seize the throne at once. The Yorkists do attack and the Duke of York is killed by Clifford and Queen Margaret, who is leading the Lancastrian forces. York's son, Edward, is placed on the throne but quickly antagonizes his benefactor, Warwick, and loses to Henry VI's supporters again, only to regain the crown at the play's conclusion. Part III ends with Edward IV on the throne, and the ominous figure of Richard, the Duke of Gloucester, looms near by, planning his own seizure of the kingdom.

Part III's imagery shows definite kinship with its predecessors in Parts I and II: the same vehicles appear and often serve the same dramatic and poetic functions. As before in the trilogy, there are both images of only a word or phrase and images of euphuistic, formal

elaboration. Much of the previous imagery reaches a culmination in Part III as Shakespeare makes clear the pattern of man's degradation in war.

I. MINOR IMAGES

Battle. As in Parts I and II, battle images constantly remind the spectator of the actual war splitting England asunder. Images are somewhat frequent but usually quite brief; for example, York says that Northumberland's "war-like ears could never brook retreat" [I, i, 5]. Many of the battle images deal with weapons rather than the actual conflict of warring armies; for example, Margaret begs her son's murderers to ease her suffering by killing her too: "Here sheath thy sword" [V, v, 68]. And several images compare a man aiming a weapon at a target with a man's desire to achieve certain goals: Clifford tells Henry that "ambitious York did level at thy crown" [II, ii, 19]. Later York's son, Gloucester, uses similar words to reveal his real reason for supporting his brother: "My thoughts aim at a further matter; I stay not for the love of Edward, but the crown" [IV, i, 123-124]. As before, battle images occasionally characterize: Henry, who develops real self-understanding in Part III, tells Exeter that "frowns, words, and threats/Shall be the war that Henry means to use" [I, i, 72-73]. Henry's description of his own unfortunate fighting tactics is apt, for when Henry finally realizes the seriousness of his nobles' quarrels all he can do is talk, and the time for talk was passed long ago--in Part II. Henry pitifully offers too little too late. A second instance

of battle imagery used to characterize is reminiscent of Burgundy's description of Joan's words in Part I; King Henry describes Margaret's abilities to affect any listener: "Her sighs will make a battery in his breast" [III, i, 37]. Like Joan, Margaret is a Frenchwoman who brings much woe to England and who, in order to lead her army, dons man's armor. Both are hardened, martial women and it is indeed appropriate that their words are as overwhelming and powerful as their deeds on the field of battle.

Light vs. dark. Light vs. dark images show numerical increase over Part II. Many of the images are used in the same way as before, with light associated with life and good, dark with evil. Like Mortimer in Part I, Clifford speaks of his fading life as a fading light: "Here burns my candle out; ay, here it dies,/Which, whiles it lasted, gave King Henry light" [II, vi, 1-2]. When the Yorkists find dying Clifford and begin their tribal rituals of taunts over the body of their enemy, Warwick remarks that "dark cloudy death o'ershades his beams of life" [II, vi, 62]. Similarly, when Warwick also faces death, he says, "These eyes, that now are dimm'd with death's black veil,/Have been as piercing as the mid-day sun" [V, ii, 16-17]. Evil is often spoken of as approaching darkness; for example, Gloucester plots against his brother, Clarence, by planning "a pitchy day for thee" [V, vi, 85]. And when King Edward learns that the ex-Queen is approaching with an army from France, he says, "in the midst of this bright-shining day/I spy a black suspicious threatening cloud" [V, iii, 3-4].

Although the sun/king analogy per se does not have new emphasis, there is a new emphasis on the sun as a Yorkist symbol. The sun was the emblem of the house of York and magical use of the sun is made in Part III to prophesy future events in much the same way as the witch's predictions are used in Part II. As Act II opens, two of York's three remaining sons, Richard and Edward, are on a plain near Mortimer's Cross, talking of their father's military prowess and, not knowing that the Lancastrians have killed him, they wonder about his fate. Just as Richard observes, "See how the morning opes her golden gates,/And takes her farewell of the glorious sun" [II, i, 21-22], suddenly there appear in the air "three suns" [Quarto s.d.]. Edward is understandably startled and asks Richard what he sees. The brother replies:

Three glorious suns, each one a perfect sun;
 Not separated with the racking clouds,
 But sever'd in a pale clear-shining sky.
 See, see! they join, embrace, and seem to kiss,
 As if they vow'd some league inviolable:
 Now are they but one lamp, one light, one sun.
 In this the heaven figures some event.

[26-32]

As before in the trilogy, the characters recognize stellar behavior as portent for earthly events. Edward interprets the strange sight as token of heavenly favor for the Yorkist cause:

I think it cites us, brother, to the field,
 That we, the sons of brave Plantagenet,
Each one already blazing by our meeds,
Should notwithstanding join our lights together,
And over-shine the earth, as this the world,
 Whate'er it bodes, henceforward will I bear
 Upon my target three fair-shining suns.

[II, i, 34-40]

Edward's political speech prompts Richard the punster to quip: "Nay, bear three daughters: by your leave I speak it,/You love the breeder better than the male" [41-42].

The sun as York's emblem continues to receive attention, thus inevitably associating the Yorkists with kingship. For example, King Edward in the flush of victory hears the news of ex-Queen Margaret's approach and says:

. . . in the midst of this bright-shining day
I spy a black suspicious threatening cloud
That will encounter with our glorious sun.

[V, iii, 3-5]

His brother, Clarence, urges him to be of good cheer because "thy very beams will dry those vapours up,/For every cloud engenders not a storm" [12-13].

The idea of sunbeams drying up vapors is representative of a significant characteristic of sun images in Part III, that is, the marked emphasis on the sun's destructive potential. In Part III, we do not find the sun's rays emitting beneficent light but rather only scorching heat and drought and pain. As indicated in Edward's speech above (Act V, scene iii, lines 3-5), sun and sea/storm images often appear together as warring opposites. As such, the two images are part of the cosmic conflict in the play: sun and cloud battle for supremacy. In Act II, scene iii, Edward regrets that "Edward's sun is clouded" [7]. Similarly, garden images which concentrate on the natural weather cycle emphasize the danger offered to frail growing things by "summer's scalding heat" [V, vii, 18], or by the "piercing . . . mid-day sun" [V, ii, 18].

Sun and sea images appear together most notably in the Daedalus-Icarus exchange between Henry VI and his murderer, Richard, in Act V, scene vi. In the elaborate image, Henry says he was Daedalus, his son Edward was Icarus, York was Minos, King Edward was "the sun that sear'd the wings of my sweet boy" [23] and Richard was "the sea/Whose envious gulf did swallow up his life" [25]. The image is significant: for the many fathers and sons who soar throughout the trilogy only two fates are open--the fire or the flood. There is no escape for man in Part III. Highly revealing is Clifford's exclamation in Act II, scene vi:

The common people swarm like summer flies;
 And whither fly the gnats but to the sun? [Edward IV]
 And who shines now but Henry's enemies?
 O Phoebus, hadst thou never given consent
That Phaethon should check thy fiery steeds,
Thy burning car had never scorch'd the earth!
 [II, vi, 8-14]

As much as Clifford may wish otherwise, the earth has suffered and still suffers constant parching and shrivelling by the sun's blazing ways. The sun that seared the wings of Icarus and Daedalus still threatens man and the tumultuous sea still waits for his fall.

The real king, Henry VI, has failed his obligations and England is left with only king substitutes and their attempts to rule merely mutilate the concept of monarchy. The beneficent radiance of Henry V is gone completely and England must endure the scorching searing rule of Edward IV and Richard III. Richard and Edward may have interpreted the three suns they saw as favorable to their cause, but more important, the unnaturalness of such a sight bespeaks some kind of disruption of the natural scheme of the universe. In addition, the act of embracing and

kissing which the three suns engage in is the identical unnatural act which Cade, the epitome of political disorder, demanded of the impaled heads of Say and Cromer in Part II. Not only is man-made order shattered but now even natural laws have been perverted. The sun images in Part III are thus part of the universal chaos presented.

Blood, death and disease. For an analysis of the imagery found in Henry VI concerning blood, death and disease, see pages 209 to 223 under Major Images: Animal.

Acting. It is somewhat surprising that the third part of the Henry VI trilogy--the same play which strips man of the last vestiges of civilized order and whirls him into primordial chaos--contains noticeably more acting images than the two previous plays. The reverse situation might be expected, for the world of the theatre would seem to belong to civilization, not to the primitive. Yet, as man falls more and more into blood-heat and becomes part of a universal disorder, theatrical images are increasingly used by him with the emphasis on deceit, deliberate cloaking of aims and purposes, and false appearances. The unnaturalness or falsity of acting is thus its important aspect. For example, Richard suggests that Clifford's death is a sham, for "'tis but his policy to counterfeit" [II, vi, 65]. And when Warwick wishes to spur the Yorkists into action instead of merely weeping, he uses an acting image:

Why stand we like soft-hearted women here,
Wailing our losses, whiles the foe doth rage;

And look upon, as if the tragedy
Were play'd in jest by counterfeiting actors?
 [II, iii, 25-28]

Despite his denials, Warwick is indeed an actor at this precise moment, for he is deliberately 'putting on a performance' in order to prod Richard, Edward, and George into action. He is the "setter up and plucker down of kings" [37], the director who moves the other actors about the stage. As Henry VI says of him, "Warwick is a subtle orator" [III, i, 33] and he plays on the emotions of others with skill. Margaret says he "moves both wind and tide" [III, iii, 48] and fears his bewitching words [112]. It is Warwick who persuades Henry to accept York's proposal that Henry reign during his lifetime, and that, at his death, the crown go to the Duke of York and his heirs. It is Warwick who, feeling betrayed by Edward's sudden marriage to Lady Elizabeth Grey, removes Edward's crown and replaces it on Henry's head [Cf. IV, iii and vi]. Displeased with the casting of his play, he easily changes it. The play's acting images thus play an important part in characterizing Warwick, the "proud setter up and puller down of kings!" [III, ii, 157]

Images of acting appear around other characters; for example, Clifford, furious that Henry should be so unmanly as to disinherit his own son, tries to shame the meek king into action by pointing out that "the smallest worm will turn being trodden on,/And doves will peck in safeguard of their brood" [II, ii, 17-18]. Henry merely comments that "full well hath Clifford play'd the orator,/Inferring arguments of mighty force" [II, ii, 43-44]. While similar images are scattered

throughout the plays, it is important to note that many of them converge on two characters--Queen Margaret and Richard, the Duke of Gloucester.

Margaret, always the skillful female, is often spoken of as playing a role; for example, when a messenger brings news of Margaret's putting on armor, King Edward observed, "Belike she minds to play the Amazon" [IV, i, 105]. She speaks with calculated effect. Henry says of her mission to the King of France for help: Lewis is

. . . a prince soon won with moving words.
By this account, then, Margaret may win him,
For she's a woman to be pitied much:
Her sighs will make a battery in his breast;
Her tears will pierce into a marble heart;
The tiger will be in mind whiles she doth mourn;
And Nero will be tainted with remorse,
To hear and see her plaints, her brinish tears.
[III, i, 34-41]

Margaret is, in fact, successful in pleading her case for Henry, and Lewis agrees to help with money and men. Similarly, she uses all her rhetorical guiles to bolster the flagging courage of her men in Act V, scene iv. Queen Margaret indeed performs well.

But it is Richard who is the most skilled performer-deceiver in Part III. When Richard and Edward plan to persuade their father, York, to seize Henry's crown by force rather than await his death, they quarrel over which one should persuade York. Edward insists that he "can better play the orator" [I, ii, 2], but it is Richard who slyly convinces York by sophistry: an oath to an unauthorized person is not binding; Henry has no right to be king; therefore, an oath made to Henry VI is not binding. Richard thus early proves himself a skillful actor, for

he only pretends a concern for legalities in order to put himself closer to the throne.

