

Michael D. Friedman

---

## **‘I am but a fool, look you’: Will Kemp and the Performance of Welshness**

*Many scholars believe that actor Will Kemp left William Shakespeare’s company in early 1599, prompting the playwright to omit Kemp’s character Falstaff from Henry V. This essay proposes that Kemp stepped down as a shareholder but remained with the Lord Chamberlain’s men as an actor through the summer and autumn of 1599, taking small parts in Julius Caesar and the role of the Welsh Captain Fluellen in Henry V. Evidence that one of Kemp’s acknowledged parts, Launce in The Two Gentlemen of Verona, was written to be performed as a figure of Welsh descent, supports this contention.*

If you be not too much cloyed with fat meat, 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.  
(2H4 Epilogue.24–8)<sup>1</sup>

In *Henry V* William Shakespeare keeps his promise, made at the end of his previous history play, to include both fair Katherine and the death of Falstaff, but he ostensibly reneges on his vow to continue the story ‘with Sir John in it’, since the fat knight never appears on-stage. As James Shapiro observes, ‘Since at least the eighteenth century, critics have struggled to make sense of Shakespeare’s change of heart about Falstaff. Why would he abandon one of his great creations — especially after promising that we’d see Falstaff again?’<sup>2</sup> During the first half of the twentieth century scholars entertained the proposition that Shakespeare abandoned his plan because the actor Will Kemp, who had played Falstaff in both parts of *Henry IV*, left the Lord Chamberlain’s Men before *Henry V* was composed, prompting Shakespeare to change course and report Falstaff’s death as an off-stage occurrence.<sup>3</sup> Later, other scholars reversed the causality of these

---

Michael D. Friedman ([michael.friedman@scranton.edu](mailto:michael.friedman@scranton.edu)) is a professor in the English and theatre department at the University of Scranton.

events and suggested that Shakespeare's artistic decision to eliminate Falstaff from the on-stage action prompted Kemp's abrupt departure.<sup>4</sup> Both of these theories assume that Kemp left the Chamberlain's Men around the time that the Globe was being built in 1599 and did not take a role in either *Henry V* or *Julius Caesar* later that year, but the evidence supporting this contention is inconclusive. I would like to propose the alternative explanation that, although Kemp sold his share in the Globe in early 1599, he remained with the company as an actor throughout the summer and autumn, taking various small roles in *Julius Caesar* and the major part of the Welsh Captain Fluellen in *Henry V* in place of the Falstaff whom Shakespeare had originally promised.

If this scenario is correct, then Sir John may indeed have been 'in' *Henry V* in a different way than the Epilogue to *Henry IV, Part 2* led its initial auditors to expect. As William E. Engel remarks, *Henry V* 'is peppered with references that recall Falstaff's former presence as the Prince's carousing companion',<sup>5</sup> primarily in the early scenes — 2.1 and 2.3 — that describe his heartsickness and death, which his tavern companions blame on the king's rejection. If Kemp took the role of Fluellen, I contend the presence of Falstaff lingered in the minds of *Henry V*'s early spectators more strongly than has heretofore been recognized. Kemp's sudden appearance in the middle of the play as Fluellen, two scenes after the announcement of Sir John's death, may have struck early viewers as a rebirth of the cowardly Falstaff in the figure of the valiant Welsh captain. This rehabilitated version of the debauched and banished knight of the *Henry IV* plays, embodied by Kemp's portrayal of Fluellen, reunites the reformed Prince Hal with a respectable Welsh version of the disgraced English knight from whom he has politically distanced himself. Henry's acknowledgement of his own Welsh birth and his national bond with his compatriot Fluellen reverses the king's break with Falstaff and exorcizes from the play the spirit of the rejected knight whose death was once laid at Henry's feet. Nevertheless, Kemp's Fluellen continues to remind his auditors, and the king himself, that Henry does not deserve his claim to Welshness unless he displays a type of honesty that he has not always shown in the past.

We know confidently that Kemp, along with his fellow shareholders, signed the lease for the Globe Theatre on 21 February 1599,<sup>6</sup> and the construction of the new building began shortly thereafter. As James Nielson observes,

Shortly after the lease was signed ... Kemp's share in the venture was made over to the other partners, and it has generally been assumed that he left the company at this time. This supposition stems in part from the fact that while Kemp's name appears in the list of players printed in the folio edition of Jonson's *Every Man in His Humor*

(acted by Shakespeare's company in 1598), it is not in the actor list appended to the folio edition of *Every Man out of His Humor* (acted 1599 or 1600). What's more, in February 1600, not long after the Globe is supposed to have opened (most probably during the summer or certainly by the autumn of 1599), Kemp set off on the famous morris dance to Norwich that is commemorated in *Kemps nine daies wonder*.<sup>7</sup>

To this evidence T.W. Baldwin adds, 'It is interesting to note the frequent big parts for Kemp up to his withdrawal early in 1599, and then the lack of his part in *Henry V* and *Julius Caesar*, both known to belong to 1599, followed by the appearance of the court jester with Armin in 1600'.<sup>8</sup> Although we know that Kemp sold his share in the Globe early in 1599, Baldwin assumes that this transaction indicates that Kemp also left the acting company. He supports this conjecture by the further assumption that no roles for him exist in either of the two Shakespeare plays that opened in the summer and autumn of 1599. However, if such parts could be identified, it would no longer be necessary to suppose that Kemp departed from the Chamberlain's Men until the following year at the earliest.

A more careful consideration of the timeline of Kemp's departure, delineating between what we know for sure from the documentary evidence and what we might suppose based on other facts, seems in order. First, as David Grote points out, in the cast list for *Every Man Out of His Humour*, 'Jonson neglected to list a number of other members of the company, including Shakespeare, and there is an obvious Kemp role in that work'.<sup>9</sup> The names of only six 'principal comedians' (Burbage, Philips, Sly, Hemings, Condell, and Pope) were included when *Every Man Out* was entered into the Stationer's Register on 8 April 1600,<sup>10</sup> so this list cannot be considered exhaustive, and no one has argued that Shakespeare's absence from this record indicates that he was no longer a member of the company. Kemp as well as Shakespeare may have taken roles when the play was originally staged, and the earliest performances, based on textual allusions to other plays including *Julius Caesar*, could not have been before the autumn of 1599. Therefore, even if Kemp's failure to appear in *Every Man Out's* cast list does indicate that he was not a company member any longer, it only provides evidence for the latter part of 1599 or 1600, after *Henry V* and *Julius Caesar* had already been staged.

