Renaissance Queenship in
William Shakespeare's English History Plays

Yu-Chun Chiang

UCL

Ph. D.

Declaration

I, Yu-Chun Chiang _____ confirm that the work presented in this thesis is my own. Where information has been derived from other sources, I confirm that this has been indicated in the thesis.

Acknowledgments

For the completion of this thesis, I am obliged to my supervisors, Professor Helen Hackett and Professor René Weis. Helen's professionalism and guide, René's advice and trust, and their care, patience, and kind support are the key to the accomplishment of my Ph.D. study.

Gratitude are due to my examiners, Professor Alison Findlay and Professor Alison Shell, whose insightful comment, attentive scrutiny, friendliness, and useful guidance offer inspiring conversations and academic exchange, especially at the viva, assist me to amend and supplement arguments in the thesis, and illuminate the development of my future research.

I am also grateful to Professor John Russell Brown, Dr. Eric Langley, and Professor Susan Irvine for their advice in English Graduate Seminar at UCL and at my upgrade. Professor Francis So, Dr. Vivienne Westbrook, Professor Carole Levin, and our beloved friend and mentor, Professor Marshall Grossman have given me incredible support and counsel in many aspects of my doctoral career.

Without the sponsorship of the Ministry of Education in Taiwan, I would not be able to conduct my research in the U.K. Also the generous funding from the Graduate School and assistance from the Departments of English and of History enabled me to refine my knowledge and learn different methodologies of early modern studies. The support from the Cultural Division of the Taipei Representative Office in the U.K. UCL English Department, RSA, SAA, BSA, SCSC, the Shakespeare's Globe, and the Medieval and Renaissance Program in University of Nebraska-Lincoln allowed me to expand my vision and network in academia.

I would like to thank my Ph.D. classmates – Lesley Moss, Nick Shepley, Anna Smaill, and Helena Langford – and many other colleagues in the study of English literature, Dr. Shun-Liang Chao, Dr. Miranda El-Rayess, Dr. Andy Kesson, Dr. Tehan Yeh, Dr. Ruei-Yin Yang, Shan-Yun Huang, Han-Hsi Cheng, Vivian Liu, Dr. Mulan Wang, Liang-Tsu Chen, Yi-Hsin Hsu, Ruen-Chuan Ma, and Robin Lin, for their encouragement, support, and sharing.

How fortunate I am to have so many loving and understanding friends and family members, who offer me intellectual, spiritual, and emotional support through my Ph.D. study: Michelle Shiau, Mickey Shan, Yu-Chin Yu, Si-Chin Chen, Yi-Chih Yang, Tommy Yang, Tracy Pillai, Gerry Gilchrist, Hui-Chun Wu, Eileen Sun, Dr. Peiying Lin, Claudia Sima, Dr. Aiduan Li, Yang-Chang Chao, Pauline Kao, Li-Wen Tsai, and Chris Mathews to name a few. The love from my parents, sister, and brother is the power supporting me to keep sailing on the ocean of knowledge.

Abstract

This thesis explores how queens in Shakespeare's English history plays manipulate virtues, space, and memory to embody a specific demeanour in the contexts of early modern England. In the late 1990s, Jean E. Howard's and Phyllis Rackin's *Engendering a Nation* established a feminist study of Shakespeare's English history plays, focusing on how women support or undermine patriarchal authorities. Yet analysing women's words and actions in the light of nationalism, New Historicism, and women's traditional roles as daughters, wives, and mothers within feminism restricts potential readings of women in early modern English literature. This thesis then studies the most powerful women, the queens, to see how they establish themselves as models or counterexamples for women. It first distinguishes between queens regnant, regent, and consort, and investigates the relationship between queenship and kingship. It then traces the three stages of the queens' 'career': the pursuit, practice, and residue of queenship. The 'pursuit' analyses how queens-to-be implement their virtues in accepting and rejecting kings' favours. The queenly virtues parallel and contrast to Machiavelli's idea of '*virtù*' and Pierre Bourdieu's theory of 'cultural capital'. Entitled to exceptional royal status, queens transgress the boundaries of gender and space divisions, while their subversive behaviours are often endorsed by patriarchs. Finally, when queens are widowed, deposed, or divorced, they engage themselves in writing histories; they become monuments presenting alternative memories and insubordinate voices against patriarchal grand narratives. Shakespeare's queens create iconographical paradigms, which are so recognisable and iconic that their queenship is reiteratively reproduced and appropriated in arts and real practices of later periods. Using early modern arguments and modern theories, this thesis provides a synthesised reading of queens in Shakespeare's English histories, shedding new light on the position of women in early modern England.

Table of Contents

Prefatory Notes on the Text

All the Shakespeare text used in this thesis are quoted from *The Norton Shakespeare*, edited by Steven Greenblatt, et al. (New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1997), except passages from *Edward III*, which are from *The New Cambridge Shakespeare,* edited. by Giorgio Melchiori (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

General Introduction

> O now let Richmond and Elizabeth,
>
> The true succeeders of each royal house,
>
> By God's fair ordinance conjoin together,
>
> And let their heirs – God, if his will be so –
>
> Enrich the time to come with smooth-faced peace,
>
> With smiling plenty, and fair prosperous days.

<div align="right">(Richard III 5.8.29-34)</div>

Shakespeare comments on the first marriage of the Tudor dynasty with an emphasis on the union of the two dominant aristocratic families of Lancaster and York and Elizabeth's role as a mother of the future heirs to the English throne. Jacqueline Johnson argues that the emphasis on Elizabeth of York's maternal image suggests pro-Yorkist propaganda, which not only claims that the Queen is of 'equal status' to Henry VII in the union, but also empowers her as a parent of the next monarch.[1] Despite the fact that she does not have any lines in the play, her marriage to Henry VII is central to the plot: the perfect ending to the Wars of the Roses. Shakespeare shows his interest in English history and the representations of its queens. The union of the Lancastrian and Yorkist families through the marriage of Elizabeth and Henry VII was configured as the start of the Tudor myth by early modern chroniclers such as Edward Hall, Raphael Holinshed, and John Foxe. Decades after the marriages, divorces, and executions of Henry VIII's queens and the reigns of Mary I and Elizabeth I, Shakespeare's adaptations and dramatisations of historical chronicles feature a panorama of English queenship. This thesis consists of surveys of historical contexts based on the work of historians of society and culture, followed by close readings of Shakespeare's English history plays. This is the first analytical study of queens as a group in Shakespeare's history plays.

The scarcity of teaching manuals or tracts about how to be a queen consort in early modern England parallels the shortage of studies of queens consort as portrayed in early modern literature. To overcome this inadequacy of feminist studies, this thesis focuses on the queenship of queens consort in Shakespeare's English history plays. In

---

[1] Jacqueline Johnson, 'Elizabeth of York: Mother of the Tudor Dynasty', in *Rituals and Rhetoric of Queenship: Medieval to Early Modern*, ed. by Liz Oakley-Brown and Louise J. Wilkinson (Dublin: Four Courts Press Ltd, 2009), pp. 47-58 (p. 54).

contrast to the ruling monarchs, queens consort play the role of helpmate, wife, and mother not only quite literally in their royal households, but also metaphorically for the whole of England. As the most powerful woman in a patriarchal society, a queen consort might attract more attention and be written about in history than other women in early modern England. Drawing on extant historical documents for comparison, this study of Shakespeare's history plays may reveal to us the playwright's specific view on queens in the written history, his attitude towards English Renaissance historiography, and his own adapted version of English history. It is important to see what Shakespeare chose to emphasise, to recreate, and to amplify from the chronicles.

Shakespeare was not the only playwright who dramatised British history, but he is the most significant one. For instance, Christopher Marlowe's *Edward II* (?1593), Samuel Rowley's *When You See Me You Know Me* (1605), and Thomas Heywood's *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody* (1605) were history plays written about the same time as Shakespeare's. However, none of these Elizabethan and Jacobean playwrights engaged as deeply with portraying English history as Shakespeare did. Shakespeare appropriated English Renaissance chronicles on medieval and early modern English monarchs and extended his dramatisation from the courts of the kings and queens to the society of the commoners from the years 1199 (King John's succession) to 1533 (the birth of Elizabeth I) selectively. His interest in history is unparalleled among early modern English playwrights. His reputation as a playwright for the public theatre was initially founded upon the success of his English history plays, which were deemed to constitute 'a great national dramatic epic'.[2] It would be too ambitious and impractical to analyse all the extant history plays of the early modern English theatre. Rather, this thesis sets out to focus on Shakespeare's English history plays, the mainstream of history plays in early modern theatre.

In a seminal study, *Engendering A Nation: A Feminist Account of Shakespeare's English Histories,* Jean E. Howard and Phyllis Rackin examine the portrayal of female characters in nine of the history plays, all except *Henry VIII and Edward III*. They argue that in the first tetralogy and in *King John*, women are more powerful and influential than the men involved in the politics of the chaotic England of the time. However, when England is united and peace is achieved, women's power and their transgression into

---

[2] Marion Wynne-Davies ed., *Bloomsbury Guides to English Literature: The Renaissance* (London: Bloomsbury, 1994), p. 160.

politics wane as they are once again subjugated to patriarchal authority. In Shakespeare's work, powerful women signify chaos and disorder; even though Shakespeare allows female characters lines and involvement in the action on the stage and depicts them as powerful matriarchs in the courts and on battlefields, most of their images are still negated.

According to Howard and Rackin, the negation propaganda is extended to the second tetralogy. They argue that female characters play minimal roles in *Richard II*, *Henry IV, Part I and II*, and *Henry V* and they are 'delimited by the private affective bonds of family loyalty' and 'preoccupied by concerns for their male relations'.[3] Howard and Rackin reckon that the division of public and private spheres and lives is a sign of the coming of modernity, which is suggested in the second tetralogy. Women's power is even more suppressed in the second tetralogy: when society is disordered, they do not obtain the chances to participate actively and simultaneously in the politics in the courts. Whereas when society regains its order, women resume the roles which are identified within the restraints of their marital status: daughters, wives, mothers, and widows, unlike men who are identified by their professions. Howard and Rackin argue that there are great and powerful women in the tetralogies, but they are either negated or later deprived of their voices.

Therefore, despite the power that women assume and exercise in the first tetralogy, the upheavals in politics and the subversion of gender hierarchies come to an end when order is retrieved. Howard's and Rackin's research reveals the reality of patriarchal societies in history and the dilemma facing modern feminist studies of early modern English literature. Previously, critics tended to find traits of feminism in early modern English literature, politics, and history, but Howard's and Rackin's work refutes this hypothesis, arguing that it is impossible for feminism to overturn history; early modern England cannot be read as a feminist or matriarchal land. The contribution of Howard's and Rackin's study is to bring the focus of scholars working in the fields of Shakespeare, women, and historical studies to bear on a few specific female characters to provide a reflection of early modern women in Shakespeare's plays. What Howard and Rackin present is a powerful analysis of a part of the truth about women and their representations in early modern England. With recent discoveries of various kinds of

---

[3] Jean E. Howard, and Phyllis Rackin, *Engendering a Nation: A Feminist Account of Shakespeare's English Histories* (London: Routledge, 1997), p. 140.

historical evidence about women's involvement in writing, publishing, religious and political matters, domestic and courtly affairs publicly or privately, more 'truths' about women are being continually discovered and a fuller picture of women's life and its representation is gradually revealed.[4]

This thesis focuses on the representations of queens in Shakespeare's English history plays. In *Women in Shakespeare: A Dictionary*, Alison Findlay gives the following definitions of queens in Shakespeare's plays: 'a female sovereign such as a goddess of mythology, a female ruler of an independent state, or the wife or consort of a king'.[5] Here Findlay is drawing attention to three types of queens: mythical queens, queens regnant, and queens consort. Although Shakespeare mostly portrayed mythical and historical queens, he made references to prominent biblical female figures in his depictions of some queens. In particular, he alludes to wise, virtuous, and able women, such as the Virgin Mary, Deborah, and Esther. Findlay observes some features of queens: representing government; objects of spectacles and rituals; images of majestic rhetoric; those in possession of emotional self-control and autonomous agency; and finally serving as models for women.[6] In the contexts of the previous Marian and the present Elizabethan reigns, female rule was seriously debated. The difference between kings and queens regnant, and the legitimacy of the Tudor succession and of Mary Queen of Scots, were discussed fervently in the treatises of John Knox, John Aylmer, John Leslie, and Thomas Smith.[7] The debates contributed to Shakespeare's various presentations of government and the political intervention of queens consort. As Findlay suggests, in the formation and reinforcement of queenship, spectacles and rhetoric are essential in establishing majesty; in fact, they contribute to one of the main differences between queens and common women. Although Findlay states that queens present the

---

[4] For example, see Anne Somerset, *Ladies in Waiting: From the Tudors to the Present Day* (London: Phoenix, 1984 and 2005); Margaret J. M. Ezell, *The Patriarch's Wife: Literary Evidence and the History of the Family* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1987); Kate Aughterson ed., *Renaissance Woman: A Sourcebook, Constructions of Femininity in England* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995); Betty S. Travitsky and Anne Lake Prescott eds., *Female and Male Voices in Early Modern England: An Anthology of Renaissance Writing* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000); Anita Pacheco ed., *A Companion to Early Modern Women's Writing* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002); Barbara J. Harris, *English Aristocratic Women, 1450-1550* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
[5] Alison Findlay, *Women in Shakespeare: A Dictionary* (London: Continuum, 2010), p. 335.
[6] Ibid*.,* pp. 335-336.
[7] For instance, see John Aylmer, *An harborowe for faithfull and trewe subiectes* (Strasbourg, 1559; Amsterdam, 1972), *STC* (2nd ed.)1005 and *ESTC* S100367; John Knox, *The first blast of the trumpet against the monstruous regiment of women* (Geneva, 1558; Amsterdam 1972), *STC* (2nd ed.) 15070, *ESTC* S108129; John Leslie, *A defence of the honour of the right highe, mightye and noble princesse Marie, queene of Scotlande and dowager of France [...]* (London: 1569), *ESTC* S108490; Thomas Smith, *De Republica Anglorum* (London: 1583), *ESTC* 117628.

possibility of autonomous female agency, in the limited space of her dictionary entry she does not explore further how queens make use of the specific royal identity to demonstrate and implement their autonomy. This thesis explores the practice of queens' authority in different courts, gardens, and battlefields, analysing these women's manipulation of their virtues and their self-empowerment in spatial terms.

This thesis is interested in queens in English history plays, as we can set Shakespeare's dramatisations against the narrations and records about these powerful and well-known women in historical documents. Considering the contemporary female rule of Elizabeth I and even previously of Mary I, representations of queens were an important topic of interest in Shakespeare's time. Unlike other thematic or general researches studying only one or a couple of queens, this thesis focuses on queens solely to generate a panorama of queenship under Shakespeare's dramatisation.

This thesis will first explore queens' virtues as cultural capital – a form of capital that can be accumulated, invested, and used according to Pierre Bourdieu – during the process of education, royal marital negotiation and family networking in the pursuit of queenship.[8] It will then read beyond the ambiguous spatial divisions of the public and the private where queens are practising their authority in spectacles, courts, chambers, gardens, and even on battlefields. Finally, it will trace how queens serve as eye-witnesses or living monuments and are vouchsafed, or automatically assume, the mission of historians, and explore how queens are memorialised in histories to form an iconographic history of queens.

This 'General Introduction' provides the contexts of Shakespeare's English queens in the playwright's time and in modern academia, including material pertaining to the Renaissance, early modern history and history plays, the issue of authorship, and a literature review regarding queenship. Three key ideas derived from early modern thought will serve to analyse Shakespeare's queens: virtue, space, and memorialisation.

'Renaissance Queenship in William Shakespeare's English History Plays'
• Renaissance and Early Modern

The term 'Renaissance queenship' in the title of this thesis would sound cacophonous for Joan Kelly-Gadol, who denies that women had a Renaissance.

---

[8] Pierre Bourdieu, 'The Forms of Capital', in *Sociology of Education: A Critical Reader*, ed. by Alan R. Sadovnik (New York: Routledge, 2007), pp. 83-95. Also see Pierre Bourdieu, and Jean-Claude Passeron, *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*, trans. Richard Nice (London: Sage, 1977, 1990).

According to *OED*, 'the Renaissance' means 'the revival of the arts and high culture under the influence of classical models, which began in Italy in the 14th cent. and spread throughout most of Europe by the end of the 16th; (also) the period during which this was in progress'.[9] Therefore, the Renaissance can refer to both the cultural development and the time period of this development. In her analysis of 'the Renaissance', Kelly-Gadol explicitly states that despite the development of 'mercantile and manufacturing economy' and the 'post-feudal' society, women did not have a 'renaissance' as men did, contending that the periodisation of the Renaissance neglects women's different historical experiences, especially in terms of the regulation of sexual, economic, political, and cultural roles, and ideology of and about women.[10] Those parts of the literature that nurtured the Renaissance involved courtly love, in which the chivalric theme subjugates women's sexuality to the ultimate spiritual love under the ideology of Christianity. The ideal relationship between a knight and his lady detached from women's general practice of their marital lives and paralysed their function in the running of the feudal society.[11] Kelly-Gadol's criticism attracted the feminist scholars of the 1980s, and with the introduction of new historicist studies, 'early modern' replaces 'renaissance' to refer, roughly, to the period of the fifteenth century to seventeenth century in English history. Thus, 'Renaissance' indicates the cultural activities of the early modern period, just as 'Reformation' refers to the religious transformations that were happening. As such the capitalised 'Renaissance' and 'Reformation' were not 'periods' of history but rather 'events' that occurred in different areas and in different times in history. Kelly-Gadol's feminist reminder does not mark 'Renaissance' with a masculine label; instead it clarifies the confusion of the mixed usage of cultural and historical concepts and terms.

This thesis emphasises 'Renaissance' as a specific cultural condition of early modern England, which incorporated the contexts of its political situation (Tudor reign and female rule), religious atmosphere (the Reformations), and artistic and literary development (the aftermath of the European Renaissance and England's independent culture). It agrees with Wynne-Davies's observation of the core aspects of English

---

[9] 'Renaissance, n.', *OED Online*, June 2011, Oxford University Press, UCL Library Online Sources: Database (http://dictionary.oed.com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/) [Accessed on 29 August 2011]
[10] Joan Kelly-Gadol, 'Did Women Have a Renaissance?' in *Becoming Visible: Women in European History*, ed. by Renate Bridenthal and Claudia Koonz (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1977), pp. 137-164 (pp. 139-140).
[11] Ibid., pp. 141-142.

Renaissance culture. First, 'the lateness' of the English Renaissance allowed it to assimilate more from the contemporary European Renaissance than directly from the classics. England's geographical and political independence from the Continent engendered a specific English culture. Its Renaissance literature had a more artistic than philosophical bent, which laid the foundations, probably, of early modern English drama. Finally, 'the coinciding of the Renaissance and the Reformation in England' created a more complicated condition for 'the rebirth' of culture in England.[12]

This thesis uses the term 'Renaissance Queenship' in its title because it considers the cultural context in which Shakespeare composed his plays with an emphasis on the way in which women were constructed in humanist thought, religious reformations, and the emerging consciousness of nation in early modern England. It understands that Shakespeare's history plays were cultural products of the print culture, theatre business, international trades, navigation and geographical discovery, and early colonial exploration, all of which paralleled, integrated, and contributed to the cultural context of the Renaissance. With regard to the wide European culture this thesis will draw on the writings of Niccolo Machiavelli, Juan Luis Vives, Edward Hall, Thomas Heywood, and many other early modern philosophers, historians, and writers to analyse Shakespeare's dramatisation of medieval and early modern queenship.

- **Histories and History Plays**

As the thesis focuses on queens in Shakespeare's English history plays, there are several questions to be clarified, such as whether history plays can be defined as history; what are the differences between history and history plays; and which plays can be counted as English history plays among Shakespeare's works?

What is history? Few have answered this question directly, but most of the chroniclers tried to explain the function of history and their methodology in writing histories in early modern England. I ask the question for two main reasons: first to analyse the difference between history and history plays and the difference between Renaissance and modern histories; and second to explore the idea of memory and history in terms of queenship. That is, in Shakespeare's English history plays, how his queens influence the writing of history, and aim not to be forgotten, and in the terms of literary history, how Shakespeare placed his queens in histories.

_____

[12] Wynne-Davies, *Bloomsbury Guides*, pp. 236-237.

When defining history Renaissance historians focused on the function of history with an attempt to validate their profession and mission as 'historians'. Edward Hall declared that *The Vnion* was the first complete national chronicle in English and believed it recorded the past of an England worth remembering, to advise, to honour, and to offer a mirror for the future England.[13] William Baldwin wrote *The Mirror for Magistrates* (1559), stories of famous and notorious political figures of the past in order to advise and educate contemporary officials on how they should fulfil their obligations.[14] In addition to the preservation and reflection of the past and present, these chroniclers also attempted to please their patrons – their sponsors directly and their monarchs indirectly. Overriding the secular royalties, the providence of the holy and ultimate governor of the world, God, the King of kings, is the propeller of world history; John Foxe wrote the *Actes and Monument*s (1563) to illustrate and establish the ecclesiastical history of Protestant England.

Historians might not disclose their agenda directly, but they often revealed the difficulty of writing the history in order to demonstrate the veracity of their history writing and validate their authority. In *The Vnion*, Hall at times self-questioned his ability to represent historical moments, such as the greatness of the wedding of Henry VIII to Katherine of Aragon: 'What should I speake or write, of the sumpteous fine, and delicate meates, prepared for this high and honorable coronacion, prouided for aswel in the parties beyond the sea, as in many and sundery places, within this realme, where God so abundantly hath sent suche plentie and foyson?'[15] Hall's confession of a historian's incapability is made with an attempt to show his honesty and objectivity when writing the chronicle; the confession is also a rhetorical device to suggest that the magnificence of the ceremony was beyond the power of words. In the margin of the *Chronicles* (1577, 1587), Holinshed and his editorial teams added annotations about which sources they were using, and they included different versions of the same event in the text itself. Yet they sometimes left it to the readers to choose the version they would like to believe. For Holinshed, the purpose of history writing was to record what had been said and thought at the moment, and the multiple voices, thoughts, opinions

---

[13] Edward Hall, *The vnion of the two noble and illustre famelies of Lancastre & Yorke, beyng long in continuall discension for the croune of this noble realme: with al the actes done in both the tymes of the princes, both of the one linage & of the other....*(London: Rychard Grafton, 1550), *STC* (2nd ed.) 12723.
[14] William Baldwin, *The Mirror for Magistrates* (1559), ed. by Lily B. Campbell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938).
[15] Edward Hall, 'The triumphant reigne of Kyng Henry the VIII'', in *The Vnion*, pp. i-CC.lxiii(p. iiii).

pertaining to an event; therefore, this 'multivocality' was a way to depict exactly what happened.[16] Comparing the styles of these two chroniclers, W. Gordon Zeeveld suggests that Hall deliberately created a history writing that combined the memorialisation of English greatness and the making of the state with the author's own strong self-conscious identity as the first English chronicler, while Holinshed trimmed Hall's narrations when quoting from *The Vnion* and created a 'shorter but less colourful narrative'.[17] Annabel Patterson notices Holinshed's interests in the 'voices and views' of the 'common people, the artisanal and labouring classes'; like *The Vnion*, the *Chronicle* is a documentary history of the royal households, but it also serves as a record of the variety of cultures in early modern England.[18]

Hall's and Holinshed's attitudes and concerns suggest that 'history means interpretation', emphasising the role of historians, weakening the myth of the objectivity of history, and breaking with the dullness of historiography.[19] Philip Sidney disputed their notions, arguing instead in *The Defence of Poesie* that

> [The historian is] loaden with old Mouse-eaten Records, authorising himselfe for the most part vpon other histories, whose greatest authorities are built vppon the notable foundation *Heresay*, hauing much ado to accord differing writers, & to pick truth out of partiality: better acquainted with a 1000 yeres ago, then with the present age, and yet better knowing how this world goes, then how his own wit runnes, curious for Antiquities [...].[20]

According to Sidney, historians live in the past rather than the present, contradicting what Hall and Holinshed expect their histories would offer – a mirror to the world to teach and advise. Sidney believed that historians did not enjoy the liberty of imagination as poets did. Despite Sidney's belittlement of a historian's creativity, he pointed out the editor-like role that Hall and Holinshed played when they selected the sources they used and the voices they chose to adapt.

---

[16] Annabel Patterson, *Reading Holinshed's Chronicles* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), p. 7.
[17] W. Gordon Zeeveld, 'The Influence of Hall on Shakespeare's English Historical Plays', *ELH* 3.4 (1936), pp. 317-353 (p.319).
[18] Patterson, *Reading Holinshed's Chronicles*, p. 5-7.
[19] E. H. Carr, *What is History?* [1961] 1st ed., (Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave, 2001), p. 18.
[20] Philip Sidney, *The Defence of Poesie* (London: [by Thomas Creede] for William Ponsonby, 1595), *STC* (2nd ed.) 22535 and *ESTC* S119205. C4r.

History writing involves more awareness on the historians' behalf rather than lifeless and mechanic archival consultation. The dullness in Sidney's imagined process of history writing is amended by E. H. Carr in a vivid metaphor: 'The facts are available to the historian in documents, inscriptions and so on, like fish on a fishmonger's slab. The historian collects them, take them home and cooks and serves them in whatever style appeals to him'.[21] However, Carr analyses the process of writing history further back to the time before the documents are even archived in libraries. In *What is History*, a collection of series of lectures in the 1960s, Carr traces the relation between facts, historians, and history before 'facts' are there to be selected:

> The facts are really not at all like fish on the fishmonger's slab. They are like fish swimming about in a vast and sometimes inaccessible ocean; and what the historian catches will depend, partly on chance, but mainly on what part of the ocean he chooses to fish in and what tackle he choose to use – these two factors being, of course, determined by the kind of fish he wants to catch. By and large, the historian will get the kind of facts he wants.[22]

Selection is everywhere in history writing. The unselected facts are eventually relegated to oblivion with those lost pieces of history; that is to say, unselected facts are forgotten. Selected thoughts, voices, written words need to be accepted and recognised as such to be 'facts'. To a considerable extent, facts are the products of the historian's choice. Therefore, it is important to understand the relationship between the historian and the present, knowing 'history consists essentially in seeing the past through the eyes of the present and in the light of its problems'.[23] Historians are not recorders, but evaluators; Hall and Holinshed were not chroniclers, but writers.

Similarly, Helen Hackett elaborates on the relationship between historical and literary writings thus:

> History, then, is always inevitably subjective, and shades into myth. Works of history, biography, or textual scholarship may aspire to objectivity but cannot avoid selective emphases, omissions, and

---

[21] Carr, *What is History?*, p. 3.
[22] Ibid., p. 18.
[23] Ibid., p. 15.

interpretations which reflect the concerns and interests of their authors and readerships. Fiction, drama, the pictorial arts, and film deal in more visible and self-conscious adaptations, distortions, and elaborations of the archival record. Across all these genres, the construction of different versions of history forms its own metahistory, a history of ideology.[24]

History is more than a record of political happenings, it can be represented in more than one medium, and its definition, content, and formation are consistently in the process of being adapted, appropriated, and reconfigured. Shakespeare is a writer of history and his history plays are important archives of Renaissance thoughts about medieval and early modern English history. The selection and creation of factual and fictional elements in Shakespeare's history plays reveal the ideology that Shakespeare explored in his Renaissance context. E. M. W. Tillyard explains that Shakespeare accords with the Elizabethan conception of world order, where every figure and matter is a piece of the 'great jig-saw puzzle of the universe'.[25] Tillyard's concept of Shakespeare's world has been severely challenged.[26] Howard and Rackin argue that Shakespeare's history plays contribute to the formation of England's national consciousness, but they further argue that the plays imply that 'nations are artificial creations, and the unity of a nation is a carefully constructed fiction'.[27] In terms of history writing, Howard and Rackin state that the main contribution Shakespeare made in terms of his history plays in comparison with historiographies by other historians and playwrights is his innovation of theatre as a medium of history writing and his establishment of history plays as a genre.

- **Defining Shakespeare's English History Plays**

In the list of contents of the 1623 First Folio, there are ten plays under the taxonomy of 'Histories': *The Life and Death of King John*, *The Life and Death of Richard the second*, *The First part of King Henry the Fourth*, *The Second part of K. Henry the*

---

[24] Helen Hackett, *Shakespeare and Elizabeth: The Meeting of Two Myths* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2009), p. 7.

[25] E.M. W. Tillyard, *Shakespeare's History Plays* [1944], 1st ed., (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986), p. 20.

[26] For instance, see Jonathan Dollimore, 'Introduction: Shakespeare, Cultural Materialism and the New Historicism' and Alan Sinfield, 'Introduction: Reproduction, Interventions' in *Political Shakespeare: New Essays in Cultural Materialism*, ed. by Dollimore and Sinfield (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1985), pp. 5-6 and pp. 131-132. For a synthesis of critics' opinions on Tillyard's 'Elizabethan World Picture', see Michael Taylor, 'Shakespeare in History and History in Shakespeare' in *Shakespeare Criticism in the Twentieth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 163-193 (especially pp. 168-190).

[27] Howard and Rackin, *Engendering a Nation*, p. 12.

fourth, *The Life of King Henry Fift*, *The First part of King Henry the Sixt*, *The Second part of King Henry the Sixt*, *The Third part of King Henry the Sixt*, *The Life and Death of Richard the Third*, *The Life of King Henry the Eight*. This thesis includes the above ten 'Histories' and *Edward III* (1596); however, *Macbeth*, *King Lear*, and *Cymbeline* are not included.[28] These three plays were listed under the category of 'Tragedies' in the 'Catalogve' of the First Folio. As to the discussion of queenship in English history plays, Shakespeare's Macbeth deviates from the historical monarch too much to associate them together apart from their names. Although some of Shakespeare's dramatisations differ from their original historical description, such as the image of Richard III in Hall's and Holinshed's chronicles and Shakespeare's interpretation of the King's action and psychology in the play, Shakespeare followed basic historical facts to arrange the plots of his English history plays. Even though the playwright used poetic licence to contract time span or alter time and spatial arrangements to create dramatic effects and despite the fact that he did not write these history plays according to their chronological order, these English history plays are interlocked with each other. For instance, the death of Richard II haunts Henry IV and even Henry V throughout the later parts of the second tetralogy. The characters and plots in these history plays were also highly concerned with the formation of history and construction of narratives. In contrast, despite the rich political elements in the plots, *Macbeth* contains fewer narrations concerning history writing in the conversations between characters or in plot arrangement and is less related to Shakespeare's other English or even Scottish history plays.

   King Lear is related to the historical King Lear, who ruled around 800 B.C. even 'before the founding of Rome' and thus the history is too ancient to be grouped with Shakespeare's other English history plays.[29] In addition, R. A. Foakes points out that unlike other English history plays, *King Lear* does not mention any of Lear's antecedents; it is a play which 'has no past', and thereby it is often deemed as a play with references to classical literature and reflecting on the Jacobean reign rather than one of relevance to the Lear in history.[30] *Cymbeline*, unlike most English history plays, is mainly based on a tale by Geoffrey of Monmouth and contains a few non-historical

---

[28] *Edward III* was censored, then neglected, and eventually its authorship was questioned. These issues will be discussed in the next section, 'Authorship'.

[29] R. A. Foakes, 'Introduction' in William Shakespeare's *King Lear*, ed. by R. A. Foakes, Arden Shakespeare, 2nd series (London: Thomas Nelson and Son Ltd, 1997), pp. 1-151 (p. 13).

[30] Ibid., pp. 12-13.

plots. Both *King Lear* and *Cymbeline* focus more on the portrayal of human nature than historical development. Furthermore, in studies of genre, *Macbeth* (1603-09) and *King Lear* (1605) are mainly thought to be tragedy (1603-09) and *Cymbeline* (1611) is classified as a late romance. Shakespeare's 'history plays' were first established as a genre because of the content list in the 1623 First Folio. *Macbeth*, *King Lear*, and *Cymbeline* are titled as 'tragedy' and are not listed under the category of history plays in the Folio. Most of all, as Helen Hackett notices, both regarding history in general or in artistic adaptations and representations, the key element is 'meta-history'. The English history plays contained in this thesis often refer to and even discuss the writing of history and history itself. However, by comparison, *Macbeth*, *King Lear*, and *Cymbeline* do not have such a strong focus on this topic. As this thesis focuses on the dramatisation of queenship, it notices that elements of queenship in Shakespeare's English history are associated with, extended to, and borrowed from the rest of his plays. For instance, Margaret of Anjou's military and amazonian image reminds us of Tamora in *Titus Andronicus*, which was 'premiered in the same playhouse where *Henry VI* was first performed and with the same company, almost exactly two years later'.[31] The language of Margaret and Suffolk in *Henry VI, Part One* is compared with that of Cordelia in *King Lear* in terms of the definition and interpretation of queenship, such as titles, power, and relationship with the monarchs.[32]

Shakespeare's historical dramatisation of queens can also be cross-referenced with queens in other dramatists' history plays. Margaret of Anjou is often compared with Queen Isabella in *Edward II* by Marlowe. In terms of plots and historical happenings, *Edward II* is more similar to *Richard II*, but in light of queenship, Queen Isabella might be more akin to Margaret of Anjou in *Henry VI*, especially concerning their suspicious extra-marital affairs with courtiers, their claim for their son's inheritance to the throne, their search for foreign alliance, their actions in the courts and on the battlefields. The difference between the relationship of the royal couples in *Edward II* and *Henry VI* is Edward II does not have strong emotional attachment to the queen, but more to his favourites, first Gaveston and then the Spencer father and son. While Henry VI is affectionate towards Margaret of Anjou, since they get married, he is less strong-willed

---

[31] Carol Chillington Rutter, 'Of Tygers' Hearts and Players' Hides', in *Shakespeare's Histories*, ed. by Cavanagh, Hampton-Reeves, and Longstaffe, pp.182-197 (pp. 196-197).

[32] Thomas H. McNeal, 'Margaret of Anjou: Romantic Princess and Troubled Queen', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 9 (1958), 1-10 (pp. 4-6).

than Edward II and therefore, Margaret is able to control and fill in the power vacuum of the English court, rules for Henry VI, and leads his court and army.

The comparison and contrast between *Richard II* and *Edward II* focus on government and kingship. First, both kings have favourites and thus sabotage their government and causes discontent among other nobles. In *Richard II,* Bolingbroke accepts his banishment ordered by Richard II; while Mortimer in *Richard III* allies with the Queen to conspire agains the King and his favourites. In both plays, the kings are accused as the threats to kingship; they have the right but not the ability to rule and thus engender disputes about their legitimacy and discussions of kingship. However, after Richard II's death, his innocence is remembered and appropriated during Henry IV's reign dramatised in *Henry IV, Part One* and *Two.* Yet, because Marlowe did not write about Edward III's reign, therefore, it is difficult to see what influence occurs to their son's reign despite the twist of plot development in *Edward II*, when the king's image is amended without clear trace: he becomes more innocent and might gain the audience's sympathetic support for him. In addition, after the murder of Richard II, Bolingbroke takes over and becomes King Henry IV of England; however, the shadow of his usurpation keeps haunting him and causes doubts about his legitimacy all over his reign. To repent, Henry IV attempted to conduct a holy war to Jerusalem, but could not make it; thus, he passed this mission to Henry V in his final will. On the other hand, in *Edward II*, after the King died, his son, Edward III, succeeds. Therefore, there is no question about the new King's legitimacy; the ending of the play – for Edward II to regain his justice – is Edward III's execution of Mortimer.

As a 'historian' or a 'history play dramatist', Shakespeare's speciality is to stage historical characters who review histories, serve as witnesses, memorialise, comment on the past and present, and prophesy the future in his English history plays. Among these historical characters, queens take advantage of being close to their kings and the core of power, and they often take the role of historians either automatically or under commission.

- **Authorship**

Edward III is included in the list of history plays in this thesis, but it did not appear in the First Folio in 1623. Giorgio Melchiori, the editor of *Edward III* in the *New Cambridge Shakespeare* series, explains that the disappearance of the play in the First

Folio is the result of the sensitivity of the Scottish issues therein. After its first printing

around 1596 and second edition in 1599 (both anonymously), *Edward III* was not staged

publicly or published again until Richard Rogers and William Ley catalogued it as one

of Shakespeare's works in Thomas Goff's *The Careless Shepherdess* in 1656. Melchiori

argues that as *Edward III* is a history play and its only comic plot is the depiction of the

Scottish King David and his court, the ultimate anti-protagonists, the negation of the

Scots and Scotland in the play induced serious censorship.[33] This initial anonymity and

eventual disappearance generate doubts about its authorship. Before Melchiori was able

to include the play in the *New Cambridge Shakespeare*, Eliot Slater had reviewed

disputes about *Edward III*'s authorship and used statistical research to argue for

Shakespeare's authorship of this play. Slater concentrates on usages of rare-word

vocabulary in *Edward III* in comparison to Shakespeare's other history plays and other

playwrights' writings (mainly Marlowe's).[34] He concludes that 'it is compatible with

authorship by Shakespeare at an early stage in his dramatic career', further stating that

parts of *Edward III* might have been written at different times.[35] Therefore, Slater

believes that *Edward III* was solely by Shakespeare but in different times: part A [1.2,

2.1, 2.2, 4.4] was completed earlier, while part B [the rest of the play] was later. Slater

focuses on Shakespeare's composition of the play and does not explore if it was a

collaboration, and if so, who the plausible collaborators were. Melchiori defends

Shakespeare's hand in it, but he does not exclude the possibility of a collaboration.

Melchiori does not clarify who collaborated with Shakespeare, but summarises his

observation of scholarship on authorship study of the play: scholars 'either tentatively

accepted Shakespeare's authorship of the whole, or saw the play as the work of others

revised by Shakespeare'.[36] Therefore, Shakespeare's hand 'as a collaborator can be

detected in many scenes of the play, but his sole authorship of at least Act 2 is

undeniable'.[37] This play is of interest in this thesis because of its portrayal of two

dominant female characters: the Countess of Salisbury and Queen Philippa. Both

characters demonstrate the virtues and abilities of queenship as discussed in this thesis.

Despite the fact that the play has not been recognised and included widely in various

---

[33] Giorgio Melchiori, 'Introduction', in *King Edward III*, by William Shakespeare, ed. by Giorgio Melchiori (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 1-51 (pp. 10-13).
[34] Eliot Slater, *The Problem of* The Reign of King Edward III*: A Statistical Approach* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).
[35] Ibid., p. 135.
[36] Melchiori, 'Introduction', p. 17.
[37] Ibid.

editions of Shakespeare's canon, even if it is a collaborative work, Shakespeare's contribution in its dramatisation of aristocratic women, as Melchiori identifies it, seems undeniable. Therefore, along with the ten plays listed in the First Folio, this thesis considers *Edward III* as the eleventh and will explore its rich depictions of queenship.

In addition to the possible collaborative writing of *Edward III*, *Henry VIII* has been widely considered as a play by William Shakespeare and John Fletcher. The concept of an 'author' in theatrical practices is different from general literary ones, even in modern situations: there are screenwriters, directors, costume designers, stage designers, and presenters of body and voice (actors and actresses); the presentation of a play is a collaboration of creativities and an implementation of stage participants. Literary scholars tend to focus on the authorship of a play, the 'plotting' or writing, mainly the composition of lines that are spoken by the performers.[38] Even so, the situation in early modern English theatres still made it difficult to define a single author. According to Tiffany Stern, a printed text is a selected collection of written documents relating to a performance: the plot-scenarios, playbills and title-pages, arguments, prologues and epilogues, songs, and back-stage plots to name a few.[39] Unlike Stern's focus on performance and theatrical practice, most bibliographical scholars analyse the authorship of early modern English plays from the perspective of 'books'. Therefore, when naming Shakespeare as an author or as a playwright, he is thought to be, to borrow from Stern, the main 'play-patcher', who has contributed the most to the printed text or book of the performance.[40] The key to the disputation of Shakespearean authorship is the myth of an author's authority over the text. Different from a post-modernist idea about an author's impossible control over his text, early modern playwrights lived in a period where the English language was fluid as it underwent one of the early stages of its innovation and renovation, the inauguration of writing as a profession and creativity as a business, and the growing theatre culture in the Elizabethan and Jacobean reigns.

The relationship between the author, the work, and the reader is also further complicated by the consideration of the theatre as a medium, the cultural value of Shakespeare as an icon, and the central place of his work in the English literary canon.

---

[38] Melchiori, 'Introduction', p. 14.
[39] Tiffany Stern, *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
[40] Ibid., p. 1.

This is what Gordon McMullan intends to clarify when he discusses issues of collaboration and authorship regarding *Henry VIII*.[41]

The argument of the authorship of *Henry VIII* seems to be settled and its collaboration has been confirmed. Gordon McMullan and Brian Vickers argue that *Henry VIII* is written by Shakespeare and John Fletcher, although R. A. Foakes, the editor of *Henry VIII* in the previous series of the Arden Shakespeare, supports Shakespeare's single authorship of the play.[42] According to Vickers, Shakespeare's composition includes Act I, Scene i and ii; Act II, Scene iii and iv; line 1-203 in Act III, Scene ii; Act V, Scene i; while Fletcher's encompasses Prologue; Act I, Scene iii and iv; Act II, Scene i and ii; Act III, Scene i and line 203-end in Scene ii; Act IV, Scene i and ii; Act V, scene ii, iii, and iv.[43] Slightly differently from this division, Cyrus Hoy argues that some scenes are 'mainly by Shakespeare with "Fletcherian interpolation"', including Act II, Scene i and ii; line 203-end in Act III, Scene ii; Act IV, Scene i and ii.[44] Reviewing the history of authorship study of *Henry VIII*, Vickers notices that '[the] knowledge [of authorship study] undergoes a cyclic structure of affirmation, denial, and reaffirmation'.[45] Saying this, Vickers admits that the research of authorship can hardly reach the finalising point, but scholars should keep using new methods and tools to examine different hypotheses and testify to previous arguments.

Arguing from a cultural perspective, McMullan, the editor of *Henry VIII* in the third series of the Arden Shakespeare texts, deduces that the condition in early modern English theatres suggests a collaboration between Shakespeare and Fletcher. McMullan proposes that the issue of authorship is often investigated through three kinds of evidence: external, intuitive, and internal. The external evidence is the title page of *Henry VIII* in the 1623 First Folio which only lists Shakespeare as the author, excluding Fletcher's involvement. Intuitive evidence is ambiguous and is often based on scholars'

---

[41] Gordon McMullan, 'Introduction: Collaboration' in William Shakespeare's and John Fletcher's *King Henry VIII (All is True)*, ed. by Gordon McMullan, Arden Shakespeare, 3rd series (London: Thomson Learning, 2000), pp. 180-199. Also see Brian Vickers, '*Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* with John Fletcher', in *Shakespeare, Co-Author: A Historical Study of Five Collaborative Plays* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 333-432.

[42] See William Shakespeare, *King Henry VIII*, ed. by R. A. Foakes, Arden Shakespeare, 2nd series (London and New York: Methuen & Co, 1957 and Routledge, 1991 and 1994).

[43] Vickers, *Shakespeare, Co-Author*, p. 333-432. In terms of authorship study in different editions of editorial 'Introduction' of *Henry VIII*, Vickers prefers the 1999 Oxford edition by Jay Halio; see *King Henry VIII, or All is True*, ed. Jay Halio (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999). For Vickers's preference for Halio's study, see *Shakespeare, Co-Author*, pp. 394-395, and for his criticisms against McMullan's 'Introduction', pp. 397-402.

[44] McMullan also makes a list comparing different critics' opinions of the distribution of scenes to the two playwrights; see McMullan, 'Appendix 3', pp. 448-449.

[45] Vickers, *Shakespeare, Co-Author*, p. 388.

subjective tastes and a comparison of styles, highlighting the question of whether the writing is similar to that found in Shakespeare's other work. Intuitive evidence often inspires doubts about authorship and leads to further linguistic analyses (the internal evidence) of the texts in question, dissecting the plays into scenes or lines by separate playwrights. Corpus linguistics provides statistics of specific spellings, word usages, or metrical customs and preferences applied by writers. The establishment of such a Shakespearean corpus is based on an assumption about an extant anthology of Shakespearean works; however, such a circulation of linguistic evidence faces the problem of self-referentiality. This quasi-scientific approach is challenged by the conditions of the formation of the English language, and the nature of the theatre business and printing culture in early modern England, such as the inconsistency of spelling, the participation and interference of scribes, and the size of paper and the printing type setting. Furthermore, from a broader cultural perspective, *Henry VIII* contains many quotations almost identical to those found in Holinshed's *Chronicles* – another complex factor in the study of authorship. McMullan reviews these approaches and concludes that since *Henry VIII* was catalogued in the 1623 First Folio, since it has been 'read, performed, and witnessed in a Shakespearean context', and since much 'circumstantial' (internal) evidence indicates that Shakespeare and Fletcher had worked together, we should read *Henry VIII* as a collaboration of the two playwrights.[46]

Vickers also argues for the collaborative authorship of *Henry VIII* but he relies more on linguistic tools and historical evidence to analyse grammar units, stylometry, linguistic preferences, language changes, dating and chronology to name but a few. He criticises Foakes as a 'Shakespearean conservator', condemning his ignorance of the statistical evidence of Fletcher's style, ultimately questioning Foakes's fundamental disbelief in the linguistic approach to Shakespearean research. He also notices Foakes's self-contradiction: Foakes suspects the stylistic approach but he calculates and analyses recurring imagery of bodily movement – that is, Foakes relies on the analysis of a particular literary style – in other Shakespearean plays to defend the playwright's sole authorship of *Henry VIII*.[47] However, Vickers is not satisfied with McMullan's arguments either. He reproaches McMullan for misunderstanding the issue of authorship and the role played by 'intuitive' evidence when identifying an author, and blames him

---

[46] McMullan, 'Introduction: Collaboration', p. 198.
[47] Vickers, *Shakespeare, Co-Author*, pp. 382-383.

for undervaluing bibliographical, textual and linguistic studies to date – the various and repeated experiments that scholars have made efforts to examine the language of the play.[48] Furthermore, Vickers concludes that McMullan has ignored the history of literary and linguistic studies of authority, fallen into a 'theoretical vacuum', and 'dismissed' collaboration, which was 'a frequent practice in the drama between 1580 and 1642', as 'an irrelevant issue by claiming that theatre by its very nature is "collaborative".[49] Despite Vickers's dissatisfaction with and strong criticisms against McMullan's research and interpretation of authorship and collaboration, this thesis, as it focuses on queenship, only borrows from their research and draws a simple list of the general attribution of scenes to Shakespeare and Fletcher as stated previously.

This dissertation is aware of the difference between McMullan's inclination towards cultural study and Vickers's emphasis on a metrical and linguistic approach. Bearing this in mind, this thesis concentrates on analysing the representations of Queen Katherine of Aragon, Anne Boleyn, and Princess Elizabeth Tudor. In reading these queens, this thesis does not distinguish between the scenes or lines written by Shakespeare and those by Fletcher, but instead builds on understanding of the conditions of literary compositions, and theatre cultures and business in early modern England. Queens in Shakespeare's history plays are staged in the context of decades of female rule and various religious, historical, and literary representations of queens consort and regnant. The following sections will introduce queenship of medieval queens consort, which the playwright appropriated from historical chronicles, and queenship of early modern queens regnant (of Mary I and of Elizabeth I), which was the context of his time. The queenship in these two periods form the basis of this thesis's examination of Shakespeare's dramatisation of queenship.

• **Representations of Queens and Contexts of Female Rule**

It was not until feminist studies prospered after the 1980s that scholars started to turn their attention to Shakespeare's queens. Studies of queenship have flourished in the last two decades; most focus on representations of medieval queens consort in historical

---

[48] Ibid., pp. 397-402.
[49] Ibid, p. 400 and 398.

chronicles and artistic royal iconographies.[50] As most of the queens in Shakespeare's history plays are medieval queens consort in the chronicles, it is necessary to know the basic picture of medieval queenship under modern critics' examination. Erin Gabrielle Barrett analyses early medieval queenship in the light of royal iconography in portraits and other visual representations, discovering that in addition to being mothers and wives, the iconographic representations of queens indicate the importance of their roles in establishing the legitimacy of their royal family and its government and in fortifying international networks through a gift exchange culture.[51] Barrett's research suggests that as early as the medieval period, both historical evidence and artistic representations have showed how queens consort performed their duties beyond the domestic definition of housewifery, acting as helpmates and governesses inside and outside their kings' courts. Furthermore, medieval queenship has helped us to understand the later practice of queenship in terms of their biological, political, and economic functions. Queens consort 'played a crucial role in the creation and protection of the legitimacy' of the royal families into which they married.[52] In addition to their role as vessels of procreation, they often possessed their own households, the government of which demanded good management in economic and political business, such as revenues, expenditure, and patronage. As most of them were foreign queens, their adaptation to English native culture demonstrates their perseverance and strength, but it also suggests 'the isolation and vulnerability produced by this almost universal practice of royal exogamy'.[53] Their foreignness weaves international networks in politics and this is often commemorated in the legacy of art, such as the elaborate tombs of Eleanor of Castile and Philippa of Hainault, the queens of Edward I and of Edward III respectively.[54]

In her analysis of queenship in Anglo-Saxon literature, Stacy S. Klein questions whether queenship was even an institution before medieval England or merely a

---

[50] For instance, see John Carmi Parsons, 'The Queen's Intercession in Thirteenth-Century England' in *Power of the Weak: Studies on Medieval Women*, ed. by Jennifer Carpenter and Sally-Beth MacLean (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995), pp. 147-177. Julie Ann Smith, 'The Earliest Queen-Making Rites', *Church History* 66 (1997), 18-35. Pauline Stafford, *Queen Emma and Queen Edith: Queenship and Women's Power in Eleventh-Century England* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1997), and Pauline Stafford's earlier work, *Queens, Concubines, and Dowagers: The King's Wife in the Early Middle Ages* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1983).
[51] Erin Gabrielle Barrett, *Art and the Construction of Early Medieval Queenship: The Iconography of the Joint Royal/ Imperial Portrait and the Visual Representation of the Ruler's Consort*, University of London, 1997 (Ph.D. Thesis).
[52] Anne J. Duggan, 'Introduction' in *Queens and Queenship*, ed. by Duggan, pp. xv-xxii (p. xviii).
[53] Ibid., p. xviii.
[54] Ibid., p. xix.

construction that is imposed by modern historians.[55] She notices that queens' regency and their counsels were common in Anglo-Saxon England, in which, unlike Elizabethan England, a queen's ability to rule was not questioned. However, the fact that wives were easily replaceable and the existence of a number of concubines for the kings make for unstable ground for queens as the Benedictine reform of marriage law did not take place until the tenth century.[56] The unsystematic marriage law also contributed to an undefined queenship. Because of the possibility of changing queens easily, what queens might and should do was uncertain; this situation accidentally provided queens with opportunities to intervene in political and spiritual matters. As Klein argues, queenship, thus, was not a defined institution, but more 'an idea that took shape within the particular contexts in which it was enacted'.[57] That is to say, queenship metamorphoses to fulfil different roles such as regent, counsel, or consort, according to different situations. Queenship as an idea is fashioned through 'royal women's symbolic associations with particular virtues, biblical figures, or institutions, as forged through biblical exegesis and patristic commentaries'.[58] The researches of Barrett, Duggan, and Klein provide good approaches for studying queens in Shakespeare's history plays, especially in terms of their relation to the patriarchal authorities and regarding the iconography of queenship which is cultivated through historical and biblical typological female figures and enacted in the contexts of female rule in early modern England.

