Masculine Initiation in the *Henriad*

Halide Aral

Abstract. This essay studies masculine initiation in the *Henriad*, in the light of James Hillman's conception of the archetypes of senex and puer. The plays basically present two modes of initiation in the persons of Hal, the senex, and Falstaff, the trickster, the shadow of puer. While the former develops his masculinity in the usual heroic mode, the latter initiates in a way that suits the puer's development. And the essay argues that Falstaff's initiation through betrayal is a serious parody of Christ's initiation on the cross. The senex-puer polarity as dramatized in these characters is shown to have significant ethical and political implications as well. The contexts of the plays raise the issue of *puer senilis*, but here *puer senilis* remains only as an ideal, bringing up the question of the inevitable loss of soul in an exclusively masculine senex-driven initiatory structure, a disturbing cultural problem we continue to face today.

Keywords: Masculine initiation, puer/senex, puer senilis, betrayal, trickster, *Henriad*

The *Henriad* is a series of four plays by Shakespeare that are set during the reigns of English monarchs from Richard II to Henry V. There is some discussion around the exact number of plays included, but generally the term refers to four plays: *Richard II* (written around 1595); *Henry IV, Part 1* (1597); *Henry IV, Part 2* (1598); *Henry V* (1599). This article focuses particularly on the three Henry plays where Prince Hal struggles between his reckless, carefree life with his friend, the roguish, overweight knight Falstaff and his eventual responsibility to his father, King Henry IV. *Henry IV, Part 2* continues this conflict with Hal's transformation into a more serious leader as he ultimately assumes his role as heir to the throne, while the kingdom faces internal unrest and the dying King's health deteriorates. As he becomes King Henry V, the young monarch matures into a strong and decisive leader as he unites his kingdom and heads to victory in the battle of Agincourt, cementing his legacy as a heroic ruler.

Thematically, therefore, the *Henriad* tackles masculine initiation within a network of father-son relationships that repeatedly involve the polar archetypes of the senex, or "old man," and the puer, "eternal boy," that Shakespeare uses to dramatize contrasting psychological attitudes to time and history. Early on, Falstaff, who, although older than Hal, is in many ways the puer, appears as the father figure, and Hal, though he is still a boy,

https://doi.org/10.29173/jjs305s

is the senex-in-waiting to become the King who will repudiate Falstaff when he is done with the puer phase. The brief early friendship of these men, which eventually turns tragic, ultimately serves to initiate each of the men into different masculine roles than the one he first occupied. While Hal's development fits in the pattern of a hero's journey that involves a conscious relinquishing of the puer, Falstaff's initiation, following a different pattern, enables an ironic critique of the heroic mode, a certain development of anima grief, and speaks to our culture's search for different definitions of masculinity that need not do such injury to relationship. Therefore the essay will focus principally on the problematic development of Falstaff who, as commentators like Sitansu Maitra (1967), Edith Kern (1984) and Matthew A. Fike (2009), have also pointed out, prior to Henry V's repudiation of him, repeatedly enacts the trickster, the shadow of the puer, for a long time only playing at being a worldly-wise senex without the bitter wisdom that he will not actually own until he has experienced total rejection by his former tutee, Hal. Shakespeare presents Falstaff's initiatory betrayal as a quasi-religious experience, and I will argue in these pages that it is a serious parody of Christ's initiation on the cross. Here I must note that Cameron Hunt McNabb, too, works on the Christ connection and holds that Falstaff parodies biblical rhetoric and "casts [himself] as a parodic Christ figure" (McNabb 347). She also points to Hal's position "as a betraying Peter to a Christ-like Falstaff" (353). I had independently come to the same idea and composed my own account of how this symbolic connection works in Shakespeare's *Henriad* before coming across her essay, which anticipates and confirms my argument here: that the parodic Christ connection is not an idle amplification but one supported by the texts in which Falstaff engages with Hal. Whereas McNabb aims to clarify how parody serves to assure that the audience constructs a Christian meaning depending on its personal knowledge and opinion, I delve into the significance of parodic Christ association in terms of masculine initiation. My reading of the kind of initiation Shakespeare, as a Renaissance artist, is offering to these prototypic characters is, for the most part, based on James Hillman's (2005), radically perceptive conception of Jesus Christ as himself a puer figure his understanding of the healing power of betrayal and his concept of puer senex union (*puer senilis* in Latin, a trope that E. R. Curtius in 1973 introduced to literary analysis) as a divine alternative to mankind's more usual heroic masculinity, which attempts to separate puer immaturity and senex wisdom.

According to Hillman the polar archetypes of the puer and the senex, representing different attitudes to time, "provide the psychological foundation of the problem of history" (Hillman 35), and historical problems are essentially psychological problems caused by the split of these archetypes. The senex means being grounded in reality, with a strong sense of time while puer corresponds to imagination and creativity without feeling bounded by temporality. Any exclusive adoption of these attitudes results in a one-sided approach to life, and their division causes serious problems in social, cultural and political arenas. Senex without the puer results in what Hillman calls "soulless concretism" (Hillman 325), namely, concern with material gain or progress alone, and puer without senex becomes lost in fantasy and might end up in irresponsible action. As such, senex-puer polarity is interwoven with masculine initiation in the *Henriad*, and history in these plays evolves according to the preference of either attitude. Hal, the future king, slowly comes to embody the senex to consolidate the play's political structure across the course of the *Henriad*. The presence of Falstaff as the trickster in a historical context where time is indispensable to action poses a threat to the senex structure that is Hal's by divine right. With his

disengagement from time, Falstaff seems to be incongruous in the senex order, but a close look at the context discloses Shakespeare's insight into the nature of the socio-political change in his own day and clarifies the trickster character's accompanying relevance since he underpins the risks involved in an exclusively senex attitude to time. After exploring Falstaff's initiation, therefore, this essay will return to a more probing analysis of Hal's masculine development. It will also touch upon Hotspur as a puer figure and examine the father-son bonds that conclude the argument with particular emphasis on the urgency of keeping *puer senilis,* an underlying engram in the political context of the *Henriad*.

