

KING HENRY V



EDITED BY
EMMA SMITH
Hertford College, Oxford



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain
Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa

<http://www.cambridge.org>

© Cambridge University Press 2002

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2002

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeface Ehrhardt 10/12 pt. *System* QuarkXPress [BTS]

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Shakespeare, William, 1564–1616.

King Henry V / edited by Emma Smith.

p. cm. – (Shakespeare in production)

Includes bibliographical references (p. 237) and index.

ISBN 0 521 59428 6 – ISBN 0 521 59511 8 (pbk.)

1. Henry V, King of England, 1387–1422 – Drama.
 2. Henry V, King of England, 1387–1422 – In literature.
 3. Henry V, King of England, 1387–1422 – In motion pictures.
 4. Shakespeare, William, 1564–1616 – Film and video adaptations.
 5. Shakespeare, William, 1564–1616 – Stage history.
 6. Shakespeare, William, 1564–1616. Henry V. I. Smith, Emma, 1970–
- II. Title. III. Series.

PR2812.A2 S49 2002

822.3'3 – dc21 2001052892

ISBN 0 521 59428 6 hardcover

ISBN 0 521 59511 8 paperback

CONTENTS

List of illustrations	<i>page</i> vi
Series editors' preface	vii
Acknowledgements	ix
List of abbreviations	x
List of significant productions	xiv
Introduction	1
List of characters	82
<i>King Henry V</i>	83
Bibliography	237
Index	241

ILLUSTRATIONS

- 1 Macready as Henry V, pre-1839 (by permission of the Folger Shakespeare Library). *page 24*
- 2 Playbill from the Princess's Theatre for Charles Kean's 1859 production (by permission of the Victoria and Albert Museum, London). *27*
- 3 Mrs Kean as Chorus as the Muse of History, Act 1 (by permission of the Folger Shakespeare Library). *29*
- 4 Historical episode in Act 5 of Charles Calvert's 1879 production (by permission of the Shakespeare Centre Library). *32*
- 5 Frank Benson as a heroic Henry (1897) (by permission of the Shakespeare Centre Library). *37*
- 6 The Battle of Agincourt in Laurence Olivier's film (1944) (by permission of Carlton Pictures). *55*
- 7 Ian Holm as Henry in John Barton and Peter Hall's 1964 production (by permission of the Shakespeare Centre Library, photograph by Reg Wilson). *61*
- 8 Act 1: Alan Howard and his court in 'rehearsal' clothes in Terry Hands' 1975 production (by permission of Nobby Clark). *68*
- 9 The execution of Bardolph in Adrian Noble's 1984 production (by permission of the Shakespeare Centre Library, photograph by Joe Cocks). *72*
- 10 After the battle: Kenneth Branagh's 1989 film (Renaissance Pictures). *75*
- 11 Tableau of the Battle of Agincourt in Matthew Warchus' 1994 production (by permission of Ivan Kyncl). *77*
- 12 The audience and the stage in Mark Rylance's 1997 production at Shakespeare's Globe (by permission of Shakespeare's Globe, photograph by John Trammer). *78*

INTRODUCTION

First performed in 1599, and, according to its first appearance in print, ‘played sundry times’ by 1600, *Henry V* fell out of the theatrical repertoire after a single revival in 1605 until the eighteenth century. By the mid-twentieth century, however, a skit on Shakespeare in the theatre included a weary Henry alongside Hamlet and Juliet begging audiences to ‘give us a rest’.¹ Popularity and unpopularity both tell a story about the play and its audiences, and the fluctuating fortunes of *Henry V* in the theatre are instructive in reminding us that stage history can only be understood in a broader cultural and historical context. The political and emotional distance, for example, between George Rignold’s heroic Henry entering the stage in 1879 on a white horse called Crispin, and Michael Pennington leading a ragtag hooligan army with placards proclaiming ‘Fuck the Frogs’ (1986–9) is as much a measure of changing British attitudes to leadership as it is of the changing cultural role of Shakespeare, changing scholarly opinions or changing theatrical styles. It could be argued that the Napoleonic wars, the Festival of Britain and Vietnam have been at least as important to the history of *Henry V* in production as have Hazlitt, Kemble and Stanislavsky. Gary Taylor notes that the popularity of the play in the nineteenth century owes more to ‘English foreign policy than to English theatrical taste’,² and this association between stage and politics is a perennial feature of the play’s life in the theatre in other centuries too.

The play’s serial topicality emerges as one of the most pressing features of its life on the stage, as it reflects, recalls and participates in military conflicts from the Crimea to the Falklands. To stage the play has always been a political act, and most often consciously so. The politics to which the play has spoken have most commonly been British or, more specifically, English ones: no other Shakespeare play has been so ignored outside the English-speaking world, and it is both a cause and an effect of the insularity of its performance history that it has been seen to be so inescapably engaged with

1 Sandy Wilson, ‘Give Us A Rest’ from *See You Later* (1953), reprinted in *The Shakespeare Revue*, eds. Christopher Luscombe and Malcolm McKee, (London: Nick Hern Books, 1994), pp. 23–4.

2 Gary Taylor (ed.), *The Oxford Shakespeare: Henry V* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), p. 11.

changing and contested definitions of English and British national identity.³ In addition there are, however, specifically theatrical questions in the history of the play on the stage: star versus ensemble playing, realism versus epic, historical pageant versus contemporary *realpolitik*, the issue of roles for women. The Introduction to this volume aims to discuss these in the chronology of *Henry V* in the theatre and to trace the interventions which have shaped this ongoing narrative.

All stage histories are inevitably structured around the necessary absence of their object: the director Richard Eyre has suggested that the theatrical performance has the same ephemeral beauty as the snowman sculpted by Michelangelo during rare wintry weather in Florence.⁴ All available sources of information – promptbooks, reviews, interviews or recollections or stated intentions of theatre practitioners, photographs, and, for the most recent productions, video recordings of live performances, are partial, sometimes contradictory, and often potentially misleading. Stage history is as much an account of reception as it is of production, and often audiences do not experience what directors intended them to experience – as when to the professed surprise of the cast, some audiences at the play in the new Globe theatre in 1997 cheered the English and booed the French. Of course neither productions nor audiences are homogeneous, although stage history has tended to prefer the pragmatic singular ‘production’ over the bewilderingly multiple ‘performances’. Sometimes a long-held assumption about a play can be sustained in the face of a production which attempts to dismantle it: a number of reviews of Terry Hands’ quizzical 1975 production maintained that the play was a patriotic epic despite the director’s attempt to interrogate, rather than reproduce, this dominant interpretation.⁵ In the Commentary I have preferred to quote from rather than paraphrase or interpret promptbooks and reviews so as to allow readers to reconstruct something of these performances and form their own judgements on their significance. Unless otherwise identified, commentary on the productions by Adrian Noble, Ron Daniels and Richard Olivier is based on my own experience as an audience member; so too are the comments on the filmed versions of the play directed by Laurence Olivier, Michael Hayes, David Giles, Michael Bogdanov and Kenneth Branagh. Because not all

3 See, for example, ‘What Ish My Nation’ in David Cairns and Shaun Richards, *Writing Ireland: Colonialism, Nationalism and Culture* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988).

