Welcome to the first Shakespeare 400th anniversary issue of this magazine. The second will appear in Autumn. We would love it to feature your experiences of worldwide events and resources for Teaching Shakespeare in 2016 as well as any taking place from October onwards (email them to sarah.olive@york.ac.uk). This issue includes a bumper noticeboard and royally ushers in the year with two articles on the Henry IVs, plays touted as Shakespeare’s greatest by readers and audiences from Guardian critic Michael Billington to York B.A. English in Education undergraduates.

Twenty university students and academics from three institutions in South Korea (mainly in the North West, around Seoul) contributed to this vox pop about Shakespeare in the South Korean education system. I follow their words with an attempt to synthesise, and interpret the implications of, what they said. Sincere thanks are due to the British Council, whose researcher mobility scheme enabled me to compile this vox pop and experience Shakespeare in South Korean education first hand, as well as the participating institutions.

We’d love to hear from more Shakespeare educators and students in or from Korea or South East/East Asia. To what extent does this vox pop tally with your experiences? How do you teach or learn Shakespeare? Why? What is your ideal for Shakespeare in education? You could propose an article or blog post by emailing sarah.olive@york.ac.uk or help to grow the vox pop by visiting my website, choosing the green ‘Download’ button on the right hand side and responding to the vox pop questions.

To Study, or Not to Study?

• When I was young about 8–10, we read his book in elementary school, but after that it is hardly read it.

• Outside the English Department, some of Shakespeare’s plays (e.g. Hamlet or The Merchant of Venice) are adopted as texts for the module of liberal arts. In that case, Korean students invariably use the texts that are translated in Korean.

• Shakespeare is a universal classic. He wrote every human emotion. Not just life but motivation for how to live, the bare face of emotion.

• I think young people shouldn’t be learning Shakespeare because Shakespeare’s information be not in immediate need.

• Not all students should learn about him or his work but we cannot omit Shakespeare works when we study English literature because he made a new history about many kinds of literature such as poetry and dramas.

• Shakespeare’s works are very famous and known all over the world. I learned him first time in this class, so I don’t know a lot about him. Last year, I learned a little about Macbeth and Hamlet. I thought it was grand. And I saw the Globe’s play about Hamlet last week. After I saw that, I [understood] why people say Shakespeare is famous and honourable.

• I think students in Korea should be taught Shakespeare. He is a renowned person in literature so they should be taught him at a young age, as soon as possible.

• If we can make some of Shakespeare’s stories short, then it’ll be great to teach kids such from the age of ten to old kids. But I [am primarily concerned that we must] make it short. His words, sentences and all scenes are just perfect. So if there is no way to make it simple, it’ll be good to teach university students.
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SHAKESPEARE’S LANGUAGE
• In the English Department, Shakespeare is adopted as one of modules. But in the undergraduate level, Korean students think it difficult to understand his language in English.

• At the postgraduate level, the students begin to understand his language, and it is usually at the PhD level that Korean students start to “enjoy” his amazing language.

• I read both English editions and Korean translations. To understand his drama I need text written in Korean.

• He is amazing. Every line in his play makes my heart cry.

• I heard of the authorship debate – that it was too much for one man to do alone, so was done by several people.

METHODS OF TEACHING AND LEARNING
• The best way of experiencing Shakespeare is to be the audience of the theatre that performs Shakespeare in English. But it is difficult for Korean students to understand it.

• In Korean English, the emphasis is on your score over speaking.

• In Seoul, the students who take the Shakespeare module are usually recommended to visit to the theatre when Shakespeare’s plays are onstage, but in the provincial towns, it is difficult for the students to encounter the Shakespearean production in the theatre unless they visit Seoul.

• I heard about him in elementary school from my parent. My father suggested that I try to read his playbooks.

• I want to learn Shakespeare’s drama but I only want to use movies instead of books.

• I don’t know how much students should encounter his works outside of class. But, if they learn Shakespeare after entering university it is easy to feel it’s hard. So movie is the best way of experiencing it.

• I know that reading his works, finding the words we don’t know in class is important. However, I think and highly recommend speaking his works and hearing his works . . . If we want to learn Shakespeare we must do speaking aloud and hearing the works.

• I think there are a lot of works that we can learn, therefore it does not matter which [we study]. Each of his masterpieces

“Shakespeare is a universal classic. He wrote every human emotion. Not just life but motivation for how to live, the bare face of emotion.”
has its own charm. The best way of experiencing Shakespeare I think is reading the script and going to the theatre. I know some works are still playing Korea.

- Students should go to a theatre, read a book and other things. I think the best way of experiencing him is reading his works. It is the original way to understand his thoughts and feelings.

WHO DOES SHAKESPEARE, WHEN?
- Just over half had studied Shakespeare at some point in their formal education MSND (performed by Yohangza at WSF), Hamlet (Globe touring), Merchant of Venice (staff production), Taming of the Shrew (student production), Romeo and Juliet, and the sonnets are the most mentioned.

- All but 1 in English (including 'journalism class'), a subject within foreign language departments. 1 in drama.

- 6 studied at UG in Korea, 5 at secondary school – 4 of these were in English-speaking countries, 1 at a Korean foreign language high school, 2 at Korean primary schools.

- Students’ impressions of Shakespeare’s works: tragic, romantic, accidentally funny e.g. encountering the word ‘bosom’, universal, superior in their handling of emotions, morally/philosophically educational.

HOW IS SHAKESPEARE TAUGHT?
- Most received their Shakespeare teaching in Korean, though this was closely followed by English, and a combination of the two languages.

- Of the texts they used (Norton, Oxford Classics, Cambridge Student & storybooks were all mentioned) 4/11 stated they were in English, 2 contained parallel texts in both languages.