- **Queens Regent, Regnant and Consort: Kingship and Queenship in the 'Two Bodies' Theory**

    As the most obvious difference between a male and female ruler is their biological sex, the idea of the king's two bodies, physical mortality and spiritual sustainability, sets precedent for the discussion of the legitimacy of female rule and thus the concept of the queen's two bodies is born. Ernst H. Kantorowicz first analyses the juristic and religious origins of the idea of king's two bodies and argues that Shakespeare's *Richard II* is a play representative of this theory.[59] He also applied the 'phoenix' narrative to argue the

---

[55] Stacy S. Klein, *Ruling Women: Queenship and Gender in Anglo-Saxon Literature* (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2006).
[56] Ibid., pp. 10-12.
[57] Ibid., p. 6.
[58] Ibid. p. 7.
[59] Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1957), pp. 26-27.

attributes of immortality and resurrection in the body politic of kingship.[60] Marie Axton argues that the theory of the king's two bodies was never a fact, but rather an invented discourse that helped to describe and explain, and was ultimately used as a tool to balance, the power between the king and the state.[61] In accord with contemporary events, this discourse might be presented or adapted via various media, such as lawsuit cases, political debates, and stage plays. Similarly, the discourse of the queen's two bodies was exploited to reinforce Elizabeth I's rule and thus solved the succession problems that plagued her. In her first speech to her parliament Elizabeth I used the term 'body politic', and in 1561, the concept of the queen's two bodies was called for:

> The body politic was supposed to be *contained within the natural body of the Queen*. When lawyers spoke of this body politic they referred to a specific quality: the essence of *corporate perpetuity*. The Queen's natural body was subject to infancy, infirmity, error and old age; her body politic, created out of a combination of faith, ingenuity and practical expediency, was held to be unerring and immortal.[62]

The king's two bodies were distinguished as a natural body and a political one. This division, one based on mortality and spirituality, was the same for the queen's two bodies, but it was later further emphasised by the issue of gender: the body natural was traditionally female, while the body politic was male.

This thesis expands on this concept, proposing a notion of the queen's two bodies for queens consort. Different from kings and queens regnant, queens consort and their legitimacy and rights are created through marriage, rather than from genealogy. Similar to those of male and female monarchs, the physical bodies of queens consort might influence the development of the realms: they could be the medium of power as their natal identity was sometimes used as the cause for expansion; the carrier of power as they were exchanged for peace or alliance in international marriages; or mainly, the vessel of power in their role of procreating future heirs. Queens consorts' physical

---

[60] Ibid., pp. 388-413.
[61] Marie Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies: Drama and the Elizabethan Succession* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1977), pp. 11-12.
[62] Ibid., p. 12. As for Elizabeth I's speech, see Queen Elizabeth I, 'Queen Elizabeth's First Speech, Hatfield, November 20, 1558', in *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, ed. by Leah. S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2000), p. 52.

bodies are sometimes interpreted with a negative image as dangerous for the future heirs. For instance, their wombs become the battlefields of life and death for the foetuses; in *Henry VIII*, the King describes how Queen Katherine of Aragon's womb is fatal to male heirs: 'If it conceived a male child by me, should/ Do not more offices of life to't than/ The grave does yield to th' dead' (*HVIII* 2.4.185-188).

In contrast to the physiological significance and function of a queen consort's body, the symbolic significance of their bodies is to establish a cultural rather than legal or political legitimacy for the succession or transfer of the queens' title, status, and privileges. Kings are created through succession, whereas queens consort are made through royal marriage. The question is whether one can apply the concept of the queen's two bodies to a queen consort, that is, whether there is an everlasting body politic for her and if so, what it would be? According to Marie Axton, the concept of the king's two bodies originates from an adaptation of the Church's economic relationship with secular property. Lands were supposed to be inherited by sons from their fathers on a basis of biological genealogy. Yet, for land owned by churches, this succession did not occur as the property remained continually in the possession of the church; even though the managers – the abbots – would change, the ownership remained the same.[63] From a legal perspective, this concept is similar to the modern idea of a corporation and its relationship to the property. This *corporate perpetuity* is borrowed to explain the relationship between the king and his kingdom. For instance, Henry VIII 'treated the crown as property' and '[exploited] his legal prerogative to authorise' his favourable line of descent, securing his male and female children's succession to the English crown.[64] Therefore, the concept of the king's two bodies, as Kantorowicz terms it, is a 'Christian political theology'; it is, in origin, an economic account of inheritance.[65]

Based on the political and economic elements of the king's two bodies, I argue that the queen's two bodies can be reasoned likewise. The formation of queenship, unlike that of kingship, was not founded on biological or political lineage, but on social relation of marriage, while its succession among queens was based on cultural terms. Despite the decay of the queens' body natural, their body politic – the virtues, manners, and derivative cultures, or 'queenship'– could be, to borrow Axton's terms, 'held to be

---

[63] Ibid., pp. 13-14.
[64] Leonard Tennenhouse, 'Strategies of State and Political Plays: *A Midsummer Night's Dream, Henry IV, Henry V, Henry VIII*', in *Political Shakespeare*, ed. by Dollimore and Sinfield, pp.109-128 (p. 113).
[65] Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies*, p. 506.

unerring and immortal'.[66] It might be more appropriate to term the body politic as the body cultural for queens consort for it can then be distinguished from the body politic of a queen regnant in the light of disputes of political and legal legitimacy. Therefore, the body cultural indicates the succession of queenship among queens consort, queens regnant, and even other prominent female figures in histories – it carries their shared cultural attributes, such as the qualities, abilities, wisdom of a queen. For instance, in various writings about, and of, Elizabeth I, we may see that the queen borrows merits from Deborah, Esther, and the Virgin, while in later literature and history, queens also learn from Elizabeth I. The idea of the body cultural formulates an iconography of queenship that is shared by all queens in spite of their marital status or political authority and beyond the grid of politics and history. Therefore, the queenship of a queen consort is more than a political constituent, it is also a cultural construction. Extending from the transition and inheritance of the king's two bodies among kings, the succession or transfer of the body politic between queens may form a special culture of queens, including manners and virtues that are extraordinary to common women.

- **The Queenship of a Queen Regnant: Mary I**

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, some scholars turned their attention to the neglected and misunderstood Mary I, arguing against the negative image that had been formed by the Protestant propaganda of John Foxe's *Actes and Monuments*.[67] Although Mary I preceded Elizabeth I in history, it is Elizabeth I who has been commemorated with the image of the Virgin Queen and an able ruler, the woman who led England to fight against the Spanish Armada and maintained her own and the country's autonomy through her marriage to England, rather than to a man. Elizabeth I is remembered for her successes whereas on the contrary, Mary I is remembered for disputed decisions and 'failures' in her reign, such as her persecution of the Protestants, her marriage to Philip I, and the war against France. Through the centuries Queen Mary has been tarred with the name 'Bloody Mary' because of her religious persecution of Protestants. Her image as a ruler was entangled with her suspicious subjugation to her

---

[66] Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies*, p. 12.

[67] Academic conferences were held to discuss alternative interpretations of Mary I's rule in the last decades; for instance, in 2006, 'The Ritual and Rhetoric of Queenship, 1250-1650' conference at Canterbury Christ Church University explored various aspects of the literary and historical queenship of Elizabeth I and Mary I. The proceeding of the conference was published as a book, *Rituals and Rhetorics of Queenship: Medieval to Early Modern*, ed. by Liz Oakley-Brown and Louise J. Wilkinson (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009), which contains several papers quoted and discussed in this thesis.

Spanish husband and her loss of Calais, dashing England's hope for France. However, as Anna Whitelock clarifies, like Elizabeth's decision to remain celibate, Mary's marriage to King Philip was a considered decision and was Mary's best choice at that time. In addition, like Mary I, Elizabeth also led futile military actions, such as the battles at Newhaven in 1562 in support of the French Huguenots, England's intervention in the Dutch revolt, and military and colonial frustrations in Ireland.[68]

Reviewing discussions about Mary I, we notice that they focus on three aspects of Mary I's life and queenship: her education, her religious persecution, and her unwelcome marriage. Although there are not as many writings about Mary's intellectual performance as there are about Elizabeth's, Mary I's image as a well-educated princess remains vivid. A tradition of good education descended from Mary's grandmother, Isabella of Castile, through her mother, Katherine of Aragon, to her. It is reputed that Queen Katherine invited the humanist Juan Luis Vives to write educational treatises for Princess Mary.[69] Vives's commissioned *Instruction to a Christian Woman* was akin to a conduct book for women in general rather than for the Princess, a potential regnant. It was so popular and influential that by 1600, forty editions in English, Dutch, French, German, Italian, Spanish and Latin had been published.[70] The respect afforded to humanists and the value placed on education created a trend towards the humanist education of daughters in the English court and among well-off families, especially at the time of Henry VIII's reign.[71] Thomas More and Anthony Cooke were both famous fathers whose liberal attitudes toward the education of women enabled their learned and able daughters to pursue academic studies and then financial and political activities in

---

[68] Anna Whitelock, 'Mary Tudor: the First Queen of England', in *Rituals and Rhetorics*, pp. 59-73 (p. 71).
[69] For the relationship between Vives, Queen Katherine, and Princess Mary, and the humanist's influence on English education, see Foster Watson, ed. *Vives on Education: A Translation of the* De Trandendis Disciplinis *of Juan Luis Vives* (Cambridge: University Press of Cambridge, 1913) and Timothy G. Elston, 'Transformation or Continuity? Sixteenth-Century Education and the Legacy of Catherine of Aragon, Mary I, and Juan Luis Vives', in *High and Mighty Queens' of Early Modern England: Realities and Representations*, ed. by Carole Levin, Debra Barrett-Graves, and Jo Eldridge Carney (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 11-26.
[70] Sheila ffolliott and Betty S. Travitsky, 'Introduction: The Life of Juan Luis Vives', in *The Instruction of a Christen Woman*, by Juan Luis Vives, 1529, ed. by ffolliott and Travitsky (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2002). For Vives's contribution to women's education, see the following references: Foster Watson, ed., *Vives and the Renascence Education of Women* (London: Edward Arnold, 1912). Gloria Kaufman, 'Juan Luis Vives on the Education of Women', *Signs* 3 (1978), 891-896. Hilda L. Smith, 'Humanist Education and the Renaissance Concept of Woman' in *Women and Literature in Britain 1500-1700*, ed. by Helen Wilcox (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 9-29. For Vives's influence on education in early modern England, see also Alice T. Friedman, 'The Influence of Humanism on the Education of Girls and Boys in Tudor England', *History of Education Quarterly* 25 (1985), 57-70.
[71] For humanist education and Tudor court culture, see Aysha Polinitz, 'Humanism and Court Culture in the Education of Tudor Royal Children', in *Tudor Court Culture*, ed. by Betteridge and Riehl, pp. 42-58.

their natal and married families.[72] Humanist educators justified their defence of women's education by declaring that education could provide a good portion of the dowry in a woman's marriage. Education equipped women with ample knowledge and skills to assist their husbands, direct the children's education, and govern their households.

In addition to becoming a qualified queen consort, Mary I was also trained to be a female ruler. As *The Instruction of a Christian Woman* ended up as a rather general manual rather than a specific guide for a potential monarch, Katherine invited Vives to provide another guide for Mary. Vives then composed his *Plan of Studies for Girls* (*De Ratione Studii Puerilis Epistolae II*) and *Satellitium Sive Symbola* for the Princess in 1524.[73] The former gives detailed instruction on learning Latin, including pronunciation, grammar, writing, and so on; the latter is a collection of 239 mottos, maxims, and emblems that focus on the development of Mary's morality, religious faith, intellectual learning, and the governance of a state.[74] Some parts of the *Symbola* illustrate Vives's and Katherine's expectations of Mary, the Princess of Wales, and her future government: '*Generositas virtus, non sanguis* (Nobility consists in moral excellence, not in descent)'; '*Fortuna fallacior, quo blandior* (The more fortune smiles on us, the more deceptive it is)'; '*Princeps, multis consulendo* (A prince must consult the interests of the many)'; and '*Bellum cum vitiis* (Wage war on vices)' .[75]

Mary's ability to rule was not really questioned by her mother and instructor, and she was denigrated by centuries of historians due to her religion rather than her sex. John Foxe's propagandistic *Actes and Monuments* described Mary's reign as 'horrible and bloudye' and the Queen was portrayed as an indecisive queen dependent on her husband.[76] Nevertheless, Whitelock points out that Mary's success in retrieving her succession right and enthroning herself demonstrated her wisdom and ability in politics in the inauguration of her realm. She was not stupid or weak as history depicted, but she astutely chose the members of her privy council and particularly her private chamber

---

[72] Marjorie Keniston McIntosh, 'Sir Anthony Cooke: Tudor Humanist, Educator, and Religious Reformer', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 119 (1975), 233-250. Pearl Hogrefe, *Women of Action in Tudor England: Nine Biographical Sketches* (Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1977).

[73] Juan Luis Vives, *Opuscula Aliquot Vere Catholica. Introductio Ad Sapientiam. Satellitium Sive Symbola. De Ratione Studii Puerilis Epistolae II* (Apud P. Scholeffer: Argentorati, 1521).

[74] Watson, ed., *Vives and the Renascence Education*, p. 152.

[75] Ibid., pp. 156-158.

[76] John Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (London, 1563), p. 889. *STC* (2nd ed.) 11230 and *ESTC* S113097 (*John Foxe's* Actes and Monuments *Online*, University of Sheffield, http://www.johnfoxe.org/).

according to their former support of her and the firm Catholic beliefs they all shared. Whitelock observes that the impressions of Mary's infamous reign and Elizabeth's glorious rule are, again, the selection and interpretations of historians; such prejudiced choices reflect the contexts of anti-Hispanism, Protestant propaganda, and nationalist discourse.[77]

Expanding on Whitelock's observation, we may discover that early modern English treatises against female rule were built upon the religious framework of a Protestant discourse, and similarly, Elizabeth I and her defenders countered the assaults made on them with a Christian rhetoric of God's providence. John Knox's *The first blast of the trumpet against the monstruous regiment of women* bombarded the rule of Mary Tudor in England and Marie de Guise-Lorraine and Mary Queen of Scots in Scotland.[78] Amanda Shephard opines that Knox 'attacked Mary Tudor on the grounds of her religion and her marriage to a foreigner, but above all because of her sex'. According to her, it is sex rather than religion that Knox radically refuted in 'a synthesis of popular stereotypes' about women.[79] However, we cannot deny that the debate that Knox inaugurated gradually tended to side with the new enthroned Queen Elizabeth I, a female and Protestant queen. Female rule might not be the best option but it was a situation to be accepted when necessary. Writing his treatise, *An harborowe for faithfull and trewe subiectes*, five months after Mary I's death, John Aylmer, in an attempt to restore a political career in Elizabeth's court and downplay his former relationship with the Duke of Suffolk, whose daughter Lady Jane Gray was once his student and who was executed for rebellion in 1554, argued against Knox in support of female rule.[80] Aylmer's defence, as Shephard points out, like other contemporary treatises defending women's governance, was not written to shock his contemporaries or to overturn the patriarchal social structure, but rather to 'attract patronage from those in power, and to pander to their prejudices'.[81] Aylmer emphasised the function of Parliament and relevant institutions that could circumscribe monarchical power to lessen the influence of the incumbent ruler, and thereby the impact of the ruler's sex might decrease. Aylmer asserted it was God's design of good will, rather than punishment, that Queen Elizabeth

---

[77] Whitelock, 'Mary Tudor', p. 71.
[78] Knox, *The first blast*, *STC* (2nd ed.) 15070 and *ESTC* S108129.
[79] Amanda Shephard, *Gender and Authority in Sixteenth-Century England: The Knox Debate* (Keele: Keele University Press, 1994), p. 21 and 23.
[80] Ibid., pp. 26-27.
[81] Ibid., p. 24.

I was queened to England.[82] Like most of the debaters, Aylmer placed an emphasis on defending order in society, holding a similar attitude to Knox's towards most women, but citing Elizabeth I as the exception. Compared with Knox and Aylmer, John Leslie was less religious but a strong supporter of Mary Stuart's succession to Elizabeth I. In addition, the Catholic aristocrats Lord Henry Howard and David Chambers argued that 'women's right of inheritance in the absence of a male heir included the right to inherit office', undermining 'a rigidly patriarchal social system'.[83] It seems that these pro-Catholic debaters had more confidence than their Protestant counterparts in a woman's ability to rule and hold a position in public office.

Female rule was attacked not for itself but for a deeper-rooted religious reason; at the same time it was also defended in religious terms. After James I's accessions England and Scotland were ruled by a king again, and, according to Whitelock, this debate about female rule faded away. Nevertheless, as Shephard comments, even though patriarchy continued to dominate, the significance of the debate 'lies in the fact that [it] occurred at all'.[84] This corresponds to the study of queenship. The debates about queenship and the representations of queens cannot reverse the patriarchal reality of early modern England, but their existence, prevalence, and prosperity are the key point.

Mary I's rule seems to present an antithesis of successful queenship, and unlike the rich representations that Elizabeth I enjoys, there does not seem to be a similar 'cult of Mary'. However, a new trend in re-discovering Mary I has emerged to re-read the Tudor sisters' reigns and in the process re-evaluate Mary I's policies and the representations of her. For instance, Judith M. Richards explores Mary's establishment of queenship as the first female ruler, her inclination to the more knowledge-focused humanist side of the Catholic church, and her political contribution resulting from her meticulousness and hard-working character.[85] Whitelock argues that Mary I founded a parliamentary queenship, which legitimised her succession despite her religious belief and granted her marriage to the Spanish King Philip I regardless of the gradual formation of English national consciousness. Her governance depended on how she managed her relationship with Parliament, establishing the basis of female rule in England for Elizabeth I. Whitelock also points out that historians' selective memories emphasise Mary I's

---

[82] Aylmer, *An harborowe, STC* (2nd ed.) 1005 and *ESTC* S100367.
[83] Shephard, *Gender and Authority*, pp. 7-8.
[84] Ibid., p.21
[85] Judith M. Richards, *Mary Tudor* (London and New York: Routledge, 2008).

disfavoured marriage and her failure in Calais compared to Elizabeth I's victory against the Armada, while underestimating or ignoring the significance of Mary's strategic securing of her enthronement and Elizabeth's misjudgment concerning her support for the Huguenots at Newhaven in 1562 and her attempt in Ireland later.[86] Sabine Lucia Müller studies the concepts of Mary's body natural in the light of the queen's initial image as a 'virgin queen' and later the impact of her marriage within the context of Catholicism both in early modern England and in modern history.[87] All of these demonstrate the importance and value of re-reading queenship closely.

- **The Queenship of a Queen Regnant: Elizabeth I**

Compared with studies of medieval queenship, most studies of queenship in early modern England pay attention to Elizabeth I, especially her female rule and the fashioning of her image as a queen regnant of England. The following paragraphs will briefly introduce studies of Elizabeth I in relation to her succession issues, female rule, government and policy, relationship with and influence on male courtiers, royal progresses, iconography and portraiture, and her own writing, including the speeches, prayers, and poems.

Scholars have studied how Elizabeth I and her courtiers endeavoured to stabilise her reign through making an international marriage contract to strengthen England's allies against Mary of Scots' claim to the English throne or through re-interpreting political philosophies and theories to defend Elizabeth I's female rule. The former forms the context of Shakespeare's dramatisation of royal marriage negotiation and family networking in Part One of this thesis; the latter is involved with the issue of queens' (or generally women's) transgression into conventionally a public space of men and politics. Stephen Alford's historical study reveals William Cecil's influential negotiation with the English Parliament and his interaction with foreign courts regarding the topic of Elizabeth's marriage in terms of legitimising and stabilising her reign.[88] Axton reviews the theories of the body politic and body natural of male and female monarchs to explain the succession issues at the beginning and the end of Elizabeth's reign through relevant representations in royal entertainments, theatrical and literary works in

---

[86] Whitelock, 'Mary Tudor', pp.70-73.
[87] Sabine Lucia Müller, 'Ageing out Catholicism: Representing Mary Tudor's Body' in *Rituals and Rhetorics*, ed. by Oakley-Brown and Wilkinson, pp. 238-251.
[88] Stephen Alford, *The Early Elizabethan Polity: William Cecil and the British Succession Crisis, 1558-1569* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

Elizabethan England.[89] Cristina Malcolm and Mihoko Suzuki's collection of essays examines the contention of gender debates, female rule, and women's intervention in politics, resonating with Carole Levin's study of Elizabeth I's androgynous rule and Jennifer Clement's analysis of the Queen's strategic use of her private prayers and meditations in the discourse of the domestic compared to diplomatic politics in public, corresponding to Shakespeare's portrayal of queens expressing their personal feelings such as anger and sorrow in the English court.[90]

Elizabeth I's management of her court incurs issues of gender, spaces and politics. Patrick Collinson's *Elizabethan Essays* analyses Elizabeth's government in the light of her religious policy with its reflections on John Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* (*Actes and Monuments*) and Shakespeare's theatrical writings.[91] Natalie Mears also examines Elizabeth's government, focusing on court politics and the developing concept of the public sphere and its application to notions of space and political structure in early modern England.[92] Elizabeth I's court and its network is explored by Jessica L. Malay in feminist terms; this argument suggests that Elizabeth's strategic exercise of her power in the court was imitated by her female aristocrats in the management of their households, especially in the facets of the spatial arrangement of the households and their appropriation of powerful biblical and historical female figures, suggesting the influence of queenship on women.[93] On the other hand, Elizabeth's relationship with her male courtiers was often depicted and romanticised in literary works: Philippa Berry studies the discourse of love and chastity which fashioned and empowered the Queen through its impersonation of chivalric and Christian ladies in Elizabethan court literature.[94]

Elizabeth I's royal progresses also constitute an interesting topic in the studies of her government and self-representations along with the fluidity and temporality of the spaces in her mobile courts. Peter Sillitoe looks into the royal progress and the Queen's

---

[89] Axton, *Queen's Two Bodies*.

[90] Carole Levin, *'The Heart and Stomach of a King': Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994); Jennifer Clement, 'The Queen's Voice: Elizabeth I's *Christian Prayers and Meditations*', *Early Modern Literary Studies* 13.3 (January, 2008), 1.1-26. [http://purl.oclc.org/emls/13-3/clemquee.htm, accessed 28 September, 2009].

[91] Patrick Collinson, *Elizabethan Essays* (London: Hambledon, 1994).

[92] Natalie Mears, *Queenship and Political Discourse in the Elizabethan Realms* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

[93] Jessica Malay, 'Like a Queen: The Influence of the Elizabethan Court on the Structure of Women-Centered Households in the Early Modern Period', in *Tudor Court Culture*, ed. by Betteridge and Riehl, pp. 93-113.

[94] Philippa Berry, *Of Chastity and Power: Elizabethan Literature and the Unmarried Queen* (London: Routledge, 1989).

mobile court, arguing that the enlargement of the scope and the expansion of the accessibility of Elizabeth's court illustrates spatial dynamics in relation to the dissemination of court fashion and culture and the exhibition of royalty and power.[95] On the other hand, Mary Hill Cole's historical research into progresses presents perspectives of the guests (Elizabeth I's propaganda) and of the hosts (her subjects' responses to the preparations, proceedings, and reviews of the events) and investigates the implementation and reception of the Queen's rule. During the progresses, gift exchange, especially the bestowing of portraits of Elizabeth I, was common; so was the introduction of Elizabethan court fashion and different images of the Queen.[96]

During her progresses, Elizabeth I's iconography and portraiture were greatly produced and disseminated, creating memorialisations of the representations of her queenship. Harold Barkley assembles an anthology of portraits of famous political and literary figures in the Tudor and Stuart periods, shedding lights on the study of portraiture.[97] Roy Strong's *Gloriana: the Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I* studies Elizabeth's visual representations chronologically. He presents detailed readings of the Queen's extant portraits according to different political and religious happenings, discovering changes in propaganda to suit different occasions, such as the Queen's marriage, diplomacy, and domestic network and government.[98] Andrew Belsey and Catherine Belsey examine Elizabeth's portraits for evidence of the Queen's deification in her later reign.[99] John N. King further explores Tudor iconography and finds a theme for each monarch in their self-fashioning and representations in the age of religious reformations.[100] Karen Hearn edited and published a detailed catalogue with relevant essays for an exhibition, '*Dynasties*', held in the Tate Gallery from October 1995 to January 1996; both the exhibition and the book offer the public opportunities to apprise and understand the political propaganda in visual representations in early modern

---

[95] Peter Sillitoe, '"Where the Prince Lieth": Courtly Space and the Elizabethan Progresses' in *Tudor Court Culture*, ed. by Betteridge and Riehl, pp. 75-92.

[96] Mary Hill Cole, *The Portable Queen: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Ceremony* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999).

[97] Harold Barkley, *Likeness in Line: An Anthology of Tudor and Stuart Engraved Portraits* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1982).

[98] Roy Strong, *Gloriana: The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1987). For the following studies of Elizabeth I's portraits, see also Elizabeth W. Pomeroy, *Reading the Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I* (Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1989).

[99] Andrew Belsey and Catherine Belsey, 'Icons of Divinity: Portraits of Elizabeth I' in *Renaissance Bodies: The Human Figure in English Culture c. 1540-1660*, ed. by Lucy Gent and Nigel Llewellyn (London: Reaktion, 1990), pp. 11-35.

[100] John N. King, *Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and Art in an Age of Religious Crisis* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1989).

England.[101]

Many visual and literary representations of Elizabeth I impress the viewers and readers by their portrayal of her sacrifice of individual life, her manipulative representation of the interchangeable public self as a powerful monarch and private self as a vulnerable woman, and her appropriation of the wisdom, chastity, virtue, and power of female models in historical, ecclesiastical, and literary texts. These intriguing representations of Elizabeth I influenced Shakespeare's depiction of queens' performance and display of their public and private selves. Furthermore, the fashioning of Elizabeth I's queenship greatly appropriated virtues and their relevant symbols. In exploring the discourse of empire used by European monarchies in the late sixteenth century, Frances A. Yates analyses Elizabeth's appropriation of the images of Astraea and the Phoenix to emphasise justice and chastity in the discourse of her female rule.[102] John N. King states the importance of Elizabeth I's representations as a virgin queen: Elizabeth I 'was able to convert her unprecedented weakness as a celibate queen into a powerful propagandistic claim that she sacrificed personal interests in the name of public service'.[103] Katherine Eggert focuses on the representations of female authority in literary works by Shakespeare, Spenser, and Milton in the context of Elizabethan rule.[104] Annaliese Connolly and Lisa Hopkins's edited work *Goddesses and Queens: The Iconography of Elizabeth I* collects essays on typological readings of Elizabeth I in parallel with biblical and literary female figures to represent the Queen's virtue and vice, paying particular attention to contexts of the discovery of the virgin New World, and the issues of her government, marriage, and demise.[105]

The appropriation of female typologies is key to Elizabeth I's representations. Susan Frye examines representations of Elizabeth I in her coronation entry, royal entertainments, and literary writings by others and herself (and her court) in a

---

[101] Karen Hearn ed., *Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England 1530-1630* (London: Tate Gallery, 1995).

[102] Frances A. Yates, *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975).

[103] John N. King, 'Queen Elizabeth I: Representations of the Virgin Queen', *Renaissance Quarterly* 43 (1990), 30-74 (p. 30).

[104] Katherine Eggert, *Showing Like a Queen: Female Authority and Literary Experiment in Spenser, Shakespeare, and Milton* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000).

[105] Annaliese Connolly and Lisa Hopkins, eds., *Goddesses and Queens: The Iconography of Elizabeth I* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).

competitive mode regarding economics, policy, and the Queen's virtues.[106] Lisa
Hopkins observes a more obvious and fierce image competition between Elizabeth I and
Mary of Scots particularly concerning the issue of legitimacy and female rule.[107] Susan
Doran and Thomas S. Freeman review depictions of and references to Elizabeth I in
ecclesiastical, historical, literary, pictorial, and photographic texts in Elizabethan,
Jacobean, and modern times, that together create a literary history about the Queen.[108]
Helen Hackett's *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen* questions the assumption that Elizabeth I
became a Protestant substitute for the Virgin Mary by researching representations of
Elizabeth I in late sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England.[109]

Elizabeth I is a charismatic woman. Recent studies have focused on Elizabeth I's
scholarly talent and her role as a writer. Linda Shenk appropriates typological readings
along with research on the Queen's education and literary performance.[110] Editions of
the queen's writings have also been published in the last decade.[111] Christa Jansohn
collects essays of representations of Elizabeth during and after her reign in different
areas (England and the Low Countries), cultures (imperial Britain), and genres
(literature, drama, music, opera, etc), which suggests ways to apply the research of
Shakespeare's queenship to later literary and artistic works.[112]

Further research on Elizabeth I's afterlife provides us with the context of
Shakespeare's collaborative depiction with John Fletcher regarding the baby Princess
Elizabeth in *Henry VIII*. A resurgence of representations of Elizabeth I and a nostalgia
for her reign occurred particularly in the second decade of James I's rule. Elizabeth H.
Hageman and Katherine Conway's edited book amasses papers discussing the nostalgia,
rewriting, and reviews of Elizabeth I, her iconography, and representations of her

---

[106] Susan Frye, *Elizabeth I: The Competition for Representation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).
For the study of Elizabeth I's royal entry, see also Sandra Logan, 'Making History: The Rhetorical and
Historical Occasion of Elizabeth Tudor's Coronation Entry', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern
Studies* 31:2 (2001), 251-82.
[107] Lisa Hopkins, *Writing Renaissance Queens: Texts By and About Elizabeth I and Mary, Queen of Scots*
(Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2002).
[108] Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman, eds., *The Myth of Elizabeth* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan,
2003).
[109] Helen Hackett, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen: Elizabeth I and the Cult of the Virgin Mary* (Hampshire:
Macmillan, 1995).
[110] Linda Shenk, *Learned Queen: The Image of Elizabeth I in Politics and Poetry* (New York: Palgrave
Macmillan, 2010).
[111] Queen Elizabeth I, *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, ed. Marcus, Mueller, Rose, et al.; Queen Elizabeth I,
Queen Elizabeth I: Selected Works, ed by Steven W. May (New York: Washington Square Press, 2004);
Queen Elizabeth I, *Elizabeth I: Translations 1544-1589*, ed. by Janel Mueller and Joshua Scodel (Chicago
and London: University of Chicago Press, 2009); Queen Elizabeth I, *Elizabeth I: Translations 1592-1598*,
ed. by Janel Mueller, and Joshua Scodel (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2009).
[112] Christa Jansohn, ed., *Queen Elizabeth I: Past and Present* (Münster: LIT Verlag, 2004).

government in literary and theatrical texts, music, and symbols in Jacobean England.[113]
John Watkins explores how Elizabeth is associated with James I in a maternal image,
how the Queen and her reign over England is imagined in literary and dramatic works,
and how the queen is re-configured as a ruler and a woman during the Civil War and the
Restoration.[114] Watkins examines the history of the representations of Elizabeth I
throughout the Stuart dynasty. Elizabeth I is remembered nostalgically and
commemorated with a cult of her own throughout the centuries.

• Representations of Queens Consort

The queenship of Elizabeth I and Mary I provide numerous inspiring and useful
elements for the study of the queenship of queens consort: their marriages, education,
family networks, female rule, relationship with male and female courtiers, their virtue
and vice in government, their appropriation of space inside and outside their courts and
chambers, their interaction with Parliament, their appropriation of typological women,
their manipulation of history writing and attempt to control their memorialisation. All of
these contribute to the following analyses of the representation of queens in this thesis.
Although historical novels and modern media have presented versatile portraits of
queens in Tudor and Jacobean England, scholarly research, especially in terms of
literary representations, is comparatively insufficient or scattered among discussions of
other themes. This thesis intends to contribute to the study of queenship by examining
queens consort in Shakespeare's English history plays.

In the previous sections, I have simply narrated the representations of Mary I and
Elizabeth I; it is not difficult to discern that much of the focus has been on their
education and cultivation in early years, their marriage issues, their governance, and
eventually their memorialisations. This thesis will explore queens consort in
Shakespeare's history plays in the chronological order of their careers: first their pursuit
of queenship, then their practice, and finally the legacy/residue of their queenship. Each
stage has a keyword respectively but all are interlocked: virtue, space, and
memorialisation.

---

[113] Elizabeth H. Hageman and Katherine Conway, eds., *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England* (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2007).
[114] John Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England: Literature, History, Sovereignty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

- **Virtue**

In reviewing writings about medieval and early modern queenship, we may discover that marriage, education, and familial networking are three points interlocked in the constitution of queenship. Marriage is where queenship is first validated, education focuses on cultivating and equipping princesses to be married, and familial networks motivate and are motivated by royal marriages. Discussions of royal marriages in early modern England have predominantly focused on the issue of princesses being used as diplomatic assets to exchange for peace, sustain international relationships, and secure the circulation of money, property, estates, and other forms of wealth. Gayle Rubin argues that 'marriage transactions – the gifts and material which circulate in the ceremonies marking a marriage – are a rich source of data for determining exactly who has which rights in whom'.[115] Marriage is a way to establish, maintain, and expand kinship systems; it exchanges 'sexual access, genealogical statuses, lineage names and ancestors, rights, and *people*', especially women.[116] Women involved in this process do not enjoy as much autonomy as men do, and thereby, the marital system, it is argued, is based on the 'exchange of women'. Rubin specifies that the 'exchange of women' is a 'shorthand' expression of the 'social relation' in the kinship system in which 'men have certain rights in their female kin, and that women do not have the same rights either to themselves or to their male kin'; women do not even 'have full rights to themselves'.[117] In short, women do not enjoy autonomy in the traffic of social relations, and furthermore, they are deemed possessions/property/capital by their male kin/patriarchs.

Women's Virtues in Early Modern England

In early modern England, virtues, the principles of social behaviour, are gendered. According to *OED*, virtue means either the quality of persons or of things. The quality of persons can be understood in relation to morality and power. Virtue may indicate 'conformity of life and conduct with the principles of morality', or more specifically, 'chastity, sexual purity' for women, and 'a particular moral excellence'. In Shakespeare's *Much Ado about Nothing*, Hero's virtue is challenged: 'Hero itself can blot out Hero's virtue' (*MAAN* 4.1.83). In *King John*, the citizen of Angers praises

---

[115] Gayle Rubin, 'The Traffic in Women: Notes on the "Political Economy" of Sex', in *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, ed. by Rayna R. Reiter (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975), pp. 157-210 (p. 177).
[116] Ibid.
[117] Ibid.

Blanche's virtue and proposes the French Dauphin to marry her: 'If zealous love should go in search of virtue,/ Where should he find it purer than in Blanche?' (*KJ* 2.1.429-430). In both quotations, the virtue is referred to Hero's and Blanche's chastity. In terms of power, virtue contains an implication of masculinity, as it can mean 'physical strength, force, or energy' or 'the possession or display of manly qualities; manly excellence, manliness, courage'.[118] In *Richard II*, the King shows his favour for Mowbray, the Duke of Norfolk, before the Duke's duel with Bolingbroke, the Duke of Hereford, later Henry VII: 'Securely I espy/ Virtue with valour couched in thine eye' (*RII* 1.3.97-98). The subtle gender difference of the meaning of virtue increased in early modern English conduct books. The emphasis on strength and power in relation to masculinity can also be seen in Machiavelli's argument about *virtù* – the ability to manage the development of one's political career – in his political philosophy of governorship. The gendering of virtue will be discussed in the following passage, while the relationship between queenship, virtue, and *virtù* will be explored in 'Part One: The Pursuit of Queenship'.

In early modern England, a woman's value was ensured by the preservation of her chastity. Early modern English daughters were required to be virtuous, with chastity as the prime virtue demanded. According to Ruth Kelso, the virtues valued and pursued by men are based on the tradition of pagan culture, while those pursued by women are regulated according to Christian teachings.[119] Even the same virtues, for instance, honour, would generate different meanings and process of enactment for men and women. Honour, or reputation, for men mainly indicates the heroic code as related to ideas of patriotism and credibility, and it is a virtue that can be demonstrated through their devotion to their lords and countries. For women, however, the same word refers to chastity. As Vives insists, a woman's ultimate virtue is her chastity. In his *Instruction for a Christian Woman*, the advice regarding education, housewifery, daily activities, and human relationships is ultimately about how to protect a woman's chastity. Kelso's categorisation of male-pagan and female-Christian virtues is over-simplistic, ignoring the different contexts of each virtue for people of different classes in different times and cultures. This thesis merely uses Kelso's observation and classification to illustrate the complexity and different interpretations of each virtues for men and women in early

---

[118] 'Virtue, n.', *OED Online*. [Accessed on 18 August 2011].
[119] Ruth Kelso, *Doctrine for the Lady of the Renaissance* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1956), p. 25.

modern England and thereby generates an alternative reading of virtues attributed to and manipulated by queens.

In addition to chastity, Kelso lists other virtues important to early modern women such as obedience, prudence, silence, diligence, and so on. According to Kelso's observation, virtues, in a broad sense, encompass both innate and acquired qualities.[120] The innate qualities refer to biological features such as beauty (the outlook), health, and the family lineage (which decides whether a woman is born to be a princess, an inheritress of a gentleman, or a daughter of a farmer or shepherd). The biological tag records the possible social worth and economic value of a woman. However, there are qualities that a woman may acquire, or be provided with, according to her environmental conditions, such as wisdom through education, housewifery through practical experience or the perusal of conduct books. In addition, some abstract values such as silence, obedience, and perseverance, are central themes of the training.

Virtues are the index of a woman's worth. They are the capital with which an early modern woman has to bargain and through which she can further increase her value based on her virtue through her marriage and, after she is married, through the action of family networking. Bourdieu's research in the twentieth century discusses the social and economic differences between people's family and educational backgrounds and the discrepancies' consequential influence in cultural distinctions. He uses economic concepts in anthropological studies and proposes different types of capital, including economic capital and cultural capital.[121] The former is the generally known form of pecuniary assets that are used by individuals or corporations; the latter derives from a person's birth, education, marriage, and social networking. Combining Rubin's and Bourdieu's concepts to think about women in economic terms might challenge the concept of power and authority put forward by previous scholars. Early modern English women could not change the patriarchal society in which they lived, but their own value was increased in and through marriage, education, and networking.

Virtue and Cultural Capital

Studying the social system of kinship, Gayle Rubin argues that women are subjugated and implemented as transferable assets – gifts – and they are 'in no position

---

[120] Ibid., p. 23.
[121] Bourdieu, 'The Forms of Capital', pp. 83-95; and Bourdieu and Passeron, *Reproduction*.

to realise the benefits of their own circulation. As long as the relations specify that men exchange women, it is men who are the beneficiaries of the product of such exchanges – social organisations'.[122] According to Rubin, women are objects during the process of exchange and are passively transferred without the possibility of intervening actively. 'The Pursuit of Queenship' examines marriage and, as Rubin defines it, the 'trafficking in women': these women are 'given in marriage, taken in battle, exchanged for favours, sent as tribute, traded, bought, and sold'.[123] In Shakespeare's English histories, although it appears that aristocratic women have no power, they might undermine the marriage system and its value from within. In royal marriages they are objects and are only allowed to express their opinions on rare occasions, but their education and virtues contribute to the value of the marriages. In addition, their marriages further increase their own value/power by giving them the opportunity to manage the households and expand their networks. These objects – queens to be – thus end up participating in the process of 'the traffic in women' and they might thereby be able to influence the making of marriage. The 'objects' empower themselves through education, marriage, and family networking, using their cultural capital.

Rubin's sociological economic expression concerning women in marriage systems can be further understood through Bourdieu's analysis of different forms of capital. Combining Rubin and Bourdieu's theories suggests an alternative perspective on women and their queenship in Shakespeare's English history plays. Bourdieu defines what capital is and how it functions in society: 'capital is accumulated labor', he explains, and when it is 'appropriated on a private, i.e., exclusive, basis by agents or groups of agents, [it] enables them to appropriate social energy in the form of reified or living labour'. Capital 'makes the game of society' but not just 'the economic game'; we need to consider 'different types and subtypes of capital' in order to comprehend the structure and functioning of the social world. Bourdieu criticises the inefficient and restrained interpretation of capital in economic theory, arguing for the necessity of reconsidering other forms of capital in practice. According to Bourdieu, economic theory 'defines as disinterested those forms of exchange which ensure the *transubstantiation* whereby the most material types of capital – those which are economic in the restricted sense – can present themselves in the immaterial form of

---

[122] Rubin, 'The Traffic in Women', p. 174.
[123] Ibid., p. 175.

cultural capital or social capital and vice versa'.[124] Bourdieu's sociological studies note the conversion of capital in different – economic or non-economic, material or immaterial – forms.

Culture, along with the non-economic capital and reproduction, is embedded in a society aiming at accumulating economic/monetary profit; that is, culture, which is non-monetarily profitable, is produced and produces non-economic profit and reproduction in a capitalist society. It is important to read the reproduction of culture economically. According to Bourdieu, economic theory, which is associated with financial capital and profit, is too restricted; economic theory, he argues, should be a science that analyses every kind of exchange in the society. Bourdieu intends to re-construct and restore the general science of economy and enable people to understand the possibility of the conversion between abstract (non-monetary) capitals. He defines and categorises different forms of capital:

> Depending on the field in which it functions, and at the cost of the more or less expensive transformations which are the precondition for its efficacy in the field in question, capital can present itself in three fundamental guises: as *economic capital*, which is immediately and directly convertible into money and may be institutionalised in the form of property rights; as *cultural capital*, which is convertible, on certain conditions, into economic capital and may be institutionalised in the form of educational qualifications; and as *social capital*, made up of social obligations ('connections'), which is convertible, in certain conditions, into economic capital and may be institutionalised in the form of a title of nobility.[125]

Economic capital, cultural capital, and social capital can all be converted into each other in different conditions.

Cultural capital exists in three states: the *embodied* state ('in the form of long-standing disposition of the mind and body'); the *objectified* state ('in the form of cultural goods'); and the *institutionalised* state (as seen 'in the case of educational

---

[124] Bourdieu, 'The Forms of Capital', p. 83.
[125] Ibid., p 84.

qualifications'). Bourdieu states that education and its economy need to be reconsidered within the concept of cultural capital. He criticises the narrowly-defined economic analysis for ignoring the proportion of cultural investment made by the family according to the class and cultural inheritance of the family. This is why, when calculating the 'profit' generated from an investment in education, economists can only describe it in a form of monetary return or of statistic financial yields. They also neglect the reproduction of social structure made by education. Bourdieu emphasises the investment made by the family both economically and non-economically – that is, culturally.

One problem of using Bourdieu's re-conception of capital and explanation of economy (of exchange) in this thesis is that the social condition in early modern England was not yet a capitalist society and the bourgeoisie had not yet appeared. The class divisions at this time were different from those in modern society. There were signs, however, of a pre-capitalist economy and of the emergence of middle-class culture in early modern England, and also, because economic theory was yet to be developed, the idea of property, fortune, or 'capital' was not restricted within the narrow concept of money. For example, one distinctive feature of the economy in early modern England was the practice of patronage. Thus, human relationships or networking can be considered capital in early modern England, and this capital was widely recognised and sought after as an abstract form of property by intellectuals, politicians, writers, and artists. Therefore, Bourdieu's comprehensive definition of the science of economy might be used to understand social conditions in early modern England.

Queens' Cultural Capital Encompasses Virtues of Both Genders

Queenship integrated and transformed virtues defined and regulated for women in conduct books and for (mainly male) courtiers and princes in political treatises into cultural capital which is applied in different aspects of their domestic, social, and politic life. This thesis argues that queens apply and perform the virtues set out both for women and men; further discussions on gendered virtues, especially concerning political performance, will be conducted in 'Part One: The Pursuit of Queenship'. Queens utilised traditionally eulogised womanly virtues, like chastity, silence, and obedience, in the arena of politics. As such, without being blamed for being ambitious, political, unchaste, and un-womanlike, or being asked to justify their actions, they were able to

transgress the boundaries between the genders in both the fields of the public and the private.

• **Space**

One of the measurements and ways to preserve the most important virtue, chastity, depends on a woman's circumscribed use of space. The practice of queenship is the implementation, exhibition, and performance of queens' virtues in different spaces. The following section will first explain the complexity of space and gender, especially in terms of women's relation with the private in early modern England. 'Part Two: The Practice of Queenship' will further explore the ambiguous division of public and private and its nature in relation to architectural, political, and cultural aspects in Elizabethan England.

The concept of space in early modern England is complicated. Russell West explains how the idea of space is ingrained in every aspect of early modern England, including thought processes, memory, linguistic structure, social hierarchy, households, individual identity, and art forms. He argues that epistemologically 'the Renaissance possessed a plethora of mnemonic techniques which used mental images of buildings or rooms to systematise and categorise knowledge spatially'.[126] In terms of language, the cultivation of communicative ability is often compared to farming or gardening, imagining rhetoric as land that needs to be fertilised and worked upon. Spatial thinking also visualises the constructions of social hierarchy, the formation and function of households, and the organism of the aristocratic household and its dependants, explaining social order and the distribution of authority and interactions between different powers.

Staying in private helps women to avoid exposing themselves to the crowd, being seen or talked to, or conversing with men; however, as the model for all women in the realm, a queen is a public figure who cannot seclude herself away in the royal household. In addition, the division of public and private in early modern England is different from and more ambiguous than that in modern thought, which focuses on privacy and the discrepancy between public and private spheres. The division of public and private spheres was not clear until the end of the seventeenth century even given Habermas's emphasis on the development of newspapers and the appearance of coffee

---

[126] Russell West, *Spatial Representations and the Jacobean Stage: From Shakespeare to Webster* (Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave, 2002), p. 13.

house as channels for and sites of public opinion.[127] The usages of the terms, 'public' and 'private', in early modern writings need further investigation. Retha M. Warnicke surveys early modern writings and conduct books about women and distinguishes the usage of the term 'private' in the following arenas: relationships, business and trade, spatial dimension, and secret matters.[128] In this section, I will follow Warnicke's divisions but further explore the discrepancy of the concepts and realities of the public and private in early modern thought and in modern understanding, particularly in terms of space and women in early modern England, and space and queenship in Shakespeare's English histories.

According to Warnicke, private relationships were defined by the scope of a household, which, in early modern England, included family members and servants. The size of households could vary greatly. Therefore, the governance of a household was quite a business; to manage the household, a wife might engage herself in various matters, such as commercial activities and juristic issues, which were beyond the general division of affairs between the domestic and public arena in modern thought; that is, the scope of private business of a household in early modern England could be understood as matters of public concern or in the public sphere in modern society. What mattered to an individual in early modern England was not what personality he/she had, but where he or she belonged. Instead of identity based on personal characteristics, the 'place' that one inhabited in a household or in society at large and one's interaction and relationship with others constituted one's existence. The definition of private business and trade in early modern England thereby was based on the scope of a household, such as its production and consumption, thus varying from the idea of private sectors in modern Britain. Moreover, 'private person' was the opposite to 'public office', and the term 'public officials' referred to 'military, church, civil office holders, such as magistrates, judges, mayors, soldiers, bishops, and clerics'.[129] These professions were not open to women in early modern England. In early modern England, women were confined to the space related to household business, which was differently defined from modern understanding of the public and private spheres, and which management was

---

[127] Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. by Thomas Burger (Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1991), pp. 32-33, 59, 168-188.
[128] Retha M. Warnicke, 'Private and Public: The Boundaries of Women's Lives in Early Stuart England', in *Privileging Gender in Early Modern England*, ed. by Jean R. Brink (Kirksville, Missouri: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1993), pp. 123-140.
[129] Ibid., pp. 126-127.

involved with extensive and various activities, challenging the conventional and convenient division of the public/politic and the private/domestic.

However, as studied in 'Part One: The Pursuit of Queenship', marriage and familial networking enabled aristocratic women to enlarge the communities within which they existed. For instance, gift exchange culture allowed aristocratic women to play matriarchal roles and influence their husbands' careers and their children's education and marriages.[130] Their relationship with their natal families was further capital that they could invest in their marriage. Apart from internal social and economic matters, the management of their households also encompassed external social and economic aspects, such as the above mentioned gift exchange. In addition, key to domestic economics and politics was kinship. The scope of kinship in a royal family involved communication with other nobles; these could be strong supporters or threatening opponents. The distinction was determined, at least in part, by the queen's negotiation and management between the king and his aristocratic relatives.

In addition, as a king was often referred to as the father of the realm and a queen, the mother, it seems understandable to interpret the queen's intervention in state business as part of her duty of 'domestic' affairs. Therefore, she was often the bridge between the king and his subjects. She would hold her own court where she could receive and listen to her guests and she would weave networks to fortify support for her royal family. As such it is difficult to distinguish between the public and private elements of a queen's duties.

The spatial dimension of the private in terms of queenship in early modern England has generated various studies, such as studies of Elizabeth I's mobile court by Sillitoe, analyses of the controversy of the public and private spheres by Mears, and research of the social construction of gender and space and their relationship by Flather.[131] Most scholars, such as the three above, present a negative view to the existence of a 'private space' in political and social terms, whereas Warnicke provides an interesting point when she argues about 'private moments' which 'do not absolutely require being physically out of sight, for people can "internalize a set of barriers"'.[132] Her argument is that solitariness does not require restricted exclusion within a physical space, but rather

---

[130] See Ezell, *The Patriarch's Wife,* pp. 21-35.
[131] Sillitoe, 'Courtly Space', pp. 75-92; also see Mears, *Queenship and Political Discourse*, and Amanda Flather, *Gender and Space in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Royal Historical Society and The Boydell Press, 2007).
[132] Warnicke, 'Private and Public', p. 128.

a mental seclusion achieved by certain simple bodily movements, such as turning one's back or withdrawing to a corner of a room.[133] Therefore, space with restricted accessibility contains a certain level of privacy. For instance, queens may have a private word with kings even in ceremonies, and not to mention their reception of other courtiers in private chambers, and even when portrayed on stage, monologues and asides comprise a sense of privacy. In the trilogy of *Henry VI*, Margaret of Anjou's conversations with Suffolk in Parliament and in the court could be considered private. Naturally, this 'privateness' on the stage is understood in the contextual relationship between space, stage, and theatre.