In Richard's lengthy soliloquy, Act III, scene ii, ll. 124-195, the hunchbacked schemer declares his intentions to use any method available to capture the throne. To reach the crown he will practice any useful deceit:

Why, I can smile, and murder whiles I smile,
And cry 'Content!' to that that grieves my heart,
And wet my cheeks with artificial tears,
And frame my face to all occasions.

.
I'll play the orator as well as Nestor,
Deceive more slyly than Ulysses could.

.
I can add colours to the chameleon, [and]
Change shapes with Proteus for advantages.

[182-185; 188-189; 191-192]

Richard does exactly as he promises: he pretends loyalty to Edward's claim to the crown only in order to come closer to putting himself on the throne. In a later soliloquy, Richard blames cruel nature for his behavior; his deformed body dictated a deformed character. He was born with teeth "which plainly signified/That [he] should snarl and bite and play the dog" [V, vi, 76-77]. This image of Richard as a malevolent actor is added to by Henry's words when Richard enters his prison room: "What scene of death hath Roscius now to act?" [V, vi, 76-77] In short, Richard is an actor on England's stage; he readily assumes a false face in order to disguise his true intentions and he is a consummate artist in this skill. Thus, much of the unnaturalness of Richard's evil is presented in the play's acting images.

II. MAJOR IMAGES

Animal. The prey-thirsty menagerie and axe-wielding butchers who prowl through Part II's metaphorical landscape continue their terror into Part III of the trilogy. The metaphoric animal populace is much the same: yelping curs; stinging snakes; buzzing flies and other swarming insects; ravenous wolves, lions and foxes, innocent lambs and sheep; birds either attacking or trying to escape attack; captured and chained bears, and bridled horses.¹ Part III's animal images emphasizing slaughter and beasts of prey are all thus basically unchanged from their occurrence in Part II. Also, as in Part II, the slaughter and butchery images make their most concentrated appearance in, appropriately enough, scenes of killing and murder. Just as Part II's violent animal images reach their peak of development in Act III, scenes i and ii, the two scenes which present the plot and execution of Gloucester's murder, so Part III's slaughter images are concentrated in the death scenes of Rutland and--more important--the Duke of York and Henry VI.

Typical of Part III's animal imagery is the slaughter motif of Act I, scene iii, in which young Rutland is killed. The fact that slaughter and beasts of prey begin early in Part III is important:

¹Cf. I, i, 1, 45-49, 74-76, 89-91, 184-188, 233-234, 248-249; ii, 12-14; iii, 1, 12-17; iv, 18-21, 36-39, 40-43, 54-58, 61-64, 73-74, 111-118, 137-140, 154-155; II, i, 13-17, 21-24, 36-38, 91-14, 111-112, 126-132, 168-171; ii, 9-18, 24-33, 94, 135-138, 150-151; iii, 12-13, 35-43; iv, 12-13; v, 105-106, 125-127, 128-133; vi, 8-14, 17, 56-63, 91-95; III, i, 14, 32-33; ii, 161-162, 184-195; iii, 16-18, 157-160; IV, i, 21-23, 75; ii, 1-2, 18-25; iv, 16-24; v, 15-17, 73-78; vi, 10-15, 48-52, 74-88; vii, 25-26; viii, 1-5; x, 48-50; V, i, 1, 7, 9; ii, 1-4, 7-15; iv, 13-28, 55-58, 73-80; v, 22-29, 31, 58-61, 75-80; vi, 7-17, 18-29, 44-56; vii, 1-4, 10-14.

Part II had increased and developed violent animal images to a place of dominance in the language of Act III, after which the metaphor continues unchanged into Part III. The third play of the trilogy simply picks up the image and uses it precisely as Part II had from the third act onward. Thus, when Part III opens, man is already victim of the beast within himself.

In Act I, scene iii, young Rutland and his tutor appear on the field of battle between Sandal Castle and Wakefield. The youth cries, "Ah, whither shall I fly to scape their hands?" [1] and is frightened to see "bloody Clifford" [2] approaching them. Clifford orders his men to take away the tutor and prepares to kill Rutland, "whose father [York] slew my father [old Clifford]" [5]. Understandably, the child (twelve years old, says Hall, but in historical fact, seventeen) is terrified by his power adversary:

So looks the pent-up lion o'er the wretch
That trembles under his devouring paws;
And so he walks, insulting o'er his prey,
And so he comes to rend his limbs in sunder.
 [12-15]

Clifford's lust for blood revenge of York's killing of his father [Cf. Part II, V, ii] remains untempered by Rutland's pathetic cries for pity and he stabs the boy to death. Pleased with the blood on his sword, Clifford leaves to find York for more slaughter:

Plantagenet, I come, Plantagenet!
 And this thy son's blood cleaving to my blade
 Shall rust upon my weapon, till thy blood
 Congeal'd with this, do make me wipe off both.
 [48-51]

This brief scene (51 lines) of Rutland's death reveals the depth and nature of England's present disorder. The father-son aspect of Henry VI's conflicts which began in Part I, particularly with Talbot and his son and their similarity to Daedalus and Icarus, has grown from a whisper into a shout, echoing and re-echoing throughout Part III. War is carried from father to son and England is swept by a series of inherited hatreds: Clifford's cry, "Thy father slew my father; therefore die" [46] resounds throughout the play. As will be discussed later, this father-son quality of the conflict reaches a culminating, ritualistic dramatization in Act II, scene v, in which Henry sadly watches a father weep for his dead son and a son weep for his dead father.

Rutland's death scene vividly indicates the depths of bestial savagery into which England has fallen. Clifford's cold-blooded murder of a defenseless child breaches every rule of behavior prescribed for a gentleman soldier of honor and nobility. His cause for hatred is understandable enough: Rutland's father killed his father and he wants revenge. Yet it should be kept in mind that York had killed Clifford in what the cowboy heroes call 'a fair fight' during the battle at Saint Albans. The deed was not murder but simply a part of a war. In contrast, Clifford captures and kills a child who has no weapon and whose only protection is to beg for pity: This is murder of a most reprehensible sort. And Clifford's talk demonstrates that while revenge may have been his original stimulus to action, his prime mover is now the smell of blood, the sadistic delight in mayhem and slaughter. Once set on his path toward death, Clifford can only flail about, slashing

anyone or anything near him. As he indicates to Rutland, no deed is too distasteful for him now:

Had I thy brethren here, their lives and thine
 Were not revenge sufficient for me;
 No, if I digg'd up thy forefathers' graves
 And hung their rotten coffins up in chains,
 It could not slake mine ire nor ease my heart.
 [25-29]

Clifford relishes talk of blood and death and exits crying for York's blood to mingle with Rutland's on his sword.

The blood which permeates this scene is typical of the rampant blood-shed in Part III. Blood, disease and death have been reiterated in the first two plays of the trilogy in both literal and figurative terms, but in Part III they receive their most constant emphasis. Functioning and appearing much the same as in the two previous plays, these spectres simply loom more frequently in the last play of the trilogy.

Blood appears often in the play's staging: for example, Edward proudly shows Buckingham's blood on his sword [I, i, 10-15]; Clifford glories in young Rutland's blood on his sword [I, iii, 48-51]; and Queen Margaret gleefully taunts York with a napkin dipped in Rutland's blood [I, iv]. The nine on-stage deaths or mutilations are particularly brutal and bloody: Richard tosses down Somerset's head at his father's feet [I, i]; Clifford repeatedly stabs Rutland [I, iii]. Margaret and Clifford stab York again and again and finally impale his head on a pike [I, iv]; and an unnamed father and son drag on-stage the bloody bodies of their son and father [II, v]; Clifford enters the stage in Act II, scene vi, "wounded, with an arrow in his neck" [s.d.]

and dies in agony; Warwick, wounded in battle, dies on-stage [V, ii]; young Prince Edward is stabbed to death by King Edward, Richard, and George [V, v]; and Richard stabs to death imprisoned Henry VI [V, vi]. These deaths, like those of Part II, are a far cry from the 'neat' deaths of Part I. The battles of Part I with men dying as a result of gun shots from a distant city wall have given way to fierce hand-to-hand combat, often in the open field of battle, in which men die ugly, grotesque deaths.

These butcheries and mutilations are constantly kept before the spectator by numerous figurative and literal references to blood and death. Besides detailed emphasis on blood in the actual scenes, references are frequent in other scenes: Warwick says Henry VI has "usurping blood" [I, i, 173]; Westmoreland sneers that in Henry's "cold blood no spark of honour bides" [I, i, 190]; Queen Margaret calls Prince Edward her "dearest heart-blood" [I, i, 230]; Richard will not rest until his white rose "be dy'd/Even in the lukewarm blood of Henry's heart" [I, ii, 33-34]; Edward cries, "let our bloody colours wave!" [II, ii, 173]. Richard tells Warwick "thy brother's blood the thirsty earth hath drunk" [II, iii, 15] and he dies in "smoking blood" [21]. Margaret says the Yorkists come with "bloody steel grasp'd in their ireful hands" [II, v, 132]. Queen Elizabeth tries to "stop the rising of blood-sucking sighs" [IV, iv, 22]; King Edward wants to write in the dust with Warwick's blood [V, i, 55-57]; dying Warwick speaks of the wrinkles in his brow "now fill'd with blood" [V, ii, 19], regrets that his glory is "smear'd in dust and blood!" [23] and says his lips are sealed by "cold congealed

blood [37]; Richard goes to kill Henry, "to make a bloody supper in the Tower" [V, v, 83]. Richard is surprised that "the aspiring blood of Lancaster/Sink[s] in the ground" [V, vi, 61-62] and calls it "purple tears" [64]. Men die with "bloody marks" [II, v, 71], and Henry laments the "bloody times!" [II, v, 72]. There are appropriate references to "bloody Clifford" [I, iii, 23 and I, iv, 27] and "the bloody-minded Queen" [II, vi, 33]. Richard calls Clifford a "butcher" [II, ii, 95]. Margaret calls her son's killers "butchers" [V, v, 61] and says Richard is a "devil's butcher" [75], an appropriate addition to the characterization of this deformed malignancy.

Supporting the emphasis on blood and butchery in Part III are frequent allusions to death and diseases. As in Part II, personifications of death are numerous; for example, Queen Margaret says that York is not to be king "till our King Henry had shook hands with death" [I, iv, 102] and characters speak often of the inevitability of death; for example, dying Warwick says, "Why, what is pomp, rule, reign, but earth and dust?/ And live we how we can, yet die we must" [V, ii, 27-28]. Disease images continue unchanged from Part II: evil, particularly civil war, is compared to a disease or a wound. For example, Clifford tells Henry "the wound that bred this meeting here/ Cannot be cur'd by words" [II, ii, 121-122] and later says that "cureless are my wounds" [II, vi, 23]. Warwick wants "to provide/A salve for any sore that may betide" [IV, vi, 88]. Significantly, several disease images center around Richard. Just as slaughter, garden, and acting images are important in establishing Gloucester's character, so also are disease images helpful in creating

the repulsive figure that is Richard. As Queen Margaret says of him, "Thou wast born to be a plague to men" [V, v, 28]. In short, the blood which flows at Rutland's death is typical of Part III's attention to gore, mutilation, disease and death.

Clifford's cries for York's blood which close Act I, scene iii, are satisfied in the next scene: in Act I, scene iv, the Duke of York, defeated by the Lancastrians at Wakefield, is taunted with a paper crown and then, according to a messenger, "slaughter'd by the ireful arms/Of unrelenting Clifford, and the queen" [II, i, 57-58].

