

University of Pardubice
Faculty of Arts and Philosophy

Cinematic Portrayal of Henry V
Bachelor Thesis

Univerzita Pardubice
Fakulta filozofická
Akademický rok: 2022/2023

ZADÁNÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

(projektu, uměleckého díla, uměleckého výkonu)

Jméno a příjmení: **Václav Hochmal**
Osobní číslo: **H21199**
Studijní program: **B0231A090018 Anglický jazyk**
Specializace: **Anglický jazyk pro vzdělávání**
Téma práce: **Filmové vyobrazení Jindřicha V.**
Zadávající katedra: **Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky**

Zásady pro vypracování

Ve své bakalářské práci bude student charakterizovat kulturně historický kontext. Dále představí koncept filmových verzí dramatického zpracování historického tématu. V následné analýze nebude konfrontovat historická fakta s filmovými verzemi, ale porovná, jaké aspekty historie jednotliví režiséři využívají, jakým způsobem je interpretují a do jaké míry reflektují vlastní historickou zkušenost.

Rozsah pracovní zprávy:
Rozsah grafických prací:
Forma zpracování bakalářské práce: **tištěná/elektronická**
Jazyk zpracování: **Angličtina**

Seznam doporučené literatury:

Allmand, Christopher. *The Hundred Years War: England and France at War C.1300–C.1450*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
Branagh, Kenneth, dir. *Henry V*. London: British Broadcasting Corporation, 1989, DVD.
Donaldson, Peter S. "Taking on Shakespeare: Kenneth Branagh's 'Henry V.'" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 42, no. 1 (April 1991): 60–71. <https://academic.oup.com/sq/article-abstract/42/1/60/5084989>.
Michôd, David, dir. *The King*. Venice: Plan B Entertainment, 2019, <https://www.netflix.com/watch/80182016>
Poplawski, Paul, ed. *English Literature in Context*. 2nd ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.
Vickers, K.H. *England in the Later Middle Ages*. London: Routledge, 1950.
Warner, Nicholas. "Screening leadership through Shakespeare: Paradoxes of leader–follower relations in Henry V on film." *The Leadership Quarterly* 18, no. 1 (February 2007): 1–15. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1048984306001391>.
Wilkinson, B. *The Later Middle Ages in England 1216-1485*. London: Longman, 1969.
Wyver, John. "'All the Trimmings?': The Transfer of Theatre to Television in Adaptations of Shakespeare Stagings." *Adaptation* 7, no. 2 (August 2014): Pages 104–120. <https://academic.oup.com/adaptation/article-abstract/7/2/104/2528106>.

Vedoucí bakalářské práce: **Mgr. Olga Roebuck, Ph.D.**
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Datum zadání bakalářské práce: **2. dubna 2023**
Termín odevzdání bakalářské práce: **30. března 2024**

doc. Mgr. Jiří Kubeš, Ph.D. v.r.
děkan

Mgr. Olga Roebuck, Ph.D. v.r.
vedoucí katedry

V Pardubicích dne 30. listopadu 2023

Prohlašuji:

Práci s názvem *Cinematic Portrayal of Henry V* jsem vypracoval samostatně. Veškeré literární prameny a informace, které jsem v práci využil, jsou uvedeny v seznamu použité literatury.

Byl jsem seznámen s tím, že se na moji práci vztahují práva a povinnosti vyplývající ze zákona č. 121/2000 Sb., o právu autorském, o právech souvisejících s právem autorským a o změně některých zákonů (autorský zákon), ve znění pozdějších předpisů, zejména se skutečností, že Univerzita Pardubice má právo na uzavření licenční smlouvy o užití této práce jako školního díla podle § 60 odst. 1 autorského zákona, a s tím, že pokud dojde k užití této práce mnou nebo bude poskytnuta licence o užití jinému subjektu, je Univerzita Pardubice oprávněna ode mne požadovat přiměřený příspěvek na úhradu nákladů, které na vytvoření díla vynaložila, a to podle okolností až do jejich skutečné výše.

Beru na vědomí, že v souladu s § 47b zákona č. 111/1998 Sb., o vysokých školách a o změně a doplnění dalších zákonů (zákon o vysokých školách), ve znění pozdějších předpisů, a směrnicí Univerzity Pardubice č. 7/2019 Pravidla pro odevzdávání, zveřejňování a formální úpravu závěrečných prací, ve znění pozdějších dodatků, bude práce zveřejněna prostřednictvím Digitální knihovny Univerzity Pardubice.

V Pardubicích dne 27. 03. 2024

Václav Hochmal v.r.

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my gratitude to the supervisor of this thesis, Mgr. Olga Roebuck, Ph.D., M.Litt. for giving me highly valuable advice and guidance.

Annotation

This bachelor's thesis deals with the analysis of two film adaptations of Shakespeare's play Henry V. The theoretical part first details information about the concept of popular culture. Which is followed up by an examination of adaptation tendencies when adapting drama to film and by the historical context of the 1940s and 1980s in the United Kingdom. As the subjects of analysis are the movies Henry V by Laurence Olivier from 1944 and Henry V by Kenneth Branagh from 1989, with the focus on analysing their distinctive features in connection with their respective periods.

Keywords

Henry V, drama adaptation, films, 1940s, 1980s, The United Kingdom

Název

Filmové vyobrazení Jindřicha V.

Anotace

Tato bakalářská práce se zabývá analýzou dvou filmových adaptací Shakespearovy hry Jindřich V. V teoretické části jsou nejprve uvedeny informace o pojmu populární kultura. Na kterou navazuje zkoumání tendencí filmových adaptací dramatu a historický kontext 40. a 80. let 20. století ve Velké Británii. Jako předmět analýzy jsou vybrány filmy Jindřich V. Laurence Oliviera z roku 1944 a Jindřich V. Kennetha Branagha z roku 1989, přičemž je kladen důraz na rozbor jejich charakteristických rysů v souvislosti s daným obdobím.

Klíčová slova

Jindřich V., adaptace dramatu, filmy, 40. léta, 80. léta, Velká Británie

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	8
1. Popular Culture	9
2. Adapting Drama to Film	13
3. Cultural and Historical Context	19
4. Main Contrasts Between the Henry V Films	27
5. Merriness Against Bleakness	34
6. Differences in the Treatment of War	39
Conclusion	44
Resumé.....	46
Bibliography:	50

Introduction

The adaptation of drama to the film medium presents an important area of study, the importance of which has grown over the course of the twentieth century up until today. That is due to the increasingly growing popularity of the film format itself, which started gaining large traction at the beginning of the twentieth century. This is owing to the rapid technological advancements made during this period and to the widened access of society to the products of culture, both of which are mainly associated with the period post World War One. These changes in society led to the many renowned dramatical works, such as those of Shakespeare, getting adapted to the screen, which resulted in numerous contemporary adaptations of these critically acclaimed plays. Such film adaptations often included cultural expressions of the society in which they were created, resulting in a transformation of the original Shakespeare play to serve the changing needs of society.

Through the large increase in popular culture creations, many society-shaping tendencies and phenomena mirrored themselves in film. Hence why, the goal of this paper is to analyse two British Henry V film adaptations from two distinct periods of the 20th century in the United Kingdom. This will show how film adaptations of historical drama act as a means of reflecting the goals, struggles, and tendencies of the contemporary societies in which they are created. Importantly, there will be no connections made with the historical character of Henry V and his reign. However, the Henry V Shakespeare play will be referenced to help the analysis. Outlining the concepts of popular culture and parts of the theory of adaptation will provide the reader with an understanding of the underlying factors that affect the decisions of their creators and differentiate them from theatre plays.

Notably, the two periods during which the movies were created are the 1940s and 1980s, both of which were periods during which British society was under great strain. The paper provides an outline of how British society was affected by each period. The conflict of World War II, the situation on the Homefront of Britain, and the underlying issues that were the result of the ongoing war in the 1940s. This is followed by an outline of the 1980s, the economic crisis, accompanied by large changes within society and political turmoil combined with fears of war. This provides the necessary understanding for analysing how the events that affected the personal historical experiences of the directors, Laurence Olivier and Kenneth Branagh, shaped the adaptations into motivating and inspiring films for each of the two very difficult periods.

1. Popular Culture

Popular culture is a rather elusive term since it is hard to give a specific and accurate definition of it. This is in part because the meaning of culture is also very difficult to define. Attempting to define popular culture in complexity would not be helpful for the rest of this thesis and would require a lot of space. Thus, for relevancy, this chapter will aim to outline some of the intricacies of popular culture to help understand its basic concepts, which will aid in understanding its functions applicable to film.

The first relevant concept analysed will be that of mass culture, which was a way of viewing the emerging popular culture. The reasons behind the existence and evolution of Mass culture are accredited to a variety of phenomena. One of those, according to Edward Shils, is that a new order of society came to be after the end of the First World War, an order he calls “mass society”. He explains that it is because a major part of society, i.e. a mass of population, became a more significant part of society. He adds that this matters because, before this point in history, a major part of the population was destined to always remain outside the circles of influence on culture.¹ This essentially meant that the masses could influence cultural production. Such a change was not looked at positively by the minority, who, up until now, was in the leading position in determining what culture is. John Storey provides evidence of this, for instance, the view of a Spanish philosopher, José Ortega y Gasset, who strongly opposed mass society and wrote opinions such as that the masses no longer feel inferior to their superiors as they should. In essence, according to Storey, it says that the masses are inferior, uneducated people without culture, and even going as far as saying they are not capable of creating culture.² Similarly, negative views of mass culture were rather common amongst the upper class and creators of intellectual works. For example, another person whom Storey mentions is T. S. Elliot, and his opinion is that educating the masses would only lead to the lowering of standards to a level these people could reach.³ The standards that would be understood by this are the standards for the quality of cultural creations. These were only but a few opinions from this period, yet it goes to show how negatively the cultural elite viewed the emerging mass culture.

The negative views of mass culture were mostly one-sided because they came from an elitist point of view. However, since these views connected the term mass culture with negative connotations, such a negative meaning often conflicts with itself. Thus, a different term is used.

¹ Edward Shils, “Mass Society and Its Culture,” *Daedalus* 89, no. 2 (Spring 1960): 288.

² John Storey, *Inventing Popular Culture* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003), 25.

³ Storey, *Inventing Popular Culture*, 27.

A term that adds extra meaning and themes, i.e. the term popular culture. Evidence that it indeed was not primitive and carried a deeper meaning than the previously mentioned men thought can be seen in modern cultural studies. According to Emma Griffin, the themes of health, religion, gender, work, class, customs, and traditions were present in this culture and are nowadays considered to be important parts of popular culture.⁴ From such themes, it is evident that the products of popular culture needed to have a certain level of sophistication to convey even the more complex themes listed. Thus, the expected downfall of culture did not happen as some of the people with negative views mentioned previously believed it would happen. This leads to what is the opposite of popular culture.

The “other” of popular culture is the high culture or, in other words, the elite culture. According to Gary L. Harmon, the difference between these may appear to be simple. He notes a common assumption that popular culture is standardised, mainly commercial, with success measured by popularity, whereas elite culture is more inventive with the purpose of meeting more refined needs, where success is measured by the receptions of scholars and acclaimed critics.⁵ There is, however, an issue with making such distinctions between the two, which is very important to help with identifying what popular culture is. Storey comments on the issue by saying that if such clear distinctions are made, it would be nearly impossible to measure what is popular culture and what is not, as some elite culture has, over time, become popular culture and vice versa.⁶ An example of this would be Shakespeare, who, up until the 19th century, was a part of popular theatre, whereas now, it is mainly seen as the embodiment of high culture. Thus, it is obvious that there is no clear border between the two; rather, there is a more fluid, changing line.

In summary, so far, the complex and relevant intricacies of popular culture have been shown. In doing so, it presented the view of popular culture as mass culture and the differing views of it. It added information from recent cultural studies proving its importance connected to working with more complex themes. It showed that it is hard to make a clear distinction between popular culture and its other, the high culture, by giving an example to illustrate the ever-changing nature of it. However, to further explain the significance of popular culture, it is

⁴ Emma Griffin, “Popular Culture in Industrializing England,” *The Historical Journal* 45, no. 3 (2002): 634–35.

⁵ Gary L. Harmon, “On the Nature and Functions of Popular Culture,” *Studies in Popular Culture* 6, (1983): 6.

⁶ John Storey, *An Introduction to Cultural Theory and Popular Culture* (London: Prentice Hall Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1997), 8–9.

important to look at the functions of popular culture products. Analysing these functions will aid in giving evidence for why this culture is favoured by such a wide audience.

