Early Theatre
A Journal Associated with the Records of Early English Drama

Volume 4 | Issue 1 Article 5

1-1-2001

'Once more unto the breach': Katherine's Victory in *Henry V*

Corinne S. Abate
New York University, cabate@worldnet.att.net

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.mcmaster.ca/earlytheatre

Recommended Citation
Abate, Corinne S.. "Once more unto the breach': Katherine's Victory in *Henry V*". *Early Theatre* 4.1 (2001): 73-85 (paper). Article 5.
Available at: http://digitalcommons.mcmaster.ca/earlytheatre/vol4/iss1/5

Copyright © 2001 by Early Theatre. This Article is brought to you by DigitalCommons@McMaster. It has been accepted for inclusion in Early Theatre by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@McMaster. For more information, please contact scom@mcmaster.ca.

Early Theatre 4(2001)

CORINNE S. ABATE

'Once more unto the breach': Katharine's Victory in *Henry V*

Despite his boldness of speech, Henry V lacks confidence in the legitimacy of his plans to acquire France through war. From the outset of *Henry V*, the title character frets over his decision, insisting that the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Ely demonstrate in no uncertain terms that he may 'with right and conscience' make his claim upon the throne of France. One approach to solving this problem is to marry someone who can help legitimate his aspiration for a foreign throne. Henry's salvation, then, lies in the character of Katharine, French princess, integral political figure, and emerging bilinguist, who provides Henry with the legitimacy his claim is heretofore without. The purpose of this essay is to explore Katharine's role in 5.2, a scene in which she allays Henry's anxiety over creating rightfulness while possessing her own agency. I contend that she resists marginalization in the marital/trafficking process both with the power she possesses as a member of and pivotal place holder in the French royal family, and in her willingness and ultimate success in forcing Henry to woo her properly. Further, through a discussion of the Salic Law and its (ir)relevance to the final act of *Henry V*, I attempt to explain why Henry inflicts his fervent wooing upon a woman with whom, many scholars have argued, he need not have bothered.

To be fair, Henry's role in his own achievements, both at home and abroad, should not be ignored. Yet at the same time Katharine – just like her historical counterpart – also creates a space in which she can manoeuver herself into a centered, indispensable component of an arranged marriage, negotiated in a sex/gender system that depends upon and, as will be discussed below, even requires her willing participation.[1] It is Henry and Katharine's inextricable and co-dependent relationship to which Coppélia Kahn refers when she suggests 'though it [patriarchy] gives men control over women, it also makes them dependent on women indirectly and overtly for the validation of their manhood. Paradoxically, their power over women also makes them vulnerable to women.'[2] Kahn importantly points to the men's vulnerability within that same system, and their reliance upon women to achieve their expected goal of taking

a wife and producing heirs. When Shakespeare was writing *Henry V* in the late 16th Century, Queen Elizabeth was still unmarried and no official heir had been declared. It makes sense, then, that Shakespeare would portray an uneasy alliance between Henry – a man engrossed with the idea of playing at the role of king, but who as yet had produced no heirs – and Katharine, because as Phyllis Rackin suggests, he is 'the king who most bases his authority on women.'[3] As a result, for Henry to be successful according to the confines of the sex/gender system in which he is a participant, he needs Katharine to authorize his vision of familial justification. Not only would she help erase the recent problematic ascension of Henry IV to the English throne, but she can assist in making a more peaceful, potentially smoother, and rigorously legitimized transition for Henry VI to assume the thrones of both countries.

The saliency of the wooing scene, in which Henry 'courts Princess Katherine with a manly bluntness which is ultimately a trial to our nerves,' continues to be cause for academic debate.[4] If the scene's only purpose is for Henry to win Katharine's hand, then it is utterly superfluous as she has already been promised to Henry in the treaty negotiations with France, and he now claims: 'She is our capital demand, comprised/ Within the fore-rank of our articles' (96–7). The reason she has become his chief article, according to Andrew Gurr, is 'because Henry's demand for the French crown has been moderated to a claim for his heirs to inherit the title.'[5] Regardless that this scene is 'entirely beside the point'[6] in terms of matchmaking, it does showcase Katharine's ability to greet Henry's 'play-acting with a healthy skepticism.'[7] Unlike everyone else in the play, foe or follower, Katharine is the only person, and more importantly the only woman, who is resistant to all of Henry's shifting roles. Through Katharine's debunking of Henry throughout 5.2, her future husband is forced to try on several different hats before ultimately donning the only one he should now be wearing – the crown. More than that, this scene also shows Henry's lingering doubts about the rightfulness of his claims, because he has inherited, as Kahn states, 'his father's sense of guilt along with his father's crown' (79). Thus Henry still needs to convince himself as well as anyone within earshot that the demons of Henry IV's slippery ascension have been exorcised, and the ardent tone that inheres in his faux courting reveals such anxiety.