York appears alone on the field of battle, lamenting his loss at Wakefield: all of his followers have fled like "lambs pursu'd by hunger-starved wolves" [5]. His and his sons' efforts have all been in vain: they are like a "swan/[who] With bootless labour swim[s] against the tide/And spend[s] her strength with overmatching waves" [19-21]. York hears the sound of the pursuing Lancastrian forces and knows he "cannot fly their fury" [23] because he is faint from battle. Queen Margaret, Clifford, Northumberland, Prince Edward and soldiers find and capture York who staunchly defies his enemies even in defeat: "My ashes, like the phoenix, may bring forth/A bird that will revenge upon you all" [35-36]. York's warning echoes earlier references to the phoenix legend (for example, Lucy warns the French that from Talbot's ashes the phoenix will arise, Part I, Act IV, scene vii) and is typical of the several instances in Henry VI in which the trapped becomes the trapper. York's prophesy proves accurate indeed, for it is his son Edward who will remove Henry VI from the throne and who will be responsible for the deaths of

many Lancastrian leaders. But, at this moment, York's threat only elicits a taunt from his captor, Clifford:

So cowards fight when they can fly no further;
So doves do peck the falcon's piercing talons;
So desperate thieves, all hopeless of their lives,
 Breathe out invectives 'gainst the officers.

[40-44]

York responds to Clifford's sneers in like kind, prompting Clifford to jump to the attack. He draws his sword, but Margaret and Northumberland restrain Clifford from destroying their object of spoil.

Northumberland cries:

Hold, Clifford! do not honour him so much
 To prick thy finger, though to wound his heart
What valour were it, when a cur doth grin,
For one to thrust his hand between his teeth,
When he might spurn him with his foot away?

[54-58]

In vivid dramatization of the animal imagery, the captors bodily seize York, who vainly struggles to escape.

Clif. Ay, ay, so strives the woodcock with the gin.
 North. So doth the cony struggle in the net.

[61-62]

On Margaret's orders, the men make York stand upon a molehill and mock him with a paper crown. They circle their prey, taunting him with a napkin stained with the blood of his young son, Rutland, killed by Clifford in the previous scene, and with jeers about his "miserable state" [85]. Unable to endure his torment in silence any longer, York lashes out at the Queen:

She-wolf of France, but worse than wolves of France,
Whose tongue more poisons than the adder's tooth!

[111-112]

In a long impassioned speech, he attacks the queen, whose flinty cruelty denies her womanhood. She lacks every feminine virtue; she is a "tiger's heart wrapp'd in a woman's hide!" [137] She is more inhuman, "ten times more--than tigers of Hyrcania" [155]. York's words and tears over the "cloth dipped in the blood of my sweet boy" [157] touched even his enemy, Northumberland, who says that "had he been slaughter-man to all my kin/ I should not for my life but weep with him" [169-170]. Clifford and the queen, however, remain untouched by their victim's sorrow and anger, and, without remorse, they move in for the kill. They stab York to death and she orders his head placed on the city gates of York "so York may overlook the town of York" [180]. Dominated by images of trapped and fighting birds, greedy wolves and tigers, poisonous adders, slaughter and blood, the scene thus concludes with a bloody killing and decapitation. The Lancastrians finally weary of toying with their mouse, and they kill and mutilate the body of their prey.

A third death extremely important to the realization of the slaughter-animal imagery is that of Henry VI. Interestingly, the traps which so threatened man and animal in Part I reappear in Act III, scene i, in which Henry VI is trapped much like Talbot in Part I. As the scene opens in a chase in northern England, "two keepers with bow and arrows" [s.d.] enter and hide themselves in the greenery in order to catch "the principal of all deer" [4]. They are interrupted by the sudden appearance of the former king, Henry VI, disguised and reading a prayer-book. The keepers realize that they have, in fact, caught an even greater deer than they had anticipated, without question "the principal of all deer."

The first keeper says, "Ay, here's a deer whose skin's a keeper's fee:/
This is the quondam king; let's seize upon him" [22-23]. Henry VI is captured by these two who refuse to be persuaded by his argument that he--not Edward--is their annointed king, and Henry is led away to be imprisoned in the Tower of London.

In Act V, scene vi, we find Henry in his cage. Henry VI, again with book in hand, walks on the walls of the Tower of London accompanied by Richard and a Lieutenant whose duty is the guarding of the defeated monarch. Richard dismisses the guard, thus prompting the former to ask:

So flies the reckless shepherd from the wolf;
So first the harmless sheep doth yield his fleece,
And next his throat unto the butcher's knife,
What scene of death hath Roscius now to act?

[7-10]

Henry thus continues the butchering imagery which so dominated the scenes of Gloucester's murder in Part II, using the same images of innocent sheep and shepherd being killed by ravenous wolves and butchers. Just as Part II, particularly in Act III, scenes i and ii, had used such images to characterize the innocence of shepherd-like Gloucester and sheep-like Henry VI, so Part III continues the emphasis on Henry VI as an innocent, helpless victim of the butchers around him. Typical of such characterization by verbal imagery is Queen Margaret's cry to Henry when she learns that York and Warwick have usurped most of Henry's power, leaving him merely a titular king: "And yet shalt thou be safe? Such safety finds/The trembling lamb environed with wolves" [I, i, 248-249]. Henry himself cries in the midst of the civil war: "O bloody times!/
Whilst lions war and battle for their dens,/Poor harmless lambs abide

their enmity" [II, v, 73-75]. And Margaret urges Henry to flee with the words:

Edward and Richard, like a brace of greyhounds
Having a fearful-flying hare in sight,
With fiery eyes sparkling for very wrath,
And bloody steel grasp'd in their ireful hands,
Are at our backs.

[II, v, 129-133]

When Richard responds to Henry's query in Act V, scene vi, he says that Henry is too suspicious and "suspicion always haunts the guilty mind" [11]. The deposed king replies:

The bird that hath been limed in a bush
With trembling wings misdoubteth every bush;
And I, the hapless male to one sweet bird,
Have how the fatal object in my eye
Where my poor young was lim'd, was caught, and kill'd.

[13-17]

Henry's "poor young"--Prince Edward--was in fact caught and killed by Richard and his brothers in the previous scene, and Henry knows that his son's trapper is now his also. Perhaps Henry recalls his own earlier prediction that York's

haughty spirit, winged with desire,
Will cost my crown, and like an empty eagle
Tire on the flesh of me and of my son!

[I, i, 274-276]

York's ashes have indeed produced the phoenix he warned Margaret of in Act I, scene iv, and that bird has now killed Prince Edward and prepares to kill Henry also. Imprisoned in his cage, the Tower of London, facing certain death, Henry VI becomes an admirable figure for perhaps the only time in the trilogy. He reaches a kind of noble grandeur in his unwavering defiance of Richard and bravery in death.

Henry's lament that his "poor young was lim'd, was caught, and kill'd" prompts Richard to use an image familiar to the spectator of

Part I Henry VI:

Why, what a peevish fool was that of Crete
That taught his son the office of a fowl!
And yet, for all his wings, the fool was drown'd.
 [18-20]

Henry picks up this image so effectively used by Talbot and his son in

Part I:

I, Daedalus; my poor boy, Icarus;
Thy father, Minos, denied our course;
The sun that sear'd the wings of my sweet boy
Thy brother Edward: and thyself, the sea
Whose envious gulf did swallow up his life.
 [21-25]

As was indicated in Chapter II [cs. pp. 94-96], the Daedalus-Icarus image is highly appropriate for the play's action in which numerous fathers and sons soar together. Henry's elaborate image, with York as Minos, Edward the sun, and Richard the sea, is not only applicable to the plight of himself and his son Edward, but also fitting for other father-son duos in the trilogy: Salisbury and Talbot; Talbot and young Talbot; Salisbury and Warwick; Clifford and young Clifford; York and his sons, Edward, Richard, George and Rutland; King Edward and his young son; and the unidentified fathers and sons at Towton. In each case, father and son soar together but one or both fall to the earth, a victim of their own pride or another's jealousy. Henry's Daedalus and Icarus image, reminiscent of Talbot's similar use of it, also brings together several of the trilogy's images: animal, sun/king, and sea, and is a fanciful portrait of much of the action in the Henry VI trilogy.

Henry's image also reveals an insight into reality which is rare for him. He, who for two complete plays took scarce note that his nation was crumbling, comes at last to realize the full horror of civil war and he perceptively sees Richard as the incarnation of all the butchery and savagery rampant in the land. For once the king actually understands a situation: he foresees "much more slaughter after this" [59], for as long as Richard prowls the kingdom, England is in danger and more birds will plunge to their death. Henry says that at Richard's birth all nature bespoke the destruction to come:

The owl shriek'd at thy birth--an evil sign;
The night-crow cried, aboding luckless time;
Dogs howl'd, and hideous tempests shook down trees;
The raven rook'd her on the chimney's top,
And chattering pies in dismal discords sung;

Teeth hadst thou in thy head when thou wast born,
 To signify thou cam'st to bite the world.

[44-49; 53-54]

But Richard can bear to hear no more. He repeatedly stabs his ensnared prey and delights in the sword, which appears to weep with Henry's blood. As he stands over the slaughtered body, he admits that what Henry has said of his birth is true; he was in fact born with teeth, "which plainly signified/That I should snarl, and bite and play the dog" [76-77]. After having torn to pieces another victim, Gloucester leaves the stage on his way to remove the remaining obstacles to the throne. Gloucester's killing of Henry VI is in several ways an appropriate culmination of the trilogy's animal imagery. From Part II, Act III onward, the animal images have consistently portrayed Henry as a blameless lamb surrounded by a pack of ravenous wolves, a bleating calf led to the slaughter-house

by bloody butchers, a frail bird slyly trapped by clever men. At last the verbal images are realized in dramatic fact: the King is trapped by game keepers and caged in the tower, then toyed with by a beast of prey, and finally stabbed to death by a butcher who delights in the deed.

It is important in the development of animal imagery to note the nature of the entrapment and murder of Henry VI and the careful characterization of Richard in Part III. When traps were sprung in Part I, they were man-made devices used by man to catch an animal; the animals in Part I were trying to escape capture and were themselves seldom on the attack. But by the time slaughter, butchering, and other violent animal images reach their peak in Part II, Act III, man has himself become a trapping animal eager to capture and rend man, or another animal. This growth from man as victim to man as butcher culminates in the character of Richard, the Duke of Gloucester, who is "born with teeth" [75] and destined to "snarl and bite and play the dog" [77]. Henry is not killed by a man but by the vicious, blood-lusting animal that is Richard. Queen Margaret spits at him:

. . . thou art neither like thy sire nor dam;
 But like a foul misshapen stigmatic,
 Marked by the Destinies to be avoided,
As venom toads, or lizards' dreadful stings.
 [II, ii, 135-38]

Richard says of himself that he is "an unlicked bear whelp/That carries no impression like the dam" [III, ii, 161-162]. And he promises to "slay more gazers than the basilisk" [III, ii, 187]. Like his father who considered himself a laborious spider spinning webs to entangle the

Lancastrians [Cf. Part II, III, i, 339-340], Richard is a trapping animal eager to devour his prey. Appropriately, the Royal Shakespeare Theatre's 1964 production of Henry VI in Stratford-upon-Avon staged Richard's murder of Henry with emphasis on this quality of Richard: as Henry sits on a throne-like chair, the stage behind him is dominated by an enormous portcullis, an ominous spider-web through which Richard enters the stage. The spider pounces on the fly.

Thus, the slaughter which begins in Part II Henry VI continues its devastation throughout Part III with little change and reaches a kind of climax with Henry VI's murder. The savagery set loose when Part I's enclosures shatter reaches a peak in Part II and rages unchecked into the last play of the trilogy. As Queen Margaret so rightly observes, Henry's "realm [has become] a slaughter-house" [V, iv, 78]. One readily understands Henry's cry,

O, pity, God, this miserable age!
 What stratagems, how fell, how butcherly,
 Erroneous, mutinous, and unnatural,
 This deadly quarrel daily doth beget!
 [II, v, 88-91]

This is not to say, however, that the slaughter motif is the major characteristic of Part III as it undeniably is for Part II. While enclosures form the dominant pattern for Part I and slaughter typifies Part II, it is yet another area of imagery which is the major motif of Part III--sea imagery.