Similarly, scholars move from established facts to speculation with regard to Kemp's virtuoso morris dance from London to Norwich, which began on 11 February 1600. On 22 April of that year, the Stationers' Register records that 'he published his *Nine Daies Wonder*' in which he says of the ballad makers, 'Some swear in a Trenchmore I haue trode a good way to winne the world: others

that guess righter, affirme, I haue without good help daunst my selfe out of the world'.<sup>11</sup> E.K. Chambers was the first to suggest that by 'daunst my selfe out of the world' Kemp was 'not improbably jesting on his departure from the Globe'.<sup>12</sup> This supposition may well be true, but it does not constitute proof of Kemp's break with the Chamberlain's Men. As Richard Dutton adds, 'Even the famous Nine Day's Morris to Norwich in February-March 1600 is not evidence that he had left the company, since it took place when the theatres were closed for Lent anyway'.<sup>13</sup> In any case, *Kemps Nine Daies Wonder* speaks only to his status in the early part of 1600, not to the summer and autumn of 1599.

Moreover, Robert Armin did eventually replace Kemp in Shakespeare's company, but the records suggest that this substitution did not occur until after *Julius Caesar* and *Henry V* had been performed. The *Second Part of Tarleton's Jestes* (published on 4 August 1600, according to the Stationers' Register) notes of Armin that 'at this houre ... at the Globe on the Bankside men may see him'.<sup>14</sup> So, although Armin must have joined Shakespeare's company by August of 1600, uncertainty remains as to when Armin's career with the Chamberlain's Men began. At some point in 1600, Armin published a pamphlet entitled *Foole Vpon Foole or Six Sortes of Sottes* under the pen name 'Clonnico de Curtanio Snuff' (Snuff, Clown of the Curtain), which was reprinted in 1605 with the pseudonym changed to 'Clonnico del Mondo Snuffe' (Snuff, Clown of the Globe).<sup>15</sup> Apparently, after the Lord Chamberlain's Men had taken up residence at the Globe in 1599, Armin was still performing with Lord Chandos's Men at the Curtain in 1600. Scholars commonly date the roles generally associated with Armin's comic style, Touchstone, Feste, Lear's Fool, and Lavatch, to 1600 or after, so there is no reason to suggest that Armin's replacement of Kemp is relevant to the question of whether Kemp was still a member of the Lord Chamberlain's Men in the summer and autumn of 1599.

In fact, scholars have found some evidence to suggest that Kemp was still performing with Shakespeare's company after the construction of the Globe Theatre. Nielson reports that in a 'collection of mock correspondence called *A pil to purge melancholie*', one writer worries that he has offended his addressee's sister but 'concludes with the assurance that "that Chollericke Pill of hers will easely be digested with one pleasant conceit or other of *Monsier de Kempe* on Monday next at the Globe"'.<sup>16</sup> The observations of Thomas Platter, a Swiss traveller whose journal records his 21 September 1599 visit to the playhouse, further supports this expectation that Kemp's talents were on display at the Globe. Grote remarks that at the end of a performance of *Julius Caesar*, Platter witnessed four actors 'dance what was probably the jig'. Since the company had no other clown at that

time, 'One of those Globe dancers was most probably Kemp'.<sup>17</sup> Though far from conclusive, these references to Kemp's presence at the Globe suggest that he may have continued his acting career with the Chamberlain's Men for at least several months after selling his share in the company.

Therefore, we cannot state with assurance when Kemp entirely broke off his association with the Chamberlain's Men. The beginning of Armin's career with the company strongly suggests that Kemp had departed by the middle of 1600, but as Dutton maintains, 'we do not know when Kempe actually left ... he was with Worcester's Men by March 1602 (when Henslowe advanced him a loan) ... [but] all we know is that he left the Chamberlain's Men and joined Worcester's'.<sup>18</sup> Dutton's admission that we lack evidence regarding the exact timeline of Kemp's departure should remind us that we not only do not know *when* Kemp left the company, but we also do not know *why*. Much scholarship has focused on possible answers to this question, but in the absence of hard evidence, such discussions remain entirely speculative.<sup>19</sup>

My proposition in this essay is no less speculative than any other hypothesis, so I feel obligated to offer a plausible reason why Kemp might have remained with the Chamberlain's Men for some time after abandoning his role as a shareholder. I propose that Kemp may have sold his share in the company for the simple reason that he immediately needed the funds. What little we know about Kemp's biography suggests that he was not a shrewd money manager. As Dutton notes above, Kemp was forced to seek a loan from Henslowe in 1602.<sup>20</sup> According to David Wiles, the *Nine Daies Wonder* pamphlet demonstrates that 'Kemp conceived his dance to Norwich as a commercial venture, and he invited spectators to gamble on his failure', but 'the majority of those who had pledged themselves subsequently failed to pay up'.<sup>21</sup> Wiles further observes of Kemp that when 'we compare his career with his colleagues', we see that he was an exception in an upwardly mobile profession ... Kemp's failure to acquire money or status marks him out. Money was probably something that he sought and squandered'.<sup>22</sup> Wiles concludes that 'it is clear that Kemp died with nothing'.<sup>23</sup> I will suggest the possibility that by early 1599 Kemp had incurred debts that required ready cash, and he sold his share in the Globe to obtain it, but he continued to perform with the company, at least until the end of 1599, because he had no reason to abandon his other source of income as an actor.

The only remaining argument to dispute my hypothesis that Kemp's break from the company took place several months after he stepped down as a shareholder in early 1599 is the reputed lack of a role for him in both *Henry V* and *Julius Caesar*. This line of reasoning depends upon two assumptions: first, that no

actor other than Kemp could possibly have played Falstaff, so the character had to be killed off when Kemp departed; second, that with Falstaff eliminated no role in *Henry V* is appropriate for Kemp. Since Shakespeare's company continued to perform the *Henry IV* plays with Falstaff in them well after Kemp had demonstrably left the troupe,<sup>24</sup> this first assumption appears to be self-evidently false. In the absence of evidence that the public could not accept another actor as Falstaff, I would like to turn to the second assumption, which includes the conjecture that no part for Kemp appears in either *Henry V* or *Julius Caesar*.

