

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE

---

THE FIRST PART  
OF KING HENRY  
THE FOURTH

EDITED BY M. A. SHAABER

---

PENGUIN BOOKS

BALTIMORE · MARYLAND

THE PELICAN SHAKESPEARE  
GENERAL EDITOR ALFRED HARBAGE



THE FIRST PART OF  
KING HENRY THE FOURTH



WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE

---

THE FIRST PART  
OF KING HENRY  
THE FOURTH

EDITED BY M. A. SHAABER

---

PENGUIN BOOKS

BALTIMORE · MARYLAND

First published in *The Pelican Shakespeare* 1957  
This revised edition first published 1970 by  
Penguin Books Inc.  
7110 Ambassador Road, Baltimore, Maryland 21207

Copyright © 1957 and 1970 by Penguin Books Inc.  
Library of Congress Catalog Card Number  
73-97747

Printed in the United States of America

# CONTENTS

Shakespeare and his Stage	7
The Texts of the Plays	12
Introduction	14
Note on the Text	23
The First Part of King Henry the Fourth	25

## PUBLISHER'S NOTE

Soon after the thirty-eight volumes forming *The Pelican Shakespeare* had been published, they were brought together in *The Complete Pelican Shakespeare*. The editorial revisions and new textual features are explained in detail in the General Editor's Preface to the one-volume edition. They have all been incorporated in the present volume. The following should be mentioned in particular:

The lines are not numbered in arbitrary units. Instead all lines are numbered which contain a word, phrase, or allusion explained in the glossarial notes. In the occasional instances where there is a long stretch of unannotated text, certain lines are numbered in italics to serve the conventional reference purpose.

The intrusive and often inaccurate place-headings inserted by early editors are omitted (as is becoming standard practise), but for the convenience of those who miss them, an indication of locale now appears as first item in the annotation of each scene.

In the interest of both elegance and utility, each speech-prefix is set in a separate line when the speaker's lines are in verse, except when these words form the second half of a pentameter line. Thus the verse form of the speech is kept visually intact, and turned-over lines are avoided. What is printed as verse and what is printed as prose has, in general, the authority of the original texts. Departures from the original texts in this regard have only the authority of editorial tradition and the judgment of the Pelican editors; and, in a few instances, are admittedly arbitrary.

# SHAKESPEARE AND HIS STAGE

William Shakespeare was christened in Holy Trinity Church, Stratford-upon-Avon, April 26, 1564. His birth is traditionally assigned to April 23. He was the eldest of four boys and two girls who survived infancy in the family of John Shakespeare, glover and trader of Henley Street, and his wife Mary Arden, daughter of a small landowner of Wilmcote. In 1568 John was elected Bailiff (equivalent to Mayor) of Stratford, having already filled the minor municipal offices. The town maintained for the sons of the burgesses a free school, taught by a university graduate and offering preparation in Latin sufficient for university entrance; its early registers are lost, but there can be little doubt that Shakespeare received the formal part of his education in this school.

On November 27, 1582, a license was issued for the marriage of William Shakespeare (aged eighteen) and Ann Hathaway (aged twenty-six), and on May 26, 1583, their child Susanna was christened in Holy Trinity Church. The inference that the marriage was forced upon the youth is natural but not inevitable; betrothal was legally binding at the time, and was sometimes regarded as conferring conjugal rights. Two additional children of the marriage, the twins Hamnet and Judith, were christened on February 2, 1585. Meanwhile the prosperity of the elder Shakespeares had declined, and William was impelled to seek a career outside Stratford.

The tradition that he spent some time as a country



teacher is old but unverifiable. Because of the absence of records his early twenties are called the "lost years," and only one thing about them is certain – that at least some of these years were spent in winning a place in the acting profession. He may have begun as a provincial troupier, but by 1592 he was established in London and prominent enough to be attacked. In a pamphlet of that year, *Groats-worth of Wit*, the ailing Robert Greene complained of the neglect which university writers like himself had suffered from actors, one of whom was daring to set up as a playwright :

... an vpstart Crow, beautified with our feathers, that with his *Tygers hart wrapt in a Players hyde*, supposes he is as well able to bombast out a blanke verse as the best of you: and beeing an absolute *Iohannes fac totum*, is in his owne conceit the onely Shake-scene in a country.