- 4 had been taught about Shakespeare’s life
- 3 had been taught about Shakespeare’s times
- 3 had watched videos in class
- 1 had performed plays in class

- There was some emphasis on private reading of the texts, they were most frequently referred to as ‘books’, and one person explained that there is an emphasis on your assignment ‘score over speaking’ in English in Korea.

- One older participant’s classes as an undergraduate had involved memorisation, translation and study of leading criticism.

- 64% had seen a live production or cinema relay thereof. Many of these were from one class.
SHAKESPEARE OUTSIDE FORMAL EDUCATION

- Those who first learnt of Shakespeare outside formal education encountered him in books (own or library, including comics), movies (one mentioned watching with subtitles on, others provided caveat that most young adults won’t see for fun unless have specific interest in English – not part of mainstream culture), visiting Stratford upon Avon, drama club (after school, fairytales and sketches; university usually classics in author’s language, sometimes with a director who is an expert in that language), and seeing a French musical version of Romeo & Juliet.

- The age at which these encounters happened ranged from 10–24 year olds. Most took place at secondary school or in HE – only one in primary school. The average and median age was 18 (the mode was somewhat lower at 14–15 years old).

IDEAL SHAKESPEARE FOR CHILDREN & YOUNG ADULTS IN KOREA

- Only one advocated learning him before secondary school or HE. Their reason for this was to smooth the transition to doing at Shakespeare at HE level – one participant suggested this currently feels like a huge leap.

- Reasons against starting it earlier included teenagers’ egocentrism; a cramming-oriented secondary school education, seen as unconducive to thinking about the texts deeply; ‘Shakespeare’s information’ not being ’in immediate need’; the need for readers’ life experience to understand and enjoy Shakespeare; the better likelihood of finding classmates who are interested and knowledgeable in HE.

- Ideal methods still favoured reading (including learning definitions of unfamiliar words), matched by films. Speaking aloud and hearing his words as well as instruction from ‘Shakespearean experts’ were also suggested.

- 3 participants suggested the Ministry of Education mandate Shakespeare in national education policy beyond English subject students.

SOME CONCLUSIONS

In terms of thinking about Shakespeares in education in the region, the South Korean vox pop articulated a few resonances with teaching Shakespeare in Japan. These include some quite functional/pragmatic reasons for studying English: to travel, make and maintain work and pleasure-related relationships internationally, fulfil parents’ wishes.

Like Japanese students and educators, some South Korean contributors’ rationales alluded to citizenship education objectives such as to broaden students’ worldviews and become responsible global leaders. Historically, both countries have in common periods of withdrawal from and opening up to Western influences, involving world and domestic economy, regional and national politics, censorship and sporting events which has impacted on Shakespeare’s place in their education systems and culture. This is in addition to a shared Japanese/Korean history as coloniser and colonised, with all the intended and spontaneous influences that such a past entails.

“Like Japanese students and educators, some South Korean contributors’ rationales alluded to citizenship education objectives such as to broaden students’ worldviews and become responsible global leaders.”

South Korean vox pop contributors never alluded to the history of Japanese colonial rule explicitly. It is, however, discussed by contributors to the edited collection Glocalising Shakespeare in Korea and Beyond. They depict Shakespeare being mediated through Japanese texts and productions in early 20th century and offer some sense of the way in which Shakespeare’s alliance with Japanese language and culture was problematic for Korean patriots.

Seven years on from that volume’s publication, this vox pop found that there is much that is proudly, nationally distinctive about Shakespeare in South Korean education. Music education and musicals, both traditional and contemporary, are important in South Korea and this influences what Shakespeare productions students experience, within and beyond the classroom, and how.

Furthermore, Shakespeare seems to have become more established in South Korea since its scholars and practitioners cut out the mediation described above, sourcing Shakespeare directly from English-speaking nations, less tainted by regional, colonial politics. However, the discourse with which some students talk about Shakespeare is still inflected with a wariness of the potential for cultural imperialism his study and performance may entail (Japanese, Anglophone or North Korean). One student memorably declared that ‘Shakespeare has not yet invaded Korea’.

“Music education and musicals, both traditional and contemporary, are important in South Korea and this influences what Shakespeare productions students experience, within and beyond the classroom, and how.”
BRITISH COUNCIL SHAKESPEARE LIVES

The British Council has a new Shakespeare Lives schools’ pack created in conjunction with the Royal Shakespeare Company to mark the 400th Anniversary of Shakespeare’s death in 2016. Using Shakespeare’s plays, many of which feature on the national curriculum, this cross-curricular pack brings Shakespeare’s plays to life and celebrates Shakespeare as a writer who still speaks for all people and nations. Exploring five distinct themes – leadership and power, family and relationships, identity and equality, justice and rules, and fate and destiny – the schools’ pack provides a safe platform to discuss contemporary issues, helping students think critically and creatively about what it means to be a citizen in the twenty-first century. Find out more about Shakespeare Lives and download a copy of the Schools’ pack here: www.shakespearelives.org/ www.schoolsonline.britishcouncil.org/classroom-resources/list/shakespeare-lives

“SHAKESPEARE, C’EST NOUS!”

From Montpellier to Perpignan and Nîmes, in southern France, students, pupils and staff will celebrate Shakespeare throughout 2016. Initiatives are coordinated and supported by the Institute for Research on the Renaissance, the neo-Classical Age and the Enlightenment (IRCL, UMR 5186), funded by France’s National Centre for Scientific Research and Université Paul-Valéry Montpellier 3. The IRCL, which publishes Cahiers Élisabéthains, has a long, established history of Shakespeare studies. Edward’s Boys, from Stratford-upon-Avon, will be visiting in March and performing Beaumont’s The Woman Hater in a school, a chapel and Sortie Ouest, a professional venue outside Béziers. Students from Université Paul-Valéry will celebrate 23 April with a 24-hour “marathon”, performing all 36 plays in adaptations they are writing, staging and designing, in styles ranging from drama and dance to song, mime and puppet theatre. In several schools, pupils aged 11–18 are working on a wide range of plays. Teachers are using bilingual editions, mangas and screen adaptations, and organising visits to the theatre. Staging and performing the plays is encouraging crossdisciplinary work.