4 Richard Eyre, *Changing Stages: A View of the British Theatre in the Twentieth Century* (London: Bloomsbury, 2000), p. 10.

5 For example, the *Daily Express* review, quoted in Beauman: ‘This is a gutsy, reviving production at a time of national adversity. And boy, do we need it’ (p. 253).

productions of a play are radical reinterpretations, and because we misrepresent theatre history if we leave out the standard productions in favour of those which pioneer different approaches, I have tried to give space to periods when stage productions do not change as well as those when innovative practitioners transform the theatrical possibilities of the text. The Introduction takes a broadly chronological approach to the stage history of the play, although it will be clear that this does not imply a linear narrative of development.

I have also made extensive use of filmic examples, particularly from the films of Laurence Olivier and Kenneth Branagh, largely because these are still widely available for individual viewing and discussion unlike the melted snowmen discussed elsewhere in this book. There are, however, significant differences between stage and film versions of a play: not just the specific differences of interpretation for the different languages of the two media, which can be traced in the example of Branagh's very different stage and film versions of the play discussed below, but more fundamentally in the positioning of the audience. Plays do not control the focus of an audience in the ways that films must do: in the theatre, we always have the choice to look elsewhere. Sitting with other audience members in the theatre watching a live performance played out on a stage in front of you is very different from sitting in a cinema watching the constructed sequence of shots put together by the director, and both these are different again from the small-screen, often solitary, or domestic experience of watching Shakespeare on television or video. There are also methodological problems in this distinction: live performance exists, as Walter Benjamin put it, in 'time and space, its unique existence at the place where it happens to be',⁶ but film's material existence allows its repeated viewing and analysis by audiences far removed from the original viewers. For example, in an article first published in 1984, Graham Holderness proposes that to interpret Olivier's 1944 film as offering a "straight" patriotic version of *Henry V* is to interpret selected parts' and 'to seriously underestimate the subtlety of the film's aesthetic devices' by which, he argues, a traditional reading of Henry's character is seriously destabilised.⁷ This retrospective reinterpretation constructs meanings from the film text which do not seem to have been available to cinemagoers who saw the film in its historical context at the end of the war. I have tried to take account of film's original audiences and situation as well as recognising its

6 Walter Benjamin, 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction' in *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt (London: Fontana Press, 1993), p. 214.

7 Graham Holderness, *Shakespeare Recycled: The Making of Historical Drama* (Brighton: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992).

particular and fruitful ongoing life in the pedagogy and scholarship of Shakespeare in production.

RABBIT AND DUCK: THE PLAY'S INTRINSIC AMBIGUITIES

The relationship between academic criticism of Shakespeare and the plays in performance often seems slight. One seminal article, however, Norman Rabkin's 'Either/Or: Responding to *Henry V*' can be used to frame the major dynamic of stage interpretations of the play. Rabkin argues that, like the familiar optical illusion showing a creature that can be perceived as either a rabbit or duck, *Henry V* is either a heroic play about a 'mirror of all Christian kings' (2.0.6) or a cynical play about a ruthless and hypocritical Machiavellian tyrant. The force of the analogy, however, is in that, like the rabbit-duck, it is both of these things at the same time. Rabkin thus identifies *Henry V*'s 'ultimate power [as] precisely the fact that it points in two opposed directions, virtually daring us to choose one of the two opposed interpretations it requires of us'. Rabkin describes Shakespeare's 'terrible subversiveness' in undermining the play's ostensible message, in a view of the play which has its theatrical counterpart in Trevor Nunn's account of the 1964 production at the Royal Shakespeare Theatre as an interpretation 'which saw a play-within-a-play, a hidden play which amounted to a passionate cry by the dramatist against war'.⁸

As Nunn's comment acknowledges, Rabkin's view of the interpretive dichotomy which animates the play's critical history – whether it is a celebration of Henry's rule or a scathing analysis of bellicose powermongering – has also been a dominant feature of *Henry V* on the stage, particularly during the twentieth century. The burden of these opposing interpretations tends to coalesce around a few key scenes and speeches in the play: the Archbishop's speeches about the young Prince's reformation on taking up the throne in 1.1, the reporting of the death of Falstaff in 2.3 and the King's implication in this in 2.1, the treatment of the conspirators in 2.2, Henry's threats before the Governor of Harfleur in 3.4, the execution of Bardolph in 3.7, and Henry's attitude to Williams during and after their meeting before Agincourt in 4.1 and 4.7. More recently, Henry's instruction that the French prisoners be executed (4.7.7) before the discovery of the butchered English boys has

8 Norman Rabkin, 'Either/Or: Responding to *Henry V*' in *Shakespeare and the Problem of Meaning* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press: 1981), p. 34; p. 49; Ralph Berry, *On Directing Shakespeare: Interviews with Contemporary Directors* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1989), p. 62.

been a focus of interest provoking one essay with the title, ‘Henry V, War Criminal?’⁹ The Prologue, Epilogue and Choruses have also served to locate distinct and often mutually exclusive attitudes to the play, as realist or stylised, as *actualité* or pageant. As the Commentary to this edition demonstrates, these loci of particular interpretive conflict highlight different approaches and assumptions about the play’s tone and its characterisation of its central protagonist.