Considerations of Shakespeare's representations of queenship in terms of space need to engage with features of space in the theatre. Early modern English theatres and stages reflect and embody the philosophical conceptualisation of space in early modern England. The locality of space is expanded from references to physical location to matters of cultural geography.[134] As Henri Lefebvre asserts, 'any space implies, contains and dissimulates social relationships – and this despite the fact that a space is not a thing but rather a set of relations between things (objects and products)'.[135] These 'social relationships' are also understand as the topography of a society, which, if applied to early modern England, would include the distribution of its population, of its economic activities, and its political constitutions, mapping people's daily life. Lefebvre's influential concept of 'social space' emphasises human activities in these spaces, while Steven Mullaney extends this concept further by arguing that human activities determine and define spaces and thus physical topography (place) is associated with, or transformed into, cultural topology (space).[136] In early modern London, the social space where main political and commercial activities were conducted was bounded by city walls. Interestingly, most of entertainment venues, including most of the playhouses, were outside the city walls. Janette Dillon and Russell West analyse how the theatre as architecture occupied a place in London (the locality of a spatial construction), and how

_____

[133] Ibid., pp. 128-129.
[134] Andrew Hiscock, *The Uses of This World: Thinking Space in Shakespeare, Marlowe, Cary and Jonson* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2004), pp. 2-3.
[135] Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, trans. by Donald Nicholson-Smith (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991), pp. 82-83.
[136] See Steven Mullaney, 'Civic Rites, City Sites: The Place of the Stage', in *Staging the Renaissance: Reinterpretations of Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama*, ed. by David Scott Kastan and Peter Stallybrass (New York and London: Routledge, 1991), pp. 17-26.

this architecture epitomised the social construct of early modern English society.[137] As in a church, the seating in a theatre also indicated the hierarchically spatial distribution of people.

According to West, the space on a theatre stage is fluid: the nature of that space, or the theatrical locality, is determined by players through their social identity, their language, behaviour, and even their costumes. Therefore, when players are dressed in armour or holding spears, it is their demeanours that suggest that the stage is now a battlefield, as Andrew Hiscock suggests: 'locale is gestured towards in terms of speech, costume and performance'.[138] Sometimes, playwrights would provide mime shows before or during the plays to give the audience hints to the locality and the plots that were to follow; sometimes a playwright would create a clown figure or a chorus to inform, or even direct, the audience towards an appropriate perception of the dramatic presentation. The stage could be a space of performance – a platform for performing – or a representation of space – re-presenting the different localities of different scenes, such as the court or battlefields. It could be a representational space using images and symbols to create a place of fictional reality. For instance, in *The Tempest*, the stage is an island governed by Prospero's magic. To convert the stage from a space of performance to a representation of space, and finally to a representational space, depends on the audience's imagination. The audience recognises that characters might speak to or engage with another character in private, but the whole performance is staged publicly. The solitariness on stage is seen and heard in the same way that it was demanded of young women that they stay in private whilst still always remaining under the supervision of public eyes.[139] Similarly, Queen Elizabeth I was constantly scrutinised; her life was always exposed and her private prayers and meditations were published – even her religious solitariness was propagandised and appropriated.[140] Elizabeth I's image is a mixture of her public and private selves. Long before her succession, her virtue of being religious was depicted in a portrait sent to Prince Edward VI as a gift in 1546.[141]

For most of the early modern English people, religious solitariness was one of the

---

[137] See Janette Dillon, *Theatre, Court and City, 1595-1610: Drama and Social Space in London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), and West, *Spatial Representations*.
[138] Hiscock, *The Uses of This World*, p. 3.
[139] Warnicke, 'Private and Public', p. 132.
[140] Clement, 'The Queen's Voice', 1.1-26.
[141] The Portrait is *Princess Elizabeth* (c.1546) by William Scrots; it is now stored at Windsor Castle. For an example of the portrait in scholarly discussions, see Strong, *Gloriana*, p. 9.

secret matters through which one might preserve one's privacy. According to Warnicke, '[the] Protestant writers of early Stuart England, regardless of whether they were opposed to or approved of the Church of England's rituals and ceremonies, seemed to have agreed that women should have solitary moments alone for prayer, reading and meditation'.[142] Despite the expectation of a thorough devotion to their households, women were allowed to have time and space on and of their own to be with God. According to Karen M. Morin and Jeanne Kay Guelke, 'traditionally, most of the monotheistic traditions have located women's primary arena for religious practice not in the public house of worship or church-sanctioned organisation but in the private home'.[143] In the Middle Ages, Roman Catholic nuns 'routinely worked outside of their convents within their communities and served as missionaries to overseas colonies, enjoying considerable freedom in their personal mobility', but they were later restricted within their cloisters by the decision made by the Council of Trent in 1662. It is not until the nineteenth century that women 'could leave the traditional household while maintaining their moral capital, such as by becoming missionary teachers or by taking holy orders'.[144] Religion was an appropriate topic and provided legitimate access to a medium through which women could write and voice their opinions privately and sometimes even publicly.

As Morin and Guelke comment, religion 'has the potential to restrict women to household and local scales as well as to enlarge their sphere of activity to international levels'.[145] Religious belief, the matter of conscience, was never an individual or private business for royal figures. Henry VIII's trouble with his conscience called into dispute his marriage to Katherine of Aragon and England's relationship with Roman Catholicism. Mary I's religious faith saw Protestants persecuted and the creation of a group of Marian exiles. On many occasions religious matters permitted women to present their voices and stage their actions. As much as women were expected to stay at home they were equally welcome to join the activities of the church. Women were allowed to write about matters relating to God. In addition to the works of Anne Askew and other fervent female writers and martyrs composed during the English religious

---

[142] Warnicke, 'Private and Public', p. 139.
[143] Karen M. Morin and Jeanne Kay Guelke, 'Introduction: Women, Religion, and Space – Making the Connections' in *Women, Religion, and Space: Global Perspectives on Gender and Faith*, ed. by Karen M. Morin and Jeanne Kay Guelke (New York: Syracuse University Press, 2007). pp. xix-xxv (p. xx).
[144] Ibid., p. xxiii and xx.
[145] Ibid., p. xxvi.

reformations, Queen Katherine Parr also edited *Prayers or Meditations* (1545) and composed *The Lamentation or Complaint of a Sinner* (1547), her own spiritual autobiography; her stance on the country's religious turmoil had a degree of influence in political circles.[146]

As discussed in the previous section, being religious was one of the important virtues for women, especially for queens. In Shakespeare's English history plays, religious issues are never discussed explicitly, but are often dramatised through representations of the royal figures' religious beliefs. For instance, in *Richard III,* the Duke of Gloucester attempts to win himself a good reputation by staging a moment of being seen reading the Bible. The most sensitive scene that relates to religious issues is probably Queen Katherine of Aragon's deathbed vision in *Henry VIII.* However, in this public staging of the Queen's private vision, its 'truth' is disputed, and the question is asked whether it is a religious vision or merely the queen's hallucinatory dream. Shakespeare, whether deliberately or not, did not dramatise many of the religious aspects of the queens in his English histories. Only on few political and religious occasions, such as Anne Boleyn's coronation, Katherine of Aragon's dream vision, and Princess Elizabeth's christening, did he present and memorialise these royal women in an iconographical tradition akin to historical and biblical female figures.

- **Memorialisation**

When Shakespeare's queens lose their queenship, they can hardly occupy any space in public courts; the space they strive for after the loss of queenly titles is the space in history, and the power they maintain is their manipulation of the memorialisations by them and about them in history. To understand Shakespeare's English queen in terms of memorialisation, it is important first to acquaint ourselves with the attributes of theatre in early modern England that related to remembering, forgetting, and history writing, which is introduced in the following passage. 'Part Three: The Residue of Queenship' will then discuss the concept and attributes of memory and memorialisation to understand how queens in Shakespeare's histories serve as historians and monuments, providing an alternative history against the authoritative patriarchal version, and attempt

---

[146] See John N. King's 'Patronage and Piety: The Influence of Catherine Parr' in *Silent but for the Word: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works*, ed. by Margaret Patterson Hannay (Kent, Ohio: The Kent State University Press, 1985), pp. 43-60. Also see Susan E. James, 'Katherine [Katherine Parr] (1512–1548)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4893, accessed 31 March 2011]

to manipulate remembering and forgetting in order to be memorialised positively.

Theatre and Memory: Remembering

In 'On the Gravy Train: Shakespeare, Memory and Forgetting', Peter Holland argues that the system of theatre performance and reception is completely about memory. The modern 'renovation' of early modern theatres, whether in architectural construction (such as Shakespeare's Globe) or in name (the Royal Shakespeare Theatre, originally named as the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre), indicates a memorialisation of the playwright, his works, and his social culture. The theatres are sites procreating social history, providing a venue for public discussion and joint remembering, enabling the public to recollect the dramatised past together and to generate a combined memory of this new theatre experience. The audience's reception, including reviews and the lasting reputation of the performance, memorialises what they 'collectively witnessed', generating a collective memory.[147] Focusing his study on evidence of theatre experiences from the audience's and performers' perspectives in history, Holland examines memories in the light of both what is remembered and what is forgotten by the performers, by the audience before, during, and after the performance, and in terms of omissions or additions to the original texts of the play itself, ultimately illustrating the way in which theatre is 'a space of memory'.[148]

In addition to the audience, staging a performance itself is the embodiment of memory: the playwrights adapt historical, literary, and cultural materials in the process of writing scripts. The existence of a prompter, whether visible or invisible on stage, suggests how theatre performance is based on the fundamental concept of 'remembering', as cues and the various skills employed by the actors and actresses help them 'memorise' their lines.[149] The possible errors and differences between each performance indicate that theatres cannot ever reproduce two performances that are exactly the same, even based on their accumulated memory of former performances. Each performance is unique. Therefore, different audiences' receptions and memories of the same production will always contain discrepancies.

---

[147] Peter Holland, 'On the Gravy Train: Shakespeare, Memory and Forgetting', *Shakespeare, Memory and Performance*, ed. by Peter Holland (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 207-234 (p. 210).
[148] Ibid., p. 234.
[149] See also Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr., *Memory and Forgetting in English Renaissance Drama: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Webster* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 5.

However, there is still a general memory shared by the audiences attending different performances. Reviews by critics may present certain versions of voices and memory pertaining to the production. This mechanism is similar to history writing. There are shared, but not identical, *collective memories*, and certain versions are represented and authorised via a more effective 'texualising' medium (written, visual, or multi-media), thus generating 'histories'. Finally, the theatrical space is one of memory as well. According to Holland, '[theatre] as memory machine' encompasses the elements of memory in the process of the performance (as stated above), and the erection of the stage space and the building itself is also an action of remembering.[150]

Holland's analysis of the characteristics of memory in Shakespearean theatres resonates with the different 'arts of memory' identified by Peter Burke. In 'History as Social Memory', Burke defines five different mediums for the social organisation of transmitting memory: 1) oral tradition; 2) written records (such as memoirs); 3) images (pictorial or photographic, still or moving); 4) ritual actions (commemoration activities); and 5) space.[151] Before analysing the implementation of these arts of memory in Shakespeare's history plays, we might need to distinguish between memory, history, and memorialisation. Most of the critics talk about history and Shakespeare's plays in terms of what is remembered and what is forgotten: what kind of history Shakespeare wrote and then represented in his dramatic productions, or what the similarities and differences were between the world of reality and that portrayed on the stage, or whether there were any allegorical, typological, or symbolic references. Memory in Shakespearean studies focuses on the process of remembering and forgetting – how remembrance and oblivion occurs and functions in the societies of the audience in different times. Memorialisation, however, is the production of history and memory.

Theatre and Memory: Forgetting

---

[150] Holland, 'Shakespeare, Memory and Forgetting', p. 208-223, especially 221. We may apply Holland's analysis to explore the productions of each commemorating performance and the establishment of any Shakespearean theatres, such as Chicago Shakespeare Theatre, or any performance staged in relevant monuments, for instance, reading passages of *Henry VI* in the historical remains of the Rose Theatre, now Rose Theatre Trust.

[151] Peter Burke, 'History as Social Memory', *Varieties of Cultural History* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997), 43-59 (pp. 47-49). For the transmission of 'social memory', see also James Fentress and Chris Wickham, *Social Memory* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), especially Fentress and Wickham's 'The Ordering and Transmission of Social Memory' in their *Social Memory*, pp. 41-86. They also mention how the 'articulation' of social memory is conducted via 'rituals' that are acted out to transmit manual skills, corresponding to Burke's 'ritual action' in his taxonomy of the art of transmitting memories. See Fentress and Wickham, p. 47.

History and theatre, it seems, are as much about forgetting and oblivion as they are about remembering and commemoration. In *Memory and Forgetting in English Renaissance Drama: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Webster*, Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr. observes that 'antitheatricalists associate the theatre with the generation of (self-) forgetting in audience members'.[152] Interestingly, early modern antitheatricalists seemed to deem theatre as a place for people to indulge in their imagination and forget themselves. The theatre did demand that its audience apply their imagination and in this, a 'community of imagination' was generated; and many of the plays propagandising different political thoughts and ideas of national consciousness were staged in order to make people remember. To remember or forget oneself in relation to personal identity is more related to the individual's 'place', rather than his/her personality, in a society. The spatial conceptualisations of identity and memory are based on medieval and early modern concepts about space and order.

In the 'Preface' to his chronicle, Edward Hall discloses that the writing of history is a resistance against oblivion, the 'cancard enemye to Fame'.[153] Naming oblivion the enemy, Hall asserts that memory is a treasure that needs to be defended.[154] Oblivion indicates 'historical forgetfulness'; it aligns itself 'with death and in opposition to history', and finds no place in memory. Oblivion is a 'placelessness'.[155] The spatial concept of memory and oblivion not only refers to the physiological understanding/ imagination of how human beings divided, structured, and stored their memories in the medieval period, but it also suggests where these memories (of certain figures and events) should be placed in the collective knowledge and history of a society.[156] Expanding from this, it is important to note that women could find little space in the pages of the chronicles, thus facing oblivion in historical texts. Howard and Rackin argue that women in Shakespeare's plays find their voices and volition only when the patriarchal order is lost or endangered; once order is reinstated, women are once again exiled from the centre of the stage and the page, and their voice and actions marginalised. However, marginalisation is not the same as forgetting; as Shakespeare quoted chronicles and dramatised the queens according to both historical descriptions

---

[152] Sullivan, *Memory and Forgetting*, p. 20.
[153] Edward Hall, 'The Preface', *The Vnion*, A2r-A3r.
[154] Sullivan, *Memory and Forgetting*, p. 27.
[155] Ibid. Also see Sir Walter Raleigh, *The History of the World* (London: Walter Burre, 1614), *ESTC* S116300.
[156] See Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture* [1990], 1st ed., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

and his own inventions, the playwright gave lives to these characters and empowered women, especially aristocratic women, such as queens.

The playwright writes a new definition of the queens' two bodies, especially for queens consort: despite the deterioration of the queens' body natural, there is the body cultural passed on through queens, embodied in their virtues when practising their roles as queens in public and private. The body natural encompasses the biological aspect, such as the sexuality of queenship, their biological function as the conveyor of royal reproduction. The body cultural presents the spiritual element of queenship; as in contrast to biological motherhood, it brings out the maternity in queenship. Although Elizabeth I did not procreate biologically, she was still spiritually, culturally, and politically the mother of England and the predecessor of James I. Moreover, the queens' body cultural is elaborated in Shakespeare's English histories for princesses and queens in the history and literature of later periods. This thesis borrows from research on Elizabeth I's queenship and its foundation in historical and literary traditions to strengthen the examinations of queens consort and argue for an iconography of queenship in Shakespeare's history plays.

- **Synopsis**

This thesis analyses the pursuit, practice, and residue of queenship. Part One appraises the cultivation and function of women's virtues through marriage, education, and family networking in the making of queenship. It studies how women react to the offer of royal proposal, to present what they have been prepared for by others, or to demonstrate what they have equipped themselves with to be a qualified queen. Chapter One compares women's passive acceptance and active pursuit of queenship, arguing that in the exchange of women in marriage, these queens-to-be consciously know they function as political or financial assets, for their fathers, for the royal households, and for the country. Yet, in the process of education for future queenship, marriage negotiation, and the interaction between the patriarchs of both sides and the brides, Shakespeare depicts different levels to and aspects of the autonomy of these women. Chapter Two includes another two versions of the pursuit of queenship: 'disobedient rejection' and 'false attempt', featuring women's interpretation of their virtues and their false reading of queenship.

Part Two explores queenship in terms of the relationship between gender and space

in queens' practice of their authority in domestic and foreign courts, in spaces with limited accesses, such as chambers and gardens, and on the open fields during wars. 'The Practice of Queenship' first renders a further discussion of the idea of private and public in conduct books, in the Elizabethan court, and on the stage in early modern England. Chapter Three investigates Shakespeare's dramatic representation of queens in royal spectacles, queens' etiquette, networking, advice, and even petitions in the English court. The display of their individual cares and emotions in public space does not damage their virtues as queens, but instead, it demonstrates their knowledge and effectiveness in government, empowering their queenship through showing their private selves. When queens leave the public royal court, they return to their own private courts, but continue to be concerned with politics not only in the light of the kings' government, but also in terms of their private lives, such as their pregnancy. Under such understanding, queens' bodies belong to the kingdom and are relevant to the stability and security of the state. Their appearance on battlefields and their participation in wars present a paradox for an early modern English audience: it is unfamiliar for them because it is against the teaching of conduct books and undermines the images of women's fragility and debility; it is also familiar for them as they experienced their queens standing/presenting themselves at the military front as in the historical cases of Katherine of Aragon and Elizabeth I.

Part Three is titled 'The Residue of Queenship'. It examines queens after they are widowed, divorced, or deposed. Losing the support of their kings, either their husbands or sons, these queens endeavour to maintain their queenship; they act as eye-witnesses or historians, or serve as living monuments, attempting to engrave an alternative historical narrative against the grain of the incumbent patriarchal order. Nevertheless, these queens areengraved in history as well. The residue of queenship is the memorialisation of queenship, not only in the form of how queens write histories, but also regarding how they are written in histories. Part Three contains only one chapter, as Shakespeare provides few portrayals of queens after they lose the royal title: Chapter Five, 'Queens and Memorialisation' discusses queens and memory: how Shakespeare's English queens remember and forget, how they make use of their own memories in competition with male grand narratives to write an alternative history.

E. H. Carr defines history as 'a continuous process of interaction between the

historian and his facts, an unending dialogue between the present and the past'.[157]
Shakespeare's history plays illustrate this in his time, while our reiterative performance,
observation, and study of the plays is another process of interacting and conversing with
the past. Kingship has been explored and theorised over centuries, and yet queenship for
queens consort is less discussed. Less rigidly defined than kingship, queenship remains
more fluid. This in turn provides Shakespeare with the space to dramatise queenship in
his English history plays ever more fruitfully. This thesis is an exploratory research on
Shakespeare's representations of queenship. By reading Shakespeare's queens closely
along with the themes of virtues, space, and memorialisation, this thesis provides the
first thorough literary review of queenship in Shakespeare's English history plays.

---

[157] Carr, *What is History?*, p. 24.

Part One: The Pursuit of Queenship

BLANCHE [to LOUIS THE DAUPHIN]

> My uncle's will in this respect is mine.
>
> If he see aught in you that makes him like,
>
> That anything he sees which moves his liking
>
> I can with ease translate it to my will;
>
> Or if you will, to speak more properly,
>
> I will enforce it easily to my love.

(*King John* 2.1.511-516)

SUFFOLK How say you, madam; are ye so content?

MARGARET An if my father please, I am content.

(*Henry VI, Part One* 5.5.82-83)

KING HARRY Therefore, queen of all, Catherine, break thy mind to me

> in broken English: will thou have me?

CATHERINE Dat is as it shall please de *roi mon père*.

(*Henry V* 5.2.227-229)

ANNE By my troth and maidenhead,

> I would not be a queen.

(*Henry VIII* 2.3.23-4)

Queenship for queens consort is inaugurated with royal marriages. In the quotations above, Blanche of Spain, Margaret of Anjou, and Catherine of Valois subjugate their decisions of marriages to their fathers' wills, and only Anne Boleyn expresses her reluctance to be a queen. At first glance, it appears they are merely sacrificing themselves to the authority of the patriarchal order; however, reading these women more closely, we may find that they often use the excuse of parental consent as a means of deferring their answers when they are being proposed to. The reluctance, hesitation, or coyness, whether genuine or performative, that these women express towards the

prospect of a royal marriage is critical to their reputation and honour, suggesting a subtle issue of 'virtue' in the gender politics in early modern England. 'Part One: The Pursuit of Queenship' will explore how women use their virtue in their interaction with patriarchal authority: how women respond when they are offered royal marriage, how they access power, and how they manipulate their physical and intellectual attributes, the discourse of marriage, and the rhetoric of submissiveness.

'The Pursuit of Queenship' categorises aristocratic women in Shakespeare's English history plays into four groups in two chapters: I. Passive Acceptance; II. Active Pursuit in Chapter One, 'To Be a Queen'; III. Disobedient Rejection; and IV. False Attempt in Chapter Two, 'Not to Be a Queen'. 'Passive Acceptance' examines the cases of Blanche in *King John* and Catherine in *Henry V* with regard to how a royal marriage is contracted and how the two princesses' knowledge and education increase their value for marriage proposals. 'Active Pursuit' explores how Anne Boleyn in *Henry VIII*, and Margaret of Anjou and Lady Elizabeth Woodville in *Henry VI, Part One and Two* exploit their 'virtues' of beauty, chastity, sympathy, and humility, to manipulate familial and social networks that are related to or based on marriages. 'Disobedient Rejection' in Chapter Two investigates two specific cases. In *Richard III*, Lady Anne's reaction to the Duke of Gloucester's wooing suggests a compromise between womanly virtue and practical strategies of survival among the political mayhem of the Wars of the Roses. The second case is the Countess of Salisbury in *King Edward III*, a recently rehabilitated play in which the Countess's rejection of queenship reveals the complex issue of obedience in early modern England. The final section, 'False Attempts', examines two women's failed approach to queenship. Joan of Arc in *Henry VI, Part One* and the Duchess of Gloucester in *Henry VI, Part Two* both mis-appropriate and mis-read queenship, illustrating the discrepancies of gendered virtues for men and women and offering insight into the constitution and use of queenship. Dramatising these queens-to-be, Shakespeare provides an alternative version of the lives of women who implement their knowledge, ability, and autonomy to display and accomplish the image as virtuous, chaste, silent, and obedient women. In the pursuit of queenship, Shakespeare's aristocratic women use their virtues to empower themselves either to accommodate or to resist royal marriages within the patriarchal system.

Introduction

This introduction examines ideas of marriage, education, and family networking in teachings in conduct books, using the examples of Mary I and Elizabeth I to see how women's autonomy was configured and circumscribed in early modern England. It then explores the Renaissance idea of virtue regarding marriage, education, and familial networking. Analysing Shakespeare's female characters during the process of making royal marriage, 'The Pursuit of Queenship' reconsiders virtues in line with Machiavelli's idea of *virtù* and Pierre Bourdieu's theory of cultural capital to argue that women accumulate available resource and manipulate their marriage, education, and family networking.

Conduct Books on Marriage

Marriage seems to be the ultimate mission for a woman, but it is difficult to choose whom to marry. Kelso notices that in 1290, Francesco Barberino stated that women started to wait after they were twelve to be wedded.[1] In *The Instruction of a Christian Woman*, Juan Luis Vives advises young women not to worry about whom they will marry, but leave it instead to their 'experienced and wise' parents.[2] Young women should follow their parents' instruction rather than depending on love to decide their marriage. All that young women need to be concerned with is the preservation of their chastity: their most important value.[3] Horatio Fusco in *La vedova del Fusco* (1570) lent a voice to young women concerning their choices for marriage. Although for the most part he agreed with Vives that the decision should be the fathers', sometimes, he explained, 'for her own satisfaction she would know better than her experienced father what to do' or 'at least he should consult her mother'.[4] In *The Instruction*, Vives refutes love, especially the kind of love related to sensual satisfactions or extreme emotions. He advises that women should not force men into matrimony, but respect their freedom of choice; yet he ignores women's will in the issue of marriage. Even in the discussion of choosing a husband, Vives only considers men's will as a factor, while women need only to obey their parents; their will does not have equal importance to men's during the

---

[1] Kelso, *Doctrine,* p. 56.
[2] For the modern version of *The Instruction* used in this thesis, see Vives, *The Instruction*, ed. by ffolliott and Travitsky, pp. 76-84. For the Latin version, see J. L. Vives, 'De Institutione Feminae Christianae, Liber Primus', in *J. L. Vives, De Institutione Feminae Christianae, Liber Primus: Introduction, Critical Edition, Translation and Notes*, ed. by C. Fantazzi and C. Matheeussen (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996).
[3] Ibid., pp. 80-83.
[4] Ibid.

process of contracting marriage.[5]

<u>Education</u>

The purpose of education during the Renaissance was to prepare people for different occupations: for gentlemen, to enable them to manage government, war, or learned professions; for gentlewomen, to equip them with knowledge and ability of housewifery.[6] Education increased a woman's value in the marriage market. It could thus be viewed as a form of capital, an investment made by patriarchs that added value to their daughters as marriage material. Education was thus a kind of dowry. McIntosh notes Antony Cooke's design of his daughters' education and their subsequent beneficial marriages and familial networkings.[7] In *Doctrine for the Lady of the Renaissance*, Kelso also indicates how education and training for women are deemed as dowry because they 'would be an aid in managing the household when girls came to marry, in pleasing husband and friends with special dishes, in winning renown for skills most appropriate to women, and even in helping the mother while they were growing up'.[8]

<u>Education and the Cultivation of Queenship: the Cases of Mary I and Elizabeth I</u>

Queen Mary I and Elizabeth I, two prominent queens regnant in the Tudor dynasty, were famous for their education. Although the purpose of their educations was to enable them to make potentially powerful and beneficial marital alliances, they were tutored as befitted both a princess and a prince. Mary was not only trained to be a good hostess of a royal family, she was also educated to be a good governor. Compared with Mary, Elizabeth's education was less programmed by her parents; she was educated with Prince Edward sometimes and shared whatever was provided for him.

Mary I's education was varied, consisting of dancing, music, language, and politics. Scholars from different fields were invited to be her tutors: Richard Fetherston oversaw her education; Philip Van Wilder and Edward Paston guided her learning in music. These rich resources suggest that Mary I was cultivated, indulged, and valued by her parents. By the age of eight, three different betrothals had been arranged for Mary: with François, dauphin of France (1518-1536) in 1518, with Holy Roman Emperor Charles

---

[5] Ibid., pp. 80-83.
[6] Kelso, *Doctrine*, p. 4.
[7] McIntosh, 'Sir Anthony Cooke', p. 234.
[8] Kelso, *Doctrine,* p. 45.

V in 1521, and with James V in 1524. While Henry VIII expected Mary to be educated to be a queen consort, Mary's mother, Katherine of Aragon, deliberately provided her with the education to be a future ruler. As Mary's maternal grandmother, Queen Isabella of Castile, had been an excellent queen regnant and consort, Katherine purposely cultivated Mary for both roles as well. As discussed in 'General Introduction', Vives was commissioned to write *De ratione studii puerilis* (1521), advising Mary to 'place public interests' before her own preference and 'to be free of private concerns' and personal feelings.[9] He prepared what was suited for a future ruler and, bearing in mind that Mary was a princess, he also included what was required for a future female consort.

Prior to her education alongside Prince Edward, Elizabeth was first taught by Kat Astley, after whom William Grindal was appointed as her tutor. Later, she shared a French tutor, Jean Belmaine, and Roger Ascham with Edward. According to *ODNB*, 'Ascham himself kept a close eye on Elizabeth's lessons, for which he assumed direct responsibility after Grindal's untimely death in January 1548'.[10] Elizabeth's education was less gendered than that of other aristocratic women, during this period: one reason was the influence of humanism in Henry VIII's court. Another was that she was taught alongside Edward.

In *Henry V*, the French Princess Catherine learns English without assistance or resources from her patriarchs and her knowledge of English becomes a benefit to her future marriage proposal. Similarly, Elizabeth I's training in French was an additional benefit to consider when it came to possible marriage proposals for her during Henry VIII's and Edward VI's reigns. Elizabeth maintained her passion for learning, especially languages, throughout her life: she kept translating Greek and Latin texts after she was crowned queen and continued even into her sixties 'mainly for personal satisfaction'.[11] Patrick Collinson comments that 'Elizabeth, and for that matter Mary, were fortunate in being born at a time when enthusiasm for the project of educating aristocratic women was at its height, especially in Italy'.[12] Elizabeth's education elevated her value and

---

[9] Watson, ed., *Vives and the Renascence Education,* pp. 156-157.

[10] Patrick Collinson, 'Elizabeth I (1533-1603)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online edn, Oxford University Press, Oct 2006 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8636, accessed 28 September, 2009], par. 6.

[11] See Helen Hackett, 'Review of *Elizabeth I: Translations*, ed. By Janel Mueller and Joshua Scodel (University of Chicago Press, 2009)' in *Journal of the Northern Renaissance*, 2009. (http://www.northernrenaissance.org/reviews/emElizabeth-I-Translationsem-ed-by-Janel-Mueller-and-Joshua-Scodel-University-of-Chicago-Press-2009-br-Reviewed-by-Helen-Hackett/12), par. 3.

[12] Collinson, 'Elizabeth I', par.6.

strengthened her ability to rule; her self-motivation demonstrates her awareness of being a princess and possibly a future female ruler.

Family Networking

One benefit of contracting marriage is the expansion of kinship, which is understood as family networking in this thesis. As parents were influential in marriage negotiations, their engagement with, and consideration of, securing and enlarging the relationship network were closely associated with the exhibition and enhancement of power. The process of enlarging family networks created opportunities for both patriarchs and matriarchs to be involved in relevant political relationships. In 'Women and Politics in Early Tudor England', Barbara J. Harris argues that upper-class women, especially widowed mothers, participated greatly in the arrangement of their children's marriages. To facilitate their daughters' chances and prospect of a good marriage, mothers endeavoured to make their daughters enter 'the service of high-ranking noble women or pa[y] them extended visits,' where 'in the best circumstances', they could find husbands or be introduced to the royal court.[13]

These women would thus enjoy and even dominate spaces which were generally restricted from a woman's access. Rather than being secluded away in their households, they held active roles in making associations within different influential households and being a notable presence at the royal court. They played crucial roles in the social activities, such as gift giving and token exchange, between the households.[14] This kind of network, dominated by matriarchs, united different households, influenced their patriarchs, and sometimes even formed a voice at the king's royal court as in cases such as Henry VIII's marital issues and Edward VI's religious reformations. Harris's argument explains the influence Mildred Cecil had on her husband and the court, and Anne Bacon's influence on the religious reformation during Elizabeth I's reign. As such, women could be involved in politics even though they did not have a place in Parliament or in the King's or Queen's court.

Harris also notes however, that these women's action (what some would deem accomplishments) were often labelled man-like and 'atypical' to womankind by their

---

[13] Barbara J. Harris, 'Women and Politics in Early Tudor England', *The Historical Journal* 33.2 (1990), 259-281 (p. 263).
[14] Ibid., pp. 264-266.

male relatives in an attempt to sustain the monopoly of the masculine political system.[15] These women's involvement in politics was still dominated by a masculine authoritative system; as long as this system was, even if only superficially or theoretically, intact, women's intervention could be tolerated. Although these women's actions were 'trans-gendered' as masculine, feminists may interpret them in different ways, considering the restrictions or mores that early modern women had to follow. Harris's study draws attention to the subtle and ambiguous division of public and private politics. Among all the female aristocrats, queens were the most powerful matriarchs; their involvement in the royal children's marriages, exposure in public, and interactions with different households were not labelled as atypical or man-like, as all of these roles were part of their queenly missions. The political wisdom and virtues they exhibited and implemented contributed to family networking. In Shakespeare's English history plays, queens (incumbent or probational) are influential intercessors in the making of royal marriages and family networking.

Queens' Cultural Capital

As discussed in 'General Introduction', virtues are queens' cultural capital to be augmented from, and implied in, marriage, education, and family networking. Virtues are gendered. Kelso examines treatises and conduct books and compares the discrepancies between virtues for men and for women. She argues that the virtues required to cultivate a Renaissance courtier (man) belonged to the pagan tradition, emphasising honour and valour, while, on the other hand, the virtues expected to educate a Renaissance lady were related to Christian values such as chastity, obedience, perseverance, and humility.[16] Her observation corresponds to *OED*'s definitions of virtue. Among the aristocracy, a princess (a future queen consort and even regnant) was cultivated to be virtuous not only to be a paradigm for other women across the entire kingdom, but also to ensure she was a valuable asset in the marriage market. Different virtues were valued differently for the different roles and careers available to a woman.

In addition to womanly virtues, this thesis argues that queens' virtues include the power, wisdom, and ability to exploit political benefits and manage the risks, all of which seem to have a masculine inclination and are similar to Machiavelli's idea of

_____

[15] Ibid., pp. 276-277, 279, and 281.
[16] Kelso, *Doctrine*, p. 25.

virtù. *Virtù* is thought to be a necessary attribute for a Prince to conquer Fortune (a relationship that is often gendered with connotations of male power and female subordination).[17] However, as Barbara Speckman argues, Machiavelli's original theory of *virtù* appropriated Roman mythology without pointing out the contradictions or considering the history of female involvement in politics; therefore, in terms of gender, it might not be an 'ideological choice'.[18] Similarly, the Latin language also has an extensive interpretation of *virtù* not from *vir*, but from *virtus*, liberating it from the circumscription of gender: '[if] we return to the Latin *virtus*, meaning "excellence", we find the roots of the ideas of valo[u]r, bravery, and worth, as well as potency, which are retained in the word *virility*'.[19] The gendered characterisation of *virtù* and Fortune was convenient for Machiavelli, but this did not indicate his ignorance of the possibility for, and the ability of, a female ruler or the potential for a woman's political engagement; he was writing his political treatises and histories at a time when matriarchs were influential in Florence.

As *virtù* is the key to one's political life, another characteristic of *virtù* is societal and public.[20] *Virtù* is public, social, and political; it is a set of characteristics and abilities that, whether private or public, moral or political, are recognised and endorsed socially. Juhana Lemetti argues that '[a] virtuous person and action have an element of (moral) excellence in the sense that to be virtuous is always something appreciated or valued by that person and others,' and thereby, it 'has a social component'.[21] Therefore, *virtù* only becomes valid through a communal recognition; it is something that is public and social: elements that are also related to its performativity.[22] This characteristic not only indicates that *virtù* is required and implemented when one participates in various social activities, whether these be the running of government or activity in battle, it also reveals that *virtù* is exhibited and performed during the process of the participation so as to exalt one's reputation/honour and to increase one's authority.

---

[17] See Timo Airaksinen, 'Against All the Odds: Machiavelli on Fortune in Politics', in *Niccolo Machiavelli: History, Power, and Virtue*, ed. by Leonidas Donskis (Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2011), pp. 3-14. Barbara Spackman, 'Machiavelli and Gender' in *The Cambridge Companion to Machiavelli*, ed. by John M. Najemy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 223-238 (p. 236).

[18] Spackman, 'Machiavelli and Gender', pp. 228 and 233.

[19] Michael Jinkins and Deborah Bradshaw Jinkins, *The Character of Leadership: Political Realism and Public Virtue in Nonprofit Organizations* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1998), p. 105.

[20] For *virtù* as a social virtue, see ibid., p. 105-6.

[21] Juhana Lemetti, 'Virtue in Hobbes: Seen from a Machiavellian Point of View' in *Niccolo Machiavelli*, ed. by Donskis, pp. 79-89 (p. 79).

[22] For *virtù* and its relation with communal political lives and public concerns, see Jinkins and Jinkins, *The Character of Leadership,* p. 105.

This attribute of publicity, as discussed above about women's reputation and honour, also applies to women's virtues, particularly to queenship. In addition, as reputation and honour needed to be publicly recognised, how could any virtue be 'private', even for women? Even if women's lives were restricted to the private sphere, this demonstration of their virtue (through and of their 'privateness') is social and public. In *Coriolanus*, through the character of Aufidius, Shakespeare states that 'So our virtues/ Lie in th'interpretation of the time', indicating that virtues need to be displayed, examined, and recognised (*Cor*. 4.7.49-50). This thesis argues that queens' virtues encompass virtues of both genders and are characterised with publicity and performativity. Despite the gendered difference of virtues, queens are awarded both conventionally categorised feminine and masculine virtues. This transgression of the division between the genders and the integration, implementation, appropriation, and performance of public and private virtues, which are generally thought to be applied in political and domestic life respectively, demonstrate the queens' powers and the inauguration of their authority.

The virtues of a queen are the focus of Part One. Studying the foundation of queenship – how royal marriage contracts are made and how aristocratic women become queens in Shakespeare's history plays – this thesis discovers that virtues are cultural capital that is accumulated and invested in women. Yet women are not merely passive objects that await their entrance to the marriage market, they are also active subjects who increase and implement their own cultural capital – their virtues.

Chapter One: To Be a Queen

I. Passive Acceptance

A. Blanche in *King John*: Performing the Virtue of Obedience

Blanche in *King John* complies with her uncle's arrangement of marriage, presenting the virtue of obedience and illustrating a typical case of 'passive acceptance' in the pursuit of queenship. Liz Oakley-Brown and Louise J. Wilkinson state that 'royal daughters, sisters and more distant female kin might be highly prized as brides on the international marriage market'.[23] Blanche's marriage contract is a part of the peace treaty between England and France. Without any resistance she accepts her vocation as assigned by her uncle, King John, and subjugates herself to international politics by marrying the French Dauphin. In a few scenes, Shakespeare depicts Blanche with a more detailed characterisation than what we would expect to find in early modern English chronicles. In Holinshed's *Chronicles*, King John decides on Blanche's marriage without asking her for her consent, and Holinshed did not mention whether Blanche went to France along with King John's court and army.[24] By comparison, on the Shakespearean stage this marriage is brokered with Blanche's involvement:

> KING JOHN What say these young ones? What say you, my niece?
> BLANCHE That she is bound in honour still to do
> What you in wisdom shall vouchsafe to say.
>
> (*King John* 2.1.522-524*)*

Blanche leaves the final decision about her choices to her uncle; thus she avoids having to deal with the issue of 'love', which, interestingly enough, the Dauphin prioritises in his answer to the royal marriage. In *The English Family 1450-1700*, Ralph A. Houlbrooke argues that although in early modern England 'love' was 'widely held to be an essential element in marriage', its meaning ranged from 'friendship to passionate mutual absorption', and 'it was widely believed, especially among the upper classes, that mutual affection could easily develop within marriage between well-matched partners'.[25] As such, the Dauphin's proclamation of love is more like a performance of

---

23 See Oakley-Brown and Wilkinson, eds., 'Introduction' in *Rituals and Rhetoric,* p. 14.
24 Raphael Holinshed, *The Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland* (London : Printed by Henry Denham, at the expenses of Iohn Harison, George Bishop, Rafe Newberie, Henrie Denham, and Thomas Woodcocke, 1587), *STC* 13569 and *ESTC* S93013.
25 See Ralph A. Houlbrooke, *The English Family 1450-1700* (London: Longman, 1984), p.76.

which Blanche is aware. There are three further central criteria to take into account when choosing a marriage partner in addition to 'personal affection or love': 'the advancement of the individual or the family', 'the ideal of parity' (equal status of rank, wealth, and so on), and 'the character of the proposed partner'.[26] The Dauphin mentions love; both he and Blanche are aristocrats; but no one evaluates whether the Dauphin is personally suitable for her.[27] This implies the limited individual choice in royal marriage: that is, princes and princesses often had to give up their personal preferences and obey their patriarchs, sacrificing their private likes and dislikes for the welfare of the country. Blanche's reaction illustrates a contrast between the spirit of free consent in marriage and the circumscription that aristocratic women faced when choosing their husbands. In Europe as well as in England before the twelfth century the tradition of Germanic law emphasised that family or parental consent determined the contract of marriage, but later in the middle ages, at the end of the twelfth century, ecclesiastical law states that 'it was the consent of the bridal couple alone which rendered a marriage valid'.[28] The importance of personal mutual consent and personal will increased in late Medieval England.[29] Yet the principle of 'permitting young men and women to enter into indissoluble marriage privately, seems almost to have been designed for young people eager to escape the forces that hindered free choice in marriage'.[30] However, it seems that women born in aristocratic families had even less freedom when it came to choosing their future husbands.

Marriage is more than the union of two people legally and spiritually; it also bonds two families or clans together socially and economically. Most of all, it is about financial exchanges: fathers can intervene in their children's marriages by controlling the transaction of the jointure and dowry such as money, lands, and even inheritance rights. This situation is more prominent in aristocratic families than non-aristocratic

---

[26] Ibid, p.73.

[27] In the later section, I will analyse the implication of Margaret of Anjou's complaints about her misassumption of Henry VI's character before marrying him.

[28] See Shulamith Shahar, *The Fourth Estate: A History of Women in the Middle Ages*, trans. Chaya Galai (London: Routledge, 1983, 2002), p. 83. This principle was established under the influence of Peter Lombard (c. 1100-1160), whose *Four Books of Sentences* became the main theological reference in the Middle Ages.

[29] For instance, marriage was used as a means to 'punish' and solve cases of fornication, but because of the issue of free will and mutual consent, this imposition of marriage was forsaken in the fifteenth century. See Richard H. Helmholz, 'Abjuration *Sub Pena Nubendi* in the Church Courts of Medieval England', *Canon Law and the Law of England* (London: Hambledon Press, 1987), pp. 145-55.

[30] R. H. Helmholz, 'Marriage and Divorce', *The Oxford History of the Laws of England: Volume I: The Canon Law and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction from 597 to the 1640s* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), pp. 521-564 (p. 527).

ones. Harris notes that 'the material and ideological structures that defined aristocratic culture collaborated to secure women's compliance with the system of arranged marriage'.[31] The higher the social and economic stratum a woman belonged to, the fewer chances she would have to decline an arranged marriage. As conveyors of financial and political profit, women were often exploited by their patriarchs for their own purposes.[32] Blanche is barely given any chance to negate the decision made by the English and French patriarchs or to reveal her true mind regarding the marriage in public. In her answer to King John, she uses the third person ('she') rather than the first person ('I') to refer to herself; this not only conceals and distances herself from the negotiation, but also implies the elimination of her subjectivity. Blanche's obedience is performative and practical.

Despite her submissiveness, Blanche has a good knowledge of her function in the royal marriage and international politics.[33] Reading Blanche's participation in the argument over succession earlier in the same scene, we see that Blanche understands the political happenings in the English court (*KJ* 2.1.141-2 and 511-524). Following the Bastard's taunts about French intervention in England's succession issue, Blanche comments, 'O well did he [Richard Coeur de Lion] become that lion's robe/ That did disrobe the lion of that robe!' (*KJ* 2.1.141-2). Alluding to historical events and responding to the Bastard's word play cleverly, Blanche points out France's inappropriate intervention in English politics. Blanche's political involvement corresponds to Machiavelli's concept of *virtù*: she has a good 'sense of smell' for what the organisation is and how it is constituted and functions.[34] Although Blanche does not have any more lines until she is asked about the royal marriage five hundred lines later in the same scene, she is neither as silent nor as naive as one might expect.

Blanche's submissiveness and silence is performed to illustrate English patriarchal authority and the virtue of English ladies in front of the French court. Under such a public gaze, her obedience supports King John's legitimacy in the English succession dispute. As we have seen earlier, Blanche is able to make political comments in public; her silence, therefore, is a choice of her own. She understands the political and

---

[31] Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, p. 56.
[32] Women of higher rank and wealthier family also tended to marry at a younger age. See ibid., p. 57.
[33] Carole Levin, '"I Trust I May Not Trust Thee": Women's Visions of the World in Shakespeare's *King John*', in *Ambiguous Realities: Women in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, ed. by Carole Levin and Jeanie Watson (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987), pp. 219-234 (p. 226).
[34] Jinkins and Jinkins, *The Character of Leadership,* p. xii.

economical mechanisms of the international marriage exchange and through her performance of silence and obedience, she shows her 'daughter's acceptance' of her parents' [her uncle's] choice of a husband for her', presenting an example of passive acceptance.[35] By comparison with the scarce records of Blanche in early modern chronicles, in Shakespeare's subtle portrayal of the women, he recognises the timing and occasion to stage appropriate virtues, thus demonstrating her ability to engage in international politics as a probationer of queenship.

Blanche's awareness of her function is again illustrated in her attempt to prevent wars between England and France even before she is properly crowned as Queen of France. Because Blanche and the French Dauphine have as yet only expressed their intention to marry and have not exchanged their consent formally or even consummated their marriage, according to the Medieval canon law on marriage, they are not legally and validly married yet.[36] In the later parts of *King John*, however, Blanche has already started to play the role of a future French queen: she has already acted as an intercessor of international politics, demonstrating her virtue and power.

B. Catherine of Valois in *Henry V*: the Capital of Education

Like Blanche in *King John*, Catherine of Valois in *Henry V* is another pawn in international politics, but the political reality of her fate is concealed beneath the plots of Catherine's learning English and of Henry V's wooing. Regardless of the issues of silence and obedience, Catherine's self-taught English and the interaction between the English King and French Princess suggest an intriguing case of the pursuit of queenship. This section analyses Catherine's learning of English in the context of Renaissance humanist education and her interaction with Henry V in the light of the issues of sexuality and English nationality.

Before Catherine appears on the stage, the Chorus first refers to the marriage proposal between England and France:'Suppose th'ambassador from the French comes back,/ Tells Harry that the King doth offer him/ Catherine his daughter, and with her, to *dowry,/ Some petty and unprofitable dukedoms*' (*HV* 3.0.28-31, emphasis added). According to the Chorus, the French King intends to marry his daughter to Henry V in exchange for peace, but Henry V rejects the proposal because of her unsatisfactory

---

[35] Kelso, *Doctrine*, p. 44.
[36] For the procedure of contracting and validating a marriage, see Helmholz, 'Marriage and Divorce', p. 527.

dowry. Historically, the nuptial league was proposed and sponsored by Catherine's mother rather than her father. In the *Chronicles*, Holinshed wrote that the French Queen assumed that once the King of England beheld her daughter's 'excellent beautie', he should be 'so enflamed and rapt in hir loue, that he, to obteine hir to his wife, should the sooner agree to a gentle peace and louing concord'.[37] This passage shows that women were used as diplomatic assets and conduits between royal families and countries. It also reveals how the French queen endeavoured to expand her family network and seek peace through marriage, suggesting the power she had in family issues and state affairs.

Shakespeare does not stage the French Queen's negotiation of the marriage contract, but he suggests her contribution in the matter through dramatising her appearance in the French court along with the English and French Kings and their courtiers.[38] Moreover, Isabel, the French Queen, comments on the union of Catherine and Henry V:

> QUEEN ISABEL God, the best maker of all marriages,
>
> Combine your hearts in one, your realms in one.
>
> [...];
>
> That English may as French, French Englishmen,
>
> Receive each other, God speak this 'Amen'.
>
> (*Henry V* 5.2.331-340)

In this speech, Queen Isabel suggests that the marriage is a predestined design, reinforcing the power of the union, and plays the role of a peacemaker, endeavouring to integrate the people in two kingdoms. Queen Isabel's concern about Henry V's belligerence and threat against France has alleviated and as she expects that 'all griefs and quarrels' have been changed 'into love' (*HV* 5.2.12-19, 20). In this context, it seems that the French queen, as one of the representatives of France in the court, also welcomes this international royal marriage. Her appearance in the court and participation in the diplomatic proceedings implicates her intervention in politics and existence and action in a public arena. Queen Isabel only makes two statements in this scene of the play, but Shakespeare has already made the Queen one of the examples of

---

[37] Holinshed, *The Chronicle* (1587), Vol. 3, p. 569.
[38] Carol Banks, 'Warlike Women: "reproofe to these degenerate effeminate dayes"?' in *Shakespeare's Histories and Counter-Histories*, ed. by Dermot Cavanagh, Stuart Hampton-Reeves, and Stephen Longstaffe eds. (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2006), pp. 169-181 (pp. 179-180).

how queens consort practise their queenship to act as the bridges between kingdoms or between monarchs and their subjects. The relation between spatial politics and queenship will be further explored in 'Part Two: The Practice of Queenship'.

Another intriguing plot in *Henry V* concerning the marriage between Henry V and Catherine is the Princess's English lessons. Shakespeare describes Catherine's learning English and her individual meeting with Henry V not only to create dramatic effects but also to strengthen the audience's identification with England. In Act III, Scene iv of *Henry V,* Catherine of Valois appears on the stage for the first time – she is learning English. This unhistorical dramatisation suggests, as the Chorus has already implied, that she is taking the language lesson with a prevision to the future bond between England and France. Her learning of English could thus become an action by which she is tentatively preparing for the English queenship. In the context of Renaissance humanist education for women, a woman displays her knowledge of Latin to illustrate her intelligence and good learning, but in Shakespeare's history plays, an incumbent or probational queen of England, such as Katherine of Aragon in *Henry VIII*, often exhibits her ability to use English, rather than Latin, in order to demonstrate her tie with the country.

In her private chamber or garden, Catherine tells Alice, her gentlewoman, 'Je te prie, m'enseignez. Il faut que j'apprenne à parler' (Please teach me. I must learn to speak) (*HV* 3.4.4-5). Without explaining the reason, Catherine expresses the necessity of learning English. However, instead of finding a formal tutor, she learns English only from her gentlewoman, indicating her education is more self-motivated rather than something that has been arranged by others for her, suggesting Anglophile sentiments. A woman's education, especially regarding housewifery, was generally supervised by female figures in the family, not the males; as Harris explains skills and knowledge about wifehood were acquired by daughters through observing how their mothers, gentlewomen (in the mothers' absence), or mistresses (with whom they resided) behaved.[39] An organised educational program, like that prepared for Mary I, was not common. In addition to this, considering English was less of an international language than Latin or French, Catherine's learning of English in the early fifteenth-century French court would be more of a dramatic plot than historical fact. At the same time however, this plot might illustrate the playwright's emphasis on English as a potential

---

[39] Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, p. 32.

international language.