Initially we need to consider how we know a 'part for Kemp' when we see one. In two cases, Peter in *Romeo and Juliet* and Dogberry in *Much Ado about Nothing*, we can be certain that Shakespeare had Kemp in mind for these roles because he used Kemp's name in the stage directions or speech headings to refer to the character. Scholars have conjecturally assigned other parts to Kemp on the basis of his fame as a stage clown. For example, scholars widely believe Kemp performed during the 1590s the parts in Shakespeare's plays written in colloquial prose and designated as 'Clown' in stage directions and speech headings: the Clown in *Titus Andronicus*, Bottom in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Launcelot in *The Merchant of Venice*, and Costard in *Love's Labor's Lost*.<sup>25</sup> These figures tend to share particular traits: 'The Kempe persona is always a lower class figure; he relies heavily on direct address and typically derives much of his humor from puns, mistakes in word usage, and similar confusions of language'.<sup>26</sup> Kemp 'had an independent reputation as an improvisational entertainer who could ... perform jigs, as well as act, often in parts requiring an emphasis on physicality and the assumption of a rustic or lower-class persona'.<sup>27</sup> Wiles observes that the word 'clown' entered the English language during the Elizabethan period to express 'a new concept: the rustic who by virtue of his rusticity is necessarily inferior and ridiculous'.<sup>28</sup> In other words, 'Kemp's characters are funny without meaning to be funny, as their more educated audience recognizes their ignorance and finds them absurd'.<sup>29</sup>

Such characters blend easily into the world of comedy, but in tragedies, they tend to appear only briefly in segments that are easily detachable from the plot of the play. Like the Clown in *Titus Andronicus*, such extraneous figures are often cut from modern performances. Even during Shakespeare's time, this incongruous aspect of the tragedies became the butt of satire. As Baldwin records, the academic play *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus* (ca 1598–1602) includes the following sequence:

*Enter DROMO, drawing a clowne in with a rope.*

CLOWNE What now? thrust a man into the commonwealth whether hee will

or noe? what the devill should I doe here?

DROMO Why, what an ass art thou! dost thou not knowe a playe cannot be without a clowne? Clownes have bene thrust into playes by head and shoulders ever since Kempe could make a scurvey face; and therefore reason thou shouldst be drawne in with a cart-rope.<sup>30</sup>

This passage suggests a type of backlash against the current convention that ‘a playe cannot be without a clowne’, and the practice is specifically associated with Kemp. Therefore, it seems probable that Kemp’s roles in Shakespeare’s tragedies in the 1590s were comic figures whose appearance in these plays may strike us today as tonally odd and unnecessary.

Two scholars have proposed parts for Kemp in *Julius Caesar* that fit these criteria. Grote claims that although ‘There is no clearly identified Clown role in *Julius Caesar* ... the jokey cobbler in Act I was almost certainly intended for Kemp’.<sup>31</sup> The Cobbler’s wordplay — he refers to himself as a ‘mender of bad soles’ and offers to ‘cobble’ the tribune Flavius (1.1.14, 19) — stands out as a salient characteristic of Kemp’s parts. Focusing later in the play, Dutton inquires, ‘But what is the business of the Poet who tries to reconcile Brutus and Cassius, and is dismissed by the former with impatience at “jigging fools” [4.3.136], if it is not an opportunity for one of Kempe’s trade-mark jigs?’<sup>32</sup> The Poet’s superfluous intrusion into this serious scene may easily be omitted, and thus the part does resemble other roles Kemp may have taken in tragic plays. The inclusion of a prominent comic character does not appear to coincide with the overall design of *Julius Caesar*, but such a feature does not mean that there is no part for Kemp, who may have played the Cobbler, the Poet, and other subsidiary roles throughout the play.

Before we turn to *Henry V*, my argument requires a step backwards in time to what was probably Kemp’s first role with the Chamberlain’s Men, Launce in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. Clifford Leech declares that the ‘part was doubtless Kempe’s’ and further observes that ‘Launce makes only four appearances in the play, and ... all but one of them are easily detachable from the text’.<sup>33</sup> The role’s lack of integration with the rest of the play has led scholars to speculate that Kemp’s entry into the Chamberlain’s Men around 1594 prompted Shakespeare to revise an existing comedy to accommodate his new clown:

When Kemp and Shakespeare became fellows, equal sharers in the new company, one of Shakespeare’s first acts was to take an old play and to construct a part in it for Kemp based on Kemp’s routines or ‘merriments’. Kemp’s scenes in *The Two*



*Gentlemen of Verona* ... are only loosely tied to the narrative, and give him freedom to improvise if he chooses.<sup>34</sup>

The role of Launce exhibits many of the features that distinguish a 'part for Kemp'. In addition to its room for improvisation the part is written in colloquial prose for a lower class man who is probably rustic, being in love with a milkmaid (3.1.265–8). His long monologues are spoken as direct address to the audience using the second person, as when he speaks of his sorrowful departure from his family: 'Nay, I'll show you the manner of it' (2.3.13–14). His humour is frequently based on wordplay, either intentional puns or ridiculous malapropisms. For instance, he states soon after his initial entrance, 'I have received my proportion [portion], like the prodigious [Prodigal] son, and am going with Sir Proteus to the Imperial's [Emperor's] court' (2.3.2–4). Later in the same speech he concludes that his left shoe, which has a hole in it, must represent his mother rather than his father because it 'hath the worsor sole' (2.3.17). Notably Shakespeare later repeats this pun on sole/soul in the part of the Cobbler, the mender of bad soles in *Julius Caesar*, which suggests the possibility that both roles were intended for Kemp.

One feature, however, distinguishes the part of Launce from the other clown roles thought to have been played by Kemp: his tendency to employ the verbal tag 'look you', which is not used at all by Speed, the other lower class clown in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. In the instances quoted below, all emphases are mine:

Why, my grandam, having no eyes, *look you*, wept herself blind at my parting.  
(2.3.12–13)

Now, sir, this staff is my sister, for, *look you*, she is as white as a lily and as  
small as a wand. (2.3.19–20)

I am but a fool, *look you*, and yet I have the wit to think my master is a kind of  
a knave. (3.1.262–3)

'Item: She can milk.' *Look you*, a sweet virtue in a maid with clean hands.  
(3.1.276–7)

When a man's servant shall play the cur with him, *look you*, it goes hard....  
(4.4.1–2)

Linguist Tom McArthur states that the phrase 'look you' is 'widely regarded as a shibboleth of Welsh English': an expression that distinguishes Welsh speakers of English from those who speak English as their native tongue.<sup>35</sup> I therefore



propose that Shakespeare gave Launce this habitual expression in order to alert Kemp to portray the clown as a figure of Welsh descent.<sup>36</sup>

