Chapter 3: From the Boar's Head to the battlefield
Prince Hal's mastery of language in redeeming his time and nation

Shakespeare's theater should be understood as a powerful mass medium of the day, perhaps *the* mass medium of the day. (Is it wrong to imagine how the great playwright's might use a Twitter feed?) As such, his plays could make strong suggestions about, if not what to think, what to think *about*.[1] They helped to set the people's agenda at a time when England was moving from empire to a downsized geographic reality of but one "sceptered isle." London's playhouses "collected the entire [nation] within a shared experience: the knowledge of its own passions," to apply Roland Barthes's description of theater's social function.[2] That Shakespeare's enactments did this as theater made the people as playgoers co-authors by creating gutters of meaning only audiences could fill. There is no greater example of the possibilities of such a collaboration than *Henry V* and, more specifically, the Chorus ("And let us, ciphers, to this great attempt, / On your imaginary forces work" (I.i.17-18).[3]

This collaboration of imagination is important to a consideration of the ways Shakespeare enacted, personified, and projected a coherent national identity, for national identity is, as Benedict Anderson's seminal study of nationalism, *Imagined Nations*, argues, mostly a feat of the imagination. Even a casual reading of Anderson's study of nationalism recalls characters and themes from Shakespeare's history plays, despite the fact that Anderson's historical timeline begins two centuries after Shakespeare's death.[4] In fact, it could be argued that anyone seeking to understand national identity as the term is used today would be wise to read the Bard, who found in English and Roman history the fabric out of which to cut a huge cast of characters and a national history that is both *memoria* and prediction.[5] This is not controversial. The playwright's role shaping and even creating English national identity has occupied scholars of many disciplines and perspectives for quite some time.[6] A review of the literature finds work by textualists, cultural materialists, historicists, political scientists, scholars in literature, and theater critics, among so many others.[7]

Some argue that the playwright very intentionally articulated a unified vision or understanding of nation, while others claim that any participation Shakespeare had should be seen as unconscious, the product of a playwright negotiating his time and culture. Whether or not or to what degree Shakespeare was cognizant of his role in creating powerful social artifacts and practices, he nonetheless gave Elizabethans their outlook on themselves, and in gathering these "countrymen" and women, he focused their attention.[8] George Eliot understood this, seeing art as a medium capable of helping citizens by amplifying experience and extending contact with fellow men beyond the bounds of any one citizen's personal lot.[9] An imaginative, sophisticated account of English national identity can be found in Shakespeare's tetralogy from *Richard II* through *Henry V*, more than half of the nine history plays that James Shapiro suggests "define English identity, if not English exceptionalism."[10]

Specifically, this chapter examines Shakespeare's use of language as metaphor to track the development of Hal from a jack and a sneak-cup to worthy heir to conquering king. Such a boy-to-king progression requires a decidedly heroic interpretation of the tetralogy rather than an ironic one, a reading that celebrates Henry V as a citizen king.[11] The personal reform, which is synecdoche for national reform, is promised in Act I of *1*

Henry IV and achieved by the end of *2 Henry IV*. A record of Hal's triumphs as reformed king provides the plot for *Henry V.* Hal's reform is less important in its interiority (for character) and more important as "centralizing, homogenizing, and nationalizing," uses that make Henry a metaphor in depicting a new, modern, increasingly urban England. Jonathan Crewe argued for an analysis of *2 Henry IV* that sees Hal's reform as an instance of either a "psychologized politics" or a "politicized psychology."[12] Couldn't it be both? For the hybrid nature of Hal's "putative crossover" charts his nation's needed trajectory as well as his own.

With *King John*, the playwright projected the image that citizens as patriots could have of one another, a perception that sees nation as "a deep, horizontal comradeship," to apply Anderson's terms, and a citizenship that could inspire "love, and often profoundly self-sacrificing love."[13] In *Henry V*, the playwright uses Ireland, Scotland, and France as a spectrum of unifying "others," as anvils upon which Henry hammers out an England of "brothers." In the two parts of *Henry IV* and culminating in *Henry V*, the tools are overtly discursive; Hal moves from the common language of an Eastcheap tavern to the formal verse of his father the king to, ultimately, a regal language thoroughly his own, a majestic but personal language that is used to manifest "the great body of *our* state" (*2 Henry IV*, V.ii.137, emphasis added).

Whether or not Shakespeare wrote the two parts of *Henry IV* as a unified whole has been much debated, and at both sides of the controversy, and though it is not necessary to settle this question for the argument here, it is important that there is consensus that the two plays demonstrate a "duplication in structure" and shared themes of reformation and redemption.[14] Regardless, marking Hal's miraculous reformation from "young wanton and effeminate" boy (*Richard II*, V.iii.10) to become "Harry England" are his words. We can hear and see his transformation and growth foremost in his speech. In parallel, we hear and see an idea of nation emerge in Henry as we contrast his maturing rhetoric with the romantic, outworn medieval speech of John of Gaunt.[15]

In inscribing a nation, such reliance on language and rhetoric should not surprise, for "language is to the patriot as the eye is to the lover. Through the mother tongue, the past is restored, fellowships are imagined, futures dreamed."[16] Hal's maturation and complex moral development as evidenced in his speech produces a variable character and a brilliant, prismatic achievement through which to see Shakespeare's project, and they mirror England's equally complex social formation.[17] This pairing, of the trajectories of Hal and of England, make the plays more ambitious as histories than their immediate predecessors because they seek to present much more than a record of kingly actions. Not coincidentally, these narratives rely less on historical source material than any other of Shakespeare's histories. They are, therefore, highly creative acts.

When we first meet Hal in *1 Henry IV*, we learn of his plan to debauch himself to such a degree that his eventual reformation will "attract more eyes." Were there newspapers in his day, Hal would have by design regularly made the front page, especially of the tabloids:

> So, when this loose behavior I throw off
> And pay the debt I never promisèd,
> By how much better than my word I am,
> By so much shall I falsify men's hopes;

And like bright metal on a sullen ground,
My reformation, glittering o'er my fault,
Shall show more goodly and attract more eyes
Than that which hath no foil to set it off.
I'll so offend to make offence a skill,
Redeeming time when men think least I will. (I.ii.145-54)

At the play's outset, then, Hal signals and even begins choreographing his artifice, admitting to theater-goers up front that what they are about to witness will be part of an elaborate stratagem, one dependent on foils. This presents a riddle of character. If in fact he is a deliberate deceiver, Hal is a sort of Machiavel promising to appear as one sort of creature only to dramatize a "reform" into worthy king. However, if Hal is earnestly embarking on a unified or integrated life's work to redeem his and his country's time, he is preternaturally aware but not a master of spin.[18] Because Hal was a historical figure even for Shakespeare's audiences, his life was already known, making his speech stand outside of time.