Romeo and Juliet being a favourite, the “balcony scene” is the theme of a “festival-conference” on 23–25 November organised by the IRCL: it invites approaches from a variety of perspectives and live or video performances by pupils, students or community groups. A round table will address the use of the classics, Shakespeare included, to explore sensitive issues and foster togetherness in schools. The yearlong project, which also includes film cycles and public lectures, is supported by local institutions. More at: www.ircl.cnrs.fr

RSC DREAM TEAM 2016

To celebrate Shakespeare’s legacy in this anniversary year the RSC is inviting every UK school to take part in RSC Dream Team 2016, a nationwide celebration of his best-loved play. You can download lots of FREE resources on A Midsummer Night’s Dream including:

• 60 and 30 minute edits of A Midsummer Night’s Dream, for use by secondary, primary and special schools
• A specially-composed score suitable for all ages and abilities
• A range of other supporting resources including guidance on staging the play

Schools can also apply to perform their version of A Midsummer Night’s Dream on an RSC stage in Stratford-upon-Avon as part of the Playmaking Festival in July 2016. Whether you weave lines from the play into a lesson, create an Athenian wood in your playground or put on a full production, every school can get involved. Join the RSC Dream Team community and share your story on Twitter using #RSCDreamTeam.

Join RSC Dream Team, download the resources and find teaching ideas and inspiration at: www.rsc.org.uk/dreamteam

"SHAKESPEARE, C’EST NOUS!"
GLOBE EDUCATION AND SHAKESPEARE 400

Patrick Spottiswoode, Director of Education, Shakespeare’s Globe writes: *1616 A Momentous Year*, will celebrate not only Shakespeare’s legacy but the lives and influence of Henslowe, Beaumont, Cervantes and Tang Xianzu, all of whom died that year, as well as Jonson’s pioneering Folio which was published that year. *Read Not Dead* performances will include plays by Beaumont, Beaumont and Fletcher, Jonson and plays inspired by Cervantes’ novelas. *Dr Faustus* (1616 text) will be presented in original pronunciation. Sam Wanamaker Playhouse Talks will include Grace Ioppolo on Henslowe, Martin Butler on Jonson and his Folio, Eric Rasmusssen on the St Omer First Folio and David Crystal on OP. Gordon McMullan, the driving force behind Shakespeare 400, will give this year’s Sam Wanamaker Fellowship Lecture on what it means to remember Shakespeare in 2016 and how his cultural dominance has overshadowed his contemporaries. Two exhibitions, *Fortunes and Folios* will present Henslowe-Alleyn artefacts and documents from Dulwich College, and the recently discovered St-Omer Shakespeare First Folio. Family events include a weekend festival, *Shakespeare’s Telling Tales*, and a wickedly funny and lyrically beautiful marionette *Hamlet*.

Leading international scholars will join us for a Rose Symposium, the World Shakespeare Congress and a conference on *Cultures of Mortality. Hamlet and Japan* will be celebrated with an evening of talks and the haunting kabuki-inspired *Visions of Ophelia* performed by Aki Isoda. A free online *Teaching Shakespeare* resource will be launched at Globe Education’s summer International Teachers’ Conference, *Shakespeare Works When Shakespeare Plays*. For more details about the full range of events at Shakespeare’s Globe visit: www.shakespearesglobe.com/1616.

SHAKESPEARE: THE NEXT 400 YEARS CONFERENCE

For three days in April 2016, on the 400th anniversary of his death, actors and academics, scholars and writers, historians, comic artists, game designers and film makers will be coming together from all over the world, meeting at Elsinore, Denmark – ‘Hamlet’s castle’ – to discuss and debate the legacy, and the future, of Shakespeare’s work.

This conference/festival will explore two great questions: why, after 400 years, do we continue to read, study, perform, and enjoy the work of this playwright and poet, and how, in the next 400 years, will we continue to do so? Will we present Shakespeare in new ways? Will we use new technologies? New media? Will Shakespeare become a basis for further new works which use him as a launch pad, or even as raw material, or will we go back to the simplicity of his words themselves? There is a dedicated session on Shakespeare in the global classroom. For more information visit: www.tees.ac.uk/elsinore

SHAKESPEARE AND EDUCATION CONFERENCE, BRIGHTON, 29–30 APRIL 2016

2016 will mark the 400th anniversary of Shakespeare’s death, provoking renewed interest in his work, his legacy and his contemporary cultural capital. As teaching methods change, pedagogy develops, technologies advance and culture evolves, what role does Shakespeare play now and in the future of teaching and learning? How do we incorporate performance practice in the teaching of Shakespeare in Literature – and vice versa? What part does education play in the construction of our public ‘memory’ of Shakespeare at this time of commemoration? Speakers include: Catherine Belsey (Swansea), Coppélia Kahn (Brown), Sean McEvoy (Varndean College), Shormishtha Panja (Dehli) and Emma Smith (Oxford). With participation from RSC Education, Cambridge Schools Shakespeare and – of course – *Teaching Shakespeare*.