Shakespeare implies the importance of learning English in achieving 'good English queenship' in his English histories. In *Henry V*, Catherine's English lesson begins with phrases of practical use rather than abstract grammar, indicating the Princess's intention of using the language to communicate with her future husband and his subjects. In *Henry IV, Part One*, Mortimer's Welsh wife cannot speak English and thus she does not understand what her husband says – had Mortimer become the King of England, she would have been unable to understand her English subjects either. This inability to communicate in English suggests the inadequate queenship of Mortimer's wife and this plot seems to foreshadow Mortimer's loss in the fight for the English crown. In contrast, Katherine of Aragon in *Henry VIII* proves her worthiness to be Queen of England by refusing to converse with Cardinal Wolsey in Latin but preferring to use English (*HVIII* 3.1.41-49). In *Henry V*, after her first English lesson, Catherine of Valois is praised by her teacher, Alice, who probably also has a French accent when speaking English: 'Sauf votre honneur, en vérité vous prononcez les mots aussi droit que les natifs d'Angleterre (Saving your honour, to tell the truth you pronounce the words just as properly as the native English)' (*HV* 3.4.34-35). Alice's comment creates a comic effect and helps to create an amiable image of Catherine in front of the early modern English audience. In addition, her amusing statement, 'as properly as the native English', indicates that Catherine's preparation for the English queenship is advancing. Language acquisition may not determine whether one becomes a queen or not, but it helps to gain recognition from one's subjects.

Language and Sexuality in the Discourse of Nationality

Catherine's second appearance on the stage happens when Henry V meets the French court after his victory. Here, the complicated relationship between language, nation, and sexuality is addressed in a seemingly romantic and comic scene in which Henry V wins Catherine of Valois. Instead of asking the French King for Catherine's hand, Henry V courts the French Princess to win her as if in a play that 'ends like a comedy in the happy marriage of France [Catherine] and England [Henry]'.[40] On the surface this dramatic design decreases the sense of Catherine being a political pawn,

---

[40] René Weis, 'Shakespeare and English Renaissance Drama' in *Bloomsbury Guides*, ed. by Wynne-Davies, pp. 37-56 (p. 45).

creating instead the image of an ideal marriage that represents the love and peace of Henry V's glorious reign.

In Act V, Scene ii, the final scene of *Henry V*, the English King and French Princess finally meet each other. Henry V asks whether Catherine likes him or not and she replies that she does not understand what 'like' means (*HV* 5.2.107). Since 'like' as a verb is a common usage in English, there is a chance that Catherine is merely performing in a modest fashion. Henry V, whether taking Catherine's incomprehension as a gesture or a fact, plays with the word: 'An angel is like you, Kate, and you are like an angel' (*HV* 5.2.108). In confusing 'like' the verb and 'like' the preposition, his word play demonstrates his domination of their conversation and his confidence in this courtship. This language game not only implies the King's (and Shakespeare's) ability to manipulate English, it also indicates the richness of the language, enabling and strengthening English national identity. Linguistic issues are subtly intertwined with national consciousness. Paralleling this, in Act IV, Scene iv, Pistol captures a French soldier and mistakes his screaming of 'O Seigneur Dieu (O Lord God)' as his name ('Seingeur Dew') (*HV* 4.4.4-7). This comic potential of the difference between the languages also reinforces an awareness of national identity. The difference between two languages is further elaborated on with reference to different accents in the interaction between Henry V and his Irish and Welsh soldiers.

Shakespeare deliberately recasts the playful and private Prince Hal, rather than Henry V who coldly rejects Falstaff, by using prose. Prose suits Catherine's broken English well, but it further contrasts with the epic narrative throughout the play. Henry V leaves the diplomatic talk to his uncles and brothers and instead seeks private time with the French princess, first finalising his own business, wooing his own wife and establishing his own family, before ruling his country. English prose, along with the 'must-be' (necessarily) imperfect, broken French of Henry V, underlines the motif of authentic English identity and integrity. Henry V's attempt to speak French, unlike Catherine's learning of English, does not demonstrate preparation for submission, but rather the versatility and the pride of a true English monarch. The pride of Henry V's England is further illustrated, somewhat ironically, through the King's self-mocking: 'It is as easy for me, Kate, to conquer the kingdom as to speak so much more French' (*HV* 5.2.175). Henry V's mocking could remind the audience of the difficulty of leaning a foreign language, emphasising the effort Catherine made to learn English in order to

become an English queen.

Critics argue that the gender politics of the masculine-English and feminine-French are reinforced in *Henry V* in accord with the image of England's national, ideological, linguistic, and sexual conquest of France. Howard and Rackin see an embodied violence against sexual difference, which is performed by 'not only masculinity but nationality and military prowess'; they further argue that Henry V's Englishness in every aspect 'rapes' Catherine's and France's inferiority after his conquest.[41] Yet, we may read Catherine's learning of English in the following ways: first, it shows her knowledge of the politics and her role in it. Her self-learning indicates that she knows the wars between England and France and might have even paid attention to their development. Second, it illustrates her curiosity about English culture: as England becomes a strong power, learning its language is the basis for further political, financial, and cultural interaction. She might just be curious about another culture in Europe. Yet Shakespeare's portrayal of her learning English, rather than Latin or other European languages, also indicates the coming of English consciousness and a confidence in its culture. Third, it suggests her awareness of her role in international politics: whether she is preparing herself to become a candidate of Henry V's future queen and an eligible underground ambassador to England, her choice of learning English enables her to interact with King Henry V directly without much assistance of interpreting. Howard's and Rackin's views on the dominance and imperial power of Henry V's kingdom, his culture and language, and his masculinity provide one reading of this scene. Yet, if we consider how Catherine takes the initiative with learning this language and plays with her innocence and insufficient language ability, the scene of Catherine and Henry V's interaction might be read as a power game, but not necessarily a rape; it would be more like a flirtation: Catherine knows she eventually needs to submit to Henry V's wooing, but she does it not exactly in the way Henry V wants, echoing with another Kate in *The Taming of the Shrew*, which will be discussed in later paragraphs.

The self-learning English plot portrays Catherine with a clever, strong, independent, and even slightly comical image. Her eagerness to know the English culture and her comical clumsiness to learn the language make her attractive to the English audience. Also, as Shakespeare goes back to prose to depict the interaction between Catherine and

---

[41] Howard and Rackin, *Engendering a Nation,* see Chapter 12 on Henry V, pp. 186-215, (especially pp. 196-199).

Henry V, the language reminds us of Prince Hal in *Henry IV, Part One and Two*. Catherine, thereby, in a way succeeds Falstaff's role and becomes a verbal partner for Hal in language games. These flirtation-like word games also appear between Kate and Petruchio in *The Taming of the Shrew* and between Beatrice and Benedict in *Much Ado About Nothing*. Following the language games between male and female characters in the plays, marriage is used to end the plays as comedies. One function of the wooing scene in *Henry V* might be to create comic atmosphere within this history play.

When wooing Catherine, Henry V emphasises his use of 'tongue' and compares the difficulty of wooing to a soldier riding a horse – all of these physical and sensual references intriguingly correspond to Catherine's learning the English words for human body parts.[42] Her first lesson in Act III, Scene iv, is naming body parts in English: 'de hand, de fingers, de nails, de nick, de chin'. During the process, Catherine mistakes foot, gown, chin, and elbow with foutre, coun, sin, and dildo; her confusion of English and French vocabulary not merely creates humour, it is also significant that her malapropisms emphasise the unfamiliarity of her newly-learned English, and thus attracts the audience's attention to the correct usage of English.[43]

Furthermore, the purpose and process of learning a language is involved with signification, constructing and dissecting the signifiers and the signified. When Catherine learns the English language from the basic vocabulary of body parts, she simultaneously draws the audience's attention to her female body.[44] As discussed above, Catherine's learning to name body parts indicates the practical purpose of being able to communicate with the English King and his people in the future. However, when learning a language, the emblazonment of body parts – the association between the linguistic signifier and the physiological signified – underpins the 'overt masculinity and covert effeminacy' ascribed to the English and French identity respectively in *Henry V*.[45] Catherine seems to expose her inferiority and vulnerability in front of Henry V's masculinity and patriarchal power.

---

[42] For the relations between the order and control of one's tongue and the lingual and sexual performance, see Carla Mazzio, 'Sins of the Tongue', in *The Body in Parts*, ed. by Hillman and Mazzio, pp. 53-79.

[43] Marjorie Garber, 'Out of Joint', in *The Body in Parts*, ed. by Hillman and Mazzio, pp. 23-51 (p. 36).

[44] I would like to thank Dr. Eric Langley, who advised me about the English vocabulary of body parts that Catherine learned in relation to the underlying significance of the female body. In addition to this, the discussion of sexual violence and dissection of the female body can extend to *Titus Andronicus*, in which Demetrius and Chiron rape Lavinia, and subsequently chop her hands and cut her tongue to silence her (*TA* 2.3). *Richard III*, on the other hand, provides an example of a deformed male body.

[45] Jonathan Sawday, *The Body Emblazoned: Dissection and the Human Body in Renaissance Culture* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995). p.205. For the dissection of body parts in relation to language acquisition in linguistics, see Garber, 'Out of Joint', pp. 36-37.

Henry V's demonstration of his authority extends from his manipulation of language to include the reform of customs and laws. Jonathan Sawday argues that 'a refashioned language of the body' in 'the plain speaking of the soldier king [Henry V]' replaces the 'delicate language of courtly gesture'.[46] The political and gender conquest is shown in a replacement of French court etiquette with new English custom when Henry V attempts to kiss Catherine:

> KING HARRY O Kate, nice customs curtsy to great kings. Dear Kate, you and I cannot be confined within the weak list of a country's fashion. We are the makers of manners, Kate, and the liberty that follows our places stops the mouth of all find-faults, as I will do yours, for upholding the nice fashion of your country in denying me a kiss. Therefore, patiently and yielding. [*He kisses her*].
>
> (*Henry V* 5.2.250-255)

Henry V replaces the language that befits a court language with blunt wooing words and encourages Catherine to abandon old traditions and create new fashions with him, suggesting the authority of their future kingship and queenship. However, on French soil, the English King ignores the manner of the French court and kisses the Princess without waiting for her consent, displaying the gesture of a conqueror.

Royal Kisses

In analysing how Catherine reacts to Henry V's demand for a kiss, critics compare her with other 'Kates' in Shakespeare's plays regarding the relationship between sexuality and authority.[47] Laurie E. Maguire argues that in the play Henry V's dominion over Catherine is shown through his abbreviation of her name to 'Kate': the English King calls the French Princess 'Kate' thirty-one times, addressing her as 'Catherine' on a mere six occasions, while in Holinshed's *Chronicles* she is referred to as 'the ladie Katharine' throughout.[48] Howard and Rackin note that in *The Taming of the Shrew*,

---

[46] Sawday, *The Body Emblazoned*, p. 205.
[47] Scholars have associated Catherine in *Henry V* with Kate in *The Taming of the Shrew* and Hotspur's wife, Kate, in *Henry IV*. For instance, see Howard and Rackin, *Engendering a Nation*, pp. 192-193. Laurie E. Maguire, '"Household Kates": Chez Petruchio, Percy and Plantagenet' in *Gloriana's Face: Women, Public and Private, in the English Renaissance*, eds. by S. P. Cerasano and Marion Wynne-Davies (New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992), pp. 129-165.
[48] Maguire, 'Chez Petruchio, Percy and Plantagenet', p.131.

Petruchio does not consummate his marriage to Kate after their wedding, and in *Henry IV* Hotspur is reluctant to be emotionally and sexually engaged with his wife, another Kate: a striking contrast to the intimacy between Mortimer and his Welsh wife. Howard and Rackin argue that in these two cases, 'masculine superiority' is demonstrated through 'sexual restraint' whereas in *Henry V*, King Henry's conquest of Catherine is 'inscribed within a distinctively modern erotic discourse'.[49] Katherine Eisaman Maus argues that Catherine's participation in Henry V's wooing game is 'as coquettishness as real denial'.[50] It seems that critics focus on consummation and overlook the importance of kissing in sexual politics.

The contrasting dramatisations of male superiority through the restraint or display of sexuality in *The Taming of the Shrew* and in *Henry V* can be further illustrated with instances of kissing. Both Petruchio and Henry V confirm their victory with kisses.[51] In *The Taming of the Shrew* kissing functions as a barometer that measures the level of Kate's obedience; spiritual disobedience, however, can be concealed by ostensible physical performance. After Petruchio contracts his marriage to Kate with her father, he asks Kate to kiss him as a confirmation of their engagement (*TS* 2.1.316). Kate's silence in this marital negotiation is examined in terms of whether she is expressing her consent to the marriage or whether it is actually an invalid marital contract.[52] Later in Act IV, Scene i, after they are married, Petruchio asks Kate to kiss his cousin Ferdinand in order to establish her acquaintance with his family (*TS* 4.1.133). In even later scenes, Petruchio keeps manipulating the hierarchy of power and the morality of kissing between a husband and a wife in public and private (*TS* 5.1.124-129, 5.2.184).

Compared with kissing in private, kissing in public not only reveals one's personal affection but lays one's relationship open to the gaze of other people. Maguire argues that Shakespeare supports 'a two-tier standard of wifely behaviour' distinguishing between behaviours suitable for 'public display' and that for 'private rapport'.[53] At the very end of *Henry V,* after the French King Charles VI declares the union of England and France through royal matrimony, King Henry kisses Catherine again: 'Now welcome, Kate, and bear me witness all/ That here I kiss her as my sovereign

---

[49] Howard and Rackin, *Engendering a Nation*, pp. 192-193.
[50] See Katherine Eisaman Maus, 'Introduction to *Henry V*' in *The Norton Shakespeare*, p.1452.
[51] Maguire, 'Chez Petruchio, Percy, and Plantagenet', p. 138.
[52] See Brian Morris's note on line 311-312 in *The Taming of the Shrew* by William Shakespeare, Arden Shakespeare, 2nd series (London and New York: Methuen, 1981), p. 213.
[53] Maguire, 'Chez Petruchio, Percy and Plantagent', p.135.

Queen' (*HV* 5.2.329-330). Henry V's public kiss crowns Catherine Queen of England and solidifies the marriage of two kingdoms.[54]

The action of kissing involves two parties.[55] The politics of kissing concerns the subjectivity of the giver and the recipient of the action. It seems that a kiss of affection happens naturally without deliberately asking for consent in advance. In Act V, Scene ii, Henry V's two kisses are first proclaimed and then enacted. Whether Henry V's wooing succeeds or fails can be judged by how Catherine reacts to the kiss. Yet Shakespeare does not provide Catherine with any lines here, so that the answer relies on the performance and interpretation of the actress (or boy actor) playing the role of Catherine. From the perspective of contracting royal marriage and the pursuit of queenship, a ceremonial kiss may indicate the exchange of consent in an oath and thereby validates the marriage. However, according to the marriage law in early modern England, verbal consent was primary; therefore, Catherine's silent acceptance of the kiss would not be equal to her consent. Catherine's silence, as that of Kate in *The Taming of the Shrew*, can either be read as obedience, or as voiceless protest against the marriage as contracted by the patriarchs. Yet, in international politics, the French Princess Catherine of Valois has no alternative but to obey her father's will. Her learning of English might well illustrate the preparation she is making for her future English queenship, but it does not indicate her acceptance of the kisses or the royal marriage without any concern.

Conclusion

Blanche's and Catherine's obedient and passive acceptance of their marriage negotiations illustrates their prior knowledge of international politics. Shakespeare also portrays Blanche's internship-like practice of queenship when she attempts to prevent the war between England and France through her own intervention. Blanche's self-learning of English suggests her preparation for her future queenship. Interestingly,

---

[54] At the point of completion of this thesis, the incumbent English royal family had just held a wedding for Prince William and Catherine Middleton, the present Duke and Duchess of Cambridge. The discussion of kissing in this section reminds us of the balcony kisses, which were done when millions of people were watching and were maniacally shown and reported in news coverages. The balcony kiss became part of the tradition of English royal weddings after Prince Charles and Princess Diana's wedding in 1981. The kiss on the one hand reassures us of the willingness of the married parties and on the other hand, has become a symbol of a life happy ever after in modern fairy tales under people's gaze.

[55] Part of 'The Pursuit of Queenship' was presented at the Graduate Seminar in the Department of English Language and Literature at University College London in October 2008. I am obliged to Professor John Russell Brown, who directed me to pay attention to the significance of kisses in this scene in *Henry V*, especially in terms of Catherine's subjectivity in this action.

Blanche, being Spanish, is used as a political pawn for the English camp to pursue French queenship, and later, her English identity in *King John* is exploited by the French Dauphin as the reason to claim the English throne. On the contrary, the French in *Henry V* answer to Salic Law and thus do not recognise the female lineage in royal succession, while Henry V insists on the validity of female inheritance in his right to claim France. The analysis of Blanche's and Catherine's royal marriages in the relation to the pursuit of queenship suggests that the sanguine relation of the issue of succession can be claimed not only through male heirs (biological relation), but also through female consorts (social relation). Women as bridges to legitimacy are also staged in Shakespeare's other English history plays. In *Richard III*, Duke Richard of Gloucester first marries Lady Anne Neville before later attempting to marry his niece, Elizabeth of York, in order to validate his legitimacy in the succession to the English throne. Therefore, as Jo Eldridge Carney observes, women are the mediators of power through their procreation of royal heirs. I would expand on her observation by arguing that women not only mediate power through giving birth, but they themselves can be the figure on whom issues of kingship hinge.[56] Both Blanche and Catherine are useful to their husbands and their marriages are employed on each side by the countries involved to expand their political domains. Blanche's obedience and political knowledge and Catherine's submissiveness and education are part of their dowry in these royal marriages.

II. Active Pursuit

Marriage bonds two families together and the subsequent networks of kinship structure the power relations between the aristocracy, influencing domestic and international politics. Whether a women may have autonomy, or even just have a say in her marital negotiation, depends on her relationship with the patriarchs: that is, whether she is single, widowed, or supported by her family. Different degrees of women's autonomy are dramatised in the trilogy of *Henry VI* and *Henry VIII*: Margaret can decide whether to let her father know that she has been offered in matrimony to the King of England; Anne Boleyn does not have to ask her father, who is not on stage,

---

[56] Jo Eldrige Carney, 'Queenship in Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*: The Issue of Issue', in *Political Rhetoric, Power, and Renaissance Women*, ed. by Carole Levin and Patricia A. Sullivan (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995), pp. 189-202.

whether to accept the king's courtship; and Elizabeth Woodville, as a twice-married and widowed woman, makes her own decision about whom to marry next.

Interestingly, the three cases discussed in this section reveal the competition of different marriage proposals and their unexpected results: the more politically and financially beneficial proposals for England do not win; on the contrary, it is actually the disadvantaged queens-to-be who increase their value, power, and cultural capital through their royal marriages and subsequent family networking. This section discusses the cases of Margaret of Anjou in *Henry VI, Part One and Two*, Anne Boleyn in *Henry VIII*, and Elizabeth Woodville in *Henry VI, Part Three* in an anachronistic order either in terms of the sequence in historical records or in Shakespeare's composition. They are arranged according to the increasing strength of women's autonomy in order to explore how these three female characters empower themselves with their virtues in the making of royal marriages.

A. Margaret of Anjou in *Henry VI, Part One and Two*

It is difficult to define what is 'passive' or 'active' behaviour in the pursuit of queenship. The key to the question lies in a woman's attitude and action when she is faced with the offer of a royal marriage. Margaret of Anjou is the most discussed queen in Shakespeare's English histories, especially in terms of gender and power politics. She first appears on stage in Act V, Scene v of *Henry VI, Part One* as a captive of the Earl of Suffolk. The Earl is attracted and eager to know who she is. Margaret immediately associates herself with her royal lineage identifying herself as a 'daughter to a king,/ The King of Naples' (*1HVI* 5.5.7-8). Suffolk also reveals his English aristocratic background and their conversation is then exalted to a different level as Suffolk wraps his sexual desire in the modest rhetoric of pursuit.

The power relation between the captor and the captive is complicated by gender politics: the conquest of a state is transformed into and embodied in a sexual conquest, as is illustrated in the formerly discussed *Henry V* and in other Shakespearean plays. In *Titus Andronicus*, Tamora, Queen of the Goths, subjugates herself to and marries the Emperor Saturninus, who is charmed by her beauty; similarly, in *Antony and Cleopatra*, the Egyptian Queen submits herself and her kingdom to the Roman general; while the outer frame of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* is the wedding of Duke Theseus of Athens and the defeated Amazonian Queen, Hippolyta. The sexual conquests of foreign queens

regnant in the form of marriages indicate the subjugation of their exotic, barbarous culture to Western civilisation in a husband-wife relationship.

However, these queens' submission and subsequent wifely obedience seem to be ambiguous as their marriages only bring temporary and superficial peace for the conquering countries. Tamora is revealed to be avenging her son's death and conspires against her arch-enemy, Andronicus; Cleopatra is a femme fatale in the eye of the Romans, a depraved figure who brings Antony down to her level; and Hippolyta's true feelings about her submission to the Duke are never revealed. It is 'civilised' masculinity that demonstrates its superiority, creating a stabilising order in society by, on the surface at least, taming the wildness and sexuality of the foreign queens. Nevertheless the undercurrent of the wilful woman's performative obedience and self-empowerment subverts assumptions about the tamer and the tamed. Later in *King Henry VI, Parts Two and Three* Margaret of Anjou further proves herself to be a powerful and manipulative queen.

A Proposal of Royal Marriage

In *Henry VI, Part One*, Margaret's power is foreshadowed through her knowledge of politics and her manipulation of rhetoric. The interaction between Suffolk and Margaret in Act V, Scene v reveals the ambitions of both characters. At the beginning, the Earl of Suffolk succumbs to Margaret's beauty; his indulgence in such an affection and the rhetoric of love that he uses is comparatively rare in history plays, moulding him in the image of a poet or epistler of love (*1HVI* 5.5.16-27). Margaret seems to be sober and more rational than Suffolk and keeps asking about the ransom amount he is demanding in exchange for her freedom. Instead of being helpless or hysterical after being captured by a foreigner, Margaret is prepared to negotiate her own release, yet Suffolk ignores her inquiries, preoccupied as he is by the problem of reconciling his pre-existing marriage with his desire to take Margaret as his mistress, as demonstrated in his asides. He even considers the possibility of having his marriage annulled in order that he might then make Margaret his lawful spouse. Suffolk's case reminds the audience of the real dilemma that King Henry VIII faced, offering a cross-reference to Shakespeare's much later dramatisation of *Henry VIII*: the king's desire for Anne Boleyn and his subsequent

divorce from Katherine of Aragon.[57] However, unlike Henry VIII, Suffolk does not file a lawsuit of marital annulment, but decides instead to use King Henry VI as his puppet to satisfy his desire and ambition: 'I'll win this Lady Margaret. For whom?/ Why, for my king – tush, that's a wooden thing' (*1HVI* 5.5.44-45), he explains, acting with instant determination. Thus, the wellbeing of Henry VI and international harmony become the flag of his personal pursuit; by this means, his 'fancy may be satisfied,/ And peace established between these realms' (*1HVI* 5.5.47-48). However, there is a flaw in his plan: 'there remains a scruple in that too,/ For though her father be the King of Naples,/ Duke of Anjou and Maine, yet is he poor,/ And our nobility will scorn the match' (*1HVI* 5.5.49-52). Suffolk is aware that Margaret's 'royal lineage' is but an empty shell and thus his plan will not be looked on favourably by the other English nobles.

When Suffolk finally talks to Margaret, she in turn avoids speaking to him: she also plays with her self-indulgence by imagining being rescued by her French citizens from this mad English man (*1HVI* 5.5.57-63). In his analysis of Shakespeare's dramatisation and invention of this scene, Thomas H. McNeal calls it a 'strange blending of real and romantic' but 'unavoidable' arrangement so that the playwright could bridge Part One and Part Two of *Henry VI* together.[58] However, I argue that the depiction of Suffolk and Margaret is of comic effect and deeply significant in relation to gender politics in queenship. The interaction between the two is comic as only the audience knows what they are thinking in their asides. They take turns to make themselves heard but refuse to listen to each other; all their attempts to communicate are in vain. Finally, Suffolk captures Margaret's attention by asking, 'Say, gentle Princess, would you not suppose/ Your bondage happy to *be made a queen*?' (*1HVI* 5.5.66-67, emphasis added). 'To be made a queen' awakens Margaret from her thinking. She answers that '[t]o be a queen in bondage is more vile/ Than is a slave in base servility,/ For princes should be free' (*1HVI* 5.5.67-69). Margaret's immediate reaction indicates that regardless of the playful, revengeful, and pretending negligence of Suffolk, she has actually been listening to him all the time. Nevertheless, she distrusts him until he says, 'I'll undertake to make thee Henry's queen,/ To put a golden sceptre in thy hand,/ And set a precious crown upon thy head.' (*1HVI* 5.5.73-75). It is Suffolk's offer of a proposal of

---

[57] The historical contexts of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn's marriage was far more complicated than what Shakespeare and Fletcher included in their dramatisation, such as the religious context of reformation. Shakespeare portrays the religious issue slightly through Cardinal Wolsey's comment about Anne. The discussion in this thesis here only touches the characterisations in *Henry VI* and *Henry VIII*.
[58] McNeal, 'Margaret of Anjou', p.3.

royal marriage that eventually successfully attracts Margaret's interest.

Listening to Suffolk's clarification, Margaret ponders the proposal but avoids giving a direct answer: 'I am unworthy to be Henry's wife' (*1HVI* 5.5.78), she retorts. This self-degradation might suggest her self-awareness of her father's weak status and poverty, but it could equally be a performance of humility, a virtue that qualifies her to be a queen. Suffolk continues to encourage Margaret to accept the proposal, and his third inquiry elicits her response: 'An if my father please, I am content' (*1HVI* 5.5.83). Like Blanche in *King John*, Margaret gives no positive or negative answer of her own but instead refers her decision to her father. It seems that Margaret subjugates herself to parental authority; however, if Margaret was unwilling to accept the proposal, she could conceal it from her father's knowledge. It is obvious that the opportunity of transforming herself from a captured poor Princess of Naples to the Queen of England is desirable. Margaret's introduction of this proposal to her father suggests, to a certain degree, her ambitious pursuit of royal matrimony.

Is Margaret active or passive in the pursuit of queenship? In the previous discussions of *King John* and *Henry V*, Blanche and Catherine are used as political assets in international politics; the patriarchs determine their marriages first and then only afterwards do they perform a public inquiry as to the women's consent or courtship. Both of them display compliance with their knowledge of their roles and their obligations in the political mechanism. By comparison, Margaret is offered a proposal of royal matrimony prior to her father's knowledge about it. She plays games of rhetoric with the Earl of Suffolk, doubly confirms the proposal, and only then eventually seeks her father's consent. Even though Margaret consults her father and expresses her humility and obedience, her actions should be regarded as an example of the active pursuit of queenship.

Marital Negotiation: Women in Exchange

In the second half of Act V, Scene v of *King Henry VI, Part One*, the Earl of Suffolk and Margaret's father, René, the Duke of Anjou and King of Naples, negotiate the terms of the royal marriage proposal while Margaret listens to them silently:

> SUFFOLK   Assent, and for thy honour give consent
>   Thy daughter shall be wedded to my king,

> Whom I with pain have wooed and won thereto;
>
> And this her easy-held imprisonment
>
> Hath gained thy daughter princely liberty.
>
> (*Henry VI, Part One* 5.5.92-96)

Suffolk makes it clear that Margaret has consented to marry Henry VI. Using the imperative form and the rhetoric of royalty to present his request, he sounds formal and authoritative. René answers Suffolk thus:

> RENÉ Since thou dost deign to woo her little worth
>
> To be the princely bride of such a lord,
>
> Upon condition I may quietly
>
> Enjoy mine own, the countries Maine and Anjou,
>
> Free from oppression or the stroke of war,
>
> My daughter shall be Henry's, if he please.
>
> (*Henry VI, Part One* 5.5.107-112)

The Duke of Anjou is aware that he cannot provide a qualified title or any monetary dowry for Margaret as the future Queen of England. Nevertheless, despite offering nothing but his daughter, he still lists the conditions that he desires, taking advantage of this marriage contract to attempt to exchange his daughter for his political autonomy. Suffolk assumes and exploits Henry VI's authority to answer the Duke of Anjou, giving him 'kingly thanks' and promising to 'make this marriage to be solemnised'. Yet in his aside, Suffolk reveals that he is his own 'attorney in this case' to satisfy his desires (*1HVI* 5.5.119-126). After the marital contract is drafted, Suffolk asks Margaret if she would like to forward greetings or send love tokens to Henry VI and Margaret asks Suffolk to express her humility, chastity, and loyalty, being 'a maid, a virgin, and his servant' to Henry VI (*1HVI* 5.5.133-134). For love tokens, she has nothing but 'a pure unspotted heart' that is 'never yet taint with love' to give the King. (*1HVI* 5.5.138-139). Through the skilful control of her rhetoric, Margaret intends to create an image of herself as a virtuous woman.

Being offered the opportunity of becoming Queen of England, Margaret carefully preserves her image as a virtuous woman. After Margaret claims her virginity, fidelity,

and innocence, Suffolk kisses her (*1HVI* 5.5.140). Suffolk transposes the authority and privilege of a king, as a self-appointed envoy, from the administrative and public level to the personal and private level as a suitor. Margaret reacts to Suffolk's kiss calmly: 'That for thyself; I will not so presume/ To send such peevish tokens to a king' (*1HVI* 5.5.142-143). In the game of gender and power politics, Margaret is not necessarily the inferior party as, aware of his desire for her, she points out Suffolk's real intentions. Furthermore, by claiming a kiss as a 'peevish' (trifling) token, she intends not only to diminish the significance of that kiss, but also to silence Suffolk's sexual desire. She endeavours to protect her reputation as a virtuous woman: the kiss is frivolous and flippant because she is innocent and virtuous, and because of her innocence and chastity she would never think to give a kiss to Henry VI as a love token. Margaret's reply shows her caution and cunning: the kiss is trifling and trivial because it is not worth mentioning, implying that Suffolk should keep quiet about it. It also foreshadows the ambiguous intimacy between Margaret and Suffolk in *Henry VI, Part Two*. Unlike Catherine, who reacts to Henry V's kissing dramatically, Margaret dismisses Suffolk's kiss. Again, of course, the body language of the actor or actress playing Margaret may provide different interpretations of Margaret's relationship with Suffolk. Notwithstanding, at a linguistic level Margaret's intention to whitewash the kiss is an attempt to devalue or erase any disputable intimacy with any man apart from her future husband the King. Even before the proposal is known and endorsed by the English court, Margaret is already defending her reputation as the future queen with her circumspect choice of words.

A Disharmonious Royal Marriage for Nothing, but 'Love'

Suffolk's plan for Margaret and Henry VI to be married is not supported by the English court; on the contrary it actually engenders discord within the court even further. At the beginning of Act V, Scene ii of *Henry VI, Part One*, Henry VI is fascinated by Suffolk's description of Margaret's beauty and her virtues. Instead of focusing on Margaret's physical attributes alone, Suffolk also emphasises her 'humble lowliness of mind', extolling her humility and submissiveness to Henry VI's authority (*1HVI* 5.7.18-19). Margaret's virtues make her a worthy queen. Overwhelmed by the image he now has in his imagination of this virtuous and beautiful woman, he looks for his guardian's consent for the marriage. The Duke of Gloucester, Henry's uncle,

guardian, and the Lord Protector, reminds the King that he is already betrothed to 'another lady of esteem', alluding to the serious consequences of breaking his promises (*1HVI* 5.7.26-29). A king's repudiation may sabotage his reputation and credibility, ultimately adversely influencing the balance of international politics. Suffolk replies by claiming that a monarch may revoke 'unlawful oaths' in order to testify his authority, further claiming that the marital contract with the daughter of the Earl of Armagnac is of 'unequal odds' (*1HVI* 5.7.30-35), although Gloucester immediately challenges Suffolk by arguing that Margaret's heritage is no better (*1HVI* 5.7.36-38). In addition to the royal sanguinity of the two bridal candidates, Exeter further points out that Margaret can bring little dowry (*1HVI* 39-47). The English nobles then appraise Margaret's and the Earl of Armagnac's daughter's value in the international marriage market, comparing their rank (royal heritage), alliance (diplomatic advantage), and dowry (wealth) as if they are both commodities.[59]

Interestingly, knowing that Margaret can bring nothing profitable to the alliance, in order to win the argument Suffolk belittles all the political, social, and economic factors and instead falls back on 'love'. His love rhetoric in marital negotiation makes a contrast to the teaching in conduct books which asks women not to prioritise love when choosing a husband, but rather demands that they entrust the choice to their patriarchs. Suffolk criticises the fact that the process of negotiating a marriage is like trading in a market, declaring that such practice does not suit the dignity of a king. Ironically however, Suffolk's brief comment corresponds to Gayle Rubin's criticism of women as goods of exchange in the marriage market under a patriarchal system.[60] Yet Suffolk, as a patriarch, does not aim to sabotage or reform the system of marriage to save women from their disadvantageous status in the power structure; instead, he is using his rhetoric to fulfil his personal ambition and desire. He emphasises Margaret of Anjou's virtue only to make her worthy enough, and stresses Henry VI's love for her as invaluable. He further addresses the rest of the courtiers regarding Henry VI's authority and autonomy to make the final decision. Instead of convincing the English court that Margaret is the best choice for them, Suffolk only needs to make her the first (and only) choice in Henry VI's mind (*1HVI* 5.7.55-58).

---

[59] For an analysis of Margaret's royal and familial background in history, see Patricia-Anne Lee, 'Reflections of Power: Margaret of Anjou and the Dark Side of Queenship', *Renaissance Quarterly* 39 (1986), 183-217 (pp. 185-186).
[60] Rubin, 'The Traffic in Women', pp. 176-177.

To secure Margaret as Henry VI's only choice, Suffolk conjures up the image of an ideal marriage based on love and harmony (*1HVI* 5.7.59-65) and depicts Margaret in a queenly image:

> SUFFOLK Whom should we match with Henry, being a king,
>
>   But Margaret, that is daughter to a king?
>
>   Her peerless feature joined with her birth
>
>   Approves her fit for none but for a king.
>
>   Her valiant courage and undaunted spirit,
>
>   More than in women commonly is seen,
>
>   Will answer our hope in issue of a king.
>
>   For Henry, son unto a conqueror,
>
>   Is likely to beget more conquerors
>
>   If with a lady of so high resolve
>
>   As is fair Margaret he be linked in love.
>
>   Then yield, my lords, and here conclude with me:
>
>   That Margaret shall be queen, and none but she.
>
>   (*Henry VI, Part One* 5.7.66-78)

Suffolk refers to Margaret's courage, unwomanliness, and belligerence, alluding to her ambition and force of character and forecasting the subsequent drama in the English court. As the prompter of this marriage proposal, Suffolk prioritises his personal interest above the well-being of England. The harmony brought about by Henry VI's marriage to Margaret in Suffolk's vision will not happen. In Shakespeare's comedies the concluding marriage is often the solution to all problems that have presented themselves in the course of the play. In history plays, royal marriages are supposed to be the means by which domestic and diplomatic conflicts can be brought to an end by the bringing together of two families or nations, such as the marriage between Henry V and Catherine of Valois in Henry V or that between Henry the Earl of Richmond [later Henry VII] and Elizabeth of York in *Richard III*. Nevertheless, when a marriage is not supported from the very beginning, planting a seed of discord in the court, the harmony it brings can only ever be ephemeral and dangerous, as seen in the example of Henry VI and Margaret of Anjou in *Henry VI*. After Suffolk's lengthy persuasion (*1HVI*

5.7.48-78), Henry VI, despite his youth, the uncertainty of the 'passion of inflaming love', and the weariness he feels as a result of 'working' his thoughts, is 'assured' to 'agree to any covenants, and procure/ That Lady Margaret do vouchsafe to come/ To cross the seas to England and be crowned/ King Henry's faithful and anointed queen' (*1HVI* 5.7.81-93). King Henry excuses the 'sudden execution' of his will and seeks Gloucester's empathy with and pardon for his youthfulness (*1HVI* 5.7.96-101). While Gloucester grieves for Henry's decision, Suffolk, by comparison, rejoices that 'Margaret shall now be queen and rule the King', and he will 'rule both her, the King, and realm' (*1HVI* 5.7.107-108). In dramatising the quarrels about the marital negotiation and the discord of the English court, Shakespeare reveals the danger of a king trusting bad counsellors and prioritising his personal emotions over the concerns of the nation.

Reviewing the Marriage Contract

At the beginning of *Henry VI, Part Two*, his veteran courtiers once again attempt to dissuade Henry VI from marrying Margaret of Anjou since she offers neither dowry nor a powerful alliance for England. After the King and his new queen leave the court, the Duke of Gloucester and Lord Protector comments,

> Fatal this marriage, cancelling your fame,
>
> Blotting your names from books of memory,
>
> Razing the characters of your renown,
>
> Defacing monuments of conquered France,
>
> Undoing all, as all had never been!
>
> (*Henry VI, Part Two* 1.1.95-99)

According to the Duke of Gloucester, the marriage between Henry VI and Margaret depreciates the King's credit in international politics and will disgrace him in history, as he will be remembered as a king who broke a prior, and more beneficial marital contract for an unworthy one. Furthermore, the unprofitable marriage 'defaces' Henry V's achievement of conquering France, erasing this history and undoing England's glory in the process. Therefore, Henry VI's marriage to Margaret brings neither dowry nor diplomatic advantage; it brings disgrace to the past and discord to the future of England.

On the other hand, Margaret does not provide her view about this royal marriage nor does she defy the antagonistic English nobles when she first meets the English court. Two scenes later, she tells Suffolk of her disappointment with King Henry VI as she had been expecting a brave and strong man, like Suffolk, to be her husband:

> I tell thee, Pole [Duke of Suffolk], when in the city Tours
>
> Thou rann'st a-tilt in honour of my love
>
> And stol'st away the ladies' hearts of France,
>
> I thought King Henry had resembled thee
>
> In courage, courtship, and proportion.
>
> But all his mind is bent to holiness,
>
> To number Ave-Maries on his beads.
>
> His champions are the prophets and apostles,
>
> His weapons holy saws of sacred writ,
>
> His study is his tilt-yard, and his loves
>
> Are brazen images of canonised saints.
>
> I would the college of the cardinals
>
> Would choose him Pope, and carry him to Rome,
>
> And set the triple crown upon his head –
>
> That were a state fit for his holiness.
>
> (*Henry VI, Part Two* 1.3.54-68)

Here we see Margaret of Anjou's imagined ideal of kingship; as Jean E. Howard explains, 'Margaret thought she would be marrying a chivalric hero, one adept at the arts of love and war; instead, she finds herself wed to an ineffective, pious man who elsewhere openly expresses his desire to live as a private person rather than his country's King'.[61] Does Margaret imply that her false assumptions about the English king were what led her to introduce Suffolk's proposal regarding the royal marriage to her father? If Margaret had known what Henry VI was like, would she have kept quiet when faced with the proposal or would she have rejected the offer of English queenship? Margaret's undermining of the English patriarchal court in the later two parts of *Henry VI* suggests that she might not have wanted to give up any chance to

---

[61] See Jean E. Howard, 'Introduction' to *2 Henry VI* in *The Norton Shakespeare*, p. 203.

grasp power. Not only does Margaret misjudge Henry VI, but Suffolk underestimates Margaret too. At the end of *Henry VI, Part One*, Suffolk calculates that while Margaret plays young Henry VI like a puppet, he can, and at the same time, manipulate her to transgress the King's authority and thus rule England subterraneously.[62] Suffolk, however, underestimates Margaret: she is a woman who knows the prerogative of being a queen and takes advantage of the power vacuum in the English court; she is the one who holds both Henry VI's and Suffolk's strings.[63]

B. Anne Boleyn in *Henry VIII*

By comparison to Margaret, who still seeks her father's consent (on the surface at least), Anne Boleyn in *Henry VIII* does not have a father on stage and her marriage to Henry VIII is dramatised as being negotiated without parental intervention. At the same time, her own attitude towards the marriage remains ambiguous since it is an alliance constructed on the premise of the divorce of the King and Katherine of Aragon, and embedded within it is the issue of royal succession.

<u>Transforming Virtues: from Eloquence to Silence and Obedience</u>

When Anne Boleyn first appears in Act I, Scene iv she is a lively young lady of the court enjoying the party held by Cardinal Wolsey. Seated with Lord Sands she listens to his 'wild' statement about his father and asks what the wild manner is, cleverly conversing and flirting with him. Lord Sands senses Anne's active vivacity and imitates his father's 'wildness' by kissing her (*HVIII* 1.4.27-29). Shakespeare and Fletcher do not portray how Anne Boleyn responds to the kiss; it is left to the decision of the director. Yet this brief conversation has left an impression of Anne's 'knowing wit'.

In the second half of Wolsey's party, Anne Boleyn's vivacity transforms into ambiguous submissiveness. The party is interrupted by a group of strange visitors dressed in the costume of shepherds. Rather than dismissing them Wolsey instead salutes them and calls them 'a noble company', stating that they 'have done [his] poor

---

[62] See Gwyn Williams, 'Suffolk and Margaret: A Study of Some Sections of Shakespeare's Henry VI', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 25 (1974), 310-22. Williams traces possible sources of the unhistorical plot of Suffolk and Margaret's 'love affair' and reasons that this plot might have initially been dramatised for structural purposes, associating *Henry VI Part I* and *II* more tightly. Yet this relationship between the queen and the Duke throughout the trilogies not only enriches the characterisation of Margaret of Anjou, especially regarding her desire and ambition, but it also shows respect to the motif of tragic and adulterous love in classical traditions. More analyses about Margaret and Suffolk will be conducted in the later chapters of this dissertation.

[63] Howard, 'Introduction', pp. 203-204.

house grace' (*HVIII* 1.4.62-74). Wolsey's reaction suggests that we are witnessing one of Henry VIII's favourite games: dressing up like classical or pastoral figures, storming into parties, and enjoying being recognised. When Wolsey speculates with the Lord Chamberlain about the King's presence, it is plausible that others in the party might overhear their conversation. They might have also identified one of the strangers as the King himself. However, it is not the time to reveal his royal identity yet. Finally, Wolsey halts the party and identifies Henry VIII, completing the King's game. When Henry VIII rejoins the party, he is enchanted by Anne Boleyn's beauty and the Lord Chamberlain immediately notifies the King that she is: 'Sir Thomas Boleyn's daughter–/The Viscount Rochford – one of her highness's women' (*HVIII* 1.4.95-96). Just as Suffolk inquires about Margaret's identity in *Henry VI, Part One*, Henry VIII also asks about Anne Boleyn's name, family, rank, and position. The King returns to the party, continues to dance with Anne Boleyn, and further expresses his interest in her directly: '[*To ANNE*] Sweetheart,/ I were unmannerly to take you out/ And not to kiss you [*kisses her*]' (*HVIII* 1.4.98-99). Anne Boleyn accepts the kiss quietly without any protestation or verbal response, reacting even more calmly than Catherine in *Henry V* or Margaret of Anjou in *Henry VI, Part One*. Anne's lively manner and rhetoric is replaced by silence and obedience. Despite all the interaction between Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn in official records and other histories, Shakespeare and Fletcher chose to portray a fictional first encounter between them. It is, however, the only episode of direct interaction between the King and Anne Boleyn in the play, and it is staged immediately before the scene of the King's and Queen Katherine's divorce dispute. Shakespeare and Fletcher's arrangement complicates the issue of the King's conscience and creates Anne Boleyn as an ambiguous character.

In *Henry V* and *Henry VIII*, Catherine of Valois and Anne Boleyn both react to being wooed and kissed by the Kings submissively, but Anne Boleyn seems to have more autonomy: she is not restrained by the will of her father of other patriarchs in her family when pursuing her queenship. Comparing the royal kisses, Anne Boleyn as an English subject is obliged to obey Henry VIII's demand, while Catherine of Valois, as a French princess, maintains her royal dignity and shows her innocence through her hesitation. Both of the royal wooing scenes end with silent, but not necessarily genuinely subservient acceptance of kisses, and yet the different contexts in *Henry V* and *Henry VIII* suggest different pursuits of queenship.

Anne Boleyn's Reading of Queenship

　　When Anne Boleyn appears on the stage again in Act II, Scene iii, the divorce issue is under fervent discussion across the whole of England and she comments on her rival's queenship thus:

> ANNE　His highness having lived so long with her, and she
> 　　　　So good a lady that no tongue could ever
> 　　　　Pronounce dishonour of her – by my life,
> 　　　　She never knew harm-doing – O now, after
> 　　　　So many courses of the sun enthroned,
> 　　　　Still growing in a majesty and pomp the which
> 　　　　To leave a thousandfold more bitter than
> 　　　　'Tis sweet at first t'acquire – after this process,
> 　　　　To give her the avaunt, it is a pity
> 　　　　Would move a monster.
>
> 　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(*Henry VIII* 2.3.2-11)

In this statement, Anne emphasises Katherine is a worthy queen but most of all, she expresses the sympathy she feels for the Queen. However, she talks about Katherine according to the queen's well-projected public image rather than articulating her own thoughts on the woman and her marriage. Anne stresses the duration of the royal marriage, Katherine's virtue and popularity and the queenly pomp, but she does not mention the Queen's rivalry with Cardinal Wolsey or her intervention in politics. By ironic contrast to her ambiguous attitude to Katherine, as demonstrated by her interaction with the woman's husband, Anne exaggerates that Katherine's fall would invoke pity even from a monster. Shakespeare and Fletcher do not depict direct interaction between Katherine and Anne; it would depend on a director's interpretation to elaborate on the relationship between these two women, such as whether Katherine knows of Henry VIII's desire for Anne or how exactly Anne serves Katherine in her role as her gentlewoman, as in the script Anne makes only superficial statements about Katherine. Anne's observation of queenship seems to be superficial too: her thoughts linger mainly on the pomp and status, which Katherine has long possessed but will soon

be stripped of (*HVIII* 2.3.12-16). In Micheli's comparison, 'Anne's view of Katherine's situation appears shallow and naive compared to Katherine's awareness of the responsibilities that accompany her status' and her cause of insistence on her queenship.[64] According to Micheli, 'the gestures and movements of the two Queens and those associated with them establish them as exemplars of opposing ideals of womanhood: one primarily moral, spiritual, and strong-minded; the other primarily sexual, physical, and compliant'.[65] However, this thesis does not always view them as opposing ideals: Anne Boleyn does present contrasting attributes to Katherine, some of which Katherine has lost, such as youth and sexuality, and some of which Katherine does not show in the play, such as witty response to courtly flirtations, but if she is going to fulfil or take over the place, title, and power that belongs to Katherine, she will have to adopt the virtues in Katherine's queenship and win popularity, sympathy, and respect from the English subjects like Katherine. Micheli's reading provides rich interpretation of the two queens in the play as Shakespeare's portraits of them 'contain many points of contrast: age vs. youth, royalty vs. petty nobility, assertiveness vs. compliance, moral virtue vs. sexual appeal, everyday vs. holiday virtues, and falling vs. rising fortunes'.[66] Yet, this thesis reasons that Anne Boleyn also strives for recognition by presenting worthy and qualified queenship through displaying various virtues, such as obedience, purity, silence, and political knowledge. Whether it is ostentation or true fulfilment, Anne's gesture suggests a preparation for being a good queen.

Anne Boleyn's abhorrence of queenship might not be genuine; her recognition of the vanity of queenship is in fact more likely to be an attempt made to conceal her interest in it. Anne continues to comment on Katherine's queenship: it would be 'much better' if Katherine 'ne'er had known pomp' rather than gaining it only then to lose it (*HVIII* 2.3.12-13). The Old Lady, as Anne Boleyn's only audience on stage, responds that Katherine is 'a stranger now again', suggesting the fact that without the title of Queen of England, Katherine is but a foreigner (*HVIII* 2.3.17). Anne expresses her pity for Katherine again and reiterates that ''tis better to be lowly born' than to fall from such a high position and 'wear a golden sorrow' (*HVIII* 2.3.19-22). As if reasoning with herself, Anne finally resolves her predicament, claiming, 'By my troth and maidenhead,/ I would not be a queen' (*HVIII* 2.3.23-24). This sudden resolution creates an intriguing

---

[64] Micheli, Micheli, '"Sit by Us": Visual Imagery', p. 460.
[65] Ibid., p. 454.
[66] Ibid.

dramatic turn. It suggest that Anne Boleyn not only sympathises but also empathises with Katherine: she has put herself in Katherine's position – the position of being a Queen of England – and decided that had she been the Queen and then fallen, she would rather not have been crowned at all. The Old Lady exposes and taunts Anne's 'hypocrisy' directly and teaches her about queenship:

> OLD LADY Beshrew me, I would –
> And venture maidenhead for't; and so would you,
> For all this spice of your hypocrisy.
> You, that have so fair parts of woman on you,
> Have too, a woman's heart which ever yet
> Affected eminence, wealth, sovereignty;
> Which, to say sooth, are blessings; and which gifts,
> Saving your mincing, the capacity
> Of your soft cheveril conscience would receive
> If you might please to stretch it.
>
> (*Henry VIII* 2.3.24-33)

The Old Lady argues that it is natural that a woman would fancy being the Queen of England but this fantasy does not mean Anne cannot take pity on Katherine. The Old Lady also points out that as Anne possesses the beauty that might seduce Henry VIII to make her Queen of England she does not have to deny her ambition. Furthermore, the Old Lady teaches Anne to be strategic, recommending she use her 'soft cheveril conscience' to receive gifts including sovereignty. Regardless of the Old Lady's straightforwardness, Anne still avoids revealing her true mind insisting that she would not be a queen even 'for all the riches under heaven' (*HVIII* 2.3.35). The Old Lady ignores Anne's reiterative announcement but educates her as to the obligation of a queen in a taunting way: from appealing to the King sexually, bearing the title of Queen of England and the weight of the King's body, to procreating of male heirs (*HVIII* 2.3.36-38, 40-43, 46-49). To all these statements Anne Boleyn constantly replies that she would not be a queen (*HVIII* 2.3. 35, 44-46). Her denial suggests that she knows what the Old Lady implies; she is not as naive as she seems to be in her rhetoric of virtuous sympathy and humility.

In addition to revealing the complexity of Anne Boleyn's statement about queenship, the Old Lady's teasing and advice also suggest how an early modern audience, especially women, might be prompted by the plot and fantasise about the possibility of becoming queens. Imagination was a key factor to the success of early modern English plays; Shakespeare's dramatisation allowed the female audience to imagine their hierarchical exaltation through aristocratical or even royal marriages. Similar to Anne Boleyn's case, Elizabeth Woodville, the first commoner queen in English history, might have also fuelled their fantasy of marrying a king to exalt their status and identity. In addition, as Woodville has two children from her previous marriage when she marries Edward IV, the dramatisation of this historical events in a way gave the female audience hopes of remarriage and the expectation that their new husbands would treat the stepchildren like their own.