The pun on his name, and the parody of his line "O tiger's heart wrapped in a woman's hide" (3 *Henry VI*), pointed clearly to Shakespeare. Some of his admirers protested, and Henry Chettle, the editor of Greene's pamphlet, saw fit to apologize :

... I am as sory as if the originall fault had beene my fault, because my selfe haue seene his demeanor no lesse ciuill than he excelent in the qualitie he professes : Besides, diuers of worship haue reported his vprightnes of dealing, which argues his honesty, and his facetious grace in writting, that approoues his Art. (Prefatory epistle, *Kind-Harts Dreame*)

The plague closed the London theatres for many months in 1592–94, denying the actors their livelihood. To this period belong Shakespeare's two narrative poems, *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece*, both dedicated to the Earl of Southampton. No doubt the poet was rewarded with a gift of money as usual in such cases, but he did no further dedicating and we have no reliable information on whether Southampton, or anyone else, became his regular patron. His sonnets, first mentioned in 1598 and published without his consent in 1609, are intimate without being

explicitly autobiographical. They seem to commemorate the poet's friendship with an idealized youth, rivalry with a more favored poet, and love affair with a dark mistress; and his bitterness when the mistress betrays him in conjunction with the friend; but it is difficult to decide precisely what the "story" is, impossible to decide whether it is fictional or true. The true distinction of the sonnets, at least of those not purely conventional, rests in the universality of the thoughts and moods they express, and in their poignancy and beauty.

In 1594 was formed the theatrical company known until 1603 as the Lord Chamberlain's men, thereafter as the King's men. Its original membership included, besides Shakespeare, the beloved clown Will Kempe and the famous actor Richard Burbage. The company acted in various London theatres and even toured the provinces, but it is chiefly associated in our minds with the Globe Theatre built on the south bank of the Thames in 1599. Shakespeare was an actor and joint owner of this company (and its Globe) through the remainder of his creative years. His plays, written at the average rate of two a year, together with Burbage's acting won it its place of leadership among the London companies.

Individual plays began to appear in print, in editions both honest and piratical, and the publishers became increasingly aware of the value of Shakespeare's name on the title pages. As early as 1598 he was hailed as the leading English dramatist in the *Palladis Tamia* of Francis Meres:

As *Plautus* and *Seneca* are accounted the best for Comedy and Tragedy among the Latines, so *Shakespeare* among the English is the most excellent in both kinds for the stage: for Comedy, witnes his *Gentlemen of Verona*, his *Errors*, his *Loue labors lost*, his *Loue labours wonne* [at one time in print but no longer extant, at least under this title], his *Midsummers night dream*, & his *Merchant of Venice*; for Tragedy, his *Richard the 2*, *Richard the 3*, *Henry the 4*, *King Iohn*, *Titus Andronicus*, and his *Romeo and Iuliet*.

The note is valuable both in indicating Shakespeare's prestige and in helping us to establish a chronology. In the second half of his writing career, history plays gave place to the great tragedies; and farces and light comedies gave place to the problem plays and symbolic romances. In 1623, seven years after his death, his former fellow-actors, John Heminge and Henry Condell, cooperated with a group of London printers in bringing out his plays in collected form. The volume is generally known as the First Folio.

Shakespeare had never severed his relations with Stratford. His wife and children may sometimes have shared his London lodgings, but their home was Stratford. His son Hamnet was buried there in 1596, and his daughters Susanna and Judith were married there in 1607 and 1616 respectively. (His father, for whom he had secured a coat of arms and thus the privilege of writing himself gentleman, died in 1601, his mother in 1608.) His considerable earnings in London, as actor-sharer, part owner of the Globe, and playwright, were invested chiefly in Stratford property. In 1597 he purchased for £60 New Place, one of the two most imposing residences in the town. A number of other business transactions, as well as minor episodes in his career, have left documentary records. By 1611 he was in a position to retire, and he seems gradually to have withdrawn from theatrical activity in order to live in Stratford. In March, 1616, he made a will, leaving token bequests to Burbage, Heminge, and Condell, but the bulk of his estate to his family. The most famous feature of the will, the bequest of the second-best bed to his wife, reveals nothing about Shakespeare's marriage; the quaintness of the provision seems commonplace to those familiar with ancient testaments. Shakespeare died April 23, 1616, and was buried in the Stratford church where he had been christened. Within seven years a monument was erected to his memory on the north wall of the chancel. Its portrait bust and the Droeshout engraving on the title page of

the First Folio provide the only likenesses with an established claim to authenticity. The best verbal vignette was written by his rival Ben Jonson, the more impressive for being imbedded in a context mainly critical :

