só előtti csupán csikorog. Ugyancsak az *i* hangot emeli magasra az ötödik és hetedik sor utolsó szava (*granting/wanting*), melyben az utolsó szótag rímel, de az utolsó előtti nem. Ezzel a felső orgonapont magas hangzású rímei a shakespeare-i szonett megszokott rímképletét is ritkítják, rombolják. Romokban hever a barátság is.

A költői iróniát szolgálja az a körülmény is, hogy a rímhangzás fordított orgonapontjának kiemelt magas szólama mindvégig fonetikailag és metrikailag hangsúlytalan 'nőrímek'-ben, toldalékelemként szól.[23] A barátság tetőpontján álló 18. szonettben Shakespeare csupa hímrímű sort használ. A barátság mélypontján, a 87. szonettben tizenkét nőrímű sort ír. Csak a volt barát fennhéjázását gúnyoló második és a barátság végét hírlelő negyedik sor hímrímű.

A fokozatosan felhalmozódó indulat és irónia a verszene tekintetében is a szonettet záró sorpárban tetőződik. A sor végén a ragrím eltűnik, a rímpár kitisztul, igére főnév felel (*flatter/matter*). A tiszta rím azonban maga a tiszta irónia: a bűvölő álom hízelgő hangjára a prózai valóság tárgyilagosan tényszerű, anyagszerűen súlyos, tömör tagadással válaszol. Az illúzió magas röptét alliteráció is segíti ('*d*ream *d*oth flatter'), az illúzióvesztés zuhanását a tiszta rímet megelőző két egyszótagú szó is szolgálja (*dream doth / no such*), s a 'Thus,' 'doth' és 'such' azonosan ejtett magánhangzója is gyorsítja. A 'dream doth flatter' és a 'no such matter' teljes hangzásában a 'no' a 'dream'-et, a 'such' a 'doth'-t és a 'matter' a 'flatter'-t tagadja. A rím levágódik és elterül.

A szemantikai zuhanást az utolsó két sorban a fordított, felső orgonapont koncentrált kihangzása és hirtelen megszakadása is kifejezi. A 'thee,' 'dream' és 'sleep' *i* hangja a 'king' *i*-jéig ível, mely főnévben, sőt magas méltóságnévben felcsendülve ismétli, folytatja, fokozza és összegzi a korábbi alant járó ragrímek *-ing*-jeinek *i*-jét. Erre ölt nyelvet a 'waking' *-ing*-jének szegényes toldaléka. Itt ér véget a fordított orgonapont. A verszene szólama innen már csak lefelé léphet ('no such matter'). Az orgonapont elnémul. Hangzása is, elhallgatása is a teljes versjelentést teszi hallhatóvá. Így lesz részese a műalkotás érzékletes értékítéletének.

A Dante-, Petrarca- és Shakespeare-szonettek költői orgonapontjának formaalkotó funkciója – ha nem is egyformán, de egyaránt – bizonyítja: a versnek minden pontja archimedesi pont.[24]

Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem
Anglisztika Tanszék
Budapest

"Brothers as Doubles. Birthright and rivalry a 'brothers' in Genesis and Shakespeare, in: Ittzés Gábor – Kiséry András (szerk.), *Mives semmiségek. Elaborate trifles. Tanulmányok Ruttkay Kálmán 80. születésnapjára. Studies for Kálmán G. Ruttkay on his 80th birthday*, Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem, Piliscsaba, 2002. pp. 35–47.

BROTHERS AS DOUBLES
Birthright and rivalry of 'brothers' in Genesis and Shakespeare

FABINY Tibor

The thesis of the present paper is that the Book of Genesis and several plays of William Shakespeare provide a similar, if not identical, pattern of enemy brothers. Brothers have been created to love one another and uphold the unity of a bond that reflects the ultimate benevolence of a creating intelligence. However, reality tends to subvert this ideal vision: instead of love there is hatred, instead of unity there is division. With the words of *King Lear*'s Gloucester, 'Love cools, friendship falls off, brothers divide.'[1] These words, as scholars have long pointed out, echo the words of the Gospel, 'Now the brother shall betray the brother to death' (Mark 13:12).[2] If original sin is a vertical one, namely, the disobedience of human creatures to God the Creator, the first horizontal sin, that is, the first manifestation of sin between human beings, is fratricide. Hostility or hatred of brothers is thus the archetypal human sin. Our purpose is to explore the nature of the phenomenon of brotherly rivalry. Therefore we shall investigate its roots and motivations both in the biblical and Shakespearean texts.