Two brief examples, discussed in detail later in the Introduction, can serve as the rabbit and the duck to sketch out these poles. The first is Laurence Olivier’s 1944 film version of the play; the second is Michael Bogdanov’s touring production of the 1980s. Olivier’s Henry, thanks to the comic undermining of the episcopal conspiracy of 1.1 and extensive cuts to 2.2, 3.4, 3.7 and 4.7, is presented as an unproblematically heroic military leader. He avoids appearing inappropriately gung-ho and cuts a romantic dash in Act 5. The miraculous victory at Agincourt over effete and two-dimensional French enemies is notably bloodless and therefore sanctified. Olivier presents a Henry for a war-weary generation with victory in its sights and with its ethics of heroism fundamentally unchallenged. By contrast, Bogdanov’s production sought to undermine the last vestiges of patriotic chivalry for his late twentieth-century audiences. His Henry had an unnerving and unpredictable capacity for brutality, foregrounded in his behaviour in 2.2, 3.4 and 3.7, and his soldiers were rampaging, xenophobic jobs whose cause it was impossible for audience members to espouse without considerable discomfort. The French, by contrast, were dignified and civilised, with outdated weaponry and obsolete forms of courtesy. The war was dirty, both literally and metaphorically; the production unflinching in its iconoclasm.

At one level, these interpretive differences are attributable to historical moment – the difference between attitudes in 1944 and in the mid-1980s – but it is also important to recognise that the movement of productions of *Henry V* has not been a straightforward switch from heroic to cynical. To illustrate this, we might put the fulcrum of the rabbit-duck polarity at another recent production, Kenneth Branagh’s film of 1989. Branagh keeps much of the problematic textual material which would seem to cloud the presentation of Henry and the English cause, yet manages to maintain his ultimately sympathetic rendition of the eponymous hero, reinventing a modern version of masculine heroism deriving in part

9 See Taylor, *Henry V*, pp. 32–4; John Sutherland and Cedric Watts, *Henry V, War Criminal? And Other Shakespeare Puzzles* (Oxford: Oxford World’s Classics, 2000).

from contemporary action films. In a suggestive reversal of the terms of the interpretive debate and a counterpoint to Trevor Nunn's description of the 1964 production, James Loehlin judges that Branagh's film is more conventional than it first appears, offering 'the official version of the play disguised as the secret one'.¹⁰ The play's deployment as part of these 'official' and 'secret' discourses is a recurrent theme of its history on the stage.

1599–1642: EARLY PERFORMANCES

Most critics agree that *Henry V* offers unusually specific internal evidence about the date and circumstances of its first performances. Firstly, the Prologue's reference to 'this wooden O' (1.0.13) and the choric stress on the inadequacy of theatrical representation, have been widely accepted as allusions either to the shortcomings of the old Curtain Theatre, which was about to be superseded by the new Globe, or as an emphatic mock-modest description of this new playhouse itself. Either interpretation fixes the date for the play some time in 1599, as the lease on the site of the Globe was signed by the Lord Chamberlain's Men in February 1599 and the new venue is known to have been operative by September of the same year. Secondly, the parenthetic comparison between the victorious Henry and 'the general of our gracious empress' 'from Ireland coming,/ Bringing rebellion broachèd on his sword' (5.0.30–2) seems to fix the date of the play to spring or summer 1599, before the ignominious conclusion of the Earl of Essex's much-vaunted expedition to Ireland to quell the rebellion against English rule was well known.

Both these pieces of evidence are, however, rendered problematic by the existence of the earliest text of *Henry V*, published in 1600 under the title *The Cronicle History of Henry the fift, With his battell fought at Agin Court in France. Together with Auntient Pistoll*. This text of the play differs in several crucial respects from the text published in the First Folio of 1623 as *The Life of King Henry the Fift*, the text on which this edition, like all other modern editions, is based. *The Cronicle History of Henry the fift* is, at a little over 1,600 lines, only half the length of the Folio text; it does not include the Folio's opening scene between Canterbury and Ely (1.1), nor the Scots and Irish captains (3.3), nor Henry's famous exhortation 'Once more unto the breach' (3.1), nor the second of the scenes featuring the French lords before the Battle of Agincourt (4.2). Most significantly, it does not include any of the

10 James N. Loehlin, *Shakespeare in Performance: Henry V* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996), p. 145.

Chorus speeches nor the Prologue and Epilogue. Thus, the text as it was published in 1600 does not provide any of the evidence, detailed above, for dating the play to 1599.

Most accounts of the Quarto text have been concerned to demonstrate its limitations by contrast to the Folio, and, indeed, it has been used as a prime example of what the editors of the First Folio denigrated as those previously printed texts, 'stolen and surreptitious copies, maimed and deformed'.¹¹ It has also been argued, however, that it represents a version of the play derived, in some way, from performance: cut for touring or for presentation by a reduced cast, or to make it more politically orthodox and therefore more acceptable.¹² Andrew Gurr suggests that the 'Chorus was fitted to the play fairly early on, to strengthen a celebratory and patriotic reading, providing a means of coercing the audience into an emotionally undivided response'.¹³ by contrast, Annabel Patterson's view is that the Quarto is the more politically orthodox text. More recently, Gurr has argued that it is the Quarto text, not the Folio, which uniquely represents the play as it was performed in 1599, suggesting that the Quarto moderates potentially hostile comments on Henry, cutting the dialogue in 2.1 about the King being to blame for Falstaff's death.¹⁴ In their self-consciously revisionist edition of *The Cronicle*, Graham Holderness and Bryan Loughrey distinguish between the two texts of the play on generic grounds, finding the Folio 'epic and heroic, realistic and historical', and the tone of the Quarto 'deflect[ed] . . . to the comic mode', in which 'the new historical style . . . interacted with older modes, with the conventions of romance and the manners of comedy'.¹⁵ Even at this early point in the play's stage and textual history, therefore, the questions of genre, of realism and historical immediacy, and epic and comedy which were to engage, and sometimes vex, generations of directors and actors – the rabbit and duck, in fact – are apparently already in their

11 T.W. Craik (ed.), *The Arden Shakespeare: King Henry V* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), pp. 11–19.

12 On these possibilities, see Gary Taylor, 'We Happy Few: the 1600 Abridgement' in Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor, *Modernising Shakespeare's Spelling, with Three Studies in the Text of 'Henry V'* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979); Taylor, *Henry V*, pp. 12–20; Annabel Patterson, *Shakespeare and the Popular Voice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).

13 Andrew Gurr (ed.), *King Henry V* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), p. 7.

14 Andrew Gurr (ed.), *The First Quarto of Henry V* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 2–12.

15 Graham Holderness and Bryan Loughrey, *The Cronicle History of Henry the fifth* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1993), pp. 24–6.

frictive place. So too is that other constant in the play's varied history on the stage: its persistent topicality.

