1996

Henry IV, Part Two: a modern stage history

Calisa A. Pierce

Henry IV, Part Two:

A Modern Stage History

Thesis submitted to

The Graduate School of

Marshall University

In partial fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

English

by

Calisa A. Pierce

Marshall University

Huntington, West Virginia

December 9, 1996

This thesis was accepted on November 25 1996
Month Day Year

as meeting the research requirements for the master's degree.

Advisor E. M. Tafft

Department English

Leonard J. Deutsch

Dean of the Graduate School

Introduction

William Shakespeare's Henry IV, Part Two has too often been neglected in comparison with its predecessor, Henry IV, Part One, or its successor, Henry V. In the latter half of the twentieth century, major productions of the drama have been performed only in conjunction with Part One[1], and often with Henry V, Richard II, and other plays added in a Tillyardian cycle.

Although this trend has benefitted audiences who see the characters of Henry IV, Hal, and Falstaff develop over the course of several plays, it has tended to obscure one of the major themes of Part Two, that of "necessity." In this play, Shakespeare examines the validity of necessity as a motive for both political and personal actions, and in so doing, comments upon the political processes which also rule our modern world.

The character of Falstaff also suffers from such treatment. Viewing or reading Part One, most audiences and readers fall in love with Falstaff, that merry, larger than life knight who likes to have fun with his beloved Prince Hal. In Part Two, however, despite the minimal lapse of play time between the two dramas, Falstaff has aged and lost something of his innocence. Corrupted by the decaying kingdom around him, he, too, becomes ruled by his personal necessity.

Staging both plays together generally has resulted in a more uniform portrayal of Falstaff, either by attempting to

continue the jollier Falstaff of Part One throughout Part Two or by portraying the Falstaff of both parts as less likeable in general. Either way, a static Falstaff destroys part of Shakespeare's emphasis on necessity and politics in Part Two.

Other characters suffer, as well. Henry IV becomes weaker in Part One so that his death in Part Two seems more logical. Hal behaves much more coldly toward Falstaff in Part One so that the rejection looms inevitably on the horizon, or he acts as a child who cannot decide between his "two fathers," Henry IV and Falstaff, and who then suddenly matures in the crown scene and chooses Henry. In either case, the characterization suffers from a one-dimensional quality which Shakespeare did not write into the part.

Shakespeare's characters contain good and bad qualities, as real people do. The playwright offers no easy judgments about the motives of Hal, or Falstaff, or even Henry IV. Scholars have debated for literally centuries about whether Falstaff should have been rejected, for instance, not because Shakespeare wrote the plays so poorly that the characters remain unclear, but because Shakespeare typically wrote so well that he literally forces an audience to examine his themes and decide for themselves what his complex characters reveal through their actions.

Despite the focus of this thesis on what has been lost through concurrent staging of Henry IV, Part Two with other plays, some benefits emerge in terms of character

motivation. Obviously, a knowledge of Henry IV, Part One enriches an understanding of Part Two, and vice versa. Two particular scenes in Part One, Hal's "I know you all" (1.2.189) soliloquy and the role playing in 2.4., foreshadow the rejection in Part Two more clearly than the similar scene 2.2. with Hal and Poins in Part Two, while Falstaff's theft of the credit for Hotspur's death makes sense only because Hal must still seem dissolute in Part Two.[2]

The modern productions primarily being considered in this thesis include 1) the 1951 Royal Shakespeare Company (RSC) at Stratford-upon-Avon directed by Michael Redgrave and starring Harry Andrews as Henry IV, Richard Burton as Hal, and Anthony Quayle as Falstaff; 2) the 1964 RSC at Stratford-upon-Avon directed by Peter Hall and starring Eric Porter as Henry IV, Ian Holm as Hal, and Hugh Griffith as Falstaff; 3) Chimes at Midnight, later renamed Falstaff, a 1965 film directed by Orson Welles and starring Sir John Gielgud as Henry IV, Keith Baxter as Hal, and Orson Welles as Falstaff; 4) the 1975 RSC at Stratford-upon-Avon directed by Terry Hands and starring Emrys James as Henry IV, Alan Howard as Hal, and Brewster Mason as Falstaff; 5) the 1979 BBC television version directed by David Giles and starring Jon Finch as Henry IV, David Gwillim as Hal, and Anthony Quayle as Falstaff; 6) the 1982 RSC at London directed by Trevor Nunn and starring Patrick Stewart as Henry IV, Gerard Murphy as Hal, and Joss Ackland as Falstaff; and 7) the 1986-89 touring English Shakespeare Company (ESC) directed

by Michael Bogdanov and starring, during its three year run, first Patrick O'Connell, then John Castle, and finally Michael Cronin as Henry IV; Michael Pennington and later, John Dougall as Hal; and John Woodvine and Barry Stanton as Falstaff. Together, they make a fascinating study of the range of interpretations of Henry IV, Part Two.

Notes

[1] The 1979 BBC production might technically be considered an exception, since each play was produced separately, except that the same cast performed both Part One and Part Two, as well as Richard II and Henry V.

[2] Obviously not all critics or directors agree on this point. Most see a demoralized Hal giving in to Falstaff because he would not be believed by his father or because of his great affection for Falstaff. Nevertheless, Hal's actions make more sense when taken in light of his "I know you all" (1.2.189) soliloquy; he cannot reveal his true nature, thus "redeeming time" (1.2.211), until he is crowned king. If he moves too soon, he will lose the instant effect of redemption he desires and fail to destroy the glorious past myth which England continually compares to the current king.

Chapter One

The Rebellion

So much of what has been written about Henry IV, Part Two concerns the actions and motivations of each of the three major characters, Falstaff, Henry IV, and Hal or Henry V, that the relation of Shakespeare's main plot to his subplot is often neglected. Specifically, literary and dramatic critics alike rarely concentrate their efforts on the rebellion and the enactment of the events at Gaultree.[1]

This lack of interest in the rebellion eliminates a vital part of the drama, for Shakespeare carefully sets up a parallel plot/subplot relationship in his histories in which the events and relationships within each plot serve as a foil and/or a mirror to enrich the audience's understanding of the other plot. Thus, an examination of the rebellion, the main plot's subject matter, sheds light upon the subplot with Falstaff, while the subplot similarly enhances one's understanding of the rebellion and the scenes with Henry and Hal.

The play opens with the rebellion. No significant "play time" has elapsed since the close of Henry IV, Part One, for that play concludes with the Battle of Shrewsbury, while Part Two begins with Rumor orchestrating the reports of the battle's results. Also, scant "real time" has passed, for Henry IV was performed about 1597, while Henry IV, Part Two first appeared in 1598.[2] Nevertheless, Part

Two differs widely from Part One in its fundamental nature, as Shakespeare indicates in the Induction and first scene.

Rumor introduces ideas important to the play as a whole when he steps onstage wearing his costume "painted full of tongues" (Ind. s.d.). To an Elizabethan audience, Rumor would have resonated as the Morality figure Fame, who wore a costume decorated with eyes, ears and tongues. Although the idea of rumor itself, with its dependence on the human tongue, has remained fairly constant since Elizabethan times, many twentieth century directors have lost confidence in the ability of audiences to grasp the visual impact and even the words themselves of Rumor's Induction. In an attempt to update Part Two for modern audiences, they have experimented with various other embodiments of Rumor.[3]

Rumor's tongue-embellished costume disappeared even in the more conventional portrayals, such as that of the Royal Shakespeare Company (RSC) in 1951. This production, the first to present the plays as a tetralogy of Richard II, Henry IV, Part One, Henry IV, Part Two, and Henry V, envisioned a Tillyardian sequence relating Bolingbroke's usurpation of Richard's throne to England's ensuing years of disorder.

Worsley notes that Tanya Moiseiwitsch's Elizabethan-inspired stage design remained static throughout the entire series of plays. Occupying much of the stage, a platform with flights of steps leading down both sides topped a massive wooden structure containing a double-door central

entrance. As lights came up on the curtainless stage, a large throne downstage right by the proscenium arch was always illuminated first (Wilson and Worsley 31). This emphasis on the throne marked it as the link between the various plays in the cycle.

As Barbara Hodgden describes it, director Michael Redgrave began Part Two not with an overture, but with a visual dumbshow of the battle of Shrewsbury. Distant thunder rumbled as stage lights gradually revealed smoke, flames, and Northumberland's ragged battle flag. Lanterns and torches illuminated a wounded man and a drunken soldier singing, as others drew swords and fought. Suddenly, a player held his lantern high to expose Rumor, his face painted in "a ghastly white mask," his hair "fantastically coiffed." When he laughed, revealing "a long, lolling red tongue," the other characters froze, and then Rumor, accompanied by a clap of thunder, moved downstage to speak. Trumpets accented parts of his speech, while drums and tympani sounded at his mention of Northumberland (28-9). This Rumor, even with the Shrewsbury dumbshow, spoke Shakespeare's lines; also, although painted tongues did not appear on his costume, his white face make-up and long, open-mouthed laugh emphasized the tongue. An effective scene-setter, the Shrewsbury reminder enhanced rather than detracted from the Induction.

If Part One deals with the themes of redeeming time and of honor, with the prodigal son motif and a choice for Hal

between two fathers, Henry IV and Falstaff, then Part Two signals its difference immediately. "I speak of peace while covert enmity, / Under the smile of safety, wounds the world;" says Rumor (Ind. 9-10), and the serpent slithers into the garden.

Rumor goes on to speak of "the blunt monster with uncounted heads, / The still-discordant wavering multitude" (Ind.18-19), a multitude perhaps synonymous with those who "flock to follow" (1.1.209) the Archbishop. Rumor, a Machiavellian figure in his manipulation of this multitude, claims that the multitude may play Rumor's pipe, yet *he* clearly plays the multitude's pipe, as he demonstrates by sending false reports of the battle to Northumberland. With his "continual slanders" (Ind.6) and his manipulation of "the acts commenced on this ball of earth" (Ind.5), Rumor introduces the supreme theme of the drama, for Part Two wrestles with the theme of the nature of politics, or policy as it was called by the Elizabethans, with its hidden purposes and smiling lies. Moreover, Henry IV, Part Two is a play ruled by that watchword of politics, necessity. Thus, while Part One and Part Two both deal with the various qualities possessed by leaders, they each focus on an opposite side of this same coin; Part One examines honor, while Part Two anatomizes what many consider its reverse, politics, or necessity.

The 1979 British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) television production of the play used a similar approach to

Redgrave's without actually showing Rumor. The play began as credits rolled over several silent scenes from both Richard II and Henry IV, Part One, such scenes as Richard II baiting Henry Bolingbroke with the crown, Richard's death, and Hotspur and Henry battling fiercely at Shrewsbury. The inclusion of such moments in Part Two, of course, implies that Shakespeare wrote his history plays to be played in a cycle of English history such as Tillyard postulated. Simultaneously, Rumor spoke his lines as an ironic voiceover.

No painted tongues appeared in this production either, an omission which seems odd in relation to series producer Cedric Messina's resolution to produce a "definitive" version of Shakespeare as he was "meant to be" (Bulman, "House Style" 50).[4] Part of this conception included what Messina's successor Jonathan Miller described as "No monkey tricks": historically accurate fifteenth century (the time of the play's action) costumes and sets (Wells, "Television" 47). Although this attention to detail created a "realistic" version of Part Two (Willis 92), an authentic-looking world where the obviously fictional Rumor might create a problematical postmodern effect, the elimination of Rumor's physical appearance hardly contributed to a "definitive" Shakespeare, especially since Rumor's costume would have fit nicely into the fifteenth century time frame.

Director Gerald Freedman's depiction of Rumor, again completely without visual tongues, nevertheless employed a

twentieth century variation of Rumor's stylized Morality costume. In this 1968 New York Shakespeare Festival production, Rumor, wearing a clown's cap, sat high above the stage, "crooking a leg casually and grinning maliciously as he surveys the wanton damage" (Kerr 1). Of course, Rumor's tacit endorsement of political and social disorder fit nicely into the decade of the 1960's, an era in American history filled with assassinations, protests, riots, and involvement in an unpopular war.

Director Terry Hands' 1975 RSC production of the drama at Stratford contained some crucial modifications, including one of Rumor, that suggested a more symbolic, modernistic interpretation of Part Two. Wharton relates that one reviewer compares designer Farrah's bare, dimly lit, gray stage to the deck of an aircraft carrier (56). Suddenly twenty actors cloaked in black rushed onto it from various directions and began speaking Rumor's lines in unison as they assembled in the shape of a pyramid. After a drum roll, they continued speaking the Induction singly, alternating phrases among the various actors (Hodgdon 73). Although this version of Rumor presented a showy visual and auditory example of his machinations among humans, it did nothing to reinforce visually the concerns with politics, sickness, and old age that the Induction introduces.

Michael Bogdanov and Michael Pennington's 1986-89 English Shakespeare Company (ESC) production of The Henrys, (both parts of Henry IV plus Henry V) omitted Rumor and his

Induction; however, as Hodgdon notes, it portrayed visually the play's collapse of order and honor in an unspoken Induction during which looters raided a huge pile of discarded weapons and other battle refuse (132). Here again, the omission of the Induction's motif of politics left a gap.

Trevor Nunn's 1982 RSC production of Henry IV, Part Two at the Barbican Theatre in London partially filled this gap by scattering a silent "multitude" of extras throughout his complex, many-layered set. Dressed as Elizabethans, some beat rugs, made beds, waited tables, or hauled kegs, while others eavesdropped silently on the action (Wharton 57-8). This onstage audience created a postmodern effect in that it commented on the play thematically, during the actual play. That is, the scattered onlookers to political action suggested twentieth century political events performed before the inevitable eyes of hidden watchers, as well as before giant unseen television audiences.

Nunn's production contained two Inductions, for before Shakespeare's Induction, Nunn staged the scene--borrowed from one of Shakespeare's sources, Famous Victories, and referred to twice in Part Two--where Hal boxes the Lord Chief Justice's ear and is arrested. Hodgdon describes this skit as "played in a broadly acted style full of wise-cracking asides" (102). Obviously, the scene commented more on the character of Hal and his seeming espousal of disorder than on any other ideas contained within Part Two.

Following this humorous interlude, the actual Induction reprised both that of Terry Hands in 1975 and Nunn's own prelude to Part One, which began with a procession of Henry IV followed by white cowled monks carrying candles and singing *Te Deum* (Hodgdon 102). This time, a group of eleven actors wearing black hooded robes and carrying candles gathered in a pyramid shape on a darkened stage and began the Induction, reciting Rumor's last line in unison (Hodgdon 102). If the effect for Nunn's Part One was penitence, then Part Two's Induction suggested shadowy, unseen happenings, a good metaphor for politics, especially in this age.

Despite a concern with necessity, or political and personal rationalization, Shakespeare does not abandon Part One's focus on time, although sickness and old age now join and pervert the theme. Rumor reports, for example, that "old Northumberland, / Lies crafty-sick" (Ind.36-7), and Northumberland himself emphasizes these themes of time, sickness, and age in scene 1.1:

> For this I shall have time enough to mourn.
> In poison there is physic; and these news,
> Having been well, that would have made me sick,
> Being sick, have in some measure made me well:
> . . . . . .
> Hence, therefore, thou nice crutch! (1.1.136-39, 145)

Hodgdon reports that in the 1951 version, Northumberland "stood locked in a trance of grief and guilt" until these lines, when he threw away his crutches (29).

Although few critics have chosen to chronicle the portraits of Northumberland in various productions, some tidbits may be found. The 1951 version apparently stressed Northumberland's age and sickness, for Hodgdon mentions his "sick white face" (29). The importance of this detail lies in the connection that nearly every character, as well as England itself, suffers from these maladies. Over and over these motifs surface, of age mocking the desires of men, and of sickness, especially Henry IV's sickness, mirroring the sick realm.

At the other extreme, the 1986-89 production of The Henrys made much of Northumberland's crafty-sickness, for in one of his two scenes, he pushed a wheelchair onstage and then jumped into it with a laprobe when he heard voices (Hodgdon 133). This depiction of Northumberland probably emphasized his treachery as a matter of course, simply because he stood high in the social order, a distinction which would have automatically placed a black mark against him for director Michael Bogdanov.

The options Shakespeare rejected for scene one reveal much about the scene he actually wrote, in which Northumberland receives the news of Hotspur's death. Significantly, the audience does not see Henry IV or Hal rejoicing at the Shrewsbury victory; instead, they will soon

discover Hal's moroseness and Henry's illness. Nor does this first scene include Falstaff, despite the assertion by many critics, especially those who have watched the play performed separately, that Part Two revolves around the portly crowd-pleaser. Likewise, the audience does not witness the Archbishop and the second group of rebels learning of Hotspur's death. Instead, the audience watches Northumberland as he learns of and mourns his son's death.

In the 1979 BBC production, Bruce Purchase, a tall, rather gentle-looking man with shaggy hair who certainly did not appear unduly aged or ill, played Northumberland.[5] Although Hodgdon remarks that he "seems incredulous, even suspicious" of Lord Bardolph and Travers (48), despair and fearful foreboding marked his response to them more. Even when Lord Bardolph declaimed his lines as if in a theatre, Purchase's mild voice caressed the words, "Why, he [Hotspur] is dead" (1.1.83), while his lips formed a small, sad smile which did not reach his drooping eyes. Northumberland remained seated throughout the scene until he arose to pace across the floor as he called for the death of order:

> Let heaven kiss earth! Now let not Nature's hand
> Keep the wild flood confined! Let order die,
> And let this world no longer be a stage
> To feed contention in a lingering act;
> But let one spirit of the first-born Cain
> Reign in all bosoms, that, each heart being set
> On bloody courses, the rude scene may end,

> And darkness be the burier of the dead! (1.1.153-60)

While Purchase did a fine job with this speech, an important one with its emphasis on the death of order, his earlier mildness in the scene was jarring.