Yet Katharine has not been idly waiting for the upstart Henry to arrive at her father's castle. Instead, as is depicted in 3.4, the French princess has been teaching herself English. Shakespeare provides no scene depicting an exchange between Katharine and her father to suggest that it was a man or anyone else who prompted her to learn English; it appears that she devised this plan wholly

on her own. Because in some marital negotiations, as Gayle Rubin notes, 'position in a political hierarchy and position in a marriage system are intimately linked' (208), Katharine wisely takes the initiative to learn a second language and the social codes with which it is inscribed so as not to expose herself to traditionally subjugating methods of trafficking when her eventual meeting with Henry occurs. Suddenly becoming Queen of England, while not a role that mandates Katharine know English, invites a thorough loss of her agency if she does not. Thus it is a poised and resourceful Katharine, equipped with newly-acquired language skills, who awaits Henry in 5.2, offering resistance at every turn to Henry's ever-shifting sallies into the art of wooing.

Henry begins to woo Katharine in his favorite persona, that of the common soldier. Kahn argues that this soldier mask 'is at once the charm and the necessary condition of his courtship; it sets the distance between them on which his manhood depends' (81). Henry asks Katharine to help him win her heart:

> Fair Katherine, and most fair,
> Will you vouchsafe to teach a soldier terms
> Such as will enter at a lady's ear
> And plead his love suit to her gentle heart? (98–101)

Katharine's response, 'Your majesty shall mock at me. I cannot / speak your England' (102–3) is, as Helen Ostovich importantly notes, not an answer to Henry's question; in her silence on the subject, Katharine implicitly 'declines this role. She realistically accepts Henry within the terms of the peace treaty as her husband, but not as her lover'.[8] Henry continues as a soldier, monosyllabically asking 'Do you like me, Kate?' (106) and when she asks for an explication of the phrase 'like me,' the flowery speech of King Henry escapes as he poetically declares that 'An angel is like you, Kate, and you are like/an angel' (109–10). Katharine pauses to ask her attendant (and erstwhile English lesson coach) Alice for confirmation that she correctly interpreted Henry as saying she was like an angel. After Alice confirms this so too does Henry, which reveals to Katharine that he knows enough French to discern the meaning of any future comments she may make to her maid.

As if to test his skills, Katharine speaks in French even though she began the conversation speaking English, and decides 'les langues des hommes sont / pleine de tromperies' ['the tongues of men are full of deceits'] (116–17). Henry checks his translation for accuracy with Alice, who verifies what was said, and then praises Katharine for holding such disdain for his words, formally calling her

'the princess' (121). This slight shift in language signals the beginning of the next role Henry will perform in his speech acts. Not succeeding in his billing as a soldier, Henry alternates his formal acknowledgment of her royal rank with calling her 'Kate' in the next sentence, which means he is now playing the self-described role of 'plain king' (124). He prefers she understand no better English for if she did, then she would 'think I had sold my farm to buy my crown' (125), which is a clever conflation of his two roles. He may be choosing not to speak like one right now, but most assuredly Henry is King.

Katharine has followed both what Henry has said and what he has meant, perhaps more closely than Henry thought or desired she would. Lance Wilcox suggests that 'Shakespeare has contrived to present the king and princess as possessed of almost identical degrees of competence in each other's language', which may explain why Katharine's announcement, 'me understand well' (131), seems to rattle Henry's confidence.[9] In response to her perceived competence, Henry deliberately complicates his language, riddling it with peculiar phrases difficult for someone (who is not a native speaker) to understand – 'If I could win a lady at leapfrog' (136) and 'sit like a jackanapes' (141) are just two of Henry's many comparisons in this thick speech – all the while proclaiming 'I speak to thee plain soldier' (148), which clearly is no longer accurate. I suggest that what Henry is doing is enacting for Katharine a verbal rendition of the Treaty of Troyes that is being negotiated off-stage by delegates from both sides. His fondness (and talent) for playing Everyman precludes his first presenting himself as a king, which is why Henry continues to minimize that persona when speaking to Katharine, whose royal bearing he also minimizes as he insists on calling her Kate.[10] This interpretation is borne out by the conclusion of his speech, where Henry, speaking plainly and without flourish, asks Katharine to 'take me, take a soldier; take a soldier, take a king' (164), which also explains why he does not mention her acquisition of a king until the end of the list.