The dramatisation of Anne Boleyn's encounter, subsequent interaction, and marriage with Henry VIII could also be associated with the genre of romance among Shakespearean plays – the late plays – a group which generally includes *The Winter's Tale*, *The Tempest*, *Cymbeline* and *Henry VIII*, appealing to people's imagination of time, space, and life remote from their reality. In *The Winter's Tale*, Florizel's love for Perdita raises her from a shepherdess to a princess consort, which fairy-tale like plot is rectified by her original identity as a noble princess. In contrast, Anne Boleyn's and Elizabeth Woodville's cases would be even more powerfully appealing: in terms of reception, the rapid exaltation of Anne's status is a kind of fulfilment of the female audience's wishful thinking, while the Old Lady's reaction represents a popular voice commenting on such kind of cross-class romances.

Accepting Royal Favours: Strategic and Circumspect Anne Boleyn

Despite her rhetorical resistance to queenship, Anne Boleyn does not reject the bestowal of royal favours when it happens in reality. Immediately after Anne Boleyn's proclamation of her resolved rejection of queenship, the Lord Chamberlain reports that Henry VIII has conferred the title of the Marchioness of Pembroke on her and bestowed on her 'a thousand pound a year' (*HVIII* 2.3.57-64). On the surface, Henry VIII gives Anne such a big gift to honour her 'great mind' and 'many virtues' under 'heav'nly blessings' (*HVIII* 2.3.57-60). However, after the previous conversation between Anne Boleyn and the Old Lady, the King's real intentions seem suspicious. He might use this

gift to please and woo Anne Boleyn; it also increases Anne's value as a candidate for the future queenship. Despite these doubts, Anne Boleyn answers:

> ANNE I do not know
> What kind of my *obedience* I should tender.
> *More than my all is nothing*; nor my prayers
> Are not words duly hallowed, nor my wishes
> More worth than empty vanities; yet prayers and wishes
> Are all I can return. Beseech your lordship,
> Vouchsafe to speak *my thanks and my obedience,*
> As from *a blushing handmaid* to his highness,
> Whose health and royalty I pray for.
>
> (*Henry VIII* 2.3.65-73, emphasis added)

Anne Boleyn's answer displays her virtues – obedience, piety, humility, loyalty, gratitude, and chastity. Referring to herself as a 'blushing handmaid' she makes a sharp contrast between her original self-identity as a handmaid and now as that of Henry VIII's pensioned Marchioness. This reference can also be associated with the image of the Virgin Mary as God's humble handmaid: an image that was historically appropriated by Anne's daughter Queen Elizabeth I.[67] Anne's reference to the handmaid suggests her virtues of humility in the tradition of the Virgin Mary's iconography and thereby ennobles her own characteristics. Her humble and modest reaction to the transformation of her identity impresses the Lord Chamberlain, whose response reflects how Anne Boleyn has self-fashioned herself to be a qualified queen of England:

> LORD CHAMBERLAIN [*Aside*] I have perused her well.
> Beauty and honour in her are so mingled
> That they have caught the King, and who knows yet
> But from this lady *may proceed a gem*
> *To lighten all this isle.*
>
> (*Henry VIII* 2.3.75-79, emphasis added)

---

[67] For instance, see Clement, 'The Queen's Voice', 1.1-26.

The Lord Chamberlain's final comment corresponds to the Old Lady's reminder – amongst all the missions of a queen, the supreme importance of procreating a royal heir. The allusion to Elizabeth as a gem not only refers to Anne's ability to do her duty, but it also suggests God's providence in making Anne Queen of England in order to make her mother of Elizabeth. If we detect an allusion to the Virgin Mary again, as Anne promises to bear a messianic saviour for England, this is a kind of Annunciation scene.

Whether Anne Boleyn craves queenship or not, she is destined to be the Queen of England, as the Old Lady comments: it is as if to 'have your mouth filled up/ Before you open it' (*HVIII* 2.3.88-89). The Old Lady taunts Anne: 'How tastes it? Is it bitter? Forty pence, no./ There was a lady once – 'tis an old story –/ That would not be a queen, that would she not,/ For all the mud in Egypt. Have you heard it?' (*HVIII* 2.3.90-93). She mocks Anne with the narrative of hearsay as if talking about some distant, ambiguous, and exotic fiction. She blatantly discloses what is in Henry VIII's and Anne Boleyn's minds – the King's favour for Anne and his joint pursuit of a new queen and potential male heirs; as Micheli states, 'the bawdiness and worldly wisdom of the Old Lady' echoes the audience's response and 'set[s] Anne once more in a sexual light'.[68] Anne refuses to admit to such thoughts, beseeches the Old Lady to remain quiet about the whole incident and returns to attend Queen Katherine of Aragon (*HVIII* 2.3.102-108).

Anne Boleyn is circumspect when presenting appropriate statements and putting on a virtuous front when at court. Set against how she receives the King's favour, her reiteration of her desire 'not to be a queen' seems to be an act of self-mesmerisation rather than a modest and genuine statement. Is Anne Boleyn naive or calculating?[69] Shakespeare and Fletcher offer an opaque image of Anne Boleyn in *Henry VIII*. The opacity might result from Anne Boleyn's identity as the mother of Elizabeth I – the predecessor of James I – as the playwrights wrote the play in the contexts of their reigns. In addition, as it is possible that Jacobean historians had not yet decided how exactly to write Anne Boleyn's life, it was understandably wiser for the playwrights to dramatise Anne ambiguously. For instance, the playwrights did not mention, and perhaps this was deliberate neglect, one of the important pieces of information about

---

[68] Micheli, Micheli, '"Sit by Us": Visual Imagery', p. 459.

[69] Modern adaptations of Tudor history and biographies concerning kings and queens are fascinated by the love affair between Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn. Eric Ives, one of Anne Boleyn's modern biographers, focuses on three men in her romantic history: Henry Percy, Thomas Wyatt the elder, and Henry VIII. See Eric Ives, *The Life and Death of Anne Boleyn* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), pp. 63-92.

Anne: her education at and the experience she had received in the French court.

Anne Boleyn's Autonomy in Royal Marriage

In Shakespeare and Fletcher's subtle dramatisation, Anne Boleyn is a coy, innocent, and silent woman at the end of Act I, Scene iv; while in Act II, Scene iii, she is virtuous, humble, and modest in the eyes of the Lord Chamberlain. It seems that Anne Boleyn does not pursue queenship eagerly; however, the coyness, silence, and humility of Anne Boleyn in the play has undercurrents. First, Anne Boleyn's father is not depicted in the play – she is not static, waiting for her father to arrange her marriage for her. On the contrary, she is active in the court, flirting with male courtiers and looking for opportunities for a profitable marriage. The King confers with her first, rather than her father, elevating his courtship to the level of that between a man and a woman, rather than a negotiation between families. This linear relationship between two people, rather than something in a wider familial network, enables Anne Boleyn to respond directly and autonomously. Nevertheless, Shakespeare and Fletcher do not grant her a well-rounded characterisation. She seems to accept the King's kiss and gift of a title passively and obediently, yet there are no patriarchal figures present to affect her decision or her interaction with the King, except the King himself. Her retreat from a role as a lively lady of the court to that of submissive female subject suggests a silently active pursuit of queenship. Anne does not reject the King's favour – her loyalty to the King is more important than that to the Queen whom she serves. Her ambition can be interpreted as being coated with obedience.

In *Henry VIII*, Anne Boleyn knows the game of courtship and changes her attitude and reaction when the circumstances differ. Historically, it is known how Anne Boleyn strategically played with Henry VIII's courting and how she was able to influence him politically, especially regarding the Protestant Reformation: nevertheless, in the play Anne hardly speaks after she meets the King.[70] One reading of Anne's silence is that in

---

[70] Ives discusses Anne Boleyn's influence in terms of her intervention in Henry VIII's court, her leadership in her family, her familial networking in national politics and her wealth in Chapter 14 on 'Influence, Power and Wealth', and explores Anne's instigation, support, and patronage in the reform of the English Church in the chapter on 'The Advent of Reform'. See Ives, *The Life and Death of Anne Boleyn*, pp. 205-217 and 260-276. Ives comments that Anne 'was not a catalyst in the English Reformation; she was a key element in the equation', p. 260. George Bernard has a different view of Anne Boleyn's influence on Henry VIII's political and religious policies. He asserts that throughout her life, from Henry VIII's infatuation with her, the religious disputes, to her fall, Anne did not engage herself in these happenings as actively as Henry VIII took the initiatives, made the decisions, and implemented all. See G.W. Bernard, *Anne Boleyn: Fatal Attractions* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2010).

her pursuit of queenship she cleverly makes Henry VIII act as the pursuer, while she remains the pursued. In this case, Anne Boleyn employs womanly virtues to qualify herself as a queen; she conforms to the request of Henry VIII, accepts his courtship, and eventually becomes Queen of England.

C. Elizabeth Woodville in *Henry VI, Part Three*

When compared to Catherine's learning of English and Anne's reception of royal favours, the widowed Lady Gray in *Henry VI, Part Three* seems to possess even more autonomy in deciding her remarriage while at the same time she demonstrates her concerns about securing her present (and future) children's prosperity. Lady Gray originally comes to King Edward IV's court to protect her sons' inheritance rights, and yet the King offers her a chance to elevate her status from aristocratic widow to Queen of England. Lady Gray's case of the pursuit of queenship illustrates how a woman must balance defending her chastity virtuously with the more pragmatic task of securing her children's future, and her own. The power dynamic and presentation of virtues in this case show how women may strategically preserve their autonomy in a patriarchal context.

Lady Gray's Chastity and Constancy

At the beginning of Act III, Scene ii, the newly crowned King Edward IV brings a case to be judged: Sir Richard Gray was slain in the wars of the Yorkist and the Lancastrian families but his land was not inherited by his sons. Now as the wars are over, Lady Gray comes to the court to seek the just retribution of her husband's land.[71]

At first, Edward IV expresses his concerns for the lady's family, especially her children. In this short conversation, King Edward confirms her fertility and potential to procreate royal descendants for him. He deliberately procrastinates to satisfy the lady's petition and asks her to 'love a king' (*3HVI* 3.2.52-53). Lady Gray interprets this love as that of a subject's for their ruler. Edward IV then expresses his desire explicitly: 'To tell thee plain, I aim to lie with thee' (*3HVI* 3.2.69). To this direct and unskillful wooing, Lady Gray replies: 'To tell *you* plain, I had rather lie in prison', rejecting the king's plan

---

[71] Historically, Lady Gray's full name was Elizabeth Grey and her ex-husband was John Grey, who was on the side of the Lancastrians and died at the second battle of St. Albans. See Rosemary Horrox, 'Edward IV (1442-1483)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8520, accessed 20 Nov 2008]), par. 9.

for her to become his mistress and allying herself instead with chastity (*3HVI* 3.2.70). In his third inquiry, Edward IV threatens to fail Lady Gray's petition, but she refuses to be subdued. Lady Gray's constancy and chastity ennoble her, forcing the King to re-evaluate her:

> KING EDWARD [aside] Her looks doth argue her replete with *modesty*;
>
> Her words doth show her *wit* incomparable;
>
> All her perfections challenge sovereignty.
>
> One way or other, *she is for a king*;
>
> And she shall be my love *or else my queen*.
>
> (*Henry VI, Part Three*, 3.2.84-88, emphasis added)

King Edward sees the modesty, humility, chastity, and wit of Lady Gray; her resistance to submit makes her even more worthy to be the Queen of England than his mistress. Therefore, the King upgrades his offer: 'Say that King Edward take thee for his queen?' (*3HVI* 3.2.89). Lady Gray's response is one of disbelief: she first opines that he is making fun of her and then utters her unworthiness to be a queen humbly (*3HVI* 3.2.90-92). King Edward subsequently makes an oath upon his kingship to prove his sincerity, and the Lady responds, 'And that is more than I will yield unto./ I know I am too mean to be your queen,/ And yet too good to be your concubine' (*3HVI* 3.2.96-98). Anne Boleyn uses the same rhetoric of humility in her response to the Lord Chamberlain regarding Henry VIII's favour. The rhetoric of 'I am unworthy to be the queen' displays the humility that qualifies one to be a queen. Lady Gray also reminds the King that she is the mother of non-royal heirs: ''Twill grieve your grace my sons should call you father' (*3HVI* 3.2.100). Lady Gray then obtains the King's guarantee that he will father all her children. Finally King Edward tells Lady Gray, '[a]nswer no more, for thou shalt be my queen' and emphasises his willingness to take her sons as his own (*3HVI* 3.2.106).

Lady Gray's Strategic Pursuit of Queenship

It seems that Edward IV uses his authority to win a queen. However, examining the plots closely, we see how Lady Gray elevates herself from a poor widow, a potential concubine of a king, to eventual Queen of England. When King Edward asks Lady Gray

to 'love' him at the beginning, she avoids answering directly, just as Anne Boleyn shuns responding to the Old Lady's inquiry in *Henry VIII*. Considering the courage and wisdom Lady Gray demonstrates in seeking inheritance rights for her sons, it is reasonable to assume that when she hears King Edward's request of love, she already understands what the King really desires.

Lady Gray, however, keeps questioning the King's sincerity, forcing him to verify his offer and defence of her, while at the same time she is able to display her chastity, humility, and modesty, all of which endorse her future queenship: 'I know I am too mean to be your queen,/ And yet too good to be your concubine' (*3HVI* 3.2.97-98). As she is a widow without royal origin or substantial wealth, she might have foreseen how her queenship would be undermined; therefore she abases herself in advance to see how the King would defend her. With all her concerns having been cleared, King Edward IV eventually directly demands that she be his queen. As a woman, she has strategically obtained promises for her future and as a mother, she has pragmatically secured her sons' prosperity.

Like Margaret of Anjou's marriage to Henry VI, Lady Gray's marriage to Edward IV is not supported by the King's court. While Margaret is at least French nobility, Lady Gray's lineage is even less profitable for England. Historically, Lady Gray was the first commoner to be crowned Queen of England. This marriage brought no dowry, alliance, or family networks at all. Furthermore, King Edward IV had to abandon earlier plans to marry a French princess. As a consequence, his marriage to Lady Gray endangers the friendly alliance that France would have offered the Yorkist dynasty. In the following scene, a fierce discussion about Lady Gray's 'disqualification' as Queen of England takes place in which Lady Gray defends herself:

> LADY GRAY My lords, before it pleased his majesty
> To raise my state to title of a queen,
> Do me but right, and you must all confess
> That I was not ignoble of descent –
> And meaner than myself have had like fortune.
> But as this title honours me and mine,
> So your dislikes, to whom I would be pleasing,
> Doth cloud my joys with danger and with sorrow.

(*Henry VI, Part Three* 4.1.66-73)

Lady Gray takes advantage of her authority as a queen to demand respect from the nobles, but she is also aware of her disadvantageous family background and lack of wealth. Lady Gray's situation illustrates how queenship is established upon the basis of a healthy and strong kingship:

> KING EDWARD My love, forbear to fawn upon their frowns.
> What danger or what sorrow can befall thee
> So long as Edward is thy constant friend,
> And their true sovereign, whom they must obey?
> Nay, whom they shall obey, and love thee too –
> Unless they seek for hatred at my hands,
> Which if they do, yet will I keep thee safe,
> And they shall feel the vengeance of my wrath.

(*Henry VI, Part Three* 4.1.74-81)

King Edward uses his authority to defend his queen: none of his obedient subjects should question his choice or disrespect her. Comparing Henry VI and Edward IV in the first tetralogy, we may notice that Edward IV endorses Lady Gray's queenship in front of his court more powerfully: a monarch's personal favour creates instant political elevation for individuals. When monarchical authority is strong and effective, the favourites' privileges are further secured, creating an unusual fluidity in social and political hierarchies. Lady Gray's statement that 'meaner than myself have had like fortune' encourages reflection on the contemporary context of Henry VIII's favour for his queens and the subsequent advancement of their families and of Elizabeth I's fondness and promotion of certain male courtiers, such as Sir Walter Raleigh. Such reflection suggests how history is, in a sense, inverted in this moment. The audience in the theatre could associate the future history of the Tudor monarchs with the representation of that of the Plantagenets (now on the stage). The overlapping and cross-referencing of histories reinforced people's memory, reminding them of what they had seen, heard, and experienced during previous monarchs' rule. Once monarchs introduced their sexual desires into their governance, whether implicitly or explicitly,

they might spoil the old structure of the court, either sabotaging the stability or creating a new order.

Like the marriage of Margaret and Henry VI in *Henry VI, Part Two*, the royal marriage of Edward IV and Lady Gray sabotages the peace of the English court. In the play, the success of Edward IV's wooing of Lady Gray indicates an aborted negotiation of the marriage between the King and Lady Bona, the French King's sister. The broken match of Lady Bona and Edward IV brings several powerful negative effects to the King's reign. First, the alliance with France is broken. When Edward IV is in war with Henry VI, or rather, with Margaret of Anjou, he has no powerful international allies. Second, Edward IV's alliance with the Earl of Warwick is broken. Therefore, the Earl turns to Margaret of Anjou and Henry VI's side, offering them his military resources and even marrying his daughter, Lady Anne, later a rich heiress, to Prince Edward. Therefore, the third broken tie is the marriage proposal between Lady Anne and Richard of Gloucester. Shakespeare did not mention this proposal but composes an intriguing scene of the Duke wooing Anne in Richard III. Historically, Edward IV's insistence on marrying Lady Gray broke the marital treaty between England and France and ruined the Burgundian alliance; King Edward himself seemed to be rather embarrassed at first by his rash decision.[72] Yet, why would a king choose such an obviously non-profitable queen for his kingdom? For her beauty, virtues, or true love? In *Henry VI, Part Three* and *Henry VIII*, Lady Gray and Anne Boleyn first catch the kings' eyes with their beauty and potential for procreating royal heirs, then move the Kings with their virtues, before finally demonstrating their suitability to be Queens of England.

New Family Network, New Aristocracy

Marriage is a way to expand family networks; the acquisition of queenship can be deemed as the ultimate advancement for the bride's (the queen's) family. In Lady Gray's case, many of her family members were subsequently married to aristocrats both in the play and in history. On the surface, the King seems to marry beneath him: a royal marriage of this sort is more useful for the bride's side than for the groom's. In *Richard III*, the Queen converses with Richard Gloucester about it: 'come, come, we know your meaning, brother Gloucester./ You envy my advancement, and my friends'' (*RIII* 1.3.74-75). However, for Edward IV, marrying outside the old circle of aristocracy and

_____

[72] Horrox, 'Edward IV', par. 9.

bringing new blood into the royal line is a way of expanding his own power network, cultivating his own men, and weakening the threatening and changeable old nobles. Edward IV's exogamy might be inconsiderate as it discards the chance he has to make an alliance with France and thus stabilise his power at the beginning of his reign, but it becomes (accidentally for the King) an even more secure and speedy way to generate his own 'aristocrat fortress' within his kingdom. In historians' discussions of 'the political impact of the marriage' emphasis is 'usually placed on the consequences of finding appropriate preferment for the new queen's family'.[73] This makes a similar case to Henry VIII's marriage with Anne Boleyn. Even though Elizabeth Grey's family came from an even lower class, King Edward seized this opportunity to 'ally his dynasty more securely with the English nobility' in history.[74] Although his reign was disputed in the beginning, King Edward IV unexpectedly benefited from his marriage to Lady Gray, now Queen Elizabeth Woodville, by establishing a new strain of the loyal royal blood and a powerful familial network.

To conclude, it seems that widows have greater autonomy to choose their next husband than young ladies in court. Lady Gray in *Henry VI, Part Three* does not consult others for their opinions, but instead demonstrates her autonomy in negotiating directly with Edward IV. Her poor family background intriguingly provides the King with the opportunity to cultivate his own power circle; while her virtues, particularly her fertility, demonstrate her worthiness to be a Queen. Lady Gray also exhibits a sense of responsibility for her children (which displays another of her virtues) in her active pursuit of queenship.

---

[73] Ibid., par. 10.

[74] 'By the mid-1460s Edward was sufficiently secure on the throne for marriage into the royal family to confer welcome prestige and influence, and the royal patronage that accompanied several of the marriages should probably be seen not as the King's attempt to buy the grudging acquiescence of the noble families concerned, but as the first fruits of an alliance valued by both sides'. See ibid., par. 10.

Chapter Two: Not to Be a Queen

This chapter focuses on how women reject queenship or how they fail to obtain it. In the third category, 'the disobedient rejection' of the pursuit of queenship, Shakespeare provides the intriguing characterisation of Lady Anne in *Richard III*: from a vulnerable and resentful widow, who desires Richard of Gloucester's death, she becomes a submissive bride who relies on his protection. On the other hand, the Countess of Salisbury in *Edward III* offers the early modern English audience an example of a woman rejecting the King's favours, illustrating the virtue of obedience and establishing herself as a chaste and true English lady. However, to understand the nature of queenship fully, it is important to examine the cases of failed pursuits. There are two cases in the trilogy of *Henry VI,* Joan of Arc and the Duchess of Gloucester, that reveal the danger of mis-interpreting and mis-appropriating queenship.

III. Disobedient Rejection

  A. Lady Anne in *Richard III*

In all of Shakespeare's English history plays, Lady Anne is the only one who could have become a queen in her first marriage, if Prince Henry had succeeded his father Henry VI, rather than being murdered, but then in her second marriage when she really becomes the Queen of England, she loathes her queenship. As discussed previously, had Edward IV not broken the match with Lady Bona, Anne would have married Richard of Gloucester. Yet Shakespeare did not dramatise or suggest this consequence on the stage, but instead, only depicted Anne's career twists – from a Lancastrian Princess consort to a Yorkist Duchess and then Queen consort – in the beginning of *Richard III*.

When Lady Anne first enters the stage in *Richard III*, she is escorting the coffin of her father-in-law and mourning the deaths of the Lancastrian family. When the Duke of Gloucester appears she curses him for murdering Henry VI and her ex-husband. However, she is gradually moved by Gloucester's rhetoric and eventually accepts his proposal of marriage. This transformation is often attributed to a woman's inconsistency and Richard III's success is thought to be the triumph of rhetoric and male vanity. However, re-reading the scene and its historical allusion closely from the perspective of virtue and family networking reveals a different image of Lady Anne.

In contrast with Lady Anne's confusing reaction to Richard of Gloucester's pursuit, the Duke woos her with a clear aim: by pursuing the previous king's widowed daughter-

in-law, he attempts to whitewash his crime of murdering the last two direct descendants of the Plantagenet family. Richard's method has its historical origin in the sixth and seventh centuries when, as Pauline Stafford explains, 'royal widows were married by incoming kings or usurpers to secure through them a claim to the throne, to gain the support of their allies. The importance of such widows was grasped by rebellious sons and pretenders'.[75] Obviously, marrying Lady Anne is beneficial for Richard; however, Lady Anne, not knowing Richard's purpose, changes her role from a Princess Dowager, to the Duchess of Gloucester, and finally to Queen of England. This scene in *Richard III* in the discussion of 'Pursuit of Queenship' illustrates how the history of a woman can be re-written according to historical facts but with dramatic effect. Lady Anne's fortune as a political pawn under her father's control is dramatically transformed to her autonomy in solving the dilemma between accepting or rejecting Richard's courtship, while the Duke explains his murder of Lady Anne's father-in-law and husband as a result of his 'love' for her. Shakespeare pays attention to a long-forgotten female character and interprets her actions ambiguously. This section will study the courting scene from Lady Anne's perspective, analysing the circumstance and transition of her attitude from loathing through rejection and compromise to her final acceptance of Richard III's proposal.

Lady Anne's Betrothals in History: A Pawn in Politics

Most studies of this scene focus on the characterisation of Richard, the Duke of Gloucester, and read Lady Anne's reactions as reflections of Richard's psychology and strategy. As Lady Anne loathes the Duke so much, her acceptance of his proposal is intriguing. Historically, Anne's father, the sixth Earl of Warwick and Salisbury, expected his daughters to marry as nobly as possible. Anne's sister had married Edward IV's brother, Duke of Clarence. Lady Anne, or Anne Neville, was also an inheritor of great wealth, lands, and titles from both parents' sides. Anne was originally provided with a marriage proposal to Richard in 1469, but Edward IV rejected this during the Wars of the Roses. Thus, historically there was a time when a betrothal between Anne and the Duke of Gloucester was nearly made. After the aborted marital negotiation with the Yorkist family, Anne's father did not give up; in turn, he married his daughter into the Lancastrian family.

---

[75] Stafford, *Queens, Concubines and Dowagers*, p. 49.

Anne became the bride of Prince Edward, Henry VI's only son, when the King resumed to reign again from October 1470 to April 1471. As part of the Treaty of Angers, which agreed a joint invasion of England in order to restore the Lancastrian monarchy, the marriage was contracted by Anne's father, Henry VI, Queen Margaret of Anjou, and the French King Louis XI. Thus, Anne was part of a diplomatic package, something on which the alliance hinged, and a probationer of Lancastrian queenship. However, the deaths of Henry VI and Prince Edward made Anne's fortune gloomy. Thanks to her female networks, Isabel, Anne's sister and the Duchess of Clarence, took Anne and their mother into her custody. The Yorkists were in power again, and part of Anne's original inheritance was assigned to the Duke of Gloucester. He attempted to possess all of Anne's inheritance by marrying her, but his brother, the Duke of Clarence, intended to gain full access to Anne's property by keeping her in his household and preventing her from remarrying. Anne Neville eventually married Richard, the Duke of Gloucester. Their marriage was fulfilled according to the Earl of Warwick's original plan. Michael Hicks argues that they married each other for family networking and in particular, for financial advantages.[76] Anne Neville in history, like Lady Anne in *Richard III*, was thought to be an insignificant queen, merely a political exchange and sacrifice. In the play, Lady Anne mourns with other Yorkist queens and mothers and is called to attend the coronation of Richard III. Shakespeare does not mention that in history Anne and Richard had a son, Edward (1473-1484), later titled as Prince of Wales. Understandably, Shakespeare might have wanted to avoid the image of Richard III as a father, but neither is Anne's queenly and maternal image portrayed in the play. Had Shakespeare dramatised the little prince, Queen Anne Neville's loathing of her queenship would contradict her responsibility to protect her son's inheritance right. Furthermore, by not mentioning the prince Shakespeare avoids possible doubts challenging the legitimacy of Henry VII's succession and the Tudor dynasty.

In Holinshed's *Chronicles*, the historiographer did not give any description of the Duke of Gloucester's courting of Lady Anne or the dilemma she faced. The only passage from which the readers might learn about Lady Anne, Richard, and their matrimony is that referring to their coronation ceremony: 'On the morow, being the sixt daie of Julie [1483], the king, with queene Anne his wife, came downe out of the White

---

[76] Michael Hicks, 'Anne (1456–1485)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2006 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/556, accessed 18 July 2011].

Hall into the great hall at Westminster'.[77] There is a paragraph narrating the situation of the coronation, but nothing about how the Queen was won by Richard III. This curt record granted Shakespeare a great deal of scope for his dramaturgy.

Looking back at Act I, Scene ii of *Richard III*, critics have different views about Lady Anne's surrender. Madonne M. Miner defines Richard of Gloucester as a 'hunchbacked Machiavellian' and argues that Richard replaces Henry VI and the Prince, assuming their political and sexual roles and further deflecting the responsibility for murdering the Lancastrians to Anne's beauty, manipulating women like goods in marriage.[78] Stephen Greenblatt argues that 'Richard's wooing has nothing to do with tenderness, affection, sympathy, or even sexual attraction; we witness an aggressive male assault upon Lady Anne's rooted, eloquently expressed, and eminently justified fear and loathing'.[79] Greenblatt insists that Richard calculates his moves and knows 'how to initiate action, conceal motives, threaten, intimidate, and hurt'.[80] He focuses on Richard's strategy and control of the situation, revealing an imbalance of power relations between Richard and Anne, even though the latter has greater cause for justice. Power is not about justice, but rather control. Greenblatt remarks critically that 'Anne is *shallow, corruptible, naively ambitious*, and above all, *frightened* – all qualities that help to account for her spectacular surrender [...]'.[81] He comments that Anne is 'corruptible', indicating that he still reads the Lady from a patriarchal viewpoint, from a superior position in the power relation.

However, Lady Anne's interaction with Richard may be read alternatively. Reading from Lady Anne's perspective, Camille Slights reasons that '[t]he temptation Richard presents is power over an otherwise invulnerable man. Anne, a woman without husband or father to protect her and hence powerless in a power-mad world, surrenders to the appeal of power in the form of the chance to *reform* a strong man'.[82] Slights's point corresponds to the description of the psychology of victimised women, who fall in love with murderers or abductors, or who in their relationships fantasise about their ability to influence, reform, or bring salvation to the criminals. It is the men's power that both

---

[77] Holinshed, *The Chronicles*, Vol. 3, p. 733.
[78] Madonne M. Miner, '"Neither Mother, Wife, nor England's Queen": The Roles of Women in *Richard III*', in *The Woman's Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*, ed. by Carolyn Ruth Swift Lenz, Gayle Greene, and Carol Thomas Neely (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1980), pp. 35-55 (p. 38).
[79] Stephen Greenblatt, 'Introduction to *Richard III*' in *The Norton Shakespeare,* p. 511.
[80] Ibid.
[81] Ibid., emphasis added.
[82] Camille Wells Slights, *The Casuistical Tradition in Shakespeare, Donne, Herbert, and Milton* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), p. 75 (emphasis added).

frightens and attracts these women. In terms of power, Slights observes that Lady Anne, after losing her father-in-law and husband, could depend on none of the patriarchs. However, Slights does not specify how Lady Anne recognises Richard of Gloucester's impending power or point out that, without the protection of her patriarchs, she is equally without their power and has the chance to decide for herself.

Is Lady Anne's decision to accept Richard's proposal a sign that she recognises his power? In their games of rhetoric, Anne notices that this man can rebut her curse – demonstrating a great control of rhetoric – but at the same time, he submits his life to her, showing what influence she might have on him. All of these intriguing power politics in the courting scene correspond to Slights's arguments regarding Lady Anne's belief that she might change this man. His power, as demonstrated through his witty rhetoric, ensures her that she can depend on him; her influence on him (his 'love' for her) makes her conversely become powerful, a seeming psychology of motherhood. Furthermore, Richard of Gloucester's deformity might evoke Anne's sympathy and with his submission to her she is, on the surface at least, seemingly put in the position of being able to make a decision, rather than just being manipulated.

Lady Anne's Self-Review

Shakespeare seasons this historical passage with strong dramatic effects, especially the dagger action at the end of Act I, Scene ii. Later in Act IV, Scene iv, Shakespeare lets Lady Anne speak out as to why she has made the choice she has. She recounts the courting scene and re-writes the history of her 'romance', emphasising how she encountered Richard during the funeral procession of her former father-in-law and cast curses on Richard and any future wife that he may have. Ironically the curses come back to her now. She also explains how and why Richard was able to persuade her:

> LADY ANNE Lo, ere I can repeat this curse again,
>   Within so small a time, my woman's heart
>   Grossly grew captive to his honey words
>   And proved the subject of mine own soul's curse,
>   Which hitherto hath held mine eyes from rest –
>   For never yet one hour in his bed
>   Did I enjoy the golden dew of sleep,

But with his timorous dreams was still awaked.

(*Richard III* 4.1.77-84)

Lady Anne admits that she was bewildered by Richard of Gloucester's words and that queenship makes her suffer from insomnia. She is clear about Richard's wickedness and his 'timorous dreams', the result of his unconscious guilt. This marriage, as she cursed it to be, is a disaster. Looking back, she now regrets having submitted to his honeyed words.

This self-analysis indicates that Lady Anne's fantasy about Richard's love for her is shattered. In Act IV, Scene i, Lady Anne is notified that Richard is going to be crowned King of England, and she the Queen. Her reaction is not happy; she has realised Richard's thirst for power will eventually destroy her ('Besides, he hates me for my father Warwick,/ And will, no doubt, shortly be rid of me', *RIII* 4.1.85-86). Unlike most women, who would be thrilled by their future queenship, and unlike Lady Elizabeth Gray (Queen Elizabeth Woodville of Edward IV in *King Henry VI, Part Three*), not every widow welcomes being pursued by the King.

Anne Neville, a Tool for Pursuing Queenship

Richard's wooing of Lady Anne in Act I, Scene ii of *Richard III* is a delicate case of the pursuit of queenship. Reviewing Anne's case it shows that her acceptance of Richard's proposal is not about 'queenship', as when the Duke proposed he was not yet a king. There are few clues as to whether Lady Anne estimates the Duke's ambition. Her abhorrence of queenship as revealed in Act IV, Scene i reaffirms her image as a victim and a vulnerable woman, rather than an ambitious Duchess seeking to be the Queen of England. Historically, Lady Anne had no choice but to accept her father's arrangement, supporting his game of chasing power. In Shakespeare's dramatisation, however, the playwright does not depict this fatherly intervention, but seems to grant Lady Anne autonomy in deciding her second marriage. Comparing the dramatisation of two widows, it appears that like Lady Elizabeth Gray, Anne's widowhood gives her the freedom and opportunity to choose her next marriage; yet unlike Lady Elizabeth, Anne is still played as a pawn by the Duke of Gloucester. In *Richard III* the ambiguity of her attitude is clarified in the account she gives of the courting scene. Richard's proposal is less to do with Lady Anne's pursuit of queenship and more to do with the Duke of

Gloucester's pursuit of kingship. Instead of her using the marriage to expand her network or gain royal power in order to engage in the court politics, it is Richard who exploits Lady Anne's identity and relationship with the Plantagenets to stabilise and strengthen the legitimacy of his claim to the throne. In contrast with Greenblatt's criticism of inconsistency, Lady Anne's submission represents political and practical compromise in face of the reality of survival. For Lady Anne, Richard's manipulation of rhetoric and his former military performance demonstrate his ability to protect her and secure a life for her. In contrast to traditional understanding of virtues, Lady Anne's ambiguous attitude leaves space for different interpretations. Miner argues that in making his proposal, 'Richard does not seek a union *with* other men but rather *replaces* them by assuming their roles with respect to women'.[83] Miner's analysis might explain why Shakespeare does not include the historical fact that the couple had a son together, but instead depicts how Richard 'employs women as scapegoats and currency'.[84]

B. The Countess of Salisbury in *Edward III*

As seen in the cases of Anne Boleyn and Lady Elizabeth Gray, it might be easy to say 'no' to a king's offer to be his concubine, but it is difficult to decline a king's offer of queenship. Nevertheless, Shakespeare does provide us with such an example: the Countess of Salisbury in *Edward III.* She is the only exception in the pursuit of queenship. There are two prominent female characters in *Edward III*: the Countess of Salisbury and Queen Philippa – the mother of the Dark Prince and Richard II. The Countess of Salisbury will be discussed here, while the plots about Queen Philippa will be examined later in 'Part Two: The Practice of Queenship'. This section examines how the Countess transforms from a hospitable hostess to a disobedient subject, and finally to an educator of Edward III and a true English lady. By exploring the Countess's roles, this section illustrates how she uses her virtues, appropriates the hierarchy of different authorities, and thus empowers herself to defy tyranny.

The incident happens when Edward III sojourns at the first Earl of Salisbury's castle when the loyal Earl is away to fight the Scots for the King (1333-1338). During his stay King Edward succumbs to the Countess's ravishing beauty (*EIII* 1.2.102-106). He is aware of its influence and tries to leave, but the Countess, out of hospitality and loyalty,

_____

[83] Miner, 'The Role of Women', p. 41.
[84] Ibid.

asks the King to stay, which opens the whole theme of rejecting queenship (*EIII* 1.2.128-137, 138). As Kelso notes, at different times and in different cultures there are different standards of virtues, and the Countess of Salisbury's hospitality can invoke disputes about her chastity.[85] The disputes are resolved, as Shakespeare shows his audience how the Countess prevents the King from acting tyrannically and how she serves as his tutor making him recognise his mistakes and reform himself.

Shakespeare dramatises the tug of war of love, authority, and true obedience between King Edward and the Countess of Salisbury throughout Act II. Lodowick, the King's secretary, has noticed King Edward's affection for the Countess and suspects that the King might neglect his duty (*EIII* 2.1.1-24). Instead of consulting Lodowick about the latest situation in the Scottish war, Edward III asks his help to write love poems to the Countess. When the Countess enters the stage King Edward gradually reveals his mind; however, from how the Countess addresses the King ('my thrice gracious lord', 'thrice gentle king' to 'my thrice dread sovereign'), it is obvious that she knows what the King implies and distances herself from him (*EIII* 2.1.190, 202, and 218).

While Edward III uses different rhetoric to win the Countess, she responds accordingly to defend her chastity and his courtship gradually becomes orders: 'Thou hearst me say that I do dote on thee', 'It is thy beauty that I would enjoy' and 'But thou mayst lend it [her beauty] me to sport withal' (*EIII* 2.1.222, 229, and 235). The Countess replies to him in philosophical rhetoric about how her beauty, body, and soul are inseparable, and thus she cannot lend any of them to the King, implying that she will not comply with his desire. Since he cannot borrow them, King Edward proposes to 'buy' the Countess's love with his wealth, making his courtship a commercial transaction. Thus, King Edward moves the Countess from love object to business partner of comparatively equivalent status. However, this rhetoric also commercialises and objectifies the Countess. She answers:

> COUNTESS That love you offer me, you cannot give,
>
> For Caesar owes that tribute to his queen.
>
> That love you beg of me, I cannot give,
>
> For Sarah owes that duty to her lord.
>
> He that doth clip or counterfeit your stamp

---

[85] Kelso, *Doctrine*, p. 24.

> Shall die, my lord; and will your sacred self
>
> Commit high treason against the king of heaven,
>
> To stamp his image in forbidden metal,
>
> Forgetting your allegiance and your oath?
>
> In violating marriage'[s] sacred law
>
> You break a greater honour than yourself.
>
> [...]
>
> I know your sovereign, in my husband's love –
>
> Who now doth loyal service in his wars –,
>
> Doth but so try the wife of Salisbury,
>
> Whether she will hear a wanton's tale or no.
>
> (*Edward III* 2.1.250-275)

The Countess refuses the King's 'business proposal'; she uses classical (Caesar) and biblical (Sarah) allusions to educate the King that they should both keep their marriage oaths as committed before God – ignorance or violation of it is disobedience to the Lord. When Edward III uses his authority to demand her compliance, the Countess appeals to God, the supreme authority: she justifies her disobedience to the King as her obedience to her marriage oath before God (*EIII* 2.1.254-262).[86] The Countess of Salisbury demonstrates her knowledge of biblical jurisdiction; her wisdom in applying canon law presents a case of how women can endorse their causes with divine authority in order to fight against secular power. She empowers herself with the virtue of obedience to defy the King and protect her chastity.

In addition to addressing the indissolubility of marriage in medieval canon law, the Countess also appeals to patriotism and the order of the King's court, reminding him that her loyal husband has been sent to war for the King's and the country's welfare. While her husband is in his service, the King's courtship of her is unjust and undermines his kingly authority. Even though the Countess blatantly refuses the King's request and leaves the stage the King still indulges himself in his fantasy; the Countess's rejection even elevates her beauty. Similar to the cases of Margaret of Anjou, Anne Boleyn, and Elizabeth Woodville, women's humility and refusal ennoble them and

---

[86] Yu-Wen Teresa Wei discusses the relationship between female obedience and disobedience and authority in the context of the Protestant Reformation; see Yu-Wen Teresa Wei, 'The Religious and Gender Politics of Obedience in *Edward III*', *NTU Studies in Language and Literature* 13 (2004), 1-22.

further fuel the men's desire to win them. From another perspective regarding women's virtues, the Countess does not remain silent and obedient to the king's request as is preached in conduct books, but instead speaks aloud her disobedience in order to protect her chastity.

The Abuse of Patriarchal Authorities

King Edward III's next step is to use the hierarchy of patriarchal authority to manipulate the Countess's father, the Earl of Warwick. Strategically, Edward III first discusses flattery, oaths, and loyalty with the Earl, asks him to distinguish between different levels of obedience, and then demands that he enact his obedience to a king by using his fatherly authority to force the Countess to compromise her virtue (*EIII* 2.1.296-347). The conversation between Edward and Warwick reflects oath making and breaking in the contracting of marriages (*EIII* 2.1.327, 347).

After the King leaves, the Earl realises that if he conveys the King's unjust request to his daughter he will violate his own teachings to the Countess and undermine his fatherly dignity and authority. Shakespeare presents the irony that a father, the main tutor of virtues for his daughter, should also be the one to convince the self-same daughter to commit adultery.[87] He also understands that the King's desire undermines the order of the state, family, and himself:

> WARWICK [*Aside*] How shall I enter in this graceless errand?
> I must not call her child, for where's the father
> That will in such a suit seduce his child?
> Then 'wife of Salisbury' – shall I so begin?
> No, he's my friend – and where is found the friend
> That will do friendship such endamagement? –
> Neither my daughter, nor my dear friend's wife,
> I am not Warwick as thou thinkst I am,
> But an attorney from the court of hell,
> That thus have housed my spirit in his form,
> To do a message to thee from the king.
>
> (*Edward III* 2.1.374-384)

---

[87] For a father being a daughter's tutor and women's obligation to submit, see Kelso, *Doctrine*, p. 39.

The Earl of Warwick keeps questioning himself and feels ashamed and disqualified to call himself a father to his daughter or a friend to the Earl of Salisbury. The breakdown of order leads to identity confusions. Warwick tells the Countess to preserve her life first, rather than her honour as the King may bestow upon her more honour: 'hide' the shame, and 'temper [her] misdeeds', he suggests (*EIII* 2.1.399 and 405). The Countess blames the King for corrupting her father, and under such pressure from two patriarchs (the King and her father), she does not forsake what she has been taught and resolves to sacrifice her life instead of her honour (*EIII* 2.1.413-430). The Earl of Warwick, being educated by his daughter, resumes his reason and conscience, 'unsays' his words, and decides to break the promise he made and disobey the King: 'An honourable grave is more esteemed/ Than the polluted closet of a king' (*EIII* 2.1.433-434). Edward III uses his kingly authority to command Warwick to impose his fatherly authority on the Countess of Salisbury. The Countess, however, commits a 'double disobedience', with her ultimate obedience to God: she undermines the authority of both patriarchs in keeping her marital oath under God and scolds her father for pandering to the King's lust. The Countess of Salisbury in *Edward III* redeems her honour and that of her father by defending her chastity.

The following scene (Act II, Scene ii) begins with King Edward indulging himself in the mood of love rather than playing the role of a ruler. He detests drums, the symbolic sound of war, but demands lute music for love and joyful court life (*EIII* 2.2.46-60). He compares his relationship with the Countess to the match of Caesar and Cleopatra, a comparison that generates an ironic contrast between the images of the lustful Egyptian Empress and the virtuous English Countess. To remind the King of the ridiculousness of his pursuit the Countess of Salisbury proposes unreasonable conditions for her subjugation. She claims that as long as the King removes the obstacles between them, she will relent:

> COUNTESS My thrice loving liege,
>> Your queen, and Salisbury my wedded husband,
>> Who, living, have that title in our love
>> That we cannot bestow but by their death.
> KING EDWARD Thy opposition is beyond our law.

COUNTESS So is your desire. If the law

Can hinder you to execute the one,

Let it forbid you to attempt the other.

(*Edward III* 2.2.140-147)

The Countess states boldly and blatantly that only the death of the queen and the Earl may accomplish the King's wish. She uses ironies to insinuate and reason with the King that murder and adultery are tied together in his pursuit. However the King takes her words as a challenge and promises the Countess: 'No more: thy husband and the queen shall die' (*EIII* 2.2.150). King Edward's 'love' for the Countess leads to the abuse of authority and murder (*EIII* 2.2.159-161). The Countess then presents him with knives: one for him to kill his queen, by his own hand, and the other for her to murder her husband. To King Edward it appears that the Countess has finally revealed her cold-bloodedness and ambition. However, the situation is dramatically overturned: the Countess points the knife at herself and urges the King to give up his 'most unholy suit', or she will stain the King with her 'poor chaste blood' (*EIII* 2.2.182-186). The Countess realises that neither morality nor law will stop the King, so she gives up rhetoric and defends her chastity through actions instead.

Stabbing by dagger seems to be a symbolic action of a woman's self-defence of her honour in both *Richard III* and in *Edward III*. Addressing their unwillingness to be subjugated, both Lady Anne and the Countess of Salisbury combine their rhetoric with the action. Lady Anne's discourse of curses succumbs to Richard Gloucester's silver tongue and eventually to his bold offering of the revenging dagger to Anne. Despite the Countess's allusion to classical and biblical examples to dissuade King Edward, the Countess of Salisbury finally wins the King's surrender with her virtuous attempt to kill herself in order to defend her chastity. In these two cases, Lady Anne and the Countess of Salisbury present a set of contrasting responses to the opportunity of accessing queenship.

In her attempt at self-stabbing the Countess dominates the stage and controls the action. She even addresses the King by name directly, discarding all the hierarchical orders in her courageous defence of her chastity (*EIII* 2.2.186). The Countess's attempt to defend her chastity with suicide has a strong connection and contrast to another work by Shakespeare – *The Rape of Lucrece* (1593) – in which Lucretia kills herself after

being raped by Tarquin. Based on Roman history, Lucretia's behaviour has been criticised over centuries; as Katharine Eisaman Maus points out, Lucretia presents a two-sided image of a model of an obedient wife and a self-assertive woman, while her suicide is viewed by some Christian writers, such as Augustine, as 'not merely indecorous but sinful'.[88] Chastity not only indicates the intactness of physical body but also encompasses the integrity and purity of one's mental state.[89] Finally, at the end of Act II, Scene ii, King Edward is moved enough to comment:

> EDWARD Even by that power I swear, that gives me now
> The power to be ashamed of myself,
> I never mean to part my lips again
> In any words that tends to such a suit.
> Arise, *true English lady*, whom our isle
> May better boast of than ever Roman might
> Of her, whose ransacked treasury hath tasked
> The vain endeavour of so many pens.
> Arise, and be my fault thy honour's fame,
> Which after ages shall enrich thee with.
> I am awaked from this idle dream.
>
> (*Edward III* 2.2.188-198, emphasis added)

Being awoken from his fantasies about the Countess, the King is reformed. The Countess's wise argument about the hierarchy of authorities, her bold disobedience of the King's and her father's requests, her bold action (the attempt to kill herself in defence of her chastity), her strong determination, and most importantly her virtues, finally subdue the King's sexual desire. Edward III's association with the 'Roman' again refers to *The Rape of Lucrece*, but the play presents a different ending. Instead of killing herself and causing political revolt, the Countess uses her rhetoric, political wisdom, and virtue and dissuades the King from submitting to his desire and being a tyrant. She also alludes to her husband's trust of and devotion to the King and her commitment to her marriage oath, but before she takes the means of self-hurting, she has successfully

---

[88] Katherine Eisaman Maus, 'Introduction to *The Rape of Lucrece*' in *The Norton Shakespeare*, p.635.
[89] Ibid., p. 636.

defended herself by overriding the King's order with the superior authority of God. As a sharp contrast to *the Rape of Lucrece*, the play presents an English lady who is wiser and stronger in protecting herself and defending the honour of herself, her family, and her country, and a king who is abler to amend himself and become a paradigmatic monarch. Finally, in contrast with *The Rape of Lucrece*, which is in the form of a love poem but describes a failed and violent pursuit of love, the plot of Edward III and the Countess is composed in a frame of romance but depicts a king refused and reformed by a woman of virtue.

Why would a woman reject queenship? In the Countess of Salisbury's case the queenship that Edward III offers is based first on adultery, as both the Countess and the King are married; second on murder (at one point King Edward promises to decapitate the Earl of Salisbury and depose Queen Philippa); and finally on tyranny – a king sabotaging the social and political order by committing adultery and murder only to serve his personal desire is considered a tyrant. The plot of removing the husband of the woman whom the King desires has subtle biblical allusions to the story of King David and Bathsheba (2 Samuel 11-12). Compared with King David, Edward III's failed pursuit of the Countess of Salisbury and his reformation suggest that he may be a greater ruler than the biblical King. The virtuous Countess saves the King's virtue and is praised as a 'true English lady', emphasising the authenticity and integrity of Englishness in Shakespeare's histories, in contrast with the alleged rape of the Countess by King Edward in French literature.[90] More intriguingly, in relation to the biblical allusion to King David, Henry VIII was often typologically read as King David in English Reformation iconography. All three kings (the biblical King David, Edward III, and Henry VIII) face the difficulty of what they should prioritise, whether they should check or follow the flow of their personal desire when ruling themselves, their family, and their country. Moreover, historically and dramatically in Shakespearean texts and contexts, Henry VIII's comforting of Queen Katherine of Aragon can be likened to King David's consolation of Bathsheba after she lost her first-born child, and also to the solace Edward gives to Queen Philippa when it is rumoured that Prince Edward is imprisoned and then again later in the play when he loses his life on the battlefield.[91]

---

[90] W. M. Ormrod, 'Montagu, William, first earl of Salisbury (1301–1344)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19001, accessed 18 July 2011], par. 11.

[91] Queens' maternal love will be further explored in 'Part II: The Practice of Queenship'.

<u>The Countess of Salisbury as a Reformer and Educator of Edward III</u>

Rejecting the King's infatuation with her, the Countess of Salisbury not only preserves her chastity, but also saves Edward III from implementing tyranny. She thus transforms herself from a passive sexual object to an active advisor to the monarch. Melchiori comments that the plot of Edward III's reformation reflects Tillyard's theory about the motif of the education of the Prince in Shakespeare's history plays.[92] Both critics focus on the establishment of good kingship but I would further argue that Shakespeare presents us with an episode of how a virtuous woman becomes an educator to a king. If *Edward III* is a monarch's bildungsroman – how a king becomes a great and just ruler – then we need to remember that it is a woman who defies royal authority and rejects the pomp of queenship to preserve her honour thus ultimately conducting the prince's reformation. Furthermore, Shakespeare's dramatisation presents a different story from the medieval French propagandised legend of King Edward's raping the Countess.[93] Shakespeare's dramatic version not only serves as a rehabilitation of Edward III's image, it also provides a positive interpretation of a woman: one who cleverly protects herself from defamation and saves her nation from moral and political disorder. Although the Countess of Salisbury is not Queen of England, she is, as praised in the play, 'a true English lady' who strategically appropriates women's virtues and manipulates the issues of a woman's chastity, admonishing the King, rewriting the idea of obedience and disobedience, and transgressing into the public arena of national politics.[94]

IV. False Attempt

In previous discussions, women either become queens regardless of their true minds, or defend their chastity and honour by escaping from a king's desire. However, women in the final category of the 'False Attempt' imagine, read, or appropriate queenship

---

[92] Giorgio Melchiori, *Shakespeare's Garter Plays: Edward III to Merry Wives of Windsor* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1994), pp. 113-132.

[93] Ibid. Melchiori provides a comparison of the different versions of Edward III's infatuation with the Countess of Salisbury. Through this textual study he explores how Shakespeare adapted his sources from historical chronicles and legendary tales, and thus presented his own version of this episode, providing a powerful and intriguing version of the Countess's defence of her chastity and Edward III's reformation.