Psychoanalytical and Analytical Interpretations of Masculine Selfhood in the *Henriad*

Franz Alexander's 1933 Freudian reading of the nature of friendship between Falstaff and Hal psychoanalyses both characters as well as Hotspur. He holds that Shakespeare in Hal's experience dramatizes the characteristic development of masculinity. Hal, in the course of becoming a mature man, needs to overcome the polarization of Freudian libidinal opposites dramatized by Falstaff, who embodies "the principle of Eros in its most primary manifestation of narcissism" (Alexander 602), and Hotspur, who is Thanatos, "the exponent of destruction" (599). Hal must go beyond the fixation to the early pregenital stage that is ascribed to Falstaff and sort out the jealousy and hatred of the father as dramatized in Hotspur, and he ultimately manages to achieve both. Nonetheless, Alexander regards Hal's rejection of Falstaff as repression (598) and cannot help making an inquiry into Falstaff's appeal. Despite his hedonism, irresponsibility, and infantile character, Falstaff, he argues, with his justified disrespect for authority and disregard of social customs, serves as the signpost of "self-sufficient careless individuality" (605) that guards us against being lost in the collective like the termites.

Ernst Kris (1970) focuses on the father-son conflict as Shakespeare's central concern and explains Hal's masculine development in terms of the Oedipus complex. To summarize his account, Hal wavers between his father, the present King Henry IV, who is associated with regicide, and Falstaff, who "satisfies the libidinal demands in the father-son relation" (Kris in Faber 403) by being a playful and loveable friend. Neither father figure, however, provides Hal with the right role model for his own masculine development. His escape into debauchery in Eastcheap (a district in London known for its taverns and inns, with a disreputable reputation) serves mainly to shun his father's guilt and is in that sense an enactment of his own unconscious regicide and parricidal impulses. When he reconciles with his father, he transfers his unconscious hostility to his father onto Falstaff and hence rejects him severely: "Yet the Prince proves superior to Falstaff in wit and in reveling: he triumphs over both father and father substitute" (403). Perhaps to Kris who seems to have disregarded Falstaff's response to the Boy's report of the Doctor's response: "I am not only witty in myself, but the cause that wit is in other men" (*2 Henry IV*, 1.2.8−9).

M. D. Faber (1970) writes that he builds his own psychoanalytic argument upon those of Alexander and Kris to explore father-son conflict in the *Henriad* in the relation between Hotspur and Northumberland (Hotspur's father) as well as Hotspur's relation to Bolingbroke (or the future Henry IV) as a father figure. Faber works on the oedipal rivalry in both relationships. Northumberland's envy of his son and his failure to give fatherly

affection encourage rivalry between the father and the son and makes Hotspur an angry, rebellious man full of hatred against father figures.

In her feminist reading of the *Henriad*, Coppélia Kahn (1981) deals with the father-son bond and how the interaction helps constitute masculine identity in both the father and the son. She points to the similarity between the King Henry IV and Hal: "Neither man can freely express his true self, whatever that is, because each has something to hide . . . Hal hides his sympathy with his father, while Henry hides his guilt over the deposition and murder of Richard" (Kahn 74). Hal's taking shelter in Eastcheap, Kahn holds, is to deny his likeness to his father, but he comes to admit his love and loyalty in the scene where he takes the crown assuming that his father is dead. Peter Erickson (1985) also works on the similarity between the King Henry IV and Hal. He argues that both the father and the son have a theatrical sense of self, act with calculation and strategy, aim to impress the public, and are burdened with a guilty conscience. Being so preoccupied with theatricality, they cannot relate to each other with sincerity and openness.

Valerie Traub (1992) interprets the *Henriad* following a similar line of thought and is inspired by Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalysis. Her Lacanian feminist reading designates Falstaff as a pre-oedipal maternal figure with his huge belly who thus poses a threat to the male psyche. Hal, to become an adult male in a phallocentric patriarchal order, needs to repudiate the maternal or the feminine, and since Falstaff represents the feminine, he needs to be rejected. Having differentiated himself from a figure associated with the feminine, Hal identifies with his father and thereby completes the process of heterosexualization.

A different psychological analysis comes from Maitra (1967) who takes a more Jungian approach to masculine initiation in the *Henriad*. He regards Falstaff as the trickster, Hal's shadow, and objects to a reduction of the shadow problem to an oedipal parricidal complex as the psychological motive. Hal, he argues, does not have an unconscious or repressed hostility to his father, of the kind that in analysis could come up in dreams or *faux pas* or even cause psychosis. Rather he displays an open, conscious opposition, which he admits before his father and his affection for Falstaff is not pretense. Maitra writes:

> In Prince Hal's case the dramatist not only does not say anything in confirmation of the father-hostility hypothesis but makes express statements in support of the thesis that the trickster in Hal got the upper hand for a time and after having contributed to the maturation of the Prince's personality abdicated in favour of the rational Hal. (Maitra 144)

Having passed the trickster stage, Hal rejects Falstaff and his rejection has the overtones of revenge on himself "for the indulgence he gave to the trickster in him" (136).

Kern (1984) acknowledges L. C. Barber's (1972) view that Falstaff is connected with the theatrical (clowning) and carnivalesque (folly) tradition. But she regards Falstaff as the American Indian trickster figure who is neither a scapegoat nor the Holy Sinner as Roy Battenhouse (1975) argues. Kern, however, is not interested in analysing Falstaff's psychological development. She just displays the character's link with the theatrical trickster tradition.