The best-known brother narratives in Genesis are Cain and Abel (Gen 4), Esau and Jacob (Gen 25–48) and the Joseph Cycle (Gen 37–50). The best-known enemy brothers in Shakespeare are Claudius and Old Hamlet in *Hamlet* (cf. Claudius' 'primal eldest curse'[3]), Edmund and Edgar in *King Lear*, Duke Frederick and Duke Senior as well as Oliver and Orlando in *As You Like It*, Antonio and Prospero as well as the King of Naples and Sebastian in *The Tempest*. These classical examples of brother-conflict have frequently been studied. It is my thesis, however, that there are some plays in which the conflict between the main heroes is perhaps not between 'literal' or 'carnal' brothers but they exhaust all the characteristic traits of enemy brothers (envy, rivalry,

[1] William Shakespeare, *King Lear*, ed. Kenneth Muir (London and New York: Methuen, 1972) 1.2.103.
[2] All Bible quotations are from the King James Version (Oxford: Oxford University Press, n.d.).
[3] William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, ed. Harold Jenkins (London and New York: Methuen, 1982) 3.3.36.

mimesis, love–hatred, doubling and so on). Therefore I consider them as 'quasi-brothers.' Such quasi-brothers are, for example, Hotspur and Prince Hal in *Henry the Fourth Part One.*

From the huge amount of material available I have chosen to concentrate on a particular biblical narrative, namely, the Esau and Jacob story from Genesis and the Shakesperean history play of quasi-brothers in *Henry the Fourth Part One.*[4] In both cases we have to do with stories of growth: Jacob the younger brother, the cunning and deceitful cheater, gradually grows into becoming the leading patriarch of the nation and after his fight with the angel, that is, his 'conversion,' he will be given the name of Israel. In the Shakespearean play the formerly riotous mischief, the young Prince gradually grows into the role of the ideal monarch, and fulfils his promise of 'reformation.' However, the emergence of the ideal patriarch or the ideal monarch is achieved at the cost of rivalry and contest. In both cases the main hero can obtain identity only by overcoming, annihilating and 'appropriating' his rival, the brother–enemy or enemy–brother who, in fact, is his 'double.' The Genesis story and the Shakeperean drama are only apparently different literary genres: the Jacob Cycle with its plot, character and the atmosphere of suspense is highly dramatic, and the Shakespearen history play, though a drama, has preserved an epic flavour by presenting a condensed version of a historical narrative on stage.

The growth of the ideal patriarch
The rivalry of Esau and Jacob: subversion of the law of primogeniture

The Jacob narrative occupies almost half of the whole content of Genesis (Gen 25–48). Jacob is the most colourful character among the Hebrew patriarchs. His life, eventful even before his birth, is full of exciting, unusual episodes: the circumstances of the twin-delivery (Gen 25:24–26), his cunning purchase of Esau's birthright (Gen 25:27–34), the deception of Isaac by stealing his blessing (Gen 27), his dream of the ladder at Bethel (Gen 28:10–22), his double service for his intended wife Rachel (Gen 29:1–28), his successful husbandry with Laban (Gen 30:28–43), his heroic wrestling with the angel at Jabbok on his return (Gen 32:24–32), and at the end of his life his unexpected inversion of hands at the blessing a Joseph's two sons: Manasseh and Ephraim as if he were perhaps consciously mirroring his own supplanting of the firstborn Esau (Gen 48:13–20).

The twins

The rivalry of Esau and Jacob begins already in the womb of Rebekah: 'And the children struggled together within her' (Gen 25:22). When Rebekah inquired about it, the Lord gave the following explanation: 'Two nations are in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be separated from thy bowels; and the

[4] William Shakespeare, *Henry the Fourth Part One*, ed. A.R. Humphreys (London and New York: Methuen, 1963). Further references by act, scene and line numbers in the main text.

one people shall be stronger than the other people; the elder shall serve the younger' (Gen 25:23). The delivery of the twins marks also the future rivalry: 'And the first came out red, all over like an hairy garment; and they called him Esau. And after that came his brother out, and his hand took hold on Esau's heel; and his name was called Jacob' (Gen 25:25–26). James G. Williams pointed out that there is a pun hidden in Jacob's name.