Of course, Shakespeare focuses on Hotspur's death in scene one because order[6] and honor, two medieval concepts that stabilize the world of Part One even in the midst of the rebellions, seem to have died with him. Part Two contains little of either. Northumberland exclaims that Hotspur's death, "Being bruited once, took fire and heat away / From the best-tempered courage in his troops," (1.1.114-15). With Hotspur's fall, even Douglas ran ingloriously away. Scene 1.1 is important because it sets aside some of Shakespeare's concerns in Part One so that he can explore new ideas in Part Two, an essential task when the two plays share such similar characters, plots, and settings.

Northumberland appears again in 2.3, where BBC director Giles had Northumberland rush in followed by a furious Lady Northumberland and a distraught Lady Percy. Although the scene started effectively, this was the only bit of action in the scene, which demonstrated the unsuitability of the director's static camera shots and claustrophobic settings. Since Giles believed that Henry IV, Part Two should be "private--it all happened in rooms" (qtd. in Willis 204), he reduced the scale and camera distance in most scenes to

suggest very small areas. Theoretically, this idea may have some merit, but in practice, it detracted from the production's scope.

Peter Saccio regards Michele Dotrice's performance in this scene as a triumph:

> young widow Percy, lyrically framed by a loving camera that stresses the dazzling white linen elaborately draped and gathered around her face, makes a moving cadenza solo of her elegy for Hotspur . . . . Anthology 209)

Nevertheless, while Lady Percy's stark white face and reddened eyes certainly demonstrated her grief, the stillness of her portrayal was rather wearisome. The camera focused solely on Dotrice as she first spoke earnestly to Lord Northumberland and then moved to what appeared to be a small window slit in the massive stone wall and stared out with an unfocused gaze. Her high pitched voice slowly spat out many of her words as if she hovered on the edge of control, and yet she projected them as if for a stage performance rather than Giles' intimate room. When the camera broke away for a reaction shot from the Northumberlands, they stood together quietly, listening with expressions of gentleness and understanding on their faces. Overall, the claustrophobic, still room, the quiet vehemence of Lady Percy, and the passive Northumberlands combined to create a static scene poorly suited for television.

Giles' 1979 production reprised many of the 1951 version's characteristics, and even cast the same actor as Falstaff. Judging from reviewers' comments, Dotrice's Lady Percy may have been based on the 1951 production as well. David writes about Barbara Jefford's performance that she presented "the most moving single episode in the whole series" (132), while Sprague notes that she spoke "with a sort of hushed intensity" (qtd. in Hodgdon 83).[7]

Of course, drama critics single out Lady Percy's monologue, in which she associates Hotspur's death with the death of honor, in production after production. She claims--and obviously convinces the audience, judging from their sympathetic admiration--that Hotspur is the soul of honor, for "by his light / Did all the chivalry of England move / To do brave acts" (2.3.19-21). Shakespeare makes Lady Percy's speech so irresistible because the audience must grieve that honor shares Hotspur's grave.

Trevor Nunn directed his 1982 version of Lady Percy much like Giles, except that, as was typical for him, he injected a little unspoken interest with his stage direction. Hodgdon explains that as the scene began, Lady Northumberland moved away from her husband after they quarreled over the rebellion. When their daughter-in-law began speaking, Northumberland sat patiently on a trunk to hear her out, where gradually Lady Northumberland joined him. As she mentioned the Archbishop, Lady Percy moved to Hotspur's parents and spoke directly to them (104). The

1979 production would have benefitted from some of this type of movement.

Terry Hands' 1975 Part Two presented a more expressionistic version of the scene. Hodgdon, one of the few critics who focuses on Northumberland, writes that he wore a suit of black armor with a plumed helmet. As Lady Northumberland and Lady Percy attempted to persuade him against battle, they circled ineffectually around him (74). Both Hand's stage direction and the costuming acquired an unusual prominence here against Farrah's bare stage, lending a dominance to Northumberland much in keeping with the text. The stage direction for the scene's ending contrasted sharply with this initial impression, for both ladies led Northumberland offstage in the opposite direction of his entrance, with Lady Northumberland carrying his sword (Hodgdon 74). Even though Hands pursued his visual shorthand to extremes, the exit in this scene illustrated neatly that the women had emasculated Northumberland when they talked him out of fighting.

Although drama critics rarely stress Lord Northumberland, they seldom fail to mention Lady Percy's moving eulogy of Hotspur. In general, they associate no "theatrics" with this speech; the text speaks for itself. Honor's death, linked with the death of Hotspur by an elegy too moving to omit or to tamper with, remains a vital concept in twentieth century productions. In a century so often lacking honor, its demise seems especially poignant.

With Shakespeare's elimination of honor and order as potential themes in Henry IV, Part Two, with what theme does he replace them? Necessity. Every character in the play, especially the three major characters, lives by necessity. The playwright begins shaping this theme early in the main plot by focusing on the motives of the Archbishop of York, the new leader of the rebellion.

In scene one, Morton praises Archbishop Scroop's pure motives for rebellion:

> But now the Bishop
> Turns insurrection to religion;
> Supposed[7] sincere and holy in his thoughts,
> He's followed both with body and with mind;
> And doth enlarge his rising with the blood
> Of fair King Richard, scraped from Pomfret stones;
> Derives from heaven his quarrel and his cause . . . . (1.1.200-206)

The Archbishop, it seems, has begun a holy war to right the great wrong of Richard's death.

However, when the Archbishop appears, he exhibits no signs of such holy passion, except in the 1979 production, where Saccio commends the accurate physical casting of the part. He notes that Robert Hardy endowed the Archbishop with "a sharp asceticism, verging on the fanatical in his prominent facial bones and deeply incised facial lines" (Newsletter 1).

While the 1975 RSC and 1979 BBC productions both attempted to retain the flavor of the original play, one by using a modified Elizabethan stage and the other by creating naturalistic period costumes and set dressing, both employed stage business to add interest to the rather static council scene by focusing on the subtext of Lord Bardolph's anxiety and discomfort.

The 1979 version not only cut lines to add a more conversational tone, but also used camera cuts to reveal Lord Bardolph's displeasure with the proceedings. Clearly, he did not agree with the others' estimates of an easily-defeated King Henry IV. As he began to speak in protest at one point, the Archbishop silenced him with a stern glance. The misery of his swallowed words seemed evident as he fidgeted with his wine glass. The Archbishop demonstrated his political "savvy" with another unspoken gesture, when he pressed Lord Bardolph's shoulder as the meeting concluded. The Archbishop appeared to be a true leader and also a true politician in this scene, understanding how to motivate and manipulate others with ease.

As the leader of the second rebellion, as one of the politicians in the play living by that watchword necessity, the Archbishop should receive more critical attention than he does. However, the rebel council scene of 1.3, as Hodgdon notes, generally suffers heavy line cuts in order to achieve a conversational effect (105), and the Archbishop's most telling lines may be among them. As mentioned above,

the modern trend of staging Part Two in conjunction with other plays also diminishes his importance in relation to the major characters.

In the absence of commentary on the stage versions of the council scene, the text may be consulted. In scene 1.1, Morton sets up a picture of the Archbishop as a "sincere and holy" man (1.1.202) who "Derives from heaven his quarrel and his cause" (1.1.206). Although Rumor has wreaked havoc in this scene with false reports, Morton, the speaker, presented Northumberland with the true version of Shrewsbury, so that his characterization of the Archbishop--while tainted from being spoken in the scene most obviously associated with Rumor--may be tentatively believed. If so, according to Morton, "the blood / Of fair King Richard" (1.1.204-5) either figuratively or literally "scraped from Pomfret stones" (1.1.205) motivates Archbishop Scroop's troops. As he "Derives from heaven his quarrel and his cause" (1.1.206), Richard's murder and Bolingbroke's ungodly act in usurping a divinely appointed king should be the motivation for his rebellion.

If this is so, Scroop calculates his chances of victory too coldly in the council scene before he decides to proceed. True, the rebels wish to avoid Hotspur and Douglas' mistakes, but a man who truly is motivated by the holiness of his cause should be willing to step out in faith. Even more disturbing, in the only speech of any length in this scene, the final summation of the council in

which the Archbishop could be expected to appeal to God or the other rebels to uphold his sacred cause, Scroop decries the typical Englishman, instead, as "over-greedy" (1.3.88), "giddy" (1.3.89), and "fond" (1.3.91), a "beastly feeder" (1.3.95) which does not know its own mind--characteristics of which Scroop will attempt to take advantage to overthrow Henry IV. Shakespeare does not paint Scroop as a villain, but he does not show him as a hero, either, for Scroop's motives remain questionable.

In this speech, like Hal in Part One, Scroop also pinpoints the problem with time and public opinion: "O thoughts of men accurst! / Past and to come seems best; things present, worst" (1.3.107-8). When Richard was king, the English populace despised him and adored Bolingbroke. But now that Richard is dead, England looks back to his kingdom as a golden age. They hate being ruled by Henry IV and look forward to a time of peace and prosperity after his deposition. A true politician, Scroop, like Hal, understands public opinion well and knows how to judge the time to use it in his favor.

Scroop and the rebels appear again in the parley at Gaultree Forest, where their scenes assume a central position thematically in the play as a clash of two political factions, each motivated by a different version of necessity. However, the scenes cause difficulties for directors. First, like the similar rebel council episode, they contain a long series of static speeches which do not

play well to a modern audience. Second, those directors who wish to present Henry IV, Part Two as one episode in a cycle of dramas beginning with Richard II and culminating with Henry V must not allow Prince John to dissolve all sympathy for Hal and Henry IV with his treachery at Gaultree. Nevertheless, presenting John in a good light takes some effort.

Director Michael Redgrave struggled with these problems in his 1951 production. Energizing the scenes by cutting the historical references (presumably not needed by an audience which had seen Richard II and Henry IV, Part One) and otherwise reducing long speeches into more conversational lengths, he still had difficulty with making John sympathetic. As related by Hodgdon, his strategy was to align the royal forces on the side of the stage dominated by the massive throne and to turn Prince John toward the audience when speaking to his army as if the audience themselves comprised those troops. Further, Redgrave reversed scene 4.2's two final rhyming couplets so that the Gaultree episode ended with John's line, "God, and not we, hath safely fought today" (4.2.121) (Hodgdon 34). That even these techniques sufficed is doubtful. Certainly, by attempting to come down heavily on the side of the royals, Redgrave did not contribute to a political discourse, for this approach endorsed John's necessity, that of putting down the rebellion. John's philosophy that for a prince the end justifies the means is a truly Machiavellian notion.

Likewise, David Giles' 1979 Gaultree achieved the opposite of his desired realistic effect. Although filmed among genuine trees with actors in period dress, the scene failed to suggest convincingly an array of troops mustered in the background. Instead, the production looked static and unnatural, with a group of actors remaining mostly immobile. Willis reports that Giles even chose a long camera lens that would blur the background slightly (104).

Hodgdon contrasts this interpretation with Orson Welles' 1966 film Chimes at Midnight, a compilation of material in both parts of Henry IV and in Henry V that tells the story from Falstaff's point of view. Referring to Welles' masterful use of the landscape in long, visual shots which conveyed much emotion, critics praise the film's use of space. Characteristically, in Chimes, the visual images of the parley took prominence, with many of its words swept away by the wind (Hodgdon 49). Welles' version seemed to capture more of the audience's imagination than Giles'.

The BBC television Gaultree, like Redgrave's, also embraced a particular side in the conflict, that of the rebels, although less blatantly. Giles did this partly by cutting Mowbray and Westmoreland's long discussion about the conflict between Mowbray's father and Bolingbroke in Richard II's time. By ending the Archbishop's complaint of griefs with the words, "My brother general, the *commonwealth* / [emphasis spoken], . . . [omission Giles'] I make my quarrel in particular" (4.1.94-96), Giles stressed Scroop's concern

for England rather than his own grievances, a concern which must at least in part have been genuine.

Nunn's staging emphasized the rebels' claims that they represented the English populace's "vulgar heart" (1.3.90) by placing the rebel troops onstage. Moving among the crowd, as Hodgdon notes, the Archbishop assumed visually the position of a popular leader who was "followed both with body and with mind" (1.1.203) by loyal troops. The crowd applauded Scroop's lines, "We are denied unto his person, / Even by those men that most have done us wrong" (4.1.78-9) but thumped their staves threateningly when Westmoreland said the Prince's offer "comes from mercy, not from fear" (4.1.150). When the Archbishop paused after the lines, "Our peace will, like a broken limb united, / grow stronger for the breaking" (4.1.222-23) to allow his followers to respond, they hesitated before individually lifting their arms in consent (Hodgdon 105).

While Nunn's wonderful stage business resolved most doubts about Scroop's motives, none of it was textual. The scene still warrants a closer examination, for in it, Westmoreland asks the Archbishop that ever-fascinating question about his motives. Disregarding the stave-thumping and focusing on the words, a careful reader will once again find that the holy man does not speak of a holy cause. Although, Scroop says, "we are all diseased, / And with our surfeiting and wanton hours / Have brought ourselves into a burning fever, / And we must bleed for it" (4.1.54-7),

Scroop states that he is neither a physician, able to cure England's ills, nor "an enemy to peace" (4.1.61). Instead, he says, he has "in equal balance justly weighed / What wrongs our arms may do, what wrongs we suffer, / And find our griefs heavier than our offenses" (4.1.67-9).

Scroop's statements need to be questioned here. He does speak of Richard's death, but not of its offense to heaven. Although he invokes an England diseased and suffering, he says he is not its physician. Instead, he has calculated the costs of war versus doing nothing, and finds that the rebels' griefs are worse than those the rebels can cause by war. As in the council scene, the Archbishop speaks in cold terms incongruent with a holy cause.

Instead of detailing the rebels' griefs, Scroop explains that these have been written down in articles which he has been unable to present to the King, because "We are denied access to his person" (4.1.78), a claim that rings with authentic frustration. When Westmoreland presses the Archbishop further about these wrongs, he finally invokes the commonwealth's need for redress. Westmoreland responds that the commonwealth's problems should not concern the rebels; astonishingly, the group drops this subject and returns to the question of their personal grievances.

What is happening here? Again, the Archbishop and his fellow rebels reveal the impurity of their motives. Their concern for England fades away like mist when challenged, to reveal what truly galls them, their own lack of access to

Henry IV, a lack equivalent to a lack of power. Necessity rules these rebels. They *need* their share of power; they will do whatever they *need* to do to acquire it, including war.

The Archbishop's willingness to parley corresponds with this idea. The rebels have just learned that Northumberland will not support their action with further troops. Since they cannot win, the necessity of self-preservation dictates that they negotiate. Had the Archbishop been truly committed to England's good or to a holy cause, he would not have given up his concerns about "My brother general, the Commonwealth" (4.1.94) so easily in favor of his own list of personal grievances.

Interestingly, Westmoreland also invokes the king's right to necessity:

> Construe the times to their necessities,
> And you shall say indeed it is the time,
> And not the King, that doth you injuries.
> (4.1.104-6)

He is saying that desperate times require certain actions, and that the king *needs* to act in a certain way for the good of all. Since the king must act this way, any fault with his actions should not accrue to the king.

King Henry has already stated this same idea in his first speech, when he refers to his motive for taking Richard's throne. "God knows," he says, "I had no such intent, / But that necessity so bowed the state, / That I

and greatness were compelled to kiss . . ." (3.1.72-4). An important distinction must be made that Henry IV speaks of England's necessity, for any interpretation of Henry's character revolves naturally around the question of whether he truly acts for England's good, for his own, or for both.

After Henry and Warwick discuss Richard's now-fulfilled prophecies of rebellion, Henry returns to the idea of necessity: "Are these things then necessities? / Then let us meet them like necessities; / And that same word even now cries out on us" (3.1.92-4). Whatever his personal motives, preserving England is Henry's necessity also.

Through the idea of necessity, apparent also in the subplot with Falstaff, Shakespeare questions the nature of politics in this play. How does a person's perception of necessity relate to his or her personal desires? To what extent does necessity justify a person's actions, or to what extent does the end justify the means? These questions rule the scenes at Gaultree Forest as severely as they do Falstaff's rejection. At Gaultree, Mowbray correctly casts Prince John in the role of politician before John ever steps onto the stage. He asserts that John's parley "proceeds from policy, not love" (4.1.148), that necessity compels it. Events prove him right.

Despite the limitations of Giles' BBC setting, John Gay, a young, handsome, honey-voiced actor, played Prince John well. His not-quite-earnest-enough assertion of Shakespeare's text set the royal trap convincingly.