Language of a king

As history-telling (and history-crafting), Hal's address signals to play-goers the narrative that is to come and his central role in it, regardless of the play's misleading title. It's also important that Hal speaks here in prose, in contrast to Shakespeare's other English kings, who typically speak in verse. Hal is already imitating the people he will some day rule; he knows well the language of the common man. In sharp contrast, his father does not, though Henry is more in touch with his subjects than the narcissistic king he usurped, Richard II. The seed of "Harry England" is planted in language, and Hal's future triumphs are hinted at by his mastery *of* language, including, at the play's beginning, the everyday discourse of the tavern. This verbal mastery establishes Hal on the stage as the drama's central actor and the nexus of the play's many competing forces.

The audience sees and hears Hal's unrivaled dexterity with language in the play extempore in *1 Henry IV*, a scene in which Hal gets to play the king and preview the role. To insert a play within a play was a common stage trick of Shakespeare's typically used to ironically reveal truth through artifice. Performed as if the characters were real people portraying actors playing characters, these plays-within-the-plays focused attention, much like snow globes, by carefully selecting relationships and presenting them in miniature. They allowed considered gazes and experimentation through role-playing. In *1 Henry IV*'s snow globe, the audience gets to see in an intimate context the beginnings of Hal's transformation through the shape-shifting that it requires of its "characters." Hal can experiment with the demands of the crown psychologically and in language long before he is actually put to the test. In this contrived playworld, Hal is allowed to see himself through his father's eyes, measure his readiness to rule, and mark all he must reform and redeem in order to be found worthy. Thus, the play-within-the-play becomes, in Carol Marks Sicherman's words, "a study of authority and an exploration of Hal's emergent self."[19]

Without seeming to, Hal can also re-examine his relationship with Falstaff, who is a father to him in ways his actual father cannot be, and who completes the role-reversal

by in turn playing the prince. The audience is allowed to imagine this new world along with the central characters, a world shaken up and turned upside down. In this new world, Falstaff will no longer be valid or even welcome, so, in the play extempore, Hal can safely, even comically rehearse his friend's eventual banishment, a necessary banishment if Hal is to reject folly and misrule. Along with the prince's battlefield victory over Hotspur, his rescue of his father, and his exiling of Douglas, this early scene is among the critical moments in Shakespeare's development of Hal, one in which the audience hears Falstaff implore Hal the play-king not to banish gentle Jack. Though Hal could have responded in character with, simply, "I do," he instead couples present and future, just as the entire play extempore does, retorting: "I do; I will."[20] The prince does this for the mini-drama but also to signal to play-goers and perhaps most importantly to himself that again and for good, Falstaff as the embodiment of excess will have to be swept away to make way for a future of temperate, community-conscious Aristotelian goodness.

Shakespeare juxtaposes the play extempore with Hal's dramatic confrontation with his father, another exchange in which we see the future king begin to emerge in the ways Hal eloquently and expertly uses language:

> So please your majesty, I would I could
> Quit all offences with as clear excuse
> As well as I am doubtless I can purge
> Myself of many I am charged withal:
> Yet such extenuation let me beg,
> As, in reproof of many tales devised,
> Which oft the ear of greatness needs must hear
> By smiling pick-thanks and base news-mongers,
> I may, for some things true, wherein my youth
> Hath faulty wand'red and irregular,
> Find pardon on my true submission. (III.ii.18-28)

Hal's self-control in defense contrasts with the king's heat, which though directed at Hal is at the same time paradoxically de-personalized, as if the king were speaking as an agent for someone else:

> Heaven pardon thee! Yet let me wonder, Harry,
> At thy affections, which do hold a wing
> Quite from the flight of all thy ancestors.
> Thy place in council thou hast rudely lost.
> Which by thy younger brother is supplied,
> And art almost an alien to the hearts
> Of all the court and princes of my blood.
> The hope and expectation of thy time
> Is ruined, and the soul of every man
> Prophetically do forethink thy fall. (III.ii.29-38)

After withstanding a withering ninety-nine line critique from the king, a part of which is quoted above, Hal subsequently suffers another blistering barrage during which he can

interject only about a line and a half. However, when the king has finished, Harry seizes his chance, offering measured words that invoke "the name of God" in promising to surpass and overwhelm Hotspur. The king has not-so-secretly wished he could call Hotspur his son rather than Harry, establishing a convenient benchmark for Hal to meet, best, or remove. The prince resolves to do all three, and he delivers his promises in a piety that presages his reverential eloquence as conquering king:

> This, in the name of God, I promise here:
> The which if I perform and do survive,
> I do beseech your majesty may salve
> The long-grown wounds of my intemperature.
> If not, the end of life cancels all bonds,
> And I will die a hundred thousand deaths
> Ere break the smallest parcel of this vow. (III.ii.154-60)

Henry also invokes God, but the taint of his usurpation somewhat empties his rhetoric of the necessary gravitas. This creates another contrast, this one with Hal's effortless conjoining of personal ambition with the will and even anointing of God. Hal gives credit to God for victories he has yet to win, victories the audience knows he will win. In this same scene, Hal builds on his "I do; I will" play-acting with a soliloquy that anticipates his own validation and that of his age "on Percy's head."

Redemption

As Sicherman and others have noted, redemption is a central theme of the play and of Shakespeare's conception of Hal.[21] Ironically, it was Hal's father's usurpation that created the need for redemption in the first place, making Henry the perfect foil with which to mark the prince's development. For example, it is Henry who Hal must save on the battlefield in Act V of *1 Henry IV*, eliciting from Henry after the defeat of Douglas, "Thou hast redeemed thy lost opinion" (V.iii.48). Hotspur, too, is this sort of foil. In the same section of Hal's defense quoted above, the prince promises to "exchange" (or redeem) Hotspur's deeds with his own "glorious deeds." As early as Act I, Hal foretells of this need of heroic contrast: "And, like bright metal on a sullen ground, / My reformation, glittering o'er my fault, / Shall show more goodly and attract more eyes / Than that which hath no foil to set it off" (I.ii.149-52).