> This heel-holding is the occasion of the word-play: the word *heel*, Hebrew *eqev*, is construed by the narrative as the basis of Jacob's name, Hebrew *yaaqov*, probably suggesting 'taker of the heel' or 'supplanter.' In the Israelite tradition the prophets Hosea and Jeremiah viewed the name as meaning rivalry.[5]

It is important for us to note that the idea of the twins, 'the two in one' (*duo in uno corpore*), and, moreover, the idea of the rivalry of twins even before their delivery is not an isolated, individual episode in Genesis. There is a strikingly similar parallel in Genesis 38. The odd story of Judah and Tamar (when Tamar, disguised as a prostitute, justly or unjustly, seduces her father-in-law Judah) ends up with the birth of twins. These twins, Pharez and Zerah, in fact, the grandsons of Jacob, did something during their delivery to confuse the midwife as to which of them was going to be the firstborn. This *ante portas* rivalry for the status of the firstborn is remarkably similar to the fight of Esau and Jacob in the womb of Rebekah.

> And it came to pass, in the time of her [Tamar's] travail, that, behold, twins were in her womb. And it came to pass, when she travailed, that the one put out his hand: and the midwife took and bound upon his hand a scarlet thread, saying, This came out first. And it came to pass, as he drew back his hand, that, behold, his brother came out: and she said, How hast thou broken forth? This breech be upon thee: therefore his name was called Pharez. And afterward came out his brother, that had the scarlet thread upon his hand: and his name was called Zarah. (Gen 38:27–30)

Though we do not know details about the lives of these twins, we know that Pharez, the supplanter-firstborn, the offspring of Jacob, is the direct ancestor of Jesus (see the pedigrees in Matthew 1:3 and Luke 3:33).

The law of primogeniture

Why was the status of the firstborn so important in Israel? In Israel it was understood that the firstborn, whether of man or beast, belonged to the Lord. 'All that openeth the womb is mine' (Ex 34:19). In the practices of the neighbouring pagan religions the firstborn was even to be sacrificed (see Moab's sacrificing his firstborn in 2 Kings 3:27). The Bible, however, suggests the idea of substitution or redemption from the very beginning: the child Isaac is redeemed by a ram (Gen 22:13). However, the firstborn was demanded to

[5] James G. Williams, *The Bible, Violence and the Sacred: Liberation from the Myth of Sanctioned Violence* (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1991) 39.

be given to the Lord on the eighth day from birth (Ex 22:29–30). In Exodus 4:22 Israel is called to be the firstborn of the Lord. In Jeremiah we read, 'I am a father to Israel and Ephraim is my firstborn' (Jer 31:9). This meant that Israel was enjoying a privileged status among the nations of the world. Similarly, in each Israelite family the firstborn possessed the birthright which meant that he succeeded his father and received the largest share, a double portion of the land (Deut 21:15–17). Moreover, he was to receive a special blessing from the father. In the New Testament Christ is the firstborn (Rom 8:29, Col 1:15, Col 1:18, Heb 1:6, Rev 1:5). From the New Testament perspective the Old Testament firstborn was frequently seen as the prefiguration or type of Christ.[6] The law of primogeniture is the passing of the rights of inheritance to the firstborn son. However, this law that expressed the anxiety of society to preserve social continuity has frequently been subverted both within and beyond the book of Genesis.[7] There is a peculiar emphasis on passing over the rights and status of the firstborn in favour of a younger one. Adam's firstborn son Cain becomes a murderer. Abraham's firstborn son Ishmael is passed over in favour of Isaac; Isaac's elder son Esau is passed over in favour of Jacob; Jacob's eldest son, Reuben is passed over in favour of Judah; Joseph's eldest son Manasseh is passed over in favour of Ephraim. The human desire for continuity is subverted by divine intervention. Northrop Frye says,

> All human societies are anxious for a clear and settled line of succession: the intensity of this anxiety is written all over Shakespeare's history plays, and if Shakespeare's particular form is no longer with us, the anxiety itself is. In such things as the doctrine of apostolic succession we see how strong the need for a sense of unbroken continuity is in the Church as well. Hence the deliberate choice of a younger son represents a divine intervention in human affairs, a vertical descent into the continuity that breaks its pattern, but gives human life a new dimension by doing so.[8]

The purchasing of the birthright

Having understood the law and the self-destroying pattern of primogeniture now we can understand why it was so significant for Jacob to obtain this right. Though Esau and Jacob were twins, they were different both in appearance and in character (Gen 25:27–28). Esau was hairy and became a 'cunning hunter.' He was favoured by his father who 'did eat of his venison.' Being red he became

[6] See C.E.B. Cranfield, 'Firstborn, Birthright,' *A Theological Word Book of the Bible*, ed. Alan Richardson (London: SMC Press, 1957) 83; [Anonym.], 'Birthright,' *A Dictionary of Biblical Tradition in English Literature*, ed. David Lyle Jeffrey (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 1992) 89–91.