Water. One of the trilogy's three major images (garden and animal being the other two), the storm metaphor has often been noted as dominating Part III's figurative language. Through the first two plays,

water imagery has increased in frequency, length and violence until it becomes the raging storm which inundates England in Part III. The spectator would be justified in feeling almost drowned himself by the elaborate rhetoric about seas and storms which flood the stage, for no other vehicle in all of Henry VI's imagery enjoys more lengthy or detailed attention than does water imagery in Part III Henry VI.

Brief water images of only a line or phrase are numerous. Seemingly mere decoration for their immediate context, they nonetheless add to the overall atmosphere of stormy destruction, for even these short images are violent in nature. York complains that his soldiers "turn back and fly, like ships before the wind" [I, iv, 4]; Warwick tells York's sons, "Ten days ago I drowned these news [of York's death] in tears" [II, i, 104]; and Clifford is a fighter "who thunders to his captives blood and death" [II, i, 127]. When Queen Margaret asks Henry VI if the sight of York's impaled head does not cheer him, he replies, "Ay, as the rocks cheer them that fear their wrack" [II, ii, 5]. Gloucester and Clarence make cynical remarks about their brother's wooing of Lady Elizabeth Gray, and the eldest observes: "He plies her hard; and much rain wears the marble" [III, ii, 50-51]. The aphoristic nature of Gloucester's remark is typical of several other sea images also, such as Clarence's "A little fire is quickly trodden out,/Which, being suffer'd, rivers cannot quench" [IV, viii, 7-8], or King Edward's "It boots not to resist both wind and tide" [IV, iii, 59], or the son's observation in II, v, "Ill blows the wind that profits nobody" [55]. When Lady Elizabeth Gray, who has become queen and is carrying Edward's

child, receives news of her husband's capture, she refuses to weep
 "lest with my sighs or tears I blast or drown" [IV, iv, 23] the unborn
 child.

More numerous, however, are the lengthy, elaborate passages of
 sea and storm images. Man's emotions are often described in terms of
 bad weather and tempests: for example, when Queen Margaret taunts her
 captive, York, he replies:

Bid'st thou me rage? Why, now thou hast thy wish:
 Would'st have me weep? Why, now thou hast thy will.
 For raging wind blows up incessant showers,
 And when the rage allays, the rain begins.

[I, iv, 143-146]

Similarly, in Act II, scene v, a grieving father addresses the dead
 son he has unknowingly slain in battle:

Throw up thine eye! see, see, what showers arise.
Blown with the windy tempest of my heart
 Upon thy wounds, that kills mine eye and heart!

[85-87]

For their son's death his wife will "shed seas of tears and ne'er be
 satisfied!" [106] When Queen Margaret goes to Lewis, King of France,
 for aid for her dethroned husband, her state of depression prompts the
 king to ask: "Why, say, fair Queen, whence springs this deep despair?"
 [III, iii, 12] The queen responds: "From such a cause as fills mine
eyes with tears/And stops my tongue, while heart is drown'd in cares"
 [13-14]. And Lewis later urges Margaret to "calm the storm" [III, iii,
 38].

These personal tempests of emotion are caught up in a storm far
 greater than that of one individual's anger or sorrow--the storms of
 civil war. There is not one single storm just as there is not one lone

civil disturbance. The personal storms of emotion, the "tempestuous gusts" stirred in Henry VI by the anticipation of marrying Margaret in Part I, York's "black storm" [III, i, 349] of popular rebellion in Part II, Suffolk's "cloudy brow" and "stormy hate" [2 HVI, III, i, 155]; Warwick's "tempest of the field" [2 HVI, V, i, 198], "the windy tempest" [3 HVI, II, v, 86] of an unnamed father's grief and his wife's "seas of tears" [106] are not separate storms. Rather they are, as Knight² says of Lear's tempests, aspects of the same storm--the storm of civil disorder, the tempest of cosmic chaos.

Comparing civil war to a storm is scarcely original with Shakespeare; the analogy between tumult in the skies and turmoil in the body politic was common in Elizabethan times, and Shakespeare may have taken an additional suggestion from Hall's description of the Wars of the Roses: "The one parte sometime flowyng, and sometime ebbying" [clxxxvij]. It is not, however, the question of origin or uniqueness that is of significance; instead, what is of importance is the use Shakespeare makes of the storm-war image in these three particular plays. G. Wilson Knight has pointed out the music/order vs. storm/disorder conflict as the unique characteristic of the Shakespeare canon.³ Significantly, this conflict is just as obviously basic to the meaning as his first three plays as to his last one, The Tempest. Although the music end of the spectrum receives but scant attention,⁴ the storm

²G. Wilson Knight, The Shakespearian Tempest (Oxford, 1932), p. 7.

³Ibid. ⁴Cf. Chapter II, pp. 78-81.

disorder image is fully developed in Part III Henry VI.

Almost every character in Part III makes reference to the Yorkist-Lancastrian strife in terms of a storm. For example, Somerset speaks of "storms . . . of civil enmity" [IV, vi, 98], and Montgomery leads troops "to help King Edward in his time of storm/As every loyal subject ought to do" [IV, vii, 43-44]. And Montague regrets the fact that King Edward chose to wed Lady Elizabeth Grey rather than his French fiancée, Lady Bona, because such a marriage "would more have strengthen'd this our commonwealth/'Gainst foreign storms than any home-bred marriage" [IV, i, 36-37]. But, as might be expected, it is the major figures--the Kings Henry VI and Edward IV, Queen Margaret and Gloucester--who have the longest passages of storm-war rhetoric.

Henry VI, whose unkingly meekness and passivity cause him to be the calm eye in the center of the storm, frequently describes the war in sea-storm imagery. Although Henry is finally coming to realize the full extent of his nation's disintegration, he apparently can--or will--do no more to stop it than in Parts I and II. Instead of being the firm helmsman England desperately needs, he is but a storm-tossed ship himself. Although it is his throne that the Yorkists and Lancastrians are fighting over, he stands to one side while the two forces battle it out.

During the battle near Towton, Henry VI draws aloof from the fighting and the effective scene which ensues (Act II, scene v) is built upon the storm-war image. Henry enters the stage alone and speaks:

This battle fares like to the morning's war,
When dying clouds contend with growing light,

.....

Now sways it this way, like a mighty sea
Forc'd by the tide to combat with the wind;
Now sways it that way, like the self-same sea
Forc'd to retire by fury of the wind.

Sometime the flood prevails, and then the wind;
Now one the better, then another best.

.....

So is the equal poise of this fell war.

[1-2, 5-10, 13].

Henry is full of sorrow for the civil storm which sweeps his nation and tosses the ship of state first one way and then the other. He sits down on a mole-hill (ironically, the setting of York's previous mock coronation) and wishes he were dead rather than alive in such a world of "grief and woe" [20]. Sadly, Henry reflects that he has never really wanted to be a king: "O God! methinks it were a happy life/To be no better than a homely swain [shepherd]" [21-22]. Instead of realizing that he is a shepherd--the royal shepherd for an entire nation, Henry vainly wishes for the idyllic pleasures of private life and thereby completely discards his real shepherd duties. Full of longing for simple joys, Henry recites the various activities of a rural swain with the same quiet and soothing rhythm as a devout man uses to tell his beads and murmur his "Hail Marys":

So many hours must I tend my flock;
 So many hours must I take my rest;
 So many hours must I contemplate;
 So many hours must I sport myself;
 So many days my ewes have been with young;
 So many weeks till the poor fools will wean;
 So many years ere I shall shear the fleece:
 So minutes, hours, days, weeks, months, and years,
 Pass'd over to the end they were created,

Would bring white hairs unto a quiet grave.
 Ah! what a life were this! how sweet! how lovely!
 [31-41]

The poignancy of Henry's speech is reinforced by Part III's frequent characterization of the king as an innocent sheep or shepherd surrounded by wolves and butchers. But Henry himself fails to understand that king and shepherd are but two sides of the same coin and at the precise moment when he should be performing his duty as the public shepherd, he is instead sitting on a mole-hill wishing he were a private shepherd. And as usual he wishes only the easy passing of time rather than duties and responsibilities. While his blood-stained nation lies in death throes all about him, Henry's pitiful figure sits alone, contemplative and futile.

Suddenly Henry's meditations are interrupted. An unnamed soldier enters with the body of an enemy whom he has slain in battle. He continues the war-storm imagery initiated by Henry: since "ill blows the wind that profits nobody" [55], this dead man may have some valuables to take as booty. To his horror, the soldier recognizes the man as his father and falls to weeping. Scarcely has Henry had time to share the youth's sorrow "tear for tear" [76] before a father carries in the body of his son, whom he has likewise slain in battle unwittingly. All the fathers and sons of the trilogy who soar together and then fall are symbolically present in the characters of these unnamed fathers and sons. These fathers and sons are visual representations of not only the trilogy's garden images: in the appearance of these fathers and sons we see the tree-limb/blossom image presented in three-dimensional terms.

Sacrificial victims of civil war's butchery, these unidentified figures reflect the nature of these dynastic wars with their senseless killing of family and friend. The scene's staging also represents the "equal poise of this fell war" [13] in dramatic terms: the scene's symmetrical staging with father and son on one side, son and father on the other and Henry caught in the middle effectively realizes the ebb and flow, the rhythmical repetition and sameness of the civil war. Significantly both the unnamed son and father continue the storm images: the father sheds "showers of tears" [85] and has a "windy tempest" [86] of grief, and his wife will weep "seas of tears" [106].

This symmetrical staging of Act II, scene v, with its artificial chorus-like comment on the war, is characteristic of much of Part III Henry VI. Indeed the narrative of the play follows closely the "equal poise" of the Wars of the Roses: the entire scheme of action in Part III reflects the rhythmical flow and ebb on first one side, then the other. First the Yorkists have control, then Margaret's forces do, then the Yorkists regain final dominance; Henry VI loses his crown to Edward, then regains it, only to lose it again. Henry VI sits weeping on the same mole-hill on which his enemy York was killed. Clifford's head is impaled on the same pike which formerly held York's bloody head [Cf. Act II, scene vi]. While Part I possesses an up and down plot, that is, the English begin in success, and as they slowly fall, the French forces rise to victory, Part III displays a marked back and forth movement. Part II, which develops the growth of the Yorkist-Lancastrian conflict from its almost obscured origins in Part I,

eliminates the 'good duke Humphrey,' thus clearing the stage of England for the inundating flood of anarchy in Part III. Earlier problems of war with France and squabbles with other ambitious nobles are submerged by the struggle between the red rose and the white. Just as the two family badges are alike save only in color, the two forces seem much alike. Although Henry is consistently imagized as a lamb or shepherd, butchers and lambs are found within the ranks of both sides: the Lancastrians may have their bloody-minded Clifford but the Yorkists have their regicidal Gloucester. With Henry VI too meek to rule and York equally unfit to rule, there simply is not a claimant or a cause to pull for. And, after York's murder, when his eldest son, Edward, assumes the claim, the situation is unimproved, for Edward remains a mildly distasteful figure without the appeal of Henry's gentleness or his father's strength. As one editor phrases it, "there is nothing to choose between Margaret and the House of York."⁵ Neither side can successfully carry into battle the white banner of right and virtue; this is not a contest between black and white, good and evil. Instead the effect is that of a see-saw battle between two wrongs, two gray entities, neither of whom really deserves victory and the crown, and both of whom move Henry VI about like a pawn in a chess game. Whoever wins, England will be the loser.

The equal nature of the civil war struggles in Part III is reflected in the staging and positions of several scenes. Balance and symmetry

⁵Francis Ferguson, Henry VI Parts One, Two and Three, The Laurel Shakespeare (New York, 1963), p. 13.

characterize the play. The Folio stage directions opening Act IV, scene i, are representative: "Enter King Edward; Lady Grey; Pembroke, Stafford, Hastings. Four stand on one side and four on the other." Likewise the staging of Act III, scene iii, is significant: King Lewis, his sister Bona, Queen Margaret and her son, and others enter the stage. Margaret tells Lewis of the defeat of her husband, Henry VI, and asks for help in reinstating him to the throne of England. But before she can press her suit to its success, Warwick enters and presents his case for King Edward and a marital alliance between England and France. The staging is that of Henry's Towton scene: Lewis stands caught between two stormy forces [Cf. 38-39 and 47-48], each of which holds a mighty sway, and he is pulled first one way, then the other. As Henry sees the scene in his mind's eye he describes it to the Keepers in Act III, scene i:

She on his left side craving aid for Henry:

He on his right, asking a wife for Edward.