London in 1599 was certainly in need of a feel-good play, and the famous English victory at Agincourt, already familiar to Elizabethan playgoers from earlier plays on the subject, was the perfect scenario. Fears of foreign invasion, high food prices, the repeated musters for soldiers for campaigns in the Low Countries and in Ireland, the requisitioning of horses, food supplies and other commodities needed for the military, all took their toll on Londoners. The long military campaign in Ireland, memorably dubbed by one historian 'England's Vietnam',¹⁶ was a particularly insistent part of English metropolitan consciousness at the time of the play's first performances, and the play's reference to 'kern of Ireland' (3.8.49), Pistol's 'Colin o custure me' on hearing the French soldier speak (4.4.3), Henry's promise to Katherine 'England is thine, Ireland is thine, France is thine' (5.2.217), and Macmorris, Shakespeare's only Irish character, all register this preoccupation. It has been convincingly argued that for contemporaries Shakespeare's French represented a version – and an idealised, conquerable version – of the intractable Irish.¹⁷ Seen in this light, the play offers a highly topical fantasy: a vicarious stage-victory against overwhelming odds, achievable in the theatre and, as the Chorus to Act 5 makes clear, much longed-for, but elusive, outside it.

When it was performed in 1599, the play also featured as part of a serial dramatic *Bildungsroman* on the maturation of Prince Hal, already presented in *1 Henry IV* (performed in the early months of 1597) and *2 Henry IV* (performed in 1598). Audiences had had their appetite misleadingly whetted at the end of *2 Henry IV*, after the coronation of Hal as Henry V and his banishment of his erstwhile companion Falstaff, where the Epilogue promises a further play where 'our humble author will continue the story with Sir John in it, and make you merry with fair Katherine of France, where, for anything I know, Falstaff shall die of a sweat' (Epilogue, 21–3).¹⁸ Strikingly, this establishes the essentially comic material – Falstaff and Katherine – of the proposed *Henry V* as its major attraction, and this hint of the play's generic instability is highlighted in eighteenth-century adaptations discussed below.

16 C.G. Cruikshank, *Elizabeth's Army* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2nd edn, 1966), p. 16; R.B. Outhwaite, 'Dearth, the English Crown and the "Crisis of the 1590s"' in *The European Crisis of the 1590s: Essays in Comparative History*, ed. Peter Clark (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1985), pp. 22–43, p. 32.

17 Joel B. Altman, "'Vile Participation': The Amplification of Violence in the Theater of *Henry V*", *Shakespeare Quarterly* 42 (1991), p. 19.

18 Giorgio Melchiori (ed.), *The Second Part of King Henry IV* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

The sense, for contemporaries, of the play in an extended dialogue with previous plays was lost from virtually all performances up until the middle of the twentieth century, when the fashion for playing the history plays in sequence was invented.

Whichever theatre the play was written for, it requires relatively few props. One recent editor argues that ‘in other of Shakespeare’s plays battles have their exits and their entrances . . . but *Henry V* alone wholly dedicates itself to dramatizing this brutal, exhilarating, and depressingly persistent human activity’.¹⁹ While this may be true, it is worth stressing that this most martial of plays does not include any onstage fighting other than the dishonourable and often-cut scene between Pistol and the French soldier Le Fer (4.4). While it may indeed be impossible for ‘this cockpit [to] hold / The vasty fields of France’ (1.0.11–12), it is striking that the play does not make use of the short scenes of hand-to-hand combat, the established stage synecdoche to represent battles, as in the depiction of the Battle of Shrewsbury at the end of *1 Henry IV*. Thus, chief among the props required are some items of armour and armaments including a cannon (3.0.33), and the ‘four or five . . . ragged foils’ (4.0.50) mentioned by the Chorus would probably suffice. A single throne would be needed to serve for both the English and French courts thus stressing the visual parallels between 1.2 and 2.4, and some ‘scaling ladders’ (folio stage direction at 3.1) are called for at the siege of Harfleur, at which the *frons scenae* must have served for the city walls. The gallery over the stage would provide the platform for the Governor of the town to parley with Henry (3.4.43). Costumes would have been, as was the Elizabethan theatre norm, contemporary rather than historical. It is likely that the chief tragedian of the Lord Chamberlain’s Men, Richard Burbage, would have taken the part of Henry. The number of actors required to perform the play has been the subject of much debate, but doubling may have enabled a cast of fifteen or so players to put it on.²⁰ Both Quarto and Folio versions of the play are dominated by Henry’s character (549 or 34 per cent of 1,600 lines in the Quarto, and 1,056 or 31 per cent of 3,380 lines in the Folio²¹), with Llewellyn the next most vocal character in both versions.

19 Taylor, *Henry V*, p. 1.

20 See Thomas L. Berger, ‘Casting *Henry V*’, *Shakespeare Studies* 20 (1988), pp. 89–104; T.J. King, *Casting Shakespeare’s Plays: London Actors and their Roles 1590–1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 86–7; and also Pauline Kiernan, *Staging Shakespeare at the New Globe* (Basingstoke and London: Macmillan, 1999), on the 1997 New Globe production of *Henry V* with a cast of fifteen.

21 For comparative figures for principal characters in other plays, see King, *Casting Shakespeare’s Plays*.

Perhaps because of its very immediate topicality, the play does not seem to have been a runaway theatrical success. The only evidence for the play's production history in the seventeenth century suggests that it was revived for a single performance at court in January 1605, and then sank into obscurity. It is not known whether the text for this performance was closer to the Folio or Quarto: although 'we have to hope that the company was sensitive enough to their new patron's accent and ancestry'²² to cut the significantly named Scottish character Jamy when they performed before King James. While other of Shakespeare's plays continued to be reprinted and, occasionally performed, up to the 1630s, *Henry V* was largely neglected. The Quarto text was reprinted in 1602 and in 1619 (the title page of this third edition bears the false date '1608'): perhaps the play's apparent inscription in the political narrative of the summer of 1599 meant that it was quickly, and seemingly irrevocably, out of fashion.