As is the case with defining popular culture itself, there are noteworthy problems with trying to explain how it functions. Namely, many have overlooked its positive effects and rather focused on the negative aspects, as can be seen in the previous paragraphs. Based on Harmon, an often overlooked positive feature is that it serves more than to entertain; it has the important function of providing the individuals who consume its products with a sort of guidance.⁷ This can be understood as giving the consumers morals that society desires or the ones it despises. Essentially, as Harmon summarises, it provides role models. He goes on to say that without these, many people would not be able to identify with the shared values and beliefs that allow such a mass society to function.⁸ This, in essence, means that popular culture has the capability to help the society that partakes in it. Moreover, that is only one of its functions.

More recurring functions can be observed in popular culture. Harmon says that not only does it provide role models for the consumers, but it also reacts to the changing situation in society and adjusts itself to account for these new hero-like inspiring figures.⁹ So, it spreads new and changing values throughout society in an entertaining yet also educating manner. Harmon further adds that popular culture products focus on the specific issues troubling the individual consuming, and it can help them deal with them, thus positively affecting the consumers, i.e., society.¹⁰ This goes to show how fluid the whole concept of popular culture is because it shows an important function of adaptability to the current issues that trouble the target audience. In doing so, each work can be influential in a different manner, and by that, it attracts the people affected by the chosen theme. An example of this would be, according to Harmon, the novel *Catch XXII*, which, even though it exhibited some elite cultural themes, became highly popular. This became a part of popular culture mainly owing to the fact that many people's own opinions aligned with the criticism of American society from the novel.¹¹ That means that adaptability plays a key role in popular culture as, thanks to it, it can be spread among a larger audience, and the role model characters can be modified to be best suited for the audience. This method of giving morals to society could be understood as educating society

⁷ Harmon, "Functions," 10.

⁸ Harmon, "Functions," 11.

⁹ Harmon, "Functions," 10.

¹⁰ Harmon, "Functions," 10-12.

¹¹ Harmon, "Functions," 8.

in the desired fields, which was, up until the rise of popular culture, predominantly the domain of high culture.

Educating the audience through cultural products was mainly done by high culture; however, with popular culture becoming the mainstream form of culture, it also does have this function. Contradicting the positiveness of this function would be the ideas of Hannah Arendt, which are more in line with the beliefs of inferiority. Even though she refers to mass culture, this chapter previously established that it is just a way of viewing popular culture; thus, the functionality remains the same. Arendt explains that such culture is dangerous not because it entertains but because it tries to educate while entertaining. She says that the creators of mass culture take previously created pieces of culture and twist, rewrite, and change them to suit the masses. To try and entertain them whilst conveying the educational message of the now-changed work. According to her, this substantially diminishes its previous value because it was not created due to authentic needs.¹² Essentially, recreating an admirable work to better attract a wider audience presupposes it to lose its original meaning, which made it admirable in the first place. While it may hold partial truth, due to the fact that numerous popular culture works are not created of high quality, there are those that refute this argument.

The works that would disapprove of such an argument are the two Henry V movies chosen for this thesis. Both were based on the work of Shakespeare and whilst adapting it, they added themes that were tailored to the wider audience of the period. Neither of these are considered culture-destroying products but rather highly regarded adaptations of Shakespeare's work by many critics. In summary, the fact that there is a large variety of new popular culture products being created, some of which are simpler than others, does not mean that all of them are the same, neither does it mean that new adaptations of old works are worse by changing them to suit the different audience better.

In conclusion, this chapter provided evidence that popular culture should not be automatically connected to a negative meaning for a multitude of reasons, such as the functions it serves in society. This means that works that are based on high-quality historical works should not be discarded only for the reason that they aim to or, by chance, appeal to a wide audience. Such evidence would be the two Henry V movies analysed in the practical chapters, which are both regarded as popular culture, yet both are also highly regarded by many intellectuals.

¹² Hannah Arendt, "Society and Culture," *Daedalus* 89, no. 2 (1960): 4-8.

2. Adapting Drama to Film

Adapting drama to film is a phenomenon that began with the rise of new technologies. That were discovered and gained a lot of traction at the beginning of the twentieth century. The film opened up a lot of new possibilities when it came to depicting cultural products. Susan Sontag gives evidence of this by saying that the film as a medium can depict any performing art it chooses.¹³ However, the specific art that is adapted is not the same on film. For example, if a movie adaptation of a drama such as *Henry V* by Shakespeare is made, it is not the same as if a person went to a theatre because film often changes many things when it comes to adapting such a play. That is why this chapter aims to lay out how film adaptations differ in relation to their source material. Firstly, noting a common assumption about film adaptations of drama. Then, examining the distinctions between film and drama will help establish how the process of adaptation works and show some of the challenges that arise during this process. After this is detailed, a part about the specifics of adapting a renowned historical drama by Shakespeare will conclude the chapter.

First of all, both theatre and film are visual arts, but both vary greatly in form and standards. Out of the two, film is the newest one, becoming widespread in the twentieth century, whereas the origins of theatre go way back to ancient Greece. What connects them, according to Richard M. Gollin, is that both are a form of drama. He explains that screen drama is related to stage drama in the way that both are “two major branches from the same plant.”¹⁴ Gollin goes on to clarify that this means stage drama shouldn’t be considered the only appreciated form of dramatical production because many high-quality drama films have been created by dramatists, with critics and the public both enjoying them.¹⁵ This goes to show that screen productions are not a lesser form of drama. The differences are what makes each of them have unique abilities, but that also means that successfully adapting a stage drama to the screen is not simple. Hence, taking a look at the differences between film and theatre productions will help formulate the aspects of adapting plays to the screen.

Firstly, an important distinction between the two is that each theatrical performance of a specific play is not the same, whereas a film remains the same every time it is viewed. According to Gollin, this is because “film exists in definitive production, preserved

¹³ Susan Sontag, “Film and Theatre,” *The Tulane Drama Review* 11, no. 1 (1966): 24–25.

¹⁴ Richard M. Gollin, “Film as Dramatic Literature,” *College English* 30, no. 6 (1969): 426.

¹⁵ Gollin, “Film as Dramatic Literature,” 426.

photographically in entirety.”¹⁶ Owing to this fact, the creator of the film can make the film more readily available to the public, which helps to spread and preserve the meaning the creator placed in it. Susan Sontag gives evidence of this by writing that films are created with complete control of their creator, who plans everything to convey a desired and specific meaning. She then adds that in theatre, the performances of the plays are different, with each rendition being different.¹⁷ This allows the movie to be preserved and analysed in-depth as it can be rewatched as many times as desired. The meaning and the message, if there is one, are preserved, whereas, as Sontag said, a theatrical performance will be different each time it is viewed. This is backed up by Gollin saying that each play is preserved mainly as a script, of which each performance is different based on how the performers play them.¹⁸ In conclusion, films are permanent objects that, whenever viewed, convey the same meaning, whereas theatre is everchanging because of the different performances and interpretations of the script.

This leads to the form of the scripts of these two contrasting arts, which shows a difference in the language used. According to Robert Steele, if a film script were to be read like many people read a playbook, they would get much less satisfaction and information from it. That is because the most powerful part of a film is its visual content.¹⁹ This is a big distinction to drama scripts, which are often read to teach or learn about a specific play, as there often is not an easy opportunity to see the play performed as intended. This means that adaptations of a theatre play regularly need to change the language to include the needed visual content more than the language content. Ian Balfour explains that this is the case because the film would not be able to use so much language for a variety of reasons. For example, a part of the play text might be imagistic, which would not be fit for a film since it can be replaced visually.²⁰ This process of transforming parts of the script into visual content and, overall, the visual side of the film allows the depiction of a more realistic setting than a theatre stage would. However, such an adaptation needs to be careful in making these changes because, as Jean Mitry says, the text of a drama is what makes up its form entirely because it includes everything that is needed to convey all the desired information to the viewer. He contrasts this to cinema, where, similarly to Balfour, he says that adapting a drama to film cannot be done by simply using the same text as that would not produce anything new, and it would not fit the form of the cinema as it is a

¹⁶ Gollin, “Film as Dramatic Literature,” 426.

¹⁷ Sontag, “Film and Theatre,” 31.

¹⁸ Gollin, “Film as Dramatic Literature,” 426.

¹⁹ Robert Steele, “The Two Faces of Drama,” *Cinema Journal* 6 (1966): 17.

²⁰ Ian Balfour, “Adapting to the Image and Resisting It: On Filming Literature and a Possible World for Literary Studies,” *PMLA* 125, no. 4 (2010): 974.

visual art.²¹ From this, we can gather that the adaptation has to make significant changes to the script of a drama due to theatre specifics that cannot be easily translated into the film format. Thus, the cinema adaptation has to add to, change, and transform the original work, which then leads this analysis to examine how such films work with their source material and what needs to change if they adapt drama.

The treatment of source material by movie creators is often a discussion-inducing phenomenon that accompanies nearly every well-liked cultural product that gets adapted to the screen. Adaptations are often said to be breaking from their source material, which is a case when a drama is the target of adaptation. One reason for this is a change in the contents, such as changing the original text of a play to suit the film better. Numerous causes have been previously mentioned in this chapter, but in summary, it is done since recreating all the spoken text of a play in a film would break the form itself and because the screen play leans on its visual content much more than the theatre play.

This action of straying away from the specifics of the theatre play allows the adaptation to incorporate something new that wasn't in the play before. Gollin notes that the first film adaptations that became successful and interesting were the ones breaking away from the constraints of the theatre forms. In that process, they become a movie instead of a filmed stage performance.²² Steele gives evidence of this after examining multiple film adaptations of plays by saying, "The closer a film is to the play upon which it is based, the harder it will fall." He further goes on to clarify that it is because the authors try to create it as true to the original as possible that they end up using theatrical forms. Such as imagistic language, stationary camera, and unmoving filming set akin to a theatre stage.²³ As previously established, these theatrical forms do not work well in film. Unless the intention is purely to capture the live performance of a play on film to make that reprisal of it permanent and rewatchable. Sontag presents a slightly different viewpoint by saying that the success of a film adaptation hinges on the degree to which the creators rearrange and disarrange the action and the spoken text.²⁴ She adds that by making use of features the film medium has, such as editing and camera work, it can present a complex use of space, enabling previously impossible experiences. It is the use of film medium-specific techniques that makes film adaptations successful by expanding and shaping

²¹ Jean Mitry, "Remarks on the Problem of Cinematic Adaptation," *The Bulletin of the Midwest Modern Language Association* 4, no. 1 (1971): 1-3.

²² Gollin, "Film as Dramatic Literature," 425.

²³ Steele, "Two Faces of Drama," 20-21.

²⁴ Sontag, "Film and Theatre," 28.

the original work into something new and original.²⁵ This means that film can depict many aspects of the drama script, which would otherwise be left to the imagination. Furthermore, it does not need to rely on the actors to transmit all necessary information to the audience through speech, which would be the case in theatre, and it also can present complex scenery in comparison to the limits of the theatre stage. That means that numerous parts of a drama script can be transformed into the format that suits the film form the most, which in the end produces a higher quality product than if all aspects of the play being adapted were kept for the movie.

A summary that can be drawn from this is that the authors of drama adaptations have to consider a great deal of facts about the original play script they want to adapt to film. Firstly, the text has to be combed through in detail to remove any language that serves theatrical functions, which would be unnecessary dialogue in a movie since it can be replaced by visuals. After this is done, it will already present a quite different product. But still, for it to be considered a quality adaptation, it needs to make proper use of the options the film medium presents, such as editing combined with skilled camera work to convey complex scenes on a largely different scale compared to theatre. In doing all of this, the creators of these adaptations can shape the final product into a unique and original experience by adding their own desired motifs. All of this is why most movie adaptations are vastly different from stage performances and their scripts.

Moreover, adapting the drama of a renowned playwright like Shakespeare has some of its specifics that need to be mentioned. The main reason for this is that the two movies chosen for the analytical part of this thesis are adaptations of Shakespeare's play Henry V. Hence why, describing the tendencies in adapting these plays is helpful.

Firstly, as has been established, adaptation is not easy, hence why a challenge to the creators of these works arises, which is fidelity to the original work. This becomes even more significant when it concerns the play of a renowned writer such as Shakespeare. Preeti Oza says, "Fidelity refers to the degree to which an adaptation remains faithful to the original text, capturing its themes, characters, and plot." She then presents the conflict of strictly following the source materials in contrast to the creativity of adaptation.²⁶ This presents an issue of whether it is best to remain true to the plays to honour the original message of the work or if using creativity to add new themes that are more relevant to the new audience is the ideal way.