[94] Eric Sams argues that the representation of 'a true English lady' is associated with another English lady, the virtuous Queen Elizabeth I. See Eric Sams ed., *Shakespeare's Edward III* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), p. 4.

incorrectly, causing their own fall and sometimes even that of their families. Unlike female characters in the sections on 'passive acceptance', 'active pursuit', and 'disobedient rejection', Joan of Arc and the Duchess of Gloucester in *Henry VI* do not fully appreciate the political situation, misappropriating the title and attribute of queenship and neglecting to enact or even display the virtues of chastity, humility, and silence in the process of pursuing or accessing queenship. This section will examine how their unruly ambition is defamed and how Shakespeare dramatises queenship from their negative examples.

A. Joan of Arc in *Henry VI, Part One*

The image of Joan of Arc in Shakespeare's English history plays is problematic and negative. It is problematic in that she is involved with supernatural powers to gain military victories for France, making the justice of her triumph suspicious, and negative in that her reputation as a 'holy maid', 'prophet', 'Amazon', or 'Deborah' on the French side is denigrated to a 'witch' and 'whore' in the English camp.[95] When Joan finally has a chance to justify herself before the English, she changes the narratives of her nativity and identities too frequently. Lacking consistency, losing her courage on the battlefield, and ruining her reputation as a chaste maid, Joan convinces neither the English nor the audience of her innocence. Joan's reaction to the opportunity of obtaining queenship and her lying about her relationship with the French nobles further disempower her. It is important to explore how Shakespeare deliberately moulds an example of a negative French figure to contrast with virtuous English women.

At her first appearance on the Shakespearean stage in *Henry VI, Part One*, Joan of Arc is offered potential queenship; yet she is more eager to demonstrate her ability in front of the French aristocrats through the ultimate masculine act of war. At the beginning of Act I, Scene iii, the Bastard of Orléans introduces Joan as 'a holy maid' and 'a prophet', who has visions of the past and the future, to Charles, the French Dauphin, and his court (*1HVI* 1.3.30-36). Such boasting causes suspicion; the Dauphin tests Joan by changing the places that he, René (Duke of Anjou), and the Duke of Alençon stand in the court to confuse their identities. Joan, however, immediately recognises the trick and identifies the Dauphin correctly (*1HVI* 1.3.44-49). In a private conversation with the Dauphin that follows, Joan explains that she has been sent by

---

[95] Rutter, 'Of Tygers' Hearts', p.190.

Heaven: all her power and ability is predestined, not least considering she was born a shepherd's daughter but has transformed herself into a holy maid, woman warrior, and a defender of her country. Interestingly, as the invocation and appropriation of the iconography of the Holy Virgin applies to female characters only, Joan is the only one who can obtain potency through Marian miracles, and the Dauphin and other French male aristocrats, let alone the English soldiers, cannot aspire to the same power but remain amazed or bewildered.[96] To reinforce such a 'miracle', she claims that her original complexion was dark and ugly but has become fair and beautiful. To endorse herself, Joan of Arc invokes symbolic attributes of beauty and whiteness as associated with innocence and chastity.

By contrast, the emphasis on Joan's military image implicates her 'unwomanliness' and her lack of feminine attributes such as silence and humility. The most intriguing change in her identity is that Joan exceeds her sex and becomes a suitable warlike mate for the Dauphin. Joan's bold statement astonishes the Dauphin (*1HVI* 1.3.83-84). He then changes the image he has of Joan as an independent Amazonian woman to a 'Deborah', the prophet and judge in the Old Testament assisting the Israelite, Barak, in fighting the Caananites. From an independent woman to a helpmate, Charles subtly reveals his changing perception of Joan, appropriating her to the position of a consort (*1HVI* 1.3.86-91). The Dauphin does not inquire where Joan's power comes from; instead he woos Joan in an attempt to make her his mistress and even his queen. Joan, however, rejects him and insists that she 'must not yield to any rites of love' because of her sacred vocation, and that she will not ask for any reward until all of Charles's foes have succumbed to her might (*1HVI* 1.3.92-95). Joan's resistance to queenship differs from Anne Boleyn's reluctance and Elizabeth Woodville's rejection. By contrast to their humility, Joan of Arc is more eager to prove her superior power to commoners and aristocrats through her self-made association with God.

Joan's answer simultaneously creates hers as a divine image while also revealing her human weakness: the search for fame and wealth. Joan might be more ambitious than the Dauphin thinks: she 'chooses' to be a holy maid thus enabling herself to acquire a power superior to the patriarchs and approach the supreme authority of God directly. Joan and Charles's 'long talk' together causes René and Alençon to question and banter

---

[96] Ruben Espinosa, *Masculinity and Marian Efficacy in Shakespeare's England* (Surrey: Ashgate, 2011), p. 46.

about her chastity (*1HVI* 1.2.98-99). Shakespeare subtly foreshadows Joan's ambiguous identity and unwomanly behaviour and rhetoric right in her first appearance on the stage. Joan wraps her discourse in the language of prophecy and the Dauphin also alludes to ancient and biblical episodes to mythologise Joan (*1HVI* 1.3.119-124 and 128-129). Charles might have been obsessed with Joan's 'sacredness', but the discourse of a legendary figure might also be just what the French army needs in order to frustrate the English.

This quasi-apotheosis is, however, interpreted by the English as the story of a devil. When Joan and the heroic Talbot meet on the battlefield in Act I, Scene vii of *Henry VI, Part One*, Talbot immediately comments on the anomaly of a woman in armour and defames Joan as a 'devil', 'devil's dam', and 'witch' as 'power in woman has one single source, darkness, with two names, sexuality and witchcraft'.[97] Joan's behaviour presents a different type of female to the English camp. When she retreats after the first short battle with Talbot, she proclaims: 'Talbot, farewell. Thy hour is not yet come./ I must go victual Orléans forthwith' (*1HVI* 1.7.13-14). Instead of confessing that she is defeated or discouraged by Talbot, Joan speaks like a prophetess to intimidate Talbot prior to their next military engagement. This 'prophecy' does not terrify Talbot, who instead comments that Joan is 'a witch by fear, not force' (*1HVI* 1.7.21). Talbot recognises that Joan does not possess actual military skills or strength; she is merely able to manipulate any battlefield confrontation she is involved in because of the bizarreness her opponent feels on seeing a woman in armour.

Talbot perceives that this strategic intimidation is the result of ignorance and inexperience, but the French keep indulging themselves in the legend of Joan and eventually make her the real leader of the French troops. As their luck in warfare changes, the French nobles blame each other for their setbacks and Joan encourages them to stop quarrelling and takes efficient measures (*1HVI* 2.1.73-78). Joan is endowed with rational and practical strategy on the battlefield, while the French nobles are effeminate, enjoying themselves in squabbles. In contrast with these men of words, Joan is a woman of action. In Act III, Joan even disguises herself as a peasant and guides the Dauphin to invade cities. The whole of Act III is about Joan's performance and interaction with masculinity on the battlefield in relation to gender identification and national awareness.

_____

[97] Ibid., p.191.

Joan's Problematic Identity

Joan's fluid identity does not fit into conventional profiles of English ladies. She is a femme fatale, a woman warrior, a saviour, a witch, a thorn, a liar, and an inconsistent woman. In terms of the pursuit of queenship, Joan's status is ambivalent. The Dauphin shows obvious interest in her as Joan's military strength increases her female sexual attraction; that is, Joan's assumption of the role of a soldier and appropriation of masculinity is correlated to her sexuality and other male characters' effeminacy. As Ben Spiller comments, she '[saps] male potency through feminine sexuality'.[98] All the conversations conducted by French or English men with Joan and the references they make to her are heavily embedded with sexual implications. In the beginning, the Dauphin exalts her as another Deborah and Astraea, courting her with the rhetoric of chivalry, though he never offers her the French queenship explicitly; but neither does Joan reveal any ambition to be the French queen. Her only reference to the queenship is her manipulation of the identity and privilege which she thinks a French queen (or princess consort) would enjoy in order to save herself from being executed by the English in later scenes. The queenship she intends to associate herself with is that of the Holy Virgin Mary in Heaven.

In Act V, Scene vi, Joan is captured by the English and faces inquisition. She denies her natal identity in front of her shepherd father, trying to erase and rewrite her original nativity narrative: 'Decrepit miser, base ignoble wretch,/ I am descended of a gentler blood./ Thou art no father nor no friend of mine' (*1HVI* 5.6.7-9). Joan's denial irritates her father, who at first persuades Joan to forfeit her pretensions and accept her more base origins. After having been rejected several times, the father in return refutes the biological tie between him and his thankless daughter, curses Joan, and encourages the English to burn her (*1HVI* 5.6.10-13, 17-20, and 23-33).[99] Spiller argues that Joan's issue is not her nationality but her gender and illustrates his view by pointing out that even Joan's shepherd father also joins the English soldiers' discourse, cursing his own daughter and approving the plan to burn her to death, so that Joan becomes 'the ultimate scapegoat for insecure men'.[100] However, it might be the shepherd's attempt to save his

---

[98] Ben Spiller, 'Warlike Mates? Queen Elizabeth, and Joan La Pucelle in *1 Henry VI*', in *Goddesses and Queens*, ed. by Connolly and Hopkins, pp. 34-44 (p.81). Banks also discusses Joan's military image briefly in 'Warlike Women', pp. 169-181.
[99] Rutter, 'Of Tygers' Hearts', p.192.
[100] Spiller, 'Warlike Mates?', pp. 39-40.

own life rather than defend his country or the patriarchal system. My thesis focuses more on how Joan manipulates her discourse, applies or is compared to different female models, and creates multiple identities for her own survival, especially on how she uses the roles of being a representative of the Holy Virgin and a potential queen consort. In this scene, Joan first rejects and then is rejected by the patriarchal system concerning her identity. She already offends and threatens the patriarchy in the form of her cross-dressing and valiant performances on the battlefield, and in this scene, she furthers her subversion; however, her multiple identities do not undermine the definition of masculinity or the order of the patriarchal society as in her interaction with the French Dauphin and nobles previously, but simply loses her the support from her father and her credit in front of the English soldiers.

Erasing her original nativity narrative, Joan then creates her own version declaring that she is 'issued from the progeny of kings' and 'virtuous and holy, chosen from above', and remains 'a virgin from her tender infancy/ Chaste and immaculate in very thought', pretending to be a royal heir and reinforcing her virtues and chastity (*1HVI* 5.6.36-53). When she realises that this will not persuade the English to pardon her, she then switches to the identity of a mother ('I am with child') implying a sexual relationship with the French nobles. By associating herself with the French nobility, Joan attempts to use royal prerogatives to escape her execution. Her inconsistent and problematic narrative strategy incites the English to mock: 'the holy maid' is now 'with child'. They also suspect that the child might be Charles's bastard, and if so, they would not let the French heir and its mother live. Thereby, Joan rewrites her story again: 'You are deceived. My child is none of his./ It was Alençon that enjoyed my love' (*1HVI* 5.6.72-73). But Alençon is not a powerful and valid candidate for the Englishmen, either. Joan then switches to another French nobleman that she knows: 'O give me leave, I have deluded you./ 'Twas neither Charles nor yet the Duke I named,/ But René King of Naples that prevailed' (*1HVI* 5.6.76-78). Unlike the Dauphin and Alençon, René, the King of Naples, is a married man, thus Joan now makes herself an adulterer and her excuse sounds even weaker. This narrative of self-defence cannot be trusted; from a princess consort to a Duchess and eventually to the mistress of a less-known king, none of Joan's ever-changing identities are valid. Joan appropriates and manipulates the identity of her false husbands and of the fathers of her fake child. Furthermore, her choice of potential fathers deteriorates as they increase in number: the

English Duke of Warwick taunts Joan for choosing a married man at the end, making herself an adulterous mistress. Having discredited herself she has no other weapons left but her curses (*1HVI* 5.6.86-91).

In Joan's defence, all the names of her child's possible fathers she quotes are the French men that she met in the French camp; her association with the French nobles based on sexual relationships sabotages her claims of chastity and contradicts the previous proclamation she made about her virginity. This wins her no advantage in securing her life and it also ensures she loses any respect and awe that the English men might have for her in the beginning. Spiller argues that Joan's multiple identities disturb the vague division between the English and the French under the contexts of both being Roman Catholic countries at that time and the domestic War of Roses in England; all of these further undermine the rhetoric of Protestant England in the 1590s.[101] Spiller's argument does point out the contradiction of English discourse in the dramatisation of Joan of Arc in *Henry VI, Part One*. However, Kathryn Schwarz explains in another way: Joan's 'multiple identities give way to multiple performances.' Schwarz does not think that Joan succeeds (or can survive) because she 'functions only problematically within an economy governed by men because her value, as a sexual commodity and as an iconographic figure, does not remain constant'.[102] Similarly, I do not think Joan's multiple identity strategy helps her to achieve her goal because of the contradictions within the different identities she chooses to utilise. She does not integrate the images of the Virgin, Deborah, Princess consort of the Dauphin, a mistress of the Duke, a pregnant woman with a reasonable explanation. In addition, she does not use resources available to her effectively: she rejects the shepherd-father's narration about her nativity without denying him or providing an alternative narrative convincingly.

On the other hand, Margaret of Anjou's manipulation of different phases of her roles along with different virtues are more effective. As Schwarz analyses, in comparison with Joan, 'Margaret instead manipulates the terms of the social, occupying the middle ground of domestic convention; her performance of the roles of mother, wife, and queen brings masculinity and femininity into their most ruinous conflation'.[103] Margaret's manipulation of virtues in different space at different times will be discussed further in

---

[101] Spiller, 'Warlike Mates?', pp. 35-38.
[102] Kathryn Schwarz, *Tough Love: Amazon Encounters in the English Renaissance* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2000), p. 82.
[103] Ibid.

'Part Two: The Practice of Queenship'. The difference between Joan's and Margaret's applications of their multiple identities/images is that the former does not accommodate them to different contexts as well as the latter. In Schwarz's argument, there is a hypothetical division of masculinity with publicity, and femininity with domesticity, which Margaret recognises and utilises better as I will illustrate in the reading of Margaret in different spaces later.[104] In comparison with other female characters, Joan of Arc lacks the political knowledge of international diplomacy, such as that of Blanche in *King John* and of Catherine in *Henry V*. Her false appropriation and reading of queenship leads her to stray from queenship even further.

Also, Joan's multiple identities remind the audience of Elizabeth I's different typologies used in different religious, political, and literary writings, evoking our doubt and our interest in reading different images of the Queen and of other queens consort in literature and history. Spiller's connection of Elizabeth I with Joan of Arc is based on his review of Fiona Bell's Joan in Royal Shakespeare Company's production in 2000 and he interprets Joan's military image and relationship with her father and the patriarchal order in comparison with those of Elizabeth in the context of her rule in the late 1590s.[105] These comparisons need more historical and textual research, and yet his analysis of Joan in association with Margaret are far more powerful. According to Spiller, the obvious sequence of Joan's and Margaret's appearance on stage already suggests to the audience the relation between them and provides theatre companies with a possible choice of the same cast for the two characters.[106] Schwarz further points out the Amazonian image shared by Joan and Margaret creates another link between them, but Joan 'does a good deal of damage' to the English patriarchy from outside, while Margaret does it domestically, corresponding to Howard's and Rackin's analysis of women in the second tetralogy in *Engendering a Nation*.[107] Schwarz argues that 'in the first, second, and third parts of *Henry VI* female agency moves from margin to centre, a movement that begins with the claim that the enemy is an Amazon and ends in the recognition of something distinctly amazonian about the woman who is queen, mother, and wife'.[108]

---

[104] Schwarz, *Tough Love*, p. 81.
[105] Spiller, 'Warlike Mate?', pp. 40-42. Rutter also reviews this production along with Janet Suzman's and Charlotte Cornwell's performances of Joan in 1963 and 1977 respectively but she argues in terms of gender politics and theatrics in 'Of Tygers' Hearts', pp. 194-196.
[106] Spiller, 'Warlike Mate?', p. 40.
[107] Schwarz, *Tough Love*, p. 37; Howard and Rackin, *Engendering a Nation*, p. 65.
[108] Schwarz, *Tough Love*, p. 80.

This thesis agrees with Howard, Rackin, and Schwarz; however, their feminist criticisms tend to read women as a subversive power undermining patriarchal power, and analyse how dangerous these women are; all of these terms are used from the perspective of patriarchal power and echo its value judgements. Under the circumstance of patriarchal dominion in early modern England, I argue slightly differently from the perspective of what women might do, what resources they might use, and what space and memory they can occupy and create in various stages of queenship. Furthermore, according to Schwarz's division, queen, mother, and wife seems to be in different categories. In my analysis, I emphasise more how women can take all these roles together. The example of Joan's characterisation in *Henry VI* illustrates how different virtues – obedience, courage, chastity, silence, political knowledge – are strategically used by potential queens consort throughout Shakespeare's English Histories.

B. The Duchess of Gloucester in *Henry VI, Part Two*

In addition to Margaret of Anjou and Joan of Arc, there is another ambitious woman in the trilogy of *Henry VI*: the Duchess of Gloucester. This section will explore the danger and falsehood of women's ambitions in court politics and the relation between women, witchcraft, and power. The Duchess forgets her virtues, such as obedience, loyalty and humility, as well as her status; she does not conceal her ambition and thus provides opportunities for her enemies to conspire against her. The Duchess strives for her husband's advancement which would then bring queenship to her, but the Duke does not support her unjust ambition. In addition, except Joan of Arc and Margaret of Anjou, most of the female characters are depicted as peace-loving women, but the Duchess actively looks for rebellion so she might establish a new order of the court.

The Duchess first appears in Act I, Scene ii when her husband, the Duke of Gloucester, has just returned from the court after the argument about Henry VI's unprofitable marriage to Margaret of Anjou. As a royal uncle and the Lord Protector, the Duke is worrying about the King's ability to rule. Yet his concern is interpreted differently by his wife: 'What seest thou there? King Henry's diadem,/ Enchased with all the honours of the world?/ If so, gaze on, and grovel on thy face/ Until thy head be circled with the same' (*2HVI* 1.2.7-10). The Duchess of Gloucester discloses her ambition to her husband and encourages him that they can reach the ultimate royal glory together: 'We'll both together lift our heads to heaven/ And never more abase our sight

so low/ As to vouchsafe one glance unto the ground' (*2HVI* 1.2.14-16). The Duke asks the Duchess to 'banish the canker of ambitious thoughts' and shows his sincere worries for Henry VI (*2HVI* 1.2.17-22). In addition to his concerns for the King, the Duke dreamed that his staff, the symbol of the Lord Protector's authority, was broken in two by the Cardinal of Beaufort, and 'on the pieces of the broken wand/ Were placed the heads' of the Duke of Somerset and the Duke of Suffolk, foreshadowing the downfalls of the dukes (*2HVI* 1.2.27-30). By comparison, the Duchess has a different dream:

> DUCHESS But list to me, my Humphrey, my sweet duke:
> Methought I sat in seat of majesty
> In the cathedral church of Westminster,
> And in that chair where kings and queens are crowned,
> Where Henry and Dame Margaret kneeled to me,
> And on my head did set the diadem.
>
> (*Henry VI, Part Two* 1.2.35-40)

In contrast with the Duke of Gloucester's dream, the Duchess dreams of their coronation and the pomp of her queenship. The Duke frustrates the Duchess's fantasy and scolds her as a 'presumptuous dame', calling her 'ill-nurtured Eleanor' and telling her to be content with being the 'second woman in the realm' and 'the Protector's wife' (*2HVI* 1.2.42-49).

The Duke of Gloucester warns that the Duchess's discontent and ambition might incur their fall, but the Duchess does not relinquish her dream.[109] In her soliloquy, she belittles her husband's circumspection and loyalty from a gendered perspective:

> DUCHESS *Were I a man,* a duke, and next of blood,
> I would remove these tedious stumbling blocks
> And smooth my way upon their headless necks.
> And, *being a woman*, I will not be slack
> To play my part in fortune's pageant.
>
> (*Henry VI, Part Two* 1.2.63-67, emphasis added)

---

[109] Carole Levin, *Dreaming the English Renaissance: Politics and Desire in Court and Culture* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), p. 95.

Like Lady Macbeth, the Duchess bemoans the fact that as she is not a man she cannot exercise her ambition outwardly; however, she does not give up the chance to exploit the necessary resources to reach her goal. According to Nina S. Levine, Eleanor's story was a 'national sensation' and appeared in 'every extant fifteenth-century English chronicle and in popular ballads' as, her husband being the Lord Protector, she 'occupied the highest position among women in England'.[110] Carole Levin also traces the narration of Eleanor's dream recorded in *The Mirror of Magistrates* and argues that Eleanor in *Henry VI, Part Two* prefigures Lady Macbeth, explaining how their dreams reflect the content and consequence of their power thirst.[111] Levine's and Levin's studies provide multiple readings of the Duchess's exploitation of necromancy and her dream as a reflection of her ambition and an irony of her fate. Through their studies, we may also notice the complexity of political power games in *Henry VI, Part Two*. Shakespeare portrayed Eleanor's haughty attitude and contempt causing Queen Margaret's discontent and invoking the Queen to make use of it, conspiring against the Duchess and the Duke as well; as Nina S. Levine argues, Eleanor is an aggressor and a victim of 'political entrapment'.[112] In their conspiracy, Sir John Hume tempts the Duchess by addressing her as 'majesty' and implies that her title will 'multiply' (*2HVI* 1.2.72-73). The Duchess is immediately obsessed with such an opportunity and asks Hume to arrange a conjuration to foresee the future. John Hume's case reveals how Suffolk, Queen Margaret, and Cardinal Beaufort are going to take advantage of the Duchess's false ambition to topple her and her husband (*2HVI* 1.2.87-107).[113]

In the following scene, the Duchess's grievance and ambition are fuelled by a trivial incident, which is fictional rather than something based on historical evidence. The Duke and Duchess of Gloucester are invited to King Henry VI's hawking game. During the game the Duke avoids any indication of his possible transgression against the King's authority to prevent himself from accusation of treason. On the other side, the Duchess intends to protect and demonstrate her authority eagerly, but Queen Margaret frustrates her arrogance. Following the King's procession, Queen Margaret deliberately drops her fan and makes the Duchess pick it up:

---

[110] Nina S. Levine, 'The Case of Eleanor Cobham: Authorizing History in *2 Henry VI*', *Shakespeare Studies* 22 (1994), pp. 104-121 (p. 106).
[111] Levin, *Dreaming the English Renaissance*, p. 96..
[112] Levine, 'The Case of Eleanor Cobham', pp. 105-106.
[113] Levin, *Dreaming the English Renaissance*, pp. 94-98.

> QUEEN [MARGARET] *lets fall her fan*
>
> > [*To the* DUCHESS] Give me my fan – what, minion, can ye not?
> >
> > *She gives the* DUCHESS *a box on the ear*
> >
> > I cry you mercy madam! Was it you?
>
> DUCHESS Was't I? Yea, I it was, proud Frenchwoman!
>
> > Could I come near your beauty with my nails,
> >
> > I'd set my ten commandments in your face.
>
> > > > (*Henry VI, Part Two* 1.3.142-146)

The Duchess does not believe that Queen Margaret mistakes her for a lowly servant in front of everyone in the court.[114] Despite the fact that King Henry VI makes excuses for Margaret's unintentional mistake, the Duchess claims she will seek her revenge on the woman. Margaret might abuse her authority in order to demonstrate her power or even to instigate the Duchess's hatred and fuel her ambition for queenship. In this relatively minor incident we see how Margaret plays with her authority, reinforcing the Duchess's wrong interpretation about a queen's prerogative.

Witchcraft and Treason

Falling into the conspiracy prepared for her, the Duchess seeks supernatural power with which to pursue queenship. In the witchcraft scene, John Hume and Roger Bolingbroke describe the Duchess as 'a woman of an invincible spirit', commenting on her commissioning an exorcism (*2HVI* 1.4.6-7). Margery Jordan, a witch, evokes a spirit called Asnath (anagram of Sathan, Satan), who gives an ambiguous prophecy about King Henry and the Dukes in the court. Immediately after these prophecies are revealed, the Duke of York and Buckingham come onto the stage to arrest the witch, her cronies, and the Duchess of Gloucester.

In the following scene, Queen Margaret constantly implies the potential threat the Duke of Gloucester's ambition poses to Henry VI, and while the Duke attempts to prove

---

[114] Though Margaret does not have abundant wealth and strong alliance as her dowry, which causes doubts in the English court, I do not agree with Patricia-Anne Lee's simplistic and biased analysis which states that Margaret's behaviour here results from her jealousy of the Duchess and her weakness of 'lack [ing] the true qualities of royalty' (see Lee, 'Reflections of Power', p. 215). This thesis argues that the virtue to be manipulated in queenship can be cultivated and accumulated via education, marriage, and family networking; whereas Margaret's action in this scene is to conspire against the Duchess.

his innocence and loyalty, the Duchess's treason and apprehension are reported, leaving the Duke of Gloucester embarrassed. To prove his innocence the Duke reproaches his wife at her absence in King Henry VI's court:

> GLOUCESTER Noble she [the Duchess] is, but if she have forgot
>
> > Honour and virtue and conversed with such
> >
> > As, like to pitch, defile nobility,
> >
> > I banish her my bed and company,
> >
> > And give her as a prey to law and shame
> >
> > That hath dishonoured Gloucester's honest name.
>
> > > (*Henry VI, Part Two* 2.1.204-209)

The Duke of Gloucester does not defend his wife but instead divorces himself from her and her crime. Ironically, the fundamental goal of the Duchess's ambition is to make her husband the most powerful man in the kingdom *de facto* and *de jure* (from a Lord Protector to the King of England). Her husband's 'divorce' scuppers her ambition, effort, and wifehood.[115]

The Duchess's mistrust and abuse of witchcraft ultimately lead to her fall and consequently destroy her husband. Following the Duke of Gloucester's denial of his wife, the Duchess is brought to court for trial. The Duchess is sentenced to perform 'three days' open penance' and is banished to the Isle of Man (*2HVI* 2.3.9-13). She accepts the judgement without further excuses or defences, and the Duke displays his sorrow for her and asks to retire. King Henry VI agrees that the Duke should resign his Lord Protectorship (*2HVI* 2.3.23-28). Thus, after the Duchess's banishment the Duke also loses his power; although the Duke is innocent, the Duchess's fall affects his political career.

The following scene dramatises the interaction between the Duke and the Duchess, showing the Duchess's belated knowledge of court politics. The Duke mourns for the Duchess's fall and pities the shame of her open penance, while the Duchess, despite lamenting the loss of her privilege, keeps worrying about her husband's career and security (*2HVI* 2.4.43-58). The Duchess clearly names the Duke's enemies and analyses

---

[115] Levin points out that historically the Duke was 'forced to divorce' the Duchess, who was originally his mistress and whom he later married for love. See ibid., pp. 94-96.

how they might conspire against him. The Duchess might be blindly driven by her ambition to misappropriate witchcraft, but her analysis of the English court indicates her eventual understanding of the power structure of English politics.

Regardless of the Duchess's warnings the Duke is overconfident in Henry VI's trust in his loyalty and seems to be naive about the present court politics under Margaret of Anjou's manipulation: 'And had I twenty times so many foes,/ And each of them had twenty times their power,/ All these could not procure me any scathe/ So long as I am loyal, true, and crimeless' (*2HVI* 2.4.61-64). The Duke of Gloucester's fall is predestined due to his priority in the line of succession. He is always suspected of treason as he is third in line to the throne after Henry VI and John Duke of Bedford.[116] Finally, the Duchess is left alone on stage: the proud and ambitious Duchess of Act I has disappeared and a divorced and fallen woman grieving her shame and banishment stands in her place. In a mere two acts Shakespeare presents an aristocratic woman's loss of glory and fame because of her ambition.[117]

The Duchess of Gloucester in Other Historical Texts

Nina Levine analyses Renaissance historical narrations about the Duchess of Gloucester, Eleanor Cobham, and concludes that Shakespeare's representation of the Duchess incorporates Edward Hall's contradictory and John Foxe's defensive narrations of her. The Duchess's treason was more complex than abuse of necromancy; it was linked to political conspiracy and religious controversy.[118] Carole Levin suggests that Shakespeare's dramatisation of the Duchess's dream alludes to the narration of Eleanor Cobham's dream in the 1578 edition of *The Mirror of Magistrates*, part of which was 'a continuation' of John Lydgate's *The Fall of Princes* composed under the commission of the Duke of Gloucester around 1431.[119] In *Mirror of the Magistrates*, the Duchess recounts having dreamed of visiting different palaces and of her husband's fall due to her ill doing.[120] In contrast to the discussion of courtiership, especially the rise and fall of male magistrates, in *Henry VI* Shakespeare displays how the Duchess of Gloucester

---

[116] Ibid., p. 94.

[117] Historically, the Duchess 'was required to walk barefoot through London carrying a taper that she finally took to St. Paul's and placed on the high altar' for her public penance before being imprisoned for the rest of her life. See ibid., pp. 93-98, especially p. 94.

[118] Nina S. Levine, 'Dangerous Practices: Making History in *2 Henry VI*' in *Women's Matters: Politics, Gender, and Nation in Shakespeare's Early History Plays* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1998), pp. 47-67.

[119] Levin, *Dreaming the English Renaissance*, p. 97.

[120] Baldwin, *The Mirror for Magistrates*, p. 441.

chases her ambition, approaches the centre of authority, and loses her moderation and humility – the reputed virtue of queenship.

Conclusion of 'False Attempt' at Queenship

In the first and second part of *Henry VI*, Shakespeare presents three ambitious women with great contrasts between them. Joan of Arc is depicted as a witch, while the Duchess of Gloucester resorts to sorcery to achieve her political ambition. These two cases seem to reveal part of Shakespeare's attitude toward rumour and witchcraft in the context of gender and politics. Margaret of Anjou knows how to play with the idea of pursuing queenship: scheming with the Duke of Suffolk and Beaufort, she successfully traps the Duchess of Gloucester with a false fantasy of queenship and subsequently topples the Duke of Gloucester, the Lord Protector. Margaret of Anjou and the Duchess of Gloucester present a further contrast regarding the balance between title and ability in rulership. Margaret marries Henry VI, who, although he holds the title of the King of England, is weak in actual ability to rule. The Duchess of Gloucester's husband is the Lord Protector, the man who actually rules England despite not being the monarch. As is the case with Lady Macbeth, the Duchess's fantasy of queenship entraps her in Suffolk's and Margaret's conspiracy of the false prophecy, revealing her superficial reading of queenship. The Duchess regards the most important element of queenship to be the pomp and ceremony and resorts to wrong authorities – false prophecies and witchcraft – to fulfil her ambition, leading to the opposite and tragic end of her dream.[121]

Conclusion of Part One: The Pursuit of Queenship

According to Lawrence Stone, for 'the landed classes in pre-Reformation England', marriage and the subsequent 'family planning' have three objectives: 'the continuity of the male line, the preservation intact of the inherited property, and the acquisition through marriage of further property or useful political alliance'.[122] Royal individuals were part of 'the landed classes', and their marriages had similar objectives and conditions but a greater scale of influence; making a royal marriage involved personal

---

[121] Levin, *Dreaming the English Renaissance*, p. 97.
[122] See Lawrence Stone, *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979), p. 37.

willingness, parental consent, money, family networking, domestic and foreign alliances, and national and international stability.

Chapter One has examined how female characters accept queenship. Passively, they perform their obedience to the patriarchs and exhibit their knowledge in politics as in the cases of Blanche of Spain in *King John* and Catherine of Valois in *Henry V*. Shakespeare's dramatisation of their learning and participation in the forum of international politics illustrate how aristocratic women display and make use of their virtues – their cultural capital – in the pursuit of queenship. Actively, they strategically manipulate their advantages and autonomy to determine their own marriages prior to their patriarchs' negotiations. Despite the inferior networking in their natal families and their miserable dowries, Margaret of Anjou in *Henry VI*, *Part One* and *Part Two,* Anne Boleyn in *Henry VIII*, and Elizabeth Woodville in *Henry VI, Part Three* are all more favoured by the Kings than their courts, but the three queens-to-be implement their rhetoric and virtues of humility and obedience to qualify them ultimately to be Queens of England.

Chapter Two has reviewed how women regret, reject, or fail to obtain queenship. Lady Anne in *Richard III* does not welcome the unexpected queenship and her original acceptance of Richard of Gloucester's proposal might result from her search for a protector and her misguided expectation that she will be able to reform the Duke. The gender politics in the courting scene inspires discussions about women's vulnerability and their assumption of the role of victim. However, the Countess of Salisbury proves that a woman's inferiority in physical or political strength need not impede her self-defence or pursuit of justice. The Countess appeals to the supreme authority of God in order that she might disobey her father and King Edward III, securing her honour and saving the King from becoming a tyrant. Her rejection of queenship makes her an example of the true English lady and an educator and reformer of the King. Finally, Joan of Arc and the Duchess of Gloucester appropriate the idea of queenship falsely. The former destroys her own reputation and defames her military accomplishments because of her inconsistent identities and abuse of her narratives of nativity and queenship. The latter is dissatisfied with her husband's authority as the Lord Protector and attempts to resort to witchcraft to fulfil her fantasy of becoming England's queen. Both complain that their female gender impedes their ambition, and although they do successfully transgress the boundaries of their gender, they also mis-read and mis-

appropriate queenly authorities.

Part One: The Pursuit of Queenship has briefly explored how female characters approach authority – in what conditions they grasp, accept, or reject queenship and how they interact with the patriarchal centre of power to equip themselves with an 'authoritative' status in order that they might access actual authority. Aristocratic women might follow the track paved by patriarchy and become pawns in international or national policies, brokered for either political or financial needs, but, despite being the objects in the exchange market of marriage, they can still be manipulators of virtues – cultural capital – cultivated and granted through marriage, education, and familial networks.

Part Two: The Practice of Queenship

Sir,

I am about to weep, but thinking that

We are a queen, or long have dreamed so, certain

The daughter of a king, my drops of tears

I'll turn to sparks of fire.

(*Henry VIII* 2.4.68-71)

Katherine of Aragon in Act II, Scene iv of *Henry VIII: All Is True* states that as a queen, she will transform her sorrow to anger to maintain her dignity and seek justice. Carney explains, 'weeping is not considered appropriate behaviour for a queen'; Katherine should avoid 'the weak customs of the general lot of women' and display the exceptional and superior qualities of a queen.[1] Later in a private visit in Act III, Scene i, Cardinal Wolsey reminds Katherine to moderate her temper in accord with her queenly status (*HVIII* 3.1). These two passages suggest that there is a specific pattern of demeanour for queens in public and private. They are not encouraged to reveal personal emotions in front of people. Gwynne Kennedy notices that in early modern England 'a woman's anger is a sign of weakness that confirms her innate inferiority and her need to submit to male authority, as well as a response to a particular situation'.[2] If Katherine loses control of her emotion, she exposes her vulnerability and disempowers herself in front of the Cardinal and Henry VIII's court. The previous part of 'The Pursuit of Queenship' has demonstrated how noble women in Shakespeare's English histories strategically appropriate virtues to control and use education, marriage, and familial networking to accept, seek, or reject queenship. Having been granted exceptional status as queens, these women implement their 'virtues' and the resources they have acquired in different spaces.

Gender and space are key concepts for interpreting Shakespeare's dramatisation of female characters' practice of queenship in this part of the thesis. As we saw in the General Introduction, in early modern England the relation between gender and space was not clearly defined. The male-public and female-private division were in fact

---

[1] Carney, 'Queenship in Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*', p. 191.
[2] Gwynne Kennedy, *Just Anger: Representing Women's Anger in Early Modern England* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2000), pp. 3-4.

loosely delineated in conduct books. Modern historians such as Amanda Flather and Lena Cowen Orlin, have found various evidence to challenge this rough division in practice.[3] First, the idea of public and private space in early modern England is different from modern conceptualisation of public and private spheres in political and sociological usages. Habermas's theory of the public and the private spheres originated in his observation of the birth and development of newspapers and of the formation of a consciousness of civil society among a general public.[4] His findings would be inappropriate to map household politics in fifteenth- to early seventeenth-century England.[5] Second, the concept of privacy was not quite developed: not only the aristocracy, but also the commoners were living in a society without personal secrecy. Feminist perspectives further argue that 'men abroad, women within walls' is a patriarchal attempt to formulate a space code in order to maintain absolute male authority in satisfying their biological needs and ideological advantages.[6] Dramatising English histories from the 1590s to the 1610s, Shakespeare depicted queens in gardens, households, public courts, and even battlefields, which not only staged the ambiguity of spaces but also illustrated manipulations of such ambiguity. He endowed queens with lines and actions in his history plays, in contrast to the curt records of queens in official documents. The dearth of narratives about queens in private in historical chronicles was compensated for by Shakespeare's depiction of queens' personal feelings and bodies in a mixture of private and public domains.

    Part Two, 'The Practice of Queenship', includes an introduction and two chapters. The introduction will analyse the issue of 'space' in relation to social, political, and theatrical practice in early modern England. Chapter Three on 'Queens in Court' studies how queens consort exhibit and implement their virtues to interact with the English courts in the spaces of various 'public' occasions; while Chapter Four, 'Queens away from Court', compares the most masculine and feminine features of spatial practices when queens are either inside or outside the court without the king's presence but practically and spiritually more closely involved in English politics. Instead of

---

[3] See Amanda Flather, *Gender and Space in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Royal Historical Society and The Boydell Press, 2007), and Lena Cowen Orlin, *Private Matters and Public Culture in Post-Reformation England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994) and *Locating Privacy in Tudor London* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).
[4] Habermas, *Structural Transformation*, pp. 30-34 and 73-79, especially see his diagram of 'a schema of social realms' showing 'the blueprint of the bourgeois public sphere in the eighteenth century' on p. 30.
[5] Mears, *Queenship and Political Discourse*, pp. 23-30.
[6] Alison Findlay, *Playing Spaces in Early Women's Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 17-19.

analysing queens in terms of their roles as mothers, wives, and other identities defined by their marital status, this thesis explores queens' implementation of their queenship regarding space and gender. Shakespeare's representations of English queens consort reflect the relations between gender and space in books and practices, illustrating how women may strategically use the environment and resources assigned to them.

Introduction

<u>Public and Private in Conduct Books</u>

Early modern conduct books preach a gendered division of spaces. Juan Luis Vives strongly advised that unmarried young women should avoid occasions that might expose them, including appearing in public or even speaking and drawing people's attention.[7] Any attention, concern, and talk about them would only incur disputation against their virtues. Therefore, a secluded and silent life was the best defence of their chastity. After getting married, they should remain in their households, rather than getting involved in their husbands' businesses, again avoiding opportunities of damaging their honour. In John Dod's and Robert Cleaver's *A Godlie Forme of Householde Government* (London, 1598), the authors described the spatial attribution of assignments to husbands and wives according to an 'economic rationale', arguing that women's place was 'in the house' and they must 'keep silent' and 'modest'.[8] Where a woman was, is related to what she was; exposing herself in public sabotages her reputation.

Under such circumstances, a public life for women in early modern England seemed to be quite impossible. As Merry E. Wiesner notes, a man might have his family and career at the same time, but it was difficult for a women to have a private life and a public life, especially in government administration, 'not only because of the realities of Renaissance politics, but also because for a woman, a public reputation was dishonourable, a sure sign of immorality and scandal'.[9] Women were allowed to deal with matters that belonged to the private domain:

---

[7] Vives, *The Instruction*, pp. 57-66.
[8] Lena Cowen Orlin, *Elizabethan Households: An Anthology* (Washington, D. C.: The Folger Shakespeare Library, 1995), p. 90.
[9] Merry E. Wiesner, 'Women's Defense of Their Public Role', in *Women in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: Literary and Historical Perspectives*, ed. by Mary Beth Rose (New York: Syracuse University Press, 1986), pp. 1-27 (p. 12).

Women were free to write and speak on religious matters as long as these were private and familial; prayer books, religious poetry, books of religious instructions for children, and devotional literature were perfectly acceptable. Sermons, exhortations, theological treatises or doctrinal statements were not, however, both because they were more often presented publicly and because they concerned the church – any church, whether Protestant or Catholic – as a public institution.[10]

Women were allowed to express themselves, especially their personal feelings on the subjects of personal belief and family business, but they were not encouraged to explain, interpret, or discuss theological issues publicly. They were part of the congregation and of the public, but they needed to remain silent and should assume the roles of educators beyond the boundaries of their families. Therefore, it is clear that women were excluded from anything related to the public realm, even in religious issues.

However, when recording what Elizabeth I's ladies did in the court and at their homes, Holinshed seemed to picture a daily public and private life of court ladies:

Beside these things I could in like sort set downe the waies and meanes, wherby our ancient ladies of the court dou shun and auoid idlenesse, some of them exercising their fingers with the needle, other in caulworke, diuerse in spinning of like, some in continuall reading either of the holie scriptures, or histories of our owne or foren nations about us, and diuerse in writing volumes of their owne, or translating of other mens into our English and Latine toong, whilest the yoongest sort in the meane time applie their lutes, citharnes, prickesong, and all kind of musike, which they use onelie for recreation sake, when they haue leisure, and are free from attendance upon the queenes maiestie, or such as they belong unto. Now manie of the eldest sort also are skilfull in surgerie and distillation of waters, beside sundrie other artificiall practises perteining to the ornature and commendations of their bodies [...]. Neuerthelesse this I will generallie saie of them all, that as ech of them are cuning in somthing whery[n]

_____

[10] Ibid., p. 21.

they keepe themselues occupied in the court, so there is in maner none of them,

but when they be at home, can helpe to supplie the ordinarie want of the kitchen

with a number of delicat dishes of their owne deuising, wherein the Portingall is

their cheefe counsellor, as some of them are most commonlie with the clearke of

the kitchen, who useth (by a tricke take up of late) to giue in a briefe rehearsall

of such and so manie dishes as are to come in at euerie course throughout the

whole seruice in the dinner or supper while [...].[11]

According to Holinshed, the activities that the ladies in Elizabeth I 's court conducted might not be as political or essential to the government of the country as those of her male courtiers, and yet the ladies were able to manage both the Queen's household (as public offices for the ladies) and their own households (in their private roles as mistresses, wives, and mothers at home). These ladies might be involved in needlework, as traditionally expected, or in reading, translation, court entertainments, cookery, and even in medical practice. Therefore, even though conduct books had suggested an ideal model of a 'chaste, silent, and obedient' woman's life, in practice, it was impossible to seclude women within the walls of their household. The ladies might not hold a profession like men of a certain craft, but most of them possessed a special skill and had chances to practise it in Elizabeth I's court.

The definition of public and private was broadened and challenged. Wiesner reasons: either 'the Spirit had indeed given them [early modern women] the right to address public religious matters' or 'there simply was no basis for division between public and private matters of religion'.[12] However, women's public roles did not conform to our modern concepts about public life. For instance, in order to sustain their lives and manage their households, especially after the death of their husbands, women would make appearances in public to work and run businesses. Wiesner concludes that

> [w]idows, working women, writers, medical practitioners, midwives, and
>
> female religious thinkers all defined a "public role" somewhat
>
> differently. For some, it was the ability to bring their own suits to court;
>
> for others, the right to keep operating a shop, to use skills they had

---

[11] Holinshed, 'Of Palaces belonging to the prince. Chap. 15', in *The Chronicle*s, vol. 1, p. 196.
[12] Wiesner, 'Women's Defense', p. 21.

mastered [...], for still others, the opportunity to write something that would be remembered forever.[13]

Wiesner observes how the division of public and private spaces in early modern England differs from the concept of public and private spheres in our modern society. Early modern English women mainly and, most of the time, only managed the household, which business, in fact, encompassed activities in public and in private as we would now conceive it. Therefore, our definition of the public and the private, and of the politic and of the domestic, need to be adjusted to have better understanding of women in early modern England.

Social Space

In early modern England, the terms 'public' and 'private' were also ambiguous in relation to social space. Social space is an idea based on Henri Lefebvre's study of space and power.[14] In 'Civic Rites, City Site: The Place of the Stage', Steven Mullaney applies Lefebvre's concept to argue that 'physical topography' (place) is associated or transformed into 'cultural topology' (space), such that space is determined and defined by human activities.[15] Mullaney opines that unlike a modern society, early modern England did not have well-designed urban planning. As such, a large amount of unused or undefined lands (or squares, or pieces of small lands) were available for use as sites for various activities.[16] Once a certain activity was held in a certain place with a certain frequency, a ritual was established, and that 'place' became a 'space' for a specific ceremonial activity. The 'place' was thus defined. For instance, Westminster Abbey was first used as a place for the coronation by the last Anglo-Saxon King Harold II, who was crowned in the Abbey in 1066.[17] Since then, most of the coronations of English monarchs were held in Westminster Abbey.[18] The Abbey then not only possessed its religious attributes, but was also related to the English monarchy. When space was religiously, culturally, or politically sanctioned for a specific purpose – such as an abbey

---

[13] Ibid., p. 22.
[14] Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*.
[15] Mullaney, 'Civic Rites, City Sites', pp. 17-26.
[16] Ibid., p. 18.
[17] See Roy Strong, *Coronation: From the 8th to the 21st Century* (London: Harper Perennial, 2005, 2006). p. 30. Also see Richard Jenkyns, *Westminster Abbey* (London: Profile Books, 2004), p. 11.
[18] For the location and dates of kings' and queens' coronations, see the chart of 'The Monarch AD 871 to the Present' in Strong's *Coronation*.

for coronation, a church for preaching, a square for marketing, a tavern for accommodation, eating, and drinking, or even a post or 'table' for posting theatre playbills or government proclamations – it would be strange, challenging, and even illegitimate to use the space for other purposes.[19]

Since space is 'socially produced' and defined by human activities, it can be changed according to the variation of people's behaviours. This constitutes one of the features of space: the fluidity of spatial relations.[20] For instance, Westminster Abbey can be a place for preaching and for coronation. The fluidity of space is further timed and gendered according to the varieties of human activities that take place. In early modern England, a private chamber, which was originally accessible for both male and female courtiers and servants, might be transformed into a labour room. During the process of childbirth and churching, it was circumscribed as a women-only space (except for male doctors). Once the temporary event ended, the chamber reverted to its general usage and its boundary was no longer defined by gender, but more likely, by professions and ranks. The temporality of spatial relation and human activities, as Amanda Flather suggests, indicates that space can be defined by time.[21] The potential fluidity and temporality of spatial relations rendered the binary gendered division of space controversial and the ideal social order in relation to space questionable.

In early modern England, social space could be conceptualised and its boundary was formulated in terms of rank, profession, and gender – the identity/place that one takes in a society. Everyone in the society was assigned a specific position to enact their allocated missions, which design allowed the society to preserve its order. Any unexpected or undesirable motion within the ordered society might cause disorder, challenging the spatial design. For instance, as described before, it would be illegitimate for a woman to stand in the pulpit and preach. This spatial design could also be seen in the organisation of the architecture and function of early modern households and their dependants, which epitomised the social order, distribution of authority, and interaction between different powers. The master and mistress were the main governors of the household, and lived with their consanguine and non-consanguine family members,

---

[19] For regulations and distributions of posts or bulletins of posting playbills, *siquis*, title pages, advertisements, or government announcements in early modern London, see Stern, *Documents of Performance*, pp. 50-53.
[20] Hiscock, *The Uses of This World,* p. 1. Also see Emrys Jones, *Space and Place*, in *The Estyn Evans Lecture* (Belfast: Department of Geography, The Queen's University of Belfast, 1976), p. 4.
[21] Flather, *Gender and Space*. For the relationship between time, gender, social behaviour code, and space, see examples on pp. 30, 93, 130, and 175.

which might include tutors for the children, personnel in the kitchen and the stable, and so on. To maintain the proper function of the household required everyone to behave according to their roles – their places – in this domestic space. An individual's innate personality was less relevant than where that person belonged. Instead of identities based on characteristics, the 'place' that one owned in a household or in the society and his/her interaction and relationship with others signified one's existence.

Gender was an important attribute that helped to assign people to a specific space. As discussed above, space is fluid and temporary; gender as an attribute to define spatial relations and to circumscribe human activities depends not only on custom, but also on law. Arguing for a fluidity of gender boundaries in spatial relations, Flather points out the contradictions and discrepancies between prescriptive literature (such as conduct books and housewifery manuals) and actual daily spatial practice in eating, sleeping, shopping, working, and church-going. The most obvious example might be that women were not allowed to preach. Therefore, despite their seats being arranged in an order of rank, women could never be members of the clergy or take a place in the pulpits. In early modern England, the appearance of women in Parliament would be deemed as anomalous as well. Queen Mary I and Elizabeth I had set up exceptions as queens regnant in the vehement and constant debates about female rule. Furthermore, Shakespeare's queens consort in his English history plays would have even stronger impacts on stage, considering that commoners in early modern England would not be able to see Mary I and Elizabeth I attend Parliament sessions, but could watch queens consort intruding into Parliament and royal courts on stage. When the playwright staged his queens consort in military costumes and even fighting on battlefields, it brought forward experiences subversive and dissimilar to the audience's daily practice of spatial relations.

Queenship gives queens the privilege and authority to transgress general gender boundaries of space. In maintaining the order of societies, customs might leave more room for the manoeuvre of gender and space, but laws substantially restricted women's right in performing public offices in Parliament, in being witnesses in judicial courts, in inheriting and managing their husbands' properties and businesses in the public sphere, in preaching in the church, and in publishing their writings, especially concerning religious and political matters.[22] The above regulations about women's activities and

---

[22] Wiesner, 'Women's Defense', pp. 1-27.

rights in different spaces were associated with the idea of legitimate accessibility. Queens were provided with more privileges and authorities to access spaces. Furthermore, under the shield of her queenship, a queen would lead other noble women into different public spaces without causing suspicion or ruining their chastity. The public spaces in question included royal courts, judicial courts, and Parliament, and noble women could include ladies-in-waiting in the queens' courts.

Because of the complexity of concepts of space, 'Part Two: The Practice of Queenship' will focus on examining queens in 'dramatic spaces' in Shakespeare's English history plays in the context of the influence of Elizabeth I's queenship on space and the nature of the stage as a space.[23]

Space in Elizabeth I's Court

Space in relation to Elizabeth I's court and household under her queenship can be explored from 'physical' and 'political' aspects. Physical court space can be considered from the existence of fixed court venues in architectural structures, such as the court in the Whitehall Palace, and from the presence of royal individuals, which generates and transforms a common space into a royal court space.[24] Therefore, a space can be redefined by the presence of the monarch, as a space is determined by human activities. When Elizabeth I was on one of her progresses, her court, which now referred to the courtiers following her and the space they were occupying, was travelling with her. Therefore, analysing Shakespeare's queens in his English history plays, I reason that most of the stage space was royal and public in a king's presence, except when specific stage directions or lines spoken indicate a private chamber or closet.[25] The presence of queens consort might not be as effective as that of kings to define a space as public, considering the nature and mission entitled to her queenship. Queens in Shakespeare's English histories are dramatised in various 'public' and 'private' spaces either by their presence or co-presence with their kings or by the businesses they manage. The fluidity

---

[23] In contrast, for the nature of theatre as a space, scholars have examined how a theatre as a piece of architecture occupied a place in London (the locality of a spatial construction in London's social geography) and how this architecture epitomised the social construction of early modern English society, such as the mixed nature of audiences and the seating arrangements. For examples of such discussions, see Dillon, *Theatre, Court and City* and West, *Spatial Representations*.