... I loved the man, and doe honour his memory (on this side idolatry) as much as any. Hee was indeed honest, and of an open and free nature: had an excellent Phantsie, brave notions, and gentle expressions. . . . (Timber or Discoveries, ca. 1623-30)

\*

The reader of Shakespeare's plays is aided by a general knowledge of the way in which they were staged. The King's men acquired a roofed and artificially lighted theatre only toward the close of Shakespeare's career, and then only for winter use. Nearly all his plays were designed for performance in such structures as the Globe - a three-tiered amphitheatre with a large rectangular platform extending to the center of its yard. The plays were staged by daylight, by large casts brilliantly costumed, but with only a minimum of properties, without scenery, and quite possibly without intermissions. There was a rear stage gallery for action "above," and a curtained rear recess for "discoveries" and other special effects, but by far the major portion of any play was enacted upon the projecting platform, with episode following episode in swift succession, and with shifts of time and place signaled the audience only by the momentary clearing of the stage between the episodes. Information about the identity of the characters and, when necessary, about the time and place of the action was incorporated in the dialogue. No place-headings have been inserted in the present editions ; these are apt to obscure the original fluidity of structure, with the emphasis upon action and speech rather than scenic background. (Indications of place are supplied in the footnotes.) The acting, including that of the youthful apprentices to the profession who performed the parts of

women, was highly skillful, with a premium placed upon grace of gesture and beauty of diction. The audiences, a cross section of the general public, commonly numbered a thousand, sometimes more than two thousand. Judged by the type of plays they applauded, these audiences were not only large but also perceptive.

## THE TEXTS OF THE PLAYS

About half of Shakespeare's plays appeared in print for the first time in the folio volume of 1623. The others had been published individually, usually in quarto volumes, during his lifetime or in the six years following his death. The copy used by the printers of the quartos varied greatly in merit, sometimes representing Shakespeare's true text, sometimes only a debased version of that text. The copy used by the printers of the folio also varied in merit, but was chosen with care. Since it consisted of the best available manuscripts, or the more acceptable quartos (although frequently in editions other than the first), or of quartos corrected by reference to manuscripts, we have good or reasonably good texts of most of the thirty-seven plays.

In the present series, the plays have been newly edited from quarto or folio texts, depending, when a choice offered, upon which is now regarded by bibliographical specialists as the more authoritative. The ideal has been to reproduce the chosen texts with as few alterations as possible, beyond occasional relineation, expansion of abbreviations, and modernization of punctuation and spelling. Emendation is held to a minimum, and such material as has been added, in the way of stage directions and lines supplied by an alternative text, has been enclosed in square brackets.

None of the plays printed in Shakespeare's lifetime were divided into acts and scenes, and the inference is that the

author's own manuscripts were not so divided. In the folio collection, some of the plays remained undivided, some were divided into acts, and some were divided into acts and scenes. During the eighteenth century all of the plays were divided into acts and scenes, and in the Cambridge edition of the mid-nineteenth century, from which the influential Globe text derived, this division was more or less regularized and the lines were numbered. Many useful works of reference employ the act-scene-line apparatus thus established.

Since this act-scene division is obviously convenient, but is of very dubious authority so far as Shakespeare's own structural principles are concerned, or the original manner of staging his plays, a problem is presented to modern editors. In the present series the act-scene division is retained marginally, and may be viewed as a reference aid like the line numbering. A star marks the points of division when these points have been determined by a cleared stage indicating a shift of time and place in the action of the play, or when no harm results from the editorial assumption that there is such a shift. However, at those points where the established division is clearly misleading – that is, where continuous action has been split up into separate "scenes" – the star is omitted and the distortion corrected. This mechanical expedient seemed the best means of combining utility and accuracy.

THE GENERAL EDITOR

# INTRODUCTION

Shakespeare wrote *1 Henry IV* soon after *Richard II*. The plays are closely linked: *1 Henry IV* begins very soon after the end of *Richard II* and often refers to the events of that play; anticipations of *1 Henry IV* are planted in *Richard II*. As *Richard II* was written by 1596, the likely date for *1 Henry IV* is 1597.