²⁵ Sontag, "Film and Theatre," 29–30.

²⁶ Preeti Oza, "Adaptation Theories in Literature – Shakespeare into Films and Cinema," *Gradiva Review Journal* 10, no. 3 (2024): 11–12.

Even though it creates the risk of possibly diminishing the values and intentions of the original Shakespeare work, it also presents the opportunity to bring a creation that would otherwise be known only to those interested in historical drama to a broader audience.

Secondly, the reason why Shakespeare was chosen to be adapted is significant to the resulting adaptation. It is not only because the creators admire the original plays or the playwright but because they strive to transform these pieces not only to bring them to a broader audience but to use them to convey present topics important to society as well. Oza gives evidence of this by saying that the works of Shakespeare have something called cultural capital, which means that they are viewed as a product of high quality and prestige. She goes on to say that many creators desire to use this cultural capital to get more attention for their work, but more importantly, they aim to reinterpret it into a new and unique creation.²⁷ This can be understood as adapting Shakespeare to a modern form, not by changing the language or simply filming a stage performance, but by building on top of these high-quality narratives and tailoring them to the present cultural context and society. Thus, as Oza believes, creating a film adaptation that becomes as significant as the original Shakespeare's plays.²⁸ Such evidence of the significance of these new films can be seen in the two Henry V movies chosen for the analytical part, as both are popular and a target of many academic articles debating many aspects of their intentions and themes.

The older of the two is called *The Chronicle History of King Henry the Fifth with His Battell Fought at Agincourt in France*, which is also the original name of the play written by Shakespeare. More commonly, it is referred to as *Henry V* by Laurence Olivier, who was the director and the main figure behind this film's creation in 1944. The second and newer film, *Henry V*, was directed and adapted to film by Kenneth Branagh in the year 1989. As stated at the beginning of this paragraph, these movies are considered important creations by academics who often compare and analyse these two, which signifies that some Shakespeare adaptations have become as important as their source plays. An example of this would be the journal article by Robert F. Willson Jr., where he notes that Olivier's movie "is regarded by most critics as one of the best filmic adaptations of a Shakespearean play." And also writes that Branagh's version is not an effort to upstage Olivier, but it is a film created under different conditions with different intentions, which makes it an adaptation worthy of analysis. After this, he concludes that it

²⁷ Oza, "Shakespeare into Films," 12.

²⁸ Oza, "Shakespeare into Films," 12–13.

deserves to be considered a great film instead of a poor attempt at upstaging a legend.²⁹ In summary, both movies are highly regarded, and both were uniquely made to fit their period the best. Thus, these adaptations are not merely attempting to benefit from Shakespeare's work, but they build on top of these quality narratives to present the work of Shakespeare to an audience that has different needs.

In conclusion, during the process of adapting a Shakespearean movie, the directors that are doing so have to walk a fine line between staying true to the original to not diminish the cultural capital that it holds whilst being creative enough to develop their movie into such an adaptation that is considered a creation worthy of the prestige associated with Shakespeare. An example of those are the two Henry V films by Olivier and Branagh, respectively. Both are considered modern versions of Shakespeare that utilise the original narrative to serve the new audience in the form of a film.

²⁹ Robert F. Willson Jr., "War and Reflection on War: The Olivier and Branagh Films of "Henry V"," *Shakespeare Bulletin* 9, no. 3 (1991): 27–29.

3. Cultural and Historical Context

This chapter aims to provide the cultural and historical context of the two Henry V movies chosen for the analytical part of this bachelor's thesis. It explores two periods of the twentieth century: the forties and the eighties in the United Kingdom. Firstly, it discusses the Second World War and the Homefront in the United Kingdom. Secondly, it is concerned with the so-called turbulent eighties. This was done to provide information on what was going on in British society and what could have influenced the creators of their films.

The movie Henry V by Laurence Olivier was released in 1944 for a particular reason. The reason was to serve as a propaganda film, which, according to Willson, was because the British wartime Ministry of Information approached Olivier to make a movie for that purpose.³⁰ During the five years of war before the release of Henry V in 1944, a lot of events happened that could have affected the film. Hence, the following text aims to provide an understanding of the situation at the Homefront of Britain and why such a film was requested.

Firstly, the term Homefront should be explained. According to Deborah Cohler, this term is tied to the land area of the state at war where there are no hostilities present. She says that this separates the civilians from the military frontline, where battles are fought, which makes the Homefront be understood as a safe space. But by calling this area Homefront, she notes that it enlists all civilians present in the war effort.³¹ In the case of the United Kingdom, there would be hostilities present in its geographical area; nonetheless, this term was still used due to its significance.

The situation on the Homefront was complex and changing depending on the situation in the war. But before the war even started, there was already an uneasy feeling amongst the part of the British society that had experience with war from World War One. They wanted to avoid the repetition of such a tragic conflict. As Jeffrey Record states, the Great War had a great influence on public opinion during the years leading up to the Second World War. He further adds that this had a very deep impact on Britain because many people still had powerful memories of the lost people and of the horrors of that war.³² This fear was further exacerbated by the growing turmoil in continental Europe. As Neil R. Storey writes, Britain was preparing

³⁰ Willson, "War and Reflection," 27.

³¹ Deborah Cohler, "Introduction: Homefront Frontlines and Transnational Geometries of Empire and Resistance," *Feminist Formations* 29, no. 1 (2017): 7.

³² Jeffrey Record, *APPEASEMENT RECONSIDERED: INVESTIGATING THE MYTHOLOGY OF THE 1930s* (Strategic Studies Institute: US Army War College, 2005), 11.

for war due to the growing militarisation of Germany and because of the observations of what was going on in the Spanish Civil War. He adds that many government and volunteer organisations were established to help people prepare themselves for the coming struggle, for example, by giving lectures on how to prepare for anticipated air raids and how to make their homes safer for when the bombs come, even teachers were given instructions to teach children what to do in evacuations.³³ From this, it is clear that the society was preparing for a difficult period; it also shows how they worked together to help each other in light of the looming conflict. Most of British society had to come together during this uneasy period of anticipation. However, as Storey notes, it was these preparations and the events unfolding in Europe that led many people to not wonder about whether the war would happen but rather when it would happen.³⁴ This came true with the start of the war in 1939 and the upcoming battle for Britain in 1940 that would be a historical, and difficult moment for the British people since no wars with outsiders touched the Isles since the Normans in 1066.

Thus, the hardships and challenges for the Homefront began with the Battle for Britain and with the bombing of cities by Germany. Mark Clapson writes that the enemy sought to destroy iconic buildings, disrupt infrastructure, and damage the morale of civilians. He further adds that the main target was London, with the main goal of inflicting as much damage as possible to its inhabitants. These air raids were the most frequent and heaviest during the Blitz in the years 1940 and 1941, but even though the raids were less frequent after this period, they continued until the end of the war in 1945.³⁵ Even though such air raids were anticipated and preparations were made for them, they still left a large mark on many cities and on many people who inhabited them. Thus, in this period, it was important for the government to try to help the people endure this and to uphold good morale amongst the civilian population.

Morale of civilians was a very important concept on the Homefront throughout the war, to which the bombings posed a great danger. Amy Bell provides information about this by noting that the British government's institution called the Ministry of Information relied on surveys of public opinion for the indications of morale. She adds that they needed this information because it was needed to retain high morale among the civilians whose participation in the war effort was increasingly more important. However, she notes that

³³ Neil R. Storey, Fiona Kay, *The Home Front in World War Two: Britain's Heritage* (Stroud: Amberley Publishing Limited, 2017), 7–12.

³⁴ Storey et al., *The Home Front*, 12.

³⁵ Mark Clapson, "Air Raids in Britain, 1940-45," in *The Blitz Companion: Aerial Warfare, Civilians and the City since 1911*, (London: University of Westminster Press): 36–41.

although the British propaganda tried to suppress the feelings of fear from propagating to maintain the morale and the “stiff upper lip” attitude, fear was still a large factor amongst the populace enduring the air raids.³⁶ This creates a situation where it is difficult to identify the effects the bombing had on British society. But Clapson adds that the often-mentioned heroic triumph of overcoming the Blitz and the perpetuation of national unity by the government, both of which were viewed highly positively, mostly ignored the underlying psychological damage that the bombings caused.³⁷ This meant that even though the government’s focus on this had worked in keeping the morale at a good level, it did so by propaganda. The effect of this undoubtedly helped during the war, but the fear and consequent psychological problems were not dealt with.

The concept of national unity, or in other words, the concept of togetherness, was aimed at bringing all people together in the face of adversity against the enemy, and based on many recollections of the war period, it worked. However, Jose Harris contradicts this by saying that it might not have been entirely true because many new sources have opened up since the war and that most perpetrators of this unity of everyone were mainly “Cinema, radio, war artists, Pathe News and Picture Post,” which he adds were used to promote an image beneficial to the realm and the conflict. He says that there indeed was an ironclad unanimity in fighting the war and continuing to oppose Germany, but that solidarity and love for other people was something else.³⁸ This shows that the nation was not as united in all aspects as it might have seemed, and it would explain the need for a large amount of domestic propaganda aimed at spreading the feeling of unity as much as possible. Harris goes on to provide some examples that outline a few of the issues present, such as the evacuation scheme, which was thought to bring solidarity between people, but instead, he says that it often confirmed the stereotypes the rural people and the middle class had of the poor urban evacuees, which they then tried to avoid and if it was not possible they then treated them with less sympathy. Another aspect he mentions is an increased amount of indictable offences recorded by the police, 478,394 in 1945 compared to 305,114 offences in 1940. To which he adds that juvenile delinquency and female convictions have almost doubled during wartime.³⁹ This goes to show that the situation on the Homefront was not as good as it might have seemed, and there indeed was a need for propaganda to sway

³⁶ Amy Bell, “Landscapes of Fear: Wartime London, 1939-1945,” *Journal of British Studies* 48, no. 1 (2009): 153–55.

³⁷ Mark Clapson, “Air Raids,” 58–61.

³⁸ Jose Harris, “War and Social History: Britain and the Home Front during the Second World War,” *Contemporary European History* 1, no. 1 (1992): 19.

³⁹ Jose Harris, “War and Social History,” 28–29.

the public's opinion in the right direction. If it helped uphold morale, then it consequently helped keep some of the aforementioned issues in a controllable state.

In conclusion, the situation on the Homefront was multi-faceted. The British people were more united than ever against their enemies, yet there were some glaring issues still present in the society. Many issues that were troubling people were often ignored so as not to weaken morale, which would have consequently weakened the war effort. This meant that the people of Britain were subjected to a large amount of propaganda to maintain their morale, but in doing so, many issues were not brought up but rather ignored. It is clear that the British government used many popular culture products to sway public opinion in favour of the conflict, which can be seen in how they requested the creation of Olivier's version of *Henry V*. Furthermore, a second popular movie version of this historical play was produced many years after the difficult situation after the war, yet it could be argued that Britain in the 1980s needed this drama as much as the forties did.

The movie *Henry V* by Kenneth Branagh was released toward the end of the eighties in 1989. The intention behind creating this movie depicting a heroic figure and a strong national spirit was most definitely brought about by the turmoil that was rocking Britain during the eighties. This part will be mostly concerned with events that could have been instrumental to the motivation behind the creation of this movie, yet not all can be dissected in depth due to the constraints of space or due to the very complicated nature of some of them. Such as the Troubles in Ireland, which had a profound impact on Britain during the eighties. However, since it would need to be a very complex explanation, it would take up most of the space. As this space is required to describe the plethora of other important issues of the 1980s, such a complex topic is not included in the following paragraphs.

Before the 1980s events are delved into in more detail, it is noteworthy to mention what preceded them and what started the issues. According to Stephen Edgell and Vic Duke, an international recession that began in the mid-1970s started a major economic crisis in the United Kingdom. They continue by summarising that the actions of the 1979 Conservative government that were trying to deal with this crisis caused large changes in British society.⁴⁰ The leader of the ruling conservative party was Margaret Thatcher, and she was very different from the previous prime ministers. Anthony King describes her as more of a warrior in the way she

⁴⁰ Stephen Edgell, Vic Duke, "Radicalism, Radicalization and Recession: Britain in the 1980s," *The British Journal of Sociology* 37, no. 4 (1986): 479–480.

handled politics. He says that she did what she wanted and did not bother with the consensus-seeking approach that was typical of politics in Britain until her election. What that meant was that she would institute all the changes she wanted without making compromises on policies.⁴¹ Owing to such personality traits and determination, Thatcher and her government would go on to institute many changes. Some of the most relevant changes in Britain will be outlined in the following paragraphs.