Fike (2009) brings fresh insight into Falstaff's development from a Jungian standpoint. He also points to the link between the trickster and the shadow and regards Falstaff as a trickster who is "not only a shadow father figure but also an aspect of Hal

himself" (Fike 67). Fike's analysis enables us to see the character's spiritual journey in a new light. He regards Falstaff as a dynamic character who can experience *enantiodromia*, that is, he can change into the opposite through recognition that comes with a disaster. He also works in detail on Falstaff's inflation that ultimately brings about humanization of the trickster and individuation. To make his point Fike analyses Falstaff's allusion to the parable of Dives and Lazarus, and how it betrays the character's dual nature. Until Hal's rejection Falstaff appears as Dives (feeling superior/positive inflation), but after that he changes into Lazarus (feeling inferior/negative inflation). The conversion into the opposite paves the way for individuation. Fike's meticulous study of Falstaff's deathbed experience sheds light on the view that by identifying with Lazarus the character moves outside the cycle of inflation and individuates. He then gains an access not only to the unconscious but also to the conscience and deserves salvation because "the banishment brings about a softer heart through greater awareness of what has been unconscious, which in turn enables him to accept the grace to which he alludes in *1 Henry IV*" (83).

Falstaff's Affinity with the Medieval Fool and Christ

According to Barber, Shakespeare's portrayal of Falstaff draws heavily on the Medieval tradition of carnival that owes much to the ancient Saturnalia, which had been a trickster solution to the problem of the senex aspect of the established Roman culture. These transgressive cultural practices were, in effect, closely connected to the mythical trickster figure. C. G. Jung in his essay on the trickster figure states that the trickster's ability to transform the meaningless into the meaningful raises him to the stature of a cultural savior, or in Catholic terms, a saint, and is the motif beneath the Medieval carnival and ecclesiastical customs that derive from the pre-Christian saturnalian tradition. Following the New Year, people held festivities with dancing and singing, and in the twelfth century these festivities degenerated into *festum stultorum* or the fools' feast and *festum asinorum* mainly held in France. Max Harris (2011) gives an account of ass festival as practiced in Beavoise in France where a girl with a baby in her arms walked into church to represent flight to Egypt. These celebrations according to Jung reflected the effort to associate the ass with Christ: "since, from ancient times, the god of the Jews was vulgarly conceived to be an ass—a prejudice which extended to Christ himself" (*Archetypes*, *CW* 9, par. 463). Although the Feast of Fools was primarily celebrated in France, more than any other country in Europe, Harris says, it was also practiced in England between 1222 and 1391 owing to the Norman invasion. The exact content of these activities is not very clear, but archbishops complained about the dissolute behaviors inside and outside the church. In 1390 William Courtney, archbishop of Canterbury, banned these practices. However, "boy bishops" (where the low-ranking choir boys chose a fellow choir boy as their bishop), continued to be practiced until Henry VIII's Royal Proclamation of July 22, 1541 to prohibit some of these celebrations. But in spite of the ban the Feast of Fools was practiced for a little longer.

Long after these ceremonies were banned for being blasphemous these Medieval customs were reborn as both Paul Radin and Jung have pointed out, on the Italian stage as Pulcinellas, buffoons, and clowns. Radin says that "many of the Trickster traits were perpetuated in the figure of the medieval jester and have survived right up to the present day in the Punch-and-Judy-plays and in the clown" (Radin xxiii). Falstaff, the trickster, as Maitra and Battenhouse argue, belongs within this tradition of fools. In other words, he

inherits his association with the savior from this Medieval saturnalian tradition and the mythical trickster that is behind these festivities. Harvey Cox in his *Feast of Fools* points out that Christ was a holy fool for the Medieval people and explains the aspects of Christ that resemble clown symbols:

> Like the jester Christ defies customs and scorns crowned heads. Like a wandering troubadour he has no place to lay his head. Like the clown in the circus parade, he satirizes existing authority by riding into town replete with regal pageantry when he has no earthly power . . . At the end he is costumed by his enemies in a mocking caricature of royal paraphernalia (Cox 140).

When considered in the light of the Saturnalia that links the clown with Christ, Falstaff has all these subversive and self-destructive characteristics of the clown, and this connection also reinforces, in a comic spirit, the Christ association. Falstaff is outside natural time as Hal says: "What a devil hast thou to do with the time of the day?" (*1Henry IV*, 1.2.5−6). His indifference to time contrasts with the serious attitude of King Henry IV and his enemies who are committed to a power struggle and shape the course of history. Hence with his ahistorical stance in a historical context and with his refusal to partake in the adult world of responsibility, Falstaff is subversive of the senex attitude to life that rests on rational order, security and responsibility. He lives on borrowed money and legalizes theft as his vocation: "Why, Hal ′tis my vocation"; moreover, he refuses to settle down to a secure life and despite his old age feels young: "They hate us youth" (*1 Henry IV*, 1.2.100 and *2.2.83*). When Hal finally becomes King Henry V, he punishes this puer attitude very strictly with his public rejection of Falstaff. The corrupt rule of his father, Henry IV, who had departed from the Christian principle of righteousness by usurpation of the kingship, is the target of Falstaff's satire. Falstaff refers, with bitter irony, to the times that can afford this Machiavellian stratagem: "virtue is of so little regard in these costermongers' times that true valour is turned bearherd; . . . all the other gifts appertinent to man as the malice of this age shapes them, are not worth a gooseberry" (*2 Henry IV*, 1.2.167−72). And ironically, he cannot back his nonchalance with any real earthly power just as Christ could not. He takes Hal to be a true friend and counts heavily on his power as the future king. The recklessness that Christ and Falstaff have in common ends up in self-destructiveness. Neither Christ, who does not take any measures against Judas nor Falstaff can be prudent. Their imprudence stems from their being divinely disconnected from the human psyche and being cut off from the psyche causes a lack of containment or psychological leaking of their nature, which is spirit.