WORLD SHAKESPEARE CONGRESS: CREATING AND RE-CREATING SHAKESPEARE

31 JULY – 6 AUGUST 2016

The 2016 World Shakespeare Congress – four hundred years after the playwright’s death – will celebrate Shakespeare’s memory and the global cultural legacy of his works. Uniquely, ambitiously, fittingly, this quatercentenary World Congress will be based in not just one but two locations: in Shakespeare’s birthplace, and final resting-place, Stratford-upon-Avon; and in the city where he made his name and where his genius flourished – London. The 2016 hosts – in Stratford, the Royal Shakespeare Company, the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, and the University of Birmingham’s Shakespeare Institute; in London, Shakespeare’s Globe and the London Shakespeare Centre, King’s College London – look forward to welcoming delegates from around the world to share in a range of cultural and intellectual opportunities in the places where Shakespeare was born, acted, wrote and died.
BRITISH SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE:
SHAKESPEAREAN TRANSFORMATIONS:
DEATH, LIFE, AND AFTERLIVES
HULL, 8–11 SEPTEMBER 2016
The conference will be held in the official run-up to Hull’s year as the UK’s City of Culture in 2017. The programme will include plenary lectures, papers, seminars, workshops, and performances at Hull Truck and the Gulbenkian Centre. There will also be special workshops and sessions pedagogy. We welcome proposals for papers (20 minutes), panels (90 minutes), or seminars/workshops (90 minutes) on any aspect of the conference theme, broadly interpreted. Abstracts (no more than 200 words) should be sent to bsa2016@hull.ac.uk by 15 December 2015.

ASIAN SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE
1–3 DECEMBER 2016
Heads up for the Asian Shakespeare Association conference, Dehli, 1–3 December 2016. More details will be posted on asianshakespeare.org/site/conferences/view/delhi

SHAKESPEARE AT THE EDGES
17–19 NOVEMBER 2016
The 13th biennial international conference of the Australian and New Zealand Shakespeare Association, will be hosted by the University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand. conference.anzsa.org

Further details about dates, plenary speakers, postgraduate travel bursaries, postgraduate and early career prizes, venues and accommodation will appear shortly on the ANZSA bulletin page: bulletin.anzsa.org

A call for papers and proposals for panel sessions and workshops to follow. Conference convener is Dr Mark Houlahan, University of Waikato (maph@waikato.ac.nz). Conference email: anzsa2016@waikato.ac.nz.

We’re always looking to publish lively, engaging reports on teaching Shakespeare-related conferences, symposia, panels and workshops that our readers have attended – please contact sarah.olive@york.ac.uk if you’re interested in contributing one.
AN APPROACH TO TEACHING HENRY IV, PART 1

In his essay on Twelfth Night in Precious Nonsense, Stephen Booth proposes that “throughout his career, Shakespeare experiments with – and gets energy from – setting audiences to watch – or, rather, try to watch – a play other than the one he shows them” (183). In Henry IV, Part 1, the play Shakespeare sets his audience to watch is a variation on the story of the prodigal son: the madcap, wastrel Prince comes home, is reconciled to his father, and, after his heroic, individual combat with Hotspur at Shrewsbury, displaces his brother and takes his hereditary and rightful place at court. Falstaff’s description of his soldiers at 4.2.34–35 as “a hundred and fifty tottered prodigals lately come from swine-keeping, from eating draff and husks” momentarily calls attention to this parallel. But even if Shakespeare had never written Henry IV, Part 2, this allegorical understanding of the play, as convincing as it sometimes seems, does not entirely reflect what a reader or an audience experiences in the play.

Although we shall never be able to answer it, I begin teaching Henry IV, Part 1, with a question that will guide our subsequent discussion of the play: who is Prince Hal? I ask this question for several reasons. First, it allows me to look closely at one dimension of the “energy” Stephen Booth finds in many of Shakespeare’s plays. (The same question about Falstaff would, of course, focus on another dimension of that energy). Then, I hope to make clear that, although the play continually raises the question, it never answers it or, to put it more precisely, it offers several answers, all of which seem plausible, but none of which is ever compelling.

More generally, I hope students, in seeking an answer to the question, will come to recognize that when we find meaning in the patterns of a play, we are more often than not simply defining what is indefinite, proposing what we believe or desire the play to mean. Finally, I want to show, by looking carefully both at the script and at recorded performances, that the Prince we encounter in a production is the Prince an actor or an actor and director have chosen for us from among plausible possibilities. The play is indefinite: the players today ordinarily seek to define their characters and, in so doing, define the play.

I look first at Hal’s soliloquy at the end of 1.2. The soliloquy is heavily patterned, highly coherent, although its patterns, its coherence, are more linguistic than ideational. It also, to adapt Stephen Booth’s description of the entire play, feels organized rather than organic (“Coherences” 44). The opening lines, “I know you all, and will awhile uphold/ The unyoked humor of your idleness” (195–96), with their repetition of sounds (“all,” “will,” “awhile,” “idle,” “you” and “humor,” “uphold” and “unyoked”), momentarily calls attention to this parallel. But even if Shakespeare had never written Henry IV, Part 2, this allegorical understanding of the play, as convincing as it sometimes seems, does not entirely reflect what a reader or an audience experiences in the play.

Although we shall never be able to answer it, I begin teaching Henry IV, Part 1, with a question that will guide our subsequent discussion of the play: who is Prince Hal? I ask this question for several reasons. First, it allows me to look closely at one dimension of the “energy” Stephen Booth finds in many of Shakespeare’s plays. (The same question about Falstaff would, of course, focus on another dimension of that energy). Then, I hope to make clear that, although the play continually raises the question, it never answers it or, to put it more precisely, it offers several answers, all of which seem plausible, but none of which is ever compelling. More generally, I hope students, in seeking an answer to the question, will come to recognize that when we find meaning in the patterns of a play, we are more often than not simply defining what is indefinite, proposing what we believe or desire the play to mean.