The period of government of Margaret Thatcher is important to analyse as she was in power for the entirety of the 1980s. Firstly, her and the conservative party's aim was quite ambitious in what they sought to accomplish. According to Andrew Gamble, this was “a government that was determined to end British decline and the crisis of state authority by making an ideological and political break with social democracy.” He explains that these sharp changes were needed; otherwise, recovering from this crisis would have taken longer because the pre-Thatcher system that had been in place since the 1940s was not working very well in the changing scape of the world.⁴² That meant that the post-war political framework led to the need for changes, as by the eighties, the system had aged so much that it would not have been able to offer solutions that would help resolve the issues. In replacing the old system, many new policies were passed during Thatcher’s government with differing effects.

The policies aimed at doing a national revival were often revolutionary in the sense that they went sharply against the established ones that sustained the nation up until this point. As Gamble says, one of the major changes that the Thatcher government introduced was privatisation. Up until the privatisation, many services were nationalised, such as gas, water, transit, health care, etc. This effort, as Gamble explains, was not a single policy but a combination of many smaller changes aimed at freeing the market from state control.⁴³ Overall, all Thatcher policies, including privatisation, were aimed at solving the economic problems not by national cooperation but by allowing capital to function freely, according to James Fulcher.⁴⁴ The way Thatcher decided to solve the economic problem had helped the nation deal with certain issues, but in doing so, it created or worsened other problems as well.

⁴¹ Anthony King, “The Outsider as Political Leader: The Case of Margaret Thatcher,” *British Journal of Political Science* 32, no. 3 (2002): 446–447.

⁴² Andrew Gamble, “Privatization, Thatcherism, and the British State,” *Journal of Law and Society* 16, no. 1 (1988): 1–3.

⁴³ Gamble, “Privatization, Thatcherism,” 1–4.

⁴⁴ James Fulcher, “Did British Society Change Character in the 1920s or the 1980s,” *The British journal of Sociology* 48, no. 3 (1997): 518.

One such problem that arose because of the new policies that changed the nature of the British economy was a division in the nation. According to Ron Martin, that was the north-south divide, which is, as he says, the disparity between the north and the south part of the nation in the economic, social, and political fields. He adds that this divide started during the nineteenth century but that the national revival during the 1980s did not lessen the divide; it increased it.⁴⁵ This meant that the turmoil within society increased with this divide becoming more profound, which added to the other economic and societal issues that were plaguing Britain during this period. Even though Thatcher sought to lessen this divide, she did it with a bad approach. As Martin notes, all the measures of the Thatcher government that were created to provide more economic efficiency, such as privatisation and monetary policies, have impacted the older manufacturing regions the most. He adds that this was furthered by the focus on newer and more internationally competitive sectors such as “high technology, the financial sector, and internationally tradeable business services”, which were much more prevalent in the South. He continues by saying that instead of reviving the nation to the previous one nation politics, it created two divided nations. He says that this would have most likely needed to happen even under a different government, but the way Thatcher did it offered very little help to the North in adjusting.⁴⁶ Thus, this had put further strain on British society, which could have been lessened in this case if more attention had been paid to helping the old northern regions transition to the new economy. This help never came, which, combined with the other issues, some of which were previously mentioned, made society start to push back.

The problems of the 1980s led parts of British society to defend itself in differing ways. For example, the workers turned to strikes in order to negotiate better wages and conditions. Charles Umney writes that such strikes were typical of the post-war era. He adds that workers and unions used this to get what they wanted.⁴⁷ This was something that would not work well with the economic reforms Thatcher wanted. This is why many laws and policies were passed to limit the power of unions and limit strikes. Furthermore, as Umney states, all industries that were considered to hold the power of unions either decreased in size or were privatised. He summarises that the changes made significantly limited the bargaining power of the employees in favour of the employers.⁴⁸ This meant that workers would no longer be able to demand higher

⁴⁵ Ron Martin, “The Political Economy of Britain’s North-South Divide,” *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 13, no. 4 (1988): 389.

⁴⁶ Ron Martin, “North-South Divide,” 410–411.

⁴⁷ Charles Umney, “Changing Class Dynamics in Britain,” In *Class Matters: Inequality and Exploitation in 21st century Britain*, (London: Pluto Press): 43–45.

⁴⁸ Umney, “Changing Class Dynamics,” 46–48.

wages in the new economy effectively and would have fewer ways to exert their will in their workplace. As was the case with the North-South divide, this move of stripping the unions of power was inevitable due to the changing economic landscape in the world. Umney supports this by saying that the Thatcherite legislations were not the main reason why this needed to happen but that they were more of a means of getting to an inevitable result.⁴⁹ Even though this needed to happen for the economy to align with international tendencies, it left parts of the society at the mercy of capital. This led to dissatisfaction of workers and, in some cases, to the worsening of work conditions, namely to more radicalisation of society.

The radicalisation of British society was influenced by the difficult situation in society during the 1980s. This resulted in an increase of radicalised groups, an example of which would be a group like the Skinheads; another example of radicalisation would be the birth of punk rock, which was a youth culture of a radical nature. An explanation of punk will serve as an exemplary showcase of how a part of society reacted to this difficult period. It does not account for the reactions of the other unmentioned parts, but it will illustrate the complexity. Matthew Worley says that punk music resonated with the young because it discussed all the issues of the period.⁵⁰ In a different article, Worley writes that punk in Britain could be understood as a revolt of the young generation against the established postwar consensus-seeking society.⁵¹ This coincides with the state of this postwar society as it fell into disarray in the 1970s and 1980s, as was previously mentioned. Thus, punk in Britain can be understood as a way of showing dissatisfaction with that society. Worley proves this by saying that punk was against every status quo. He adds that punk is not only a music style but more like an attitude.⁵² An example of this would be the stance of punk against war, which during the 80s gained significance as the events of the Falkland War in 1982 unfolded and as Cold War tensions grew. Worley then explains that not all punk bands focused on the same problems or had the same approaches to them, nor were they all radical to the same degree. The general idea was that the young generation had a way of voicing their concerns, which otherwise would have gone unnoticed during this complicated period.⁵³ This anti-war attitude and generally the overall punk attitude toward society, albeit radical in some way, did allow the youth to have a way to fight back against notions they did

⁴⁹ Umney, "Changing Class Dynamics," 48–49.

⁵⁰ Matthew Worley, "Punk, Politics and British (Fan)Zines, 1976-84: 'While the World Was Dying, Did You Wonder Why?'," *History Workshop Journal*, no. 79 (2015): 83.

⁵¹ Matthew Worley, "One Nation Under the Bomb: The Cold War and British Punk to 1984," *Journal for the Study of Radicalism* 5, no. 2 (2011): 69.

⁵² Worley, "British Punk to 1984," 69–70.

⁵³ Worley, "British Punk to 1984," 79.

not agree with or to fight for what they wanted. This contributes to the following analysis by illustrating the views and attitudes of the younger generation, which have not been previously mentioned in this chapter but are relevant to show that all parts of society were enduring hardships during this period. Importantly, it shows how difficult the 80s were if radicalised groups were on the rise with the example of punk youth culture.

Overall, it is evident that the eighties were a turbulent period for the United Kingdom. The issues affecting British society were widely varied and, in being so, affected nearly every aspect of said society. The large political and policy changes created a nation with an entirely different approach compared to that of the 1940s and the post-war period. Along with this, the society had to endure large structural changes in the economy and the struggles associated with them, the effects of the Troubles, The Falkland War, the tensions associated with the Cold War, and the rise of radicalised groups like skinheads and certain parts of punk rock. Notably, this was not an exhaustive description of all the problems that plagued the period, but it gives a sufficient amount of information about the 1980s. So, such a tough period goes to show that a drama adaptation that was already once created to unite the nation might be created under the pressure of the difficulties once again to attempt to help the society.

4. Main Contrasts Between the Henry V Films

This chapter will present numerous differences between the two movies in connection with the theory from previous chapters. That entails looking at multiple directorial decisions that shape each film into what they are. Considering these decisions simultaneously with the theoretical background provided in this paper will help show the intentions behind each movie. This will become an important part of understanding the following chapters.

First and foremost, both movies begin with a monologue of the chorus, in other words, the narrator. At first glance, the chorus might seem similar between the two; however, upon examining how each director depicted this part of the movie, a deeper intention can be made out. Olivier's approach entails starting the movie in the way it would be played at The Globe Theatre; hence, the chorus introduces the play as if it were in a theatre. After this, the play doesn't transfer straight to a movie form; it continues as a Shakespearean-era stage play for 25 more minutes before transitioning to the film. Whereas Branagh has the chorus walk through a movie set whilst introducing the play, after which he opens a large door, and the movie begins without any stage performance. If Olivier's version is considered from the adaptation theory viewpoint, it would indicate two reasons as to why he is depicting the Globe theatre and the play in the way it would be performed by Shakespeare. Firstly, to respect the original play and the associated greatness of Shakespeare. Secondly, to gain credibility for his adaptation and benefit from the cultural capital associated with the play. This would be beneficial in helping the popularity of the movie, which was crucial as it aimed for the widest audience possible amongst the British people. That was due to the previously mentioned fact that its creation was requested by the wartime Ministry of Information to act as Homefront propaganda. Branagh had a different aim. His chorus and beginning were not trying to benefit from the cultural capital, nor was the movie created at the request of the government. Branagh strode to gain popularity by making the movie more realistic as it was a better fit for the difficult period of disillusionment that the 1980s were. Through the use of the contemporary movie set for the chorus, it hinted at the realistic approach of the movie, which was then further reinforced throughout its entirety. In the other chorus appearances, he behaves and delivers his lines as if he is part of what is going on and not merely an unaffected spectator. If this is considered from the viewpoint of popular culture, it depicts how Branagh has tailored the movie to fit the contemporary audience of the 80s, which is a function of popular culture and adaptations described in the theoretical part. Many of the differences between the two movies can be

ascribed to the attempts to make the films relatable and targeted at their respective contemporary audiences.

A significant adaptation difference between Olivier's and Branagh's productions is the difference in whether certain key scenes were excluded or kept in the resulting drama adaptation. Wilson says that some scenes were removed during the process of adapting the play's script due to the constraints of a commercial production aiming to be about two hours long. He goes on to say that, unlike Olivier, Branagh did not cut the scenes for the sake of political propaganda but for the convenience of making the resulting product more understandable for the 80s audience.⁵⁴ The fact that some of the scenes were unfit for the propaganda Henry V movie shows that Branagh had quite different intentions when including them in his production. Thus, analysing these scenes will aid in understanding some of the intricacies of these adaptations and their intentions.

Chronologically, the first scene that was missing in Olivier and present in Branagh was the scene where Henry V exposes traitorous members among his noble followers: Grey, Cambridge, and Scroop. These men were his friends, but they would betray him for France, the enemy. Considering who requested the creation of Olivier's Henry V and had a say in what will be included, it does explain why this scene was omitted. It would show that even their people, the English, can turn against each other and that traitors are a real threat. This, of course, considering the propaganda nature of this production, would not fit the unifying message that was sought after, as national unity was a focus of the British Homefront propaganda. Branagh's inclusion of this scene likely aims to represent the play closer to how it was intended whilst keeping to the commercial format required of him. Notably, he was not blocked from choosing what scenes to depict. This part of the movie shows the 1980s audience a relatively known problem, as this period was full of turmoil that was even of a political nature. Lastly, it once again aligns with the reoccurring method of portraying the play in a realistic manner compared to the 1944 Henry V. Following this scene, there is another disparity between the depicted message once the English set off into France.