This idea of replacing the wanton, inglorious, and common with the determined, glorious actions of a prince is at the heart of the redemption theme that unifies the Henriad, and it is a distinctly Pauline redemption in promising more than just a mending of one's ways, but a sort of "born again" re-creation of a type with which Shakespeare would have been intimately familiar. As part of his schooling, he memorized vast portions of the New Testament. In fact, "redeeming the time" can be found verbatim in Paul's letters both to the Ephesians (5:16: "See how you walk circumspectly, not as unwise, but as wise: redeeming the time, because the days are evil.") and to the Colossians (4:5: "Walk in wisdom toward them that are without, redeeming the time.").[22]

There has been vigorous debate as to what "redeeming" time may have meant to Elizabethan audiences. Paul A. Jorgensen has argued that to redeem time would have

been "clearly understood" as taking full advantage of the time that man is given for eternal salvation, an interpretation that the Ephesians 5 and Colossians 4 references echo.[23] Hal's "sins," if sins they be, would not seem to doom or in any way preclude his earthly reign; many royals have sown their wild oats before settling down to rule and rule well. As evidence, Jorgensen points to a sermon by William Whately published in 1606, "The Redemption of Time," a sermon Shakespeare perhaps had access to when writing his *Henry IV* plays and one that identified wisdom as the chief aim or goal for those seeking to redeem their time. This interpretation of Hal de-emphasizes his spectacular achievements in defeating Hotspur and casting off Falstaff and instead underscores a variation of the "prodigal son" motif from the Gospel of Luke, in which the wayward son learns wisdom before returning to reclaim his rightful position.[24] Combating Hotspur and rejecting his wayward youth, Jorgensen argues, redeem Hal in the eyes and estimations of others, chiefly his father, but they do nothing to redeem the time as that expression and idea would have been used by Elizabethans, according to Jorgensen's reading.[25] Hal's statement in *2 Henry IV*, "For heaven doth know – so shall the world perceive" (V.v.51), also supports this interpretation, indicating that God (heaven) has known Hal throughout, while the audience, too, perceives in him an integrity and a constancy. It is the plays' many other characters who are taken by surprise when Hal proves valiant and worthy, and their reactions confirm for the audience that Hal is, in fact, a changed man.

One character who is not surprised is the Earl of Warwick, who defends the prince before his father the king:

> My gracious lord, you look beyond him quite:
> The prince but studies his companions
> Like a strange tongue, wherein, to gain the language,
> 'Tis needful that the most immodest word
> Be looked upon and learned; which once attained,
> Your highness knows, comes to no further use
> But to be known and hated. So, like gross terms,
> The prince will, in the perfectness of time,
> Cast off his followers, and their memory
> Shall as a pattern or a measure live,
> By which his grace must mete the lives of others,
> Turning past evils to advantages. (*2 Henry IV*, IV.ii.69-80)

For Warwick, Hal is studying and learning "strange tongues" in order to "gain the language" and improve, even master his rhetoric and, therefore, his impending role as king. Thus, Warwick gives voice to Shakespeare, whose metaphor it really is, and a most apt one for a playwright to choose. When Hal has achieved language mastery, at least in the metaphor, he will reform ("cast off his followers") and redeem ("turn past evils to advantages") himself. He will be ready. Warwick's defense here eloquently summarizes the unifying theme of the two *Henry IV* plays and in its eloquence *is* the very metaphor it evokes.[26]

Casting off Falstaff

As useful as Hotspur is as a contrast to Hal, the plays' more useful and enduring of foils for the development of Hal, other than the unredeemed character of Hal himself, is of course Falstaff, that most exquisite of Shakespearean creations that the playwright uses for so many different theatrical purposes. As an endearing, charming, even enchanting resistance to rule or law of any kind, and as a living, breathing critique of self-discipline, constancy, and religious orthodoxy, Falstaff is an obvious threat to any project of nationhood and civic good, as well as to any sort of religious orthodoxy that such a project would seem to require.

Falstaff is "a representation of secular immanence upon the stage" and a conception of freedom of soul attainable only by a mind that had received from Shakespeare's own "the inexplicable touch of infinity" that the playwright bestowed also on only a handful of his characters.[27] In fact, Falstaff is so compelling as character that it is possible that as character he had grown larger and fuller than Shakespeare possibly even intended, as A. C. Bradley persuasively reasoned more than a century ago. In inventing this ebullient personality, the playwright quite possibly became "caught up on the wind of his own genius, and carried so far that he could not descend to earth at the selected spot," a reference to the awkwardness so many playgoers feel when the lovable Fat Jack is taken away to be killed, rather than simply banished or even just left alone.[28]

in *1 Henry IV*, Falstaff says, "Let us be Diana's foresters, gentlemen of the shade, minions of the moon, and let men say we be men of good government, being governed, as the sea is, by our noble and chaste mistress the moon" (I.ii.17-19). He certainly *sounds* as if he supports good government, but we know the irreverent, even anarchic character to be a disruptive force of misrule; he serves himself and his immediate needs and pleasures, not any higher good. He is no citizen, who would seek and practice freedom within society not from it, and he has no interest in the civic good. He is, therefore, a threat to the body politic. Harold Bloom notes that the character's irreverence is undoubtedly life-enhancing, but it is state-destroying; of course, Hal must extinguish such a threat if he is to personify the power of the state as king.[29]

Jack Falstaff is also a threat to the church, as any such gleefully self-indulgent, seemingly guilt-free romp through life would be, especially one so dedicated to the pursuit of hedonistic pleasure, enjoyment, and ease. But he knows his Bible. In fact, the character's familiarity with the conventicle style of speech associated with church reformers of the period is another aspect of Falstaff's rhetoric of subversiveness. Naseeb Shaheen notes that about half of the biblical citations in *1 Henry IV* come from Falstaff.[30] The character's agile, witty parody of Puritan sanctimony serves to stiff-arm the church and to mock Protestantism as centerpieces of Falstaff's festival of self and superego. By inhabiting the discourses of church and state, he parodies and profanes both, bringing them low. Therefore, in addition to being useful to Shakespeare in exploring the limits of freedom in the contexts of societal and civic commitments, Falstaff also dramatizes Hal's ascendancy in becoming the state. When Hal inhabits the same discourses so flouted by Falstaff, he does so honestly, even with conviction. His rhetoric can soar all the higher, or seem to, juxtaposed as it is with that of "poor, plump Jack."