“I hope students, in seeking an answer to the question, will come to recognize that when we find meaning in the patterns of a play, we are more often than not simply defining what is indefinite, proposing what we believe or desire the play to mean.”

The word “sun” brings with it a range of meanings and responses, none of which are finally relevant to the meaning of the lines, but still seem somehow relevant to them. As the scene began, Falstaff proposed that he and Hal “go by the moon . . . and not by Phoebus” (14–5), but Hal decides to “imitate the sun.” With sun we might also hear son, since both the King in 1.1.78ff and Falstaff in 1.2.97 (“I’ll be damned for never a King’s son in Christendom!”) have already referred to Hal as the son of the King. As Hal develops his image (which may momentarily recall the Biblical transfiguration of Jesus), the loosely alliterative language continues, and, although he seems to credit the sun with more agency that it has, we understand (or at least think we understand) what he says: his time in Eastcheap is a political move, a Machiavellian exercise in public relations. Hal seems not a foolish prodigal son, soon to be eating husks with swine, but a shrewd politician.

Hal’s new image, the “playing holidays,” however, disrupts that understanding and a different Hal begins to emerge. While from one point of view the new image seems simply to reiterate in terms of holidays what Hal has just said in terms of the sun, it also opens up another understanding of
him. The Prince now becomes a man who has the capacity “to sport” when the opportunity presents itself, to enjoy life, a moderate man who knows the value of a holiday from the demands of the world, demands that Hotspur and the King never escape and Falstaff never feels. The earlier image of the sun, of course, has made those holidays even more attractive because we imagine them the bright sunny days we too wish for on our holidays. We are now a little more than half way through the soliloquy, and two Hals have presented themselves to us.

But a third one is about to appear, the Hal who will “pay the debt I never promised.” While the words seem simply to mean that he will at some point take his place at court and make up for his escapades in Eastcheap with Falstaff and his friends, we also hear them in another way: the Prince will reluctantly take up the burden of kingship and embrace (perhaps with a sense of its absurdity) the role his birth has imposed upon him. Michael Pennington, playing Hal for the English Shakespeare Company, seems to have built his conception of Hal around such a reading of the line. That third understanding of Hal emerges for a moment, and, without ever displacing the other two, fixes itself as a possibility in our minds, and all three of them (to varying degrees at various times) subsequently color our responses to the Prince and our understanding of him in the scenes that follow.

As the soliloquy continues, Hal’s final image again seems at first simply to restate in different terms the meaning of the first one. But it does not quite do so. The line, “By so much shall I falsify men’s hopes,” may leave us momentarily disoriented, for it asks us to understand “hopes” as “expectations” (one of its secondary meanings): men (or at least the King in 1.1.) seem to hope the Prince will reform and, if he does, he will not, therefore, falsify their hopes (i.e., what they want to happen), but bring them to fruition. The clouds (in lines 198–203) clear away so that the sun can shine alone in the sky: the “bright metal” (that the image of the sun leads us to imagine as gold) shows “more goodly” in contrast to the sullen ground. But the words that recall the earlier image of the sun (“bright” and “glittering”), the rhetorical similarity of the two extended images (one at the beginning of the soliloquy, one at the end), and the word “so,” which implies (but does not actually deliver) an earned, logical conclusion to what has come before it, all combine to make the soliloquy feel simpler, more ideationally consistent than it really is. At the same time, the word “foil,” while it refers to the dark ground against which the bright metal is set off, simultaneously suggests the bright metal itself (gold foil) as well as one of the organizing principles of the play, the various sets of foils formed by Hotspur, King Henry, Falstaff, and the Prince. The closing couplet (as closing couplets do) brings a sense of finality, of confirmation; a sense (as the couplet often does in the sonnets) that the soliloquy is more ideationally coherent than it actually is. It ends finally with two words we have heard before and shall hear clearly again: “I will.”

Our search for the Prince continues in 3.2 as we look at the parallels between Hal’s soliloquy and the speeches of the King. Once again, a linguistic pattern emerges which seems to confirm an ideational pattern, but does not entirely do so. King Henry’s speeches not only recall the words with which Falstaff played him in 2.4, but also use and reuse the words which Hal spoke in his soliloquy: “By being seldom seen, I could not stir/But, like a comet, I was wond’red at” (46–7) and “My presence, like a robe pontifical,/Ne’er seen but wond’red at; and so my state,/Seldom but sumptuous, showed like a feast” (56–8) and “Afford no extraordinary gaze/Such as is bent on sunlight majesty/When it shines seldom in admiring eyes” (78–80). (Italics added). The King also recalls the expectations, the hopes of men, “The hope and expectation of thy time/Is ruined, and the soul of every man/Prophetically doth forethink thy fall” (36–8) and suggests an analogy between honey and holidays, “They surfeited with honey and began/To loath the taste of sweetness” (71–2).

“The linguistic connections between Hal’s soliloquy and the King’s speech are clear, but the ideational ones are not. They suggest the King and Hal are alike, but they also suggest the King and Hal are not alike.”
The linguistic connections between Hal’s soliloquy and the King’s speech are clear, but the ideational ones are not. They suggest the King and Hal are alike, but they also suggest the King and Hal are not alike, first because the King is speaking more literally than Hal was (actually being seen versus being seen for the person one actually is) and because the parallel the King inadvertently draws seems to reflect only one of the three Princes we encountered in the soliloquy, the Machiavellian one, and demeans and dismisses the common people that we necessarily imagine as the loveable rogues from Eastcheap whom the Prince seems (sometimes) to have generously befriended and who earlier entertained us so engagingly in the tavern: lines 56–58 allude to the sumptuary laws that prohibited excess of food and clothing among ordinary people and seem thus to connect the King again with Falstaff. While the Prince’s response also recalls his earlier soliloquy, “I will redeem all this on Percy’s head/And, in the closing of some glorious day,/Be bold to tell you that I am your son” (132–34), it at the same time as a result sustains the ambiguity around the Prince (italics added). Hal’s interview with his father, for all its linguistic promise, for all its echoes and patterning, does not answer the question who is Hal. Instead it suggests simultaneously that Hal is both like and not like his father.