[24] Sillitoe, 'Courtly Space', pp. 75-76.

[25] For the idea of a gendered privacy or secrecy, especially in relation to closets, see both James Knowles's '"Infinite riches in a little room": Marlowe and the Aesthetics of the Closet' and Sasha Roberts's 'Shakespeare "creepes into the womens closets about bedtime": Women Reading in a Room of Their Own' in McMullan, ed., *Renaissance Configurations,* pp. 3-29 and pp. 30-63.

and temporality of space affected by queens in Shakespeare's history plays dramatically elaborate the nature of queenship as a mixture with public and private elements.

Politically Elizabethan court space was often discussed with the idea of 'public spheres'. When queens in Shakespeare's history plays appear in court – obvious public space – and are involved in state business, their intrusion into politics is different from the participation in public spheres in the concept of modern politics, considering that the idea of a public sphere was not fully developed in early modern England. Mears examines historians' observation of the court politics under Henry VIII and Elizabeth I and concludes that the political culture in both courts still largely depended on personal politics – that is, the policy making in both the courts of Henry VIII and Elizabeth I was not institutionalised, but relied on the monarchs' decisions with advice from certain trusted and intimate counsellors.[26] Therefore, I would argue that this political culture, unlike the bureaucratic one in modern politics, made Parliament more like a public discussion forum of policies, rather than a sector that made decisions. Parliament and any other court that functioned similarly as a political forum could thus be thought of as a 'public sphere' though they were privileged and exclusive to the nobles, especially male ones. Queens appearing in courts and in Parliament in Shakespeare's English history plays could be deemed to be involved in the realms of early modern 'public spheres'.

However, as Mears warns, the contemporary notion of 'the public' in England did not emerge until the seventeenth century under more strict criteria, such as the circulation of news (newspapers and news pamphlets), the existence of an arena (such as a coffee house) where common people could discuss political issues, and the spirit and relation that opposed incumbent authorities or distinguished civil service from royal patronage.[27] 'Public spheres' and 'private spheres' might not have been developed and formulated in Henrician, Elizabethan, and Jacobean England. Nevertheless the 'public' and 'private' had been grounded with the prosperity of humanism, the evolution of print, and the development of trade, all of which had started to manifest a 'growth in the state's ability to impose its will on its subjects'.[28] The political division of public and private in early modern England could be furthered outside the court, that is, to the

---

[26] Mears, *Queenship and Political Discourse,* pp. 14-16. Mears also explores deeply into the networking and politics in Elizabeth I's court in 'Chapter 2: Elizabeth and the Politics of Intimacy', pp. 33-71.
[27] Ibid., pp. 25-26.
[28] Ibid., p. 25.

discussion of local politics, which was gradually developed after religious reformations when local governments gained their autonomy progressively. Local politics, or popular politics, are embedded in Shakespeare's history plays through plots like Jack Cade's riots, or through subplots of commoners' petitions, trials, and discussions, which are more relevant to queens, such as those petitions presented to Margaret of Anjou in *Henry VI, Part Two* and those dissents reported offstage to Katherine of Aragon but conveyed by the queen onstage to the King in *Henry VIII: All is True*.

Theatrical Space

Onstage or offstage, the dramatic space of the stage parallels the idea of 'diegesis', a fictional world in the texts of novels, and allows Shakespeare to apply his dramatic licence to create unhistorical representations of queens on the early modern stage.[29] A stage contains two layers of space: the dramatic space, as defined above, and the physical space. The physical space is considered from the perspective of performance, such as the actual size of the stage, stage shape, and spatial arrangement of stage designs (doors, hallways, pillars, cellars, balcony, ceilings, and so on). One of the natures of the stage is that its physical space is public, open to spectators; that is, all the words and actions put on stage, no matter in the form of asides or happening secretly or privately in dramatic space, are visible and audible to the audience. Nothing that happens on stage is private.

The physical space remains unchanged during the performance; however, the dramatic space on stage is fluid and shifts according to the presentations of actors, such as their social identities presented through costumes, languages, and behaviours.[30] When players wear armour or hold spears, their demeanour suggests that the dramatic space on the stage is now a battlefield. According to Russell West, sometimes playwrights would provide mime shows before or during the plays to give the audience hints of the locality of the following plots; sometimes, they would arrange a clown figure or chorus to inform, even direct, the audience how to perceive the spatial relation in the dramatic presentations. As the Chorus in the prologue of *Henry V* declares

CHORUS   [...] can this cockpit hold

---

[29] Findlay terms this fictional world/space on stage as 'settings'. See Findlay, *Playing Spaces*, p. 3.
[30] West, *Spatial Representations*, p. 29. Also see Findlay for the spatial relationship between texts, actors, audience (Ibid., pp. 10-11).

> The vasty fields of France, Or may we cram
>
> Within this wooden O the very casques
>
> That did affright the air at Agincourt?

(*Henry V* Prologue 11-14)

The Chorus exposes the limitation of stage space and invites the audience to use their 'imaginary forces' to complement these 'imperfections' with their thoughts (*HV* Prologue 15-23). However, not every scene in Shakespeare's plays had directions of its locality; even in printed texts, the play-scripts did not always have clear indications of space in stage directions. Stern argues that backstage-plots recorded the information about the locality and characters of each scene to direct the actors' entrances and exits and manage the backstage; however, most backstage-plots were lost and thereby the locality of each scene were inferred from the texts and added later to the stage directions by editors.[31] Therefore, during the performance, it would depend on the audiences' or readers' judgement of where the dramatic characters were and what dramatic space it was. For instance, from the conversations between Queen Isabel and her ladies about flowers or between the two gardeners about gardening, the audience would be able to judge that it is the garden scene in *Richard II*. The audience's imagination, association, and familiarity with the stage as a space are vital to the spatial relation in plays. Dramatic space, or theatrical locality in plays, is similarly featured with fluidity and temporality as social spaces, and its nature is determined by the staged performance.

---

[31] Stern, *Documents of Performance*, pp. 201-231.

Chapter Three: Queens in Court

I. Queens in Royal Spectacles

The first occasion for queens to exhibit their queenship to the general public is the coronation and its pageants. Among Shakespeare's English history plays, only Anne Boleyn's coronation in *Henry VIII* is dramatised. In this collaborative work by Shakespeare and Fletcher, Anne Boleyn illustrates how a queen displays her female virtues to establish her queenly legitimacy through public recognition. Pauline Stafford argues about the importance of this public display: '[r]oyal women not only organised the concrete spectacle of royalty in its domestic context; they were themselves an important part of that spectacle. Queens appeared loaded with gems and finery, displaying their husbands' wealth.'[32] Anne Boleyn's silent and static presence in the coronation spectacle can be viewed as a symbol of her conformity to a patriarchal exhibition of power. Yet the coronation can also be read as an example of performative feminism. Shakespeare and Fletcher tactically depict this ceremony through the report and discussion of three gentlemen in the play; this dramaturgy enables the playwrights to translate chronicle textual records of royal spectacles into verbal and visual narrations on stage.

Establishing Queenship in Coronation: Anne Boleyn in *Henry VIII*

Anne Boleyn's coronation in Shakespeare and Fletcher's *Henry VIII* explains how authority is established through public display and recognition. Carney argues that there are three main missions of queenship embedded in *Henry VIII*: royal spectacles, superiority over other women, and royal procreation.[33] Among these, royal spectacles are the most ostensible: that is, through people's gaze, queenship gains recognition. Furthermore, Anne Boleyn's coronation serves people's enjoyment of watching royal spectacles, an important entertainment in early modern England.[34]

It is important for people to feel that they are participating in public events. Shakespeare and Fletcher suggest this by portraying Anne Boleyn's coronation from the commoners' perspectives. At the beginning of the coronation in Act IV, Scene i, two gentlemen come onto the stage and express their interest in watching public royal

---

[32] Stafford, *Queens, Concubines and Dowagers*, p. 108.
[33] Carney, 'Queenship in Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*', pp. 191-192.
[34] William Leahy, '"You Cannot Show Me": Two Tudor Coronation Processions, Shakespeare's *King Henry VIII* and the Staging of Anne Boleyn', *EnterText: An Interactive Interdisciplinary E-Journal for Cultural and Historical Studies and Creative Work* 3.1 (2003), 132-144 (p. 134).

spectacles, remembering their last gathering of waiting on the street of Westminster Abbey to watch the Duke of Buckingham escorted after his trial. The accessibility of the street space gives everyone an opportunity to see the royals and obtain the sense of participating in momentous national occasions and state affairs, creating a scenario of popular politics: 'The citizens,/ I am sure, have shown at full their royal minds –/ As, let 'em have their rights, they are ever forward –/ In celebration of this day with shows,/ Pageants, and sights of honour' (*HVIII* 4.1.7-11). Shows, pageants, and 'sights of honour' are one of the means for the royals to communicate with their subjects. With the royals being recognised through symbols on clothing, coats of arms, and accessories, or through physiologies, spectacles thus establish an identity, an ordered system of royal symbols, and the authority behind them.

Another citizen expresses the view that this coronation reminds him of Katherine's coronation approximately twenty years ago. This reminiscence immediately refreshes people's minds about what happened to Katherine – mainly her divorce hearing in the previous scene (*HVIII* 4.1.24-34). The new queen's coronation overlaps with people's memory of royal figures on similar occasions. The accumulation of history shows that the reiterative practice of rituals strengthens legitimacy and authority but it also brings out the political and religious contexts of Anne's arrival to her queenship. As the second gentleman subtly addresses Katherine as 'the Princess Dowager' rather than 'Queen', it suggests that Katherine's fall and Anne's rise are interlocked consequentially (*HVIII* 4.1.23). The memory of a divorced queen portrayed with the approaching coronation of a new queen creates a dramatic contrast of Katherine's and Anne's fortunes.

Shakespeare and Fletcher followed Raphael Holinshed's *Chronicle* closely to establish the sense of formality and royalty of Anne Boleyn's coronation (*HVIII* 4.1.36 SD 'The Order of the Coronation'). Like news reporters, two gentlemen comment about what they see in the coronation pageants; they not only keep the audience informed but also direct the focus of their attention (*HVIII* 4.1.37-42). Finally, onto the stage '[*enter*] ANNE, *the* [*new*] *Queen, in her robe. Her hair,* [*which hangs loose, is*] *richly adorned with pearl.* [*She wears a*] *crown.*' (*HVIII* 4.1.36 SD 'The Order of the Coronation'). In Shakespeare's and Fletcher's arrangement, the Jacobean audience experienced anew what the early Tudor people had seen in Anne Boleyn's coronation. The narrative of report also creates a sense of legitimacy for Anne Boleyn, her forthcoming baby, and the Church of England.

The spectators' comments reveal how to read Anne Boleyn's queenship under the propaganda of Henry VIII's court. One of the gentlemen gives an account of Anne Boleyn's public image: 'Sir, as I have a soul, she is an angel./ Our King has all the Indies in his arms,/ And more, and richer, when he strains that lady./ *I cannot blame his conscience*' (*HVIII* 4.1.44-47, emphasis added). This comment implicitly refers to the King's Great Matter – his divorce from Katherine of Aragon and new marriage with Anne Boleyn. It reminds the audience of the fact that Anne Boleyn's queenship is established under the contexts of a disputable royal divorce. Unlike the first two gentlemen waiting on the streets, a third gentleman of a higher rank witnesses the ceremony inside the Abbey and reports what he saw:

> THIRD GENTLEMAN The rich stream
>
>   Of lords and ladies, having brought the Queen
>
>   To a prepared place in the choir, fell off
>
>   A distance from her, while her grace sat down
>
>   To rest a while – some half an hour or so –
>
>   In a chair of state, opposing freely
>
>   The beauty of her person to the people.
>
>   Believe me, sir, she is the goodliest woman
>
>   That ever lay by man; [...].
>
> (*Henry VIII* 4.1.64-72)

This narration continues for another twelve lines, describing the spatial arrangement, action, gesture, and the royal pomp during the ceremony. He describes the new queen's beauty and the way she exhibits it. Showing a woman's beauty is against teachings in conduct books, but queens exhibit counter examples of conventional behaviour codes for women and establish alternative models for women to empower themselves and exploit available resources. Micheli's interpretation of the viewers' report and conversations emphasises their observation of Anne's youth, beauty, and sexuality and argues that the impression of Anne created by Shakespeare remains 'amid feasting and revelry'.[35] However, I argue that instead of creating a festive atmosphere accompanying

---

[35] Linda McJ. Micheli, '"Sit by Us": Visual Imagery and the Two Queens in *Henry VIII*', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 38 (1987), 452-466 (p. 463).

Anne's every appearance, Shakespeare followed Holinshed's narration closely in the section of Anne's coronation, and depicted Anne as part of the ceremony to, on the one hand, establish Anne as a model of queenship and femininity, generating a grand narrative conformed to the patriarchal discourse, contrasting to the Old Lady's bawdy language and on the other hand, to suggest how quick Anne has adapted herself to the decorum, learned all the manners of a queen, and equips herself with all the qualities of a queen.

Performing Queenship

Anne Boleyn remains silent and uses gestures such as kneeling and praying to demonstrate that she is well-qualified to be Queen of England. The third gentleman also narrates Anne Boleyn's ceremonial action during her coronation:

> THE THIRD GENTLEMAN At length her grace rose, and with modest paces
>   Came to the altar, where she *kneeled*, and saint-like
>   *Cast her fair eyes to heaven*, and *prayed* devoutly,
>   Then rose again, and *bowed* her to the people,
>   When by the Archbishop of Canterbury
>   *She has all the royal makings of a queen*,
>   As *holy oil*, Edward Confessor's *crown*,
>   The *rod* and *bird of peace*, and all such emblems
>   Laid nobly on her. Which performed, the choir,
>   With all the choicest music of the kingdom,
>   Together sung *Te Deum*. So she parted,
>   And with the same full state paced back again
>   To York Place, where the feast is held.
>
>   (*Henry VIII* 4.1.84-96, emphasis added)

In this account, the gentleman describes each action that Anne Boleyn performed in detail and speaks appropriately of her queenly manner, using words such as 'modest', 'saint-like', and 'devoutly'. She displays her humility to God and her people and thus acquires 'all the royal makings of a queen', obtaining people's recognition. Anne is anointed, suggesting the divinity of her queenship. Roy Strong investigates how the

process of coronation apotheosises the monarchs and their spouses.[36] The holy oil, crown, rod, and other emblems are all heavily embedded with biblical and mythical symbolical powers, authorising the kings' body politic. Queens consort, whose identities depend on kingship, also gain the legitimacy of their authority through similar processes.[37] After all of these are performed, Anne Boleyn is crowned Queen of England.

Consecrating Anne Boleyn's queenship is not for herself, but is a necessary procedure for the legitimacy of the royal heirs procreated by her and to reinforce the authority of the newly reformed English Church.[38] Among Henry VIII's six queens, only Katherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn were crowned. The former had a joint coronation with the King shortly after he succeeded to the throne at the age of eighteen, while the latter had the last coronation that was held separately from the King in English royal history. The ceremonial crowning proclaimed Anne Boleyn as the legitimate wife of Henry VIII and Queen of England, and the child she would bear (in fact, she was already pregnant before the coronation) would be the legitimate heir to the English throne. Anne Boleyn's queenship was secured due to the legitimacy that needed to be bestowed to her future children in the ceremony.[39]

Anne Boleyn's performative silence in the coronation makes her queenship a ritual in *Henry VIII*. Micheli comments that on public occasions, Anne is 'a wordless icon, an object of admiration and desire, a symbol of woman's dynastic role rather than a fully realised individual or a participant in the day-to-day business of the court'.[40] Yet Anne is more than a static and lifeless icon; by performing the conventional ceremony of the coronation, she infuses the royal tradition and history into her queenship and enlists herself in royal family. The anointing increases the sanctity of her queenship, endorsing her legitimacy ceremonially; however, it is ironic that this religious performance renders the Protestant Queen Anne Boleyn to be 'saint-like'. Although the turmoil of religious reformations was not staged in *Henry VIII*, Shakespeare and Fletcher embedded this issue subtly in the play. John N. King points out that the Catholic elements in Anne

---

[36] Strong, *Coronation*, pp. 3-12.
[37] The difference between king's two bodies and queen's two bodies will be discussed in Chapter 4.
[38] Stafford argues that 'a queen received little formal power through consecration, which was designed more for the benefit of the dynasty than of herself. Insofar as it helped her son it could not fail to help her, but it was only one of a series of factors that could make queens influential during their husbands' lifetime'. See Stafford, *Queens, Concubines and Dowagers*, p. 134.
[39] See Oakley-Brown and Wilkinson's 'Introduction' in *The Ritual and Rhetoric of Queenship*, p. 13.
[40] Micheli, '"Sit by Us": Visual Imagery', p. 465.

Boleyn's coronation reflect the transition from Roman Catholic to Protestant faith as in conflict with classical and Catholic symbols in Tudor royal iconography. The ultimate model of queenship, religious or political, is still represented by the Blessed Lady: 'The scenario continued the late medieval tradition of praising queens consort as types of female saints and the Blessed Virgin Mary'.[41]

Finally, the fluency of the ceremony depends greatly on the new queen's familiarity and knowledge of it. Her silence and conformity to the ceremony might be interpreted as succumbing to patriarchal authority, but can be read better as a strategic performance of queenship. Anne's performative queenship is presented through reporting, a narrative that depends upon the narrator's memory and the listeners' imagination. In the play, her coronation is open to the public, but not everyone has the access to Westminster Abbey to watch the ceremonial queenship. If directors follow Shakespeare and Fletcher's dramaturgy, then the audience in the theatre, like most people in Henry VIII's reign in 1533, would mainly obtain a verbal description of the grandeur, while the coronation, which was staged silently in the background according to stage directions, reflected the images that appeared in the audience's imagination. The publicity of a queen's coronation is essential for the queen to perform and exhibit her virtues (silence, decorum, chastity, obedience, humility, and beauty) and thus to increase her value, strengthen her ties to the newly married family, endorse her legitimacy, and promote her ability to be Queen. Similar to report-like narrations in historical writings, Shakespeare's and Fletcher's dramatisation of the gentlemen describing and discussing the ceremony suggests that Anne's virtues are disseminated via oral reports and that her image is created with Henry VIII's supportive political propaganda.

II. Queens in the English Courts

The following section investigates queens' participation and performance in the English court, starting from the first greeting and meetings to the conflicts and negotiations with the court in four different categories: queens' etiquette, advice, begging, and anger. Through close textual analyses, it discovers that the more queens reveal their personal and private emotions, the more they are engaged in political and public interventions in state affairs, creating an ambiguity in the alleged division of the

---

[41] King, *Tudor Royal Iconography*, p. 50.

public and private and undermining the conventional dichotomy of gendered space.

A. Queens' Etiquette: Meeting the Court

1. Margaret of Anjou

In comparison with gaining public recognition in coronations, being received by the English court requires queens to be endorsed and supported by their kings and perform their queenly authority with confidence. When meeting the English court for the first time, Margaret of Anjou attempts to achieve this aim by using her etiquette and rhetoric to demonstrate Henry VI's endorsement of her authority as Queen of England.

Margaret's royal lineage and dowry disappoint Henry VI's court but the new queen displays her virtues, such as respect, obedience, humility, and dignity, to fortify her queenship and tackle the English patriarchs carefully. At the beginning of *Henry VI, Part Two*, the Duke of Suffolk reports how he acted as the deputy of Henry VI, performed royal marriage rites in France, and escorted the new queen to the English court (*2HVI* 1.1.1-16). King Henry VI welcomes Margaret, kisses her, and praises her beauty (*2HVI* 1.1.17-23). By comparison with Henry V's wooing and kissing Catherine of Valois in *Henry V,* the kiss between Henry VI and Margaret seems to be a more superficial act of decorum. Replying to the King's reception, Margaret makes her debut speech in the English court:

> QUEEN MARGARET   Th' excess of love I bear unto your grace
>
>   Forbids me to be lavish of my tongue
>
>   Lest I should speak more than beseems a woman.
>
>   Let this suffice: my bliss is in your liking,
>
>   And naught can make poor Margaret miserable
>
>   Unless the frown of mighty England's King.
>
>   (*Henry VI, Part Two* 1.1. 24-29)

At the beginning of her speech, Margaret first admits that her overwhelming love for Henry VI obstructs her speech, which she does not excel at because she is a typical woman. Margaret's statement is strategic: on the one hand, she is a general woman, succumbing to her emotion for her husband, the King, and incapable of expressing herself, while on the other hand, she manages to display her love for the King

appropriately because she is in an exceptional position as the Queen of England. She also subjects her happiness and misery to the King's likes and dislikes, revealing her compliance and humility. She argues that her ability and courage to transgress the boundary of appropriate conduct for women result from her sincere and constant love for her husband (*2HVI* 1.1.29.1-8). Her performative self-abasement and compliance demonstrate her awareness of and ability in the manipulation of the boundaries of the propriety of language.

Margaret's language fascinates the King:

> KING HENRY   Her sight did ravish, but her grace in speech,
>
> Her words yclad with wisdom's majesty,
>
> Makes me from wond'ring fall to weeping joys,
>
> Such is the fullness of my heart's content.
>
> (*Henry VI, Part Two* 1.1.30-33)

Henry VI is ravished by her beauty and rhetoric. Howard and Rackin criticise the King's 'weeping joys' as effeminising him, displaying his lack of self-control and judgement.[42] It seems that in their first meeting Shakespeare has foreshadowed a strategic Margaret and sentimental Henry VI. In Margaret's first appearance in the English court, no matter whether Henry VI's court endorses her queenship, they kneel and shout 'Long Live Queen Margaret, England's happiness' as part of the court etiquette (*2HVI* 1.1.35).

However, after the courtesy, Henry VI and Margaret leave the court, while the courtiers reveal their discontent with this marriage, challenging the foundation of Margaret's queenship. This royal matrimony is unwelcome to the English court because of Margaret's small dowry and the forfeiture of England's rights in Anjou and Maine in the royal marriage contract. The Duke of Gloucester, the King's uncle and Lord Protector, expresses his disappointment about this fatal and shameful marriage and defines it an erasure of England's glory (*2HVI* 1.1.71-99). *Henry VI, Part One* is one of the history plays written in the early years of Shakespeare's playwrighting career. In this play, he portrays how Margaret establishes and empowers herself in her debut meeting with the English court through a performance of her virtues. She expresses her subjugated status as a humble and loving wife; however, her skilled control of language

---

[42] Howard and Rackin, *Engendering a Nation*, pp. 67-68.

foreshadows her future intervention in English politics.

2. Katherine of Aragon

Anne Boleyn's static and ceremonial performance in her coronation and Margaret's first introduction to the English court illustrate how new queens may establish their queenship through public display, while Katherine in *Henry VIII* provides an example of how a powerful queen can manipulate the dynamic of the court by gaining control of the space. Of the four scenes in which Katherine of Aragon appears, she enters onto the stage with royal processions and queenly pomp, particularly in two scenes: in Act I, Scene ii, she enters into the court unexpectedly and interrupts the administrative and judicial proceedings, intervening in the Duke of Buckingham's treason trial and in tyrannic taxation; in Act II, Scene iv, she enters the court of her divorce hearing with her own ladies-in-waiting, ignores the summons of the trial court, and acts at her own will to beg for Henry VIII's love and favour. Her dramatic entry on both occasions illustrates how the dominion of space empowers queenship in public courts.

Act I, Scene ii in *Henry VIII* presents the King's court as a place of state business, a space that women are generally not allowed to engage in which yet is intruded into by a powerful queen. In the beginning, King Henry praises Cardinal Wolsey for his devotion to public affairs and then summons a Surveyor, who used to serve the Duke of Buckingham, to investigate the Duke's treason. When the court is about to start interrogating, suddenly a crier announces:

> CRIER (*within*) Room for the Queen, ushered by the Duke of Norfolk.
> > *Enter* QUEEN [KATHERINE, *the Duke of*] NORFOLK, *and* [*the Duke of*] SUFFOLK. *She Kneels.* KING [HENRY] *riseth from his state, takes her up, and kisses her.*
> > > (*Henry VIII* SD 1.2.9)

The queen's unexpected arrival temporarily stops the proceeding of the inquisition. All the action of her entrance happens silently but powerfully. By making everyone, including the audience beyond the stage, wait for her to finish her curtsey, Katherine grasps everyone's attention by creating a pause in the court and generating an effect similar to dramatic suspense. The crier proclaims the appearance of Katherine with the

company of the Duke of Norfolk and Suffolk, indicating that the Queen has her own supporters in the court. Henry VIII does not sit still to watch Katherine's movement, but leaves his throne and provides a welcoming reception. Henry VIII's action suggests the intimacy of the royal spouse and the Queen's closeness to the centre of power. She is blamed neither for her sudden appearance in the court without the King's consent, nor for her interruption of the court proceedings. By being the centre of people's attention and the target of people's gaze, Katherine establishes her authority as the Queen of England in the court. Katherine's action is in contrast to the behaviour codes in conduct books for common women; her public appearance and even her conversation with male courtiers in the court do not sabotage the integrity of her chastity. Katherine's presence at the court not only offers a display of royal spectacle, but emphasises the exceptionality of a queen and her engagement in political issues. Shakespeare and Fletcher tactically portray Katherine's powerful queenship via a dramatical and majestic entrance.

The spatial closeness between Katherine and Henry VIII presented in a public court blatantly reveals the power dynamics in the court. When Katherine appears in Act II, Scene iv again, she is facing her own trial court of the divorce case. The Queen is no longer the King's favourite, and her seat is no longer arranged next to the King's. Shakespeare and Fletcher followed the record in Holinshed's *Chronicles* closely: the seating order for the nobles and prelates in the court suggests the formality and authority of the court. The stage direction is so detailed that it seems to command a precise representation of the historical moment:

> *Trumpets: sennet.* [*Then*] *cornets. Enter two vergers with short silver wands; next them two* SCRIBES *in the habit of doctors; after them the* [Arch] *bishop of Canterbury alone; after him the Bishops of* LINCOLN, *Ely, Rochester, and Saint Asaph; next them, with some small distance, follows a gentleman bearing* [*both*] *the purse* [*containing*] *the great seal and a cardinal's hat* [...]; *after them, side by side, the two cardinals,* [WOLSEY and CAMPEIUS; *then*] *two noblemen with the sword and mace. The* KING [*ascends to his seat*] *under the cloth of state; the two cardinals sit under him as judges;* <u>*the* QUEEN [*attended by* GRIFFITH *her gentleman usher*] *takes place some distance from the* KING;</u> [...]. *The rest of the attendants stand in convenient order about the stage.*

(*Henry VIII* 2.4.0 SD, emphasis added)

Contrary to the spatial arrangement in Act I, Scene ii, Katherine is distanced from King Henry in this scene. Her alienation in spatial terms corresponds to the Queen's de-centred status in the court. Katherine might be aware of her loss of the King's favour. To regain her power in the court, she ignores the proceeding of the divorce trial; when she is called, she '*makes no answer, [but] rises out of her chair, goes about the court, comes to the* KING, *and kneels at his feet*' (*HVIII* 2.4.10 SD). By declining to answer, Katherine resists the authority of the trial court. She deliberately 'goes about the court', dominating the court space with a speechless but dramatic movement. Her silence strategically attracts everyone's attention, empowering herself with people's gazes. Instead of positioning herself in front of the judges and bishops, she comes directly to King Henry VIII. As discussed in 'The Pursuit of Queenship', the queenship of queens consort relies greatly on the integrity and consensus of kingship. Katherine is aware that she needs to subject herself to the King's likes and dislikes, so she kneels in front of the King. The eloquent and courageous Queen, who defends the Duke of Buckingham and the English people in Act I, Scene ii, suddenly reveals her feminine weakness in front of the public and begs for the King's love, trust, and fidelity. Even before she speaks, she has successfully kept everyone in the playhouse focusing on her; as Micheli argues, Katherine makes use of non-verbal elements and visual movements to sabotage the pictorial, ordered ceremony and the authority of Henry VIII's court behind it.[43] Katherine is familiar with the performativity of queenship; wherever she stands, kneels, speaks, and acts, she is the centre of the stage.

In *Henry VIII: All is True*, Shakespeare and Fletcher dramatise a Katherine who empowers her queenship by dominating the space of the court strategically; the impact of Katherine's authority comes partly from the contrast of her control of space and gesture of humility. For instance, Katherine uses 'kneeling' to show her courtesy (*HVIII* 1.2) and her subjugation to Henry VIII's authority (*HVIII* 2.4); as Flather suggests, 'gesture and demeanour should demonstrate esteem'.[44] However, her interaction with the court space demonstrates her superiority to the patriarchal authority of the trial court that it presents and represents. In comparison with Katherine, other queens consort do

---

[43] Micheli, '"Sit by Us": Visual Imagery' and the Two Queens in *Henry VIII*', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 38 (1987), 452-466.
[44] Flather, *Gender and Space*, p. 26.

not acquire the same detailed dramatisations of their entrance or exhibition of royal pomp, but rely more on the arrangements and designs of different directors' presentations; for instance, Margaret of Anjou in *Henry VI, Part Three* obtains a brief narrative about her military image. To sum up, the recognition of queenship depends not only upon royal symbols displayed in royal spectacles relevant to a queen and the procession of personnel accompanying queens, but also upon the queen's demeanour, including her management and familiarity with court space, showing her manner as the mistress, the queen of that space. Despite conventional advice on women's seclusion, silence, and submissiveness, queens' self-display is elemental to their queenship.

B. Queens' Advice: Networking in the Court

Queens are expected to act as a bridge between kings and their subjects, conveying the people's voices to monarchs and explaining the kings' intentions and motives for their political decisions to the people. In Shakespeare's English history plays, queens consort do not seclude themselves in their chambers, but provide information and give opinions to their royal husbands strategically for their own profits or the people's good. This section first explores how Margaret engages herself in politics, manipulating the networking in the English court to advance her own power in *Henry VI, Part Two*. In contrast to Margaret's relatively negative image, Katherine of Aragon offers a more positive but still powerful image of a queen consort in Act II, Scene i of *Henry VIII*. This section will focus on how queens familiarise themselves with the networking of power in the English court, participate in political issues of public concern, and engage with patriarchs in a male-only space.

1. Margaret of Anjou: Forming Her Own Network in *Henry VI, Part Two*

As a foreign queen in England, Margaret of Anjou not only makes appearances in the English court, but also takes advantage of the disharmonious factions to fortify her queenship. In Shakespeare's dramatisation, we may see how Margaret interacts with, creates, and manipulates the English aristocratic networks. Her contest with the Duke of Gloucester through the whole of *Henry VI, Part Two* illustrates how she uses issues of public concern, especially treason, to approach the power centre and form her own power network in practising her queenship in public courts and in Parliament, and

eventually appropriates Henry VI's kingship on battlefields.

As the King's companion, Margaret does not stay within her own private chamber, but joins the royal pastime of hawking, indicating her participation in English aristocratic networking activities. She also takes advantage of the discussion about hawking to observe and intervene in the power networking in the court. King Henry VI first notices the impressive performance of Gloucester's hawk, and the Duke of Suffolk extends the comparison to Gloucester's excessive power in the realm (*2HVI* 2.1.5-8, 9-12). Gloucester defends himself by accusing Cardinal Beaufort of secular ambition overriding his religious service (*2HVI* 2.1.13-14, 16-17, 23-26). The royal sport becomes a metaphor for the undercurrent of the political power game in the court. Gloucester turns to accuse Suffolk of insolence, while Margaret reproaches Gloucester for being ambitious (*2HVI* 2.1.31-31). King Henry VI finally asks for peace and advises his queen not to encourage the discord, but to act as a peacemaker in the court, acting as the bridge more appropriately (*2HVI* 2.1.33-34). King Henry's statement silences Margaret until she inquires of the Simpcox scheme and mocks Gloucester over his innocence of his wife's treason (*2HVI* 2.1.89-90, 198-199). Margaret's compliance is the act of a good, obedient, and virtuous queen. In the following scenes, she seizes chances to remove any threatening political enemies.

Margaret is a sharp observer of political developments, takes opportunities to eliminate her foes to create a political power vacuum, and engages herself in political debates in the English court and Parliament. Earlier in Act I, Scene iii, Margaret complains to Suffolk about Gloucester's wife, who appropriates the majestic pomp of a queen as if her husband is not the Lord Protector, but the King of England (*2HVI* 1.3.79-91). Previously 'The Pursuit of Queenship' has discussed how Margaret humiliates the Duchess in a fan-dropping incident to demonstrate her superiority to the Lord Protector's wife (*2HVI* 1.3.142-151). Later in Act II, Scene iii, after the Duchess is sentenced for treason, Margaret directly demands of the Duke of Gloucester to surrender staff and his right as the Lord Protector (*2HVI* 2.3.28-31). By forming her own political network and eliminating threats, Margaret stabilises her queenship.

From criticising and scheming privately, Margaret gradually reveals her aggressive ambition publicly. In Act III, Scene i, in Parliament (according to the stage direction), Margaret openly expresses her opinions against the Duke of Gloucester (*2HVI* 3.1.4-41). She associates him with his wife's witchcraft and treason, implying his

potential betrayal of Henry VI and persuading the King to retrieve his kingly power. Margaret's appearance in Parliament does not seem to surprise the English court, or incur any objection, at least not publicly. Her participation in the political debates and accusation against Gloucester are not restrained. Her public statement in Parliament in Act III, Scene i displays not only her rhetoric but also her strategy and ability to manipulate the innate discord of the English court.

When the Duke of Gloucester finally appears in Parliament, his defence cannot clear him from the accusations foregrounded by Margaret and is rebutted by all the rest of the nobles. He is now the target of everyone's conspiracy as his Duchess reminded him at her fall earlier in Act II, Scene iv. The Duke is aware of the situation and identifies Margaret in particular as his arch-enemy: 'And you, my sovereign lady, with the rest,/ Causeless have laid disgraces on my head,/ And with your best endeavour have stirred up/ My liefest liege to be mine enemy' (*2HVI* 3.1.161-164). The Duke understands Margaret's influence on Henry VI and accuses her of generating discord between him and the King, while failing to be the bridge between the subjects and their monarch. Although Henry VI believes the Duke is innocent, his kingship is not powerful enough to quiet his court or to save the Duke. The King cannot demonstrate his authority, and even sheds effeminate tears, discrediting his ability to rule (*2HVI* 3.1.221-222). After Henry VI leaves Parliament, Margaret remains in the political arena to discuss how to accelerate the Duke of Gloucester's fall, as if she had taken over Henry VI's kingship. She is more determined than the King regarding the Duke's fate: 'This Gloucester should be quickly rid the world/ To rid us from the fear we have of him' (*2HVI* 3.1.233-234). Margaret continues to intervene in the English court to remove all her foes and to subjugate the English court to her queenship. In Act III, Scene i, she dispatches the Duke of York to subdue the Irish rebellion, sending another of her enemies away from the court. In Act IV, Scene iv, she appears in Parliament again to hear reports about the Jack Cade riot, while intriguingly and inappropriately showing her sorrow for the death of the Duke of Suffolk in front of the King and his court. When Henry VI senses her excessive lamenting and questions her loyalty, she immediately pulls herself together in front of the public and replies that were the King dead, she would not be in mourning, but dead herself, using her language to secure her status (*2HVI* 4.4.19-24).

The relationship between Margaret and the Duke of Suffolk is significant to the

development of Margaret's queenship. In 'Suffolk and Margaret: A Study of Some Sections of Shakespeare's *Henry VI*', Gwyn Williams argues that historically the relationship between Suffolk and Margaret was akin to pure sponsorship and power networking, rather than adultery as Shakespeare portrayed in *Henry VI*.[45] Shakespeare uses this unhistorical disputed relationship to foreground how Margaret accesses English politics, establishes her own network, and even despises Henry VI's weak kingship in contrast to Suffolk's manliness and her own power. Shakespeare's dramatisation of this adulterous relationship between a queen and a courtier is not simply a copy of the chivalric tales; instead, Shakespeare deliberately contrasts Margaret with other queens: she challenges all the boundaries, including revealing a close connection with one of the courtiers. It seems that the relationship between Margaret and Suffolk is not as secret as they thought.[46] When Henry VI banishes Suffolk in Act III, Scene ii, despite Margaret's strong will and manipulation of the English court in the previous and following scenes, she does not disobey the King's order. The farewell scene between Margaret and Suffolk in Act III, Scene ii in *Henry VI, Part Two* seems to be excessively melodramatic, and whether the nature of their relationship is based on pure love or political symbiosis is intriguing and dramatic. Margaret violates the ultimate rule – to preserve chastity among other virtues. Under such circumstances, whatever she endeavours to accomplish or preserve could be undervalued or disputed. Her practice of queenship is thus undermined.

When Henry VI surprisingly uses his authority to banish Suffolk, Margaret is not defeated by losing her strongest and most intimate ally, but composes herself and gradually takes control of the power core. In Act V, Scene iv of *Henry VI, Part Two*, Margaret not only resumes her role as a queen, but also surrogates Henry VI's part in defending his kingship – she gives military advice to the King, telling him to retreat to London for a better chance of defeating the rebellious Duke of York later. Henry VI's lame authority and the consequent power vacuum in the English court result in Margaret's surrogacy of Henry VI's role during the Wars of the Roses. Although she was once devastated by the banishment and death of the Duke of Suffolk, Margaret is clearly aware of her true power base and the source of her queenship: she never relinquishes the seat next to King Henry VI, no matter how defective his kingship is.

---

[45] Williams, 'Suffolk and Margaret', pp. 310-322.
[46] Ibid., p. 316.

Her 'place' is next to the King. From the moment she enters the English court, Margaret understands the power structure of the English court and strategically takes advantage of court politics to advance herself. Her appearance in the spaces of the English court and Parliament does not seem an anomaly in a realm ruled by a weak king.

2. Katherine of Aragon: Defending Her Network in *Henry VIII*

Margaret is not the only powerful queen in Shakespeare's English history plays. In *Henry VIII*, Shakespeare and Fletcher provide another example of a queen who intervenes in state affairs and engages herself in the court publicly with sharp knowledge and political ability equal to men. In Act I, Scene ii of *Henry VIII*, Katherine fails to decriminalise the Duke of Buckingham's treason and save him from being executed, but succeeds in waiving an unjust taxation for the English people. Katherine is invited to hear the testimony of Buckingham's Surveyor, concerning the Duke's treason. The Surveyor reports how Buckingham talked about the King's and Queen's lack of male heirs, his opportunity to seize the crown, and his intention to banish Cardinal Wolsey from the court subsequently (*HVIII* 1.2.134-139). Wolsey comments on the testimony and attempts to influence the King's judgment and manipulate the attendants' interpretation. Recognising Wolsey's tactic, Katherine immediately refutes Wolsey's criticism, asking him to speak 'with charity' (*HVIII* 1.2.143). Henry VIII does not endorse Wolsey or Katherine directly, but asks the Surveyor to 'speak on' to tell more about the Duke's treacherous doings (*HVIII* 1.2.144-147).

In his language, the King shows his prejudice regarding this trial. Katherine thus undermines the Surveyor's testimony by revealing his history with the Duke:

> QUEEN KATHERINE If I know you well,
>> You were the Duke's Surveyor, and lost your office
>> On the complaint o'th' tenants. Take good heed
>> You charge not in your spleen a noble person
>> And spoil your nobler soul. I say, take heed;
>> Yes, heartily beseech you.
>
> (*Henry VIII* 1.2.173-177)

Katherine first reminds the court of the Surveyor's suspicious motive: it is revenge for

the Duke's dismissal of him. She warns the Surveyor about the sin of calumniation and reminds him twice to 'take heed', showing her queenly authority; she then ends her statement with 'heartily beseech you', trying to move the Surveyor by her sincerity. Katherine's knowledge about the details of how the Surveyor lost his office and why he would incriminate the Duke indicates her networking with Buckingham and her engagement with the subjects in the realm. It is obvious that Katherine is not naive or ignorant of court politics and state affairs.

However, Katherine's inquiry about the Surveyor's credibility is not pursued by Henry VIII. Because of the King's attitude, both Katherine and Wolsey acknowledge the King's will and remain silent. It is not until the King calls the Duke 'a giant traitor' that Wolsey taunts Katherine: 'Now, madam, may his highness live in freedom,/ And this man out of prison?' (*HVIII* 1.2.200-202). Katherine answers nothing but 'God mend all', implying that Wolsey should refer to his own conscience (*HVIII* 1.2.203). Wolsey remains silent because he knows that the King has made a prejudgment of the Duke's treason and thus he has only to wait for the result; Katherine also knows the King's mind but her silence indicates the futility of defending the Duke any further. Katherine's final silence also shows her obedience, superficially, for it can be interpreted as a soundless protest, as both Henry VIII and Wolsey know her stance. Katherine is not silenced, but chooses to remain silent. Act I, Scene ii of *Henry VIII* then continues with Katherine's petition to revoke taxation for the English, which in the next section is compared with the begging of other queens consort for kings to show their people mercy.

Conclusion of 'Queens Advice'

Comparing Margaret's and Katherine's cases, it is not difficult to see the difference between two courts and two queens' strategies in interacting with English politics. As has been discussed above, Margaret removes her political enemy and takes advantage of the power vacuum in Henry VI's court. When losing her main supporter, the Duke of Suffolk, she becomes more self-reliant and eventually replaces Henry VI as the centre of power. In *Henry VIII*, Buckingham's fall in Act I, Scene ii emphasises the features of Henry VIII's court: the rise of a new aristocracy, the familial networking among nobles, and the limits to the political intervention that can be made by a queen consort. One of the reasons that Wolsey is disliked by the nobles is his rapid rise from an inferior rank to

the King's side. Wolsey's elevation results not only from his ability in political affairs, but also from Henry VIII's intention to cultivate his own people and replace the old aristocracy, which threatens his authority. An irregular elevation of a commoner breaks the order of general selection of magistrates and thereby undermines the old power structure of the court.

The royal court and the strata of aristocracy are originally formed by a group of people with biological ties. Whoever owns the greatest right of primogeniture has the most legitimate claim to the throne; others in the family circle can have a share of the power. As discussed in the case of Edward IV and the newly formed nobles by his marriage with Elizabeth Woodville in 'The Pursuit of Queenship', one way for a king to secure full obedience to his court is to infuse new blood into the court, break the old order, re-distribute power shares, and create a new group of 'the King's men'. The old nobles are based on consanguine relationships, while the new nobles are created according to the king's favour. It is when a king's authority is strong, healthy, and effective that such favour is most desirable for the king's subjects. A similar mechanism applies to queens consort. Therefore, queens consort are like courtiers, who need to strive for kings' favour. They are a part of the family circle and have to keep their familial networking strong and effective. Nevertheless, in the case of a queen consort, the king's favour also reflects on the marriage state. Foreign queens married to England can hardly bring with them their old family circles; they have to establish new ones in the new court. Katherine's defence of the Duke of Buckingham can be understood as her defence of a good magistrate and as an attempt to weaken Wolsey's power, as well as an effect of her close relationship with the Duke's family historically. Adapting herself to the characteristics and changes in Henry VIII's court, Katherine strategically maintains her advantages. All of these indicate Katherine's engagement with English politics.

Like Margaret of Anjou, Katherine of Aragon is a powerful queen consort; unlike Margaret, who is stigmatised, Katherine is portrayed as a good woman, which difference might result from the way they intervene in politics and from the different contexts of the English court. Katherine does not confront a completely antagonistic English court, even through she has an obvious ultimate political enemy, Wolsey, and faces a more wilful and comparatively strong King Henry VIII. In feminist criticism, Margaret is defended for her power on stage but lamented for being stigmatised by

patriarchs and for being forgotten in the later account that appears in *Richard III*; while Katherine gains praise for her powerful engagement in the English court with an image of a good woman well maintained. Analysing the two queens' performances in public courts as regards political networking, 'Queens' Advice' argues that they both have sharp observation and a good knowledge of English politics, knowing how to manipulate the power and resources available to them and how to position themselves in public.

C. Queens' Supplications: Interceding with the Court

The following section examines 'queens' supplications' to see how they perform their feminine weakness and manipulate their wifely care for the kings in order to make petitions of public concern. Regardless of the virtue of obedience, in the interaction with kings' supreme authorities, queens apply a strategic rhetoric to influence the patriarchs. The rhetoric appropriates queens' inferiority as women and performs feminine weakness to validate tears, kindliness, and tender consideration for the people, especially in the public courts. A biblical type for this is Queen Esther, who saves her Jewish people by manipulating her virtue of obedience and the soft strategy of begging, advising the King to protect his reputation and benefits, while influencing the King's decision making. This rhetoric of 'woman's weakness' was also often used by Queen Elizabeth I in her public speeches and prayers which were composed in private but later published.[47] Queens in Shakespeare's English history plays often make use of their feminine weakness to achieve their political agenda, showing their private and emotional selves in political issues in public courts. 'Queens' Supplications' examines three cases in Shakespeare's English histories with a sequence of increasing influence and manipulation of power in English politics: Blanche in *King John*, Queen Philippa in *Edward III*, and Katherine of Aragon in *Henry VIII*.

1. Blanche in *King John*: A Novice Queen in a Dilemma

As 'The Pursuit of Queenship' argues, Blanche of Spain is aware of her role as a political pawn and virtuously submits herself to her uncle's arrangement of marrying the French Dauphin to prevent an international war. However, when King John defies the Pope's authority and is thus excommunicated, the French King Philip, agitated by

---

[47] Clement, 'The Queen's Voice', 1.1-26.

Pandolf, the Cardinal of Milan backed by the Pope, intends to topple King John and possess the English throne. The English-French league is broken, and Blanche, the poor probationary French queen, is torn between obedience to her uncle and to her newly wedded husband:

> LOUIS THE DAUPHIN Father, to arms!
>
>   BLANCHE   Upon thy wedding day?
>
>   Against the blood that thou hast married?
>
>   What, shall our feast be kept with slaughtered men?
>
>   Shall braying trumpets and loud churlish drums,
>
>   Clamours of hell, be measures to our pomp?
>
>   [*She kneels*]
>
>   O husband, hear me! Ay, alack, how new
>
>   Is 'husband' in my mouth! Even for that name
>
>   Which till this time my tongue did ne'er pronounce,
>
>   Upon my knee I beg, go not to arms
>
>   Against mine uncle.
>
>   (*King John* 3.1.226-234)

Blanche asks the Dauphin not to wage wars on their wedding day, and then she kneels and elevates her petition from the concerns of a couple's happiness to that of a family's future. Her statement reveals one of the essences of royal marriage and the dilemma of foreign queens consort: royal marriage is a way to establish an alliance and expand the family network, but the woman who is exchanged during the process might be torn when the alliance breaks.[48] The whole royalty of Europe is in fact a big family; international wars are blood against blood. Being unmarried, Blanche only has to subject her will to her guardian uncle, King John; being married, she faces two sources of patriarchal authority. When these authorities diverge, she is forced to choose whom

---

[48] 'Like Elizabeth of York in *Richard III* and Katherine of France in *Henry V*, Blanche will serve as the inert female material of masculine history-making'. See Howard and Rackin, *Engendering a Nation*, p. 123.

to obey.[49]

Right after Blanche's kneeling, Lady Constance, seeking the French to support her son Arthur to inherit the English throne, undermines Blanche's petition also by kneeling ('O, upon my knee/ Made hard with kneeling') (*KJ* 3.1.235-238).[50] Blanche resorts to her identity as the Dauphin's wife and his 'love', which he asserted when proposing to her earlier: 'Now shall I see thy love: what motive may/ Be stronger with thee than the name of wife?' (*K J* 3.1.239-240). Undermining Blanche's rhetoric, Lady Constance reminds Blanche of her wifely obedience and support of war against England (*KJ* 3.1.241-242). Blanche's endeavour affects neither the French nor English camps, so she relents:

> BLANCHE Which is the side that I must go withal?
> I am with both, each army hath a hand,
> And in their rage, I having hold of both,
> They whirl asunder and dismember me.
> Husband, I cannot pray that thou mayst win. –
> Uncle, I needs must pray that thou mayst lose. –
> Father, I may not wish the fortune thine. –
> Grandam, I will not wish thy wishes thrive.
> Whoever wins, on that side shall I lose,
> Assured loss before the match be played.

<div align="right">(King John 3.1.253-262)</div>

The royal marriage was thought beneficial to both England and France, but for Blanche, she will never be a winner in this war of interpretation.[51] Although Blanche is not yet the French queen, she is already playing the role of an intercessor between the English and French courts, acting like many queens in international politics.

Presenting her petition on the basis of her feminine attributes and wifely duties,

---

[49] In Blanche's supplication, she does not mention religious issues. For the discussion of *King John* and English religious reformations, see Levin, 'Women's Visions', in *Ambiguous Realities*, ed. by Levin and Watson, pp. 219-234. Also see Donna B. Hamilton, *Shakespeare and the Politics of Protestant England* (New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992), and A. J. Piesse, '*King John*: Changing Perspectives', in *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History Plays*, ed. by Michael Hattaway (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 126-140.
[50] Howard and Rackin, *Engendering a Nation*, p. 120.
[51] Ibid., p. 124.

Blanche's presence and speech in the public courts are not questioned or prohibited. The presence of Blanche is of significance in *King John* and is further emphasised in the diplomatic conflict between King John and the French court. As in the quotation above, she shows her dilemma in the power struggle, which corresponds to her position on the stage: when King John's court and the French court each take a side of the stage, Blanche would be situated in the centre of the stage and the conflict. The spatial arrangement echoes the plot development and at this moment, Blanche becomes a key figure of this diplomatic disputation and the centre of the spectators' view. Furthermore, the tug of war might be envisioned and dramatised in physical terms with Blanche being dragged by both sides and her obedience and loyalty being dismembered metaphorically with the image of dismembering her body. All of these make Blanche become the centre of focus on the stage and transgress into the place of public courts without being much questioned.