Although the play was called *The History of Henry IV* in all the early printings beginning with the quarto of 1598 (it was differentiated from the second part only when the two were first printed together in the folio of 1623), it is not chiefly concerned with King Henry IV, and when he wrote it Shakespeare evidently had other interests in mind. As he followed it up with *2 Henry IV* and *Henry V*, it may seem that his idea was to write a series of plays on the ultimate origins of the Wars of the Roses similar to the series on these wars – the three parts of *Henry VI* and *Richard III* – which he had written more than five years earlier. But though the ultimate origins of the rivalry of Lancaster and York are to be found in the deposition of Richard II, the dire effects prophesied by the Bishop of Carlisle (*Richard II*, IV, i) were long postponed and fighting did not break out for almost half a century. Over this interval loomed the heroic figure of Henry of Monmouth, the savior of his country (or at least his father's reign) as Prince of Wales, the conqueror of France as King Henry V, who while he lived averted the consequences of disaffection. He is the theme of the two *Henry IV* plays

## INTRODUCTION

and of *Henry V*. Moreover, it is a story with a triumphant, not a tragic, outcome, and it required a different mode of treatment from *Richard II*.

The real center of *1 Henry IV*, the only character active in all the elements of the plot, is Prince Hal. Shakespeare's decision to present him in two plays\* rather than one must ★ have grown out of the curious legend of the prince's wild youth that he found in the histories. These credited the victor of Agincourt, the most Christian of the medieval kings of England, with an unruly and profligate youth, spent in dissolute company, which, however, he shed like a coat the moment he was called upon to rule. The first phase of this astonishing development is the subject of this play; it is the prelude to the revelation of Henry V in all his glory. *unruly youth legendary*

Though the contrast between the truant prince and the glorious king is kept before us in this play, just as it is in *Henry V*, it is a contrast of appearances rather than realities. > To Shakespeare the prince is the same man potentially as the king. The discrepancy is not between a bad prince and a good king but between the prince's true nature and his reputation, between what he will be when called upon to assert himself and what he seems to be while idly, even basely, biding his time. There is no real reformation: the prince always knows what is right and > prefers it; only appearances are against him. To reconcile this discrepancy Shakespeare resorted to a most un-psychological explanation, that the prince was deliberately waiting for the best opportunity to show the stuff he was made of, but evidently he thought it sufficient. Actually the play, by implication, gives a much better reason – that the prince was enjoying Falstaff – and this reason spectators at the play cordially accept.  
~~~~~~~~~

\* *1 Henry IV* and *Henry V*: to the present editor it seems more likely than not that *2 Henry IV* is an unpremeditated sequel to the first part, supplying the demand for more Falstaff.



The play, then, is a true story expanded and given additional dramatic force by the playwright's art. Much of it is based on the chronicler Holinshed's account of the reigns of Henry IV and Henry V. Shakespeare had also read the earlier chronicle of Hall (with whose story Holinshed's for the most part coincides) and Samuel Daniel's poem, *The Civil Wars* (1595), which magnifies the part of the prince in the battle of Shrewsbury and suggests his combat with Hotspur. An old play called *The Famous Victories of Henry V* had already covered the ground, beginning with the robbery on Gad's Hill and ending with the French marriage. As it is known to us only from an abbreviated and garbled version printed in 1598, it is hard to say how much Shakespeare, who presumably knew the authentic version of it, drew from it. But Shakespeare was not a historian but a playwright and his task was not to reproduce history but to transform it into drama. When good drama and history happened to coincide, he would give a faithful enough account of history as his informants had recorded it; when history proved recalcitrant to dramatization, he would ignore it or remold it to serve his purpose. As a result the play combines details perfectly true with others wholly imaginary. In a manner of speaking, the former warrant the latter. Shakespeare remembers that Bolingbroke landed at Ravenspurgh, swore an oath at Doncaster, and met Hotspur at Berkeley Castle; when he makes the king older than he really was and Hotspur younger it is not out of ignorance but out of a sense of what will make his play more effective. With the playwright's instinct for compressed and continuous action, he suppresses all indications of intervals of time between the successive episodes of the story, so that everything seems to happen in a few weeks, though actually a year elapsed between the defeat of Mortimer (June 22, 1402) and the battle of Shrewsbury (July 21, 1403). When history is silent, failing to explain why the prince played the madcap, what form his pranks took, what kind of man Hotspur really