We go next to Eastcheap and look at the play of Falstaff and Hal in 2.4. In his first long speech of their play, Falstaff (particularly with son and sun) echoes, as the King does in 3.2, Hal’s soliloquy, and in “pointed at” seems to anticipate King Henry’s “That men would tell their children ‘This is he!’/Others would say, ‘Where? Which is Bolingbroke?’” The word “micher” (truant) recalls the “playing holidays” of the soliloquy, but Falstaff gives it a less positive connotation.

All three Princes seem present in the play, and, if we choose among them, we simply chose the one we believe or desire to be there. In the theatre, of course, the actor playing Hal will choose for us. Similarly, various Falstaffs, as I shall suggest, seem present as well. While one Prince may hurt and humiliate Falstaff during the play, another may only tease him and enjoy the game they are playing together. But the question of who Hal is probably comes down to their last exchange, their parallel the King inadvertently draws seems to reflect only one of the three Princes we encountered in the soliloquy, the Machiavellian one, and demeans and dismisses the common people that we necessarily imagine as the loveable rogues from Eastcheap whom the Prince seems (sometimes) to have generously befriended and who earlier entertained us so engagingly in the tavern: lines 56–58 allude to the sumptuary laws that prohibited excess of food and clothing among ordinary people and seem thus to connect the King again with Falstaff. While the Prince’s response also recalls his earlier soliloquy, “I will redeem all this on Percy’s head/And, in the closing of some glorious day,/Be bold to tell you that I am your son” (132–34), it at the same time as a result sustains the ambiguity around the Prince (italics added). Hal’s interview with his father, for all its linguistic promise, for all its echoes and patterning, does not answer the question who is Hal. Instead it suggests simultaneously that Hal is both like and not like his father.

The question about Hal seems initially to be put to rest at Shrewsbury when in 5.4 the Prince and Hotspur (his most obvious foil) meet in single combat, the climactic and inevitable encounter the play has implicitly promised since its first scene. When the fighting is done, Hotspur and Falstaff lie dead on the stage with Hal alive between them, a neat and satisfying allegorical tableau that suppresses our question about Hal (but does not actually answer it). A humane, magnanimous, compassionate Prince stands (in most stagings of the scene) between Hotspur and Falstaff, the foils (“on a sullen ground”) that now set off his bright metal, apparently reconciling within himself the competing extremes which they seem to represent, extremes which the play has repeatedly called to our attention – sport and work, pleasure and duty, excess and austerity.

Falstaff, however, does not play his appropriate role in the allegory, and (like the linguistic coherences that repeatedly disrupt the univocal understanding of the Prince we think them meant to effect), he rises from the dead to disrupt our feeling that the tensions in the play have been resolved, to undo the comforting sense of closure the deeply moving, clearly organized allegorical moment has just evoked in us.
Falstaff, moreover, seems far less attractive here than he does in other parts of the play as he surreptitiously stabs the corpse of Hotspur “for reward.” The Prince’s promise to “gild” Falstaff’s lie echoes his “glitter’ning o’er my fault” and Vernon’s “Glittering in golden coats like images,” and it suggests, as it did in the two earlier instances, both transformation and duplicity (italics added). Has Hal transformed the iron world of politics and honor by admitting Falstaff to it, or does he rather feel that Falstaff might continue to be politically useful to him? While the play ends neatly with the King’s speech, the audience seems left to wonder, as it has throughout the play, who Hal is and what his gilding of Falstaff’s lie might really (really) mean.

While I do not ordinarily teach Henry IV, Part 2 in its entirety, we do look at the ending of the play, the rejection of Falstaff, both on the page and in performance. It begins with an echo of the opening lines of Hal’s soliloquy: “I know you all!” “I know thee not, old man.” Hal’s words seem harsh, but actors, apparently recalling the Prince of holidays in the soliloquy, find ways to soften them, making a private joke of gormandizing and the “gaping grave,” for example, tingeing some of the lines with regret, turning others into a public speech, another exercise in public relations, for the benefit of the entire kingdom. At the end of Henry 4, Part 2, the prodigal son has come home, Hal has rejected Eastcheap, and the reformation of the madcap Prince is complete. But we have seen different play, less straightforward than the allegory Shakespeare seems to have set us to watch, a play that has refused to answer the question it has kept (admittedly more effectively in Part 1 than Part 2) consistently before us: who is Prince Hal, now King Henry the Fifth? As he has been throughout the two plays, Hal remains an enigma, his role in the arrest of Falstaff and his comrades unclear, the truths of his heart, as they are with any public figure, beyond our knowing.