[44-45]

While such tableau-like balance and symmetry may reflect accurately the nature of the Wars of the Roses with their innumerable intrigues, inconclusive battles, and many reversals, the effect in a theatre is rather static. Some of the battle action may be exciting and a few characters memorable (who could forget Queen Margaret brandishing that bloodied napkin in York's face?), but emphasis on balance and symmetry and show occasionally becomes so excessive that a spectator may justifiably feel he is watching a parade or a pageant rather than drama. For example, in Act V, scene i, the spectator watches five armies, each with

"drum and colours" [s.d.] march into the city of Coventry. Granted the sweep is impressive, but is the artificial, ritualistic impressiveness of grand opera rather than drama.

While Henry's Towton scene is thus significant in characterizing the nature of Part III's civil war, the king is not the only major figure to use sea-storm images for various aspects of the Wars of the Roses. King Edward IV also utilizes the image; for example, he tells Queen Margaret that Henry VI was doomed the moment he stooped beneath his state to marry her:

Even then that sunshine brew'd a shower for him
That wash'd his father's fortunes forth of France
And heap'd sedition on his crown at home.

[II, ii, 156-158]

The image is particularly apt in light of Chapter III's discussion of Queen Margaret's lengthy storm passage in Part II, Act III, scene ii, in which it was pointed out that the actual storm threatening her life in her voyage to England was the same figurative tempest she brought with her to devastate England. The image thus adds another brush stroke to the already ominous portrait of the warrior-queen. The image is repeated by King Edward when he hears that the former queen is landing with French army and support to reclaim Henry's throne: "In the midst of this bright-shining day, / I spy a black, suspicious threat'ning cloud" [V, iii, 3-4]. Edward's brother, George, the Duke of Clarence, replies:

A little gale will soon disperse that cloud
And blow it to the source from whence it came;
Thy very beams will dry those vapours up,
For every cloud engenders not a storm.

[V, iii, 10-13]

Queen Margaret is not always characterized as part of the storm; sometimes she is a ship or a ship's pilot braving the storm. But unlike Henry she fights against the elements. King Edward adds to both her characterization and her husband's when he tells his followers:

Some troops pursue the bloody-minded queen,
That led calm Henry, though he were a king,
As doth a sail, fill'd with a fretting gust,
Command an argosy to stem the waves.

[II, vi, 33-36]

Clad in man's armor, the haughty queen does in fact lead Henry about as though he were her team's mascot rather than its captain. Margaret recognizes her own nature and behavior; when the former queen goes to tell King Lewis of France about her lost power, she assumes an angry humility: "Now Margaret/Must strike her sail" [III, iii, 4-5].

Significantly, it is Queen Margaret who has the longest and most often commented upon passage of sea-storm imagery in the play, indeed in the entire trilogy. In Act V, scene iv, Queen Margaret is leading her forces to Tewkesbury to attempt to regain the English throne from Edward IV and the Yorkists. The Wars of the Roses have taken a heavy toll on both sides of the conflict, and Margaret tries to cheer the flagging spirits of Prince Edward, Somerset and Oxford. It is appropriate that the Queen, whose rhetorical outburst about her stormy voyage to England was the longest sea passage in Part II (Act III, scene ii), now speaks of civil war as a storm. As was shown in the previous chapter, Margaret's bombast about the actual storm which threatened her life was at the same time representative of the figurative storm she brought

with her to England. She who brought down upon England much of the
fury of civil storms how speaks to her dwindling army:

What though the mast be now blown overboard,
The cable broke, the holding anchor lost,
And half our sailors swallow'd in the flood [?]
[V, iv, 3-5]

Margaret recounts the Lancastrian losses and tries to show that each
loss can be overcome, in terms reflective of the Elizabethan fondness
for analogy:

Say Warwick was our anchor; what of that?
And Montague our top-mast; what of him?
Our slaughter'd friends the tackles; what of these?
Why, is not Oxford here another anchor?
And Somerset another goodly mast?
The friends of France our shrouds and tacklings?
And, though unskilful, why not Ned and I
For once allow'd the skilful pilot's charge?
[13-20]

Knowing that Henry cannot or will not pilot the ship of state, dauntless
Margaret more than willingly takes control. Fiercely determined to win
at any cost, the queen asserts:

We will not from the helm to sit and weep,
But keep our course, though the rough wind say no,
From shelves and rocks that threaten us with wrack.
As good to chide the waves as speak them fair.
And what is Edward but a ruthless sea?
What Clarence but a quicksand of deceit?
And Richard but a ragged fatal rock?
All these the enemies to our poor bark.
[21-28]

Knowing that the battle will be difficult, she warns her forces not to
waver or think of changing sides:

Say you can swim--alas, 'tis but a while!
Tread on the sand--why, there you quickly sink:
Bestride the rock--the tide will wash you off,
Or else you famish; that a three-fold death.
This speak I, lords, to let you understand

If case some one of you would fly from us,
 That there's no hop'd-for mercy with the brothers
More than with ruthless waves, with sands, and rocks.
 Why, courage then! What cannot be avoided
 'Twere childish weakness to lament or fear.
 [29-38]

Margaret's 40-line harangue has its calculated effect: the men are duly shamed into renewed vigor. Her imagistic passage functions much the same as Talbot's "How are we park'd and bounded in a pale--" speech in Part I (Act IV, scene ii); that is, through the images themselves the two military leaders tap man's reserves of fierceness and pride and desire for victory. There is, however, an important difference between the two speeches: while Talbot speaks spontaneously, letting the image develop naturally according to its own bent, Queen Margaret, who is always the actress supreme, manipulates and controls the image in order to achieve the desired effect on her listeners. Talbot speaks to and for himself; Margaret is deliberately playing upon the emotions of her followers in order to whip them into a fever pitch of battle-readiness. Henry himself comments on Margaret's acting abilities. When she goes to King Lewis of France for help, Henry remarks that "Lewis is a prince soon won with moving words,/By this account, then, Margaret may win him" [III, i, 34-35]. Like her long sea-storm description in Part II, this elaborate and detailed passage of civil war-storm imagery is a deliberate piece of rhetoric inserted into the situation, not growing naturally out of it. Yet it is vital to remember that the artificiality of such a speech is not Shakespeare's but Margaret's: granted, the early Shakespeare is also learning to create characters who are themselves users of rhetoric. Such a one is Queen Margaret. Always in command of

herself and usually of others as well, Margaret uses images and arguments and tears with as much self-discipline and premeditation as any seasoned trouper on the boards. Gentle enough to love Suffolk and her son almost to distraction, yet cruel enough to taunt York with the blood of his own dead child, Queen Margaret is a many-faceted character and one of Shakespeare's most successful achievements in Henry VI.

Margaret's "What though the mast" speech is not only the play's most detailed war-storm comparison, but also its last, save one brief but significant instance. As has been discussed in this chapter's section on animal imagery, when Gloucester enters Henry's chamber in the Tower of London (Act V, scene vi), the two bandy back and forth the image of Henry VI and Prince Edward as Daedalus and Icarus. Henry says:

I, Daedalus; my poor boy, Icarus;
Thy father, Minos, that denied our course;
The sun that sear'd the winds of my sweet boy,
Thy brother Edward; and thyself, the sea
Whose envious gulf did swallow up his life.

[21-25]

This exchange between Gloucester and Henry VI includes an important aspect of the trilogy's water imagery: images of the sea are frequently associated with animals. It is, of course, natural that animals which normally live in or near water participate in the sea imagery; for example, York speaks of his defeated army:

We budg'd again; as I have seen a swan
With bootless labour swim against the tide
And spend her strength with over-matching waves.

[I, iv, 19-21]

But, in addition to this type of combination animal-water imagery, there are numerous passages in which unrelated animal images and sea images

function side by side. It should be noted that at the same time slaughter images reach their peak, i.e., Part II, Act III, violent storm images are also increasing. The scenes which the section on animal imagery has noted as full of butchery images display a parallel abundance of storm, tempest, and sea images. The point is not so much that they are associated with each other but that both types of imagery share the same function, that is, they indicate the pattern of man's dissolutions as his political order dissolves. The storm and slaughter images may be viewed on one level simply as atmosphere for the political chaos and murder on stage, but on a second level the pattern of their development reveals a parallel pattern in man's fall from civilization to primordial mayhem. Brief examples include York's statement that his followers "turn back and fly, like ships before the wind/Or lambs pursu'd by hunger-starved wolves" [I, iv, 4-5]. The weeping father in II, v, is blown by "the windy tempest" [86] of his heart and prays to God for pity on "this miserable age" [88] with its "butchery" [89] strategems. His wife will "for slaughter of my son/Shed seas of tears and ne'er be satisfied!" [105-106]

Thus, while garden imagery is unchanged throughout the entire trilogy and forms a poetic context of the natural frailty and decay of all living things, the other two major images--animal and sea--show a parallel and interdependent development. Through the gradual change in animal and sea images, Shakespeare clearly indicates the universal pattern of human disintegration in civil war. Part I Henry VI, which plants the seeds leading to civil disorder, is dominated by an

enclosure motif: animal images of traps and snares are reinforced by a marked emphasis upon walls, towers, chains, and other man-made devices of restraint. Sea images are brief, infrequent, and peaceful. Part II Henry VI, which nurtured the seedlings of civil disorder, is dominated by slaughter and butchering imagery in which Part I's concern for restraints and containment gives way to a new appetite for blood, death, and mutilation. At the same time, sea images are becoming longer, more frequent, and quite unpleasant and violent. As Part III Henry VI unfolds, the full harvest of civil disorder is reaped; slaughter and butchery images continue unchanged in cruelty and blood-lust, while sea images reach their peak in stormy violence, length and frequency. As the dramatic imagery moves in scope from rational to animal to cosmic, the pattern of human degradation is clear: in Part I man is a thinking being responsible for his deeds, able to reach decisions and then follow them through or change the decision if necessary. While Henry VI may have inherited his grandfather's sin and York a family claim to the throne, it is still they themselves who determine their own actions and reap the results. In Part I, man takes deliberated steps--he decides when to set up barriers and when to break them down, he sets traps, he builds city walls or climbs them, he wears tawny coats, he imprisons another in chains, and so on. The world is one of decision followed by action. But what if those decisions are the wrong ones? Part II clearly shows us the results.

The decisions made in Part I (Henry's for inaction, Suffolk's for power and Margaret, the nobles to quarrel) break all bounds of

order in England and man falls from the level of rational life to the bestial. He is no longer concerned with merely restraining another human being; instead, he delights in toying with him and then tearing him into bits. Blood demands blood and man in Part II Henry VI thus sells his birthright, i.e., his ability to choose his own destiny. He no longer directs his fate through the use of his reason; instead, he is subject to the animal within himself now released on the world. With Gloucester's murder, the beast is released, never to be caged again, for each violent deed necessitates another until the universal destruction of Part III is inevitable.