Shakespeare experimented with various depictions of Welshness, some of which, I would argue, are more obvious than others. In certain cases, he announces that a character is Welsh, as when he has Westmoreland refer to 'the irregular and wild Glendower' as a 'Welshman' (*IH4* 1.1.40–1); when he has Shallow mention 'Sir Hugh the Welsh priest' (*MWW* 2.1.188–9); and when he has King Henry refer to Fluellen as a 'Welshman' (*H5* 4.1.85). In two of these instances, Hugh Evans and Fluellen, he also endows the character on the page with a thick Welsh accent, based on certain mannerisms of speech. As Megan S. Lloyd recounts of the latter,

Fluellen's speech certainly includes what might be termed as 'Welsh' characteristics, from his substituting 'p's' for 'b's,' as in 'plo[w] up' [3.2.62], to his usage of plural nouns where singular ones are correct, as in 'the mines is' [3.2.57], to his odd idiomatic phrasing, like 'speak fewer' [4.1.66] for 'speak lower'. Idiosyncratic phrases like 'look you' and other oddities of pronunciation mark his Welsh speech throughout the play.<sup>37</sup>

With Glendower, however, Shakespeare does not indicate through spelling, diction, or phrasing that the character speaks with any trace of a Welsh accent; in fact, Glendower boasts to Hotspur, 'I can speak English, lord, as well as you; / For I was trained up in the English court' (3.1.118–19). Of course an actor might choose to speak Glendower's lines 'with the characteristic Welsh lilt',<sup>38</sup> and Glendower does speak to his daughter in the Welsh language (3.1.193 sd), but the part does not require him to speak English in any sort of dialect. Between the two extremes of Welsh depiction represented by Fluellen and Glendower, Shakespeare offers through Launce a more moderate depiction of Welshness based on less overt markers of Welsh descent.

As Lloyd notes above, Fluellen and Sir Hugh share with Launce the regular employment of the phrase 'look you', which Shakespeare strongly associates with Welsh speakers of English. Fluellen uses the expression twenty times, and Parson Evans speaks it thrice,<sup>39</sup> two fewer times than Launce. Some other figures in Shakespeare's plays employ this characteristic parenthetical phrase once,<sup>40</sup> but only a handful of characters not designated as Welsh use it twice in the same manner as Fluellen, Evans, and Launce: Grumio in *The Taming of the Shrew*, Mistress Quickly in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, the Clown in *Antony and Cleopatra*, and the Third Servingman in *Coriolanus*.<sup>41</sup> One may notice that all of

these figures are comic, lower class characters, and with the exception of Mistress Quickly, they resemble the types of roles that Shakespeare wrote for Kemp, even though some of the plays in which they appear were written after he had left the company. The Third Servingman from *Coriolanus* merits some additional consideration because he appears in 4.5 with other Volscian servants, one of whom, the Second Servingman, also uses the phrase once (175). I propose that in order to delineate these figures from their Roman counterparts (the plebeians, whom the same actors were probably doubling in earlier acts), Shakespeare used 'look you' as a marker to indicate that Aufidius's servants should be embodied as Welshmen. Indeed, Stanley Wells notes that in Peter Hall's 1959 production of *Coriolanus* at the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre, the Servingmen adopted 'Welsh accents ... as a device for distinguishing the Volscians from the Romans'.<sup>42</sup> I suggest that Shakespeare expects his actors to recognize the habitual use of the phrase 'look you' as a signal to portray a character with a moderate Welsh accent, perhaps befitting a Welshman who immigrated to England some time ago or an individual born in England to Welsh parents.<sup>43</sup>

If Kemp played Launce, and if Launce was written to be performed as a man of Welsh descent, then Shakespeare must have considered Kemp capable of playing a Welshman. Certainly, the role of Fluellen calls upon an actor to foreground stereotypical Welsh speech patterns more insistently than the part of Launce does, but I would contend that in these two roles, Shakespeare distinguishes between a native Welshman still residing in his own nation (Fluellen) and an assimilated Welshman who retains certain mannerisms peculiar to his cultural background (Launce). One may ask why Shakespeare would not simply have turned to one of the 'numerous Welsh actors in Elizabethan London'<sup>44</sup> to play Fluellen, but what was called for in this role is not a genuine Welsh person, but a 'Stage Welshman',<sup>45</sup> a comic portrayal of Welsh traits exaggerated to the point of ludicrousness. G.R. Hibbard posits that characters such as Glendower, Hugh Evans, and Fluellen suggest that 'there was a Welsh actor in Shakespeare's company, or at least an actor who could give a convincing imitation of English as spoken by a Welshman; and that Shakespeare gradually perceived the comic possibilities of this manner of speech'.<sup>46</sup> I propose that Will Kemp was a player who could 'give a convincing imitation of English as spoken by a Welshman' and Shakespeare wrote the part of Fluellen, as he did for Launce, Dogberry, and Peter, with Kemp in mind.

So, if Kemp was still a member of the Chamberlain's Men when Shakespeare composed *Henry V*, why did he break his promise to include Falstaff and substitute Fluellen in his place? I concur with Colin MacCabe that 'Hal's banishment of Falstaff is a symbolic act of such magnitude that it would be difficult to

undo'.<sup>47</sup> I believe that *Henry V* began to take shape as the story of a king who, by sometimes questionable means, was briefly able to unify the various nations of Britain. Such a plan might be hindered by the disruptive figure of Falstaff, from whom Henry had already separated himself, and it would require representatives of the English, Irish, Scottish, and Welsh nations to fight together under King Henry. Shakespeare elected to make Henry's break with Falstaff permanent, but he allowed the spectre of Falstaff to hover over the play through several textual references to Henry's callous treatment of his former comrade, including Hostess Quickly's verdict, 'The King has killed his heart' (2.1.88). Fluellen, as the Welsh Captain, fits comfortably into this design, and Shakespeare 'built up Fluellen as a replacement for Falstaff in *Henry V*'.<sup>48</sup>

Wiles argues that 'the Falstaff of the two *Henry IV* plays is structurally the clown's part, albeit with significant modifications. If Falstaff is structurally the clown's part, it is reasonable ... to conclude that the part was written for Kemp'.<sup>49</sup> If Falstaff was Kemp's clown part and Shakespeare eliminated the character from *Henry V*, this removal created a vacuum to be filled. As Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield submit, 'It is here that Fluellen enters, offering an alternative to Falstaff among the lesser gentry'.<sup>50</sup> As an 'alternative to Falstaff' in *Henry V*, Fluellen takes what is 'structurally the clown's part' in that play, and therefore we might expect the character to be played by Kemp, even though Fluellen is not designated as 'Clown' in the speech headings or stage directions. Kemp's portrayal of the Welsh Captain may have emphasized the part's clownish aspects, but such a depiction does not necessarily prevent the character from also offering a serious critique of the offenses committed by the king.