By the time our discussions of Henry IV, Part 1 are finished, I hope students have come to understand that the patterns through which we ordinarily seek to find meaning in a play do not, in fact, give us meaning, since they are, as I have tried to show, open to multiple and simultaneous understandings. “Our minds,” as Stephen Booth once put it in his essay on King Lear, are “firmly fixed in two places at once,” and an audience “entertains two or more precise understandings at once, understandings that might, but do not, clash in the mind” (33). The patterns, whether we recognize them or not, give the play the feel of coherence and completeness, satisfy us as we come (consciously or unconsciously) upon them, but they do not reveal the meaning of the play or even of the Prince. If students who read Henry IV, Part 1, recognize that three Prince Hals (and at least as many Falstaffs) are simultaneously and inseparably present in it, that it offers no univocal understanding of the Prince and has itself no univocal meaning, they will at least have read the play more honestly and, if nothing else, be prepared to resist in other plays what Stephen Booth once called the “benign lie” of interpretation (“Function” 265).
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REPLACING THE SHAKESPEARE CANON WITH THE HENRY TRILOGY

Many students’ eyes roll and jaws go slack when assigned reading from Shakespeare’s canon: Romeo and Juliet, Hamlet, Julius Caesar, Macbeth, A Midsummer Night’s Dream, Othello, Taming of the Shrew, and The Merchant of Venice (Kelly, 2014). Instead of giving high schoolers stories aimed at their movie going and video gaming interests, school teachers repeatedly offer those same plays (Kelly, 2014) that are unlikely to capture a teenagers’ imagination or induce students to become lifelong Shakespeare fans. The high school curriculum should be more in tune with the students’ needs. This is why Henry IV, Parts One and Two, with Henry V, are a better introduction to Shakespeare for adolescents than the top eight in the canon (Barnet, 1998). The Henry plays are proven ticket-sellers for theaters that serve adult male buyers (Barnett, 1998).

This paper looks at Hal and Falstaff as a pair, and examines how their interactions compare to modern pop-culture relationships appealing to teens. SelfMadeHero [sic], publishers of Manga Shakespeare, a pop-culture comic in the Japanese pop-art style, say, the series brings “Shakespeare to life in a visual way for a new audience. [We] wanted these mangas to be seen as entertainment rather than as primarily educational” (Hayley, 2010). Lyrics of the Broadway hit musical spoof Something Rotten proclaim a sentiment shared by many outside of academia: “His plays are wordy . . . He has no sense about the audience, he makes them feel so dumb” (Wayne Kirkpatrick, 2015). These modern successes show that teens have a voluntary interest in Shakespeare if presented under new and exciting circumstances.

THREE ON A MATCH

This section looks at numbers supporting the fact that teenagers love trilogies. For reading, the popularity of teen trilogies has broken all publishing records. The Twilight trilogy sold over $1.6 million in books globally. Significant revenues were also made from film and DVD sales (Statistic Brain, 2013). In 2012, the Scholastic publishing house announced that they printed over 50 million copies of the Hunger Games trilogy and over 150 million copies of the Harry Potter seven-book series in the U.S. (Haq, 2012). The hugely successful trilogy, J.R.R Tolkien’s Lord of the Rings, written in the 1940s is still recognized as young reader’s favorite in the U.S., the U.K., Germany, and Australia. Teens love to read trilogies and enjoy the continuity offered by a trilogy. Introducing Shakespeare to high-school readers through a three-part series is a great way to capture their imagination, creating an audience for the Bard that will last beyond the eleventh grade. Shakespeare’s Henry IV, Part One and Henry IV, Part Two, plus Henry V, are his definitive trilogy. These give readers the chance to watch Hal grow from a carefree youth who knows that he must one day accept greatness, meanwhile dealing with a fat sidekick and overcoming several enemies on his inevitable rise to power. That is remarkably similar to what J.K. Rowling’s young readers experienced through seven Harry Potter books, watching him grow into his power to push back the forces of evil. Also, except for the gender change of the main character, it is similar to Suzanne Collins’ Hunger Games trilogy’s protagonist Katniss Everdeen surviving her society’s annual death match to become a hero.

HUMOR: FROM FALSTAFF TO GRIFFIN

To see how teens buy into characters such as Hal and Falstaff, look no further than the TV-marathon staples of Ian Fleming’s James Bond spy-flicks and Seth MacFarlane’s Family Guy animated sitcom on the FOX network. Teens of this early 21st century will see clear connection from Falstaff to Peter Löwenbräu Griffin, the main character of Family Guy, an animated sitcom on the FOX network. Starting with their names, comparing Griffin to Falstaff provides immediate similarities. Griffin may be named for the author of The Theory of Blackjack, Peter A. Griffin (Udonis, n.d.); that book feeds on its readers’ desire to get rich quick through card-counting in Las Vegas casinos. The name ilussrates that the
“JOHN FALSTAFF AND PETER GRIFFIN ARE THE BUTT OF MOST OF THE JOKES IN THEIR SCENES, THE CHARACTERS MOST LIKELY TO FAIL FOR THE SAKE OF FAILURE.”

Peter Griffin character is looking for a way to cheat his way into a fortune, a direct link to Falstaff’s innermost desire.

John Falstaff and Peter Griffin are the butt of most of the jokes in their scenes, the characters most likely to fail for the sake of failure. Watching Falstaff, we see a clown at work – not one offered just for comic relief. His desire to be “rich beyond the dreams of avarice” (Johnson, 1765; John Musker, 1992) forces him to put into motion motion comic schemes beyond his abilities. The idea of someone ballsy enough to push unrealistic limits appeals to most men because Falstaff is “an unreal, though wholly convincing figure – for the reason that he refuses to take anything in life seriously.” (Baker, 1919)

Both Griffin and Falstaff are overweight, lazy, lying, heavy drinkers, each of a station in life lower than they like to admit. Peter has a short attention span, which frequently leads him to bizarre situations. Falstaff’s poor, or at least selective, memory also places him in unbelievable situations. Both men run from a fight rather than stand up for themselves. In Falstaff, we see this in Henry IV, Part One, 2.4, when Hal and Poins pose as thieves to rob Falstaff, and the fat knight runs off into the dark woods, leaving behind his horse, his ill-gotten gains, and his dignity. Griffin exhibits a similar act of cowardice in a 2014 episode of Family Guy when interlopers at his bar of choice take the booth usually used by Griffin and his drinking buddies. When they stand up to defend their turf, they back down in a hysterical and humiliating scene (FOX Broadcasting Network, 2014).