In Part III man's personal chaos assumes grander proportions and becomes part of a cosmic disorder. The last vestiges of rational control have disappeared and man is the floundering victim of a tide of passions and events over which he can exert no guidance at all. The characters in Part III Henry VI no longer have the power to decide their own actions or fate; they can only fulfill the destiny determined by their choices. No longer makers of history, they are merely flotsam on its surging tide. The animal forces raging in Part II have now joined a broader disorder, one which involves the earth, the sea, and the heavens, indeed, the entire cosmos. From such an apparently small event as the picking of red and white roses in the Temple Garden develops a storm which threatens universal destruction. Through the trilogy's dramatic imagery the point is clearly made that man has destiny-controlling choices in this world, but that when man makes the wrong choices, he releases uncontrollable natural forces which can reduce the entire universe to chaos. And man returns to the primordial slime.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

From a study of dramatic imagery in Shakespeare's Henry VI trilogy emerges a variety of metaphors: acting, sexual, battle, disease, Biblical, blood, death, star and sun, and light vs. dark, with the three major ones being garden, animal, and water. Such an examination is inherently fragmented as first one vehicle and then another is discussed. However, it should be kept in mind that the metaphors noted in previous chapters as functioning a certain way in a certain scene work, not alone, but together in scenes. Strands of metaphor do not exist as isolated phenomena. For example, the scene of York's murder by Queen Margaret and Clifford (III Henry VI, I, iv) utilizes an effective blending of the trilogy's three main strands of imagery.

The most obvious imagery in the scene is that of the jungle and slaughter-house--fierce animal metaphors of all kind. Defeated by the Queen's army at Wakefield, the weary Duke of York bravely but futilely faces the Lancastrian leaders, Margaret, Clifford and Northumberland. Thus far we are merely watching the traditional acts of men at war, but when York is secured the action on stage changes ominously: instead of witnessing men at war we quickly realize that we are watching vicious animals circling their hapless prey. York is mockingly placed on a mole-hill as an ersatz throne and given a paper crown while Margaret, Clifford, and Northumberland jeer at the helplessness

of their victim. In these actions we see not only animal but also acting images rendered in three-dimensional terms. York has been figuratively climbing to the throne, and now he literally ascends a mound of dirt to an imitation throne. Like Duchess Eleanor, Talbot's son, and others in the trilogy who soar upward like eager birds, York flies high, but his flight is brief and futile. As York steps on to the mole-hill and Margaret orders a paper crown placed on his head, we also see the embodiment of the trilogy's acting images: York is given a replica of the real crown which has been the subject of the Yorkist-Lancastrian contention. He assumes the garb, the costume, the artificial trapping of the role he has wanted so desperately to play: King of England. York thus becomes a make-believe king, a copy of the original--in short, an actor in a grotesque drama of state. Margaret taunts York with a napkin dipped in the blood of his young son, Rutland, brutally murdered by Clifford in the previous scene, and asks where his "mess of sons" [73] are now. The unnatural cruelty of Margaret at last goads York into speech: he calls her an inhuman, ruthless "tiger's heart wrapp'd in a woman's hide!" [137] Untouched, Margaret and Clifford move in for the kill and stab York. As she stands over the bloody body of her victim, Margaret orders his head placed "on York gates;/So York may overlook the town of York" [179-180].

Such cruelty as Margaret and Clifford demonstrate indicates the extent of England's disorder. All lines of degree are gone; Margaret is no longer queen, wife, or woman. Clifford is not soldier, subject, or man. Instead, they are blood-thirsty animals who shatter the

time-honored traditions of honor in battle, respect for an enemy's bravery, and sympathy for the loyalties of family and kin. Merely capturing the enemy's leader and winning the battle are not sufficient for Margaret and Clifford, who have become relentless thirsters for blood. Defeating York is not enough: they must humiliate, degrade, mutilate him; they want blood for the sake of reveling in its smell, touch and sight. Margaret's flaunting of a napkin soaked in the blood of young Rutland, her jeers at York's desire to be king and his love for his sons, and Clifford's unrestrained eagerness to stab York--these are not the deeds of men in war; rather they are the actions of an over-fed housecat, toying with her mouse. Just as the cat pretends to let the mouse go in order to have the fun of catching him again and watching him squirm anew, Margaret teases and taunts York until he finally lashes back verbally, much to her entertainment. As Margaret, clad in masculine garb--a soldier's armor--mockingly watches York finally respond to her jibes, she relishes the last signs of life from her victim before she and Clifford tire of their cat-and-mouse game and move in for the kill.

In York's murder we see the trilogy's verbal images of animal, acting, traps, beasts of prey, slaughter and blood realized in the stage presentation. When York first enters alone, he regrets that his followers have all fled before the Queen's army like "lambs pursu'd by hunger-starved wolves" [5]. Quickly discovered and seized by the Lancastrians, York curses them with a prophecy we have heard before in Henry VI: "My ashes, like the phoenix, may bring forth/A bird that will revenge upon you all" [35-36]. Clifford's response to his outburst

continues the animal imagery: "So doves do peck the falcon's piercing talons" [41]. When, according to the Folio stage directions, "they lay hands on York, who struggles," Clifford observes, "Ay, ay, so strives the woodcock with the gin" [61]. And Northumberland adds, "So doth the cony struggle in the net" [62]. In short, action and words alike suggest the animal-like behavior of York and his captors. York is clearly depicted in this scene as the victim of cruel animals who relish his torment and mutilation.

At the same time the Duke of York is a parent-tree figure who has already had one child-limb torn from him and now faces destruction himself. The garden imagery as it appears throughout the trilogy is thus embodied in this scene: York is the "sweet stem from York's stock" [1 HVI, II, v, 41], "the flower of Europe" [3 HVI, II, i, 71]; his son-blossom, Rutland, has just been senselessly killed, and now York faces Margaret and Clifford, who will cut him down just as he nears fruition. As has been noted in Chapter III, man and flower alike are often mowed down in Henry VI just before or at their moment of maturation and glory, just so with York who has come within inches of gaining the throne of England. When he almost has the crown within his grasp he is seized and decapitated with no more remorse than one shows when snipping a flower. That York is such a flower-tree-parent is recognized even by the messenger reporting the murder: York fell just as "many strokes, though with a little axe, / Hews down and fells the hardest-timber'd oak" [II, i, 54-55]. As has been previously pointed out, the trilogy's garden imagery is not consistent (man may be a gardener or a flower, a child

is both limb and/or blossom), and one of these inconsistencies appears at York's murder. York is clearly presented as having barely reached maturity, yet he also speaks of himself as being ready for harvest. Shakespeare's characters inevitably meet a fate which they have called down upon themselves; they reap what they have sown. In spite of any sympathies aroused by the pitiful brave figure of York, standing alone amid heartless enemies, it must be remembered that York brought disgrace upon himself by rebelling against his king. When he allowed his son, Richard, to persuade him to revolution by tricks of sophistry, he signed his own death warrant. Thus, when York defies Margaret with a curse, "in thy need such comfort come to thee/As now I reap at thy too cruel hand!" he may speak more truth than he realizes. The curse is obvious sarcasm, for York receives anything but comfort from Margaret; however, his choice of the word 'reap' is very appropriate in that such discomfort is precisely the result which might be expected from his earlier choices and deeds. York's bloody, perverse coronation and murder are the consequences of his own actions against the crown: York does indeed reap what he has sown. And rebellion bears bitter fruit.

Thus, in the murder and mutilation of York we witness the visual manifestation of all the natural frailty, the briefness of life before death and decay, the constant threat to life and the inevitability of reaping what is sown--all the ideas contained in the trilogy's poetic images of the garden. We actually witness the cutting down of a parent-tree figure already shorn of a child-limb but nonetheless nearing complete fulfillment, and we thus we see poetic images rendered in dramatic terms.

The trilogy's sea-storm imagery is also at work in this scene, although less noticeably so than animal or garden images. Margaret has been frequently noted as playing an important part in bringing to England the tempest of civil war. Her lengthy tirade in Part II, III, ii, about her difficult voyage to England has been remarked as indicating her role as the instigator of England's storm-war. In her taunting of York to the point of tears we watch Margaret perform in physical terms the same engendering of a storm within an individual that she figuratively engenders within the nation. We have heard before that Margaret has been a dark cloud in England's gathering storm; now we actually see her cause a literal storm. When Margaret demands that York "stamp, rave, and fret" [I, iv, 91] in order to amuse her, York replies:

Bid'st thou me rage? Why, now thou hast thy wish.
 Would'st have me weep? Why, now thou hast thy will.
For raging wind blows up incessant showers,
And when the rage allays, the rain begins.

[143-146]

As before in the trilogy, tears and storms are intertwined as York speaks of the tears prompted by Margaret's taunts as raindrops following a storm. Human passions are often portrayed in the Henry VI trilogy as storms, and in this instance we actually see Margaret responsible for a literal storm on the individual level just as we have been hearing that she is responsible for a figurative one on the national level.

Thus, the trilogy's three major images--garden, animal, and sea--are all at work in one important scene, supported by acting images. Such combinations appear throughout the trilogy; indeed, every scene combines images in some way. But the length of the present study will not permit

a separate discussion of these numerous scenes. The noting of their existence will have to suffice here. At the same time, it should be noted that in several scenes Shakespeare appears to neglect an opportunity to make his images work effectively: for example, in Part II, I, iv, Duchess Eleanor is trapped in her garden by Gloucester's enemies as she looks down on the magical practices of a witch. The obvious opportunity to make images of high-soaring birds, trapped animals, and garden plants work together is curiously ignored by Shakespeare.

The value of a study of dramatic imagery in Henry VI is threefold. Its first--and most obvious--significance is that it reveals the early poetic techniques of William Shakespeare, budding dramatist. We find that Shakespeare is already handling imagery in much the same way as he will in his later, more mature plays. In his first three plays Shakespeare draws upon the stock of common Elizabethan metaphors--for example, the sun/king and storm/war analogies--and frequently employs them in the artificial euphuistic style so popular at that period. But, at the same time, Shakespeare is already employing brief images in an integral manner, relating them to the play's other elements and making the resultant drama an organic whole. While Henry VI has its numerous detachable purple patches, it also has its complex network of poetic images, literal references, characters and action working together to make a cogent statement about man in war. Thus, while Henry VI overflows with ornate, inorganic images, it, at the same time, anticipates Shakespeare's development of the compact organic image of King Lear or

Macbeth. Not only does the imagery embellish the ideas in Henry VI, but in many instances the imagery is the idea.

The second value of a study of Henry VI's dramatic imagery lies in what it tells us about the Shakespeare canon as a whole. We find that Henry VI's images are typical of their fellows throughout the canon in their common background in Renaissance thought. Just as he is the adapter and borrower par excellence of plots, Shakespeare also absorbs and reworks an already existing body of Renaissance images; for example, the 'world-as-a-stage' metaphor, the sun/king analogy, or the tempest/war analogy. As is so often the case with Shakespearean studies, we are forced to conclude that Shakespeare's genius lay not in originality of material but in originality of treatment. And in Henry VI, signs of that aspect of his developing genius are readily apparent.

The Shakespeare canon also reveals remarkably consistent ideas: in Henry VI we find the same horror of disorder and tempests that is the basis of Shakespeare's last play, The Tempest. Not only is Shakespeare already using the same images that he will employ in later plays, but also he is manipulating them to make the same statements as in later plays: rebellion against the crown is a temporal evil which destroys rebels and king alike. Shakespeare early and late decries such disorder in the state as the worst of earthly evils.

The third--and perhaps most important--value of studying Henry VI's dramatic imagery is what such an analysis can reveal about the trilogy itself. By examining verbal imagery as it interacts with the other dramatic elements, we establish a clearer understanding of what the plays

are all about. Probably the most important single fact gained from the study is that the trilogy's imagery undergoes a marked development as the emphasis shifts from enclosures in Part I to wild animals and slaughter in Part II and finally to storms in Part III.¹ In examining this imagistic progression, one becomes aware that Henry VI is not just another play about civil war but rather a play about the inevitable changes man undergoes as a result of that civil war.