Yet Katharine, who has already chided Henry for his feeble and hollow attempts at wooing her romantically, turns the conversation toward addressing the national ramifications their royal union would create, and asks Henry to explain how she is expected to align herself willingly with him when he appears to be the enemy of France. He says that he could not stop fighting until possessing all of France, and assures her that 'when France is mine and I am yours, then / yours is France and you are mine' (172–3). Henry's sentence structure is complex, so given her incipient language skills, Katharine seemingly does not comprehend what Henry is saying. Henry, then, taking his

behavioural cues from Katharine, accommodates her in much the same way her forays into speaking English have been for his benefit, and provides his explanation in French. In his well-meaning but tortured attempt to paraphrase his English, Henry uses the French word 'possession' to convey that Katharine will possess France as he will be in possession of her. Jean Howard and Phyllis Rackin suggest that 'lacking a legitimate patrimonial title to the name of king, Henry secures it by matrimonial conquest.'[11] However, his translation contains faulty logic because he predicates her ascension to the French throne upon marrying him, and both he and Katharine know that this need not be the case because Katharine always had the potential to possess France, although admittedly in line behind the Dauphin. Therefore, being married to Henry only moves Katharine up on the list of inheritors, and does not place her name among those in contention for the first time. So if Henry has already won the war and will soon be king of France despite Katharine's say in the matter, then why does he take such pains to posit himself as Katharine's champion when her impeccable pedigree remains intact regardless of his involvement? The rest of this paper will be devoted to answering this question.

One answer is provided in 1.2, when Henry asks the Archbishop of Canterbury for clarification on the Salic Law. According to Canterbury, that law says 'No woman shall succeed in Salic land' (39), but he then goes on to proclaim that the law is not even applicable to France because the Salic land is located in Germany.[12] Henry is still not satisfied and reveals his concern by asking, 'May I with right and conscience make this claim?' (96), implying that he wants more support for the justification of his actions than an antiquated law can provide. It must be remembered, as Henry always does, that his father, Henry IV, became king under controversial and usurping conditions, and his hope was that the 'bypaths and indirect crooked ways' (*2 Henry IV* 4.5.184) that characterized his own ascension would not affect Prince Hal. Given his earnestness on the subject, it is not surprising, then, that in *Henry V*, Henry's need to justify his rightfulness to rule in England would include his need to authorize his claims upon the French throne, and what better way to assuage his fears of impropriety than to confirm that a woman *can* legitimately rule France? Such a claim assures Henry that he would not be perpetrating a second usurpation in the role of Katharine as his equal ruling partner once he obtained the throne from King Charles.

As if Canterbury's exegeses of the Salic Law were not convincing enough, he further assures Henry that the Bible itself says that a woman can and should inherit the throne of her father:

> For in the Book of Numbers it is writ:
> When the man dies, let the inheritance
> Descend unto the daughter. (98–100)

Always concerned with the appearance of right-doing, Henry needs Katharine's positioning in the ruling family of her country to create an atmosphere of legitimacy around his actions. Henry's fears, however, are not assuaged and so as a further precaution against failure, he has himself listed in the treaty as Charles' son. By having himself described as an heir – an historical fact that Shakespeare takes care to include in the play – Henry cleverly avoids two sticky situations. The first is what Theodor Meron calls 'the embarrassment of deposing his future father-in-law'.[13] The second applies to the Salic Law, the relevance of which is still unclear, and so Henry takes the law out of play. As Meron explains, in his new role of heir of France 'Henry hoped to avoid a direct conflict with the Salic law prohibiting the passing of the French crown through females or the female line. Accordingly, the carefully drafted Treaty of Troyes made no reference to the Plantagenet claim to the crown of France' (182). This is a startling change of posture by the man who earlier proclaimed 'No king of England if not King of France!' (2.2.193). Yet by tapping into Katharine's unblemished and unchallenged royal standing, as well as creating a similar provenance for himself, Henry can continue to ease his conscience and create a more peaceful and unquestioned path for his heir. Working this hard to reconstruct what Rackin calls 'the uncontested union of authority and power' (60) enjoyed by earlier kings points toward the unnatural and unordained status of Henry as ruler both in England and already in France. Henry wants to guarantee that a line fraught with such obstacles will no longer exist for his heirs. But he needs Katharine's willing assistance to accomplish this.