Shakespeare also uses Falstaff to connect Hal to the England and English of old, for Falstaff served Thomas Mowbray, Duke of Norfolk, Henry IV's rival at the beginning of *Richard II*. Henry's accusation of treachery led to Mowbray's banishment from England, inspiring Mowbray to articulate a moving farewell to England and to even

English as his language, a fusion of nationhood and language. Language for Anderson is one of any nation's principal unifiers and identifiers, which the Mowbray character seems to acknowledge with his lament. Hinging a love of the land with a love of the language, the character transcends politics and petty quarrels to articulate a kind of patriotism that can be seen as aligned with that of John of Gaunt as that character articulated and embodied it in *Richard II*, in his deathbed speech and ode to England. Thus, when Hal rejects Falstaff to fulfill the promise he made in his first soliloquy, the prince is disconnecting the future from Gaunt's and Mowbray's feudal Old England past and the antiquated notions of patriotism it required.

Sir John also reminds us of Hal's (and Shakespeare's) project by frequently pledging to change his ways, then returning immediately to jesting, idleness, and dallying. "Well, I'll repent, and that suddenly, while I am in some liking," Falstaff says in his typical casual, prose-y diction that suggests he will do nothing of the sort (III.iii.3-4). His mode of language, then, is consistent with the imaginative, exuberant, irreverent libertarian he is, which also contrasts sharply with Hal, whose controlled verse-y prose communicates resolve and discipline. A study of Falstaff's oaths reveals a quicksilver capacity to "swear" to God or the Lord one minute and prove a villain in the very next, so that by *1 Henry IV*'s end, as we say goodbye, we know better than to believe anything Jack says. "I'll purge, and leave sack, and live cleanly as a nobleman should do," he promises, but likely only to himself (V.iii.153-54).

Shakespeare uses sack, a sweet wine fortified with brandy and known today as sherry, as an emblem or visual marker of Falstaff's wanton, carefree world, the world Hal will leave behind, as well as the means with which Falstaff maintains and even defends that world. In *2 Henry IV*, Falstaff declares, "If I had a thousand sons, the first principle I would teach them should be to forswear thin potations and to addict themselves to sack" (IV.ii.451-53), while in *1 Henry IV*, at Shrewsbury, sack is seemingly Jack's weapon; when Hal reaches into Falstaff's weapon case on the battlefield, he pulls out not a sword but a bottle of sack, throwing it back at Jack in disgust. But sweet wine *is* Falstaff's sword, his weapon of choice to fight and defend what is his. A "a good sherry-sack" gives Sir John Sack-and-sugar wit, and it warms his blood, according to the character's doxology on the wide-ranging benefits of the fermented drink in *2 Henry IV* (IV.ii.428-453).

Shakespeare gives Falstaff such free reign, such near-perfect freedom, that it must have been difficult for the playwright to end him, to remove such a vivid figure and dynamic personality out of the way of Hal and, therefore, of future England. Hal as Henry will need to be serious, respectable, moral, and stately, all attributes that impose limits and obligations and, as the great English critic A. C. Bradley wrote, "make us subjects of the old father antic the law, and the categorical imperative, and our station and its duties, and conscience, and reputation, and other people's opinions, and all sorts of nuisances."[31] Sir John is so free from these "nuisances" that he can't be said to be their enemy, because to combat them would be to recognize them. "They are absurd to him; and to reduce a thing ad absurdum is to reduce it to nothing and to walk about free and rejoicing," Bradley observed. "This is what Falstaff does with all the would-be serious things of life, sometimes only by his words, sometimes by his actions, too."[32]

To emphasize the visual marking of Hal's transcendence, a 1984 production of *1 Henry IV* in Santa Cruz, California contemporized the characters by casting Falstaff as an

aging Hell's Angel and his Eastcheap drinking buddies as a biker gang. Visually, the Hell's Angels motif put into stark relief Hal's ascension from gang member in leather and chains to businessman diplomat to five-star general, and the development of his language roughly tracks the predictable wardrobe changes. The production featured a distilling scene in which, after victory at Shrewsbury, a tired, filthy Hal reluctantly poses for photos while flanked by a fresh Falstaff flashing the "V" sign, lighting up a victory cigar, and soaking up as much of the publicity as he could.[33] It is an apt, social media/selfie-ready image of the two characters' play-lives – the valiant battlefield hero and his sidekick sycophant posing for the iPhone, and a wildly free personality enjoying enjoyment itself. In Santa Cruz as in England, Shakespeare abides.

Of course, the principal visual marker in the play is "Fat Jack" himself sporting a girth that indexes the character's unregeneracy and, over all else, epicurean pleasure-seeking. With his "fat paunch" and "huge hill of flesh," Jack represented to the pulpits of the day a villainous lifestyle of corruption and consumption, so much so, in fact, that Hal's condemnation at the end of *2 Henry IV*, in which he rejects the "profane," "swelled" Jack, should be read not as high-handed and hypocritical, which it certainly sounds, but as an appropriate, even expected reproach and rebuke from a close friend. Hal exhorts Falstaff to a "reformation" in a godly discourse common to the late fifteenth century.[34] Thus, Jack symbolizes and signifies all that disqualified Hal from the throne so completely that when Hal says to Falstaff, "I know thee not" (V.v.41), Hal could have just as easily been speaking to himself, or that part of himself that frequented the Boar's Head tavern with Fat Jack. "Presume not that I am the thing I was. . . . I have turned away from my former self" and the Boar's Head fellowship (V.v.50-52), Hal declares.