[7] Northrop Frye, 'The Question of Primogeniture,' *The Bible and Literature: Thirty Video Programs with Manuals* (Toronto: Media Center, The University of Toronto, 1982–1983) Lecture 15. See also his *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982) 182–86; Tibor Fabiny, *The Lion and the Lamb: Figuralism and Fulfilment in the Bible, Art and Literature* (London: Macmillan, 1992) 51–52.

[8] Frye, *The Great Code* 182.

the ancestor of the Edomites whose land was called Seir which, as Hebrew scholars tell us, means 'hair.'[9] While Esau was an outdoorman, Jacob was an indoorman, he 'was dwelling in tents.' He was 'smooth' which can also mean 'tricky,' 'deceitful.' This cunning intellectual was favoured by his mother. The story is known to all of us (Gen 25:29–34): one day Esau returned extremely hungry after hunting. He saw the stew that Jacob was boiling. Esau (or Edom) was hungry for the red, red stuff (*ha-adom, ha-adom*).[10] Jacob agrees to give him a pottage of lentils, provided Esau was willing to sell him his birthright. 'I am at the point to die. What profit shall this birthright do to me?' says Esau and swears to sell his birthright. Esau being a carnal man 'did eat and drink, rose up and went away.' The narrator briefly sums up his conclusion, 'Thus Esau despised his birthright.' The intelligent, cunning younger brother, however, understood its significance.

The theft of blessing

The passive elder brother is not aware of the weight of his loss. The introverted intellectual, Jacob, however, knows that he must remain active: purchasing the birthright from his elder brother is not enough, he needs also the blessing of his father Isaac. While the purchasing of the birthright was condensed into six simple verses by the narrator, the theft of the blessing is worked out in a detailed, minutely elaborated and exciting narration of forty-six verses (Gen 27). Isaac, recognising his age, wants to give his blessing due to the firstborn Esau. He sends him to the field to get some venison and prepare the 'savoury meat.' The preparation of the sacrificial meal is a precondition of the blessing. The killing and cooking of an animal is a substitution for actual sacrifice. However, Rebekah overhearing Isaac's plans, informs Jacob immediately. When Jacob hesitates, Rebekah takes on all responsibility: 'Upon me be thy curse, only obey my voice' (Gen 27:13). The blind Isaac cannot see but he can hear, smell and touch. His perception of smell (olfactory image) is deceived by Esau's 'goodly raiment' put on Jacob; his touching sense (tactile image) is cheated by the kid skins upon Jacob's smooth neck. His tasting sense (gustatory image) is deceived by Rebekah's proper preparation of the 'savoury meat.' Though his auditory image warns him, 'the voice is Jacob's voice,' he is calmed by his tactile perception: 'but the hands are the hands of Esau.' It is important to note that the kid skin is sacrificial, the skin of a sacrificed animal. René Girard says,

> Two sorts of substitutions are telescoped here: that of one brother for another, and that of an animal for a man. Only the first receives explicit recognition in the text; however, this first one serves as the screen upon which the shadow of the second is projected.[11]

[9] Williams 39.

[10] *Ibid.*

[11] René Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977) 5, quoted by Williams 43.

This is indeed the peak, the most dramatic scene of the whole Jacob Cycle. Jacob can overcome his rival, the elder brother only if he appropriates him, only if he gets identified with him. This is the classical manifestation of what Girard calls 'mimetic rivalry.' Esau is both a model and an enemy to Jacob. As a model he invites Jacob to imitate him, but as an enemy he invites Jacob to overcome him: 'The desire to imitate the feared and respected model results in a double bind in which the model for the subject is always a potential rival and the rival is always an implicit model.'[12] Jacob has to imitate his rival; moreover, he has to identify with Esau. At this point mimetic rivalry reaches a point when the rival, that is, Esau becomes the *double* of the subject, that is, Jacob. With the words of René Girard, 'When all differences have been eliminated and the similarity between the two figures has been achieved, we say that the antagonists are *doubles*.'[13]