Jungian analyst William Willeford also underlines the Fool's Christ association. Some features of Christ's life, he holds, resemble those of the fool. Jesus like the clown is homeless: "His teachings contain much that is foolish to the wise (I Cor. I. 27), and he made a spectacle of his folly" (Willeford 230). In addition to these, "Holy fools" function as a satiric agent, especially about the deviations from the religious norm, and shift our attention to the values and the truth beyond those reason comprehends. It is for this reason that "In Shakespeare . . . the simpleton is a figure of simplicity and purity of heart" (232). Within this cultural context of the fool, Falstaff, the renegade, though he is a criminal and "rivals Dives for gluttony" (76), as Fike rightly points out, also partakes in Christ's purity of heart. He is a "Barthelomew boar-pig" (*2 Henry IV*, 2.4.227), "the martlemas" (*2 Henry*

IV, 2.2.97), the "christom child" (*Henry V*, 2.3.11−12) whom Shakespeare sends to Arthur's bosom: "he is in Arthur's bosom, if ever man went to Arthur's bosom" (*Henry V*, 2.3.9−10). His innocence comes from his child-like unawareness, his adolescent state of mind, which cannot acknowledge responsibility of action or register the moral nature of his experience. Rather he rationalizes irresponsibility with his superb sense of humor: "Thou knowest in the state of innocency Adam fell, and what would Jack Falstaff do in the days of villainy?" (*1 Henry IV*, 3.3.163−65). We know that he has not forgotten what the inside of a church is like: "An I have not forgotten what the inside of a church is made of" (*1 Henry IV*, 3.3.7−8); nor has he given up faith. Falstaff's crimes, no matter how grave they are, do not weigh on us because he does not act with an adult sense of responsibility.

Falstaff's Initiation as a Serious Parody of Christ's Initiation

Some references in the text encourage a reading of Shakespeare's treatment of Falstaff's initiation, however parodic it may be, as a serious parallel to Christ's initiation. Falstaff's remark about Hal as a corrupting agent is revealing: "Before I knew thee, Hal, I knew nothing; and now am I, if a man should speak truly, a little better than one of the wicked" (*1 Henry IV*, 1.2.89−91). Richmond Noble reads these lines as a biblical reference and says: "Falstaff first compares himself to Adam . . . then, it might appear, gives a deadly thrust. Compare the crucifixion of Christ between the two thieves and Mark xv.28" (Noble, 170). Naseeb Shaheen, on the other hand, reads "of the wicked" as mimicry of Puritan idiom: "Compare the reference at *2 Henry IV*, 2.4.327−29 where the phrase 'of the wicked' also occurs. Falstaff is mimicking the Puritan idiom" (Shaheen 139). Yet Shaheen omits the "one," inclusion of which might further encourage Noble's reading. Another significant remark with Christ association comes from the Lord Chief Justice: "You are too impatient to bear crosses" (*2 Henry IV*, 1.2.226−27). Noble sees this line as a reference to Luke 14.27: "And whosoeuer doth not bear his crosse" (Noble 176). Similarly, Shaheen regards it as a refence to Luke 14.27 and Luke 9.23: "'Let him . . . take up his crosse daily, and follow me'" (158). The implication of crucifixion provides an ironic link between the crucified Christ and Falstaff, who has been reminded often of the gallows. Falstaff, the thief, is emotionally crucified by Henry V, the former Hal whom he loved so much, to die in utter disillusionment.

No matter how odd the Christ association seems, a reading of Christ's way of being on the basis of Hillman's conception of the puer archetype reveals Falstaff's ironic affinity with him. According to Hillman, as a puer Christ, the son of God, embodies the spiritual powers of psyche, and being connected with the spirit, he is concerned with the soul's eternity and perfection. He is therefore not for this world. With his complete trust in logos security, which means unbroken union with God, he flies in aspiration to heaven and falls like Icarus to drown in the unconsciousness of this world, which like Henry V knows him not. Having direct access to the spirit, he is "the inspiration of meaning and brings meaning as vision wherever he appears" (Hillman 54). Falstaff, the trickster, acts as the shadow of Christ's positive attribute but has much in common with him given the nature of his initiation through betrayal. Just as Christ on the cross voices how let-down he feels by his Father, Falstaff, the aged youth who up to now rejects all the responsibilities of maturity, is finally forced to enter the adult world of recognition of sovereign power through King Henry V's humiliating public rejection of him. Through the tragic initiation into a Lear-like cast-out and powerless state, Shakespeare is able to symbolize in Falstaff's tragic

initiation the disabling impact of Christ's example as an innocent lamb with complete trust that God (his royal father) will in the end sort out the difficulties of being a man for him. The image of Christ as a seductive assumption belonging to the adolescent stage of development, which cannot be sustained in an earthly way but can only be realized as a supernatural possibility, can block men who are not gods from their capacity to father themselves. This is how a man like Falstaff is castrated: he has not been forced to adapt to the adult world where a man needs to acquire integrity with "masculine virtues of skill, calculated risk and of courage" (Hillman 197). Instead, his anima can only complete his maturation as a man through suffering, betrayal, and abandonment. Falstaff's individuation is an ultimately lonely one. As a fun-loving, living nightcap, Falstaff is as innocent and vulnerable as Christ in his dealings with the children of other men with whom he plays, as it were, in the dark. That's why he trusts Hal despite his suspicion about his grace: "for grace thou wilt have none" (*1 Henry IV*, 1.2.16−17) until Hal, the divine patriarch, bleeds his heart with a fatal wound: "I know thee not, old man" (*2 Henry IV*, 5.5.47).