ADAPTATIONS 1642–1738

Theatrical Shakespeare was restored to England along with the monarchy, as plays from the pre-Civil War theatre were adapted to the new theatrical and social climate. *Henry V* was not, however, one of the earliest rehabilitations. When Samuel Pepys records attending two performances of *Henry V* in 1664 and again in 1668 with Thomas Betterton in the central role, it seems likely that this was not Shakespeare's play, but the rhymed verse drama by Robert Boyle, Earl of Orrery. Boyle's play seems only to confirm the contemporary insignificance of Shakespeare's, in that it shows no discernible trace of the earlier dramatic account of Henry's reign. It begins almost where Shakespeare leaves off: the Battle of Agincourt is concluded, offstage, between Boyle's first and third scenes, leaving the rest of the play for a representation of Henry not as military leader but as victorious lover. A secondary love plot, between Anne of Burgundy and Henry's brother the Duke of Bedford, highlights the significance of the romance plot to this exercise in the Restoration heroic genre. It is not until the eighteenth century that Shakespeare's play begins its – literally – piecemeal return to the stage.

In 1700, Betterton's *The Sequel of Henry the Fourth* comprised most of Shakespeare's 2 *Henry IV* with the addition, in its final act, of material from Acts 1 and 2 of *Henry V*, ending with Henry's 'No king of England if not king of France!' (2.2.188). In the same year, Colley Cibber also took some

22 Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearian Playing Companies* (Oxford, Clarendon Press: 1996), p. 288.

lines from the play, largely from the Chorus to Act 5, for his *The Tragical History of King Richard III*, first performed at the Theatre Royal in July 1700. The early eighteenth century thus saw the play as having some meritorious speeches, rather than as a performable script in its entirety. It seems that its generic hybridity as both comic and epic was troubling: two more thoroughgoing reworkings of the play by Charles Molloy and Aaron Hill each choose and highlight one genre in their retelling. Charles Molloy's *The Half-Pay Officers: A Comedy* of 1720 tells its readers that 'The Character of *Fluellin* has been esteem'd, (next to that of Sir *John Falstaff*) the best and most humorous, that *Shakspear* ever wrote; there are many other Things in this, that have been reckon'd good Comedy',²³ and proceeds to embroil 'Fluellin' and Macmorris in a comedy of manners among various non-Shakespearean characters. Some comic set pieces from *Henry V* are imported, and there is a scene in which a character named Culverin takes Pistol's place in the enforced consumption of a leek. There is, however, hidden in this comedy a definite anti-French sentiment: the Prologue decries debased English tastes:

In vain Old Shakespear's Virtue treads the Stage,
On empty Benches doom'd to spend his Rage;
When we would entertain, we're forc'd to Ship ye
Tumblers from France, mock Kings from Mississippi!

Molloy's selective use of *Henry V* is significantly connected to this implicit manifesto for native theatricals, as a salvo in the struggle between Britain and France for global cultural and political hegemony.

If Molloy chooses to extract the comic characters from *Henry V*, a later adaptation by Aaron Hill plumps for tragedy. His *King Henry the Fifth: Or, the Conquest of France, By the English. A Tragedy* includes much more material from Shakespeare than does Molloy, and he also makes use of Orrery's earlier play.²⁴ In Hill's story, Henry has been followed to France by his spurned mistress, Harriet, a niece of the conspirator Scroop. In true comic Shakespearean fashion, she has dressed in men's clothes for the escapade, and, indeed, *Twelfth Night* plays a significant supporting role in the play's construction. Harriet's fury against her erstwhile lover prompts her to join the conspiracy of Scroop, Grey and Cambridge against the King, but she is discovered and brought to Henry. She explains how her anger drove her to seek revenge, but Henry disarms her by arguing that 'Kings must have no

23 Charles Molloy, *The Half-Pay Officers: A Comedy* (London, 1720), p. v.

24 See Landon Burns, 'Three Views of King Henry V', *Drama Survey* 1.3 (1962), pp. 278–300.

Wishes for Themselves! / We are our People's Properties'. Assuring her that 'Were I now what I was, when Harriet bless'd me / Still were I Hers – My Love can never die!',²⁵ Henry persuades her to betray the conspiracy. She then kills herself 'Since, without it, you can ne'er be happy',²⁶ leaving Henry free to marry Catherine. In the meantime, Catherine has been forced into marriage with a Henry she has never met, while she is nursing a love for a mysterious Englishman, Owen Tudor, who wooed her the year before. Her brother the Dauphin tries to stop the marriage, and so the Battle of Agincourt is explicitly figured as a fight for Catherine. The battle itself is not represented, but substituted by a scene in which 'The Genius of England rises, and sings' a paean to 'Albion' and an exclamatory commentary on the course of the combat:

They bend, they break! the fainting Gauls give way!
And yield, reluctant, to their Victor's Sway.
Happy Albion! – strong to gain!
Let Union teach Thee, not to win, in vain.²⁷

Catherine and Henry are united, whereupon the Princess realises that the conquering King is none other than her own Owen Tudor ('Tis He! – 'Tis Tudor! – O! amazing Chance!²⁸).

Hill's 'Preface to the Reader' describes the play as a '*new Fabrick*, yet I built on *His Foundation*',²⁹ and expresses the disingenuous hope that it will not be popular given the debased and lightweight tastes of the age. Like Molloy, Hill identifies his work as engaged in a commercial and dramatic Agincourt with other, implicitly Frenchified, entertainments: a struggle which is both aesthetic and nationalistic:

No *French Tricks*, however, in the Days of *my Hero*, were able to stand before him: Fortune favour'd him, *then*, against incredible Odds! and who knows, (if the Ladies will forgive me the Presumption of comparing *small Things* with *Great*,) but he may, *now*, become a Match, even for *Eunuchs*, and *Merry-Andrews!*

Yet the Victory, at *Agencourt*, was an Action, not more wonderful! And it is, I fear, become impossible, since I have, imprudently, neglected to list those Squadrons of *light-arm'd Forces*, which have, so often, won the Day, for Our *Leaders*, in modern Poetry.³⁰

25 Aaron Hill, *King Henry the Fifth: Or, the Conquest of France, By the English. A Tragedy* (London: 1723), p. 41.

26 *Ibid.*, p. 43. 27 *Ibid.*, p. 57. 28 *Ibid.*, p. 127.

29 *Ibid.*, sig. A3–v^o. 30 *Ibid.*, sig. A4–v^o.