While Griffin is a clowning oaf, Falstaff (in medieval terms) is the despicable and darker Vice character representing evil life choices (DeVries, 1998). Vice usually brags about his conquests in battle, which is not relevant to our suburban cartoon dad. Falstaff, however, has a “distorted honor, displaying features of the braggart soldier, whether derived from Roman comedies [sic] miles gloriosus or the later capitano figure of the Italian commedia dell’arte” (Lutkus, 1998). David DeVries tells us the obvious: “Throughout the Middle English drama, and particularly in the morality plays, it is evil that gets the laughs.” And Falstaff, at least in Henry IV, Part One, gets plenty of laughs. Teens love laughing at someone’s expense.

TEENs LOVE CELEBRITIES

Teens could be also brought to the Henry trilogy through the actor Tom Hiddleston, who plays Hal in The Hollow Crown BBC TV Mini-Series. More importantly to teens he also plays the Norse trickster god Loki, brother of Thor and son of Odin, in five movies and one videogame of the Marvel Universe. Teens can connect to Hal through this actor they already recognize and whose movies they already buy into. Sales of Hiddleston’s Avengers and Thor movies in 2012 and 2013 exceed $1 billion in the US, and over $2.5 billion worldwide (Nash Information Services, LLC, 2014).

FROM HAL TO BOND

Prince Hal can also be seen by this teen-aged demographic through the unflappable, fictional, Brit James Bond: suave and freewheeling, a drinker and womanizer, but always willing to drop those vices for love of god and country. There are twenty-four Bond books and movies, so we know the characterization is known and accepted by teens, the largest group of moviegoers (BBC News Entertainment, 2014). The plot of the 2006 Bond movie, Casino Royal, features a Brit pretending to be a rich playboy. His mission is to trick an enemy of the state, Le Chuffer, to lose all of his money earmarked for evil doing in a high-stakes baccarat game. This is reminiscent of an early mission for Hal to rob Falstaff who, as highway robber, is an enemy of the state. In both stories, the hero wins and gets the money. Bond relies on the character Felix Leiter, who appears in most of the twenty-three Bond books and films, providing help in the way of arms, funds or tactical information. Leiter is a one-dimensional supporting figure whose job is to help the suave playboy “save the day” in the role of hero. Leiter reflects the role of Poins in the Henry plays, a loyal aide always ready to provide assistance to get Hal out of a tight spot.

“PRINCE HAL CAN ALSO BE SEEN BY THIS TEEN-AGED DEMOGRAPHIC THROUGH THE UNFLAPPABLE, FICTIONAL, BRIT JAMES BOND: SUAVE AND FREEWHEELING, A DRinker AND WOMANIZER, BUT ALWAYS WILLING TO DROP THOSE VICes FOR LOVE OF GOD AND COUNTRY.”

Linking Hal to Bond, review the end of Henry IV, Part One where Hal slays his archenemy, Hotspur, just like secret agent 007 uses his license to kill in each James Bond movie. But the Hal/Hotspur battle is fictionalized, with Shakespeare taking poetic license to kill. Prince Henry was actually 16 years old when he battled Henry “Harry Hotspur” Percy at Shrewsbury (Livingston, 2013), and was severely injured by an enemy’s arrow through his cheek. Hal did not kill Percy; that was accomplished by an arrow from a longbow. Sharing this fact would grab the attention of teens who likely experience battle only through the best-selling time-jumping video game Assassin’s Creed 4 (Video Game Manor, 2014).

BUDDY HUMOR

Henry IV, Part One is the original, albeit strange version, of the buddy-movie, “typically starring two mismatched male characters” (Cohen, 2013). High schoolers can easily
appreciate Shakespeare through Falstaff and Hal by focusing on the proven, winning formula of the “buddy movie.” Falstaff is the overeating, drinking, conniving fool who could not succeed on his own merits, paired with Hal, the suave, naive and (presumably) handsome prince, an avowed playboy who understands that he must give up this life of a player who will inevitably accept his responsibilities of the crown. As in all buddy-movies, the audience wants to see how they interact. How does the prince get to be king? And what of Falstaff? Will he get to the court on the prince’s coattails, or will he fall in disgrace? In the beginning of the act one, scene two, Falstaff and Hal seem inseparable, especially for Falstaff, who familiarly calls Hal “lad” (1). The audience knows better early on that the Prince will ditch his fat drinking buddy when Hal announces in his soliloquy that his “loose behavior” will be “thrown off” when he later accepts his “redeeming time” and his duty-bound responsibilities as king (I.2.202). Unlike many buddy-movies, this early use of the formula gives one partner a distinct advantage: Hal will improve through his station in life but, ultimately, will not take his buddy Falstaff along for the ride.

**TEENS APPEASED**

There is no doubt that teaching the same plays for decades or more has failed to build a generation of students who appreciate or even want to read or see more Shakespeare. Teaching *Henry IV, Part One* with or without *Henry IV, Part Two* and *Henry V* gives teens a new experience: they cannot approach this Shakespeare with the caricatures or misconceptions from seeing other films or – more likely – hearing cliché cultural references that ooze out of the canon (Kelly, 2014). The *Henry* plays give teens the trilogies they love to read; they get to watch Falstaff for comic relief; they witness the growth of a young man into the strength and confidence of adulthood; and they provide the buddy-movie vibe between two key characters.

“The *Henry* plays give teens the trilogies they love to read; they get to watch Falstaff for comic relief; they witness the growth of a young man into the strength and confidence of adulthood; and they provide the buddy-movie vibe between two key characters.”
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