Michael Davies refers to the two parts of *Henry IV* as "a specifically Reformation drama" that presents Hal as a Protestant hero, such that it is little surprise that in this pivot away from Eastcheap, Hal sounds like a Puritan delivering a Calvinist sermon.[35] Davies points out that the appropriate Protestant response in the late sixteenth century to such hedonism and excess would be to reject and distance oneself from the bad company that enabled it.[36] In all private occasions of life and in private conversation, Elizabethan Protestants were taught that "the godly man not only could but must cut himself off from the ungodly," as Patrick Collinson has noted. Paul admonished in 1 Corinthians 5:9-13 that Christians should not "keep company" with "fornicators" (or anyone who is likewise "covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner").[37] According to Peter Martyr's *Treatise* on this subject, believers could try to win unbelievers over to the faith, but they were otherwise barred from indulging "in familiar conversation for their own pleasure and recreation or for profit or gain. And if the unbelievers should prove incorrigible, they were to be utterly forsaken."[38]

To return to the final act of the two parts of *Henry IV*, important to the argument here is that the speech act in which Hal throws off and even erases Falstaff (as king, he has the chief justice send Falstaff to his death) is principally a rejection of Fat Jack's speech as the playwright continues to mine the metaphorical value and power of language. It is important that the road to reformation is or should be one of sincere prayer –another speech act. For an additional layer of metaphorical meaning, in warning Jack against "gourmandizing," or eating, Hal conjures the image of a gaping grave "eating" he who cannot seem to eat too much, a grave "thrice wider" than was the norm:

I know thee not, old man. *Fall to thy prayers.*
How ill white hairs become a fool and jester!
I have long dreamed of such a kind of man,
So surfeit-swelled, so old and so profane.
But being awake, I do despise my dream.
Make less thy body hence, and more thy grace;
Leave gormandizing; know the grave doth gape
For thee thrice wider than for other men.
Reply not to me with a fool-born jest.
Presume not that I am the thing I was,
For God doth know – so shall the world perceive –
That I have turned away my former self,
So will I those that kept me company.
When thou dost hear I am as I have been,
Approach me, and thou shalt be as thou wast,
The tutor and the feeder of my riots:
Till then, I banish thee, on pain of death,
As I have done the rest of my misleaders,
Not to come near our person by ten mile.
For competence of life I will allow you,
That lack of means enforce you not to evil.
And, *as we hear you do reform yourselves*,
We will, according to your strengths and qualities,
Give you advancement. –Be it your charge, my lord,
To see performed the tenor of our word. –Set on.
(2 Henry IV, V.v.42-65, emphases added)

Falstaff rejected notions of truth, honor, law, patriotism, duty, courage, war, and death as absurd, and he did so with mirth. This left Hal to restore these very same virtues and uphold them as king. Hal, therefore, must shed his youth and the waywardness, truancy, and immaturity that marked it. This maturation, as it anticipates his succession to the throne, is the key achievement of the second Henry play, and it is argued here that the accomplishment is also an emblem or marker for the development of England as nation, as well. As Henry goes, so goes England. In Henry, England has a king who speaks as his people and for his people, who eschews vices for virtue, excess for discipline, and division for reconciliation. We find out in wonderfully theatrical ways in *Henry V* how virtuous Hal is in replacing a father who served as a sort of interim figure between the narcissistic Richard and Harry England. Taking the crown militarily and holding England together while Hal could grow up, Henry IV is a bridge from the feudalism of old England, represented by John of Gaunt, to a new, national England. Henry's illness might be the playwright visually marking the gathering infirmity of England as it is threatened from within, further setting up the need for Hal as redeemer of his and England's time and building on the weeds-in-the-garden metaphor Shakespeare presents in the third act of *Richard II*. It is as Henry readies to die that Hal's reformation and redemption are effected. Thus, the *Henry IV* plays are about transition, about becoming, and it is in Hal's speech that we see it occur.

Besting Hotspur

The increase in Hal's verbal dexterity is perhaps most fully displayed when he mocks Hotspur, which is significant, because Percy must be eclipsed if Hal is to earn his father's respect. Hotspur's own speech is a paradigm of traditional patriotism, loyalty, and, above all, honor, offering yet another marked contrast to Hal and also to Falstaff. Sicherman calls the prince's speeches to and about Hotspur in *1 Henry IV* Hal's "greatest verse," a preview of the verse he will speak as king.[39] Unlike Falstaff, Hotspur is at first glance the sort of champion we should pull for, the sort about which epic movies are made. Cue Brad Pitt or Gerard Butler. This is why Henry wishes Hotspur were his heir ("Yea, there thou mak'st me sad and mak'st me sin / In envy that my Lord Northumberland / Should be the father of so blest a son: / A son who is the theme of honour's tongue; / Amongst a grove, the very straightest plant" [I.i.77-81]). Mark Van Doren, for one, has described Hotspur's poetry as "unsurpassed."[40]

Thus, linguistically, Hotspur would seem to be Hal's match, just as he is militarily Hal's equal on the battlefield. But playgoers know better than to place their bets on Percy, for he is one-dimensional and genuinely, fundamentally impetuous. So is his speech. Caring nothing of political matters, Hotspur instead seeks action in his devotion to "bright honour" (I.iii.205). For Hotspur, honor is almost material, something that he can "pluck . . . from the pale-faced moon," and easily at that, or maybe even get by diving to "the bottom of the deep," or grab by the hair (I.iii.205-8). He sees it as an honor that is based on valor earned (or "redeemed," line 209) on the battlefield.