Indeed, he all but admits this motive to Katharine at the conclusion of his next failed attempt to revert to playing the part of sincere wooer. Both he and Katharine continue to dance around one another verbally, always testing each other's comprehension skills by false-modestly denying the knowledge each of them possesses about the other's language. Katharine returns to speaking in French, and Henry dispenses with asking for an interpreter. Henry reprises the role of plain king who seems so concerned about Katharine's feelings for him, by asking 'Canst thou love me?' (189). Her answer is an honest one and so as not to be misconstrued, spoken in equally plain English: 'I cannot tell' (190). In return for her honesty Henry again follows her lead, and asks Katharine to help him make an heir who would be 'half French, half English, that shall / go to Constantinople and take the Turk by the beard?' (202–3). Henry's heir

would be half hers and not wholly English because of his father's heritage, another tacit admission by Henry that he is relying upon Katharine's solid standing to buoy the legitimacy of his children. Yet his concern for her happy involvement in procreating is influenced by another explanation to the question posed earlier: the biological beliefs of Shakespeare's day.

Ostovich claims that 'according to folklore and to early medical and pre-scientific texts on conception, both sexes had to anticipate pleasure and experience orgasm in order to procreate successfully' (157). In her research on gynecological and obstetrical texts published from 1540–1740, Audrey Eccles also found that most scientists believed the woman produced a seed or 'stone' which was thought to be 'emitted during orgasm and mixed with the male seed on conception'. And despite a lack of consensus on how conception was achieved, 'a robust insistence on mutual pleasure was maintained throughout this period'.[14] Further, it must be remembered that this is an arranged marriage, and as Rubin correctly points out, 'The needs of sexuality and procreation must be satisfied as much as the need to eat, and one of the most obvious deductions which can be made from the data of anthropology is that these needs are hardly ever satisfied in any "natural" form, any more than are the needs for food.... Every society also has a sex / gender system – a set of arrangements by which the biological raw material of human sex and procreation is shaped by human, social intervention and satisfied in a conventional manner, no matter how bizarre some of the conventions may be' (165). This helps to explain why Henry, while engaging in the decidedly bizarre convention of wooing a woman to whom a marriage is already arranged, has also sought Katharine's willingness to help him produce heirs. If she declines or involuntarily concedes, Henry may not achieve the successful ascension line with which he has been so preoccupied. After all, Henry knows from painful personal experience that royal legitimacy does not occur naturally. Thus as Rackin states succinctly: 'the royal authority that Henry V finally represents is an achievement, not an inheritance' (79).

Yet Katharine's desire to keep the conversation away from the Petrarchan and anything romantic does not deter Henry from employing those tactics. However, continuing to preen for Katharine's approval and convince her of the love he feels may be another example of Henry's concern over usurpation. That is, Henry seeks Katharine's approval not because he wants it but because he feels he needs it to avoid creating in Katharine a sense of being overthrown. This wooing of Katharine has been a new experience for Henry: it is Katharine's own model of comportment that Henry has mimicked throughout the pro-

ceedings, Katharine's resistance to all his shifting roles around which Henry has had to manoeuver, and Katharine's acceptance of him that Henry desperately needs to secure. If she willingly agrees to becoming not only his wife but more importantly the equal co-creator of his heir, Henry 'will tell thee aloud, "England is thine, Ireland is / thine, France is thine, and Henry Plantagenet is thine"' (232–3). In an act of self-marginalization, Henry proudly delineates all the material holdings Katharine will possess, while listing himself as the last and least important commodity she will acquire. Katharine eventually accepts Henry's offer because it will content her father, which means that it will also content her. Whether or not it will content Henry is never mentioned because, as Marilyn Williamson notes, while all this play-acting is going on, 'they both know that her father's wishes will settle the issue' (329).