The experience of being cast off is, in Hillman's words, "a breakthrough onto another level of consciousness" (197). It signifies, as Hillman describes, a move into the adult world of responsibility. The puer, however, wishes to remain in the security of the paternal world where he is understood and taken care of by the omniscient God. In Christian terms the paternal world corresponds to the Eden of Logos where father and son, namely, God and Adam, are united without the interference of Eve, the feminine or the evil of Christianity. Christ, as Hillman remarks, has the puer attitude, and it brings about his crucifixion. He acts with absolute trust in God, and although he knows that he is being betrayed by Peter and Judas, he asks forgiveness for them. On the cross, however, he resentfully cries: "'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?'" (*Authorized King James version*, Matt. 27.46), not grasping the purpose of the God's design. The awareness of being let down is, for Hillman, not just a "delivery from the mother's breast" (Hillman 200) but also the breakdown of what he calls primal trust in the father. The bitter experience, however, is the ultimate purpose of betrayal for Christ and for Falstaff, too.

Betrayal, as Hillman explains, enables a man to separate from the puer trust and thus from any illusions about the enduring protectiveness of the mother. The breakdown of the illusion allows him to relate to his own psyche through the anima, which develops through the conscious experience of suffering. Only when a man has begun to create his own soul through such disappointment can he start to love truly without guarantee of maternal protection. The establishment of the anima relation is materialized through the feminine figures who surround Christ before and after the crucifixion—washing of the feet at supper; the silver that is associated with the feminine; the warning that comes from Pilate's wife; plenty of Marys around; the wound in the side, which signifies "the released fountain of life, feeling and emotion" (Hillman 201); and women's discovery of the risen Christ. The blood symbolism refers to the outpouring of the emotional side to connect man to the feminine, that is, to the source of life. Christ with betrayal becomes human, and "The puer God dies when the primal trust is broken, and the man is born. And a man is born only when the feminine in him is born" (201). Such a process of initiation is also true for Falstaff. When read in terms of masculine individuation, betrayal is expected to start off the integration of the trickster that is essential to advance to a higher stage of masculine consciousness. Falstaff, the trickster, now being wounded by Hal's rejection, needs to relate to the anima and father himself in the adult world to be a man. Like Christ, he is

accompanied by feminine figures who evoke anima relation explicitly: Doll Tearsheet and Mistress Quickly who acts as a mother and a nurse figure to give him care until his last breath. Being only a serious parody of Christ and having spent his life in the carefree life of the tavern without any emotional commitment to a woman, Falstaff can afford such feminine figures. Yet they sympathize with him. Mistress Quickly does not abandon Falstaff despite the serious troubles he created for her in the past. Her forgiveness is important in that she regards him as a naive, innocent man who deserves grace in the afterlife rather than a vice figure to be condemned.

There is, however, a remarkable difference between the attitudes of betraying love-objects. God as a caring father figure betrays Christ to teach him a lesson in growing up, and they ultimately unite in mutual love after the resurrection. Falstaff, on the other hand, is rejected by Hal, his paradoxical father-son figure, out of power drive to be comforted, so we hope, later in Arthur's bosom, and his resurrection is only a mock one in the battle scene. Hence betrayal for Falstaff is bound to end up in tragic isolation no matter how hard he tries to hide his wound and humiliation by glossing over the insult: "Do not you grieve at this; I shall be sent for in private to him. Look you, he must seem thus to the world" (*2 Henry IV*, 5.5.76−78). Shakespeare is bitterly realistic about the impact of rejection on Falstaff. What he will have to learn after this painful experience will be fatal, as Shallow says: "A colour that I fear you will die in" (*2 Henry IV*, 5.5.87). He is now to understand what it means to be an adult man, and that requires a bitter process of seeing through himself, admitting his lifelong refusal to take responsibility. His friends' account of Falstaff's state after rejection points to the fact that the trickster, with his woundedness, has finally become vulnerable. He can no longer be the man he was; that is, he can neither feel secure in his former tricksterish, reckless way of life nor enjoy carefree escapism. Falstaff bleeds emotionally and suffers: "His heart is fracted and corroborate" (*Henry V*, 2.1.124) because as Mistress Quickly says, "The King has killed his heart" (*Henry V*, 2.1.88).

His grief after banishment implies that the process of integrating the trickster has started. Falstaff who, despite his faith, could not relate to God as a man of integrity and who never had a Mary as a loving mother or God as a caring father who wisely guides his son's spiritual growth, turns to God as a father figure while he dies calling His name. In Christ's case the prevalent emotion on the cross is complaint, which is a sign of becoming human. As Hillman points out, "Puer comes into his own, but complainingly" (226). In Falstaff's case it is difficult to decide the tone of his address to God. What the Boy says about his cursing of wine and women ("and said they were devils incarnate" (*Henry V*, 2.3.30)) suggests that Falstaff's sense of reality has changed and that he is fully aware of how wasted his life. So it is very likely that "Falstaff's deathbed statements indicate a painful awareness of, and contrition for, his faults" (Fike 83), and he begs forgiveness from the Father. But when considered in terms of the betrayal theme, his cry might as well indicate a recognition of his vulnerability, his neediness and hence a complaint, a painful exclamation about his lot. God is now surely his sole refuge, and Falstaff recites Psalm 23 to express his wish to be affirmed and restored by God the Heavenly Father in the green pastures of Eden with complete trust and integrity.