Both Hotspur and Falstaff, then, are "irresponsible and self-indulgent," just in very different ways.[41] One is willing to risk his life, even eager to do so, while the other risks the lives of everyone around him by rejecting honor, but really, above all, to save his own, ample skin. The playwright made Hotspur a contemporary of Hal's rather than the historical Hotspur three years older than the king in order, it would seem, to enable Hal to emerge as the Aristotelian golden mean between the extremes personified by his two primary character foils. Hotspur's "extravagant chivalric commitments" play out on one side of Hal while Falstaff's Platonic pleasure principle and baser allegiances play out on the other. Consider the emphasis Hal's words have for an audience that just heard Falstaff celebrate the mistress of the moon:

> I know you all, and will awhile uphold
> The unyoked humour of your idleness.
> Yet herein will I imitate the sun,
> Who doth permit the base contagious clouds
> To smother up his beauty from the world,
> That, when he please again to be himself,
> Being wanted, he may be more wondered at,
> By breaking through the foul and ugly mists
> Of vapours that did seem to strangle him. (I.ii.132-40)

For similar reasons, Shakespeare has Hal victorious at Shrewsbury despite the historical evidence because the play's narrative trajectory requires him to be. In Holinshed's

Chronicles, it is Henry who secured the victory at Shrewsbury. Hal can thus "earn" his crown and replace divine sanction, which failed with Richard II, with humanly legitimate rule. Importantly, his rhetoric does not attempt to access legitimacy by God; his redemption can, therefore, be England's redemption. In Shakespeare's text, a kind of history is created or inscribed that "leads to a coherent moral ending."[42]

As Hal's language patterns move from the pub to the court to the battlefield to coronation, he grows into and begins to own the regal speech that will mark Henry V as valorous victor and legitimate ruler of England, an England that he will unite against the threat of civil war. Following the confrontation with his father, Hal's voice grows, his mastery of language unfurling like a royal banner. Even as he moves from prose to verse, the latter on display whenever he must act the prince, Hal is growing into the crown. As Henry V, he speaks complex but rhythmic sentences as part of rousing cries to victory, and as new king, he is introduced early in *Henry V* by the Archbishop of Canterbury with a celebration of his facility with language rather than his prowess with the sword or a divine ordination by God. Linguistic divinity is his defining characteristic and that which makes him eligible to lead, according to the archbishop:

> Hear him but reason in divinity,
> And, all-admiring, with an inward wish
> You would desire the king were made a prelate.
> Hear him debate of commonwealth affairs,
> You would say it hath been all in all his study.
> List his discourse of war, and you shall hear
> A fearful battle rendered you in music.
> Turn him to any cause of policy,
> The Gordian knot of it he will unloose,
> Familiar as his garter, that, when he speaks,
> The air, a chartered libertine, is still,
> And the mute wonder lurketh in men's ears,
> To steal his sweet and honeyed sentences. (I.i.40-52)

Canterbury is showing Warwick's prophecy proved true. Hear his divine reasoning, Canterbury invites, his expert debating of those things important to the daily lives of those he rules. Hear his musical discourse of even war. Observe how his speech controls that which is most free, the very air, and produces mute wonder in men eager to hear his sweet, honeyed words. Again, Shakespeare employs a metaphor of food-to-mouth, in this case the eating of honeyed sentences, even as part of the larger metaphor of language as performed reality. And the playwright does so with historical precedence. Holinshed's *Chronicles* describe Hal as the "blacke haired" king "of countenance amiable, eloquent and grave was his speech, and of great grace and power to persuade . . . a lode-starre in honour, and mirror of magnificence."[43] Even by the end of *1 Henry IV*, Hal can say accurately, believably, "I am the Prince of Wales" (V.iii.64). Gone is the imitator and fraternity house pledge, and in his place has arisen, mostly displayed through language, the future king.

In this transformation is an irony: To unite England, or as Sicherman puts it, to be a brother to all Englishmen, Hal has separated or isolated himself.[44] Emotionally isolated

throughout the play, by its end we see why, which is to accomplish his transformation within, just as England's will also have to be achieved. A telescoping or blooming of these declarations comes in *2 Henry IV*, where we see Hal move from declarations of self to those of nation:

> The tide of blood in me
> Hath proudly flowed in vanity till now.
> Now doth it turn and ebb back to the sea,
> Where it shall mingle with the state of floods
> And flow henceforth in formal majesty.
> Now call we our high court of parliament,
> And let us choose such limbs of noble counsel,
> That the great body of our state may go
> In equal rank with the best governed nation (V.ii.130-38)

In this eloquent and rather long speech, Hal moves from his own "vanity" to concerns for "the great body of our state," pledging to put England on par with "the best governed nation" or nations on earth. And for Hal it is "our" state and nation, one in which "we" call together "our" high court of parliament.

As king, Harry establishes a new world and new authority by displacing the vertical hierarchy of Richard with a horizontal "band of brothers" and by moving, as Anny Crunelle-Vanrigh put it, from "regalia to charisma, and from kingship to kinship."[45] Rather than relying on God for legitimacy, Hal looks to his "brothers," but without de-sacralizing the monarchy.[46] In his oft-quoted battle oration in *Henry V*'s Act IV, Hal becomes a sort of historiographer, for before the battle has even been waged, he takes the perspective of the distant future -- the Elizabethan present -- to cast Agincourt as a holy day in England's as-yet-unlived history. He is creating out of French air English rite and ritual for the imagined community that is – or will be – England.

> I am a king that find thee, and I know
> 'Tis not the balm, the sceptre and the ball,
> The sword, the mace, the crown imperial,
> The intertissued robe of gold and pearl,
> The farcèd title running 'fore the king,
> The throne he sits on, nor the tide of pomp
> That beats upon the high shore of this world.
> No, not all these, thrice-gorgeous ceremony,
> Not all these, laid in bed majestical,
> Can sleep so soundly as the wretched slave,
> Who with a body filled and vacant mind
> Gets him to rest, crammed with distressful bread;
> Never sees horrid night, the child of hell,
> But like a lackey, from the rise to set,
> Sweats in the eye of Phoebus and all night
> Sleeps in Elysium: next day after dawn,
> Doth rise and help Hyperion to his horse,

And follows so the ever-running year,
With profitable labour, to his grave.
And but for ceremony, such a wretch,
Winding up days with toil and nights with sleep,
Had the fore-hand and vantage of a king. (*Henry V*, IV.i.213-234)

Borne by Henry's (and, therefore, Shakespeare's) inscrutable rhetorical powers, nearly two centuries after the "fact," we hear, beating in darkness, the hearts of the dead and the living. In exchanging the "majestic" symbols of the crown for those of fraternity, Hal as semiotician displaces God as his champion and replaces him with his fellow English, re-interpreting the symbols and props of rule, the very substance of rule for Richard II – scepter and ball, sword, mace, crown, and robe – as mere ceremony and illusion. By doing so he relocates kingly authority, escapes the past, especially that part of the past culminating in Richard II, and throws off that past's shame and guilt.[47]

A citizen king, Hal is associated by Shakespeare conspicuously and idiosyncratically with the capital city. Such extensive use of London as urban context by the playwright is unique to *Henry V*, and it dramatizes the break Hal makes and represents from England's "old, static, feudal, agrarian past," a past seen ("But now behold . . .") by the Chorus at *Henry V*'s end, and therefore punctuation for the end of the Henriad, as irrelevant.