Deferring to Westmoreland, he conveyed an air of uncertainty and innocence so that Westmoreland's lines, "Pleaseth Your Grace to answer them directly" (4.2.52) seemed to instruct him to have confidence. When he spoke smilingly "of our restored love and amity" (4.2.65), he knelt to kiss the Archbishop's ring. After this, John and Westmoreland both emphasized the irony of their friendly comments with stressed words, such as Westmoreland's, ". . . my love to ye / Shall show itself more *openly* hereafter" (4.2.75-6). Although Giles lacked energy in his direction, he abandoned none of the scenes' emphasis on policy.

In his 1986 production, Bogdanov employed symbolism in costuming, music, and even props to push his Machiavellian characterization of Prince John perilously near melodrama. Wells notes that while the rebel leaders dressed in tweeds and cardigans, John appeared in a uniform ("London" 160-61). Linked with Bogdanov's intention of creating a Shakespeare more accessible to "new, young audiences" (qtd. in Berry 219), John's dress may rightly be interpreted as a warning. Likewise, the Prince offered glasses of wine (as opposed to beer in bottles) to the rebels. This sounded an elitist note in Bogdanov's repertory of gestures, for Falstaff and Hal gulped bottled beer, while French ladies drank champagne from glasses in Henry V (Wells, "London" 161).

In this version, commandos seized the rebels and marched them off to be shot *onstage*, while the sound track played the phrase "The King shall rejoice!" by Handel, and

while Westmoreland enjoyed his sherry (Hodgdon 136). Obviously, Bogdanov was not drumming up sympathy for the royal cause. His blatant partisanship for the rebels, like that of Redgrave's for Prince John, undercut the theme of necessity by modulating the conflict to suggest a right side versus a wrong one.

Terry Hands' 1975 version of Gaultree employed an equally heavy-handed symbolism. Hodgdon describes John's entrance as a long, circling procession which had come to indicate entrapment elsewhere in the play. He made a point of forcing apart the rebels aggressively by going through their midst, as Westmoreland also did at his earlier entrance. When the two made their vows, they turned away from the Archbishop and the other rebel leaders to face the audience as if to underscore their duplicity. Croaking ravens added another heavy touch of menace. Finally, when John signaled his iron-masked thugs by pulling on his gloves, they surrounded the Archbishop (Hodgdon 75). In this case, the director's patent sympathy with the rebel party had the effect of canceling out any dialogue as to the necessity of Prince John's actions.

Trevor Nunn's 1982 RSC version of Gaultree reversed modern tradition by cutting only eleven lines from the Gaultree scenes (Hodgdon 105), a decision which allowed him to explore the rebels' motivations more thoroughly. Wharton comments that this approach transformed Prince John and Westmoreland into "sour-faced sermonizers" by contrasting

their long, pious speeches with their hypocritical actions (77), an effect which the text surely intends.

Prince John added to the characterization of the royal party as devious politicians. Wharton describes that when Prince John seized the Archbishop's hand to arrest him, the Prince mockingly pretended he would lift it to his lips in order to kiss his ring, before he instead ripped the ring from the Archbishop's finger (77). Although Prince John's villainy fits well with the text, the Archbishop's status as an altruistic popular leader in Nunn's earlier scene casts John in an even worse light than the text indicates.

When Prince John appears in person, for instance, he immediately upbraids the Archbishop for his role in the rebellion and wastes no time in accusing the Archbishop of political motives:

> You have ta'en up,
> Under the counterfeited zeal of God,
> The subjects of his substitute, my father,
> And both against the peace of heaven and him
> Have here up-swarmed them. (4.2.26-30)

Having seen the council scene with its cold calculation of chances for success, and having seen the rebels' quick abandonment of altruistic motives in the previous scene, the audience should at least wonder whether John isn't right about the Archbishop's counterfeited zeal.

Indeed, Scroop makes no pretense in this scene that he is acting for the good of England. Facing an uneven battle,

he speaks of the rebels' need "To hold our safety up" and of "our most just and right desires" (4.2.35, 40). When Prince John promises redress of the rebels' articles, the Archbishop and the others agree readily to peace.

Here, of course, John betrays the spirit if not the exact literal word of his promise and orders the chief rebels away to be executed. Prince John has mastered the tenets of "policy" and of "necessity," and he acts here out of necessity. Like Machiavelli's ideal Prince, John embraces honesty and honor only when they serve his own needs, abandoning them as the situation requires.

Any heavy-handed weighting of one side or the other in the Gaultree scenes clearly works against Shakespeare's method of allowing the audience to decide what it thinks about a given question. Although Prince John undoubtedly played the Machiavel at Gaultree, his motivation may well have been England's good. Conversely, despite his traditional portrayal as a naive idealist, Archbishop Scroop's motives deserve some scrutiny as well. In all these twentieth century productions, with the exception of the 1979 BBC film, the directors promoted their own interpretations of the scene so vigorously that the audience's need to ponder necessity and policy diminished.

In summary, modern productions of Henry IV, Part Two have generally neglected Shakespeare's motifs of necessity and policy, although the 1951 RSC version emphasized these ideas by including a literal Induction amidst the remnants

of the Shrewsbury battlefield. Chimes and Bogdanov's 1986-89 production omitted the Induction, and information about the 1964 staging remains scarce. While ignoring the political undertones, the 1975 cast did a fine job of acting out Rumor's malicious function. The 1979 voiceover Induction with flashbacks from Richard II and Part One worked well, as did the 1982 Induction spoken among shadowy black figures, although Nunn's decision to include the Famous Victories scene did more toward reminding the audience of Hal's dissolute actions than toward cueing the play's political concerns.

Northumberland's scenes have been rather overlooked by theatre critics. Clearly the 1951 Northumberland was aged, ill, and guilt-ridden. With the wheelchair ruse, Bogdanov made much of Northumberland's crafty-sickness in 1986-89; unfortunately, by actually showing the craftiness, Bogdanov went too far, for Shakespeare leaves his audience somewhat uncertain of the extent of Northumberland's illness. Giles' 1979 Northumberland, too young and healthy-looking to contribute to Shakespeare's motifs of age and disease, merely seemed indecisive. Critics largely ignored the 1964 and 1982 RSC's Northumberland and rebel party. Of all these versions, the 1975 Northumberland played the age and illness suitably, although his last exit, with Lady Percy carrying his sword offstage, was too heavy on symbolism.

Lady Percy, on the other hand, nearly always created a favorable impression with reviewers, especially in 1951 and

1979. This phenomenon can be traced both to her magnificent speech and to its subjects, Hotspur and honor; a lost concept in the latter twentieth century, honor contains a peculiar appeal for audiences.

Likewise, most modern productions have contained a strong bias toward either the rebels or the royals, a bias which obviates any need on the audience's part to think about the proclaimed necessity of rebellion or of Prince John's actions. Michael Redgrave's nationalistic 1951 version portrayed a righteous Prince John. Chimes focused mainly on Falstaff, of course. While David Giles' BBC program came down only marginally on the side of the rebels, Terry Hands in 1975, Trevor Nunn in 1982, and Michael Bogdanov's 1986-89 touring company depicted John as a villain. Despite its bias, Trevor Nunn's version, with the Archbishop shown onstage as a popular leader, provoked more thought than the rather boring but more fair 1979 television presentation.

In conclusion, the rebels' share of the theme of politics and necessity surely suffers from the twentieth century practice of staging both Part One and Part Two of Henry IV together, usually with Richard II and/or Henry V. By focusing attention on the character development of Henry IV, Hal, and Falstaff, the major characters who continue through the series, directors often neglect the rebels and fail to expound the individual ideas which Shakespeare examined within each separate play.

Notes

[1] Barbara Hodgdon's contribution to the Shakespeare in Performance series is an invaluable exception.

[2] The first play was entered into the Stationers' Register and published under the title The History of Henry the Fourth.

[3] Most critical opinion agrees that the Elizabethan stage, sparsely dressed with few props, depended on actors' spoken cues for set decoration, with Henry V's Induction often cited as evidence. Barbara Hodgdon points out that Shakespeare's original audience must therefore have been conditioned to respond primarily to aural cues (1-2). She accounts for much of the modern experimentation with staging Shakespeare as an effort to accommodate the modern audience's expectation of visual cues. While this makes sense to a point, Rumor's costume and the costuming and hand-held props of Shakespeare's other characters can only be classified as visual cues. Further, the use of visual cues may sometimes be a way of rationalizing audience-pleasing spectacle rather than an enhancement to interpretation.

[4] Obviously, from a critical point of view, this is a "loaded" statement which should have exploded in Messina's face. Today most scholars agree that no one, not even Shakespeare himself after the fact, can state categorically how the dramas were "meant to be."

[5] I speak of order not only as opposed to disorder in Henry IV's England, but also as the idea that every being has its ordained place in the hierarchy of the universe. See E. M. W. Tillyard's Shakespeare's History Plays (New York: Collier, 1962) for a discussion of the Medieval concept of order in Shakespeare's histories.

[6] I was lucky enough to view a videotape of this drama.

[7] The meaning here is not "falsely imagined" but rather "rightly believed."

Chapter Two

The Henrys

The themes of necessity and policy, of time and sickness, and of youth versus age, together spotlight the characters of King Henry IV and his son, Prince Hal. Throughout the four history plays which tell their story, Henry's and Hal's motives are continually called into question by other characters. Audiences and critics have also vigorously debated their motives. Are the two men political creatures ruled by self-interest, or by selfless interest in the state? Henry IV, Part Two clarifies that their actions proceed from necessity, but whose necessity, that of the Bolingbrokes, of England, or some combination thereof?

Henry IV speaks to this question as soon as he appears midway through the play, thus indicating its centrality. The scene begins with Henry's soliloquy on sleep, concluding with the well-known words, "Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown" (3.1.31). Although few drama critics have analyzed this fascinating scene in which Henry IV states, truthfully or not, his motivation for assuming Richard II's crown, it is mentioned occasionally. Most productions focus on Henry's isolation and guilt in 3.1.

Typically, Hands attempted to pantomime this isolation. Hodgdon relates that Henry walked slowly downstage "along a tunnel of light" to speak the soliloquy. When Westmoreland and the others clustered around him "in a wedge-like

formation" later in the scene, he moved away. Finally, everyone bowed and exited, leaving the King isolated once more as he spoke his final line, "We would, dear lords, unto the Holy Land" (3.1.108) to listeners who had vanished (Hodgdon 74). This focus on Henry's isolation and introspection failed to clarify the issue of Henry's motives; the isolation said, rather, that Henry's motives were private and unknowable.

While Patrick Stewart's businesslike Henry IV attempted more aggressively to isolate himself, director Nunn's onstage watchers belied Henry's brusque self-containment, suggesting wordlessly that no one can ever be truly alone or even unobserved, although the King did retreat without them to "the darkest corner of the chamber" to speak his soliloquy (Hodgdon 112). As soon as Warwick and Surrey entered, however, the King resumed poring over his business correspondence. Hodgdon notes that he "only grudgingly" responded to the others, "as though determined to bear the kingdom's cares alone" (112).

Henry's costume, a white tunic buttoned to the neck over black trousers tucked into black boots (Wharton 49), and his characteristic habit of busying himself obsessively with stacks of papers, both conveyed the extreme degree of his emotional rigidity, characterizing him, in the words of Nicholas Shrimpton, as "an austere civil servant with religious qualms" (153). These suggestions of austerity and compulsive care for the state hint at a penitential Henry, a

reformed Henry who has assumed some burden of guilt for his actions in the past and seeks now to atone for them through good government. Nunn sketched a Henry IV who has been motivated formerly by his own needs but who is now motivated by the needs of his kingdom. This interpretation failed to show any of the magnetism of Henry Bolingbroke, a manner Richard II described as

> . . . his courtship to the common people,
> How he did seem to dive into their hearts
> With humble and familiar courtesy,
> What reverence he did throw away on slaves,
> Wooing poor craftsmen with the craft of smiles
> And patient underbearing of his fortune,
> As 'twere to banish their affects with him.
> (Richard II, 1.4.24-30)

Even allowing for the effects of age and disillusionment, a good Henry IV should still contain some hint of this former glory.

Harry Andrews, the 1951 monarch, displayed much more than a hint of this majesty. Although little information can be found about the staging of this particular scene, critics raved about his King Harry's "leonine head," "flashing eye," and "finely controlled dramatic power" (qtd. in Hodgdon 35). Granted that these gushing adjectives may have been partly a function of England's need for national affirmation at the time, Andrews still must have portrayed a particularly regal monarch.

Welles' 1965 Chimes at Midnight depicted another regal and isolated Henry IV, one without the distractions of pantomime, on-stage watchers, or paper shuffling found in other productions. Jack Jorgens describes Gielgud in the scene:

> Sick, sleepless, and alone, he looks out a castle window with the shadow of a bar across his face, musing at 'how many thousand of my poorest subjects are at this hour asleep.' Gentle strains of cello, harp, and oboe sound in the background. The King's isolation is emphasized by long shots which imprison him with massive pillars . . . . (120)

Welles allowed the King his privacy; he also allowed his audience the luxury of deciding for themselves what they thought about Henry and the necessity behind his actions. Nevertheless, the symbolism of a Henry imprisoned by pillars and shadows of bars suggested a Henry who was suffering from some degree of guilt; whatever this king's motives in Henry IV, Part Two, whether those of the state's necessity or his own, Welles whispered that at some time in the past this Henry had been guilty of self-interest. Sadly, this sensitive portrayal was wasted on Chimes, which Welles intended from the first to focus on Falstaff.

Unlike these other characterizations, Jon Finch's BBC Henry, who seemed anything but regal, did not allow the audience to speculate on anything. Wild-eyed and fidgety,

dressed in a white nightgown, his hands wrapped in bulky white bandages or mitts and crossed over his chest, his face encrusted with sores, he looked peevish and ill. (The BBC production can never be accused of overlooking the theme of sickness.) In the midst of the soliloquy, Henry shouted, "O thou dull god" (3.1.15) with such theatrical vehemence that the viewer must be filled with distaste at a king who so lacked dignity.

Presuming that Finch and director Giles chose to overtheatricalize Henry's soliloquy (rather than presuming that the performance resulted from poor acting and poor directing), an audience must see Henry as an actor-king, a man so accustomed to posturing that his statements and motives remained doubtful even when he was alone. Later in the scene, when Henry spoke of his motives in taking the throne, he disclaimed, ". . . God *knows*, I had no such intent / But that necessity so bowed the state / That I and greatness were compelled to kiss . . . [emphasis spoken]" (3.1.72-74). Finch proclaimed England's necessity as his only motivation so over-vigorously that the audience could be allowed little thought in the matter: few could believe this king's motives were genuine. As Hodgdon points out, even Warwick's "impatience and embarrassment" at Henry's "self-indulgent mannerisms" served to lead the audience to such an interpretation (50). This Henry, all outer surface and no inner substance, gave one of the most distasteful performances of all.

Eric Porter, in the 1964 RSC production, also played an extremely ill Henry IV, yet Wharton characterizes his Henry as "dignified--even graceful--in movement and voice," with eyes "haunted by the past. At times, with a characteristic gesture of raising his hands, he seemed to be trying to ward off his ghosts" (433). He wore a plain monkish robe, belted with a rope. Again, the production depicted a Henry haunted by past guilt, a penitential Henry who perhaps may have forsaken self-interest to live for the good of the state. What made Porter's interpretation superior to Stewart's was his dignity and grace, reminders of a Bolingbroke who once "was reputed then / In England the most valiant gentleman" (4.1.131-2).

In most modern productions, then, this scene at least implies Henry's past guilt, his guilty motive of self-interest in obtaining Richard's crown. Portrayals of Henry differ, however, as to whether he currently acts from personal or public necessity. The symbolically penitential Patrick Stewart and Eric Porter Henrys suggested a man motivated by England's needs, while Jon Finch's Henry led to the opposite stance of Henry as a self-motivated actor, a liar. The other versions failed to verify Henry's present definition of necessity in this scene, by presenting an isolated, unknowable Henry. Nevertheless, this option replicates the experience of reading Shakespeare most closely, for the dramatist himself provides few guidelines for determining Henry's degree of guilt.[1] Of them all, Sir

John Gielgud's and Harry Andrews' reserved, yet regal Henrys seemed most appropriate for the scene.

Did Henry act from self-interest when he assumed Richard's crown? Surely, at least in part, he did, yet he points out repeatedly that this action was thrust upon him as necessary for the state's health. In this play, the audience sees both king and country diseased, the country torn apart by civil war and struggling with corruption at all levels of society, while the king suffers and dies from an unspecified illness. Obviously, something has gone wrong, for Henry's coronation did not heal England's sickness.

The audience must wonder whether Henry has always acted in the best interests of the state, or whether he has acted according to personal desires, or some combination of both. Most audiences and scholars of Part Two interpret Henry's sleeplessness, his illness, and his isolation as signs that Henry suffers some degree of guilt for assuming the crown, whether this guilt results from Henry's selfish motives, or whether it proceeds from the realization that England has not prospered under his rule. Should they not also conclude that a man who repents guiltily seeks to change, that whatever his past motives, such a Henry must now be acting for the good of the state rather than himself?

Just as interpretations of Henry diverge, stage portrayals of Hal differ widely. Some productions paint him as an innocent lad seeking a loving father in Falstaff to

replace the bitter, uninterested Henry IV. Some directors present him as a Machiavel, cold and manipulative, ruled by his own necessity, a desire for power. However, like many of Shakespeare's great characters, Hal remains an enigma. Prince Hal, like a living human being, refuses to be compartmentalized. Perhaps he does manipulate events to suit his own motives, and perhaps he does enjoy Falstaff's company--few critics would categorically deny either of these statements--yet surely he also possesses a deeper motive, a desire to be the great king who will reunite England. Hal's necessity, then, would be that of England.