Once Jacob has appropriated, though illegally, the blessing, Esau returns only to hear that he has just been robbed off his paternal blessing. When he learned how he had been cheated, he 'cried with a great and exceeding bitter cry' (Gen 27:34). Then he began to storm his father with hundreds of rhetorical questions trying to persuade Isaac to revoke the blessing he gave to Jacob. But Isaac would not and could not revoke the blessing. For the Semitic mind words create and destroy, therefore blessings and curses have almost an independent material reality. And this is the moment when Esau's bitter envy and desperate hatred is born: 'and Esau said in his heart, The days for mourning of my father are at hand; then I will slay my brother Jacob' (Gen 27:41). But the second intended fratricide could not take place: upon the advice of Rebekah Jacob fled the confused domestic place to the land of his uncle Laban to start a (temporary) new life. These years will be the period of intellectual, emotional and spiritual growth.

The other dramatic peak of the story is his return to his homeland several years later. He is extremely afraid to meet his brother Esau. However, by that time Jacob has learned to pray (Gen 32:9–12). And now, the dreaded encounter is preceded by his wrestling with the angel at the crossing of the river Jabbok. This wrestling is very similar to the wrestling with Esau already in Rebekah's womb. And the blessing he demands from the angel is similar to the blessing he stole from his father and brother. In wrestling with the angel he simultaneously wrestles with God, with himself and with the Esau he was carrying in himself. The outcome of this new fight and new blessing is something like a new birth. The ghost of Esau departed from his soul and in his new birth he was given the new name of Israel. 'And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel; for I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved' (Gen 32:30). After this dramatic turning point he obtains a new identity and becomes ready to meet his brother Esau. Earlier he had expected a tragic encounter but instead, 'Esau ran to meet him, and embraced him, and fell on his neck, and kissed him: and they wept'

[12] Williams 8.
[13] Girard, *Violence* 159, quoted by Williams 9.

(Gen 33:4). And Jacob, now as Israel, can tell his brother Esau, 'I have seen thy face, as though I had seen the face of God' (Gen 33:10). It is only in the Bible that the face of the dreaded enemy, the former rival, the robbed tragic brother is seen as the face of God. Johnson says,

> The Face of God is the gracious power that differentiates properly and appropriately. The encounter with the *Panim* has done what birth and sacrifice and patriarchal blessing could not do: separate the rival twins so that they could be brothers and not enemies.[14]

Jacob the cheater has grown into Israel, the father of a people, the mighty man of God.

The growth of the ideal monarch
The rivalry of Hotspur and Prince Hal: the subversion of the law of machiavellism

Shakespeare's *Henry the Fourth Part One* has rightly been praised as the best of the history plays. This artistic masterpiece, belonging to the more mature 'Lancaster Tetralogy' has many dimensions. It reflects Shakespeare's political philosophy or philosophy of history, but the monotony of the 'serious' real world is constantly challenged and subverted by Shakespeare's greatest comic figure, Sir John Falstaff, the Lord of Misrule. Simultaneously, there is much tragic potential in the drama, especially around the figure of Hotspur. It has frequently been argued that the play is about the growth of an ideal Prince; it is Shakespeare's great 'morality play' or *Bildungsroman*. But critics have mainly compared and contrasted the characters of Falstaff and the Prince, and the rejection of Falstaff at the end of *Part Two* has long divided the critical opinion.[15] Though the contrasting personalities of the two young men, Prince Hal and Hotspur have frequently been noted, nobody, to my knowledge, has tried to discuss the relationship in terms of René Girard's theory of mimetic rivalry. It is strange because recently Girard himself has published a book also on Shakespeare with the title *A Theatre of Envy: William Shakespeare*.[16] He applies his ideas of 'violence,' 'mimetic rivalry,' 'sacrifice,' 'scapegoating' and the like to Shakespeare, and he provides several discussions of 'brothers' (*Hamlet*, *The Tempest*). Moreover, he is aware of the dramatic role of 'doubles' or 'twins,' as of Hermia and Helena in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* ('double

[14] Williams 53.
[15] Romantic critics as Hazlitt or Morgan considered Falstaff 'the bliss of freedom gained in humour' and his rejection by his former companion, the freshly crowned King, a cruel and cool-hearted gesture of the hypocrite Hal. This view was challenged by the book of J. Dover Wilson, *The Fortunes of Falstaff* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1944), in which the author argued that the play should be read as a morality play, the Prince being Everyman and Falstaff the morality agent of Vice.
[16] René Girard, *A Theatre of Envy: William Shakespeare* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).