A new Prologue addresses a theme which was to be of considerable importance to subsequent eighteenth- and nineteenth-century productions of Shakespeare's play: the paucity of its roles for women. 'Hid,' we are told, 'In the Cloud of Battle, Shakespear's Care, / Blind, with the Dust of War, o'er-look'd the Fair', and this lack is to be made good in Hill's version. Here 'Love softens War, – and War invigo'rates Love'. The Prologue also draws attention to the play's 'Example', arguing that the differences between the Dauphin and Henry demonstrate 'the diffe'rent Genius of the Realms disclos'd'. The French are 'vain', 'boastful', 'proud' as opposed to the English 'calmly resolv'd'. It is internal politics, however, which dominate, and the rebellion of Grey, Scroop and Cambridge is not a prefatory incident as it is in Shakespeare, but the main business of Hill's play. The overriding message of civil harmony is affirmed in Henry's concluding lines:

O! that the bright Example might inspire!
 And teach my Country not to waste her Fire!
 But, shunning Faction, and Domestic Hate,
 Bend All her Vigour, to advance her State.³¹

Ultimately, the Epilogue confirms that these aims for civic harmony are thwarted under the reign of his weak son. Whereas Shakespeare identifies the young Henry VI's responsibility for losing France, Hill stresses how 'Division, Faction, and Debate / And that rank Weed, Rebellion, choak'd the state'.³²

Hill's claim in his preface to be out of step with prevailing fashions is disingenuous: his *Henry V* is an index to the tastes of his age. Out go the indecorous battle and tavern scenes and the disreputable prose of Henry's erstwhile companions; in comes the melodramatic spurned-mistress plot to give a prominent breeches role and the opportunity for pathos at her death. In place of Shakespeare's Chorus who moves the action back and forth across the Channel, Hill adheres more closely to classical unities, by confining the action to France and opening the play at Harfleur. Where Shakespeare includes comic characters and scenes, Hill purges them to fix his play as a tragedy. The play becomes an account of the King's loves, not his wars: Princess Catherine and Harriet vie for the emotional heart of the play, as other actions are subordinated to this intrigue. Henry appears relatively little in his own play, as the stage is dominated by the two women. Henry is revealed, 'despite Hill's attempts to launder his indiscretions . . . as a

31 *Ibid.*, p. 61. 32 *Ibid.*, p. 62.

singularly untrustworthy potential husband, his conquest of France an extension of his conquest of Catherine, rather than vice versa'.³³

Aaron Hill's version of the play was printed in 1723, the year of its first performances at Drury Lane. Its main theatrical innovation was the introduction of a practicable bridge on stage to enable Act 3 scene 1 to begin: 'SCENE changes to a Barrier, on a Bridge, Trumpets from Both Sides: Enter, on one Part, the French King, on the Bridge, attended by the Dukes of Orleans, and Bourbon, &c. below: – On the other Side of the Bridge, King Henry, with the Dukes of Exeter, and York, Scroop, Cambridge, and Gray, below.' The play was revived for seven performances in 1735 and a further two in 1736 at Goodman Fields, and then adapted for performance in August 1746 at Drury Lane as a one-act play *The Conspiracy Discovered*, with the pointed subtitle 'French Policy Defeated'. The play promised an unmissable combination of history and contemporary politics, with a newspaper reporting 'rich antique Habits of the times' and a playbill describing 'a Representation of the Trials of the Lords for High-Treason in the Reign of King Henry V'.³⁴ The contemporaneous trial of noblemen indicted after the Jacobite Rebellion of 1745 supplied the necessary topicality. In 1746 Shakespeare's play was performed in the same season as Hill's version, but even as performances of the original *Henry V* became more common, Hill's play was not quickly forgotten. Forty years later, a review of John Kemble's performance of Shakespeare's Henry began with a survey of adaptations of the play, and noted that Hill's play was 'not contemptible, but then we still see Shakespeare's jewels in the shrine he has made for them'. The reviewer goes on to recall that 'we cannot but admire Mr Hill's idea of introducing Lord Scroop's niece Harriet'.³⁵ The issue of roles for women, so ingeniously addressed by Hill's adaptation, was to continue to resurface in the history of Shakespeare's play in performance.

THE MID-EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Since the play's inhospitality to female performers and audience members had been seen as an obstacle to its successful reception, it is striking that *Henry V* owes its return to the stage to the Shakespeare Ladies'

33 Michael Dobson, *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation and Authorship 1660–1769* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), p. 96.

34 A.H. Scouten, *The London Stage 1660–1800, part 3 1729–47* (Carbondale: South Illinois Press, 1960–8), p. 1244; Charles Beecher Hogan, *Shakespeare in the Theatre 1701–1800* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952), vol. 1, p. 199.

35 *The Prompter*, 27 October 1789, p. 14.

Club. This was a circle of aristocratic women who petitioned theatre managements, including Covent Garden's John Rich, to revive more Shakespeare plays in place of the commercially favoured Restoration comedies and Italianate operas. Garrick later acknowledged their important role in prompting theatres to perform the plays: '*It was you Ladies that restor'd Shakespeare to the Stage.*'³⁶ When, at Covent Garden in February 1738, Shakespeare's *Henry V* was performed on four successive nights, marking its return to the stage after an absence of over 120 years, the playbill described the revival as 'at the Desire of Several Ladies of Quality'.³⁷ There were a further five performances that year, with a full cast including Dennis Delane as Henry. Thereafter the play was revived at Covent Garden and becomes a regular, although not frequent, part of the London repertoire, with one or two performances in most years between 1739 and 1782.

The play's popularity in the eighteenth-century theatre thus lagged well behind the tragedies of *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, *Othello* and *King Lear*, and also well behind a more popular history play such as *1 Henry IV*. At the same time, however, the play's hero was closely associated with its author and his growing reputation during the eighteenth century. In 1741 the monument to Shakespeare unveiled in Westminster Abbey incorporated a bust of Henry V, with Richard III and Elizabeth I, alongside the full-length marble statue of the playwright. Royal associations accrued through performance, too. In January 1739, *Henry V* was performed 'By his Majesty's command' in front of the 'King, Duke, Princesses Amelia, Caroline, Maria and Louisa', and performances in the 1750–1 season were advertised 'by command of their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales'.³⁸ At some points, particularly during the Seven Years War against France (1756–63), the play was performed every year, with playbills bearing the emphatic subtitle 'With the Conquest of the French at Agincourt'. If the listing order of actors on playbills is any testimony, the comic roles of Llewellyn (particularly in performances by John Hippisley from 1738 to 1746, 'fam'd in *Fluellin, Pistol's Hector*' as the *Bath Journal* put it at his death in 1748³⁹) and a swaggering Pistol (established by Theophilus Cibber's performances in the 1740s) were also popular elements. In November and December 1761, with William Smith in the title role, the play was given an unprecedented twenty-three