Richard Burton's 1951 characterization of Hal leaned toward the Machiavel because he treated Falstaff with such reserve. Often unsmiling, Hal had to be lured into laughter by Falstaff even in Part One, and then the Prince seemed to be laughing at, rather than with, Sir John (Wilson 48-9). Kenneth Tynan describes Burton's Hal as a "still, brimming pool, running disturbingly deep" (112). Surprisingly, both Tynan and Seltzer describe this Hal as likeable (Seltzer 21-22).

Richard David suggests that from Burton's first entrance in Part One (the 1951 RSC production was presented in a cycle of Richard II, Parts One and Two of Henry IV, and Henry V), the directors sought to establish Hal's kingliness, because Redgrave and Quayle saw Hal as "the hero and the climax of the whole cycle" (131). In fact, this quality of Burton's performance was often cited, with one

cast member commenting, "He brings his cathedral on with him" (qtd. in Seltzer 21).

Thus, when Hal dragged down the stairs, dropping and retrieving his sword and then throwing a boot at the snoring Falstaff, the audience should have perceived in him a "brooding, disillusioned" mood that reflected more than physical tiredness (David 130, 136). Richard Burton's Hal did not enjoy the tavern world.

Apparently, this unsmiling Hal disliked Falstaff and merely used his relationship with Falstaff according to the infamous master plan Hal outlines in Part One, as a foil by which Hal's future redemption may shine the brighter. Many scholars consider Hal's first scene in Part Two to be Shakespeare's restatement of the Prince's plan. "Before God, I am exceeding weary" are Hal's first words (2.2.1). As he and Poins speak lazily together, he reveals that his weariness rests with his present life. The Prince tells Poins:

> By this hand, thou thinkest me as far in the devil's book as thou and Falstaff for obduracy and persistency. Let the end try the man. But I tell thee, my heart bleeds inwardly that my father is so sick. And keeping such vile company as thou art hath in reason taken from me all ostentation of sorrow. (2.2.42-47)

When Poins does not understand this statement, Hal asks Poins what he would think if Hal "should weep" (2.2.49-50).

"I would think thee a most princely hypocrite," he replies (2.2.51).

Modern productions have interpreted this scene in various ways. If Hal is a cold-blooded Machiavel ruled by policy throughout both Henry IV, Part One and Part Two, a true hypocrite, then he grows weary in this scene of keeping up the pretense of enjoying his idle life with Falstaff. If Hal was an innocent young man seeking a surrogate father with Falstaff in Part One, as is often postulated, then this scene in Part Two indicates his growing maturity and desire for closeness with his true father. Yet if Hal is a clever young man who loves Falstaff but who also is using him in his plan to redeem himself and heal England under his kingship, then this scene indicates his restlessness to "get on with it," his growing impatience with the sham, and his honest desire to be with his ill father.

Modern directors have split their interpretations of Hal between the two extremes of cold, Machiavellian self-interest and youthful innocence maturing into the harsh demands of kingship, even though Shakespeare suggests in both plays that the royals live by necessity and that Hal has made a conscious choice to do what is necessary for England's good, despite his genuine love for Falstaff. In the end, Falstaff remains the difficulty with modern interpretations of Hal, for even the most Machiavellian Hal cannot fail to convey at least some of the affection Hal shows for Falstaff in the text.

In Hal's first appearance of Part Two of the 1951 production, he symbolically changed clothing. Richard Burton entered in a dressing gown accompanied by Poins carrying his Shrewsbury clothing and donned new clothes, "something gay and *jeune premier*," as the preparation script notes (Hodgdon 32). By this simple action, the director conveyed a clear insight into Hal's plan, if not into the motives behind it. Had a more human Prince performed this action with a resigned sigh, this would have been an excellent bit of stage business.

Hal has revealed his princeliness at Shrewsbury in Part One with his defeat of Hotspur. Notably, he willingly--or at least, too easily--gave credit for Hotspur's death to Falstaff. This crucial action makes sense only because Hal's plan calls for him to redeem himself *when he becomes king*. He has acted honorably, as he promised his father, yet now he must once more conceal his quality by giving away the credit to Falstaff and by resuming his role of the disreputable roisterer--thus, the change of clothing.

Both the Welles film and Hands' 1975 production illustrated visually Hal's self-expressed weariness, also. Using a favorite technique of choosing a setting to reflect his characters' emotions, Welles placed a "weary, melancholy Hal and bitter, cynical Poins" beside a still pond (Jorgens 112-13),

Typically, Hands pantomimed Hal's emotional state through his stage entrance. The production's prompt copy

indicates that Hal wandered slowly from upstage right across to downstage left before speaking his line about weariness. This Hal of Alan Howard played moodily with a stick and, says Robert Cushman, "aims most of his speeches somewhere past his companion's right ear" (qtd. in Hodgdon 78-9).

Since Alan Howard portrayed an "emotionally regressive" Hal throughout most of Part One and Part Two (Wharton 48), Hal's melancholy in this scene depicted a step in an uncomfortable maturing process of growing beyond the fun of tavern life to the responsibilities of kingship, thus placing Hands' production squarely within the camp of those who see both parts of Henry IV as a *Bildungsroman* for Hal, an approach which ignores the significance of the "I know you all" (Henry IV, Part One, 1.2.189) soliloquy.

In contrast, the 1979 BBC version, as it often did, echoed the 1951 interpretation of Part Two, although it also startled the viewer with its original portrayal of a Poins who took offense at Hal's word play. Indeed, David Gwillim's Hal purposely wounded Poins with his words and with his attitude that Poins lay so far beneath him that his "friend's" feelings held no relevance. Not surprisingly, Gwillim's expressed worry over his father's illness seemed quite insincere. Wharton agrees that this Hal offered "a calculated insult" to Poins and that his laughter had "a scoffing quality" (70). In this scene, director Giles' Hal revealed quickly the cold Machiavel who would reject

Falstaff without a qualm, although later in the tavern scene, he seems to show Falstaff genuine affection.

Director Trevor Nunn's Hal, played by Gerard Murphy, was even less appealing than Gwillim's portrayal, for this Hal lacked intelligence. Smallwood describes him as "big, raw-boned and rather shambling, bare-chested, with a toothy grin and a mop of greasy blond hair . . ." (427). This Hal, characterized by Wharton as "a creature of impulse rather than of calculation" (74), lacked the cleverness to even entertain thoughts of policy or necessity. Even allowing for a *Bildungsroman* interpretation of the play, no viewer could imagine such a Prince acquiring the qualities apparent in the majestic Henry V.

Bogdanov's 1986 production came closest to presenting a Hal who functioned within both intellectual and emotional realms. According to Wells, Michael Pennington's Hal showed genuine affection to Falstaff in Part One (the plays were presented in a cycle of Henry IV, Part One, Henry IV, Part Two, and Henry V as The Henrys), while also exhibiting genuine intelligence ("Shakespeare Performances" 160, 162). Hodgdon describes the scene with Poins as follows:

> Hal first appeared--dressed in an open-necked red shirt, cricketing trousers and plimsolls--lounging on a couch and drinking beer from a bottle. Testy and bored, he used Poins as a whipping boy for his self-hatred, and Poins paced the room, snapping back at him. (139)

As Bardolph and the Page exited, Poins started to follow them. Pennington, with "schoolboy condescension" stopped him with the words, "Follow me, Ned" (2.2.169-70), (Hodgdon 139-40).

Pennington explains that he tried to portray a mixture of "chilly political clearsightedness with a wayward, unstable quality" (qtd. in Hodgdon 139). He says Hal "is wayward in emotion, too, in that he falls dangerously in love with the life [Falstaff and the tavern] that he has committed himself to leaving" (qtd. in Hodgdon 139). Some of these characteristics come through more clearly in Hal's other scenes. Despite the affection for Falstaff, Pennington's snappishness and emotional instability made his Prince rather unlikeable.

The tavern scene in Part Two fascinates drama critics because it contrasts so clearly with the great tavern scene in Part One when the plays are presented together, as they have been invariably in modern times.[2] Leaving aside the question of a changed Falstaff for the moment, the drama critic frequently examines the relationship between Falstaff and Hal. Most modern critics agree that for the plays to succeed in a cycle--that is, for the rejection scene to be believable--Hal and Falstaff must grow apart. As they share only the tavern scene (2.4) before Falstaff's rejection, this scene provides the sole opportunity in Part Two to illustrate their estrangement.

McLaverty points out that since the fabulous tavern scene of Part One (2.4), the relationship between Hal and Falstaff has lost "shared life, ease of communication, the intimacy which makes abuse innocuous" (108). In Part Two, for example, the audience first encounters Hal in his house rather than at the tavern, Falstaff communicates with Hal by letter, and Hal must ask Bardolph how Falstaff fares. When Hal and Falstaff do meet at the tavern, no great comic scene ensues. Various productions, of course, have treated Part Two's tavern meeting differently.

In Terry Hands' 1975 production, Alan Howard's Hal not only interrupted, but also in Peter Thomson's words, "wantonly vilifies" the sweet scene between Falstaff and Doll Tearsheet (154). Thomson describes Hal "resisting a lust for Doll only because of his greater delight in destroying Falstaff's finest moment" (154-55). In a production with such creative staging, Alan Howard himself is vilified repeatedly by the critics for his completely unsympathetic portrayal of the Prince here.

Both Thomson (154) and Hodgdon (76) find another element of this scene disturbing. Hands created a parallel between Falstaff's, "Peace, good Doll, do not speak like a death's-head, do not bid me remember mine end" (2.4.232-33)and King Henry's death by having Alan Howard silently observe both episodes "with sinister relish" (Thomson 155; Hodgdon 76). During the tavern scene, Hal "crouched above him [Falstaff], watching from behind red curtains painted

with a Boar's Head" (Hodgdon 76), while during the crown scene the Prince, "framed by the guillotine-like structure of his dying father's bed, looked down from behind the crown at the King he believed to be dead" (Thomson 155). Given Hands' propensity for expressing ideas visually, these scenes suggested that Hal hated both his "fathers," Henry and Falstaff. Hands' characterization of Henry IV, Part Two as a play in which "sons replace fathers" and his assertion that Hal is "placed between the self-denial of his father and the self-indulgence of Falstaff" (Hayman, qtd. in Hodgdon 77) further support this disagreeable interpretation.

David Gwillim portrayed a kinder, if not overly affectionate, Hal in the 1979 BBC tavern scene, despite his Machiavellian beginning. He, Poins, and all the company joked like friends, although Hodgdon notes that throughout the tender dialogue between Falstaff and Doll, the camera cut in with shots of Hal and Poins which registered their "mocking voyeurism" (57).

In the text, Falstaff obviously feels an estrangement. As many critics have pointed out, he offers no outrageous tale this time when the Prince challenges him, "You whoreson candle-mine you, how vilely did you speak of me even now before this honest, virtuous, civil gentlewoman!" (2.4.299-301). In keeping with this idea, Gwillim's Hal controlled this tavern scene, rather than Falstaff, and Falstaff seemed

nervous as he asserted, "No abuse, Hal, o' mine honor, no abuse" (2.4.312).

If Falstaff and the tavern represent carnival or disorder, as C. L. Barber suggests, Hal clearly began to move toward the order of the royal party in Giles' BBC version of this scene, for Hal too obviously sprang to life when Peto arrived with his news. Nevertheless, Gwillim's Hal made a special effort to turn toward Falstaff and tell him goodnight as he hurried out. Growing away from Falstaff as he may have been, this Hal still displayed some affection in this well-played scene.

Wharton describes Gerard Murphy's 1982 Hal as impulsive, childish, often ill-tempered at his "life of waste" and taking this dissatisfaction out on Falstaff and others in Part One. Alternately, this Hal showed much spontaneous physical affection toward the fat knight, sometimes hugging him or even wrestling with him (Wharton 74-5). Murphy acted much the same in Part Two, alternately snarling at Falstaff and hugging him.

In Nunn's 1982 production, he scattered extras throughout his multi-leveled set so that the tavern, especially, carried a sense of bustling life going on around the center action; this also created a typical late twentieth-century milieu of anonymous observers overseeing political and social events.

According to Hodgdon, into this setting a violent Pistol exploded, setting off a three-level chase which

Bardolph, Francis and the two drawers, extras, and even Hal and Poins joined. After Pistol was routed, Hal and Poins hid under the bed covers; when they revealed themselves, Falstaff was so startled that he stood up and let Doll slide onto the floor. Murphy's Hal responded to Doll's open invitation at this point, joining her on the bed and leaving her alone only when Falstaff warned him authoritatively with "His grace says that which his flesh rebels against" (2.4.349-50), (Hodgdon 107-108). Despite this flash of temper, Hal still parted with Falstaff by gently kissing him on the cheek (Wharton 75).

In this production, Nunn treated his audience--rather in defiance of the text--to a brawling tavern scene comparable to those in Part One. Despite the entertainment value, the scene failed to illustrate any change in the relationship of Hal and Falstaff. Unlike Gwillim's Hal, who was growing away from Falstaff in the tavern scene and who would reject him at least partly because Hal's role as redeemer-king demanded it, Murphy's Hal never resolved his love/hate relationship with Falstaff. Hal's resentment continued even as his unthinking submission to Falstaff as a father figure did. Like Alan Howard's Hal, leering down at Falstaff from behind the curtains, Murphy's Hal revealed an antagonism toward Falstaff which would find its ultimate expression in the rejection scene. Naturally, these suggestions of personal motives for Falstaff's rejection

must fail to convince the viewer who believes Hal rejects a Falstaff he loves, for England's good.

In contrast to these two scenes, Bogdanov's 1986 Part Two presented a changed Hal in the tavern episode. When the Prince revealed himself, his attempts to banter with Falstaff fell flat, so that Falstaff rescued him from an awkward pause with his "No abuse, Hal" (2.4.312), (Hodgdon 140). Falstaff still reigned as the master of his world in this version, yet Hal had grown beyond it. When Peto arrived with his news from court, Hodgdon relates that Hal tore off his apron disguise and rushed away, tossing the words, "Falstaff, good night" (2.4.365) over his shoulder as an afterthought (140). Pennington's Hal had clearly moved away from the friendly, disordered tavern world to the rigid, ordered existence looming ahead of him, so much so that he could no longer trade insults easily with Falstaff or even take the time to bid him an affectionate good night. This scene illustrated the growing distance between Hal and Falstaff most believably.

Oddly, after Hal rushes out of the tavern, Shakespeare has him stroll, joking, into the tense palace scene where Henry has collapsed. The explanation? Hal has remembered his role as the idle roisterer after too-clearly revealing his true feelings in the dash from the tavern. As at Shrewsbury, when he gave away the honor he won from Hotspur, the Prince must continue to hide behind his mask so that he may amaze the nation when he redeems himself as king.

The crown scene (4.5) remains the testing ground for all the various interpretations of Hal and Henry IV. As King Henry lies dying, Hal's mask slips away once again; he takes the crown, and then present and future kings reconcile as the crown passes stormily from one to the other.

Critics differ wildly, however, as to what Hal actually reveals, as do modern productions of the drama. Some portray an innocent Prince coming of age, learning to love the father he has hated; some present the Machiavel in his finest moment, at last acquiring what he has desired all along; but some at least hint at a Prince taking the crown he has both prepared for and dreaded, a Prince who has forsaken and hurt the father he loves so that he can become the king he must be for England's sake.

In the 1951 cycle, which began with Richard II and concluded with Henry V, Henry IV drew all the critical attention in the crown scene. Critics raved about Harry Andrews in phrases such as, "Seldom has approaching death been done with grimmer sincerity, till failing strength has quenched even the flashing eye" (Manchester Guardian, qtd. in Hodgdon 35). At least in this nationalistic production, which struggled to place even Prince John in a sympathetic light, no one wrestled with the idea of Henry IV's guilt.

In fact, the director prepared the mood carefully as the scene began. King Henry entered in a procession of standard bearers, crown and scepter bearers, various attendants, and soft music. Monks appeared onstage as a

clock chimed (Hodgdon 36). The setting spoke of an honored king whose illness and imminent death was being mourned.

The prompt copy of the script shows marked stresses of Henry's bitter lines to Hal about the crown and of those focusing on the legitimacy of the Bolingbrokes' claim to kingship, as well as Henry's dramatic climax:

> O my son,
> God put it in thy mind to take it hence,
> That thou mightst win the more thy father's love,
> Pleading so wisely in excuse of it! (4.5.177-80),
> (Hodgdon 36)

The only critical mention of Richard Burton in this crown scene records merely Hal's "quiet dignity and sense of feeling" (Birmingham Mail, qtd. in Hodgdon 35). Apparently, the scene was effective in showing both Henry's dying majesty and Hal's mature acceptance of kingship.

At the other end of the spectrum, Wharton's description of the "self-containment and control" of Ian Holm's 1964 Hal sounds suspiciously close to the Machiavel extreme. When he took the crown and placed it on his head, his face remained impassive, and he moved forward "staring into space like a sleepwalker." Clenching his father's hand during the crown scene, he choked up with tears, but he held them back, and when he heard his brothers returning, he stood up so that they wouldn't see him "in his father's arms" (68). Few crown scenes have been played with such repressed emotion,

and Hal's concealing his grief from his brothers seems pointless.