Initiation of Hal, the Senex, and Hotspur, the Puer

Hal and Falstaff display dramatically opposite personalities and become adult men in different ways. Unlike Falstaff, who paradoxically represents the Eternal Youth, an

orientation associated with perennial adolescence, Hal, who represents the senex, initiates in a way that fits the pattern of the hero's journey as described by Jung. In patriarchal self-organization, initiation means, as Jung holds, a man's becoming conscious, and Jung likens this process to the movement of the sun. The hero who symbolizes the libido "is the first and foremost a self-representation of the longing of the unconscious . . . for consciousness" (*Symbols, CW* 5, par. 299). The hero becomes conscious, that is, realizes himself by moving outside the mother's world of security and inertia, but the process of independence from her involves discarding the feminine. Then follows the phase of submitting to the anima in mid-life, which means facing the limitations of the heroic ego and not holding on to assertiveness any longer. In the two *King Henry IV* plays Hal, the young prince, succeeds in strengthening his masculine ego but fails in abiding by the anima and insists on competence in the later phase of his development as the King Henry V. Hal's senex traits further reinforce his heroic ego formation. Right from the beginning he is prudent, devious, and sober despite his biting, ungratious sense of humor: "Thou judgest false already. I mean thou shalt have the hanging of the thieves and so become a rare hangman" (*1Henry IV*, 1. 2.63−65). The scene where Falstaff and Hal act out the King Henry IV and Hal by exchanging parts also reveals Hal as a senex figure—indeed a Machiavellian one. He voices openly his plan to banish Falstaff, no doubt, when the right time comes: "I do, I will" (*1 Henry IV*, 2.4.468). Being a senex, he lives in a space-time continuum, and as a master of timing and calculation he deliberately isolates himself, patiently waiting for the right time to prove his merit: "I know you all, and will awhile uphold / The unyoked humour of your idleness" (*1 King Henry IV*, 1.2.185−86).

Hal's senex character is clarified not just in contradistinction to Falstaff, the trickster, but also to Hotspur, the puer, whose initiation has a different pattern than that of a hero. To understand Hotspur's route, it might here be helpful to recall Hillman's conception of the development of the puer's ego personality. Unlike a hero who realizes himself in opposition to the mother, "the puer takes its definition from the senex-puer polarity" (Hillman 115). The puer according to Hillman does not struggle with the *magna mater*, which means the mother in a magnified form. Rather, being himself spirit, he needs the matter to realize himself without aiming to affect it as a hero does. Hence, he is outside the mother complex and comes to know himself via another spirit. In other words, he needs the father, the spirit, to become a man, and the mother does not intervene to set any antagonism between the father and the son. The crux in a puer's development is his relation to the senex, namely, his ability to achieve *puer senilis*. If the puer is separated from the senex, he cannot develop a sense of survival and loses his sense of limit and order; his traits like inspiration, verticality, opportunism and independence become distorted, appearing to be the symptoms of a mother-bound psychology. The puer needs to avoid such distortion to restore balance in his psyche by integrating the senex or being affirmed by the father.

Hotspur has many puer qualities, but he does not come up as an ideal figure, one that embodies *puer senilis*. His very puer traits render him irksome. He is obsessed with honor and is vertical; that is, he is imaginative as is manifested in his boastfulness: "By heaven, methinks it were an easy leap / To pluck bright honour from the pale-faced moon" (*1Henry IV*, 1.3.200−01). In his analysis of Hotspur, Hillman comments on the character's longing for eternity and his ironic death caused by time: "Dying from wounds, he feels himself caught by time, and slain not by his actual enemy and heroic counterpart, the other Henry, but by the senex (time, Chronos)" (160). Hal, the senex embodies Father Time and

puts an end to Hotspur's claims to eternity. Although he is involved in a web of kinship bonds and is married, Hotspur does not feel related to anyone; he does not have a telos, a home to go back to, or any sense of belonging. His only loyalty is to the spirit that drives him beyond reality. Hence he easily dismisses his wife when she poses a threat to his pursuit of honor: "Away, away, you trifler! Love? I love thee not; / I care not for thee, Kate" (*1Henry IV*, 2.3.86–87). Not having incorporated his senex component, Hotspur is also imprudent and reckless. He refuses to doubt his father and his allies despite the letter of warning. He heads to the battle even when he is clearly let down by his father and Glendower. His consequent death on the battlefield is not a hero's tragic end but a puer fall (Hillman 172), which like that of Icarus signifies a preceding hubris or what Jungian psychology calls inflation. Puer's hubris does not, however, mean ambition like that of a tragic hero but an unheeding ascensionism, that is, an aspiration to be with the Gods, and the Gods punish the puer's ascensionism because it attempts to disturb the hierarchy of being. Hotspur does not know his place as a mortal man and finally pays for it.

While Hotspur is motivated by a longing for eternity, worldly order and power are Hal's major concerns. He does not waste time with sack like Falstaff, the trickster, or with boasting like Hotspur, the puer, but acts rationally. Action is definitely indispensable to the hero's way of being, but as Hillman holds, "For action the specific psychological attitude of literalizing is necessary" (150). Hal literalizes his ambition for the crown by killing Hotspur, his rival, to prove his competence at precisely the right time and on the right occasion. Yet in the process of consolidating his ego he "will have as part of this pattern the shadow of the hero—estrangement from the feminine and compulsive masculinity—foreshadowing the sterile and bitter senex . . ." (Hillman 138). Hal is the bitter senex who seeks political power alone and remains self-bound. Unwilling to care for others right from the beginning, be it his father or his friend, he can banish Falstaff without the least concern for his feelings and pride. Falstaff, however, with his warmth and unjudgmental care, helps Hal initiate into manhood by giving him love, which the war-torn, weary, and demanding King Henry IV cannot.