In both movies, upon arriving in France, the English besiege the town of Harfleur, where there is a speech made by Henry V to inspire his troops to go "Once more into the breach". Which in both strengthens the morale of the troops and acts as a reminder of the strong national feeling required to win the battle. However, when the time comes in the movie to parlay with

⁵⁴ Willson, "War and Reflection," 28.

the town's governor, a stark difference allows a glance at the distinct intentions behind each film that are the subject of this practical part. In Olivier, the parlay is conducted in a very calm manner compared to Branagh, as Henry only says "How yet resolves the Governor of the town? This is the latest parley we'll admit!" this is followed by the Governor's surrender of the town after which Henry says "Open your gates. Come, brother Gloucester. Go you, and enter Harfleur. There remain, and fortify it strongly against the French. Use mercy to them all."⁵⁵ This exchange is indicative of the nature of the movie, which has not been brought up before. That is to, in a sense, glorify war by ridding it of the ugly side of it. Of such, there will be more evidence provided further on in this text. Branagh presents a wholly different picture, which Willson notes was a part of the original Shakespeare play.⁵⁶ That is after the same beginning two sentences Olivier's Henry said, Branagh's Henry proclaims:

Therefore, to our best mercy give yourselves, or, like to men proud of destruction, defy us to our worst. For as I am a soldier, if I begin the battery once again, I will not leave the half-achieved Harfleur till in her ashes she lie buried. Therefore, you men of Harfleur, take pity of your town and of your people whiles yet my soldiers are in my command, whiles yet the cool and temperate wind of grace o'erblows the filthy and contagious clouds of heady murder, spoil and villainy! If not, why, in a moment look to see the blind and bloody soldier with foul hand defile the locks of your shrill, shrieking daughters, your fathers taken by their silvered beards and their most reverend heads dashed to the walls, your naked infants spitted upon pikes whiles the mad mothers with their howls confused do break the clouds! What say you? Will you yield and this avoid? Or, guilty in defence, be thus destroyed?⁵⁷

Once again, considering that Olivier needed to create a film to bolster the British Homefront, it explains why such a scene showing the king threatening with such horrible actions would not have the effect desired by the Ministry of Information. By this, Branagh shows a side of war Olivier needed to avoid depicting; he shows that the English were in no way like saints. This lends an explanation that Branagh, in his desire to depict war truthfully and realistically, used this to show the struggle of the English in the siege for Harfleur. A struggle so big that they would be capable of doing what Henry said to the governor. Yet after the governor yields, Branagh's Henry does what Olivier's Henry did and shows mercy. He is showing a good heart but not without the dark side first.

These evil intentions that Henry V from the 1989 film voiced at Harfleur serve a specific purpose in the grand scheme of the entire movie. They do not serve to paint the king as an evil man, they serve the function of showing the psychological side of the character, which is

⁵⁵ Olivier, Laurence, dir. *Henry V* (London: Two Cities Films, 1944), DVD, 53:25-54:20.

⁵⁶ Willson, "War and Reflection," 28-29.

⁵⁷ Branagh, Kenneth, dir. *Henry V* (London: British Broadcasting Corporation, 1989), DVD, 48:40-50:03.

something Olivier does not depict to the same extent as Branagh does. If examined from the adaptation viewpoint, it allows the viewer a more meaningful connection with the characters in the way that it tries to depict the inner struggles and challenges the characters face. This is additionally furthered by visually showing Branagh's Henry as heavily fatigued after the siege is over, which lends more credibility to the dark speech and his emotions. Thus, what Branagh does with is, is show the viewer the effect war has on an otherwise honourable man when he is faced with more war. The surrender of the governor averts, and Henry then proceeds by being merciful, saying the same words as Olivier, which have already been cited. By depicting the psychological side of Henry's character, the speech, and the battle scene in this way, Branagh gives the viewer an idea of the cost of war. Thus, this shows an anti-war sentiment, which is the exact opposite of Olivier's work. In conclusion, this portrays one of Branagh's key intentions, which will be mentioned more in the ensuing chapter. Yet before that is delved into in detail, a review of the distinct treatment of the French by each of the directors will provide an outline of additional intentions for analysis.

Both releases of Henry V have the French as the enemy, provoking the war in the same way. However, when it comes to depicting how this enemy behaves when not on the battlefield and later even on the battlefield, a significant difference between the approaches of the two directors can be found. Firstly, starting with the behaviour outside the battlefield, Olivier portrays the French court as being in disarray and dismay. The guards are sleeping on the job, the king looks as if he does not take proper care of himself, and one of the nobles is playing with a toy. When the English delegation comes to this court, the French hurry to make everything look normal, with this Olivier signals that the enemy leadership might function like the English, but they, in fact, do not and are depicted as more of a joke. Behind the decision to depict the enemies in this light is once again the propaganda nature of the film; however, here, the French could be viewed as a likening to the Germans that the British were at war with during the creation of this movie. That was most likely intended to make them seem less scary and more like someone who could be made fun of, which would, in turn, bolster the morale in the fight against them. Notably, this mocking of the enemy was empowered by the release date of this movie, which was after the D-Day landings in Normandy, when the sight of victory was possible. In contrast to this, Branagh depicts the French court as competent and in a similar light to the English court. By doing this, he does not lessen the enemy threat by making them look worse, which fits the realistic theme he is striving for in this movie. Moreover, in 1989, there was the risk of the Cold War, so there was no desire for a scene that would instil the notion

of the enemy's inferiority. Such would also not work well considering the previously mentioned anti-war theme. A similar comparison of the two can be found during the battle scenes.

Before the battle takes place at Agincourt, both armies are waiting for morning in close proximity to each other. Olivier adds more to these scenes to better suit his film's intention. During the scene when the French nobles come outside of the tent to glance at the English army, Olivier adds more lines of dialogue, which are not present in Branagh's, where Orleáns, who is a French noble, says "Foolish curs, that run winking into the mouth of a Russian bear, and have their heads crushed, like rotten apples."⁵⁸ These words and the rest of their conversation strongly mock the English. The mention of the Russian bear would indicate the previously mentioned likening of the French to the Germans due to the alliance the English had with the Russians during the Second World War. Another reason for its inclusion would, according to Willson, be that Olivier was asked to make a second movie by the Ministry of Information specifically to make the British warm up to their new Russian allies.⁵⁹ This he follows up with a scene where the nobles have to be helped into their saddles by cranes, making them look ridiculous and weak in the process, once again furthering the propaganda message. Another distinction can be made during the process of the battle.

When the battle begins and does not seem to be going in favour of the French, the nobles make a speech about rather dying heroically in battle than surviving with guilt. Here, Olivier, in contrast to Branagh, once more utilises the previously set-up view of the French nobles to achieve an all-time high in their bad behaviour in the movie. He does this by, instead of having them charge into the battle, they go around the battle lines and murder the English camp boys. The Dauphin who provoked the war runs away, once more proving the French to be lesser. The death of the camp boys enrages Henry, who, in one-on-one combat, heroically defeats the French noble responsible. The combination of these scenes and their significance can be tied to the English experience during the war, where Germans bombed British cities. Here, King Henry symbolises the British soldiers taking revenge on those cowardly enemies for what they did during the Blitz. The entire setup of the previous depictions of the French led to this moment being the main scene to bolster the morale of its viewers in the fight against Germany. Whereas Branagh does not have the nobles kill the camp boys, but rather unspecified French soldiers do this. The French nobles in his movie do charge into the battle, but they are not focused on as

⁵⁸ Olivier, *Henry V*, 1:10:45-1:10:55.

⁵⁹ Willson, "War and Reflection," 28-29.

the cause of the worst problems. What Branagh showed by this is that the atrocities of war, the killing of the boys, can be done by regular soldiers, which adds to the anti-war message. Furthermore, Branagh's Henry does not take revenge for the killing of the boys. Instead, he is devastated by it, and his determination is undermined by this shocking event. After this, he does not ride into battle, but instead, the battle finishes there in an English victory. With which he cleverly symbolises the pointlessness of the death of the boys, which does not affect the outcome in comparison to Olivier, where it bolstered the English determination.

Lastly, in both of the Henry V movies, the friends from Henry's youth are depicted. However, their fates, which are important in the 1989 movie, get left out in 1944. The reason for the inclusion or exclusion of the fates of the three men, Bardolph, Corporal Nym and Ancient Pistol, are again rooted in the previously mentioned intentions. By including their fates during the war in France, Branagh further develops Henry's character. He has to give the order to hang Bardolph, who was a good friend of Henry during his youth, for stealing because he cannot make exceptions in law. After the camera cuts back to Henry's face from Bardolph's hanged body, he says

We would have all such offenders so cut off. And we give express charge that in our marches through the country there be nothing compelled from the villages, nothing taken but paid for, none of the French upbraided or abused in disdainful language. For when lenity and cruelty play for a kingdom, the gentler gamester is the soonest winner.⁶⁰

with tears forming in his eyes. The death of Nym serves as another stark reminder of the cost of war during the battle of Agincourt, and the fate of Ancient Pistol losing both his friends reinforces the present anti-war theme. Since Olivier aimed to depict the English in the best possible light, he avoided including many of the scenes that would hamper that goal. Thus, he resorted to excluding the fates of Bardolph and Nym, and even though Ancient Pistol was present towards the end, there was no mention of the two excluded men.

In conclusion, the two Henry V directors each made large changes in the process of adapting the Shakespeare play. In most of the outlined cases, the films present themselves almost as opposed to each other in the intentions behind depicting certain themes. That is because both Olivier and Branagh mirror the spirit of the period in which each was produced. Olivier included more propagandistic themes meant to help the British cause in winning World War 2, which was done by making the English honourable and good whilst villainising the French, who were made to reflect the Germans the British were at war with. Branagh focused

⁶⁰ Branagh, *Henry V*, 1:03:55-1:04:35.

on the depiction of political intrigue, relationships, and war. He achieves this by taking a realistic approach in adapting the story, which reflects the bleakness of the 1980s, during which his film was being created. He also includes the psychological side of the characters, which is one of the methods he uses to convey an anti-war sentiment that is present throughout the film. All in all, both serve important functions in representing the common themes of their periods, but with the 1944 version being made for propaganda, it presents a more selective view.

5. Merriness Against Bleakness

The previous chapter had established distinct features and revealed some of the intentions behind each of the movies. The focus of this chapter will be on comparing the movies in the aspect that the 1944 Henry V is depicted with more lively colours, more grandiose, more positive facial expressions and more comedy, whereas 1989 Henry V is depicted with bleaker colours, focus on more subtle details with significant meaning and more serious conduct of characters. Hence, the name of this chapter is merriness against bleakness. The aim is to analyse what these directorial choices imply and how they reflect the respective periods when these two films were created.

First of all, the difference between the movies that stands out is the different colour schemes that are present throughout their entirety. As has been mentioned in the introduction, the 1944 film uses more lively and vibrant colours, whilst the 1989 movie uses a more bleak and earthier colour scheme. In the previous chapter, the mentioned theatre beginning of Olivier's film uses colours like it would be the case in a Shakespearean performance, yet when the move from the theatre to the film format is made, the lively colours stay, albeit the exaggerated makeup and some costumes do not. Many of the scenes have colourful backgrounds that look as if they were painted, which gives the scenes a more theatrical feel. The season depicted in the movie is summer, which lends it the possibility to use these vibrant colours and associate more with a happier theme. This will be important when comparing it to the 1989 Henry. If the way Olivier uses these colours is considered with the intentions detailed in the previous chapter, it gives way to the explanation that this was done to further the propaganda theme once again. That is done by making the scenes look vibrant and lush even though they are where a war is being fought. This helps with instilling the notion that war is not bad or ugly, but instead, the land that is being fought for looks very attractive. This reinforces the near-war glorifying nature depicted in many scenes throughout the 1944 Henry V. Such is even more clear when compared to the 1989 film.

From the beginning, Branagh strays away from using overly vibrant colours that would be more commonly associated with a happier theme. In doing so, it gives the scenes a more serious and realistic look. This is because, as previously established, Branagh aims to portray the play more realistically. In contrast to Olivier, he does not use any painted background but instead relies completely on either filming sets made to look as close to reality as possible or on using the real-world natural environment to film the other scenes. This is more in line with the film format compared to the theatrical features of Olivier's film. In combination with the

depicted time of year being the early autumn, there is also frequent rain shown in the movie. This sets up a grave mood. Such a mood then lends itself to the comparison with the period of the 1980s, which, as outlined in the theoretical part, was not filled with happiness and glorification of war. But rather by the uncertainty of the future, with fear of possible conflict with an unforeseen destructive ability that a nuclear war entailed. It was a period where a popular youth culture was punk, which was a reaction to the young generation's bleak prospects for the future. Thus, by taking all of this into account, many similarities can be drawn from the depicted mood in Branagh's *Henry V* with the period of the 1980s.

Further contrasts between the two that show a similar picture include the difference in costumes. In the 1944 *Henry V*, the nobles tend to wear very colourful, and detailed costumes similar to that of the costumes used in the theatre performance at the beginning. The clothes of the nobles look lavish. During the battle at Agincourt, both the English and the French have shining knight armour with vibrant standards and decorated horses. On the contrary, in Branagh, the costumes are less detailed, overall, more simplified. They are depicted as more functional than decorative, combined with the bleaker colour scheme previously described. In Olivier, this points to the merrier setting and desired understanding. The over-the-top colourful and lavish clothes and armour portray even the battle as something near luxurious and grandiose. Branagh does not aim for a grandiose and glorious depiction of war; thus, his choice of costumes aligns well with his goal of showing the realities of the period. By doing this, he can focus more on depicting the struggles and harsh realities through the lens of the camera and on the psychology of his characters.