36 Quoted by Dobson, *The Making of the National Poet*, p. 148.

37 Scouten, *The London Stage*, p. 704.

38 G.W. Stone, *The London Stage 1660–1800, part 4 1747–76* (Carbondale: South Illinois Press, 1960–8), p. 223.

39 Quoted by Cecil Price, *Theatre in the Age of Garrick* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1973), p. 184.

successive performances. This popular production also appears to have begun a practice that was to dominate nineteenth-century stagings by introducing ‘the Procession from the Abbey at the Coronation’: the coronation scene from *2 Henry IV*. This was initially included to celebrate the coronation of George III, but was apparently retained and supplemented with further pageantry. In 1767, Covent Garden was again advertising Smith as Henry, ‘to which will be added the Procession from the Abbey at the Coronation, with the Representation of Westminster Hall and the Ceremony of the Champion’,⁴⁰ and it may have been that a real horse was brought on to the stage for this final tableau. Spectacle and pageantry were increasingly becoming key to theatrical success.

Apart from these obvious scenic interpolations, it is hard to trace the precise variations of these different performances. Playbills up to 1759 make it clear that the Chorus was a part of these performances, sometimes doubled by the actor playing the Archbishop of Canterbury. Perhaps to pre-empt criticism of this non-naturalistic intrusion, playbills of the 1740s often include the parenthetical classical justification ‘(after the manner of the Ancients)’⁴¹ before the actor’s name. In 1744 ‘a New Prologue’ was promised, along with the stirring musical inclusions ‘Songs *To Arms* and *Britons Strike Home*’.⁴² The performance of 25 April 1754 was concluded with an Epilogue by Theophilus Cibber, who also played Pistol, ‘in the character of Nobody’.⁴³ In 1747 and 1748, Garrick played the Chorus, dressed in eighteenth-century costume including a powdered wig. In a letter of March 1748, he defended, with characteristic pedantry, his delivery of the Prologue to the Shakespearean Peter Whalley, author of *An Enquiry into the Learning of Shakespeare*: ‘I cannot but think you have mistook me in the Prologue to Henry the 5th – surely the little pause was made at *Fire!* and I connected the subsequent Relative, Verb and Accusative Case (*that would ascend the brightest Heav’n &c.*) in one Breath? I know in the general I speak it so, but may have fail’d the Night you heard me.’⁴⁴ In performances from 1760 to April 1767, however, despite the fact that many of the other actors remain constant, there is no mention of the Chorus role, until playbills for performances in September 1767 promise that the Chorus will be ‘restored’.⁴⁵ It

40 George C.D. Odell, *Shakespeare: From Betterton to Irving* (London: Constable, 1963), vol. 1, p. 428.

41 Scouten, *The London Stage*, p. 1102.

42 *Ibid.*, p. 1103.

43 *Ibid.*, p. 1170.

44 David M. Little and George M. Kahrl (eds.), *The Letters of David Garrick* (London: Oxford University Press, 1963), vol. 1, p. 93.

45 Hogan, *Shakespeare in the Theatre*, vol. II, p. 285.

may well be that this role was a casualty of new inclusions such as the coronation procession and Ceremony of the Champion. The increasingly illusionistic and spectacular productions of the play could not sustain the demystificatory tones of the non-naturalistic choric voice: the scenic efforts made to represent such pageants as the coronation were not to be undermined by the Chorus' continual mock-modesty. If the Chorus was restored in late 1767, it seems to have been dropped again for subsequent performances, although productions in 1778 and 1779 advertise the 'original Chorus'.⁴⁶

Some idea of other omissions from the play in performances can be gleaned from Bell's acting edition of Shakespeare, published in 1774, with editorial comment by Francis Gentleman. Bell's *Henry V* is described 'As Performed at the Theatre-Royal, Covent-Garden. Regulated by Mr Younger, Prompter of that Theatre', and its text is informative about the kinds of cuts made for eighteenth-century performances. The 'Advertisement' sets out the method:

as the Theatres, especially of late, have been generally right in their omissions, of this author particularly, we have printed our text after their regulations; and from this part of our design, an evident use will arise; that those who take books to the Theatre, will not be so puzzled themselves to accompany the speaker; nor so apt to condemn performers of being imperfect, when they pass over what is designedly omitted.⁴⁷

The edition, however, is not only descriptive but sometimes prescriptive: 'it has been our peculiar endeavour to render what we call the essence of Shakespeare, more instructive and intelligible; especially to the ladies and to youth; glaring indecencies being removed, and intricate passages explained'.⁴⁸ Such indecencies included the language lesson of 3.5, and speeches which might blur the lines of Henry's heroic characterisation such as his anger at the traitors in 2.2 and his threats before Harfleur in 3.4. Bell's edition, following Molloy and Hill in their adaptations, acknowledges that the play is generically mixed: 'the plot is irregular and tainted with some low quibbling comedy'.⁴⁹ The annotations to the text give a clear indication of

46 Stone, *The London Stage*, p. 171.

47 *Bell's Edition of Shakespeare's Plays, As they are now performed at the Theatres Royal in London; Regulated from the Prompt Books of each House By Permission; with Notes Critical and Illustrative; By the Authors of the Dramatic Censor* (London and York, 1774), vol. 1, pp. 6–7.

48 *Ibid.*, p. 10.

49 *Ibid.*, p. 3.

which parts of the play were valued and which disparaged. Shakespeare's 'prolixity' is often remarked upon, the comic scenes are thought unworthy and dramatic unity is often thought wanting. Bell's edition is thus explicitly evaluative in both moral and aesthetic terms – and not merely, or reliably, the representation of the play as performed in the theatre.