The role of Fluellen contains additional features associated with a 'part for Kemp'. The part is written in colloquial prose, and despite Dollimore and Sinfield's suggestion that Fluellen belongs to the 'lesser gentry', he is not addressed by any social title. Fluellen does allege that Pistol has called him a 'mountain squire' (5.1.35), but 'the term is meant to be abusive and cannot be relied on as descriptive'.<sup>51</sup> As Lloyd concludes, 'Fluellen is a soldier, a captain, but not a man of rank'.<sup>52</sup> The part of Fluellen also requires an actor skilled as Kemp was in physical comedy to engage in scenes such as the beating of Pistol (5.1). Moreover, the character's speech features the 'mistakes in word usage, and similar confusions of language' that typify Kemp's comic persona. The most prominent example of such wordplay appears in Fluellen's comparison of King Henry to Alexander of Macedon:

FLUELLEN What call you the town's name where Alexander the Pig was born?

GOWER Alexander the Great.

FLUELLEN Why, I pray you, is not 'pig' great? The pig, or the great, or the mighty, or the huge, or the magnanimous, are all one reckonings, save the phrase is a little variations. (4.7.12–18)

Plainly this exchange serves to disparage King Henry, if the conqueror to whom he is being compared is a 'pig', yet this dialogue also recalls similar wordplay from an earlier clown's part believed to have been taken by Kemp: Costard in *Love's Labor's Lost*. During the Masque of the Nine Worthies Costard begins the show in the guise of a Roman conqueror whose boyhood hero was Alexander of Macedon:

COSTARD 'I Pompey am, Pompey surnamed the Big —'

DUMAINE 'The Great.'

COSTARD It is 'Great,' sir. — 'Pompey surnamed the Great...' (5.2.546–8)

Later in the scene, as Armado threatens to kill Costard for defaming him, Berowne urges the clown on with cries of 'Greater than "Great"! Great, great, great Pompey! Pompey the Huge!' (5.2.682–3). Fluellen's confusion of 'pig'/'big', 'great', and 'huge' strongly resembles similar malapropisms employed in association with a role (Costard) that most scholars agree was played by Kemp, which supports the claim that the part of the Welsh captain in *Henry V* could have been written for the same actor. Both characters call upon the services of a player who knows how to be 'funny without meaning to be funny', or, in Fluellen's case, satirical without meaning to be satirical.

According to Marvin Carlson playwrights have long exploited the device of recalling earlier performances of similar characters performed by the same actor. He writes that 'actors became associated in the public mind with certain types of roles, but ... popular actors created certain idiosyncratic ways of performing those types, establishing an echo effect in role after role to which both public and dramatists responded'.<sup>53</sup> Juliet Dusinberre acknowledges this 'echo effect' in Shakespeare's time when she states, 'The idea that a clown brings on to the stage his past history of clowning would have been taken for granted in the Elizabethan theatre'.<sup>54</sup> Will Kemp exemplified this phenomenon so well 'because he never submerged his own personality in the role that he played'.<sup>55</sup> The appearance of Kemp's name in place of the characters Peter and Dogberry reveals that 'Shakespeare occasionally forgot to distinguish actor and role' because 'Kemp always played Kemp whatever role he was assigned'.<sup>56</sup> Therefore, as R. Scott Fraser notes in conjunction with the *Henry IV* plays, 'when Kemp walked on stage some early

modern audience members might have seen Falstaff . . . and some might have seen Kemp himself.<sup>57</sup>

Shakespeare exploited Kemp's complex identity as both his current character and his other clown figures from the past in the depiction of Fluellen in *Henry V*. This function appears most evident later in the Welshman's contrast between King Henry and Alexander the Great:

FLUELLEN As Alexander killed his friend Cleitus, being in his ales and his cups, so also Harry Monmouth, being in his right wits and his good judgments, turned away the fat knight with the great-belly doublet. He was full of jests, and gipes, and knaveries, and mocks. I have forgot his name.

GOWER Sir John Falstaff.

FLUELLEN That is he. (4.7.43–51)

Scholars generally explain the humour of this passage as a reference to Sir John Oldcastle, the Protestant martyr whose name was originally used in place of 'Falstaff' until one of his descendants forced Shakespeare to change it.<sup>58</sup> This account may be accurate, but if Kemp is playing Fluellen, the comedy of this exchange may derive from an entirely different source. Those audience members who had seen Kemp play Falstaff would now be witnessing Kemp playing Fluellen, having difficulty remembering the name of a character he himself had played. Essentially Kemp would be pretending to forget his own name. In doing so Kemp would also be engaging in the same form of humour that he, as Falstaff pretending to be Prince Hal's father, employed during the play extempore at the Boar's Head tavern in *Henry IV, Part 1*:

FALSTAFF And yet there is a virtuous man whom I have often noted in thy company, but I know not his name.

PRINCE What manner of man, an it like your Majesty?

FALSTAFF A goodly, portly man, i' faith, and a corpulent; of a cheerful look, a pleasing eye, and a most noble carriage; and as I think, his age some fifty, or, by'r Lady, inclining to threescore; and now I remember me, his name is Falstaff. (2.4.413–21)

If indeed Kemp played Fluellen in the original performances of *Henry V*, audience members would have been amused by the complicated spectacle of Kemp, pretending to be a Welsh captain, forgetting the name of Falstaff, who, while embodied by Kemp, pretended to be Henry IV and feigned to forget his own

real name. Such an effect is most likely to succeed if the actor portraying Fluellen is, like Kemp, always playing himself, and viewers are therefore able to perceive echoes of the actor's previous roles within his current portrayal.

Such echoes were likely evident upon Fluellen's first appearance in *Henry V*, when he compels Pistol, Nym, Bardolph, and the Boy to engage in the battle at Harfleur. The Epilogue's promise at the end of *Henry IV, Part 2* has primed spectators to expect to see Kemp as Falstaff in *Henry V*, but the description of Falstaff's death in 2.3 has frustrated this expectation. Two scenes later the folio text contains a stage direction 'Enter Fluellen' and the following exchange:

FLU. Vp to the breach, you Dogges; auaunt you Cullions.