The psychology of the characters in these movies widely differs. As mentioned, Branagh's focus was to add more psychological depth and meaning to Henry and his decision-making, whereas Olivier delivers happier and more positive-minded characters. This can be seen in the beginning of the 1944 film that takes place in the theatre, as there is more comedy involved, which lessens the seriousness of Henry's decision to go to war. In contrast to this, in Branagh, this exact scene where the two men of the church present the salic law do so in grave seriousness. A scene that depicts the political intrigue that is part of this justification of war can be seen before the presentation of the salic law. In this scene, the two men of the church are conspiring about why they need to advocate for this war by saying "But, my good lord, how now for the mitigation of this bill urged by the commons? Doth his majesty incline to it or no?" The bill mentioned by these men earlier in the conversation would take half of the church's possessions. To which lord Canterbury answers "He seems indifferent, or rather swaying more

upon our part. For I have made an offer to his majesty, as touching France.”⁶¹ Hinting at the fact that this war is not as rightly justified as it might seem. This is a foreshadowing of the anti-war theme this movie presents at this point in the plot. Furthermore, through this focus on the psychology of King Henry, Branagh aims to make his decisions and depicted personal experience more powerful. By offering the viewer glimpses into Henry’s youth, during which he drank with the men who are now dying under his command in France, he deepens how relatable Henry is to the audience. In doing so, Branagh presents a King who is burdened with the responsibilities expected of him and shows the inner struggles he has to battle to become victorious. This presents how Branagh takes a different approach to depicting a heroic character meant to inspire. While Olivier paints Henry as a steadfast, unwavering man without inner struggles, Branagh does the opposite of that. The 1989 Henry portrays many emotions that are not fit for propaganda that is meant to help the British cause during the war. Thus, Olivier avoided including any scenes that would lend themselves to have any undesired effect on Henry’s psychology.

The emotions of other characters and their facial expressions during dialogues or when listening to Henry mirror the findings of the previous paragraph. In Olivier, the side characters avoid showing any emotions that could be understood as a sign of weakness, such as crying or any similar display of sadness. That does not include the anger associated with the murdered camp boys. Which, as previously established, acted more as a call to stronger action against the French. However, the emotions on the positive side of the spectrum are plentifully present even in the face of great adversity. An example of this would be the siege at Harfleur in the scene where the English lieutenants talk. In Olivier, the scene takes place away from the battlefield in a peaceful setting during the day, with the officers making fun of each other and exchanging opinions. In the 1989 Henry V, this dialogue takes place on the battlefield in a ditch similar to a trench and during the night with the battle going on in the background. This presents the siege at Harfleur as nothing all too difficult in Olivier, while Branagh paints a darker picture of the siege. Additionally, the differences in how character expressions are given space during Henry’s speeches are handled differently to serve specific purposes. In Olivier’s Henry, the main camera focus is on Henry during his speech, and only then the camera moves away slowly to include the other characters. This leaves only one point of view when viewing these speeches, one point of interpretation of these motivating speeches, meaning that agreement with what is said by Henry is implied among all the characters. Such would be a connection to the one-nation

⁶¹ Branagh, *Henry V*, 5:08-5:30.

propaganda notion that was perpetuated in Britain during World War Two to depict strong unity in the face of danger. Even though the two movies share similarities in what is said during these speeches as they are both adapting the original Shakespeare play script, the approaches of each of the directors allow them to portray unique intentions other than that of motivation.

In the 1989 *Henry V*, there are frequent close-up camera shots aimed at the faces of the characters that are listening to the king's speeches for a particular reason. That is because the reactions of the characters are important in how Branagh portrays Henry. Through the expressions of Henry's officers and men, the viewer sees the interactions of these people with the speech akin to how it would happen in reality. This gives these scenes a more human aspect, and it makes Henry seem more like the other soldiers than only like the noble king. Seeing the widespread agreeing and motivated expressions on the faces of the characters whilst they listen to the motivating speech makes these scenes more believable for the viewer. Thus making these speeches even more powerful than they would be if they were performed as they were in Olivier's *Henry V*. The real world parallel to Branagh's decision to portray it this way would be the increasing divisions in British society during the 80s, where many groups of people were split because of political decisions of the government. Radical groups that strongly opposed the government grew in popularity at the time as well. Thus, depicting the agreement with Henry's words induces the notion that it is not only Henry's decision what happens next but that it is a widely accepted decision among all his men. This also showcases Henry's greatness through his ability to lead well. What is done by this from a commercial viewpoint as well is that it deals with the issue of how some groups do not agree with authority. It does so by depicting the decisions within the film as popular decisions with the majority of the characters. Thus, making the film more attractive to these groups of people results in the film gaining a larger audience. From this and previous findings, it is evident that both movies use different techniques to reflect the needs of their respective time periods and to get their desired message across. Furthermore, how these dialogues are performed leads to a finding that further reinforces these conclusions.

As Olivier was tasked with creating an inspiring and epic movie, Branagh desired to portray gritty realism. Thus, both directors also reflected this in the way they presented the inspiring lines of text. In the 1944 *Henry V*, the lines are said with high energy, high confidence, and fast pronunciation to add to the overall grandiose theme that was previously mentioned, which is a more theatrical manner of speaking than that usually associated with the film format. However, based on the period, such can be compared to the typical confident and energetic speech present in propaganda creations of the period as well. This further reflects the intended

nature of the movie, which is to serve as propaganda for the war effort. On the other hand, in Branagh, the speech is slower and, owing to that, more realistic, which leaves room for more emotion, which he uses in conjunction with the previously mentioned deeper psychology of characters. Such also reflects its period, as the 1980s were described as moving away from the old ways, not only in politics; thus, a move to something more reflective of the human experience was required. In essence, Olivier's manner of speaking was more theatrical, which aligned well with the intended nature of his movie, whilst Branagh further developed a realistic approach in addressing the manner of speech.

In conclusion, both directors reflect on their respective periods through the use of various techniques that help convey the desired intentions of the movies. Both often use near-opposite approaches that showcase the evolution and changing values of the society for which it is made. Olivier, by his use of vibrant colours, luxurious costumes, employment of comedy and a specific manner of speaking, further reinforces the propagandistic intentions behind his movie. While also depicting a happier theme to alleviate the dark and tiring effects of the ongoing Second World War. On the other hand, Branagh provided the viewer with a bleaker colour scheme, more emotional characters with deeper psychology, which helps in understanding the decisions they make and costumes that better reflect his realism-focused directorial approach to the adaptation of the play. Notably, some of the mentioned differences can also be connected to the fact that Olivier used forms closer to the theatre than did Branagh, who, for the most part, used only those typical for a film format. However, considering the context of each 1944 and 1989 provided in the theoretical part of this thesis with the findings of the practical part, it so far shows that most of these directorial decisions were made to reflect the period and the different target audiences.

6. Differences in the Treatment of War

In the previous chapters, it has been revealed that Henry V from 1944 tends to glorify war, whereas Henry V from 1989 paints war as tragic and difficult. Thus, this chapter will aim to analyse the two battle scenes, Harfleur and Agincourt, from the two movies to find out how each director approached these scenes with their respective goals in mind. Furthermore, the aftermath of the English victory will be detailed, along with its importance for the message behind each film. This, along with the previously mentioned themes and directorial decisions, will aid in illustrating how each director reaches the depiction of the heroic character of Henry.

Beginning with the siege at Harfleur, which has already been briefly mentioned in the previous chapters, Olivier depicts this as would be expected from a movie that aims to show only the picture that motivates war. In doing so, he does not depict the city itself or the battlefield. The scene takes place somewhere outside the city where Henry and his soldiers regroup for Henry to give his “Once more unto the breach” inspiring speech before charging off the set toward the danger that is not visible. No soldiers in this scene, apart from the one wounded soldier in the short opening where they flee the city to regroup, are visibly wounded or shaken. Even after it calms down for the speech to be the focus, the other soldiers listening are standing exactly in the spot where the wounded soldier was, indicating that there is no danger whatsoever. Furthermore, neither Henry nor any of the soldiers look dirty or exhausted. With this, Olivier avoids connecting the war with any bad meaning; thus, the focus is on showing a glorious charge into battle for England. As was indicated before, Branagh approaches this very differently.

The siege in the 1989 Henry V begins similarly with the English army fleeing out of the city and with Henry giving a speech shortly after. However, in contrast to Olivier, the scene takes place at night, right on a battlefield filled with fire, explosions, and screaming. The soldiers fleeing are visibly tired and dirty; some even fall into the mud whilst running down a slope. Even Henry is depicted as winded by the siege. During the speech, he addresses the soldiers more directly by making eye contact instead of presenting a speech akin to a theatre performance like Olivier. This makes the speech look and feel more believable. It gives it more authenticity. It shows the tension of the speech building up as the expressions on the faces of the English soldiers gradually change from tired at the start of Henry’s speech to riled up and motivated toward the end. Here, Branagh, through his realistic approach, creates a battle scene that is much more impactful on the viewer. After the battle and after the previously mentioned parlay, there is a scene where Henry talks to his officer, Exeter. In Olivier’s film, he says calmly

“Tonight in Harfleur will we be your guests. Tomorrow for the march are we addressed.”⁶² In Branagh’s film, Henry says the same words; however, he first drinks a lot of water due to being exhausted; his face has blood, dirt, and sweat on it, and he pauses to catch his breath while speaking. After that, he nearly trips and falls due to pain, but Exeter catches him. When this is combined with the parlay speech that is filled with terrifying threats, it gives the viewer a glimpse of the struggles of war and shows that neither side is without the power to do horrible things. The difference in portraying this siege illustrates well the previous findings of how Olivier paints the war as noble without struggle, whereas Branagh includes even the horrible sides of the war. This finding will also mirror itself unto the battle of Agincourt.

During the battle at Agincourt in the movies, the following themes of absolving war of the bad in the 1944 *Henry V* versus the worst of war in the 1989 adaptation will become apparent. In conjunction with that, Henry's heroic character arc will reach the climax in both movies during this battle. In either of the two, the battle is lengthy and highly detailed in comparison to the original Shakespeare play, according to Willson.⁶³ That is because the usefulness of this part is significant to the intentions of each director. Owing to the film format, it can be created on a much greater scale compared to that of a theatre stage, which makes it more attractive to viewers. In both movies, the previously mentioned themes and other findings project themselves onto the way this battle is portrayed greatly. This is due to it being the peak of the plot in these movies.

For the portrayal of this battle, Olivier breaks away from the typical painted background that is present in most of the film’s scenes and instead films the battle in a real natural environment. This allows him to depict a greater scale, which makes the battle scenes more impressive. Through this, he shows the great odds that are against the English, yet their faces exhibit very little signs of fear even though they are outnumbered five to one. Before the battle begins, the English prepare elaborate defences, and Henry bolsters their morale with his speech. Upon the battle’s start, the powerful French knights are caught by surprise by the impassable English defence and are routed by arrow fire. The knights, in the process of trying to escape the volleys of deadly arrows, run into their foot soldiers, which creates a death trap. This shows rather a slaughter of the French than a battle against all odds for the English. Another example is the trap the French knights fall for by following the longbowmen into the forest, where they are jumped by English men from the trees who defeat the knights using nothing more than a

⁶² Olivier, *Henry V*, 54:29-54:36.

⁶³ Willson, “War and Reflection,” 28–29.

dagger. By this, Olivier depicts the English as cunning and good strategists and the French as proud but weak because of that. Due to losing the battle greatly, the French nobles resort to attacking the camp boys who cannot mount any resistance. With this order of the scenes, he paints the French nobles as dishonourable cowards who would rather kill the defenceless than face the stronger English soldiers. By this, Olivier insinuates that even though the British are facing grave odds, they can, through their determination and courage, defeat the dishonourable enemy. Such is important for its propagandistic value when fighting in the Second World War against Germany. Further, such similarities can be drawn from this. The moment when Henry rides into battle, enraged by the act of cowardice and terror by the French, shows the heroism of his character by defeating a French noble, avenging the injustice. The connection that can be drawn from this is to the Allied invasion of Europe, of which Britain was an instrumental part, avenging the civilians killed by the German bombing of British cities. This connection can be made due to the previously mentioned fact that the release of this movie was timed to be right after the successful D-Day landings. The next point that provides more evidence of absolving the war of the bad is the large absence of blood throughout the battle. The only place where any blood is depicted is on the murdered camp boys, which invites further hatred toward the enemy. It also shows that civilians can suffer from war at the hands of the evil enemy, yet the English soldiers are portrayed as nearly untouchable. There is also no dirt or sweat on the English men, nor do they look exhausted, even though Henry himself mentioned multiple times leading up to the battle that many of his men are ill and fatigued. All of this falls within the confines of Olivier's approach to portraying this play, and it aids in the propaganda power of the movie.