KEMBLE

In 1755 theatrical and cultural Francophobia was at its height. David Garrick's Drury Lane theatre was attacked by a mob angered by the engagement of a French troupe, and a salvo from the Anti-Gallican faction resurrected Shakespeare's ghost to advise him:

'To give you Pardon, I encline,
If you'll revive a Work of mine;
You need not fear it will miscarry,'
'What Play d'ye mean, Sir' – 'My *fifth Harry*.'⁵⁰

As if in delayed answer to this summons, John Kemble played the role of Henry on sixteen occasions between October 1789 and 1792 in a landmark production as London theatregoers shuddered at bloodthirsty reports of events in revolutionary France. Kemble's version of the play was clearly designed to clarify Henry's heroism within this context of contemporary popular anti-French opinion, and his adaptation of Bell's Covent Garden acting edition made more extensive cuts and scene switches to produce a theatrical script which was to dominate the play in performance for the next half-century. It is striking how, apparently independently, Kemble's acting text closely resembles the first published version of *Henry V*, the Quarto text of 1600, and it may be that this coincidental similarity adds a retrospective endorsement to the dramatic qualities of this often-disparaged early text. In November 1803, after the failure of the Peace of Amiens permanently to end the Napoleonic Wars between Britain and France, a benefit performance of the play in aid of the 'Patriotic Fund' was concluded with an 'Occasional Address to the Volunteers'.⁵¹ The *Times* review felt that the production worked 'to convince our Gallic neighbours that in the midst of all their triumphs they are but mere mortals'.⁵² In the same year, invasion fears prompted the *Gentleman's Magazine* to reproduce a

⁵⁰ Quoted in Dobson, *The Making of the National Poet*, p. 203.

⁵¹ See Jonathan Bate, *Shakespearean Constitutions: Politics, Theatre, Criticism 1730–1830* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), p. 63.

⁵² *The Times*, 2 October 1789.

broadside called 'Shakspeare's Ghost', in which 'Shakspeare now speaks in the character of a true Englishman and a sturdy John Bull, indignant that a French Army should wage war in our Isle'. Patriotic passages, largely from *King John* and *Henry V*, were tweaked for the occasion, so that the last line of Henry's speech at the siege of Harfleur became 'Cry God for us! for England! and King George!'.

Kemble's biographer James Boaden, writing in 1825, gives his own reasons for the relative unpopularity of the play before Kemble's revival, although he overstates the case in stating that it had been unperformed for twenty years. Again, the main objection to the play seems to be on gender terms: 'it may be presumed that the mob always like to be told, that Englishmen, extenuated by disease and in numbers as one compared with ten, are yet sure to become the conquerors of France'. However, while the play may have masculine appeal, it suffers from 'so little female interest in the drama, that we cannot wonder at the coldness of our fair country-women to these fighting plays'.⁵³ Even the charms of Miss De Camp, playing Katherine, could not compensate: even if she did speak 'the few broken sentences . . . incomparably',⁵⁴ eighteenth-century decorum demanded the excision of one of her two scenes and some swingeing cuts to the remaining one. Of Kemble's own performance, the reviews were variable. *The Prompter* found much to praise, including Henry's address 'to the divinity' (4.1.263ff.), his treatment of the three traitors and his conversation with Williams. Their only advice to the leading actor was 'to sacrifice a very little of his declamation, in some passages of this beautiful play, to easy expression', although his delivery of the lines following 'And Crispin Crispian shall ne'er go by' (4.3.57) was described as 'supremely conceived and uttered'.⁵⁵ Elsewhere, however, these same lines are highlighted to mock Kemble's habitual slow delivery and stiff posture. A satirical squib entitled *How to Tear a Speech to Tatters* pictured an unbendingly formal Kemble reciting 'From – this – day – to – the – end – ing – of – the – world – – Ti – tum – tum – ti – ti – tum – ti –'.⁵⁶ However, Kemble's appeal to patriotic anti-French sentiment was undeniable: he 'had a way of placing emphasis on the nobility of dying in the King's company while at war with France, and for this he was rewarded with much applause'.⁵⁷ *The Prompter*, however, would have liked more clarity about the play's disparagement of the French enemies,

53 James Boaden, *Memoirs of the Life of John Philip Kemble, Esq.* (London, 1825), vol. II, p. 8.

54 *The Monthly Mirror*, December 1801, p. 422.

55 *The Prompter*, 27 October 1789, p. 15.

56 Quoted by Bate, *Shakespearean Constitutions*, p. 35.

57 *Ibid.*, p. 63.

criticising Mr Barrymore as the Dauphin for his failure to show sufficient insolent disdain.

Kemble's production was designed to be spectacular. Character lists in the promptbook seem to work on the principle of amplification wherever possible: where a stage direction reads 'Herald' or 'Lord', a careful hand has inserted 'Two' or sometimes 'Four'. 1.2, for example, includes not one but two heralds and four supernumerary lords in addition to those with speaking parts. Diagrams of the blocking of different scenes suggests that the stage was almost always full of actors. Its nineteen scenes were played in some fourteen or fifteen impressive sets, including 'Audience Chamber', 'French Court at Troyes' and extensive landscapes for the battle scenes, one including a view of the eponymous Castle of Agincourt, for Henry to gesture towards at 4.7.78. Some elaborate sets are described, such as one at Harfleur, which may owe something to Aaron Hill's innovations some sixty years previously: 'When the Gates are opened, a Bridge is discovered. The 12 French soldiers and their Captain, drawn up on it, salute as the King crosses it.'⁵⁸ At the end of Act 3, there are repeated handwritten admonitions in the promptbook. After the stage direction 'A March' the annotation reads 'very long', and there is a reminder 'Beg them to take time in this scene', presumably in order that King Henry's tent for Act 4 could be shifted into position.

The elaborate staging this implies was not, however, to the taste of 'A.A.', writing in *The Monthly Mirror* in December 1801. A.A. demolished the production for its systematic anachronism in properties and furnishings, and for the paucity of its decoration. Reminding readers that the play is set in 1415, A.A. is scornful at 'the Audience chamber' with its mishmash of architectural details, and, 'as for Henry's throne, if a few steps, a modern arm chair, can make it so, why it is well'. Southampton is represented by 'a wretched daub . . . of modern ships, a light-house &c.', Henry's clothing is part Caroline, part Elizabethan, part modern, and his tent lamentably under-furnished with 'one table, two candelabras and two stools'. There are woefully few banners – only one for Henry and none at all for France, and the difference between tastes at the turn of the nineteenth century and those of two centuries earlier is demonstrated in the exclamation: 'some half dozen blanket coverings hung on trees or tied to poles. This for the warlike state of France'. Perhaps it would have been better for Kemble had he pre-empted such criticisms by retaining the Chorus' apologia: instead, his adaptation pushed the play towards the patriotism and historical spectacle which were to dominate nineteenth-century stage interpretations.

⁵⁸ Kemble promptbook, p. 29.