The business deal successfully concluded, Henry attempts to seal the agreement by kissing Katharine's hand but she objects to his taking such liberties. Her disapproval at his action is understandable, but the explanation she provides is, to me, unexpectedly self-deprecating:

> Ma foi, je ne veux point que vous abaissiez vostre grandeur
> en baisant le main d'une de vostre seigneurie indigne
> serviteur. Excusez-moi, je vous supplie, mon très-
> puissant seigneur. (245–49)
>
> [My faith, I do not wish you to lower your dignity by kissing
> the hand of your lordship's unworthy servant. Excuse me, I
> pray you, my all-powerful lord.]

Throughout this scene, Katharine has given no indication that she posits herself beneath Henry's standing as to describe herself as his servant. Rather, her conduct and knowledge of what she provides for Henry thwart this statement outright. I argue, therefore, that she is playfully lobbing back at Henry the hyperbolic genuflecting that he has inflicted upon her throughout this scene. Further, revealing such a subtle and deft ability to play with Henry may point toward how much of his speeches and role-playing Katharine has followed and understood. Henry gathers her meaning and pretends her objection is not to the kiss but its location, so he offers instead to kiss her lips, an act Gurr describes as 'a more egalitarian gesture than kissing hands' (205). It is a light moment that reveals how well the two partners understand one another.[15] In his next speech Henry exalts Katharine to being his equal, saying that they will change the world together: 'O Kate, nice customs curtsy to great kings. / Dear Kate, you and I cannot be confined within the / weak list of a country's fashion'

(260–2). Gone is Henry's pretense that he is merely a soldier, bachelor, or sonneteer.[16] Katharine's consistent resistance to each role Henry has offered has finally forced him to assume his true role of king, and with her, they will together set down the rules of conduct befitting their rank, for 'We are the makers of manners, Kate; and / the liberty that follows our places stops the / mouths of all findfaults' (262–4).

With that, the councilmen return and Burgundy, in his now-infamous sneer, asks Henry 'teach you our princess English?' (273). Burgundy, of course, is referring to a less wholesome lesson that Henry may be teaching the princess, but Henry does not engage in Burgundy's inscription of Katharine's conquered status as his wife. Nor does Henry need to make such comments because he and Katharine have personally negotiated with one another, resulting not in a silencing thrust upon Katharine, as some critics have argued, but rather an empowering of her status and of her titles that are newly enhanced as to now include queen of Great Britain.[17] As Harvey Rovine explains, the silence of women 'often reveals admirable human qualities such as devotion, forgiveness, mutuality, and fidelity'.[18] Silence need not signal obedience, then, and could instead point to what Christina Luckyj characterizes as 'an independent or defiant mind'.[19] Jonathan Goldberg, though, provides the most trenchant and helpful explanation: 'It is not necessarily a sign of power to have a voice, not necessarily a sign of subjection to lose it'.[20] Thus the act of not speaking produces an opening in the text that is not so easily explained, nor does this space have to be confined to only one meaning or interpretation, empowering or misogynistic. Indeed, what I interpret as Katharine's deliberate silence while Burgundy continues to speak when his country has lost the war supports Goldberg's observation.

It would appear that the unfortunate tone of Burgundy's comments reveals more about his personal bitterness over losing control of France to a man he reviles rather than any interest as to the status, sexual or otherwise, of Katharine's relationship with Henry. France may have been co-opted by Henry, but Katharine was not. Besides, Shakespeare would have needed to take care if he were to relegate Katharine to such a subjected position, because her historical counterpart played far too important a role in the English royal family to be so abused. Sometime after Henry died in 1422 Katharine, still quite young, married again and with this second joining to a Welsh gentleman, Owen Tudor, founded the Tudor line in England. According to Ralph A. Griffiths, the 'substantial estates and cash granted her as dower' which Katharine brought with her into that marriage allowed her to maintain a

'queenly state in her own household'.[21] Rackin is right in pointing out that 'Shakespeare never mentions Katherine's Welsh marriage, not in *Henry V*, and not in *1 Henry VI*, the play that depicts the early years of her son's life' (170). Yet I argue that Shakespeare would want to avoid the subject of Wales because it 'evoked powerful anxieties for the genealogically obsessed patriarchal culture ruled by Elizabeth I' (Rackin 170), the Tudor queen on the throne when Shakespeare wrote this play, who was a direct descendant of Katharine and Owen, and therefore has no direct connection to Henry at all. Such a fact has no place in a play constructed solely to exalt Henry's accomplishments, and its inclusion would only highlight Henry's unsuccessful endeavour to create an unquestioned right to the throne for his heirs. It is irrelevant, then, for there to be any mention of the French Katharine's Welsh marriage.[22] Instead, it is enough to say that Shakespeare would have been aware of Katharine's background and would make sure that she appears – in a play that functions to rally around and bolster the deeds and victories of Henry V – a solvent figure, above reproach, agency intact.