Branagh, like Olivier, depicts this battle in line with the approaches outlined in his directorial style. In contrast to the 1944 *Henry V*, he begins the inspiring speech surrounded by his men in close proximity, depicting fewer men than Olivier, which makes Henry appear closer to his men. This portrays him more as a soldier who commands his troops instead of a king who has no connection with his men, which is aided by the attention of the other soldiers' reactions to him and by his direct manner of addressing the speeches toward his men. This makes the character of Henry stand out more. Furthermore, it depicts him as significantly likeable among his men, which coerces the viewer to have the same view of him. Then, the men get into battle positions, with Henry among his men in the first line, which gives more evidence of Branagh's depiction of Henry as a formidable, courageous, and likeable leader. Once the English catch sight of their enemy, they visibly gasp in fear due to the vast numerical advantage of the French. This is one of the first significant contrasts to Olivier because, through the depiction of

emotions, it adds credibility and allows the viewer to believe that what they are seeing is an insurmountable struggle. As the battle is being fought, there is a lot of misery depicted through visceral death scenes accompanied by a large amount of blood. The terrain is very muddy and difficult to fight on, which is similar to what the French got trapped in Olivier's film; however, here, the entire battle takes place in the rough terrain. The death of many familiar characters is not ignored, as in the 1944 *Henry V*, but instead, it is shown in close detail. Henry's dialogue mid-battle has the same words as Olivier's, yet the words "Well have we done, thrice-valiant countrymen! Yet all's not done! Yet keep the French the field!"⁶⁴ are screamed by Henry while huddled next to a corpse of a young English officer in the mud with a few of his battle torn soldiers before charging into battle once more. During the intense fighting, the English camp boys are killed, but Henry, who is shocked and angered by this, does not charge into battle seeking revenge. This is because he is cut off by the French herald, whom he tackles to the ground and screams at him out of desperation and exhaustion from the horrible battle. But after he is told that he and his army have won the battle, he is relieved, but it is not portrayed as a glorious victory. Thus, his relief is bittersweet. That means that even though they achieved a great victory, which is a notion that Olivier entirely focused on, here Branagh depicts it as a victory at a great cost. That is, even though the counted loss of life is the same. In the aftermath of the battle, Henry carries the body of one of the dead boys across the vast battlefield in a long continuous camera shot, which shows the great devastation of the battle and the many dead people. In this shot, he includes soldiers weeping for their dead friends, French mothers devastated due to the loss of their sons, exhausted and wounded soldiers completely devastated by the battle sitting to rest, surrounded by death. By this, Branagh solidifies the anti-war stance of his adaptation, which is akin to how Olivier solidified his war-glorifying stance through his depiction of the battle.

Based on these two extensive descriptions of the battle at Agincourt as portrayed by the two movies, the approach of each director can be summarised. Olivier portrayed the battle carefully, not to make the English seem weak in any way but to show the glory of victory and the revenge for the unjust murder of the boys. With this, he is aiming to create an image of the English might, who, even against great odds, can achieve a great victory. This fits the previously mentioned nature of his work being a propaganda movie. In comparison, Branagh demonstrates his anti-war rhetoric by depicting the battle as a gruesome fight with a great loss of life. Not only that, but he also shows Henry as more engaged in the fight alongside his men; in the

⁶⁴ Branagh, *Henry V*, 1:42:39-1:42:50.

process of this, he portrays him as more vulnerable to emotions than the nearly unshakeable Olivier's Henry. This fits his realistic approach and makes Henry a more likeable character to the disillusioned society of 1980s Britain. After the battle, both movies move to the scene of negotiating peace, where there are few differences between the two, yet some subtle ones are present.

In both Olivier's and Branagh's *Henry V*, the movie ends with peace being arranged with the French leadership, and it is solidified by Henry's promise of marriage to the French Katherine, whom Henry himself persuades with his own words. This portrays Henry as a chivalrous bringer of peace, who, after a great victory, ends the quarrel between the two countries by uniting them through marriage. However, if all previous findings and descriptions are connected, then the ending in Olivier's film is considered more of a triumph of the English than what it is in Branagh. That is an end to the horrific spectacle of war, which is achieved by a final union of the two countries, promising a period of stability and peace.

In conclusion, the two movies stay true to their previously described nature, even in the depiction of the battle of Agincourt. Olivier encapsulates the English might and the heroic character of Henry through the glorious English victory. As expected, Branagh portrays the battle as an important victory as well, but one that is achieved through courage in the face of the struggle and the high cost of life. This solidifies the anti-war rhetoric Branagh was building up throughout the entirety of the movie by presenting the large toll it takes on human life and the toll it takes on the minds of those who survive. Both movies present the same ending of peace promised by the marriage of Henry to Katherine; however, upon considering the entire scope of the two movies, the marriage represents slightly different ideas. Branagh presents it as a union promising peace and an end to the costly war, which is supported by the struggles depicted throughout the movie. In comparison, Olivier depicts the union as more of a triumph of the English victory. The evidence that leads to such a conclusion can be seen in the analysed themes and intentions. Overall, both movies present the battles in great detail to support their desired message.

Conclusion

The aim of this thesis is to analyse the two distinct Henry V movies and how each director tailored the adaptation to suit the society for which it was made. To achieve this and provide a theoretical background for the topic of popular culture, it was outlined, showing the importance of popular culture creations for society. This is in contrast to the belief that popular culture is deeply inferior to elite culture, yet as shown, the difference between the two can, at times, be quite arbitrary due to the fluid nature of what is considered popular and what is not. Furthermore, owing to its functions, it demonstrated the ability to help society. The tendencies in adapting a theatre play to a film showed why many adaptations need to be different in many aspects to be considered successful. Adding to that, specifically, the adaptations of Shakespeare's works require the directors to be careful not to diminish the renown associated with such works while adding something new to them, which applies to both the Henry V movies. Owing to the historical context chapter, the need for the two movies as unifying and patriotic movies is explained in connection to the two largely different but very turbulent periods of the 1940s and 1980s. This arrived at the conclusion that Henry V from 1944 was created to serve as propaganda to bolster morale on the Homefront of Britain due to it having to endure bombing raids and unrest in society. The need for a 1989 Henry V arose from a period of economic crisis, large divisions in society, and fears of large-scale war.

Both of the directors, Laurence Olivier and Kenneth Branagh, have reflected the needs of their respective periods in their adaptations of the plays. Olivier strove to achieve this through a noble depiction of war, absolving it of all the horror connected to it. He did this in many ways, such as depicting few emotions and showing the English as superior and the French as inferior while avoiding anything bad about war. Furthermore, he used lush colours, painted backgrounds, and highly decorated costumes to solidify the intended propaganda message by portraying all connected with this war as good or attractive to the viewer. This fits the intended propaganda intention behind the movie, while by utilising some theatrical forms, he pays respect to the original Shakespeare play. Depicting the English and the French in the way he did, while adding some new lines of dialogue to help that, he likens the conflict to the Second World War by presenting the French as a resemblance of the Germans. This ushers in the resulting victory, and the English triumph over their enemy as something their nation can and will do again when united, like winning the Second World War, which this movie did to bolster morale on the Homefront.

Branagh's approach in adapting the play to film is to make it closer to film by utilising its form fully in contrast to Olivier's. What that resulted in was no use of painted backgrounds or visibly hand-made filming sets but rather a realistic portrayal of the play. That encapsulates one of the central motifs of Branagh, realism. This is visible in the attention to portraying the characters with emotions and complex psychology behind their way of acting, mainly behind the main character, Henry. What this helps Branagh in depicting is an anti-war theme that can be connected to many of the fears of war in the 1980s. He shows this by portraying blood, the death of soldiers and civilians alike, threats of horrible deeds toward the enemy, and a gritty atmosphere. His use of bleak colours, serious conduct of characters, and his stance toward war help portray the struggle in the movie as much more serious compared to that of Olivier. This reflects the difficult period of disillusionment in the 1980s in Britain and makes the character of Henry stand out as more human, which makes him more relatable to the contemporary audience facing many great struggles of inner and outer nature akin to Henry. Owing to this, Branagh's adaptation targets individual viewers well by showing them that by overcoming their struggles, a promise of lasting peace is attainable, with a similar underlying patriotic inspiration that Olivier delivered.

In essence, both directors used near-opposite approaches in adapting Shakespeare's play to target their respective contemporary audiences. This shows how different each of these periods was and how the values of the society were reflected in the decisions of the two directors.

Resumé

Cílem této bakalářské práce je analyzovat, jak každý z režisérů reflektoval svou vlastní historickou zkušenost ve filmové adaptaci Shakespearovy hry Jindřich V. První kapitola představuje pojem populární kultura, neboť filmový formát je často počítán mezi produkty populární kultury. Pojednává o negativních konotacích spojených s tímto pojmem jako takovým. Přitom předkládá několik protichůdných názorů, například že populární kultura by se nikdy neměla pokoušet vzdělávat své publikum kvůli své podřadnosti vůči svému zavedenému protějšku, elitní či jinak řečeno vysoké kultuře. Konzultace novějších zdrojů z oblasti studia populární kultury však ukazuje, že mnoho výtvorů populární kultury obsahuje komplexní témata, která byla připisována pouze elitní kultuře. To dokazuje, že ne všechny výtvořiny populární kultury jsou podřadné. Zmínka o tom, že neplatí pro všechny je nutná, protože jak prokázal čas a recenze nesčetných akademiků, stále existuje mnoho produktů populární kultury, které jsou vytvářeny pouze s cílem pobavit bez přidané hodnoty. Je nutno zmínit, že rozdíl mezi tím, co se označuje za kulturu populární či elitní, je neustále měnící se hranice. Jelikož to, co lze považovat za populární kulturu a co za kulturu elitní se s časem mění. Toto ukazuje na problém odmítání či neuznávání jakéhokoliv produktu těchto kultur pouze na základě toho, ke kterému z nich daný výtvor patří.

Podrobné popsání tendencí v procesu adaptace divadelních her do filmové podoby ve druhé kapitole, pomáhá pochopit nutnost mnoha rozdílů mezi původní hrou a její výslednou filmovou adaptací. Zkrácení dialogů a monologů filmovými režiséry, aby se vešly do časového limitu, který se od filmu očekává, vysvětluje vystřížení některých scén. Změny ve výsledné adaptaci jsou dále vysvětleny schopností filmu nahradit velké části scénáře hry vizuálními efekty. To režisérům umožňuje prezentovat různé úhly pohledu, jež mohou být divákovi prezentovány díky kamerám a střihu. Dále je diskutováno téma, co spočívá v adaptaci Shakespearovy hry do filmové podoby. To proto, že věhlas spojený se Shakespearem propůjčuje těmto adaptacím dobré jméno, ale v důsledku toho musí režiséři dbát na to, aby zachovali určitou míru věrnosti vůči původní předloze. Dále aby, dopadem jejich tvůrčích změn nebo změn, kterých si proces adaptace žádá, úplně nezměnily původní záměry předlohy. Na toto musí dát pozor proto, aby ctili předlohu, tak jak ji vytvořil Shakespeare. To režisérům umožňuje využít dané kvalitně zpracované děje pro přidání svých hodnot. To je pro tuto práci relevantní, protože oba režiséři Jindřicha V. museli při tvorbě svých adaptací toto dodržet.