But now behold, in the quick forge and working-house of thought,
How London doth pour forth out her citizens. (V.Chorus.22-24).

Hal's new, modern England is one of industry, commerce, and progressivism, a factory and beehive of good "citizens" rather than subjects. Elizabethan audiences of the play were in fact seeing the realization of this new urban cityscape that by the end of the sixteenth century was beginning to dominate England.[48]

This final Chorus asks the audience in the form of a sonnet to accept the action they have just seen on the stage as history despite the fact that England's "mighty men" have been shown only in miniature and notwithstanding the play's "mangling" of the glory of these national heroes, a mangling apparently due to the "unable pen" of the play's "bending author" and the inadequacies of the "wooden O" in which it was enacted:

Thus far, with rough and all-unable pen,
Our bending author hath pursued the story,
In little room confining mighty men,
Mangling by starts the full course of their glory.
Small time, but in that small most greatly lived
This star of England. Fortune made his sword;
By which the world's best garden be achieved,
And of it left his son imperial lord.
Henry the Sixth, in infant bands crowned King
Of France and England, did this king succeed,
Whose state so many had the managing,
That they lost France and made his England bleed,

Which oft our stage hath shown; and, for their sake,
In your fair minds let this acceptance take. (V.Epilogue.1-14)

As an apology, this Chorus offers a dazzling meta-commentary on the action of the stage.[49] An actor speaks these rehearsed lines as part of a role, lines that ask audiences who file into playhouses to excuse the "confining" theater and the "unable" playwright in order to accept, at least in their minds, the action on the stage as a form of historical truth. If this entreaty is met with success, all the more credit paradoxically belongs to the theater for achieving artistic triumph despite its modest means, which follows a logic not unlike Hal's own in *1 Henry IV* when he promises to use the limitations of his youth to magnify the achievement of his maturity. Shakespeare achieves with language a king, even a nation; a king who establishes and communicates his kingliness through rhetorical mastery. If Hal is at all believable, and he is one of Shakespeare's most fully developed and revealed characters, credit is due to the actors. We see and learn of Hal through the eyes of his father and his brother, his military-political rival, his drinking buddy, courtiers and ministers of state, the Bishop of Canterbury, rebels and rabble-rousers, and the all-knowing Chorus. But we hear from Hal directly, as well, even his innermost thoughts and anticipations, making him a powerful character with which to personify nation and nationhood. Richard II's "hollow" crown is hollow no more.[50]

---

[1] Maxwell McCombs, *Setting the Agenda: The Mass Media and Public Opinion* (Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley, 2013). In this book, McCombs, with Don Shaw one of the founders of agenda-setting media theory, states one of mass media's powers as the "ability to influence the salience of topics on the public agenda" (3).
[2] Roland Barthes, *What Is Sport?* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2007), 57.
[3] All references to the play are to *The RSC William Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen, eds. (New York: The Modern Library, 2007).
[4] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso Books, 1991).
[5] Constance C. T. Hunt expertly demonstrates how Shakespeare can inform liberal theory and Marxist theory as explanations of the emergence of a modern sense of nationalism in her article, "The Origins of National Identity in Shakespeare's Henry V," *Perspectives on Political Science* 36, no. 3 (2007): 133-140.
[6] As David Scott Kastan noted, the term "history play" is an odd one, oxymoronically pairing a genre of truth-telling with an imaginative, fictive form ("'To Set a Form upon that Indigest': Shakespeare's Fictions of History" *Comparative Drama* 17, no. 1 (Spring 1983): 1-16. Only since the late sixties have scholars given Shakespeare credit for sophisticated historical understanding of any sort of systematic kind (see Sigurd Burckhardt, in "Swoll'n with Some Other Grief: Shakespeare's Prince Hal Trilogy," *Shakespeare Meanings* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1968), 144-205.
[7] See, to cite just a few examples, David Baker, *Between Nations: Shakespeare, Spenser, Marvell, and the Question of Britain* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1997), in which the author provides an exhaustive review of scholarship on the question of nationalism; J. O. Bartley, *Teague, Shenkin and Sawney: An Historical Study of the Earliest Irish, Welsh and Scottish Characters in English Plays* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1954); Jean Howard and Phyllis Rackin, *Engendering a Nation: A Feminist Account of Shakespeare's Histories* (New York: Routledge, 1997); Phyllis Rackin, *Stages of History: Shakespeare's English Chronicles* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1990); Peter Womack, "Imaging Communities: Theatres and the English Nation in the Sixteenth Century," in *Culture and History 1350-1260: Essays on English Communities, Identities and Writing*, ed. David Aers (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992), 91-145; Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); Michael Neill, "Broken English and Broken Irish: Nation, Language, and the Optic Power in Shakespeare's Histories," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45 (Spring 1994): 1-32; Claire McEachern, *The Poetics of English Nationhood, 1590-1612* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 83-137; A. Truninger, *Paddy and Paycock: A Study of the Stage Irishman from Shakespeare to*

O'Casey (Bern: Francke, 1976); Kathleen Rabl, "Taming the 'Wild Irish' in English Renaissance Drama," in *Literary Interrelations: Ireland, England and the World*, eds. Wolfgang Zach and Heinz Kosok, *Studies in English and Comparative Literature* 3 (Tubingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1987): 47-59; Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980); and Jonathan Baldo, "Wars of Memory in *Henry V*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 46 (Summer 1996): 132-159.

[8] Martin Heidegger, *Poetry, Language, Thought* (New York, N.Y.: Harper & Row, 1971), 43. Heidegger called a work of art any social artifact or practice that performed these roles of gathering, focusing, and expressing, art that he claimed "gives to things their look and to men their outlook on themselves."

[9] In Alain de Botton, *The News: A User's Manual* (New York: Pantheon, 2014), 86.

[10] James Shapiro, *The Year of Lear: Shakespeare in 1606* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2015), 40.