cherry [...] union in partition'[17]), of Rosalind and Celia in *As You Like It* ('like Juno's swans [...] coupled and inseparable'[18]), or of Leontes and Polixenes in *The Winter's Tale* ('twinn'd lambs'[19]). However, Girard has entirely omitted the history plays from his bulky volume on Shakespeare. This is the gap I would like to fill in the second part of my paper. What follows is an attempt of a 'Girardian' reading of the Hotspur–Prince Hal relationship in *Henry The Fourth Part One*.

The 'changelings'

While in the case of Esau and Jacob the rivalry began already in Rebekah's womb, the first image associated with the contrast of Hotspur and the Prince is that of the cradle. The play begins with the King's 'envy' of the Lord Northumberland for his son Hotspur who is 'the theme of honour's tongue,' 'sweet Fortune's minion,' while his own son is a riotous young man of dishonour.

> Oh, that it could be proved
> That some night-tripping fairy had exchanged
> In cradle clothes our children where they lay,
> And called mine Percy, his Plantaganet!
> That would I have his Harry, and he mine. (1.1.85–89)

Appearance versus reality

Thematically the play, like the great tragedies *Hamlet*, *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, unfolds the theme of 'appearance versus reality.' The world is different from what it seems to be, people are different in reality from what they appear to be. The perspective of appearances presents a world that claims to be normal. Only the end of the play reveals that it was a fake world, a world turned upside down. All dramatic energy (conflict, climax, dénouement, tragic waste) is at labour to bring about this painful but purifying recognition. In *Henry the Fourth Part One* the 'appearance versus reality' theme is manifested by the juxtaposition of the two Harrys, Harry Percy and Harry Plantaganet. Hotspur or Harry Percy, the son of Northumberland appears to be the ideal soldier. In the war against the Scots he made his name as a mighty, chivalrous warrior. As a rebel against the King he has good chances to the English throne. The Machievallian philosophy of power dictates that, contrary to the medieval idea of divine rights, only talent, personal ambition, cunning manipulation and a bit of good luck are

[17] William Shakespeare, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, ed. Harold Brooks (London and New York: Methuen, 1979) 3.2.209–10.
[18] William Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, ed. Agnes Latham (London and New York: Methuen, 1975) 1.3.71–72.
[19] William Shakespeare, *Winter's Tale*, ed. J.H.P. Pafford (London and New York: Methuen, 1963) 1.2.66.

necessary to gain the crown. King Henry IV seized power from Richard II while being an ambitious, Machiavellian, young Bolingbroke. He is absolutely aware that history might repeat itself and he sees his former self in the threatening Hotspur. He says to his son,

> For all the world
> As thou art to this hour was Richard then
> When I from France set foot at Ravenspurgh,
> And even as I was then is Percy now.
> Now by my sceptre, and my soul to boot,
> He hath more worthy interest to the state
> Than thou the shadow of succession. (3.2.93–99)

While the King and the rest of the world holds that the Prince is an idler, a waster, a 'shadow of succession,' the Prince, on the contrary, knows himself and knows the world. In his rightly celebrated famous soliloquy 'I know you all,' he consciously compares himself to the sun 'Who doth permit the base contagious clouds / To smother up its beauty from the world' (1.2.194–95). Though he has bad reputation because of his attachment to Falstaff and the London underworld, only time is necessary for the sun to break through 'the foul and ugly mists / Of vapours that did seem to strangle him' (1.2.197–98). He promises his 'reformation,' that, in due course, he will 'throw off' the 'loose behaviour.' This is his secret but magnificent programme of 'redeeming time' (1.2.212).

The war of 'speaking images'

We must notice that the two great rivals never meet, never appear on stage together until the very end of the play in act 5. However, the other is always present either by means of imagination or by means of images construed of the other based on reports of mediating messengers. These 'speaking images' reveal what they think of one another. One should observe the dramatic tension of these images and the dynamism of their gradual change in the course of the play. At the beginning, the mediating images are traditional, they confirm the standard opinion of the world: the Prince of Wales being a riotous drunkard and Hotspur being a great warrior. Both the Prince and Percy caricature the standard, publicly approved, conventional images. Thus Hotspur mocks the 'sword-and-buckler Prince of Wales' whom he wishes to poison 'with a pot of ale' (1.3.228, 230), and the Prince entertains Falstaff how Hotspur of the North kills 'some six or seven dozen of Scots at a breakfast' (2.4.100).