PIST. Be mercifull great Duke to men of Mould: abate thy Rage, abate thy manly Rage; abate thy Rage, great Duke. (TLN 1136–41)<sup>59</sup>

Although readers immediately know that Fluellen is the character urging the tavern crew to enter the fray, early viewers were given no such chance to identify this soldier until later in the scene, when Gower addresses him as 'Captain *Fluellen*' (TLN 1172). Until Gower names the character, early audiences saw only the actor Kemp, whom they expected to see as Falstaff, portraying a valiant soldier of uncertain identity. The folio text is also puzzling in that Fluellen's line contains none of the markers of Welshness that are so prominent in all of his other dialogue in the play. This anglicized version of Fluellen's first speech contrasts strongly with the equivalent exchange in the 'bad' quarto of 1600:

FLEW. Godes plud vp to the breaches

You rascals, will you not vp to the breaches?

NIM. Abate thy rage sweete knight,

Abate thy rage.

(TLN 1154–7)<sup>60</sup>

In the quarto version, Fluellen's ethnicity is immediately apparent in the confusion of 'b' and 'p' sounds ('plud') and the misuse of plural nouns ('breaches') characteristic of the stage Welshman. Moreover, in this rendition Nym rather than Pistol responds to Fluellen's command, and Nym refers to the captain not as a 'Duke' but as a 'knight'. This appellation coincides with Nym's habitual means of referring to Falstaff, as when Nym declares earlier in the play, 'The King hath run bad humours on the knight, that's the even of it' (2.1.121–2). Whichever version of this scene early spectators saw, they witnessed Kemp's creation of a new character, a valorous Welshman, out of the ashes of his portrayal of the cowardly Falstaff, and the after-image of the fat knight presumably lingered in their view of the Welsh captain.

The Falstaffian echoes in Kemp's depiction of Fluellen achieve their primary purpose in the sequence immediately following the French herald's delivery of the news that Henry's forces have won the day at Agincourt. Fluellen reminds the king of the military service rendered by Welshmen to Henry's ancestors, commemorated by 'wearing leeks in their Monmouth caps ... upon Saint Tavy's Day' (4.7.98–102), a custom that Henry himself is rumored to observe.

The king responds, 'I wear it for a memorable honor, / For I am Welsh, you know, good countryman' (4.7.103–4). Henry publicly acknowledges his own Welsh birth and thereby his national bond with his 'countryman' Fluellen, embodied by Kemp, whom early viewers were encouraged to associate with his previous role as Falstaff. The establishment of this connection provided early audience members with a reconciliation between the king and the fat knight whose possibility was hinted at in the scene of Falstaff's rejection at the end of *Henry IV, Part 2*, when the newly crowned king offered his 'misleaders' this vow: 'as we hear you do reform yourselves, / We will, according to your strengths and qualities, / Give you advancement' (5.5.64, 68–70). Henry's recognition of his fellowship with Kemp's valiant Fluellen, a reformed version of the cowardly Falstaff, fulfills the king's promise to re-establish his connection with his former companion and potentially repairs some of the damage done to Henry's reputation by his repudiation of his old friend. This reconciliation banishes the spectre of the brokenhearted Falstaff from the play, and the fat knight is never mentioned again.

We might conclude, along with Robert S. Babcock, that by 'butchering spoken English through the use of Welsh mutations, Fluellen, noble as his character may be, thus becomes an object of derision'.<sup>61</sup> Casting in this role Will Kemp, the most famous clown of his generation, might also be said to heighten the ridiculousness of the character and thereby reflect negatively upon the Welsh nation. However, Kemp's Welsh persona has already proven to be an unexpectedly shrewd judge of character, as when Launce observes of his perfidious employer Proteus in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, 'I am but a fool, look you, and yet I have the wit to think my master is a kind of a knave' (3.1.262–3). As Launce alone perceives the unscrupulousness of his master, so too does Fluellen, perhaps unconsciously, suspect the duplicity of Henry V. In response to the king's gesture of national fellowship the Welsh captain replies, 'By Jeshu, I am Your Majesty's countryman. I care not who know it. I will confess it to all the 'orld. I need not to be ashamed of Your Majesty, praised be God, so long as Your Majesty is an honest man' (4.7.110–13). Fluellen's declaration unintentionally implies that he has reasons to be ashamed to confess his national connection to Henry because the king may not be as 'honest' as he appears to the rest of the world. Such an echo of one of Kemp's previous



clown roles redeems the wit of Fluellen and suggests that, in spite of his linguistic quirks, he remains capable of defending personal integrity as an essential quality of Welshness.

## Notes

---

I am indebted to Susan Trussler for the origin of this essay and to Megan S. Lloyd for her comments on an early draft.

- 1 Unless otherwise noted, quotations from Shakespeare's plays refer to *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*, ed. David Bevington, 5th edn (New York, 2004).
- 2 James Shapiro, *A Year in the Life of William Shakespeare: 1599* (New York, 2005), 37.
- 3 Henry David Gray, 'The Rôles of William Kemp', *Modern Language Review* 25 (1930), 261–273, 266, states, '*Henry V* was composed in the autumn of 1599, after Kemp had gone. When Shakespeare wrote his *Henry V* there was no Kemp in the company, and so there was no Falstaff in the play'. Following Gray, John Dover Wilson, *The Fortunes of Falstaff* (Cambridge, 1964), 125, writes, 'The theory, in short, is that when Shakespeare promised, in the Epilogue to *Henry IV*, a Falstaff in *Henry V*, he contemplated that Kempe would be there to play him, but that, Kempe having left in the meantime, he was obliged to alter his plans. And if Falstaff could not appear, a dramatic explanation for his absence must be provided, and the only satisfactory one was an account of his death'.
- 4 David Wiles, *Shakespeare's Clown: Actor and Text in the Elizabethan Playhouse* (Cambridge, 1987), 117, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511553417>, offers that a 'decision by Shakespeare to downgrade or obliterate Falstaff's part would provide a plausible motive for Kemp's sudden withdrawal from the company'. Shapiro, *A Year*, 36–7, also leans in this direction when he declares, 'That Shakespeare chose to cut his comic star out of *Henry the Fifth* defied expectations, for audiences familiar with stage versions of this story took for granted they'd be seeing a clown. Whether it precipitated Kemp's decision or was made in response to it is hard to tell, though I suspect the former'.
- 5 William E. Engel, 'Handling Memory in the Henriad: Forgetting Falstaff', in *The Routledge Handbook of Shakespeare and Memory*, ed. Andrew Hiscock (London, 2018), 165–79, 165, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315745947-13>.
- 6 Gray, 'The Rôles', 266.