Through the trilogy's garden imagery, appearing basically unchanged throughout the three plays, Shakespeare emphasizes the natural frailty of all life. Man and flower alike struggle to reach their brief pinnacle of beauty, only to be cut down by frosts, cankers and blight; their common fate can only be death and decay. Yet within this bleak context Shakespeare nonetheless recognizes man's ability to control his short life. Through Part I's motif of enclosures, traps, and snares, Shakespeare indicates the rational nature of man, a somewhat ordered, thinking being who is capable of making decisions and then carrying them out. When man thus chooses civil war in Part I, his decisions release the all consuming forces which devour his nation and himself in Parts II and III. Again through the plays' imagery, we learn what happens to the nature of man as those rampant destructive forces erode his very being: man becomes victim of his own brutalizing essence and is tossed back into the primordial chaos from when he sprang. The rational man who

¹For an interesting example of this imagistic progression condensed into three scenes, cf. the death of Talbot's son, Part I, IV, v, vi, and vii. Talbot's son "is hemm'd about," then fights like a lion and finally dies in a "sea of blood."

chose civil war in Part I is thus transformed by that same war into a raging animal and finally reduced even to senseless flotsam on history's relentless tides. This reduction of man from rational to animal to inanimate object is indeed the main point of Henry VI, a dramatic trilogy whose theme is man's disintegration in war. The point is clearly made by Shakespeare's manipulation of what the present study calls 'dramatic imagery,' by the playwright's deliberate and interweaving of poetic images about butchers, walls, traps, and tempests with real walls, slaughter and blood-shed, Henry's cage in the tower and Margaret's storm at sea. Verbal images join literal allusions, narrative, staging and action to present a vivid portrait of a nation falling into the abyss of civil disorder. The picture is an ugly one, for Shakespeare, like most of his contemporaries, feared no temporal evil more than another series of dynastic wars like the Wars of the Roses from which England had just recovered. But the picture is impressive, and because England faced the prospect of no successor being named to Elizabeth, the threat was once again frighteningly real.

An analysis of Henry VI's dramatic imagery would seem to settle at least one critical issue: that of whether or not Shakespeare thought the civil war of York vs. Lancaster to be divine retribution for Henry VI's seizure of the crown in 1399. E. M. W. Tillyard and others are undeniably correct that Shakespeare embraced the popular so-called 'Tudor myth,' that is, he believed that Henry Bolingbroke's usurpation of Richard II's crown was a sin which provoked divine vengeance upon "the third heir [Henry VI] through the agency of another usurper

[Edward IV], whose sin is again avenged upon the third heir [Richard III]."² And order is finally restored only through the victory of Henry VII and the House of Tudor at Bosworth Field. But, at the same time, Shakespeare's view of history encompassed more than this strictly orthodox interpretation. While Shakespeare anticipated Raleigh's view that "ill doing hath alwaies beene attended with ill successe" and would have accepted Raleigh's illustrative pattern (ill-doing of Edward III was paid for by Richard II, that of Henry IV by Henry VI, Edward IV by Richard III),³ he nonetheless placed definite responsibility upon the individual as arbiter of his own fate. The father's sins may indeed be visited upon the son, but in the final analysis it is the son's own behavior which ultimately decides his fate. Thus, while the views of Lily B. Campbell, E. M. W. Tillyard and J. A. R. Marriott⁴ are unquestionably right that Shakespeare's view of history in Henry VI reflects the orthodox Tudor philosophy of the Wars of the Roses as God's vengeance for Henry IV's sin, these critics have stopped short of the complete picture.

Critics who have enlarged their understanding of Shakespeare's philosophy of history are M. M. Reese, J. P. Brockbank, Irving Ribner,

²Lily Bess Campbell, Shakespeare's "Histories": Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy (San Marino, Cal., 1947), p. 122.

³Ibid., pp. 122-123.

⁴E. M. W. Tillyard, Shakespeare's History Plays (New York, 1946); J. A. R. Marriott, English History in Shakespeare (London, 1918).

and H. M. V. Matthews.⁵ Reese, for instance, attempts to reconcile the Tudor view of history with what he feels was Shakespeare's conviction that man by his own actions co-operates in his own destiny. As Brockbank, Ribner, and Matthews understand Henry VI, we spectators are not merely watching divine retribution for Henry IV's usurpation unfold on the stage but rather we watch men sinning anew and paying for those new sins in blood and anarchy. Henry's catastrophic virtue and Richard's catastrophic evil are not an inescapable inheritance from the distant past but are initiated by the happenings we witness. Undoubtedly, as Henry himself admits, Henry VI's claim to the throne is shaky and to Shakespeare's audience the nemesis pursuing his grandfather's unlawful seizure of the throne is implicitly present throughout the trilogy; however, it is the actions of the characters actually on the stage which release the anarchy of civil war.

The unity of the trilogy lies in its portrayal of the gradual reduction of English order into chaos because none of her national figures chooses to maintain his proper place. It should be remembered that observation of degree was also an important part of the Tudor view of history and that in Henry VI we watch a graphic display of the disastrous results of breaching degree. Matthews states that Shakespeare's purpose in Henry VI is to demonstrate "the disastrous results of disunity

⁵Max Meredith Reese, The Cease of Majesty (New York, 1961); J. P. Brockback, "The Frame of Disorder--Henry VI," Early Shakespeare, Stratford-on-Avon Studies 3, 1961; Irving Ribner, The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare (Princeton, 1957); H. M. V. Matthews, Character and Symbol in Shakespeare's Plays (Cambridge, 1962).

in the commonwealth."⁶ That civil disunity stems

from the failure of men to fulfil their proper roles, and this failure spreads downwards through society like a rot until fathers and sons murder each other without knowing why, and men believe that seven half-penny loaves can be had for a penny and that three-hooped pots have ten hoops.⁷

In short, each character--by choice--fails to enact his assigned role and national chaos results.

The Reese-Brockbank-Ribner-Matthews analysis of Henry VI is clearly supported by the present study's conclusions about the trilogy's dramatic imagery. As Chapter II has pointed out, Part I's motif of enclosures, traps, and snares is indicative of man's rational nature, an aspect of his being which is brutalized by the very war which he himself chooses. Through the trilogy's dramatic imagery, Shakespeare makes it clear that man does direct his own destiny and that the Wars of the Roses sweep England, not because Henry IV sinned years ago, but because Henry VI, his queen and his nobles commit their own sins. Henry chooses not to act, Queen Margaret to rule the nation itself, and Henry's nobles to squabble rather than support their king--these are the decisions which destroy England's order. These decisions and their chaotic results are what Henry VI is all about and they are what a study of the trilogy's dramatic imagery helps to illuminate.

⁶Matthews, p. 27.

⁷Ibid.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, Peter. Shakespeare's Henry VI and Richard III. Cambridge, 1929.
- Allen, Don Cameron. Image and Meaning; Metaphoric Traditions in Renaissance Poetry. Baltimore, 1960.
- Anderson, Ruth Leila. Elizabethan Psychology and Shakespeare's Plays. University of Iowa Humanistic Studies, Vol. III, no. 4. Iowa City, 1927.
- Armstrong, Edward A. Shakespeare's Imagination. London, 1946.
- Baker, George Pierce. The Development of Shakespeare as a Dramatist. New York, 1907.
- Barfield, Owen. Poetic Diction. London, 1928.
- Bethell, S. L. "Shakespeare's Imagery: The Diabolic Images in Othello," Shakespeare Survey, 5 (1952), 62-80.
- Betts, George Herbert. "The Distribution and Functions of Mental Imagery," Teachers College, Columbia University Contributions to Education, no. 26. New York, 1909.
- Blunden, Edmund. Shakespeare's Significance. London, 1929.
- Bodkin, Maud. Archetypal Patterns in Poetry. London, 1948.
- _____. Studies of Type-Images in Poetry, Religion, and Philosophy. London, 1951.
- Brockbank, J. P. "The Frame of Disorder--Henry VI," Early Shakespeare, Stratford-on-Avon Studies 3, 1961.
- Brooke, C. F. Tucker. "The Authorship of the Second and Third Parts of King Henry VI," Trans. Connecticut Acad. of Arts and Sciences, XVII (1912), 141-211.
- _____, ed. King Henry VI, Part 1 and 2. Yale, 1923.
- _____. The Tudor Drama. New York, 1911.
- Brooks, Cleanth. Modern Poetry and the Tradition. Chapel Hill, 1939.
- _____. "Shakespeare as a Symbolist Poet," Yale Review, XXXIV (1945), 642-665.

- Brown, Stephen I. The World of Imagery. London, 1927.
- Buck, Gertrude. "The Metaphor: A Study in the Psychology of Rhetoric," Contributions to Rhetorical Theory, V (Ann Arbor, 1899).
- Burns, James Jesse. The Story of English Kings, According to Shakespeare. New York, 1899.
- Bush, Douglas. "Classical Myths in Shakespeare's Plays," Elizabethan and Jacobean Studies Presented to F. P. Wilson, 1959.
- Cairncross, Andres, ed. The First Part of King Henry VI. New Arden Edition. London, 1957.
- _____. The Second Part of King Henry VI. New Arden Edition. London, 1962.
- _____. The Third Part of King Henry VI. New Arden Edition. London, 1964.
- Campbell, Lily Bess. Shakespeare's "Histories": Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy. San Marino, Cal., 1947.
- Chambers, E. K. Shakespeare: A Survey. New York, 1958.
- _____. Shakespearean Gleanings. Oxford, 1944.
- _____. The Elizabethan Stage. 4 vols. Oxford, 1923.
- _____. William Shakespeare. 2 vols. London, 1930.
- Chapman, Raymond. "The Wheel of Fortune in Shakespeare's Historical Plays," Review of English Studies, January, 1950.
- Charlton, H. B. "Shakespeare, Politics, and Politicians," Lecture to the English Association, 1929.
- Charney, Maurice. Shakespeare's Roman Plays: The Function of Imagery in the Drama. Cambridge, Mass., 1961.
- Clemen, Wolfgang. "Anticipation and Foreboding in Shakespeare's Early Histories," Shakespeare Survey, 6 (1953), 25-35.
- _____. "Popular Drama and History Plays," English Tragedy Before Shakespeare. London, 1961, 192-210.
- _____. The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery. Cambridge, Mass., 1951.
- _____. "Tradition and Originality in Shakespeare's Richard III," Shakespeare Quarterly, V (1954), 247-257.

Craig, Hardin. An Interpretation of Shakespeare. Columbia, Mo., 1948.

_____. "Shakespeare and Formal Logic," Studies in English Philosophy: A Miscellany in Honor of Frederick Klaeber, 380-396.

_____. "Shakespeare and the History Play," Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies, Washington, 1948.

_____. The Enchanted Glass: The Elizabethan Mind in Literature. New York, 1936.

Croce, Benedetto. The Essence of Aesthetic. London, 1921.

Darius, Raymond J. "The Coherence of Metaphor in Shakespeare's English History Plays." Doctoral dissertation, Harvard, 1951.

Dayton, B. E. "Animal Similes and Metaphors in Shakespeare's Plays." University of Washington Abstracts, II (1937), 119-122.

Denny, C. F. "The Sources of I Henry VI as an Indication of Revision," PQ, XVI (1937), 225-248.

Doran, Madeline. Henry VI, Parts II and III. University of Iowa Humanities Studies, 1928.

Dowden, Edward. Shakespeare: His Mind and Art. London. 1875.

Downer, Alan S. "The Life of Our Design: The Functions of Imagery in the the Poetic Drama," Hudson Review, II (1949), 242-263.

Ellacombe, Henry Nicholson. The Plant-lore and Garden Craft of Shakespeare. Exeter, 1878.

Ellis-Fermor, Una. "Shakespeare and His World: The Poet's Imagery," The Listener, XVII (July 28, 1949), 157-158.

_____. Some Recent Research in Shakespeare's Imagery. Oxford, 1937.

_____. The Frontiers of Drama. London, 1945.

Ensor, Allison Rash. "Dramatic Imagery and Allusion." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1959.

Evans, B. Ifor. The Language of Shakespeare's Plays. London, 1952.

Evans, G. Blakemore. "Review of J. Dover Wilson's Editions of Henry VI," Shakespeare Quarterly, IV (1953), 84-92.

Falconer, Alexander Frederick. A Glossary of Shakespeare's Sea and Naval Terms. London, 1965.