However, the standard, ironised images are gradually being replaced by more serious ones. They mutually receive impulses of one another by the mediating reports and develop pictures of one another though physically they are never together. By a 'negative capability,' though the other is never present, they define themselves in terms of the other. Shakespeare, distorting history, presents them more or less of the same age, while in reality Hotspur was 46

when Hal was only 14! Both heroes are Harrys, both are candidates for the crown of England – they are rivals. They are complementary figures as they complete one another; they are like interchangeable brothers or twins. Their rivalry is mimetic; they both imitate the (ideal of the) other. They need one another; neither of them exists without the other. If the King, according to Kantorowitz, is a 'body,'[20] their rivalry is an Esau-and-Jacob kind of wrestling in the body: they are 'two in one,' *duo in uno corpore*. England's civil war is the process of the painful delivery, and the country is groaning until the proper successor is to be born. Society, as always, is anxious for the continuity of the royal line just as the Old Testament people were anxious for primogeniture. As the traditional idea of primogeniture was subverted by divine intervention, so is the modern, Machiavellian sense of continuity is also subverted by the Prince's 'reformation' and 'redeeming time.' However, time is necessary to redeem time, and the Prince, like Jacob, needs time to grow until time is ripe for him to be born. This process develops by means of, and during the period of, mimetic rivalry. This growth is impossible without the other. The other for the subject is both a model and an enemy as we have seen: 'the model for the subject is always a potential rival and the rival is always an implicit model.'[21] The Prince is conscious of this when he says the key sentence of the whole play, in the first dramatic encounter with his father, 'Percy is but my factor' (3.2.147). It means that he consciously plays a game and knows that Hotspur is only his agent, buyer, who is going to buy the glory for him. The Prince needs this model, 'factor,' or agent, only to imitate and eventually overcome.

All this is revealed at the crucial turning point of the drama in act 3, scene 2, in the Prince's confrontation with his father. The King reproves the Prince for having lost his 'princely privilege' (3.2.86) and, in contrast, praises Hotspur as 'Mars in swathling clothes' (3.2.112) and even accuses his son that he would fight against him 'under Percy's pay' (3.2.126). This unfair charge cuts to the heart. In a powerful and passionate monologue the Prince reveals his emotional attachment to his father and his determination to 'redeem' all the false accusations 'on Percy's head' (3.2.132). He envisages the end, the 'glorious day' on which 'this gallant Hotspur, this all-praised knight, / And your unthought of Harry chance to meet' (3.2.140–41). This will be the day when he can prove that 'I am your son' (3.2.134). 'For the time will come' when he will prove that Percy was his factor, the agent who was 'gathering material for the use of the owner.'[22] This strong, prophetic determination is confirmed by a solemn oath.

> This in the name of God I promise here,
> The which if He be pleas'd I shall perform,

[20] Ernst H. Kantorowitz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1957).

[21] See above, note 12.

[22] C.W.R.D. Moseley, *Shakespeare's History Plays: Richard II to Henry V: The Making of a King* (London: Penguin Books, 1988) 132.

> I do beseach your Majesty may salve
> The long-grown wounds of my impertinence:
> If not, the end of life cancels all bands,
> And I will die a hundred thousand deaths
> Ere break the smallest parcel of this vow. (3.2.153–59)

From this time onwards the loyalty and commitment to his father will be obvious for his environment as well. As a new-born soldier he leaves Falstaff and the Eastcheap tavern with the sententious war cry, 'The land is burning, Percy stands on high, / And either we or they must lower lie' (3.3.202–03). Rivalry is not imitation or competition any more. It has become the question of either–or, of life and death.

Henceforth, however, the images the rivals receive of one another are, all of a sudden, of positive nature. When Hotspur is about to mock the 'nimble-footed madcap Prince of Wales' (4.1.95), Vernon, contrary to his expectation, begins the appraisal of the Prince with the vivid description of his royal symbolism (eagle, gold, sun, heavenly messengers).

> I saw young Harry with a beaver on,
> His cushes on his thighs, gallantly arm'd,
> Rise from the ground like feather'd Mercury. (4.1.103–05)

But the intensity of this image is already too much for Hotspur to bear, he can only interrupt Vernon, 'No more, no more' (4.1.111). He identifies with the bleeding of Mars on the sacrificial altar. This vision makes Hotspur even more eager, it sets him on fire. But in this wild image he also recognises the either–or alternative.