- 7 James Nielson, 'William Kemp at the Globe', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 44 (1993), 466–8, 466, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2871002>.
- 8 T.W. Baldwin, *The Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company* (New York, 1961), 245.
- 9 David Grote, *The Best Actors in the World: Shakespeare and His Acting Company* (Westport, CT, 2002), 85. Grote does not identify this role, but he presumably refers to the character Sogliardo, who is described by Grace Tiffany, 'Shakespeare's Playwrights', in *Shakespeare the Man: New Decipherings*, ed. R.W. Desai (Madison, NJ, 2014), 1–16, 6, as a 'country bumpkin'.
- 10 Ben Jonson, *Every Man Out of His Humour*, ed. Helen Ostovich (Manchester, 2001), 1, 100.
- 11 Joseph Allen Bryant, Jr, 'Shakespeare's Falstaff and the Mantle of Dick Tarlton', *Studies in Philology* 51.2 (1954), 149–62, 161. Bryant quotes from G.B. Harrison, ed., *Nine Daies Wonder* (London, 1923), 3.
- 12 E.K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1923), 326.
- 13 Richard Dutton, *Licensing, Censorship and Authorship in Early Modern England* (New York, 2000), 34, <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230598713>.
- 14 Quoted in T.W. Baldwin, 'Shakespeare's Jester: The Dates of *Much Ado* and *As You Like It*', *Modern Language Notes* 39 (1924), 447–455, 449.
- 15 Ibid, 448.
- 16 Nielson, 'William Kemp', 467.
- 17 Grote, *The Best*, 83–4.
- 18 Dutton, *Licensing*, 34–5.
- 19 Bryant, 'Shakespeare's Falstaff', 162, guesses that 'Kemp may have played Falstaff in two plays and rebelled at being required to restrict himself a third time'. Grote, *The Best*, 82, 79, imagines a personal conflict through which 'tempers flared' and 'a major disagreement' drove Kemp out of the company. Wiles, *Shakespeare's Clown*, 36, posits that 'professional differences' led to Kemp's departure, and Kathleen Campbell, 'Shakespeare's Actors as Collaborators: Will Kempe and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*', in *Two Gentlemen of Verona: Critical Essays*, ed. June Schlueter (New York, 1996), 179–87, 185, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203775035>, specifies one such difference as 'Kempe's inability or unwillingness to vary his basic style and character'. Similarly, Shapiro, *A Year*, 37, postulates, 'The parting of ways between Shakespeare and Kemp ... was a rejection not only of a certain kind of comedy but also a declaration that from here on in, it was going to be a playwright's and not an actor's theater, no matter how popular the actor'. Ultimately Shapiro, *A Year*, 36, acknowledges that the 'full story of why Kemp changed his mind about the Globe and the Chamberlain's Men will never be known'.

- 20 Wiles, *Shakespeare's Clown*, 41, records that 'Henslowe in 1602, in a section of the *Diary* used for private debts, records that Kemp had to borrow 20/- [20 shillings]'.  
 21 Ibid, 25.  
 22 Ibid, 41.  
 23 Ibid.  
 24 David Scott Kastan, ed., *King Henry IV, Part 1*, 3rd edn (London, 2002), 78–9, suggests that 'Thomas Pope, who also played clown roles for the company' may have been the first to embody Falstaff, or 'if he did not originate the role, probably succeeded Kemp in playing it'. If Kastan is correct, then Shakespeare had another actor at his disposal during the period when *Henry V* was composed who was capable of undertaking such a part. Actor John Lowin, who joined the company in 1603, also made a name for himself in the role of Falstaff; see Kastan, ed., *King Henry IV, Part 1*, 79.  
 25 For the Clown in *Titus Andronicus*, see Baldwin, *The Organization*, 405; Grote, *The Best*, 36; Margie Pignataro, 'Unearthing *Hamlet's* Fool: A Metatheatrical Excavation of Yorick', *Journal of the Wooden O Symposium* 6 (2006), 74–89, 76; and Stanley Wells, *Shakespeare and Co.: Christopher Marlowe, Thomas Dekker, Ben Jonson, Thomas Middleton, John Fletcher, and the Other Players in His Story* (New York, 2006), 34. For Bottom, see Baldwin, *The Organization*, 405; Campbell, 'Shakespeare's Actors', 181; William Carroll, ed., *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, 3rd edn (London, 2004), 127; Grote, *The Best*, 26; Jean E. Howard, 'Stage Masculinities, National History, and the Making of London Theatrical Culture', in *Center or Margin: Revisions of the English Renaissance in Honor of Leeds Barroll*, ed. Lena Cowen Orlin (Susquehanna, PA, 2006), 199–214, 207; Pignataro, 'Unearthing', 76; Shapiro, *A Year*, 38; and Wells, *Shakespeare*, 34. For Launcelot, see Baldwin, *The Organization*, 241; Campbell, 'Shakespeare's Actors', 181; Grote, *The Best*, 16; Shapiro, *A Year*, 38; and Wiles, *Shakespeare's Clown*, 75. For Costard, see Baldwin, *The Organization*, 241; Campbell, 'Shakespeare's Actors', 181; Carroll, *The Two Gentlemen*, 127; Grote, *The Best*, 44; Howard, 'Stage Masculinities', 207; Shapiro, *A Year*, 38; Wells, *Shakespeare*, 34; and Wiles, *Shakespeare's Clown*, 75.  
 26 Campbell, 'Shakespeare's Actors', 182.  
 27 Howard, 'Stage Masculinities', 208.  
 28 Wiles, *Shakespeare's Clown*, 61.  
 29 Pignataro, 'Unearthing', 77.  
 30 Baldwin, *The Organization*, 242. Baldwin quotes from William Dunn Macray's edition of *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus* (London, 1886), 22–3.  
 31 Grote, *The Best*, 85.  
 32 Dutton, *Licensing*, 34.