This is a noteworthy accomplishment by Shakespeare: to create a female character whose independent centre of power is sought but never violated. In 5.2, Katharine actively participates in negotiating a space to occupy in an arranged marriage to Henry who himself experiences a language lesson, which reveals his need to share in the legitimacy she bestows. Katharine also reflects Shakespeare's shrewd understanding of the sex / gender system of his time, fraught with its own difficulties and anxieties, bound up in an unmarried queen and an uneasy relationship to women's agency. It is ironic, then, that an enforced nuptial, traditionally the site of a business opportunity in which any profit is reserved for the father and not the bride, becomes instead in *Henry V* an unexpected opportunity for a fictional wife to fashion herself into an equal marriage partner. That Shakespeare constructed Katharine resisting subjugation is his literary acknowledgment of the indispensable role performed by women to maintain a sex/gender system that was, ultimately, restricting for and demanding from both men and women alike.

Notes

1 This term, an alternative to the monolithic 'patriarchal system', comes from Gayle Rubin and her ground-breaking essay 'The Traffic in Women: Notes on the "Political Economy" of Sex', *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, Rayna R. Reiter (ed) (New York, 1975), 157–211. Rubin explains that 'patriarchy' is an insufficient label as opposed to a sex/gender system that maintains 'a distinction between the human capacity and necessity to create a sexual world, and the empirically oppressive ways in which sexual worlds have been organized. Patriarchy subsumes both meanings into the same term. Sex/gender system, on the other hand, is a neutral term which refers to the domain and indicates that oppression is not inevitable in that domain, but is the product of the specific social relations which organize it' (168).

2 Coppélia Kahn, *Man's Estate: Masculine Identity in Shakespeare* (Berkeley, 1981), 17.

3 Phyllis Rackin, *Stages of History: Shakespeare's English Chronicles* (Ithaca, 1990), 164.

4 This apt description comes from Alfred Harbage in his introduction to the play in *The Complete Pelican Shakespeare* (New York, 1977), 743. All quotations from *Henry V* will refer to this edition.

5 Andrew Gurr (ed), *King Henry V* (Cambridge, 1992), 200.

6 Katharine Eisaman Maus, Introduction to *Henry V* in *The Norton Shakespeare* (New York, 1997), 1451. Maus suggests that Katharine's refusal to play along nicely in Henry's game 'can as easily be interpreted as coquettishness as real denial' (1452). However, I am arguing that it is the very act of Katharine's defiance to Henry that is important, not its relevance.

7 Marilyn L. Williamson, 'The Courtship of Katherine and the Second Tetralogy', *Criticism* 17.4 (1975), 331.

8 Helen Ostovich, '"Teach you our princess English?": Equivocal Translation of the French in *Henry V*', *Gender Rhetorics: Postures of Dominance and Submission in History*, Richard C. Trexler (ed) (Binghamton, 1994), 156.

9 Lance Wilcox, 'Katherine of France as Victim and Bride', *Shakespeare Studies* 17 (1985), 70.

10 The debate on the meaning behind Henry's constant use of 'Kate' is too large a topic to discuss here. While there are scholars who agree with my reading – that it helps to bolster Henry's role-playing as the plain soldier – others disagree and interpret the nickname as a misogynistic tool Henry wields to trivialize his new bride. For the latter, see Ostovich, 'Teach you our princess English?' 158;

and Laurie E. Maguire, '"Household Kates": Chez Petruchio, Percy and Plantagenet', *Gloriana's Face: Women, Public and Private, in the English Renaissance*, S.P. Cerasano and Marion Wynne-Davies (eds) (Detroit, 1992), 131. I would also point out that Henry applies renaming techniques to himself, not only throughout the Henriad, but also in this play; when he borrows Erpingham's cloak to roam around the campsite, King Henry V reverts to calling himself the very unroyal 'Harry'. See P.K. Ayers, '"Fellows of infinite tongue": Henry V and the King's English', *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 34.2 (1994), 253–277.