Hal was more human in the 1979 BBC version. He came in joking, stopped as if stunned at Clarence's look, and asked, "How doth the King?" (4.5.10) in a breathless voice, rushing in to give Henry his good news without stopping to hear that the King already knew it. He appeared shocked to find Henry so ill.

At seeing the crown, which the King had not worn at all in this production, Hal smiled and said, "Sleep with it now . . ." (4.5.25). In a moment, raising his voice in alarm, Hal shook his father, looking out to the chamber where the others waited, and then wept as he began, "Thy due from me / Is tears and heavy sorrows of the blood . . ." (4.5.37-8). Then, leaning forward to kiss his father, Hal's eyes fixed on the crown. He took Henry's hand and lay it back down, and then, speaking of "lineal honor" (4.5.46) to Henry's still form, he walked away with the crown.

Although Wharton describes Hal lifting the crown "reverently, wonderingly, to his own head, his voice trembling with feeling" and protests that Hal forgot the kiss to his father (53), Gwillim actually struck just the right note of true grief mixed with a knowledge of his imminent destiny in this segment. Obsessed with his future kingship as he has always been, Hal would naturally focus on his new responsibilities once his father was (he thought) dead.

Jon Finch's Henry, however, came across as vituperative rather than angry or heartbroken. Energized, Finch sprang from the bed and shouted for the others. Hal leapt back into the room and then stood with bowed head as Henry spit out his bitter accusations, looking up briefly when Henry exclaimed, "Thy life did manifest thou lovedst me not . . ." (4.5.104). As Henry concluded, he tried to put the crown back on Hal's head (the camera had not shown Hal giving it back), but Hal either knelt or was pushed down by Henry.

Hal's sincerity as he explained to his father how he had taken the crown melted Henry's heart, and they sat in the floor together until Henry began coughing and choking at the words "the former days" (4.5.215). Hal wept again as he began speaking "My gracious liege" (4.5.220). Although to Wharton their emotion seemed unnatural, centered only on their "shared obsession," the crown (54), Hal appeared rather as a loving son truly grieving for his dying father.

Chimes depicts a similar Hal. In its crown scene, Hal helped Henry to the throne after Henry awakened and bitterly accused Hal of desiring his death (Jorgens 271). Welles highlighted the themes of guilt and penitence by having Gielgud's Henry IV, enthroned, speak of his acquisition of the crown and of the resulting turmoil in England, while Gregorian chants sounded in the background. Borrowing a line from the accession scene, Welles ended with Hal holding high the crown while proclaiming, "Now call we our high [court of] parliament" (5.2.134) in "ringing tones" (120).

Keith Baxter's Hal cast off any personal grief and assumed sovereignty of manner immediately, as easily as if it had been handed over intact with the crown.

Jorgens relates that Welles showed Hal had succeeded his father in both name and spirit with two camera shots: the first showed him "distant as his father always was, undefined in the smoke and sunlight," and the second showed Henry V in the foreground with Henry IV lying dead in the background (121). By visually portraying Hal in the same manner as Henry, and by aurally signifying Henry's guilt and penitence with the Gregorian chants, Welles foreshadowed the regal Henry V and made his rejection of Falstaff inevitable.

Welles' version of the Prince--despite its very limited focus on him as compared to Falstaff--comes close to the ideal of a Hal who has forsaken the father he loves so as to play the roisterer and redeem himself when the time is ripe. In the process he discovers a substitute father whom he also loves and must forsake. This ideal Hal places the good of England above all and accepts his sovereignty easily because he has long prepared for it. Welles himself supported this interpretation in an interview, when he claimed, "The relationship between Falstaff and the prince is not a simple comic relationship . . . but always a preparation for the end" (qtd. in Crowl 41).

In contrast to the relative dignity of Welles' episode, Hands' 1975 crown scene stunned the audience with its manic intensity. The disturbing instance of Hal leering down at

his father's bed must have preceded Alan Howard's placing of the crown on his head, for when he did, he was transformed. Billington, in the Guardian, comments:

> [Hal] makes something deeply thrilling of the scene at Westminster, where he first tries on the crown, blinking and squinnying like someone pitched into a room full of light and allowing his voice to acquire a note of iron as he entertains the thought of kingship. Gone is the cliche notion of Hal as the cold-hearted schemer; instead we have a complex man educating himself for monarchy. (qtd. in Hodgdon 80)

Howard must have acted this scene beautifully, for the consensus among drama critics was that he matured into kingship the instant he placed the crown on his head.

As a foil to this instant maturity, Emrys James' King Henry catapulted into hysteria as soon as he awakened to find the crown on Hal's head. When the Prince returned it, Hodgdon relates that James hugged the crown to him until he proclaimed, "And bid the merry bells ring to thine ear / That thou art crowned . . ." (4.5.111-12), at which point he smashed the crown back onto Hal's head. Hal screamed--in protest, not in pain--and Henry pushed on by thrusting a golden bedspread around Hal's shoulders, leaping onto a chair to imitate a town crier, crawling on the floor as a wild dog, and howling in pain at the thought of an England "Peopled with wolves" (4.5.137) before collapsing onto the

bed (80-81). Even in his death, even in the manic guise of Emrys James, Henry moved quickly from his hurt at Hal's supposed hatred of him to his care for the kingdom.

Hal's fictionalized crown story, which comes next, can be explained as a Machiavellian manipulation of his father, as a means to calm him down, as Hal's true feelings dressed up in appropriate words, or as a combination of any or all of these ideas. Richard David believes the moment as enacted by Howard sincere, a brief pause for Hal between his roles of "wanton prince" and "hero king" (qtd. in Hodgdon 81). This implies, however, that Hal *acted* the part of the rakish prince before this scene; other critics found no such sophistication in Howard's interpretation.

At any rate, Henry and Hal embraced lovingly as the Prince finished explaining and placed the crown on the floor. James collapsed to his knees in prayer at the words, "How I came by the crown, O God forgive" (4.5.218) (Hodgdon 81), repenting finally of at least some degree of guilt. Hands emphasized the emotional father/son reunion by lopping off the entrance of Warwick and the others; instead, Hal helped his father up and carried him out (Wharton 49).

In this production, the crown scene electrified the audience with its raw emotion. A thunderbolt in the form of the crown struck Hal and shocked him into a knowledge of his royal duty. King Henry raged around the room and raved about his wayward son and his doomed kingdom before succumbing to this new, earnest Hal and fading away toward

death. Emotionally moving as this scene may have been, however, such an abrupt change in Hal jolts the viewer too much and strains credibility. Further, Emrys James' King Henry, whose motivation had seemed unknowable in 3.1, completely lost control in this scene with unbelievable theatrics nowhere indicated in the text.

In Nunn's 1982 production, Smallwood finds in Hal "a somewhat bored submission" to his reconciliation with Henry and to "the inexorable doom of kingly power" (427). Other critics disagree. Wharton describes this crown scene as another example of a Hal suddenly growing up. Murphy's Hal exploded with grief, "his nose blocked and his voice choked with tears, knuckles in his eyes, his whole body shaking with sobs" (51). Sturdily built, Murphy had exhibited a range of "loutish, awkward" mannerisms up to this time, but after the crown scene these disappeared (52). Nunn's interpretation differed from Hands' in terms of what caused Hal to mature suddenly: in Hands' production, the crown changed the Prince, while the King's death affected Hal in the 1982 drama--a great improvement.

Oddly, Hal discovered his love for his father in Nunn's production amid Patrick Stewart's especially harsh portrayal of Henry IV. Wharton records that the King spoke to Hal with "violent sarcasm" and listened to Hal's explanation of why Hal took the crown with his face turned away and "a sardonic grimace of a smile." Only when Stewart cried, "O

my son," (4.5.177) and embraced Hal did Henry reveal his love for the Prince (51).

Hodgdon agrees that the focus in Nunn's production was not on the crown but on the father/son relationship. Unlike other Hals, Murphy displayed no fascination for the crown. This Hal "jammed" the crown angrily onto his head, where it did not fit (114). When Henry shared his last advice on kingship, the Prince, immersed in grief, "seemed hardly to hear" (Wharton 51). Nunn's production presented too little; Hal matured as a man, but did not reveal his fitness to rule a kingdom.

In contrast, the focus returned to the crown in Bogdanov's 1986 production. Crowl describes a Hal filled with "uncertainty and feelings of reduced stature" when he was with his father (153). As in the BBC version, Henry IV had never appeared with the crown in Part Two. Even more than in Giles' scene, the crown captivated Hal. Hodgdon recalls the moment:

> He reached avidly for the crown and, rising slowly, set it on his head; as though gazing into a mirror, he enjoyed the mantle of power and, hypnotised by the crown and his own image, left the room like one in a trance." (140)

Reviewers scarcely mention the King here, most likely because critical attention has shifted gradually from Henry to Hal since the 1951 production.

Like Gwillim's Hal in the BBC production, Pennington's grief for his father's death did not diminish because of his fascination with the crown. Hodgdon relates that Henry's insults moved Hal to tears and that when his father summoned him to sit beside him, he "curled into his father's body, both to seek its comfort and to lend his own strength to the dying man" (140). Pennington, like Gwillim, evoked that intriguing mixture of warm man and cold monarch that has fascinated Shakespeare's audiences and readers for several centuries.

In summary, the various productions characterize themselves by their depictions of Hal and his motives. The least appropriate Hals were those immature young men who drifted along in an idle tavern life with no plan. The 1982 Prince, Gerard Murphy, fit into this category. His Hal lacked intelligence and maturity. He had a poor relationship with his father, but also a love/hate response to Falstaff, which eliminated any excuse for his roistering. In the crown scene, when he matured suddenly due to his father's death, he displayed no fascination for the crown, thus indicating his lack of enthusiasm for kingship. His father--played by Patrick Stewart as one of the more penitential Henrys and a cold, businesslike monarch--was disagreeable, as well. Although the recognition of past guilt was acceptable, the King lacked any hint of the magnetism he once possessed.

In the 1975 production, Alan Howard also portrayed an immature Hal, although his Prince gradually grew up during the play. In an especially disturbing interpretation, this Hal, who apparently detested both "fathers," was brought to manhood by the experience of wearing the crown rather than by Henry's death. However, that Emrys James' manic crown scene appalled Hal can hardly be faulted. With his complete lack of dignity, he was one of the worst King Henrys.

The Machiavel, a Hal who has planned ahead toward his kingship and does not care whom he hurts in the process, defines another category of Princes. Richard Burton's 1951 Hal fit into this class simply because of his innate majesty mixed with extreme coldness toward Falstaff. Any Prince who would so clearly use a man's friendship for his own ends must be a Machiavel. (Of course, Burton's reception was also aided by Quayle's unlikeable Falstaff, as will become evident below.) Nevertheless, Burton's father, Harry Andrews, depicted one of the better King Henrys, a regal monarch whom the audience adored.

Ian Holm also portrayed a Machiavellian Prince in 1964, one who repressed all emotion other than a fleeting display of grief in the crown scene, a scene where his fascination with the crown revealed his motives very clearly. Eric Porter played his father well--as a very ill, penitential Henry who possessed great majesty.

In the 1986-89 touring version, Michael Pennington interpreted Hal closer to the ideal, as a Prince who felt a

genuine affection for Falstaff despite his plan of redemption. This Hal exhibited grief in the crown scene, but a grief mixed with a fascination for the crown. Unfortunately, as indicated below, Pennington rejected Falstaff so unfeelingly that he placed himself finally in the category of Princes who care only about their personal necessity.

Chimes' Keith Baxter balanced his Hal well between the extremes of a Machiavellian Hal and a Hal with no plan, for his Hal was clearly weary of the pretense of enjoying tavern life but displayed a genuine affection for Falstaff. Played by Sir John Gielgud, Henry IV also exhibited the appropriate interpretation of a suggestion of guilt mixed with innate dignity. Had these two fine actors been allowed to exploit their full range in the actual Shakespearean drama, instead of in Welles' Falstaff-oriented melange of scenes from various plays in the cycle, they would doubtless have presented definitive characterizations of both roles.

The final Hal, BBC's David Gwillim, depicted a human Hal, one who felt affection for Falstaff, impatience with his own role-playing, grief for his father, and fascination for the crown. His motives came close to the ideal mix of his own necessity and England's. Sadly, his portrayal came opposite that of Jon Finch--a theatrical, vituperative Henry IV--and it occurred in an unimaginative production poor in almost every other respect.

The ideal characterizations of Hal and Henry IV in the same staging of the drama have yet to happen in this century. Meanwhile, the crown scene does not end Hal's story, of course, although it completes the tale of Henry IV's reign, a tale filled with illness of both king and state, with cold necessity and policy, with penitence and grief and a war-filled search for peace and order. In a way, Henry IV's saga still does not end, for in the accession scene, as the new Henry V tells the Lord Chief Justice, "You shall be as a father to my youth" (5.2.118), Henry V espouses the forces of order and justice and vows to continue his father's struggle to bring order to the state.

Henry V's greatest proving ground, his final meeting with Falstaff, must properly wait for a discussion of the fat knight himself; however, the crown scene is the more important of Hal's episodes, because Hal's character development there determines how he will act in the final scene.

Notes

[1] Of course, Shakespeare's failure to commit to Henry IV's guilt may also have been a function of his own dilemma, similar to that of Hal and Henry, of needing to negotiate between his public necessity of truthful drama and his private necessity of self-preservation. Elizabeth I would have thoroughly quashed any overt suggestion of the earlier monarch's wrongdoing.

[2] The plays originally were performed close enough together for the contrast to be obvious, as well, in 1597 and 1598, especially since Falstaff was apparently an extremely popular character from the start.

Chapter Three

Falstaff

And what of the self-described "sweet Jack Falstaff, kind Jack Falstaff, true Jack Falstaff, valiant Jack Falstaff" (Part One, 2.4.470-71)? In Falstaff's play-acting in Part One, he says, ". . . banish plump Jack, and banish all the world" (2.24.474-5), and audiences since Shakespeare's own time have mourned that the new Henry V does just that.

Falstaff's endearing humanity, with his love of simple comforts and his irrepressible merry-making, appeals to the rogue in nearly everyone. The love affair with Falstaff does not apply to every audience or every critic, of course, but a majority of both will certainly cite the fat knight as one of Shakespeare's most inventive, vivid creations, a character who takes on life so thoroughly that scholars often find themselves discussing him as if he were a genuine personality.

In modern productions, Falstaff continues to be a character who will not be ignored, for his interpretation onstage determines to a large extent how the audience will accept Henry V. Obviously, the more the audience's sympathy rests with Falstaff, the more outraged they will be at his rejection. This presents a real problem for those directors who intend to follow Part Two with a Henry V hero-king.

Some modern directors have attempted to solve this dilemma in a way that Shakespeare's text does not, by

weighting the audience's loyalty toward Hal through a deliberate intensification of Falstaff's worst qualities or even by presenting a Falstaff who wears a mask, who only pretends to love Hal and to be an amiable clown. This trend has gained impetus through the common practice of staging Parts One and Two of Henry IV together, often with Henry V and Richard II included. Directors often decide to downplay Falstaff's genial qualities, even in Part One, so that his banishment in Part Two will not jar an audience who must see Hal as the hero of Henry V.

Certainly, a decaying of Falstaff's good qualities may be part of the general decline of England's health in Part Two; he, too, lives by his own necessity. Nevertheless, portraying the Falstaff of Part One especially, a play with very different concerns than Part Two, as a character living behind a mask, a character basically who deserves to be banished, will not do. If the playwright did not embellish his text to single out Hal, Falstaff, Henry IV, or even Richard II as a villain, modern directors must give their audiences the same right to decide for themselves whether Falstaff deserves to be banished or whether instead he is simply an unwitting victim of Hal's--and England's--necessity.

The 1951 production especially fell prey to an anti-Falstaff bias. Still reeling economically and esteem-wise from World War II, England needed an epic saga which linked the glorious past of Henry V to its own present, and the RSC

presented this nationalistic tonic in its cycle of Richard II, Henry IV Parts One and Two, and Henry V. Falstaff must remain incidental in Stratford-upon-Avon in such a time, for Britain sought a warrior-hero.

Anthony Quayle served as the overall director of the plays in 1951, with Michael Redgrave directing Henry IV, Part Two. Playing Falstaff as well, Quayle spurned a tempting opportunity to center the plays around the portly comedian. Instead, he chose to point the audience's sympathy toward Hal.

The reviews illuminate Quayle's approach. Oscar Wilde describes Falstaff as "over-padded and over-painted," clumsy in movements with an "elegantly unctuous" voice (qtd. in David 136). Supporting the physical description, photographs reveal a ridiculously rotund caricature with bushy white upswept brows, white hair puffed out on either side of the head with sideburns and an upstanding forelock, and an improbable nose. Black and white photographs fail to emphasize another favorite target of critics, Falstaff's garish red and white make-up, which Hodgdon links to Rumor's make-up and Northumberland's stark white face, and thus to "artificiality and disguise" (27).

The motivation for Falstaff's outlandish appearance remains unclear, yet it does suggest other interpretations, as well as Hodgdon's: first, simply a desire to alienate the audience from such a bizarre creature; second, an emphasis on Falstaff as a formal clown, an interpretation which seems

doubtful in light of various critical commentary; and finally, a connection to the themes of sickness and age, along with the characters of Northumberland and Henry IV.