- 33 Clifford Leech, ed., *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, 2nd edn (London, 1969), xxvi. Carroll, *The Two Gentlemen*, 130, submits that the hypothesis that Kemp played Launce is 'supported by compelling evidence, rising to near certainty'.
- 34 Wiles, *Shakespeare's Clown*, 73.
- 35 Tom McArthur, *The Oxford Guide to World English* (Oxford, 2002), 111. David Crystal, *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*, 2nd edn (Cambridge, 2003), 335, adds that the tag 'look you' is 'thought by outsiders to be "typically Welsh", and [is] used in a stereotyped way in literature', but 'is rarely if ever used by real Welsh English speakers'.
- 36 One reason why Shakespeare might have portrayed Launce as Welsh would be to stress his status as an outsider in the Duke's court. J.O. Bartley, *Teague, Shenkin, and Sawney: Being an Historical Study of the Earliest Irish, Welsh and Scottish Characters in English Plays* (Cork, 1954), 50, observes that, on the Elizabethan stage, a Welshman 'is often a stranger visiting London, and even when this point is not specifically made there is frequently a clear implication of rusticity'. The rustic Launce travels from the town of Verona to the big city of Milan and encounters difficulties adapting to the behavioral norms of the court, just as a newly-arrived Welshman might in London.
- 37 Megan S. Lloyd, *'Speak it in Welsh': Wales and the Welsh Language in Shakespeare* (Lanham, MD, 2007), 74–5.
- 38 G.R. Hibbard, ed., *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (Baltimore, 1973), 9.
- 39 Lloyd, *'Speak it in Welsh'*, 75.
- 40 Shakespeare frequently employs the words 'look' and 'you' in sequence with meanings that differ from the usage of Fluellen, Hugh Evans, and Launce. For example, the phrase sometimes operates as a command to look at something, as when Abhorson says to Claudio, 'Look you, sir, here comes your ghostly father' (*MFM* 4.3.48–9). It also sometimes means 'do you look', as when Egeon asks Antipholus of Ephesus, 'Why look you strange on me?' (*Errors* 5.1.296). In some cases, the phrase means 'do you expect', as when Borachio asks Don John, 'Look you for any other issue?' (*Much Ado* 2.2.28–9). In other cases, it substitutes for 'be sure to', as when Escalus tells the Friar, 'Look you speak justly' (*MFM* 5.1.304). Hamlet occasionally employs the phrase as a non-parenthetical command to notice something, as when he orders Gertrude, 'Look you now what follows' (3.4.64). The characteristic Welsh usage is an essentially meaningless parenthetical phrase equivalent to 'you know' in modern spoken English.
- 41 For Grumio, see *Shrew* 1.2.30, 76; for Mistress Quickly, see *MWW* 1.4.89, 2.2.117; for the Clown, see *Antony* 5.2.262, 265; and for the Third Servingman, see *Coriolanus* 4.5.214, 216.

- 42 Stanley Wells, 'Peter Hall's *Coriolanus*, 1959', *Furman Studies* ns 23 (1976), 1–22, 13.
- 43 Lloyd, 'Speak it in Welsh', n 100, reminds us that Shakespeare probably knew a number of Welshmen who came to live in his hometown: 'Given its location, Stratford welcomed many Welsh who moved to England for opportunity ... Thomas Jenkins, a London Welshman, became schoolmaster in Stratford and may have been the model for Sir Hugh'.
- 44 Camille Adkins, 'Glendower and Fluellen; Or, Where Are the Leeks of Yesterday?', *CCTE Studies* 48 (1983), 101–8, 102.
- 45 Bartley, *Teague*, 69.
- 46 Hibbard, *The Merry Wives*, 48. Bartley, *Teague*, 57, agrees that some Renaissance actors may have specialized in playing particular ethnic stereotypes. Speaking of the character Morgan from *The Valiant Welshman* (ca 1610–15), Bartley writes, 'His nationality is continually stressed in a way in which that of his elevated compatriots is not, so much so as to suggest that the part was written for an actor whose comic presentation of Welsh character was a known draw'. Grote, *The Best*, 81, speculates that the actor Samuel Crosse, 'with his Welsh accent', played Fluellen, but Crosse is not a Welsh name, and Grote provides no evidence to suggest that Crosse was admired for his portrayal of a stage Welshman.
- 47 Colin MacCabe, 'Abusing Self and Others: Puritan Accounts of the Shakespearean Stage', *Critical Quarterly* 30 (1988), 3–17, 10, [https://doi.org/10.1111-lj.1467-8705.1988.tb00310.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/lj.1467-8705.1988.tb00310.x).
- 48 Joan Rees, 'Shakespeare's Welshmen', in *Literature and Nationalism*, ed. Vincent Newey (Liverpool, 1991), 22–40, 36.
- 49 Bente A. Videbaek, *The Stage Clown in Shakespeare's Theatre* (Westport, CT), 139–40, agrees with Wiles that Falstaff is the clown's part and therefore was probably played by Kemp.
- 50 Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield, 'History and Ideology: The Instance of *Henry V*', in *Alternative Shakespeares*, ed. John Drakakis (London, 2002), 209–30, 226, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203425749>.
- 51 Rees, 'Shakespeare's Welshmen', 30.
- 52 Lloyd, 'Speak it in Welsh', 73.
- 53 Marvin Carlson, *The Haunted Stage: The Theatre as Memory Machine* (Ann Arbor, 2001), 61, <https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.17168>.
- 54 Dusinberre, 'Topical Forest', 247.
- 55 Wiles, *Shakespeare's Clown*, 55.
- 56 Shapiro, *A Year*, 40, 32.

- 57 R. Scott Fraser, “‘The king has killed his heart’: The Death of Falstaff in *Henry V*. *SEDERI: Yearbook of the Spanish and Portuguese Society for English Renaissance Studies* 20 (2010), 145–157, 147–8.
- 58 For instance, Gary Taylor, ed., *Henry V*, in *Oxford Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1982), n 246, annotates the passage as follows: ‘Probably a joking allusion to the name having had to be changed (from Oldcastle to Falstaff)’.
- 59 Quotations from the first folio text of *Henry V* refer to *The Norton Facsimile: The First Folio of Shakespeare*, prep. Charlton Hinman, 2nd edn (New York, 1996).
- 60 Quotations from the ‘bad’ quarto refer to ‘Facsimile Viewer: Henry V, Quarto 1 (1600)’, *Internet Shakespeare Editions*, last modified 31 December 2018, [https://internetshakespeare.uvic.ca/Library/facsimile/overview/book/Q1\\_H5.html](https://internetshakespeare.uvic.ca/Library/facsimile/overview/book/Q1_H5.html).
- 61 Robert S. Babcock, “‘For I Am Welsh, You Know’: Henry V, Fluellen, and the Place of Wales in the Sixteenth-Century English Nation’, in *In Laudem Caroli: Renaissance and Reformation Studies for Charles G. Nauert*, ed. James V. Mehl (Kirksville, MO, 1998), 189–99, 196.