11 Jean Howard and Phyllis Rackin, *Engendering a Nation: A Feminist Account of Shakespeare's English Histories* (London, 1997), 214.

12 Today, Canterbury's claim does not seem accurate because ancient Gaul, which included most of France, did employ the Salic Law. For a complete and illuminating discussion of this law and its application, see part three in Katherine Fischer Drew, *The Laws of the Salian Franks* (Philadelphia, 1991). For the law's specific use in this play, see The New Cambridge Shakespeare edition of *King Henry V*, Andrew Gurr (ed), 18–29; and Katherine Eggert, 'Nostalgia and the Not Yet Late Queen: Refusing Female Rule in *Henry V*', *ELH* 61.3 (1994), 524–9.

13 Theodor Meron, *Henry's Wars and Shakespeare's Laws: Perspectives on the Law of War in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1993), 180.

14 Audrey Eccles, *Obstetrics and Gynaecology in Tudor and Stuart England* (Kent, OH, 1982), 30, 37.

15 For disagreement, see Howard and Rackin, *Engendering a Nation*, who read Katharine as 'subjected to a symbolic rape when Henry forces her to endure his kiss' (214–15). I would argue instead that both in this scene and in the English lesson, Katharine scoffs at appropriate language, so while she may be surprised by Henry's impropriety, Henry has also made it clear that he will not risk offending her lest it disrupt his construction of a seamless ascension for their heirs.

16 In her essay 'Hand-me-Down-Heroics: Shakespeare's Retrospective of Popular Elizabethan Heroical Drama in *Henry V*', *Shakespeare's English Histories: A Quest for Form and Genre*, John W. Velz (ed) (Binghamton, 1996) 171–203, A. Elizabeth Ross persuasively suggests that Henry adopts yet another persona throughout this wooing scene as well, for he also 'chooses the bluff good humor of his popular past; he adopts the humor of Hal to woo his wife' (195).

17 Jean Howard concludes in her essay '"Effeminately Dolent": Gender and Legitimacy in Ford's *Perkin Warbeck*', *John Ford: Critical Re-visions*, Michael

Neill (ed) (Cambridge, 1988), 261–279, that this final act shows how 'the female becomes just another conquered territory, properly subjected to masculine control' (263). While it is true that Katharine marries Henry, who gains a more legitimized rule of France as a result, and thus assumes her expected role in the sex/gender system, I have been arguing all along that I do not believe it comes at a cost to her agency. Rather, my point is that Katharine has been preparing for such an outcome and therefore is not subsumed nor marginalized in her new alliance when the moment arrives.

18 Harvey Rovine, *Silence in Shakespeare: Drama, Power, and Gender* (Ann Arbor, MI, 1987), 69.

19 Christine Luckyj, '"A Moving Rhetoricke": Women's Silences and Renaissance Texts', *Renaissance Drama* 24, (1993), 37.

20 Jonathan Goldberg, 'Shakespearean Inscriptions: The Voicing of Power', *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*, Patricia Parker and Geoffrey Hartman (eds) (New York, 1985), 130.

21 Ralph A. Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI: The Exercise of Royal Authority, 1422–1461* (Berkeley, 1981), 56. Griffiths goes on to say that Katharine, who lived at court with the new king after Henry V died, 'played an important role in bringing up her son. Indeed, some of those who joined the king's service did so with the queen's commendation'.

22 For disagreement, see Eggert, 'Nostalgia and the Not Yet Late Queen', who believes that Shakespeare's purposeful omission of Katharine's subsequent creation of an illustrious line, in stark contrast to Henry's line that died with his son, is his way of writing a play that imposes its own Salic Law, for 'by excluding Katharine's Tudor marriage, the play effectively cancels the woman's part in English succession, and instead hails Henry V as the sole shaper of kingship' (542). I argue instead that despite any anxieties Shakespeare may have wanted to convey about Elizabeth I's non-married status, he could neither degrade the queen's lineage nor privilege it at the risk of diminishing one of the play's main functions, which is to highlight the heroic achievements of Henry V. Rackin discusses the marginalization of the Welsh language, as well as the construction of Wales as a feminized and therefore vilified space throughout the first and second tetralogies. See chapter 4 of *Stages of History*, as well as her essay 'Historical Difference / Sexual Difference', *Privileging Gender in Early Modern England*, Jean R. Brink (ed) (Kirksville, 1993), 52–63.