- Fehrman, Carl. "The Study of Shakespeare's Imagery," Moderna Sprak (Stockholm), VI (1957), 7-20.
- Ferguson, Francis. Henry VI Parts One, Two and Three. The Laurel Shakespeare. New York, 1963.
- Foakes, R. A. "Imagery in Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama." Doctoral dissertation, Birmingham, 1952.
- _____. "Suggestions for a New Approach to Shakespeare's Imagery," Shakespeare Survey, 5 (1952), 81-92.
- Foss, Martin. Symbol and Metaphor in Human Experience. Princeton, 1949.
- Friedman, Norman. "Imagery: From Sensation by Symbol," Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, XII (1953), 25-37.
- Frye, Northrop. "Levels of Meaning in Literature," Kenyon Review, XIII (1951), 246-252.
- _____. "The Archetypes of Literature," Kenyon Review, XIII (1951), 92-110.
- Gardner, W. H. "Aspects of Shakespeare's Imagery," The Month, X (1953), 41-51.
- Gaw, Allison. "The Origin and Development of 'I Henry VI.'" University of Carolina Studies, I, 1926.
- Greer, Clayton Alvis. "The York and Lancaster Quarto-Folio Sequence," PMLA, 48 (1933), 655-704.
- Habgood, F. E. C. and W. S. Melsome. "Professor Spurgeon and Her Images," Baconiana, XXV (July, 1941), 213-235.
- Halliday, F. E. The Poetry of Shakespeare's Plays. London, 1954.
- Hankins, John Erskine. Shakespeare's Derived Imagery. Lawrence, Kansas, 1953.
- Hapgood, Robert. "Shakespeare and the Ritualists," Shakespeare Survey, 15 (1962), 111-124.
- Hart, Alfred. Shakespeare and the Homilies. Melbourne, 1934.
- Hastings, William T. "Shakespeare's Imagery," SAB, XL (1936), 131-141.
- Heilman, Robert B. Magic in the Web: Action and Language in Othello. Lexington, 1956.

- _____. This Great Stage: Image and Structure in King Lear. Baton Rouge, 1948.
- Henle, Paul. "Metaphor," Language, Thought and Culture, University of Michigan Press, 1958.
- Henneman, J. B. "The Episodes in Shakespeare's I Henry VI," PMLA, XV (1900), 290-320.
- Hilliard, Addie Suggs. "Shakespeare's Botanical Imagery." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1964.
- Hodges, John C. with Mary E. Whitten. Harbrace Handbook. New York, 1962.
- Holland, Norman Norwood. The Shakespearean Imagination. New York, 1964.
- Holmes, Elizabeth. Aspects of Elizabethan Imagery. Oxford, 1929.
- Hornstein, Lillian Herlands. "The Analysis of Imagery," PMLA, LVII (1942), 638-653.
- Hyman, Stanley Edgar. The Armed Vision. New York, 1948.
- Isaacs, J. "Shakespeare's Imagery," TLS (Sept. 12, 1936), 729.
- Jackson, Sir Barry. "On Producing Henry VI," Shakespeare Survey, 5 (1953).
- Jordan, John E. "The Reporter of Henry VI, Part 2," PMLA, 64 (1949), 1089-1113.
- Jorgensen, Paul A. Shakespeare's Military World. Berkeley, 1956.
- Joseph, Sister Miriam. Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language, New York, 1947.
- Kellett, E. E. "Some Notes on a Feature of Shakespeare's Style," Suggestions (Cambridge, Mass., 1923), 57-58.
- Kennedy, M. B. The Oration in Shakespeare. Chapel Hill, N. C., 1942.
- Kernan, Alvin B. "A Comparison of the Imagery in 3 Henry VI and The True Tragedie of Richard Duke of York," SP, LI (1954), 431-442.
- King, Lucile. "Text Sources of the Folio and Quarto Henry VI," PMLA, LI (1936), 702-718.
- _____. "The Use of Hall's Chronicles in the Folio and Quarto Texts of Henry VI," PQ, XIII (1934), 321-322.
- Kingsford, C. L. "Fifteenth Century History in Shakespeare's Plays," Prejudice and Promise in XVth Century England. Oxford, 1925.

- Kirschbaum, Leo. "The Authorship of I Henry VI," PMLA, 67 (1952), 809-822.
- Knight, G. Wilson. The Imperial Theme. Oxford, 1931.
- _____. The Shakespearian Tempest. Oxford, 1932.
- _____. The Sovereign Flower. London, 1958.
- _____. The Wheel of Fire. Oxford, 1930.
- Knights, Lionel Charles. Further Explorations. Stanford, 1965.
- _____. "On Some Contemporary Trends in Shakespeare Criticism and Other Preliminary Considerations," Some Shakespearean Themes. London, 1959.
- _____ and Basil Cottle, eds. Metaphor and Symbol. Colston Research Society. London, 1960.
- Kolbe, Msgr. F. C. Shakespeare's Way. London, 1930.
- Law, Robert A. "Links Between Shakespeare's History Plays," SP, L (1953), 168-187.
- _____. "Shakespeare's Historical Plays," SP, LI (1954), 40-41.
- _____. "The Chronicles and the Three Parts of Henry VI," University of Texas Studies in English, XXXIII (1954), 13-32.
- Lawlor, John. "Mind and Hand: Some Reflections on the Study of Shakespeare's Imagery," Shakespeare Quarterly, VIII (1957), 179-183.
- Lee, Jane. "On the Authorship of the Second and Third Parts of Henry VI and Their Originals," Trans. New Sh. Soc. (1875-1876), 219-279.
- Leech, Clifford. William Shakespeare: The Chronicles. London, 1962.
- Liu, J. Y. "A Marlo-Shakespearian Image Cluster," Notes and Queries, 196 (1951), 336-337.
- Mahood, Molly Maureen. Shakespeare's Word Play. London, 1957.
- Malone, Edmund. "Dissertation on the Three Parts of Henry VI," The Plays and Poems of Shakespeare, XVIII (London, 1821), 557-597.
- Marder, Louis. "History Cycle at Antioch College," Shakespeare Quarterly, IV (1953), 57-58.
- Marriott, J. A. R. English History in Shakespeare. London, 1918.

- Matthews, H. M. V. Character and Symbol in Shakespeare's Plays. Cambridge, Mass., 1962.
- McKerrow, R. B. "A Note on the Bad Quartos of 2 and 3 Henry VI and the Folio Text," RES, XMI (1937), 64-72.
- _____. "A Note on Henry VI, Part II and The Contention of York and Lancaster," RES, IX (1933), 157-169.
- Morozov, Mikhail M. "The Individualization of Shakespeare's Characters Through Imagery," Shakespeare Survey, 2 (1949), 83-106.
- Muir, Kenneth. "Fifty Years of Shakespeare Criticism: 1900-1950," Shakespeare Survey, 4 (1951), 1-25.
- _____. "Shakespeare's Imagery--Then and Now," Shakespeare Survey, 18 (1965), 46-58.
- Murry, J. Middleton. "Metaphor," J. Middleton Murry: Selected Criticism 1916-1957, Richard Rees, ed., London, 1960.
- Nurooka, Iskmu. "Poetic Images in the Elizabethan Period," Bunka (Tohoku University, Sendai, 1956), xx, No. 3.
- Oyama, Toshiko. A Study of Shakespeare's Imagery. Tokyo, 1953.
- Palmer, John Leslie. Political Characters of Shakespeare. London, 1945.
- Pasternak, Boris. "Shakespeare's Imagery and Rhythm," Arena, I (1950), 33-37.
- Patch, H. R. The Goddess Fortune in Medieval Literature. New York, 1927.
- Phipson, Emma. "The Natural History Similes in Henry VI," New Sh. Soc. Trans. 1877-9, 354-385.
- Pongs, Herman, Das Bild in der Dichtung. Marburg, 1927.
- Price, Hereward T. "Shakespeare's Imagery," Michigan Alumnus Quarterly Review, L (1944), 207-220.
- Prior, Moody E. "Imagery as a Test of Authorship," Shakespeare Quarterly, VI (1955), 381-386.
- _____. The Language of Tragedy. New York, 1947.
- Prouty, C. T. The Contention and Shakespeare's '2 Henry VI,' 1954.
- Rajan, Balachandra. "Similes and Metaphors in Shakespeare," Paradise Lost and the Seventeenth Century Reader. London, 1947.

- Ransom, John Crowe. "Shakespeare at Sonnets," The World's Body (New York, 1938), 270-303.
- Reese, Max Meredith. The Cease of Majesty. New York, 1961.
- Ribner, Irving. The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare. Princeton, 1957.
- Richards, I. A. The Philosophy of Rhetoric. London, 1936.
- Righter, Anne. Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play. London, 1964.
- Root, Robert Kilburn. Classical Mythology in Shakespeare. New York, 1903.
- Rylands, George. Words and Poetry. London, 1926.
- Schricks, W. "Solar Symbolism and Related Imagery in Shakespeare," RBPH, XXIX (1951), 112-128.
- Sen Gupta, S. C. Shakespeare's Historical Plays. Oxford, 1964.
- Sewell, Arthur, "Character and Social Order," Character and Society in Shakespeare. Oxford, 1951.
- Sewell, Elizabeth. The Human Metaphor. University of Notre Dame Press, 1964.
- Smith, Charles George. Shakespeare's Proverb-lore. Cambridge, Mass., 1963.
- Spencer, Hazelton. The Art and Life of William Shakespeare. New York, 1940.
- Spencer, Theodore. Shakespeare and the Nature of Man. Cambridge, Mass., 1943.
- Sprague, Arthur Colby. Shakespeare's Histories. London, 1964.
- Spurgeon, Caroline F. E. Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us. New York, 1935.
- Stauffer, Donald A. Shakespeare's World of Images. New York, 1949.
- Svartengren, T. Hilding. Intensifying Similes in English. London, 1918.
- Thrall, William Flint and Addison Hibbard. A Handbook to Literature. Revised by C. Hugh Holman. New York, 1960.
- Tillyard, E. M. W. The Elizabethan World Picture. New York, 1944.

- Tillyard, E. M. W. "Shakespeare's Historical Cycle: Organism or Compilation?" SP, VI (1954), 34-39.
- _____. Shakespeare's History Plays. New York, 1946.
- Traversi, D. A. Approach to Shakespeare. London, 1938.
- Valentine, C. W. "The Function of Images in the Appreciation of Poetry," British Journal of Psychology, XIV (1923), 164-191.
- Venezky, Alice S. Pageantry on the Shakespearean Stage. New York, 1951.
- Waith, Eugene M., ed. Shakespeare: The Histories. Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1965.
- Wellek, Rene and Austin Warren. Theory of Literature. New York, 1949.
- Wells, Henry W. Poetic Imagery: Illustrated from Elizabethan Literature. New York, 1924.
- Wheelwright, Philip. "Symbol, Metaphor, and Myth," Sewanee Review, LVIII (1950), 678-698.
- _____. "Semantics and Ontology," Metaphor and Symbol. Lionel Charles Knights and Basil Cottle, eds. London, 1960.
- Whiter, Walter. A Specimen of a Commentary on Shakespeare Containing I. Notes on "As You Like It." II. An Attempt to Explain and Illustrate Various Passages, on a New Principle of Criticism Derived from Mr. Locke's Doctrine of the Association of Ideas. London, 1794.
- Willcock, Gladys D. "Language and Poetry in Shakespeare's Early Plays," Proceedings of the British Academy, XL (1954), 103-117.
- Wilson, Frank P. Marlowe and the Early Shakespeare. Oxford, 1953.
- _____. "Shakespeare and the Diction of Common Life," Proceedings of the British Academy, XXVI (1941).
- Wilson, J. Dover. "Malone and the Upstart Crow," Shakespeare Survey, 4 (1951), 56-68.
- _____. I Henry VI. Cambridge, Mass., 1952.
- _____. 2 Henry VI. Cambridge, Mass., 1952.
- _____. 3 Henry VI. Cambridge, Mass., 1952.
- _____. The Essential Shakespeare. Cambridge, Mass., 1962.