Třetí a poslední teoretická kapitola se zabývá obdobím 40. a 80. let 20. století ve Velké Británii, neboť Jindřich V. Laurence Oliviera pochází z roku 1944 a Jindřich V. Kennetha

Branagha z roku 1989. Vzhledem k tomu, že obě tato období byla pro britskou společnost velmi náročná, je jejich kontext důležitý pro pochopení, co ovlivnilo režiséry při jejich tvorbě. V případě historického kontextu pro film Jindřich V. z roku 1944 byla hlavní oblastí zájmu domácí fronta Spojeného Království, protože to bylo poprvé od normanské invaze v roce 1066, kdy se britských ostrovů dotkla válka. K tomu se přidává skutečnost, že tato adaptace byla nařízena ministerstvem informací, aby pomohla britskému válečnému úsilí, jakožto propaganda. Blitz, což bylo bombardování Británie Německem, především hustě obydleným místům, mělo pochopitelně velký dopad na civilní obyvatelstvo. Ony negativní dopady byly většinou potlačeny, aby nevypluly na povrch cílenou propagandou britské vlády. Příkladem této propagandy by byl tzv. "Stiff upper lip" postoj a politika spojeného národa, jejímž cílem bylo ukázat silnou jednotu národa a vzájemnou solidaritu. Potřeba propagandistického filmu o Jindřichu V. nabývá na důležitosti, když se vezmou v potaz literární zdroje, které vznikly delší dobu po válce. Tyto zdroje poukazují na mnohé potíže, přímo na negativní realitu doby, kde sjednocující a vlastenecký film by pomohl morálce na domácí frontě. Dopady bombardování na psychiku postižených byly nesporně negativní a solidarita v britské společnosti nebyla tak vysoká, jak se zdálo. K tomu důkazem je, že v mnoha případech evakuovaným osobám z nižších vrstev nebo matkám samoživitelkám byl odmítán úkryt od vyšších vrstev žijících na relativně bezpečném venkově. Kromě toho byla válečná kriminalita ve srovnání s předválečnými statistikami ztlačena výšší. Tyto skutečnosti poukazují na potřebu vytvořit tento film, ovšem osmdesátá letá byla též velmi náročná pro společnost, proto se druhá část této kapitoly zabývá tím, co mohlo ovlivnit Branagha při tvorbě jeho adaptace.

Osmdesátá léta minulého století byla v duchu nesčetných ekonomických problémů značného rázu, které měly velký dopad na společnost Spojeného Království. Zároveň v této době byla v čele vlády Margaret Thatcherová, která se rozhodla zavádět potřebné změny pro oživení ekonomiky její země velmi razantním způsobem. To vedlo například k privatizaci, jelikož mnohé služby byly ve vlastnictví státu. Nadále oslabila moc odborů, které doposud měly značnou moc ve vyjednávání platů a pracovních podmínek. Pomocí těchto změn přiblížila Spojené Království ke směru, kterým se ubírala ekonomika ostatních vyspělých zemí. Naneštěstí toto způsobilo i mnoho potíží, jakožto například veliký socio-ekonomický rozdíl mezi industriálním severem a na služby orientovaným jihem právě na úkor severu. Nutno zmínit, že v průběhu tohoto desetiletí ve společnosti koloval strach ze studené války, a války obecně, kvůli rostoucímu napětí ve světě a činnosti IRA či Falklandské válce. To vše způsobilo radikalizaci společnosti mnoha způsoby, například došlo k šíření ideologie skinheadů nebo

popularizaci punku. Pomocí punku se mohla mladá generace vyjadřovat k dění ve své zemi, ovšem i mezi nimi byli více radikální části, ale i ty méně. To vše poukazuje na rozdělenou společnost širokou škálou problémů a odůvodňuje potřebu tyto problémy zohlednit ve filmu, či nabídnout dobové společnosti příběh ukazující hrdinské překonání velkých potíží.

Čtvrtá kapitola se zabývá analýzou hlavních rozdílů mezi filmy. V nich identifikuje způsoby, jakými jednotliví režiséři přistupují ke zpracování tohoto dramatu. Zde Olivier vynechává scény, které by nějak mohly poškodit vnímání války. Příkladem toho je vynechání scény, kde Jindřich V. odhalí zrádce ve svých řadách. Tato selektivnost koresponduje s jeho cílem vytvořit propagandistický film inspirující anglické diváky k poražení Německa ve druhé světové válce. Toho dále dosahuje skrze přirovnávání nepřátel Jindřicha k Němcům, či zesměšňováním arogantních nepřátel, aby se zdáli jako podřadní vůči silným Angličanům. Oproti tomu Branagh scénu se zrádci zahrnuje, a to co je ve filmu Oliviera ukázáno s humorem, je zde bráno velmi vážně. Příkladem toho je vyhlášení války, vzhled i chování Francouzů, či vyhrožování starostovi obléhaného francouzského města Jindřichem, aby se vzdal. Tím posledním Branagh poukazuje na postoj filmu proti válce. To utvrzuje za pomoci zmíněného vyhrožování, vyobrazení důsledků války, na ty, jež ji vedou, či smrt jeho přátel z mládí. Tímto čtvrtá kapitola identifikovala několik hlavních tendencí Oliviera a Branagha, které jsou nadále rozvíjeny v následující páté kapitole.

Zmíněné tendence obou režisérů se odrážejí i ve způsobu jakým prezentují prostředí, kde se děj odehrává, kostýmy postav a emoce postav. Olivier zde sahá po letním prostředí, které se více pojí s pozitivními konotacemi nežli těmi negativními, jak je tomu u Branagha. Toho dosahuje za pomoci pozadí, které má malovaný a sytě barevný vzhled. Kostýmy Olivierových postav jsou značně zdobné, a to především i právě zbroj, ve které postavy válčí. To lze spojit s jeho propagandistickým záměrem vyobrazit válku a její průběh jako něco honosného a lákavého, zároveň se tak i vyhýbá zobrazení negativní nálady. Kdežto Branagh využívá přírodní prostředí podzimu a s tím spojené nepříznivé počasí. Nadále jsou jeho kostýmy jednoduché a nezdobné, vyhýbá se tak oproti Olivierovi spojování války s čímkoliv honosným, což bude zřetelnější ve finální kapitole práce. Branaghovy postavy vyjadřují i negativní emoce, poměrně často ve srovnání s Olivierovými postavami, které jsou obecně veselejší bez negativních emocí. Díky tomuto i Branagh prezentuje samotného Jindřicha jakožto pouhého muže, který čelí velkému psychickému náporu spojeného s jeho povinností krále a válkou, nikoliv nezdoledného hrdinu, jak tomu je ve druhém filmu. Tím dosahuje vyobrazení Jindřicha, které je více lidské

oproti Olivierovi, což reflektuje dobu osmdesátých let vyobrazením hrdiny, který je blíže samotným lidem nežli pouze králi.

Finální kapitola analyzuje dvě bitvy, Harfleur a Agincourt, především to, jak odlišně jsou vyobrazeny v jednotlivých filmech. Olivier se u Harfleur, jak již je pro jeho film typické, vyhýbá vyobrazení následků války na Angličanech. Také zde je zde velmi omezené vyobrazení samotné bitvy, a to pouze na útěk pro přeskupení, které dá prostor pro Jindřicha říct svůj inspirující proslov. Vojáci nejsou nikterak unavení, či špinaví od boje. Kdežto Branagh prezentuje bitvu v duchu realismu tím, že ukazuje bojiště plné bahna, ohně, řevu. Tváře vojáků jsou špinavé od krve a bahna. Toto odráží odlišný přístup režisérů, jak ho identifikovala čtvrtá kapitola. Následně u vrcholu obou filmů, tím je bitva u Agincourt, jsou Angličané u Oliviera vyobrazení jakožto chrabří a vypočítaví, tím, jak se vypořádají se značnou nepřátelskou přesilou. Jako u Harfleur, tak i zde Angličané nejsou viditelně unaveni, ani špinaví či od krve. Na konci bitvy je bojiště vyobrazeno jako zelená louka s pár těly, a ne jako místo, kde bojovalo několik tisíc mužů. Tímto Olivier dosahuje špičky jeho filmu podporujícího válku. Kdežto Branagh ukazuje bitvu jako strastiplnou. Provázenou úmrtími několika důležitých postav, spoustou krve, utrpení a hrubého bojování muže proti muži. Kontrastem je, že u Oliviera to vypadalo tak, že Angličané od počátku nepochybovali o své šanci na vítězství. U Branagha to je zobrazeno rozlišně tak, že Angličané jsou v jeho filmu vystrašení v momentě, co spatří armádu protivníka. Po anglickém vítězství nese Branaghův Jindřich tělo anglického chlapce přes bitevní pole plné těl, utrpení a nářku ze ztracených přátel. Pomocí tohoto zdůrazňuje hrůzy války a vrcholí protiválečný postoj jeho adaptace. Oba režiséři film zakončují uzavřením míru mezi oběma zeměmi sňatkem Jindřicha a francouzské princezny Kateřiny. Tím oba režiséři ukazují naději na mír po překonání i těch zdánlivě nemožných problémů, ovšem k tomuto se dostávají rozlišným způsobem, jak bylo zjištěno v těchto praktických kapitolách.

Bibliography:

1. Arendt, Hannah. "Society and Culture." *Daedalus* 89, no. 2 (1960): 278–87.
2. Balfour, Ian. "Adapting to the Image and Resisting It: On Filming Literature and a Possible World for Literary Studies." *PMLA* 125, no. 4 (2010): 968–76.
3. Bell, Amy. "Landscapes of Fear: Wartime London, 1939-1945." *Journal of British Studies* 48, no. 1 (2009): 153–75.
4. Branagh, Kenneth, dir. *Henry V*. London: British Broadcasting Corporation, 1989, DVD.
5. Clapson, Mark. "Air Raids in Britain, 1940–45." In *The Blitz Companion: Aerial Warfare, Civilians and the City since 1911*, 37–76. London: University of Westminster Press, 2019.
6. Cohler, Deborah. "Introduction: Homefront Frontlines and Transnational Geometries of Empire and Resistance." *Feminist Formations* 29, no. 1 (2017): vii–xvii.
7. Edgell, Stephen, and Vic Duke. "Radicalism, Radicalization and Recession: Britain in the 1980s." *The British Journal of Sociology* 37, no. 4 (1986): 479–512.
8. Fulcher, James. "Did British Society Change Character in the 1920s or the 1980s." *The British Journal of Sociology* 48, no. 3 (1997): 514–21.
9. Gamble, Andrew. "Privatization, Thatcherism, and the British State." *Journal of Law and Society* 16, no. 1 (1988): 1–20.
10. Gollin, Richard M. "Film as Dramatic Literature." *College English* 30, no. 6 (1969): 424–29.
11. Griffin, Emma. "Popular Culture in Industrializing England." *The Historical Journal* 45, no. 3 (2002): 619–35.
12. Harmon, Gary L. "On the Nature and Functions of Popular Culture." *Studies in Popular Culture* 6 (1983): 3–15.
13. Harris, Jose. "War and Social History: Britain and the Home Front during the Second World War." *Contemporary European History* 1, no. 1 (1992): 17–35.
14. King, Anthony. "The Outsider as Political Leader: The Case of Margaret Thatcher." *British Journal of Political Science* 32, no. 3 (2002): 435–54.
15. Martin, Ron. "The Political Economy of Britain's North-South Divide." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 13, no. 4 (1988): 389–418.

16. Meikle, Kyle. "REMATERIALIZING ADAPTATION THEORY." *Literature/Film Quarterly* 41, no. 3 (2013): 174–83.
17. Mitry, Jean. "Remarks on the Problem of Cinematic Adaptation." *The Bulletin of the Midwest Modern Language Association* 4, no. 1 (1971): 1–9.
18. Olivier, Laurence, dir. *Henry V*. London: Two Cities Films, 1944, DVD.
19. Oza, Preeti. "Adaptation Theories in Literature – Shakespeare into Films and Cinema." *Gradiva Review Journal* 10, no. 3 (2024): 11–23.
20. Record, Jeffrey. "APPEASEMENT RECONSIDERED: INVESTIGATING THE MYTHOLOGY OF THE 1930s." Strategic Studies Institute, US Army War College, 2005.
21. Shils, Edward. "Mass Society and Its Culture." *Daedalus* 89, no. 2 (1960): 288–314.
22. Sontag, Susan. "Film and Theatre." *The Tulane Drama Review* 11, no. 1 (1966): 24–37.
23. Steele, Robert. "The Two Faces of Drama." *Cinema Journal* 6 (1966): 16–32.
24. Storey, John. *An introduction to cultural theory and popular culture*. 2nd ed. London: Prentice Hall Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1997.
25. Storey, John. *Inventing Popular Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003
26. Storey, Neil R., Fiona Kay. *The Home Front in World War Two: Britain's Heritage*. Stroud: Amberley Publishing Limited, 2017.
27. Umney, Charles. "Changing Class Dynamics in Britain." In *Class Matters: Inequality and Exploitation in 21st Century Britain*, 40–64. Pluto Press, 2018.
28. Willson, Robert F. "War and Reflection on War: The Olivier and Branagh Films of 'Henry V.'" *Shakespeare Bulletin* 9, no. 3 (1991): 27–29.
29. WORLEY, MATTHEW. "One Nation Under the Bomb: The Cold War and British Punk to 1984." *Journal for the Study of Radicalism* 5, no. 2 (2011): 65–83.
30. Worley, Matthew. "Punk, Politics and British (Fan)Zines, 1976-84: 'While the World Was Dying, Did You Wonder Why?'" *History Workshop Journal*, no. 79 (2015): 76–106.