Fatherson

It is notable that the initiation of the two young men, Hal and Hotspur, is dramatized in the presence of the fathers. In *Fatherson*, Alfred Collins (1994) points to the significance the father-son bond and the basic dynamic of the relationship: "A son is an other self to the father, who addresses himself (and seeks a reply) in his relation to his boy. The converse is also true: the son hears himself speaking in his father's voice and wants to talk back to himself in him" (Collins 1). The relationship, however, is a complex one. To sum up Collins's account, the father-son bond is shaped by each one's desire for selfhood, and each loves himself in the other. Each idealizes the other and seeks recognition by him. But when the idealization is frustrated or one party fails to recognize the other, strife and contradictions shadow the bond, turning individuation into a painful experience. Apart from Hal and Falstaff's relationship, the *King Henry IV* plays introduce two different father-son bonds between Hal and King Henry IV and Hotspur and Northumberland. In the case of the former party, there is, right from the opening of *1Henry IV*, a contradiction between the father and the son. King Henry IV is disappointed with his son because rather than conforming to his father's authority, he leads a dissipated life. But, despite the conflicts, the father and the son are finally reconciled, and we come to see how they are

alike in their ambitious, calculating, and prudent personalities and how this likeness may have been the source of the contradiction between them. Hal, who genuinely cares for his father as his performance on the battlefield shows, desperately wants kingship. King Henry IV finally welcomes Hal when he is convinced about his loyalty and reformation: "God put it in thy mind to take it hence, / That thou mightst win the more thy father's love" (*2 Henry IV*, 4.5.178−79). Having reconciled with his father and internalized fatherhood, Hal settles down to his role as heir to throne and carries forward his mission.

In Hotspur's case, however, the father-son relationship is even more strained and complex. An undercurrent of rivalry defines the bond between the father and the son. The psychoanalyst Franz Alexander in his fine analysis of the father-son relation in the *Henry IV* plays points to the lack of affirmative fathering as the root cause of the conflict between the father and the son: ". . . Northumberland, far from being a father to his son, has resented and hated him, and that Hotspur has not known the fatherly affection so crucial to the development of a normal personality" (Alexander 436). Northumberland is not mature enough to father his son who overshadows him with his valor. Overcome by envy, he lets Hotspur go alone to a battle where defeat is certain and death, without support, is immanent. He openly betrays his son and being "crafty-sick" (*2 Henry IV*, 1.1.37) ignores the catastrophe in store for him as explicitly stated by Morton: "You knew he walk'd o'er perils, on an edge, / More likely to fall in than get o'er" (*2 Henry IV*, 1.1.170−71). The arrogant Hotspur, on the other hand, does not seek affirmation, nor does he ever display any wish to receive his father's blessings. Being his own man, he does not ask for his father's advice or try to benefit from his experience, which incites Northumberland's anger: "Why, what a wasp-stung and impatient fool / Art thou to break into this woman's mood, / Trying thine ear to no tongue but thine own!" (*1Henry IV*, 1.3.234−36). Hotspur's willfulness, however, is only natural because the puer is ruled by a drive to transcend the father who is bounded by time and history. The puer rejects the old because, as Hillman holds, "the wisdom of the old is worldly, learned from experience, learned from history, accumulated from time, and this blocks the puer's access to eternity" (Hillman 162). Hotspur believes himself to be better than his father−to be a potent warrior who knows the right course of action. But, especially as his catastrophe nears, he appears less than an efficient grown-up man because he cannot father himself which could only be possible through being initiated by the father.

The Failure of the Ideal of *Puer Senilis* in the *Henriad*

The play's historical and political contexts add a special dimension to the way Shakespeare handles such illusion-puncturing initiations. In a world where power struggle is central, Hal, with his heroic forward movement, is in tune with time and will succeed as a solar, daytime hero involved in shaping his own developmental history as well as that of his family and nation. Falstaff, with his a-historicity and indifference to time, dangerously ignoring, for instance, his advancing years, displays the opposite attitude and hence appears to be irrelevant in the world of ruthless power struggle, but his irrelevance is only seeming. That is, the *coincidentia oppositorum* of these two incompatible figures and their brief but unforgettable nights as friends outside historical circumstance in the liminal play-world of drink and debauchery are not accidental. The coincidence of Falstaff and Hal serves as a moratorium from linear development and a move into depth to clarify a radical change in Western consciousness that occurs in the Renaissance for the first time since the West was

Christianized. That change is the split between past and present, and Shakespeare as an artist intuits the future risks it involves.

In his study of the Western culture, Walter Schubart points to the change the West underwent between 1450 and 1550 and holds that the Renaissance was a time of transition from the the Gothic "to the Promethean era characterized by the heroic type of man" (Schubart 17−18). Then he gives an account of the heroic type: unlike the Medieval ascetic type, the worldly new man is no longer interested in "the sanctification of the soul; it had as its goal the ownership of the material universe" (18). Schubart names the era Promethean after the Titans who "were the cunning exploiters of the forces of nature" (18) and whose ambition was to design the world to their own advantage. His description of the heroic man accords with the Humanist ideal of the Renaissance, which displaces God and puts man to the center of the universe to the detriment of nature and soul in the long run. In the *Henriad* Shakespeare's handling of masculine initiation in a historical context accords with Schubart's concerns about the failings of the heroic mindset. Shakespeare seems to be well aware that the heroic and the Humanist ideals are a dead end. But in the *Henriad* he narrows down the broader implications of philosophical and cultural changes to political ethics alone. In Hal's person as well as in King Henry IV he displays his concern about divorcing politics from integrity. With a solar fire-stealing Promethean stance, Hal claims a traditional kingship and moves away from the old power politics to a dangerous new ethic of loyalty to humanism. He makes his way to the crown with a Machiavellian stratagem right from the beginning as many commentators on the *Henriad* notice, and unlike his father who at least is capable of the pangs of conscience, the self-bound Hal shows no sign of regret for deceiving Falstaff. The puer Falstaff, with his unworldy and unheroic stance, becomes for Henry V a subversive agent drawing him away from his destiny to reclaim the heroic archetype for contemporary man. That is, the integrity that would be involved in being loyal to the new spirit symbolized by Falstaff would be too much for the feudal Christian values Hal seemingly wants to keep alive, so he must make that spirit old and pretend that he is the redeemed new order. But his pledge of loyalty to the Lord Chief Justice as his mentor and new father figure leaves no doubt about the nature of his policy. He is in fact the senex assent of the ancient regime: "You shall be as a father to my youth, / My voice shall sound as you do prompt mine ear" (*2 Henry IV*, 5.2.118−19).