Reviewer Robert Speaight's comments support the idea that Quayle meant his Falstaff to alienate the audience. He says that although Falstaff was still comic, the audience saw him as "a gigantic excrescence on the surface of the plays, the sign of Shakespeare's creative genius, the symbol of a genial and quite intolerable anarchy" (qtd. in Wilson and Worsley 89-90). The RSC's 1951 Falstaff needed to be rejected.

Falstaff first entered in scene 1.2, amid a market distilled out of an idealized English past, at the same moment as an apprentice carried in a huge side of beef. While such visual comedy amused the audience, Hodgdon notes that the scene emphasized Falstaff's sexuality and his old age, with the knight attempting to hobble after a prostitute while he told his page, "Thou whoreson mandrake, thou are fitter to be worn in my cap than to wait at my heels" (1.2.14-16). Also, the stage lights dimmed symbolically on a brothel when near the scene's end the Lord Chief Justice told Falstaff he was old (Hodgdon 30).

In any production, this scene's importance consists of illustrating not only the antipathy between Falstaff and the Lord Chief Justice (thus setting up the thematic conflict between order and disorder) but also the essence of Falstaff's character. In this case, Falstaff exhibits a

rather unsavory personality as evidenced by his appearance and the added stage business with the prostitute.

Tellingly, theatrical reviews made little of the tavern scene in this production, focusing attention on Harry Anderson's portrayal of Henry IV's "haunted old age" instead (Beauman 207). A Times critique of May 9, 1951, however, points out that Falstaff takes scant pleasure in his clowning, for "there is always a shifty and calculating look in his eye, and he is never certain of his hold on the prince" (qtd. in Hodgdon 33). This Falstaff uses wit as a commodity to tie Hal to him, a commodity motivated by his own necessity, which is simply to obtain the creature comforts he needs to live.

Likewise, reviewers largely ignored Falstaff's part in the scene with the recruits or the Gloucestershire episodes, instead expressing delight with Alan Badel's Shallow, "the shadow of all senile vanity, pomp strutting in an eel skin" (The Observer, qtd. in Wilson and Worsley 77).

The importance of the Gloucestershire scenes rests partly in their parallels with the main plot, with the portrayal of the other England, the countryside which malingers like London under an illness, a countryside which has also been ravaged by an atmosphere in which necessity rules. Further, Shallow's obsession with his own idealized past reflects the idea of England's own rosy past for which the rebels in the main plot yearn.

The recruits and Gloucestershire scenes also glow with sheer comedy, a necessary relief after the heartwringing crown scene, among others. Significantly, unlike many modern literary scholars, nearly every stage critic of every modern production recognizes the significance of the comic elements, for they fail rarely to mention the hilarity of Justice Shallow, at the very least.

Not surprisingly for this production, scene 5.5, frequently called the "rejection scene," shifted its focus to become Henry V's triumphant coronation scene, with one reviewer comparing it favorably with an authentic royal procession (qtd. in Hodgdon 39). Banners and bunting dressed the set, while rose petals rained down on the procession amid ringing bells. Hodgdon describes how Hal, flanked by the Lord Chief Justice on one side and Falstaff on the other, "stared straight ahead as he spoke the rejection, wearing the impartial mask of one who is neither man's son but, instead, their king" (39). The Evesham Journal critic, while describing "an overwhelming, bewildered sadness" in Falstaff, nevertheless avows that Hal, "whose true integrity as played by Richard Burton we have never doubted," held the audience's allegiance even as he rejected Falstaff (qtd. in Hodgdon 40).

Director Redgrave even supports Falstaff's rejection with program notes claiming the following points: 1) Hal has prepared the audience and Falstaff for the rejection, 2) Falstaff forces Hal to reject him publicly, 3) Hal

generously gives Falstaff a "competence for life," and 4) the rejection is necessary "in terms of kingship" (Hodgdon 23). The throne which remained downstage right throughout the entire cycle of plays further stressed Hal's kingship here, as attendants draped it with a new cover and placed Hal's banner, shield, and helmet there in lieu of the play's epilogue (Hodgdon 39-40). Apparently the great majority of 1951 audiences and critics alike accepted the rejection as regrettable but necessary, spurred by both the nationalistic spirit of the times and the cycle's emphasis on Henry V's mythical qualities. However, although Quayle's interpretation illuminated Falstaff's connection to the idea of necessity and stressed parallels with the main plot, he failed to make this Falstaff likeable. Hal's choice was too easy in 1951.

The 1979 BBC production came closest to the 1951 Henry IV, Part Two in terms of a pictorial visual presentation, while presenting quite a different focus on the play. For instance, where the 1951 Festival of Britain plays gloried in all the trappings of royalty, the BBC versions emphasized historical accuracy, with authentic-looking costumes, houses, and furniture. Thus, while Falstaff entered amid the bustle of an outdoor market in both productions, the older production painted a mythical "Merrie England" market, while the television version attempted to depict a historical English market.

According to Williams, producer Cedric Messina and his capitalist backers such as the Exxon Corporation aimed to present the entire canon of Shakespeare plays "complete and unabridged" and "to use the Peter Alexander text and take no liberties with it" (96). Messina also instructed his directors to do the plays naturalistically (Bulman 51).[1] Although critic Laurence Criston comments in the April 9, 1980, Los Angeles Times, "This is the worst kind of Shakespeare in its deadly reverence for the word and its mediocre response to the spirit" (Bulman and Coursen 258), the televised version still deserves consideration.

One point of interest, of course, is that Anthony Quayle reprised his role of Falstaff. Quayle had aged nearly thirty years in the interim, and his portrayal had matured as well. This Falstaff, red-nosed and pudgy, with his mumbly "humphs" and "humms" a notable holdover from the 1951 production, played to the crowd as a Falstaff should do. Not all critics enjoyed the performance, however. Mark Crispen Miller writes that Quayle's 1979 Falstaff "is one long coy wheeze . . . with a moist selection of respiratory sound effects" (Bulman and Coursen 262).

In the scene with the Lord Chief Justice, Falstaff manipulated him as an expert comic uses a straight man, taking advantage of every short line the severe, humorless Lord Justice fed him to play to his admiring "onstage" audience, and turning to them to "cue" their laughter (Wharton 62).

Wharton divides Falstaff portrayals into two classes, the lovable, sociable tavern-frequenter and the clever, self-serving man who puts on a lovable, social facade. Even claiming that this Falstaff falls into the second class, Wharton acknowledges that "his ruddy face and russet costume brought warmth into any scene he entered" (59, 62). Although Quayle's characterization did contain a measure of menace or control, he still managed to present the sociability as a genuine aspect of the knight's character. Quayle's 1979 Falstaff interested the audience because he exhibited the type of complexity which belongs to a real character, a Shakespearean quality which has appealed to readers and audiences for hundreds of years.

In the tavern scene, for instance, Quayle played a somewhat weary, age-worn man who had barely enough strength to fend off Pistol with a couple of sword strokes before he stood gasping wordlessly while Bardolph and the Page chased Pistol away. Seeming almost childlike in his need for reassurance, he settled down to his tender scene with Doll afterwards, but his age remained very much an issue after such a display of helplessness. As noted above, when Hal made his entrance in this scene, he immediately assumed control, and Falstaff's joking seemed half-hearted and rather wary.

Nevertheless, Falstaff had recovered enough by his next scene to manage the recruits "like an expert ringmaster" (Hodgdon 57), although he recognized his mortality again in

the scene when Shallow and he reminisced about their younger days. Replying to Shallow's inquiry about Jane Nightwork with, "Old, old, Master Shallow," (3.2.206), Falstaff spoke so regretfully that he clearly referred also to his own condition. Again, such an air of sadness surrounded him as he uttered, "We have heard the chimes at midnight, Master Shallow," (3.2.214-15) that his age seemed to double.

Then, Shallow and Silence departed, and Falstaff's mood shifted. Wharton would probably claim that Falstaff showed the true man behind the mask in this scene, but this viewer interpreted Quayle's portrayal as a man of mercurial moods. At any rate, with the camera pulling in closely to Falstaff for his final soliloquy, he almost jumped out of the television set as he spoke directly into the camera, and thus the audience's faces, with what Wharton characterizes as "a crafty leering expression" (58), "If the young dace be a bait for the old pike, I see no reason in the law of nature but I may snap at him," (3.2.328-30), and then followed this statement with a sudden predatory snap of his jaws.

Falstaff clearly illustrated an England where sickness has so invaded the kingdom that Falstaff himself, the very spirit of fun, of carnival, as Barber characterizes him, has grown ill and suffers from the dread disease necessity. Falstaff has changed somewhere between Part One and Part Two (perhaps at Shrewsbury, if the two plays were to be considered two halves of a whole); he has caught the

contagion and now, like all of England from the King through the court and city even down to the denizens of Gloucestershire, he lives by necessity. He must eat, and if this necessity dictates that he must prey upon Shallow, he will certainly do so.

In the later Gloucestershire scenes, 5.1 and 5.3, as Shallow and Silence cavorted, Falstaff looked on with a singular lack of merriment again, an expression of distaste or displeasure on his face. Saccio describes his enormous confidence in his final soliloquy of 5.1 as follows:

> his face gets redder the closer he gets; a raw, predatory note mingles with his laughter on the final line, 'I *come* Master Shallow, I *come*' [emphasis Quayle's]. ("Historicity" 211-12)

Since Falstaff possesses the only soliloquies in Part Two, they become even more intimate, especially when Quayle spoke them directly to a camera in close-up. Almost menacing the audience, Falstaff still allied himself with them.

Falstaff's rejection scene disturbed the audience more than the 1951 scene apparently did, for an increase in Falstaff's amiability, no matter how small, results inevitably in a decrease in Hal's audience support. Quayle stood near a rope barrier with his friends amid the noise of far-off and then near shouting. Like all of the BBC production, the coronation parade had been condensed for television's small screen; it consisted of eight or so people walking toward the camera. Difficult to recognize,

Hal seemed unfamiliar at first. Interestingly, Saccio asserts that his new "soup-bowl" haircut" and large ermine collar made him look like an icon ("Historicity" 209).

The new Henry V noticed Falstaff with a look of dismay, although Falstaff had greeted him with an air of happy expectation. A drum interspersing the phrases and providing a mood of tension and doom, Hal bent his head as Falstaff exclaimed, "I speak to thee, my heart!" (5.5.46). Hal replied, "I know thee not, old man" (5.5.47) with regret, while Falstaff gaped in shock. When he said, "Know the grave doth gape / For thee thrice wider than for other men" (5.5.53-4), Falstaff acted as if he would laugh and began to reply, but Hal looked away.

With "so shall the world perceive, / That I have turned away my former self" (5.5.57-58), determination and strength flooded Hal's voice. With bells sounding an ironic note in the background, he stared straight at Falstaff and spoke in a controlled, forceful tone, "Till then, I banish thee" (5.5.63). He blinked and looked away as he continued, "For competence of life I will allow you" (5.5.66), and then he resumed walking amid Falstaff's deep grief. His eyes wet, Falstaff hobbled a few steps in stunned silence. As Hodgdon notes, Falstaff received no camera close-up (57). A close-up shot of a grieving Falstaff would foster sympathy, and director Giles eschewed this approach in favor of impartiality. The camera favored no one. The audience was free to pity either man, or, hopefully, both--the rejected

and the one forced by the necessity of a sick kingdom to reject him.

After King Henry V walked on, Falstaff could barely contain his tears. He spoke to Shallow without looking at him. Turning to go, he was seized by soldiers and dragged away. John laughed and spoke his last words, and then the end credits began rolling without music.

Quayle presented a fascinating Falstaff in the BBC production, a complex man, still jovial and able to play the Lord Chief Justice for a fool as the play began, yet suffering from the encroachments of old age, and corrupted along with a kingdom gone haywire. Although Quayle displayed too little of the humor that so endears Falstaff to audiences, this Falstaff's rejection cut much deeper than that of Quayle's earlier caricature.

Orson Welles' camera direction in his great Falstaffian epic Chimes at Midnight contrasted favorably with that of David Giles. Throughout the film, Welles used the camera to interpret and highlight every nuance of emotion. He also combined various scenes from Part One, Part Two, and even Henry V and Richard II to achieve the effect he desired.

To the tavern scene of Part Two, for example, Welles added part of the Hal/Poins dialogue from scene 2.2. Hapgood explains that near the end of the tavern scene, Welles had Poins say, "I would think thee a most princely hypocrite" (2.2.51), while Hal replied merely, "Every man would think me an hypocrite indeed" (2.2.55-6), and then

gave Poins "a long level look," said "Let the end try the man" (2.2.44) and hurried off, prompted "by his own revulsion" rather than by a summons (51).

The camera emphasized Hal's growing distance from Falstaff. Hodgdon explains that when Hal exited the tavern he "cuts through its jostling crowds like a knife" and then Falstaff exited immediately after him. The camera tracked each of them, slowing down for Falstaff and emphasizing how the "laughing faces" around him "seem to trap and mock him, keeping him from the prince" (Hodgdon 47).

Welles achieved other dramatic effects through his abrupt transitions from scene to scene. Jorgens relates that after Hal lifted the crown above his head and cried, "Now call we our high parliament" (5.2.134), the film cut to a shot of Shallow and Silence dancing drunkenly in a "vast empty barn," while Falstaff sat alone on "the far side of the huge room" (119-20). The juxtaposition of these visuals commented on the action. Although Hal had been crowned king, Shallow and Silence, oblivious, danced foolishly in a barn, a huge empty space that reflected the emptiness that Falstaff already felt and soon would feel in much greater measure.

Falstaff's rejection scene used camera-work to a great effect, also. Crowl relates that in a cathedral setting, Falstaff had to push through a large group of soldiers with pikes to reach Hal (48-49). Amid "cries of shock" as he halted the procession and the music (Jorgens 118), Falstaff

fell to his knees, and then the camera pulled back to show Henry V's rejection through the upheld pikes (Crowl 48-49). This shot may be interpreted as commenting both on the wall now between Hal and Falstaff and on Hal's imprisonment in his new kingship.

Hodgdon describes that when Henry V said, "I know thee not, old man" (5.5.46), he "stands with his back to" Falstaff (59-60). After the rejection, a "bewildered, hurt Falstaff" smiles one last time, according to Jorgens "in recognition of the grim humor that this is the way it must be, that Hal must . . . betray both Falstaff and himself . . ." (119). Studying the smile, and "unable to bear it" (Jorgens 119), Hal walked away between banners towards the light. Then the camera switched back to Falstaff, "whose gaze registers pride in the splendid figure" of Hal before soldiers with lances blocked his view (Hodgdon 59-60). Again, the camera worked to enhance the scene's meaning. Hal moved toward the light of a glorious kingship; Falstaff's view of him was obstructed by soldiers, the visible symbol of Hal's commitment to law and justice. Falstaff's exit stressed his solitude and abandonment, as he moved away "down a long, tunnel-like passageway, slowly diminishing in size" (Crowl 49).

Orson Welles' Falstaff was unforgettable both in his zest for life and his great pathos, but often he lacked the simple merriness that a great Falstaff should possess.

Like Welles' Falstaff, Hugh Griffith's 1964 interpretation carried more than a hint of sadness, despite his physical presence. Wharton classifies this Falstaff as genuine, a lovable, sociable, tavern-frequenter who puts on no facade (59). Often mentioned as the definitive Falstaff, Griffith was a large man with a "roaring, braying, gargling voice with . . . great sensual range" and "characteristic glittering eyes which, with his sharp features, gave his head a curious eagle-like appearance" and who played Falstaff with "gusto" (Wharton 60).

Wharton relates that in Part Two's tavern scene, Griffith sat with Doll's head on his shoulder while she spoke of patching up "thine old body for heaven" (2.4.230-31). Falstaff sat staring into the fire for a long time before replying sadly, "Peace, good Doll, do not speak like a death's-head; do not bid me remember mine end" (2.4.232-33), (Wharton 60).

The Falstaff of Terry Hands' 1975 RSC production contrasts distinctly with Welles' and Griffith's serious portrayals. Played by Brewster Mason as "benevolent," "fun," and "essentially a gentleman" (Wharton 61), this Falstaff was described by critics as "lovable," "sympathetic," and "warm" (qtd. in Hodgdon 83). Nevertheless, Harold Hobson of the Sunday Times wrote on June 29, 1975, that he still perceived the sadness. He saw "an ageing Falstaff whose interior gaiety . . . is stilled by the thought of the grave" (qtd. in Hodgdon 83).

Of course, as mentioned above, this production's uniqueness rests in the kind of expressionistic shorthand that Hands used to convey meaning visually to the audience. Thus, the first meeting between the Lord Chief Justice and Falstaff looked like a "slow-motion chase" as the Justice slowly pursued Falstaff across the stage" (Hodgdon 73).