> Come let me taste my horse,
> Who is to bear me like a thunderbolt
> Against the bosom of the Prince of Wales.
> Harry to Harry shall, hot horse to horse,
> Meet and ne'er part till one drop down a corse. (4.1.119–23)

The Prince wants to avoid the shedding of blood on either side. Therefore when Worcester and Vernon come to the camp of the King to negotiate, he offers a single combat with Hotspur. The nobility of his offer and the magnanimity of intention becomes evident when he begins to praise Percy.

> The Prince of Wales does join with all the world
> In praise of Henry Percy: but my hopes,
> This present enterprise set off his head,
> I do not think a braver gentleman
> More active-valiant or more valiant-young,
> More daring or more bold, is now alive
> For grace this latter age with noble deeds. (5.1.86–92)

The Prince admits that 'I have a truant been to chivalry' (5.1.94), but he invites Hotspur, a man of 'great name and estimation' to 'try fortune with him in a single fight' (5.1.100). This is indeed the manifestation of true chivalric virtues: nobility, magnanimity, courage, generosity and the like. The rival as double has become a partner of equal rank.

Hotspur, however, is betrayed by his uncle Worcester and Vernon because they are silent about the Prince's peace offer mentioning only the challenge. Again, Hotspur is expecting a contemptuous offer, but Vernon cannot but confirm the opposite. In his image the Prince is depicted as a modest, ideal brother to Hotspur.

> Never in my life
> Did hear a challenge urged more modestly,
> Unless *a brother should a brother dare*
> To gentle exercise and proof of arms. (5.2.51–54, italics mine)

The rival, the enemy, the double turns out to be brother. Hotspur, though pretending to dismiss this image, is nevertheless so much impressed by it that he seems to anticipate his own death by the deeply tragic image of the shortness of life.

> O gentlemen, the time of life is short!
> To spend that shortness basely were too long
> If life did ride upon a dial's point,
> Still ending at the arrival of an hour. (5.2.81–84)

Fulfilment: two stars – one sphere

At the end of the play, when the first actual encounter of the two rivals is taking place, we may have the impression that the whole drama was only a preparation for this great collision. The rivals, the enemy brothers, the doubles are coming closer and closer to one another. Their relationship has become more of an exciting attraction than hatred. The Prince says: 'Oh, this boy / Lends mettle to us all' (5.4.23). István Vas's Hungarian translation, „Ó, ez a fiú / Mindnyájunkat hevít," has even the resonance of a touch of homosexual eroticism about it. The doubles have so much been obsessed with one another that they desire to be united: the two must become one. The stronger must annihilate the weaker but this annihilation is at the same time appropriation. The Prince can annihilate his rival only by becoming identical with him. The fight is going to be something of a sexual act of union and the murder is the fulfilment.

Time is accelerating and the noise of the war is increasing. Time has become ripe for the doubles to confront and collide. One should extinguish the other. Either–or. So, says the Prince,

> Two stars keep not their motion in one sphere,
> Nor can one England brook a double reign
> Of Harry Percy and the Prince of Wales. (5.2.64–66)

They fight, and Hotspur is mortally wounded. In his fall, in one instant, he understands his tragic lot.

> I better brook the loss of brittle life
> Than those proud titles thou hast won of me;
> They wound my thoughts worse than my sword my flesh:
> But thought, the slave of life, and life, time's fool,
> And time, that takes survey of all the world,
> Must have a stop. (5.4.76–82)

He understands his own tragedy in the very moment of his death: his tragedy is that he was indeed only Hal's 'factor,' for the Prince 'redeemed' his reputation on his head: Hal's 'proud titles' were won of his defeat, and he was only needed as an instrument for the Prince so that the Prince could become what he was meant to become. His rival extinguishes him by appropriating him. The two have become one. One plus one is one. Only in the moment of his death does Hotspur recognise that he has become 'food' – no, not only for 'worms' as the Prince eulogises in his epitaph, but for a self-consuming cannibalistic appetite. A sacrificial victim of his double, of his other part.

Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem
Angol Intézet
Piliscsaba

Károli Gáspár Református Egyetem
Angol Nyelvű Irodalmak és Kultúrák Tanszéke
Budapest