[11] There is a great deal of tension between these interpretations, and there are a number of scholars on either side of the divide. See, for example, Robert Weimann, "Bifold Authority in Shakespeare's Theatre," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 39, no. 4 (Winter 1988): 401-17; Leonard Tennenhouse, *Power on Display: The Politics of Shakespeare's Genres* (London: Methuen, 1986), 69-70; Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield, "History and Ideology: The Instance of Henry V," in *Alternative Shakespeares*, John Drakakis, ed. (London: Methuen, 1985), 206-27.

[12] Jonathan Crewe, "Reforming Prince Hal: The Sovereign Inheritor in '2 Henry IV,'" *Renaissance Drama* 21, Disorder and the Drama (1990): 227-229.

[13] Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 5-6; 141.

[14] Edgar T. Schell, "Prince Hal's Second 'Reformation,'" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 21, no. 1 (Winter 1970): 11-16. Among those who have argued for unity, even continuity, are Dover Wilson, E. M. W. Tillyard, Irving Ribner, and even Samuel Jonson. Harold Jenkins argues for "both one play and two" (*The Structural Problem in Shakespeare's Henry the Fourth* [London: Signet Classic, 1956], 231), while G. K. Hunter sees unity but not continuity ("*Henry IV* and the Elizabethan Two Part Play," *Renaissance English Studies* V [1954]: 236-248).

[15] Joan Webber, "The Renewal of the King's Symbolic Role: From *Richard II* to *Henry V*," *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 4, no. 4 (Winter 1963): 530-36.

[16] Anderson, *Imagined Communities*,133.

[17] David Scott Kastan, ed., *King Henry IV, Part I*, The Arden Shakespeare (London: Thomson Learning, 2002), 7.

[18] For an articulation of the "Hal as Machiavel" argument, see, for example, Michael Manheim, *The Weak King Dilemma* (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1973).

[19] Carol Marks Sicherman, "'King Hal': The Integrity of Shakespeare's Portrait," *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 21, no. 4 (Winter 1979): 506.

[20] The coupling tenses is discussed by Paul A. Gottschalk in "Hal and the 'Play Extempore' in I Henry IV," *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 15, no. 4 (Winter 1974): 612.

[21] Sicherman, "King Hal," 508; D. J. Palmer, "Casting Off the Old Man: History and St. Paul in 'Henry IV,'" *Critical Quarterly* 12, no. 3 (September 1970): 267-283.

[22] King James Version. For an exploration of these Pauline themes, see D. J. Palmer, "Casting off the Old Man: History and St. Paul in 'Henry IV,' 267-283.

[23] Paul A. Jorgensen, *Redeeming Shakespeare's Words* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1962), 59.

[24] As eldest son and, therefore, heir, Hal does not prototypically fit the prodigal model, as Jonathan Crewe noted ("Reforming Prince Hal," 230). Applied more generally, however, the narrative arc that shows Hal sewing his wild oats, drinking, and debauching, then casting such wantonness off to return to his father to make good would seem to comport with the outline and purpose of the parable.

[25] Jorgensen, *Redeeming Shakespeare's Words*, 67-8.

[26] See Joan Webber, "The Renewal of the King's Symbolic Role," 531.

[27] Quote "secular immanence upon the stage" from Harold Bloom, *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human* (New York: Riverhead Books, 1998), 280; "touch of infinity" from A. C. Bradley, "The Rejection of Falstaff," in *Oxford Lectures on Poetry* (London, 1909; reprinted in 1965 by St. Martin's Press), 273.

[28] A. C. Bradley, "The Rejection of Falstaff," 273.

[29] Bloom, *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human*, 282.

[30] Naseeb Shaheen, *Biblical References in Shakespeare's Plays* (Newark, Del.: University of Delaware Press, 2011), 137.
[31] A. C. Bradley, "The Rejection of Falstaff," 262.
[32] Bradley, "The Rejection of Falstaff," 263.
[33] Alan C. Dessen, "Staging Shakespeare's History Plays in 1984: A Tale of Three Henrys," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 36, no. 1 (Spring 1985): 77.
[34] Michael Davies, "Falstaff's Lateness: Calvinism and the Protestant Hero in *Henry IV*," *Review of English Studies* 56, no. 225 (June 2005): 353.
[35] Ibid., 351.
[36] Ibid., 356.
[37] Patrick Collinson, "The Cohabitation of the Faithful with the Unfaithful," in Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan I. Israel, and Nicholas Tyacke (ed.s), *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (Oxford, England: Oxford Scholarship Online, 1991), 61.
[38] Ibid., 362.
[39] Sicherman, "King Hal," 506.
[40] Mark Van Doren, "Henry IV," *Henry the Fourth Parts I and II: Critical Essays*, David Bevington, ed. (New York: Garland Publishing, 1986), 99.
[41] Kastan, "'To Set a Form upon that Indigest,'" 71.
[42] Matthew H. Wikander, "The Protean Prince," *Comparative Drama* 26, no. 4 (Winter 1992-93): 301.
[43] Raphael Holinshed, *Chronicles of England, Scotlande and Irelande*, vol. III (1577). edition. Diminishing this high praise somewhat is the frequency of the term "eloquent" in Holinshed's history. Many if not most of the royals he chronicles are so described.
[44] Sicherman, "King Hal," 509.
[45] Anny Crunelle-Vanrigh, "'Henry V' as a Royal Entry," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 47, no. 2, Tudor and Stuart Drama (Spring 2007): 370.
[46] Richard F. Hardin argues that in committing "civil idolatry," Hal does in fact desacralize the throne. See *Civil Idolatry: Desacralizing and Monarchy in Spenser, Shakespeare, and Milton* (London: Associated University Presses, 1992), 29.
[47] P. K. Ayers, "'Fellows of Infinite Tongue': Henry V and the King's English," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 34, no. 2, Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama (Spring 1994): 267.
[48] Stephen Greenblatt, "Invisible Bullets," in *Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England* (London: Clarendon Press, 1988), 49-52.
[49] For a discussion of why the Chorus apologizes for the theater, see Lawrence Danson, "*Henry V*: King, Chorus, and Critics," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 34, no. 1 (Spring 1978), 27-43.
[50] *Richard II*, III.ii.160-70.