The scene with Shallow and Silence in the orchard in Gloucestershire pleased the audience with its lighthearted comedy. Benedict describes Falstaff there as "all fruity and genial, beaming at the company from above his wine and whiskers [as] Santa Claus on the razzle" (New Statesman, 6 Feb. 1976, qtd. in Hodgdon 84). Hodgdon describes how Falstaff, Shallow, and Silence sat on an orchard bench in the scene, with Davy filling cups of wine and Bardolph passing them around. When Silence stood for a last toast, "Fill the cup and let it come, / I'll pledge you a mile to the bottom" (5.3.53-4), he collapsed to the floor, crawled back to the bench, and sat beside Falstaff. Then Falstaff and Shallow raised their glasses to drink, but Silence could not, so Falstaff tilted Silence's "hooped-up" body back and forth so that the wine would pour down his throat. Startled by Pistol's knock on the door, Silence fell off the bench and began singing on the floor, while the others joined in (Hodgdon 84-5). The critics' warm responses to Falstaff hinged upon such comic scenes.

Hands reverted back to his heavy visual symbolism in the rejection scene. Wharton describes a huge white cloth

spread over the empty gray stage, now brightly lit, and strewn with golden rushes. A rough line of Falstaff's associates stood to stage left, while the royal party entered and stood to stage right, with the Lord Chief Justice opposite Falstaff. The two groups contrasting sharply with each other, the tavern group wore smocks and leggings, but the royal party wore white cloaks with scarlet St. George's crosses. Falstaff himself was dressed in a "carpet-bag design coat" (Wharton 73-4) with a huge round collar and ruff as well as drooping sleeves, red hose, and droopy boots. The King entered glittering in golden armor from head to toe, including a golden mask, and cradling a gigantic scepter which contrasted with Falstaff's wooden walking stick. As Wharton remarks, visually, Henry V's decision about Falstaff was already clear (74).

When Falstaff moved forward to greet the King, Hal at first continued to move downstage. Stopping at last to speak to Falstaff and removing his golden mask, he revealed an "agonised expression" (Hodgdon 87) consistent with his sudden maturation in the crown scene. The new King commanded Falstaff to kneel, and Falstaff remained on his knees until the royal party exited. Finally, he rose and stood at center stage, surrounded briefly by his friends before officers ran them off, and then walked slowly upstage between the Lord Chief Justice and Prince John (Hodgdon 86).

The contrasting costumes and stage positions made the rejection of this outstanding Falstaff expressionistically,

perhaps subliminally, clear, but after the warm Gloucestershire scene, they failed to make it more acceptable. The golden armor remained especially controversial, with most critics assigning it a meaning of coldness and dehumanization rather than of royal luminescence, although it could encompass both interpretations.

In 1982, Joss Ackland performed a "manic-depressive Falstaff, by turns insufferable and subdued, [who] had an insistent sense of life" (Shrimpton 153). Smallwood also notes "the hard edge of the man . . ., the ambition, the intelligence and agility of mind," along with an accent that suggested gentility and made his relation with his tavern associates "a curious mixture of affection and patronising contempt" (426).

Falstaff's confrontation with the Lord Chief Justice illustrated these qualities. Wearing a costume of a leather jerkin with epaulettes decorated with royal lions and fleurs-de-lys in scarlet, blue, and gold, Falstaff seemed anxious to flaunt his Shrewsbury honors. His manner bore this out. In the first scene with the Lord Chief Justice, Wharton relates that Falstaff stood next to him and shouted in his face, "I am as poor as Job, my lord, but not so patient" (1.2.125-6). The large crowd of stage onlookers stood quietly, "scandalized," looking at each other (65).

However, Falstaff's humor appeared just as mercurial as his anger and resentment. When the onstage crowd responded

with laughter for some of his sallies to the Justice, Falstaff put on "skittish airs" for his comment about being "in the vaward of our youth" (1.2.175), for example (Wharton 65). His anger resurfaced just as easily when the Lord Chief Justice told him, "Well, the King hath severed you and Prince Harry" (1.2.201-2). "Yea, I thank your pretty sweet wit for it" (1.2.205), Falstaff responded, shaking his walking stick right in the Justice's face (Hodgdon 113; Wharton 65).

As related above, the tavern scene shone with its spectacle of Pistol being chased throughout the many-leveled set by a crowd of characters and extras.[2] Falstaff again exhibited flashes of an unstable core with his steely command to the Prince to leave Doll alone. Nevertheless, the other characters loved this volatile Falstaff, for Hal bid him goodbye with a kiss on the cheek while Doll and Quickly wiped their eyes after Falstaff's departure. Without these onstage expressions of affection, Ackland's volatile Falstaff might not have possessed enough audience sympathy to highlight the rejection scene's pathos.

This production milked the tavern scene for every iota of fun, for director Nunn changed Bardolph's last line to "Falstaff is coming to Mistress Tearsheet," upon which Falstaff reappeared, "beaming mischievously," plopped down upon the bed, and undid his suspenders as Doll jumped on top of him, whereupon the stage lights faded to black (Hodgdon 106-8).

Ackland's Falstaff also delivered the sherris sack speech with what Wharton calls "great gusto," yet he revealed the tenderness of his emotion for Hal in that scene at the same time. When he said, "If I had a thousand sons, the first human principle I would teach them would be to forswear thin potations and to addict themselves to sack" (4.3.121-23), his voice "dropped and wavered" after the word *sons*, as if to remind the audience of his much-touted relationship with Hal as a second father (Wharton 67).

Likewise, this Falstaff exhibited a quieter side in Gloucestershire, where he relaxed and became "torpid," arriving a Shallow's house asleep in the back of a wagon and falling asleep again after dinner in 5.1 (Wharton 66).

As Hodgdon notes, Nunn minimized the transitions between act five scenes so as to create an effect of Falstaff just missing all of the action, replaced instead in the flow of events by the Lord Chief Justice (116). In the rejection scene itself, Falstaff planted himself directly in the path of the new king, who approached in a white cope stiff with gold embroidery, his face expressionless. Hodgdon relates that as Henry V began speaking to Falstaff, he restrained tears and also strained to smile, at one point approaching Falstaff and then drawing back as if afraid he would hug the old knight (116-17). Clearly, this Hal--who had, like Howard's 1975 Prince, instantly matured during the crown scene--regretted the rejection.

Falstaff, on the other hand, accepted Hal's words with astonishment and dignity, standing "rooted to the spot" until Hal departed (Smallwood 429). Then, just as the procession exited the stage, Hodgdon relates that he laughed. Perhaps he recognized the irony of his position when compared to his expectations. At any rate, when arrested, he followed the officer offstage quietly, although Pistol had to be dragged off (Hodgdon 117).[3]

This play ended with another example of Nunn's flair for spectacle, for the procession returned to close the drama. Although such an ending should have emphasized the glory of the new reigning monarch and his kingdom, its very theatricality, as Hodgdon avers, may simply have highlighted the hollowness of the new regime (118). Despite the production's too heavy stress on Falstaff's less agreeable qualities, this rejection scene was played beautifully.

One of the most intriguing portraits of Falstaff emerged in the 1986-89 English Shakespeare Company production of Henry IV, Part Two. Presented first as part of a cycle entitled The Henrys and including Richard II, Henry IV, Part One, and Henry V, and eventually as part of a longer sequence called The Wars of the Roses and incorporating Henry VI, Parts One, Two, and Three, and Richard III as well, this version employed two different Falstaffs throughout its run.

Crowl rates John Woodvine, the first of the two, as the best Falstaff ever. Woodvine's first appearance illustrates

the excitement and charm of his portrayal. Hodgdon describes a scene with Falstaff enjoying an after-dinner cigar in an elegant restaurant. He wore a purple and pink pinstripe suit decorated with medals, which he showed off at "every opportunity," topped by a gray fedora [presumably as he exited the stage] (Hodgdon 133).[4] This Falstaff dressed as if he knew how to have a good time, and as his initial scenes unfolded, he ensured that the audience enjoyed themselves as well.

When an upset Mistress Quickly appeared in scene 2.1, Woodvine soothed her with an arm around her shoulders, a "light caress on cheek and chin, a kiss blown delicately from his fingers, and the gift of a rose, placed between her teeth" (Hodgdon 134). The audience fell victim to his charm, as well.

His earlier scenes with the Lord Chief Justice illustrated Falstaff's nimble wit more clearly than most productions through ridiculous bits of stage business. Hodgdon relates that in the restaurant, a waiter emptied the remains of five bottles of white wine into one very full glass, which Falstaff drained. The page then presented him with another wine bottle containing yellow liquid, Falstaff's "good healthy water" (1.2.3-4), which Falstaff absentmindedly poured into a glass and choked on. After attempting to offer the bottle to the Lord Chief Justice and being rebuffed, Falstaff eventually left the bottle as a tip for his waiter (Hodgdon 135).

Woodvine also pocketed the bills the Justice left on his own table and tried to exit the restaurant without paying; when a waiter called him back, he paid with the Justice's money, tucked the red rose from his table into his lapel, and left with a "tiny, two-fingered wave" (Hodgdon 135). Predictably, the crowd loved this Falstaff's sense of fun and suave, debonair manner, although Hodgdon also reports an element of "ruthless mockery" for his own and others' shortcomings (133).

Crowl agrees with this assessment, for he comments that the second Falstaff, Barry Stanton was "appropriately jovial but lacked Woodvine's bite and command" (154). Most critics also cite Woodvine's aristocratic laugh ("haw haw haw") and sharp beady eyes, as well as his impeccable comedic timing (Crowl 155-6).

The Gloucestershire scenes in this production emphasized a jovial Falstaff. In the first, Shallow held a jug of applejack. Each time he said, "Sir John, you shall not be excused" (5.1.9-10), Falstaff reached for the jug, while Shallow turned away and poured himself another drink. By the time Falstaff finally grabbed the jug, it was empty, and Shallow shook his finger at Falstaff as if Falstaff had drunk it all himself (Hodgdon 136).

Hodgdon relates another funny moment in scene 5.3, a "white-tie country dinner" where everyone was drunk. After one of Falstaff's toasts, Bardolph collapsed, at which point

Shallow said, "Give Master Bardolph some wine, Davy" (5.3.25), (Hodgdon 136).

The rejection scene struck a more serious note, of course, especially since it began with such a festive air of excitement on Falstaff's part. Amid scaffolding decorated with bunting and a huge flag, Falstaff, Pistol, Shallow, and Silence entered waving small souvenir flags (Crowl 154). Photographs reveal that Falstaff wore a red uniform jacket with blue trousers and a souvenir bowler hat complete with Union Jack hatband.

The new Henry V, entering to Handel's "Coronation March" (Hodgdon 141), also wore a uniform, his topped by a cape with an enormous ermine collar which hung to his elbows, tied with huge tassels which recall Scarlett O'Hara's drapery dress. This majestic, over-the-top costume, as did Alan Howard's golden armor in the 1975 production and David Gwillim's unfamiliar haircut in the BBC version, should have signaled to Falstaff that events might not go as he planned.

Nevertheless, calling out to Hal, Falstaff knelt down with his back to the audience. Hodgdon reports that Hal, "bitterly annoyed" by Falstaff, rejected him with relish, speaking with "nastily ironic *noblesse oblige*" as he promised Falstaff "competence of life" (5.5.66) and pausing only long enough to see that the Lord Chief Justice obeyed his orders (141). Wells agrees that any pain in the rejection "was confined to Falstaff" ("Performances" 161).

As noted above, the audience's perception of Hal's role in the rejection seems to vary inversely to Falstaff's popularity.

Falstaff at first thought the rejection a joke, responding to Henry V's "Know the grave doth gape / For thee thrice wider than for other men," (5.5.53-4) with his nasal "haw haw haw" laugh until Pennington cut him off coldly with "Reply not to me with a fool-born jest" (5.5.55), (Crowl 155). After Hal departed, Falstaff, stunned, remained on his knees as he began speaking to Shallow, until he finally rose at the line, "Sir, I will be as good as my word" (5.5.86), (Hodgdon 141).

Finally, in this production everyone turned away from Falstaff, leaving him to walk alone toward the back stage doors, treading on a string of flags which Pistol had torn down after Henry V's departure. Hodgdon compares the scene to Chimes, with Falstaff moving toward "a lighted background archway, becoming increasingly diminished within the shot's deep space" (141). Crowl, on the other hand, thinks of Falstaff being "swallowed by history" as he exited through the center panel of the black metal grid which formed the back wall (154). Prince John, of course, responded with his familiar evil laugh (Hodgdon 142).

While the bitterness of Falstaff's rejection may seem excessive, it should come as no surprise to anyone familiar with Bogdanov's philosophy, which Crowl labels a "cultural materialist approach" to Shakespeare (144). Bogdanov sees

various parallels between "Thatcherian" England and the England of the play:

> Westminster Rule. Centralisation. Censorship. Power to the City. Bleed the rest of the country dry. . . . Boardrooms may have replaced the palace at Westminster, Chairpersons (mainly men) replaced monarchs, but the rules were the same. . . . How could the plays *not* be understood in a contemporary context? (Bogdanov, Michael and Michael Pennington. The English Shakespeare Company: The Story of The Wars of the Roses 1986-1989. London, 1990. 24-5. Qtd. in Hodgdon 123)

Given the vehemence of Bogdanov's explanation, Henry V could not possibly be portrayed sympathetically in the rejection scene.

In summary, modern portrayals of Falstaff can be distinguished mainly by how much comedy the portly knight retains as opposed to emphasis on his pathos or self-preservation. While elements of sadness and certainly self-interest are desirable, they should never be allowed to obscure Falstaff's basically merry nature; instead, they should complement it with intimations of corruption, illness, and old age mirroring those in the main plot.

In Chimes, for instance, Orson Welles' Falstaff invoked such pathos that his comic scenes seemed forced. Despite his brilliance, he lost an essential quality of Falstaff's nature. Often mentioned as a definitive portrayal, Hugh

Griffith's 1964 Falstaff also displayed an element of pathos, yet his was tempered with a "gusto" which balanced the performance. Brewster Mason's 1975 Falstaff was an outstanding portrayal as well, for his rollicking comedy contrasted with his sadness during the tavern scene.

Victimized by England's slide into a realm of necessity where pike eats dace, Anthony Quayle's 1979 Falstaff also must be remembered for enacting an aspect of the fat knight which audiences like to forget, although his emphasis on self-preservation was so heavy that he, like Welles, obscured Falstaff's humor. Quayle's unsympathetic 1951 caricature of Falstaff, however, was the weakest of any considered. Joss Ackland's 1982 Falstaff was also singularly unappealing, for his mercurial mood changes emphasized an unsavory undercurrent of menace that counteracted any comedy.

The Falstaff who lingers on in memory the sharpest, despite, or perhaps because of, his appearance in a drama so simplified that it reminds Wells at times of "comic strip illustrations of the action" ("Performances" 160) is Woodvine's 1986 version. This Falstaff endeared himself with his rollicking sense of fun, while at the same time his sense of incredible shock when Henry V rejected him created a very powerful effect. Further, he did not neglect the motif of necessity, for in his opening scenes in the tavern cum supper club, he created a Falstaff living by his wits,

using Mistress Quickly, the Lord Chief Justice, or even a waiter to assure that he lived in comfort.

Perhaps Shakespeare would have been happy with all of these portrayals, for a well-written character should be able to mold himself to the time of any audience and speak to the concerns of any age. In these modern productions, Falstaff seemed much better suited to this task than either Henry IV or Hal, for audiences love the fat knight in almost any incarnation.

Notes

[1] This philosophy reaped all kinds of deadly benefits for the Henry IV, Part Two television production, for the problem with presenting the play as written is that television audiences often ignore what the actors say, while they focus instead on the visual, the intimate televised depiction of vivid sets and costumes. (See Saccio, Hodgdon, and Williams, among others.)

Unfortunately, the production neglected the advantages of the camera, the ability to highlight any interpretation with lighting, angle and distance--an ability which Welles used to great effect in Chimes. (See Hodgdon, Crowl, and Hapgood.) Saccio, however, believes the television version succeeded in that the intimacy of the television camera's view illustrated how political machinations occur among a small, private group of individuals.

[2] The love of spectacle in Nunn's production can be explained both by time and location. As several critics note, in 1982, epic films such as Star Wars and Close Encounters of the Third Kind were extremely popular. Thus, the drama appealed to audience interest with such devices as Pistol's long chase and the fade to black at the end of the tavern scene, and also with such bonuses as a musical score complete with motifs for each character, a longstanding practice newly popular with cinema audiences. (See Hodgdon 110).

Also, Nunn's production played at the new Barbican Center, a complex within the City of London containing shops, a theatre, and living spaces, where real estate interests intended to profit from the snob-value of a major Shakespearean production somewhat as noble Renaissance patrons enhanced their prestige by sponsoring companies of players.

[3] Interestingly, the multi-level set populated with city dwellers parallels the theatre's own city setting. Emphasizing the correspondence between Elizabethan and modern times, Pistol enacts a realistic political demonstration in this scene, holding up a t-shirt decorated with the words "*Si fortuna me tormenta, spero contenta*" (5.5.97) and chanting "*Obsque hoc nihil est*" (5.5.28), (Hodgdon 116). Other deliberate connections to the city's political and social roots in Elizabethan times occur in the souvenir program, which contains quotations referring to urban violence, corruption, and diseases of that time (Hodgdon 96).

[4] Bogdanov wanted an "accessible" Shakespeare (Hodgdon 23-4), a play which would appeal to a "popular" audience (Wells 159). To achieve this aim, he dressed his characters in costumes culled from various periods of the twentieth century (keying the style of each costume to comment on the character's personality), used modern settings and props, and incorporated such devices as the opening of Henry IV, Part One with a group ballad.