In such a context masculine initiation needs to end when a confident, conservative claim to power comes to the fore. Such are the political and ethical implications of division between the puer and the senex that Hal feels he must make at the outset of his kingship. He cannot tone down the hardness of senex with the refreshing "moist spark" of the puer (Hillman 54) and remains as a static senex man. By suppressing the puer, Hal ensures that his mature emotive world will be without soul and compassion. In other words, his masculine senex spirit will not be softened by the anima and imagination. The regressive heroic masculinity thus portrayed in Hal indicates a retreat from the possibilities of the Renaissance, which had the capacity to hold the tension of the opposites, that is, of senex and puer, but, like Hal, could not assure a lasting happy union of old (the Medieval) and new (the Ancient Greek and Roman thinking rediscovered to modify and replace the old). In other words, the Renaissance could embrace the *gloria duplex*, "keeping consciousness of both sides" (Hillman 323), that is, the Medieval and the Ancient Greek and Roman cultures, but its potential for *puer senilis* is ultimately wasted by the imminent senex concerns for progress in material terms. In this respect, Falstaff with his imaginative power,

his capacity for love and his mockery of worldly wisdom becomes for the audience a cautionary image of all that will be lost as the spirit of the Renaissance man, the puer, is forced, as Shakespeare the writer moves toward 1600, into an increasingly senex modernity. And what characterizes that modernity most of all is a repression of the soul to the realm of psychology rather than a consciousness of soul as an ongoing possibility. As depth psychological writers remind us, we must acknowledge the reality of psyche and return to what has been lost—a potential Falstaff carries for many of us even today.

Contributor

Halide Aral is a retired instructor of English Language and Literature with an MA in the same subject and a specific interest in Shakespeare. She is Turkish.

Works Cited

Alexander, Franz. "A Note on Falstaff." *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, vol. 2, 1933, pp. 592–606.

Barber, C. L. *Shakepeare's Festive Comedy: A Study of Dramatic Form and its Relation to Social Custom.*Princeton UP, 1972.

Battenhouse, Roy. "Falstaff as Parodist and Perhaps Holy Fool." PMLA, vol. 90, no.1, 1975, pp. 32–52.

Collins, Alfred. *Fatherson: A Self Psychology of the Archetypal Masculine*. Chiron Publications, 1994.

Cox, Harvey. *Feast of Fools: A Theological Essay on Festivity and Fantasy.* Harper & Row Publishers, 1969.

Curtius, E. R. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. Translated by Willard R. Trask, Princeton UP, 1973.

Erickson, Peter. *Patriarchal Structures in Shakespearean Drama.* University of California Press, 1985.

Faber, M. D. *The Design Within; Psychoanalytical Approaches to Shakespeare*. Compiled by M. D. Faber, Science House, 1970.

———. Faber, M. D. 'Oedipal Patterns in *Henry IV.'* pp. 430–38.

———. Kris, Ernst. "Prince Hal's Conflict." pp. 389–407.

Fike, Matthew A. *A Jungian Study of Shakespeare: The Visionary Mode*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Harris, Max. *Sacred Folly: A New History of The Feast of Fools*. Cornell UP, 2011.

Hillman, James. *Senex & Puer*. Edited by Glen Slater, Putnam, 2005.

Jung, C. G. *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung.* Edited by Herbert Read et al., translated by R. F. C. Hull 2nd ed., Princeton UP, 1953–79. 20 vols. Bollingen Series 20.

——— *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. 1969. *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung*. Edited by Herbert Read et al., translated by R. F. C. Hull, 2nd ed., vol. 9, pt. 1, Princeton UP, 1991.

——— *Symbols of Transformation: An Analysis of the Prelude to a Case of Schizophrenia*. 1990. Edited by Herbert Read et al., translated by R. F. C. Hull, 2nd ed., vol. 5, Princeton UP, 1990.

Kahn, Coppélia. *Man's Estate: Masculine İdentity in Shakespeare*. U of Caroline P, 1981.

Kern, Edith. "Falstaff—A Trickster Figure." *The Upstart Crow*, vol. 5: 137, 1984.

Maitra, Sitansu. *Psychological Realism and Archetypes: The Trickster in Shakespeare*. Bookland Private, 1967.

McNabb, Cameron Hunt. "Shakespeare's Semiotics and the Problem of Falstaff." *Studies in Philology*, vol. 113, no. 2, 2016, pp. 337–57. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/439211890.

Noble, Richmond. *Shakespeare's Biblical knowledge and use of the Book of common prayer, as exemplified in the plays of the first folio*. The Macmillan Company, 1934.

Radin, Paul. *The Trickster: A Study in American Indian Mythology*. Shocken Books, 1972.

Schubart, Walter. *Russia and Western Man*. Translated by Amethé von Zeppelin. Frederick Ungar Publishing, 1950.

Shaheen, Naseeb. *Biblical References in Shakespeare's History Plays*. Associated UP, 1989.

Shakespeare, William. *King Henry IV, Part 1*, edited by D. S. Kastan, A & C Black Publishers, 2002.

———. *King Henry IV, Part 2*. Edited by A. R. Humphreys, Routledge, 1988.

———. *King Henry V*. Edited by T. W. Craik, Routledge, 1995.

The Bible, Authorized King James Version. Oxford UP, 1998.

Traub, Valery. *Desire and Anxiety: Circulations of Sexuality in Shakespearean Drama*. Routledge, 1992.

Willeford, William. *The Fool and His Scepter: A Study in Clowns and Jesters and their Audience*. Edward Arnold Publishers, 1969.