Often, this technique also promoted a postmodern effect, as the costumes and other devices jolted the audience into an examination of the drama that they might not ordinarily make, an examination that revealed comparisons between Elizabethan England and the modern day which might otherwise have gone unrecognized.

Conclusion

No modern production, and probably no production at all, including the one which Shakespeare himself directed, has succeeded in presenting all the themes of Henry IV, Part Two without bias. The trend to stage the drama in a group or cycle of plays has tended to downplay the political emphasis in Part Two and replace it with examining the resonances of Henry IV, Falstaff, and Hal's characters throughout the course of several plays. While this practice has illuminated Hal's relationship with his "two fathers" Henry IV and Falstaff, it has often submerged the theme of necessity in the process, thus destroying some of the interesting parallels between main and sub-plots.[1]

However, the major neglected motif, necessity, permeates both plots so thoroughly that it should not be ignored. In the main plot, King Henry IV had been driven by necessity, ostensibly England's, to take Richard II's crown. Henry's motives still remain questionable even in Part Two, however, for his personal necessity as a man banished and wronged, a man moreover that Richard had marked as driven with political ambition from the beginning, dictated his actions just as surely as England's need for a strong leader.

Now, in Part Two, ill and tortured by guilt and half admitting that he has been wrong, Henry rules over a similarly diseased realm which suffers from his actions. Looking back to an idealized past under Richard, several

lords as well as Archbishop Scroop have banded together to challenge Henry's kingship. Of course, necessity motivates the rebels as it did Henry Bolingbroke; ironically, this necessity resembles that of Bolingbroke, a mix of political and personal needs along with concern over the kingdom's welfare. Notably, the rebel Northumberland himself, like Henry and the kingdom, shows signs of sickness and age.

Throughout the main plot, then, weave the themes of necessity, idealization of the past, a disordered present, age and illness, and, of course, the relationship between Hal and his father. Hal, the thread which connects main and sub-plots, moves between both, although participating only briefly in the tavern world in Part Two as compared to Part One, until both plots come together at the end.

The tavern world has expanded in Part Two, of course, so that it should rightly be called the world of tavern, city, and countryside, or all of England other than the royal court. Hal's "second father" Falstaff dominates this world, a Falstaff who now exhibits signs of age and illness, and, like the main plot characters, corruption by necessity. No longer so close to the Prince, Falstaff must live by his wits, and he struggles throughout the play to obtain money to purchase the food, sherris sack, and fancy new clothing he perceives himself to need.

Like the main plot, characters in the subplot, most notably Shallow, look back to an idealized past. Similarly, they live in a disordered present. Falstaff faces a suit

from Mistress Quickly and threats from the Lord Chief Justice; his tavern world has become nearly as disordered as that of the court.

Another parallel arises when treachery moves into both the world of the court and the wider world around it. Betraying the rebels in Gaultree Forest with his carefully worded parley, Prince John reveals the poisonous underside of necessity, that it can be twisted to rationalize any act.

In the final scene, of course, when the two plots entwine, Falstaff himself is crushed by the new Henry V's sense of necessity. Although Hal sentences Falstaff with the good of his realm in mind, a lingering doubt and sadness remain as to both the motive and the effectiveness of the act. True, Falstaff does say,

> Let us take any man's horses; the laws of England are at my commandment. Blessed are they that have been my friends, and woe to my Lord Chief Justice! (5.3.138-41)

This suggests a disordered England under Falstaff's influence. Nevertheless, an England without Falstaff's great capacity for love and merriment seems a poor sort of kingdom to rule.

The treachery of the Lord Chief Justice in hauling off Falstaff to the Fleet when Henry V had only forbidden him "Not to come near our person by ten mile" (5.5.65) corresponds clearly to that of Prince John in the Gaultree

scene, especially when John comments, "I like this fair proceeding of the King's" (5.5.98).

Considered alone, then, Henry IV, Part Two examines the nature of necessity and impresses readers and audience as a political play which relates the effects of the actions of those in power to themselves and others, and which forces the audience to decide in each case whether "necessity" justifies the actions of the characters. Considered along with Richard II, Henry IV, Part One, and/or Henry V, each of which has its own themes and concerns, however, Part Two seems a more personal play, a play about a tortured ruler, a lovable old rogue, and a young man who must forsake one to emulate the other. While the cycle approach has its advantages, a modern production which presents Henry IV, Part Two as a complete play in its own right would be a treat.

Nevertheless, modern productions have contained many elements of merit. One strong production, the 1965 Chimes at Midnight, contained stellar performances by Sir John Gielgud as Henry IV, Keith Baxter as Hal, and Orson Welles as Falstaff. Unfortunately, the film's focus on Falstaff--a Falstaff especially lacking in merriment--through spliced-together scenes culled from all four Henry plays tended to obscure Shakespeare's concern with politics and necessity.

Peter Halls' 1964 RSC version also contained many memorable elements, including Hugh Griffith's characterization of Falstaff, cited by several critics as

definitive. Although information about Hall's treatment of the rebel scenes remains scarce, Eric Porter portrayed a Henry IV who was not only ill and penitential, but also majestic. Ian Holm's repressed, Machiavellian characterization of Hal marred the performance, however.

The expressionistic 1975 Terry Hands Part Two was unacceptable due to Alan Howard's interpretation of a Hal who hated both his fathers and Emrys James' manic Henry IV. Although Brewster Mason's rollicking Falstaff and aged Northumberland were good, Hands sympathized too heavily with both the rebels and Falstaff, so that any focus on necessity and policy was neglected in favor of character development.

Despite a regal Harry Andrews as Henry IV, the 1951 RSC production, with Anthony Quayle's disagreeable, exaggerated Falstaff and Richard Burton's cold, Machiavellian Hal was the least appealing of the modern stagings. Director Michael Redgrave's blatant attempt to align audience sympathy with the royals obviated any need for the audience to consider thematic questions of motivation.

Although Anthony Quayle's reprisal of his role in the 1979 BBC Part Two was superior to his first attempt, his interpretation still lacked genuine humor. The rebels received fairly unbiased treatment, but pedestrian camera work and claustrophobic sets, as well as Jon Finch's theatrical Henry IV, undermined David Gwillim's nice portrait of an ambivalent Prince.

Trevor Nunn's 1982 staging at the Barbican Theatre remains interesting because of his onstage treatment of the Archbishop as a popular leader and his multi-level set peopled with silent watchers. However, interpretations by Gerard Murphy of a unintelligent, particularly immature Hal; by Patrick Stewart of a cold, businesslike, uncharismatic Henry IV; and by Joss Ackland of a quick-tempered, menacing Falstaff--all distorted the drama into a modernistic, predatory world where each character was motivated only by his own personal desires.

The popularized 1986-89 ESC staging, with its twentieth century sets and costumes, succeeded in stimulating the audience's thought about the characters and their actions, as the best versions do. Its Gloucestershire scenes allowed the play's humor to sparkle as it should, and increased the impact of Falstaff's rejection. Because Falstaff was allowed to attract the audience here, even in his somewhat corrupted state, the audience could experience the true sadness of his rejection.

Unfortunately, as with many modern directors, Michael Bogdanov could not ignore the class elements in the play, and he counterbalanced Falstaff with a plethora of unsympathetic upper class characters: Northumberland, a particularly villainous Prince John, and a Hal initially quite close to the ideal but later so unrepentant in the rejection scene that he precluded any sense of conflict the audience may have had about the necessity of his actions.

Nevertheless, despite all these qualms, the insights that the production fostered through its sheer originality made it my personal favorite.

Obviously, the twentieth century has yet to produce my ideal version of Henry IV, Part Two. This lack is understandable, for any drama that left the audience shocked and grieved about the ending, unable to decide whether some of the main characters have done good or ill and where its loyalty should lie, would not necessarily be profitable. Nevertheless, a play whose characters and ideas inhabit an audience's thoughts and emotions and demand a response is a great drama--just the type of drama that Shakespeare wrote.

Notes

[1] So much has been written about Hal's conflict between the two worlds of tavern and court and between his two fathers, Falstaff and Henry IV, that discussing these ideas again seemed unnecessary. Hodgdon and Wharton contain much interesting information about the incorporation of these themes in modern drama.

Works Cited

Addenbrooke, David. The Royal Shakespeare Company: The Peter Hall Years. London: Kimber, 1974.

Beauman, Sally. The Royal Shakespeare Company: A History of Ten Decades. Oxford: Oxford U P, 1982.

Berry, Ralph. On Directing Shakespeare. New York: Viking, 1989.

Bulman, James C. "The BBC Shakespeare and 'House Style.'" Shakespeare on Television: An Anthology of Essays and Reviews. Ed. J. C. Bulman and H. R. Coursen. Hanover, New Hampshire: U P of New England, 1988. 50-60.

Bulman, James C. and H. R. Coursen. Shakespeare on Television: An Anthology of Essays and Reviews. Hanover, New Hampshire: U P of New England, 1988.

Crowl, Samuel. Shakespeare Observed: Studies in Performance on Stage and Screen. Athens: Ohio U P, 1992.

David, Richard. "Shakespeare's History Plays: Epic or Drama?" Shakespeare Survey: An Annual Survey of Shakespearean Study and Production. Ed. Allardyce Nicoll. Vol. 6. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1953. 129-39.

Hapgood, Robert. "Chimes at Midnight from Stage to Screen: The Art of Adaptation." Shakespeare Survey: An Annual Survey of Shakespearean Study and Production. Ed. Stanley Wells. Vol. 39. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1987. 39-52.

Hodgdon, Barbara. Henry IV, Part Two. Shakespeare in Performance Series. Manchester: Manchester U P, 1993.

Jorgens, Jack J. Shakespeare on Film. Bloomington: Indiana U P, 1977.

Kerr, Walter. "Heart Is What Hurts." New York Times Theater Reviews. 14 Jul. 1968: 1.

McLaverty, J. "No Abuse: The Prince and Falstaff in the Tavern Scenes of Henry IV." Shakespeare Survey: An Annual Survey of Shakespearean Study and Production. Ed. Stanley Wells. Vol. 34. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1981. 105-110.

Saccio, Peter. "The Historicity of the BBC History Plays." Shakespeare on Television: An Anthology of Essays and Reviews. Ed. J. C. Bulman and H. R. Coursen. Hanover, New Hampshire: U P of New England, 1988. 208-213.

---. "The Shakespeare Plays on TV." Shakespeare on Film Newsletter 6.1 (1982).

Seltzer, Daniel. "Prince Hal and Tragic Style." Shakespeare Survey: An Annual Survey of Shakespearean Study and Production. Ed. Kenneth Muir. Vol. 30. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1977. 13-27.

Shakespeare, William. The Complete Works of Shakespeare. Ed. David Bevington. New York: Harper, 1992.

Shrimpton, Nicholas. "Shakespearean Performances in Stratford-upon-Avon and London, 1981-2." Shakespeare Survey: An Annual Survey of Shakespearean Study and

Production. Ed. Stanley Wells. Vol. 35. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1983. 149-56.

Smallwood, R. L. "Henry IV, Parts 1 and 2 at the Barbican Theatre (1982)." Henry the Fourth Parts I and II: Critical Essays. Ed. David Bevington. New York: Garland, 1986. 423-30.

Thomson, Peter. "Towards a Poor Shakespeare: The Royal Shakespeare Company at Stratford in 1975." Shakespeare Survey: An Annual Survey of Shakespearean Study and Production. Ed. Kenneth Muir. Vol. 29. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1976. 151-56.

Tynan, Kenneth. A View of the English Stage, 1944-62. London: Davis, 1975.

Wells, Stanley. "Shakespeare Performances in London and Stratford-upon-Avon, 1986-7." Shakespeare Survey: An Annual Survey of Shakespearean Study and Production. Ed. Stanley Wells. Vol. 41. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1989. 159-82.

---. "Television Shakespeare." Shakespeare on Television: An Anthology of Essays and Reviews. J. C. Bulman and H. R. Coursen, eds. Hanover, New Hampshire: U P of New England, 1988. 41-49.

Wharton, T. F. Henry the Fourth Parts 1 and 2. Text and Performance Series. Gen. ed. Michael Scott. Hong Kong: Macmillan, 1983.

Williams, Michele. "Verbal-Visual, Verbal-Pictorial or Textual-Televisual? Reflections on the BBC Shakespeare

Series." Shakespeare Survey: An Annual Survey of Shakespearean Study and Production. Ed. Stanley Wells. Vol. 39. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1987. 91-102.

Willis, Susan. The BBC Shakespeare Plays: Making the Televised Canon. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1991.

Wilson, John Dover and Thomas C. Worsley. Shakespeare's Histories at Stratford, 1951. Library of Shakespearean Biography and Criticism Series II, Part C. 1952. Freeport, New York: Books For Libraries P, 1970.

Appendix A

Casts of Modern Productions (Hodgdon 146-48)

Shakespeare Memorial Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, 1951

Director: Michael Redgrave

Rumor	William Squire
King Henry IV	Harry Andrews
Henry, Prince of Wales	Richard Burton
Prince John of Lancaster	John Gay
Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester	Michael Meacham
Thomas Duke of Clarence	Brendon Barry
Westmoreland	Jack Gwillim
Earl of Warwick	Peter Jackson
Lord Chief Justice	Michael Gwynn
Sir John Falstaff	Anthony Quayle
Poins	Alan Badel
Bardolph	Michael Bates
Pistol	Richard Wordsworth
Mistress Quickly	Rosalind Atkinson
Doll Tearsheet	Heather Stannard
Earl of Northumberland	Alexander Gauge
Archbishop of York	Robert Hardy
Lady Northumberland	Joan MacArthur
Lady Percy	Barbara Jefford
Shallow	Alan Badel
Silence	William Squire

Royal Shakespeare Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, 1975

Director: Terry Hands

King Henry IV	Emrys James
Henry, Prince of Wales	Alan Howard
Prince John of Lancaster	Charles Dance
Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester	Stephen Jenn
Thomas Duke of Clarence	Anthony Naylor
Westmoreland	Reginald Jessup
Lord Chief Justice	Griffith Jones
Sir John Falstaff	Brewster Mason
Poins	Trevor Peacock
Bardolph	Tim Wylton
Pistol	Richard Moore
Mistress Quickly	Maureen Pryor
Doll Tearsheet	Mikel Lambert
Earl of Northumberland	Clement McCallin
Archbishop of York	Andre van Gysegham
Lady Northumberland	Yvonne Coulette
Lady Percy	Ann Hasson
Shallow	Sydney Bromley
Silence	Trevor Peacock

BBC Television, 1979

Director: David Giles

King Henry IV	Jon Finch
Henry, Prince of Wales	David Gwillim
Prince John of Lancaster	Rob Edwards

Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester	Martin Kneel
Thomas Duke of Clarence	Roger Davenport
Westmoreland	David Buck
Lord Chief Justice	Ralph Michael
Sir John Falstaff	Sir Anthony Quayle
Poins	Jack Galloway
Bardolph	Gordon Gostelow
Pistol	Bryan Pringle
Mistress Quickly	Brenda Bruce
Doll Tearsheet	Frances Cuka
Earl of Northumberland	Bruce Purchase
Archbishop of York	David Neal
Lady Northumberland	Jenny Laird
Lady Percy	Michele Dotrice
Shallow	Robert Eddison
Silence	Leslie French

Royal Shakespeare Company, Barbican Centre, 1982

Director: Trevor Nunn

King Henry IV	Patrick Stewart
Henry, Prince of Wales	Gerard Murphy
Prince John of Lancaster	Kevin Wallace
Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester	Philip Franks
Thomas Duke of Clarence	Simon Templeman
Westmoreland	Bernard Brown
Warwick	Brian Poyser
Lord Chief Justice	Griffith Jones

Sir John Falstaff	Joss Ackland
Poins	Miles Anderson
Bardolph	John Rogan
Pistol	Mike Gwilym
Mistress Quickly	Miriam Karlin
Doll Tearsheet	Gemma Jones
Earl of Northumberland	Robert Eddison
Archbishop of York	John Burgess
Lady Northumberland	Sheila Mitchell
Lady Percy	Harriet Walter
Shallow	Robert Eddison
Silence	David Lloyd Meredith

English Shakespeare Company, 1986-1989

[Cast list does not reflect all changes and doubles.]

Director: Michael Bogdanov

King Henry IV	Patrick O'Connell
	John Castle
	Michael Cronin
Henry, Prince of Wales	Michael Pennington
	John Dougall
Prince John of Lancaster	John Dougall
Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester	Charles Dale
Thomas Duke of Clarence	Martin Clunes
	Stephen Jameson
Westmoreland	Michael Cronin
Lord Chief Justice	Gareth Thomas

	Hugh Sullivan
Sir John Falstaff	John Woodvine
	Barry Stanton
Poins	Charles Lawson
	Charles Dale
Bardolph	Colin Farrell
Pistol	John Price
	John Castle
	Paul Brennan
Mistress Quickly	June Watson
Doll Tearsheet	Jenny Quayle
	Lynette Davies
	Francesca Ryan
Earl of Northumberland	Hugh Sullivan
	Roger Booth
Archbishop of York	Darryl Forbes-Dawson
	John Darrell
Lady Northumberland	Eluned Hawkins
Lady Percy	Jennie Stoller
	Mary Rutherford
Shallow	Clyde Pollitt
Silence	Donald Gee
	Philip Bowen

Chimes at Midnight, *1966*

Director: Orson Welles

Henry IV	John Gielgud