Although Blanche used to be considered a weak role in *King John*, this thesis argues that Shakespeare makes her a lively image of an apprentice queen: Blanche is not an ignorant political pawn, but engages herself strategically and appropriately according to her position. Furthermore, in *King John*, it is the royal aristocratic men who break their fraternal vows of the English-French league easily, while the women keep their wifely oath of loyalty to their husbands and countries. In *Engendering a Nation*, Howard and Rackin argue that women's intervention decreases after the restoration of political order, which makes a sharp contrast between the first and second tetralogies. However, my argument is slightly different: in times of disorder, men lose power, while women exploit the power and resources available to them, becoming keepers and restorers of order by transgressing the patriarchally gendered division of space.

Blanche is not the only royal consort that attempts to influence her husband among queens in Shakespeare's English history plays. In contrast to Blanche's failure, Queen Philippa and Queen Katherine of Aragon make successful petitions for their people with a strategy of prioritising their husbands' (kings') benefits in their concerns.

2. Philippa in *Edward III*: An Adviser and Educator for the King

Like most of the queens in Shakespeare's history plays, Queen Philippa does not have many scenes on stage. Only four times in *Edward III* is she referred to or shown on stage. Philippa is first mentioned in King Edward's wooing of the Countess of

Salisbury, and so the audience understands the King's marital status and the impropriety of his pursuit. Later, when the Black Prince Edward, the son of Edward III and Queen Philippa, enters the stage and meets his father, the audience learns that the Prince inherits his mother's skin colour, implying that the Queen is not a beauty. The Queen's image is not particularly favourable or even clear until Act IV, Scene ii when the Queen's action on battlefields is reported, and finally in Act V, Scene i, she makes her appearance in King Edward III's court on stage. Queen Philippa's arrival on stage in Act V, Scene i, *Edward III*'s last scene, raises three issues: the King's government of his people and the Queen's advice on it; the hierarchy of power and the difference between kingship and queenship; and the nature of maternity in queenship. The portrayal of these issues implies an argument about how a queen's role changes according to different circumstances and how she should react in different spaces.[52]

Previously in Act IV, Scene ii of *Edward III*, a French captain yielded his town and castle to King Edward III for peace. At first, the King was pleased and granted them the right of autonomy, but he recalled that the French had not recognised his legitimacy and thus suddenly changed his mind. He demanded that in two days, six of the wealthiest merchants should '[c]ome naked, all but for their linen shirts,/ With each a halter hanged about his neck,/ And prostrate yield themselves upon their knees,/ To be afflicted, hanged, or what [he] please' to demonstrate their loyalty and obedience (*EIII* 4.2.75-78). Therefore, at the beginning of Act V, Scene i, the stage direction indicates that six men come onto the stage, wearing 'shirts, barefoot, with halters about their necks', following the King's previous order (*EIII* 5.1.7 SD). However, the six men are not those whom the King demanded (the 'men of most account that should submit'), but 'servile grooms,/ Or some felonious robbers on the sea'; all of whom are apprehended for their crimes and would eventually be executed by law (*EIII* 5.1.21-25). The King is irritated and decides to stop his ear to any of their petitions (*EIII* 5.1.10). He states that though he will peacefully take over this town, he refuses to pardon the six men and orders that their bodies 'shall be dragged about these walls/ And, after, feel the stroke of quartering steel', demonstrating his authority through cruel punishments (*EIII* 5.1.33, 36-37).

Queen Philippa notices the cruelty and irrationality of King Edward's decision and

---

[52] Queen Philippa's military and maternal images will be analysed in later sections on queens on battlefields in the next chapter.

intercedes between the King and the French people. She immediately asks the King for his pardon for these potential French subjects of England:

> QUEEN Ah, be more mild unto these yielding men!
> It is a glorious thing to stablish peace,
> And kings approach the nearest unto God
> By giving life and safety unto men:
> As thou intendest to be king of France,
> So let her people live to call thee king,
> For what the sword cuts down or fire hath spoiled
> Is held in reputation none of ours.
>
> (*Edward III* 5.1.39-46)

The Queen advises the King to manage this issue more strategically, considering his reputation and future government of England and France. True obedience does not lie in tyranny, but derives from a peaceful and happy life guaranteed. The Queen not only serves as the King's 'ears', listening to the people's voice and forming a bridge between the King and his subjects, but also as his 'eyes', seeing a more profound vision for future governance than the King's temporary satisfaction of showing his authority.

Regardless of Edward III's ire, Queen Philippa speaks for the people and advises the King in public with her sincere concerns for him, acting as a reformer of Edward III. The King takes her advice and spares his French subjects (*EIII* 5.1.55). Edward III recognises his unreasonable demands and reforms himself, rather than becoming a tyrant. This is the second reformation of the King. In the play, Edward III's two reformers are the Countess of Salisbury (as discussed in 'The Pursuit of Queenship') and Queen Philippa. In his first reformation, Edward III learns that he has to sacrifice his personal preferences and desires of his private body (body natural) for the benefits of his public body (body politic). In this second reformation, he learns that even though he is the King, he should not exercise his authority excessively and demand the people's obedience inappropriately.

Both reformations are related to the education of princes and the issue of obedience. In the Countess's case, Shakespeare reveals that secular obedience has its limitations and the ultimate principle is obedience to God, whose omnipotence is the only authority

that may demand absolute submissiveness. The Countess protects her chastity and demonstrates her virtue by disobeying the King's order, showing a strategic female power. In Queen Philippa's case, the Queen also teaches King Edward the essence of kingship and proves her worthy queenship through her wisdom and her care for the King and his people. In both cases, Shakespeare dramatises virtuous and able women in English histories.

Furthermore, like Blanche, Queen Philippa addresses the King from the angle of a loving wife; unlike Blanche, Philippa's role is more than an inferior and obedient wife. Queen Philippa plays a role akin to a companion and a court adviser, softly challenging the King's temper in a public court and facilitating his reform as a good ruler.

3. Katherine in *Henry VIII*: A Bridge between the King and the Subjects

Queen Katherine of Aragon plays a similar role to Queen Philippa but in a different political context. In *Edward III*, Philippa does not have any obvious political rival, while in *Henry VIII*, Katherine needs to face the King's favourite, Cardinal Wolsey, whom Katherine believes to be a corrupted cleric and suspects of conspiring against the Duke of Buckingham and embezzlement from the treasury. In Act I, Scene ii, Shakespeare and Fletcher subtly indicate Henry VIII's dependence on the Cardinal through a spatial closeness: '*Cornetts, Enter* KING HENRY *leaning on Cardinal* [*Wolsey*]*'s shoulder*' (*HVIII* 1.2.0 SD). This subtle description implies that Katherine needs to tackle her conflict with the Cardinal carefully.

Spatial arrangement and action are very significant in *Henry VIII*. At the beginning of Act I, Scene ii, Katherine successfully directs everyone's attention towards her; when Henry VIII intends to take her up, Katherine states that she 'must longer kneel', since she is a suitor (*HVIII* 1.2.10). Henry VIII asks her to arise and '*placeth* [*her*] *by him*', indicating the Queen's status in the court (*HVIII* 1.2.11 SD). After being the centre of attention and securing her status in the court, Katherine first states that the essence of her petitions is to protect the King's 'honour' and the 'dignity' of his office (*HVIII* 1.2.16-17). Katherine deploys a rhetoric also used by Queen Philippa: she presents herself as a loving and caring wife and attempts to portray her husband as a good monarch in a peaceful realm.

After setting out the contexts for her petition, Katherine finally explains the reason

for her arrival at court:

> QUEEN KATHERINE I am solicited, not by a few,
>> And those of true condition, that your subjects
>>
>> Are in great grievance. There have been commissions
>>
>> Sent down among 'em which hath flawed the heart
>>
>> Of all their loyalties; wherein, although,
>>
>> My good lord Cardinal, they vent reproaches
>>
>> Most bitterly on you, as putter-on
>>
>> Of these exactions, yet the King our master –
>>
>> Whose honour heaven shield from soil – even he escapes not
>>
>> Language unmannerly, yea, such which breaks
>>
>> The sides of loyalty, and almost appears
>>
>> In loud rebellion.

(*Henry VIII* 1.2.19-29)

Katherine explains that she has learned the news of people's suffering and discontent toward Cardinal Wolsey and Henry VIII due to the severe taxation, which is about to ignite rebellion. The Queen knows more than the King about what is happening to the people of England. It indicates that Katherine might have her own sources of information about people's situation: she listens to people in her own court and then conveys their voices to the King in his court. Concerning the implementation of taxation, it is doubtful whether Henry VIII knows of this policy or leaves it all to Wolsey's charge. In either case, Katherine strategically avoids directly accusing Henry VIII's inappropriate management of the government and his trust in the Cardinal, but criticises Wolsey's appropriation of the monarchical authority and implicitly admonishes the King's negligence.

In begging for the Kings' favour to save people from wars, death, and heavy taxations, Blanche, Philippa, and Katherine of Aragon act as bridges between the kings and their subjects. Intercession is an important mission of queenship. John N. King discusses the ultimate type for queens consort and argues that the typology of the Virgin Mary as Queen of Heaven along with 'contemporary reflections of the Spouse of Canticles' were 'particularly appropriate prior to the Tudor age, because queens were

exclusively consorts who never ruled in their own right', but 'were viewed traditionally as royal mediators, who, like the Blessed Virgin, governed indirectly by means of mercy and a mother's love'.[53] Just like the Virgin Mary, who intercedes like a bridge between Heaven and the secular world and functions like a conveyor, bringing Jesus Christ to human beings and linking different spaces, queens also switch between public and private spaces and communicate between the King and the subjects, creating flows between different spaces and hierarchies.

III. Queens Abroad in Foreign Courts

The previous sections have analysed how queens present and perform themselves in public spectacles, English courts, and Parliament; the following section examines two cases of queens going abroad and practising their English queenship in foreign courts. Displaying English queenship is a way to demonstrate the power of England. In Shakespeare's English history plays, there are English queens visiting foreign courts, mainly the French one, to seek alliance or circumvent foreign intervention in English politics. One is Queen Eleanor in Act II, Scene i of *King John* and the other is Queen Margaret of Anjou in Act III, Scene iii in *Henry VI, Part Three*. Their traffic and appearance abroad not only cross the geographical borders of political entities, but also transgress general social conventions of behavioural codes. Their movements between different spaces – politically, geographically, and ideologically – illustrate the power and autonomy they gain and appropriate when practising queenship.

1. 'Women and Fools, break off your conference': Eleanor in *King John*

Janet Adelman comments on mothers in Shakespeare's *King John* and argues that despite the power they exhibit politically and dramatically, they disappear after Act IV 'to recuperate masculinity at the end of the play'.[54] In *King John*, Queen Eleanor advises the King on government, intervenes in international royal marriage politics, and even leads troops onto the battlefields. This section focuses on her queenship in the French court in Act II, Scene i of *King John*: how she argues with Lady Constance

---

[53] King, *Tudor Royal Iconography*, p. 196.
[54] Janet Adelman, *Suffocating Mothers: Fantasies of Maternal Origin in Shakespeare's Plays, Hamlet to The Tempest* (New York: Routledge, 1992), p. 10.

about the legitimacy of King John and Arthur in the French court, while preventing the French from interfering in English politics and defending King John's authority.

Act II, Scene i is the most lively scene in *King John*: all the main characters are on stage and have lines to speak, which means all the actors might be on stage at the same time. This is a big scene on stage. However, this scene does not illustrate the power or grandeur of either the French or English courts, but suggests disorder and chaos. Analysing Queen Eleanor in this scene reveals three aspects of her queenship in the confusion of order, space, and patriarchal authority: queens' chastity and royal children's legitimacy, matriarch's authority in negotiating royal marriages, and the education of monarchs.

Queen Eleanor and Lady Constance undermine the legitimacy of each other's children by denigrating each other's chastity because from the sixth century, sons of the King's concubines were gradually viewed 'unworthy for the throne'.[55] Lady Constance visits the French court to seek alliance for her son's inheritance to the English throne. However, before she gains the French King's support, she fights against Queen Eleanor verbally on the severest issue for a woman: chastity (*KJ* 2.1.120-133). Lady Constance keeps mocking Eleanor as a 'good grandam', criticising her ignorance of Arthur's legitimacy, while Eleanor disgraces Constance's role as a disqualified wife and mother (*KJ* 2.1.159-194). Their discussion does not touch Arthur's legitimacy in juridical terms but is more like a general quarrel between a daughter and her mother-in-law, degrading the dispute over the royal succession to family discord.[56]

The royals cannot solve the dispute, so they appeal to the commoners to decide who is entitled to the authority of the throne. Thus is the hierarchy of power disturbed once more: the people decide national politics. The legitimacy of King John and Arthur is to be decided by the citizens of Angers, who in turn advise a royal union through the marriage between Blanche and the French Dauphin. The marriage proposal ignores Arthur's issue; Constance protests against it, but Eleanor supports it and willingly provides a dowry for Blanche with an attempt to clear suspicions and fortify King John's 'unsured assurance to the crown' through the international marriage (*KJ*

---

[55] Stafford, *Queens, Concubines and Dowagers*, p. 163. For Contance's and Eleanor's arguments about their chastity, see Howard and Rackin, *Engendering a Nation*, pp. 120-121.

[56] For more analyses of Constance's character, Katherine Goodland studies her maternal image, her relationship with Arthur, and her grief of his death later in comparison with the Virgin Mother's mourning of losing her son (Jesus Christ). See Katherine Goodland, *Female Mourning in Medieval and Renaissance English Drama: From the Raising of Lazarus to King Lear* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), pp. 119-134. Also see Levine, 'Refiguring the Nation: Mothers and Sons in *King John*' in *Women's Matters*, pp. 123-145.

2.1.469-480).

Queen Eleanor's support for this marriage demonstrates her role as a royal matriarch and assists King John to stabilise his status as the legitimate English King in the international society. Blanche's marriage brings peace to the two countries and signifies the French's recognition of King John's claim to the English throne, forfeiting the French's former endorsement to Arthur's right. Rather than superseding the King's authority directly to announce the wedding, Queen Eleanor puts her son's authority before her to empower his kingship and validate his succession. Eleanor, with appropriate humility and subjugation, proves to everyone in the English and French courts that King John is the legitimate and capable ruler and she does not manipulate his government. Queen Eleanor's statement in Act II supporting King John's inheritance to the English throne contradicts to her doubt and reminder for King John that 'Your strong possession much more than your right' (*KJ*1.1.39-40). This contradiction discredits King John's proclamation of his legitimacy to the throne but it illustrates Queen Eleanor's manipulation of her virtue in the practice of her queenship. Eleanor's first suspicion is revealed in a private conversation – in an aside – with her son, giving him advice on recognising his status and ambition; this reminder is not publicised and therefore does not undermine the King's authority in front of the English court. Whereas Eleanor's endorsement for King John's claim to the throne demonstrates a queen mother's strong support for her royal son's right. The contradiction in Eleanor's attitude two statements is not acknowledged by the English court, but is revealed to the audience. Her change of attitude corresponds to Machiavelli's *virtú* as the Queen accommodates her political discourse, role, and action according to different climate of the court. For instance, the Queen even takes the role of a soldier later to defend King John's legitimacy and her warlike image is emphasised again in the report of her death in Act IV, Scene ii of *King John*, which will be discussed later in the section of 'Queens on Battlefields'. In the play, Shakespeare shows how a queen mother prioritises the King's authority before hers, even though she is a matriarchal figure, in order to endorse his legitimacy and fortify his reign domestically and diplomatically.

2. 'With my talk and tears, but full of truth': Margaret of Anjou in *Henry VI, Part Three*

Queen Eleanor deliberately avoids giving an impression of transgressing against

King John's kingship, and yet Margaret of Anjou gradually assumes her husband's authority in the trilogy of *Henry VI*. From the previous discussions on Margaret's performance in the English court and Parliament in *Henry VI, Part Two* to her appearance in the French court in *Henry VI, Part Three*, the English court has been dominated by Margaret, a matriarch figure, and suffered from the split of the Houses of York and of Lancaster, causing a domestic war based on controversies of legitimacy and ability to rule. Being the queen consort of Henry VI, Margaret of Anjou substitutes for the King to suppress the revolt of the Duke of York not only by managing his court and leading his army, but also by representing him in the French court to seek an alliance. Margaret needs to maintain her dignity as the Queen of England, while simultaneously she has to display her humility to win France's powerful ally. Act III, Scene iii can be divided into three stages: first, Margaret's negotiation with King Louis; second, the English court's quarrels in the French court; third, the formation of a league. These stages are important in dramatic terms and allow Margaret to present different facets of her queenship.

Stage 1: the Poor Queen of England: Two Sides of Margaret's Images and Rhetoric

At the beginning of Act III, Scene iii, Margaret, along with her son, Prince Edward, and her courtier, the Earl of Oxford, visit King Louis's court. The King invites Margaret to take a seat with him, indicating their equal royal authority through spatial arrangement (*3HVI* 3.3.1-3). Yet, as a suitor, Margaret chooses a position spatially and powerfully lower than the French King to demonstrate her court etiquette and humility. Not being in the English court, Margaret knows that she needs to 'serve where kings command', and yet she simultaneously stresses her dignity as the Queen of England with a 'humble state to conform' herself to the authority of the French court (*3HVI* 3.3.4-11). She further uses descriptive language, attempting to win King Louis's sympathy: 'From such a cause as fills mine eyes with tears/ And stop my tongue, while heart is drowned in cares' (*3HVI* 3.3.13-14). King Louis then '*seats her by him*' and asks her to tell her 'grief' (*3HVI* 3.3.16-17 SD). The 'poor' Margaret then says that 'England's true-anointed [and] lawful' King Henry VI is banished to Scotland by the 'proud, ambitious Edward, Duke of York'. She has come to 'crave' the French King's 'just and lawful aid' as he is their sole hope (*3HVI* 3.3.24-33). She states that, 'Scotland hath will to help, but cannot help;/ Our people and our peers are both misled,/ Our

treasure seized, our soldiers put to flight' (*3HVI* 3.3.34-36). In short, Henry VI has no allies, no money, and no support from his people. Margaret expresses their distress explicitly and urges the French King to give immediate consent to help England, and yet the King does not act on Margaret's words but defers his decision.

Stage 2: The Question of Legitimacy of the English Throne

Right after Margaret expresses her impatience, the Earl of Warwick arrives in the French court, as an ambassador from 'worthy Edward, King of Albion' [the Duke of York], to offer a marriage contract between the Duke and Lady Bona, King Louis's sister, and a league between the Yorkists and France. To dissuade King Louis from accepting this marriage alliance, Margaret immediately reminds him of the fact that the Duke usurps the throne and the league and marriage would bring him danger and dishonour, acting as the French King's sincere ally and advisor (*3HVI* 3.3.65-77). The Earl of Warwick and the Earl of Oxford start to dispute the legitimacy of two sides' inheritance and the glory England gained and lost, bringing the discords within the English court to France, and leaving the issues to the French King's judgement (*3HVI* 3.3.78-108). In a sense, the English Queen and courtiers bring their 'domestic' and 'private' affair to a foreign court; however, as Margaret is the King of Anjou's daughter, the incumbent French King Louis is one of her kinsmen, who should have shown his support for Margaret. King Louis stops the argument between Oxford and Warwick; he is intrigued by the offer of an alliance based on marriage, asking Margaret, Prince Edward, and Oxford to 'stand aside'; the marginal space indicates that they are no longer the centre of interest in the French court (*3HVI* 3.3.109-110).

Following the King's order, Margaret '*comes down from the stage and, with* PRINCE EDWARD *and* OXFORD, *stands apart*' (*3HVI* 3.3.111 SD). Differently from her autonomy and dominion in the English court and Parliament, Margaret follows King Louis's request in the French court. She knows she has to wait and not interfere in the conference between the French King Louis and Warwick, showing an image of a silent, patient, and submissive queen. After they determine to form an alliance through the marriage of Lady Bona (the French King's sister) and the Duke of York (the future Edward IV), they ask Lady Bona if she consents to marry (*3HVI* 3.3.116, 118, 122-129, 134-137). The presence of Lady Bona in the French court and her consent for the marriage with Edward IV being asked again illustrate how aristocratic women as

potential queens might make appearance and even participate in political negotiations. Lady Bona is there watching and listening to the diplomatic negotiations between the English and French courts and the political conflicts of England. Furthermore, she might view Margaret as a predecessor and observe how she acts as the Queen of England, learning from Margaret's experiences. Lady Bona's presence in the French court again reminds us of the cases of Blanche in *King John* and Catherine in *Henry V*: these aristocratic women subjugate their will to their patriarchs to decide their marriage, but under the context of obedience as their virtue, their appearance in public courts and participation in the development of politics illustrate how they use the resources and powers in royal marriages and family networking and even transgress into public space, while maintaining their image as submissive daughters. In the meantime, King Louis asks Margaret to 'draw near', ironically making her 'a witness' of this contract (*3HVI* 3.3.138). Margaret protests against the contract, but her language is weakened by King Louis's criticism and Warwick's taunt about Henry VI's weak kingship. Warwick also mocks Margaret over her weak native family networking: 'And as for you yourself, our quondam queen,/ You have a father able to maintain you,/ And better 'twere you troubled him than France' (*3HVI* 3.3.153-155). When Margaret married to Henry VI, her dowry was naught and her family networking was useless for England, which consequence now reflects on the vain financial and military assistance that her father can offer. This debasement irritates Margaret: she accuses the Earl of Warwick and the Duke of York, but she does not criticise the French King, because she believes that she still has a chance to change King Louis's mind with her 'talk and tears, both full of truth' to offer the aid she needs (*3HVI* 3.3.156-160).

Stage 3: Margaret's Acquisition of Powerful Leagues

Before Margaret makes any attempts to persuade King Louis, the situation changes again: a messenger sends letters reporting the marriage of the Duke of York and Lady Elizabeth Gray (later Queen Elizabeth Woodville). The marriage, as discussed in 'The Pursuit of Queenship', is disfavoured by people who supported the Duke of York. Margaret gloats over the situation (*3HVI* 3.3.179-180). This twist also makes Warwick change his support and reminds him of the unworthy death of his father and his niece's violated chastity – how his family was mistreated by the Yorkists (*3HVI* 3.3.186-188). The messenger further informs that the Duke's brother, Clarence, has deserted him,

because of this disfavoured marriage. Digesting the news, Lady Bona and Margaret immediately form a league to denounce the Duke of York (*3HVI* 3.3.212-217). Finally, to defend his honour, Warwick determines to make an alliance with the French King and Margaret instead, and marries his own daughter, Lady Anne, to Prince Edward *(3HVI 3.3.181-184, 192-198, 240-243)*. Upon this proposal, Margaret does not ask for Prince Edward's consent or even King Henry VI's opinion, but takes the opportunity to secure these powerful leagues immediately. She thereby tells her son, 'she [Lady Anne] is fair and virtuous,/ Therefore delay not. Give thy hand to Warwick,/ And with thy hand thy faith irrevocable/ That only Warwick's daughter shall be thine' (*3HVI* 3.3.245-248). Understanding Warwick's concern about credit and honour, Margaret reminds Prince Edward that he should not to break the vow, strengthening their leagues strategically. Margaret gains more than what she originally expected: she allies not just with France, but even also a more powerful domestic partner, the Earl of Warwick.

Conclusion

This chapter explores Shakespeare's dramatisation of queens in public spectacles and courts. It observes that queens are more than static objects in ceremonies; they display their virtues, such as obedience, piety, chastity, silence, and humility, to the public in order to establish the reputation and authority of their queenship. Their public display appropriates attributes and virtues of female models in classical, historical, and biblical literary traditions; for instance, the Virgin Mary, Deborah, and Esther. It discovers that queens manipulate the boundaries which conventionally divide public and private spaces in relation to physical places, political concerns, and personal privacy. Their appearance in public courts suggests that they are not invisible and sometimes even dominate the court space to demonstrate their power. Interestingly, the more public and political concerns and situations they are engaged in, the more private and personal feelings they show. They not only endeavour to constitute their own network, but also intercede between the Kings and their subjects with an attitude and gesture of humility and deliberate feminine vulnerability and debility. They also read the political situation correctly when they seek support in foreign courts. Critics have read Shakespeare's historical queens in terms of their roles as wives, mothers, and widows in the patriarchal system; however, this chapter presents a different perspective and analyses queens in terms of space. The following chapter will further look into the

sharp contrast of queens in private courts and on battlefields and introduce a different reading of the Queen's Two Bodies for queens consort in Shakespeare's English history plays.

Chapter Four: Queens Away from Court

IV. Queens in the Court on Their Own or in Their Own Courts

Previous discussions have introduced queens' demeanour in kings' presence; yet when kings are absent, queens need to manage their own private courts, either relying on other patriarchs or governing state businesses alone. Shakespeare's dramatisations provide us with examples of how queens interact with the English and foreign courts and protect themselves when their kings are away and when the foundation of their queenship is being undermined. This section will analyse two queens in the court on their own and one queen in her own court: Queen Isabel's interaction with Richard II's courtiers and gardeners; Queen Elizabeth Woodville's defence of the future royal heir in *Henry VI, Part Three*; and Queen Katherine of Aragon's reception of Cardinal Wolsey in her private court.

1. Isabel in *Richard II*: the Development of Queenship in Spaces

Queen Isabel in *Richard II* has long been deemed an insignificant character. This thesis argues that Shakespeare dramatises the development of her queenship in four stages in different spaces through the play: first, her accompanying Richard II to visit the Duke of Gloucester; second, her presence in the English court in the King's absence for Irish wars; third, her interests in politics and interaction with gardeners in a garden; fourth, her farewell to Richard II on the street and the mission of being the King's commissioned historian. This section discusses the first three steps of the development of Isabel's queenship to see that the farther she is from the English court, the more she participates in its politics.

Accompanying Kingship

The first appearance of Queen Isabel in *Richard II* happens in Act II, Scene i, when she accompanies the King to visit their sick uncle and former Protector, John of Gaunt, the Duke of Lancaster. Queens' companionship is important to demonstrate royal authority, as Stafford argues: '[i]n a society that relied on outward marks of distinction, the queen's provision for the royal appearance provided for the charisma of royalty itself'.[57] The appearance of the queen is itself a spectacle. However, queens' attendance and their appearances on stage are often adjusted according to required dramatic effects;

---

[57] Stafford, *Queens, Concubines and Dowagers*, p. 107.

these scenes are most likely to be deleted in performances. Queen Isabel has only one line in this scene; therefore, she can appear on stage without any words spoken or completely disappears from the stage; it depends on the director's interpretation. Despite the above possibilities, the line that Shakespeare writes for Queen Isabel in this scene subtly indicates different attitudes of the King and Queen toward the ailing Duke:

> QUEEN   How fares our noble uncle Lancaster?
> KING RICHARD   What comfort, man? How is't with aged Gaunt?
>
> (*Richard II* 2.1.71-72)

The Queen addresses the Duke according to his family and royal titles, showing her respect to him and her court etiquette as a queen. In contrast, the King first calls him 'man' and then his name, 'Gaunt', imprudently showing no respect to his former protector and guardian. Queen Isabel makes a friendly gesture to the Duke before the King disrespects him; her greetings implicitly contains a message bridging the gap between the nephew and uncle, between the King and his subject. Notwithstanding, the Queen's words and actions do not effectively mitigate the conflicts between Richard II and the Duke of Lancaster. It is close to what Oakley-Brown and Wilkinson state: 'queens consort added to the visual grandeur, opulence and spectacle of court art and style through their dress, manners, cultural pursuits and religious interests. Their presence as a royal wife at their husband's court and their participation in court ceremonial enhanced the royal dignity'.[58] Isabel's accompanying Richard II contributes to the ceremony of Richard's kingship, constituting part of the greatness of royalty.

Queen Isabel's Inaction

Isabel is often dramatised as a part of the static royal spectacle, rather than as a queen of action engaging herself actively in politics. In Act II, Scene ii of *Richard II*, the King departs to Ireland to suppress rebellions and leaves his court to the charge of another uncle, the Duke of York, and his favourite courtiers. Queen Isabel worries about Richard II and inquires of Bushy, a favourite of Richard's, as to the situation. She expresses how she had put on a 'cheerful disposition' to please and encourage the King,

---

[58] Oakley-Brown and Williams, eds., *Rituals and Rhetoric of Queenship*. See the 'Introduction', pp. 12-13.

but after the King departed, she has been possessed by an unknown grief (*RII* 2.2.4-5).
McMillin notices that Bushy advises the Queen that 'seeing through tears is a false way
of seeing', while the Queen ignores his words.[59] This mysterious sorrow makes her
incapable of anything, but 'be sad' (*RII* 2.2.30). When Green, another favourite of
Richard's, rushes in to report Bolingbroke's rebellion, the Queen is petrified:

> QUEEN Who shall hinder me?
>> I will despair, and be at enmity
>>
>> With cozening hope. He [Hope] is a flatterer,
>>
>> A parasite, a keeper-back of death,
>>
>> Who [Death] gently would dissolve the bonds of life,
>>
>> Which false hope lingers in extremity.
>
> (*Richard II* 2.2.67-72)

Except for giving a short speech about 'hope' and its consequent disappointment, the
Queen is unable to take any action, echoing Richard II's inaction when he listened to
Bolingbroke's appeal concerning his inheritance at the beginning of the play. Queen
Isabel relies on other patriarchs to dissolve the crises in Richard II's court. After the
Duke of York arrives, the Queen has no more lines in this scene. Queen Isabel's silence
and inability to manage the court make her like a common woman, who takes care of
her household but stays away from public politics. However, queens are allowed,
entitled, and even expected to take exceptional actions. McMillin argues that the
portrayal of Queen Isabel suggests an important theme in *Richard II*: grief, tears,
namelessness, and nothingness. Isabel's grief seems to be unreasonable on the surface,
but the unsaid and unnameable worries implies her instinct in politics, corresponding to
Green's report of Richard II's dangerous situation. Her tears and grief are later applied
by Richard II in his deposition scene; although the Queen is not present, her words is
everywhere.[60] Shakespeare's dramatisation of a fragile Queen Isabel emphasises the
inability of Richard II's court, foiling the King's image as a king of words and the
performativity of his kingship. Isabel's tears and grief reveals her private self, which is

---

[59] Scott McMillin, 'Shakespeare's *Richard II*: Eyes of Sorrow, Eyes of Desire', *Shakespeare Quarterly*
35, 40-52 (p. 41). For the literature of complaint and lamentation, see John Kerrigan, ed., *Motives of Woe:
Shakespeare and 'Female Complaint', A Critical Anthology* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002).
[60] McMillin, 'Shakespeare's *Richard II*', pp. 42-44.

normally inappropriate for queens and kings, but according to McMillin's reading, Isabel's grief and tears become more and more influential to the reflection of Richard II's poetics and his kingship in later scenes as the King 'gradually discovers that the experience of loss is more interesting to him than the experience of command'.[61] Through using tears, Richard II's theatre becomes 'a place of political control' and he is able to manipulate his actor-like 'feelings for timing and gesture' to affect his audience in the court and early modern spectators in the deposition and farewell scenes.[62]

Queen Isabel in a Garden

Findlay explores the nature and function of a garden in terms of early modern English women's life and what female playwrights have written about it. She argues that a garden provides ambiguity. In its architectural nature, it is an extension of a building or might be included in the original design. It can be used for entertainment or as a tool to educate women how to behave themselves by showing them the difference between nature and 'cultural constraints'.[63] However, Findlay also argues that a garden, unlike other architectural structures, is not designed to be owned or used mainly by men. In its symbolic nature, a garden is often regarded a feminine space. In early modern literature, it may be used as a metaphor or euphemism for the female pudendum ('a lady's garden'). Virgin Mary's image is often associated with a garden in the light of biblical metaphors and to the image of Mother Nature in pagan culture, as Findlay summarises: 'It is an idealised feminine terrain (the sensual bride of the Song of Songs and the purity of the Virgin Mary), identified with theatre and with a journey into the unknown'.[64] The ambiguity of a garden provides women with an opportunity to blur the division of the public/private, liberty/limitation, regular/irregular, and legitimate/illegitimate. The voices and behaviours that women can enact are flexible.

A garden is a symbol of femininity, but in Shakespeare's history plays it is also a metaphor for government. In Act III, Scene iv, Queen Isabel appears in a garden with her ladies-in-waiting; they first eavesdrop and then discuss with the gardeners about the political situation. The playwright strategically embedded the issue of gender and space in a short garden scene. The Queen demonstrates her support of Richard II's kingship on

---

[61] Ibid., p. 43.
[62] Ibid., pp. 43 and 52.
[63] Findlay, *Playing Spaces*, p. 71.
[64] Ibid., p. 66.

the verge of his deposition through her defensive conversation with the gardeners, entering the third stage of the development of her queenship.

At the beginning of this scene, Queen Isabel asks her ladies what sport they should play to entertain themselves. The queen rejects general activities for court ladies, such as lawn bowling, dance, telling tales, and singing; eventually she decides to weep – to express her emotions – because weeping might please her. As in Act II, Scene ii, Queen Isabel is still obsessed with grief. However, this time her sorrow can be reasoned: it is about the King and the State. The Queen is away from the court, but this does not mean she is distant from her concern for the King and relevant court businesses. When two gardeners come on the stage, the Queen immediately proposes to eavesdrop on their conversation to learn more about people's opinions about the state. In *Richard II*, two gardeners talk about the deposition of Richard II; that is, they discuss national politics in the garden – in private; yet the garden is an open space, accessible to people of different hierarchies. Thereby, Queen Isabel, her gentlewoman, and the two gardeners may appear in the garden at the same time to talk about King Richard's deposition, all of which indicate that the space of the garden makes boundaries of class and gender ambiguous.

Shakespeare's Appropriation of History

Shakespeare makes Richard II's two historical queens into one single queen, creating a dramatic parallel between Richard II and Queen Isabel and a contrast between his court and that of Bolingbroke. Historically, Isabella of Valois (1389-1409) was the second consort of Richard II. When Richard II married her in 1394, she was only five years old, and when Richard was deposed in 1399, she was ten. Richard died in 1400, leaving her an eleven-year-old widow. It would be difficult to associate the historical Isabella with Shakespeare's Isabel, who makes a philosophical speech about hope and grief as quoted above. Shakespeare's Isabel is a combination of Richard II's two queens, Queen Anne of Bohemia (1366-1394) and Isabella. Richard II (1367-1400) succeeded to the English throne in 1377 and married Anne of Bohemia in 1381. There are few records of Anne of Bohemia; however she was known as an 'intercessor' in Richard II's court, bridging the King and his subjects. According to the *ODNB*, '[it] was conventional in the middle ages for a queen to be cast as a mediator and Anne's

appearance in the role is unsurprising'.[65] In contrast, Shakespeare in *Richard II* stages a queen with only verbal actions, similar to her husband, King Richard. Queen Isabel's queenship remains at a ceremonial level and without real actions, whether Richard II is present or not. Ironically at the same time, Richard II's military action in Ireland, a deed and an attempt to demonstrate his authority and ability in ruling, proves to be vain, making him ultimately a king of words, a poet king.[66]

2. Elizabeth of Woodville: A Queen's Private Concerns in Public

A Pregnant Queen in Court

Compared with Queen Isabel's inability to act and weakness in King Richard II's absence, Queen Elizabeth Woodville in *Henry VI, Part Three* is more courageous and powerful. She also presents her worries about King Edward's imprisonment during the wars between the families of the Yorkists and the Lancastrians, and yet since she is now pregnant with a legitimate successor to the English crown, she defends her child and her queenship courageously. The chaotic situations during the Wars of the Roses undermine her status as the Queen of England, but she has already assumed her queenship and exhibited the strength and authority her role entails. Her pregnancy advances her authority from a queen consort to a potential queen mother. In the previous analysis in 'The Pursuit of Queenship', we have seen how Queen Woodville (Lady Elizabeth Gray at that time) defended her children of her previous marriage and fought for their inheritance rights. Now in Act IV, Scene v of *Henry VI, Part Three*, she demonstrates that she is in control of the latest news of the court and the battlefields regardless of her pregnancy.

In Act IV, Scene v, Elizabeth Woodville discusses state business with her brother, who was newly made as the Earl Rivers because of the royal marriage and familial networking. Unlike Queen Isabel's being informed about state business, Queen Elizabeth Woodville reports the news about Edward IV and the wars to the Earl, indicating her control of information and knowledge of politics. Their private conversation encompasses public affairs (the court and battlefields) and private matters

---

[65] Nigel Saul, 'Anne [Anne of Bohemia] (1366-1394)' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/555, accessed 19 Sept 2008], par. 7.
[66] Margaret Healy, *Richard II: William Shakespeare*, *Writers and Their Work* (Plymouth: Northcote House, 1998), pp. 7-15.

(her pregnancy and maternal protection of England's future ruler):

> LADY GRAY For love of Edward's offspring in my womb.
>
>   This is it that makes me bridle passion
>
>   And bear with mildness my misfortune's cross.
>
>   Ay, ay, for this I draw in many a tear
>
>   And stop the rising of blood-sucking sighs,
>
>   Lest with my sighs or tears I blast or drown
>
>   King Edward's fruit, true heir to th'English crown.
>
> <div align="right">(Henry VI, Part Three 4.5.18-24)</div>

Unlike Queen Isabel's incapability of anything but 'be[ing] sad', Queen Elizabeth Woodville does not allow herself to show any grief or depression for the sake of the protection and a quasi-antenatal training for the future king.

Queens do not normally refer to their own pregnancy in Shakespeare's English history plays. Queen Philippa's pregnancy is reported in *Edward III*, while Queen Anne Boleyn's pregnancy in *Henry VIII*, although visible during her coronation, is only implied through stage directions and the reported presence of pregnant women among the audience of the ceremony (*HVIII* 4.1.78-81). By comparison, Queen Elizabeth Woodville is an experienced mother. As previously discussed, her potential for procreation and her maternal strength might contribute to Edward IV's choice of marrying her. The Queen's tears show her helplessness, but her pregnancy makes her strong: 'I'll hence forthwith unto the sanctuary,/ To save at least the heir of Edward's right' (*3HVI* 4.5.31-32). In this scene, a sister's conversation with her brother concerning family matters becomes a queen's discussion with a courtier about national security in the court, while a mother's protection of her future child is elevated to a queen's defence of the prospective successor of the throne. Stafford argues that in the absence of her husband, a queen would still endeavour to secure her procreation of royal heirs not only to maintain the royal inheritance, but also to have 'an eye to her own future': if the son is 'minor' and 'female regency acceptable', she would have the chance to 'rule for him'. Even if the son is 'full of age', she could still have influence on his court 'as long as the mother proved useful or until a wife supplanted her in the

functions of a queen at court'.[67] Succession is an arena of power, and a queen's pregnant body is not only a conveyor of the succession, but also a carrier of power itself. This would explain why in Edward IV's absence and the crisis of losing her crown upon the King's imprisonment, Queen Elizabeth Woodville demonstrates a strong queenship.

3. Katherine of Aragon: Publicising her Private Queenship

In *Just Anger*, Gwynne Kennedy perceives the 'decline of a humoural theory of personality that depicts emotions as basically fungible' in contrast to the 'growing acceptance of a view of emotions as private property'.[68] According to Kennedy's argument, the possession of emotion is personal and private, and thus the expression of emotion is a personal choice, rather than a disorder of physical functions. This may explain the possibility for queens in Shakespeare's history plays of manipulating the release and even display of their emotions. Kennedy also suggests that justified anger is ire vented in the right way, at the right time, and with the right people.[69] Therefore, queens might be able to choose the timing, occasion, and method to express their emotion and subsequently empower themselves through such display. In Act III, Scene i of *Henry VIII*, Katherine of Aragon defines the space exclusive to women and under the authority of her queenship. At the beginning of this scene, Katherine requests music to comfort her agony and bring harmony, and yet the visit of the cardinals breaks the peace. When they enter Katherine's private court, the Queen is at her needlework with her gentlewomen, displaying wifehood in her domestic duties.[70] Stafford argues that 'these domestic duties have customarily been the sphere of women' and a queen's endeavour in this aspect indicates her care for the household, the royal finery, and aristocratic networking as their works are deemed to be 'truly royal gifts at a time when the giving and receiving of gifts mattered'.[71] Katherine's needlework on the one hand gives signs to the cardinals that they have intruded into a sphere dominated by the Queen and her ladies, and on the other hand, it reveals the Queen's practice of her wifely duties and sincere care for the King. Although Katherine's queenship is denied in Henry VIII's court, she maintains her image as the King's spouse; therefore, even though she could not display her queenship in public, she still enacts its dignity in her

---

[67] Stafford, *Queens, Concubines and Dowagers*, p. 152.
[68] Kennedy, *Just Anger*, p. 3.
[69] Ibid., p. 8.
[70] Kelso, *Doctrine*, p. 46 and Micheli, '"Sit by Us": Visual Imagery', pp. 460-461.
[71] Stafford, *Queens, Concubines and Dowagers*, p. 107.

private court.

In arguing with the cardinals, Katherine recasts the idea of obedience and appropriates her wifely image to defend her virtues and queenly authority against Cardinal Wolsey's and Campeius's slandering her queenship in her private court. Wolsey first asks the Queen to 'withdraw' into her 'private chamber' for a 'private' talk (*HVIII* 3.1.27-28). Katherine refuses and replies:

> QUEEN KATHERINE Speak it here.
>> There's nothing I have done yet, o' my conscience,
>> Deserves a corner. [...]. – if my actions
>> Were tried by ev'ry tongue, ev'ry eye saw 'em,
>> Envy and base opinion set against 'em,
>> I know my life so even. If your business
>> Seek me out and that way I am wife in,
>> Out with it boldly. Truth loves open dealing.
>
> (*Henry VIII* 3.1.29-39)

Katherine intends to publicise their conversation as she is true to her conscience and can be examined without any concealment. Furthermore, she believes that the 'open dealing' is the way to defend her chastity and reveal truth. Again in *Henry VIII*, Katherine controls the space: she chooses her private court, which is a familiar environment for her and is accessible to her servants and ladies-in-waiting, who can all be the witnesses of any injustice against her.

Katherine intends to make the whole conversation accessible and understandable to the public and leave it to their judgement, as she knows that her witnesses would be the best disseminators and defenders of her queenship. Therefore, she further hinders Wolsey from speaking Latin:

> QUEEN KATHERINE O, good my lord, no Latin.
>> I am not such a truant since my coming
>> As not to know the language I have lived in.
>> A strange tongue makes my cause more strange suspicious –
>> Pray, speak in English. Here are some will thank you,

> If you speak truth, for their poor mistress' sake.
>
> (*Henry VIII* 3.1.41-46)

Katherine again validates her queenship by stressing the space of time she has spent in England and by emphasising her effort of adapting herself to England, especially her fluency in the English tongue. Her identity with the English language, rather than Latin, proves her worthy English queenship. Interestingly, because Katherine knows that she is not favoured in Henry VIII's court, she seeks religious and juridical advice from the Pope's court. Yet at the same time, she endeavours to secure the support from the English people to defend her queenship. She attempts to prove the legitimacy and authority of her queenship by seeking internal recognitions from her court and external endorsement from foreign religious authorities.

In addition, Katherine displays her humility and feminine inferiority to strengthen her appeal and to acquire people's sympathy for her:

> QUEEN KATHERINE [...], I fear – with my weak wit,
>
> And to such men of gravity and learning,
>
> In truth I know not. I was set at work
>
> Among my maids, full little – God knows – looking
>
> Either for such men or such business.
>
> [...]
>
> Alas, I am a woman friendless, hopeless
>
> (*Henry VIII* 3.1.71-79)

At first appearance, it is like Micheli states, '[e]ven if these lines are spoken with irony, Katherine does yield' and 'accepts the inevitability of what Henry and his law have decreed'.[72] However, the queenly pride Katherine still holds to in her deathbed scene informs us that Micheli's reading of Katherine's submission is not precise. In this scene, unlike the fluency of her rhetoric in the divorce trial in Act II, Scene iv, Katherine speaks in a tone of uncertainty, denial, and seeming innocence in order to show her inability to argue against Cardinal Wolsey, performing her vulnerability and helplessness in her own court.

---

[72] Micheli, '"Sit by Us": Visual Imagery', p. 461.

After displaying her sorrow and weakness, Katherine implements another rhetorical strategy: revealing her anger, accusing Wolsey's false counsels to Henry VIII, and exposing the discord and rivalry between her and the Cardinal. Previously in the divorce court, Katherine maintained her queenly dignity and undermined the court's authority by rejecting its summons, and thereby, she did not have the chance to narrate her suspicion of Wolsey's intervention in the King's marriage issues or release her emotions fully. Since she now has the audience in her own court, she expresses her anger at the humiliation, mistreatment, ignorance, and erasure of the virtues and histories of her being the Queen of England. When she stresses her identity as a poor woman, she identifies herself with other common women regarding their inferiority under patriarchal authorities. When she reiterates her status as a dutiful and obedient wife, she appeals to other English wives, who might empathise with her anger and fear that a twenty-year long marriage might easily be annulled. Cardinal Wolsey and Cardinal Campeius can neither persuade Katherine to subjugate herself to the King's will nor to exonerate themselves from the Queen's accusation. Katherine successfully defends her authority in her private court by exploiting her identities as a woman, a wife, and a queen.

Conclusion

In these cases, it seems that in the absence of their kings, Queen Isabel and Queen Elizabeth Woodville do not engage themselves actively in state business. Isabel's innocence of the happenings in the English court and on battlefields juxtaposes with Elizabeth's knowledge of the state business and her determination to protect the future heir to the English throne. Nevertheless, Katherine of Aragon in *Henry VIII* strives to preserve and demonstrate her queenship even in doing a housewife's work in her own court, emphasising her role as the wife and mistress of the royal household. Shakespeare's different dramatisations of these three queens correspond to his depictions of their royal spouses – Richard II's inaction, Edward IV's ambition, and Henry VIII's management of his marriage and household issues; all of whose 'domestic travails' are the focus and drive of state affairs. Moreover, these queens, who might not have much space in historical chronicles, are granted subtle characterisations and powerful dramatic effects in Shakespeare's English history plays.

V. Queens on Battlefields

Royal spectacles, English courts, Parliament, and foreign courts are all places that were generally inaccessible to women in early modern England. Yet Shakespeare portrays his queens of English histories in these spaces. He even dramatises queens on battlefields, the space that was deemed to be purely masculine. There are three warrior queens in Shakespeare's English history plays: Queen Eleanor in *King John*, Queen Philippa in *Edward III*, and Queen Margaret in *Henry VI*. Among these three, only Margaret's action is actually staged, and the other two are mainly reported. This section will briefly analyse Queen Eleanor's self-identification as a soldier and investigate the military images of Margaret of Anjou in *Part Two* and *Three of Henry VI* and Philippa in *Edward III*.

1. 'I am a soldier': Eleanor in *King John*

In *King John*, Queen Eleanor is portrayed as a matriarch in the King's court. At the beginning of the play, she confirms the Bastard to be a son of Coeur-de-lion, and immediately recruits him to the Plantagenet family for the war against France, resolving this legitimacy dispute: 'Wilt thou forsake thy fortune,/ Bequeath thy land to him, and follow me?/ *I am a soldier* and now bound to France' (*KJ* 1.1.148-150, emphasis added). She is more determinative in judging the Bastard's identity and in preparing wars to France than King John, as Carol Banks states, 'Eleanor is an advocate for military courage' and represents those 'brave English women' who are 'taking matters into their own hands'.[73] It is obvious that she is more experienced and capable of managing state affairs than her son, especially when his legitimacy as the English King is still in crisis.

Using Stafford's statement about a queen mother's chance of intervening in politics, we understand that Queen Eleanor plays an important role in King John's court.[74] She and Lady Constance both defend their sons' rights to the English throne, though unskilfully, by stigmatising each other's chastity and their sons' legitimacy. Queen Eleanor's significance to King John can be further seen in Act IV, Scene ii. When King John is informed that a French military expedition is approaching, he asks, 'O, where hath our intelligence been drunk?/ Where hath it slept? Where is my mother's ear,/ That

---

[73] Banks, 'Warlike Women', p. 175.
[74] Stafford, *Queens, Concubines and Dowagers*, p. 113.

such an army could be drawn in France,/ And she not hear of it?' (*KJ* 4.2.116-118). It is obvious that King John relies greatly on Queen Eleanor to watch his back and take care of the military intelligence. He is surprised that his mother has not noticed the French invasion. The messenger explains why:

> MESSENGER   My liege, her ear
>
> Is stopped with dust. The first of April died
>
> Your noble mother. And as I hear, my lord,
>
> The Lady Constance in a frenzy died
>
> Three days before; [...].
>
> (*King John* 4.2.119-123)

Like Margaret of Anjou, the deaths of Queen Eleanor and Lady Constance seem to be insignificantly reported. Queen Eleanor was momentous to King John's government; however, the swiftness and multitude of happenings on battlefields do not allow King John to grieve for his mother's death. Even so, he expresses his unwillingness to believe that she is dead, twice lamenting her death during the wars: 'What, Mother dead?/ How wildly then walks my estate in France!' and 'My mother dead!' (*KJ* 4.2.127-128 and 182). Through these short depictions, Shakespeare portrays Queen Eleanor as an able soldier, a reliable expert in military affairs, an important advisor, and even a Queen Regent, for King John.

2. Assuming Regency: Margaret of Anjou in *Henry VI, Part Three*

The Change of Margaret's Images

Unlike Eleanor, Margaret's military actions are staged in Shakespeare's English history plays. In the first two parts of the *Henry VI* trilogy, she first presented herself as an attractive and clever French lady, who grasped the chance to become Queen of England. When she arrived in England, she quickly accustomed herself to the political culture in Henry VI's court, constructing her own power network under the King's ineffective rule. Her pursuit and practice of queenship in the previous two stages still maintained an image of her as a woman obedient to patriarchal authority, at least in exterior matters: she inquired about her father's consent to marry Henry VI, and attempted to influence Henry VI with a recognition of his kingship. However, after the

banishment and death of the Duke of Suffolk, Margaret's main supporter, she starts to assume Henry VI's authority, acknowledging that Henry VI's kingship and her queenship are endangered under the Duke of York's claim to the English throne.

Margaret of Anjou's Improvised Transgression of Henry VI's authority

In Act V, Scene i of *Henry VI, Part Two*, Margaret has recovered from the loss of the Duke of Suffolk (*2HVI* 4.4), and the Jack Cade riot has just been resolved. In Henry VI's court, Margaret no longer awaits the King's decision, but directly summons nobles to inquire of state business. Although the nobles still show their courtesy to Henry VI as their king, his royal authority becomes relatively superficial, leaving Margaret more space to govern his country. When military engagements start in Act V, Scene iv, Margaret publicly and clearly displays her disappointment and impatience at Henry VI's sluggishness (*2HVI* 5.4.3-12); the King is 'recognised as a failure to both [his] wife and the warring nation'.[75]

Henry VI's inaction stimulates Margaret to transgress upon her husband's kingly authority in *Henry VI, Part Three*.[76] If Margaret designed her previous political intervention in the English court in advance, her subversive transgression is improvised out of necessity on battlefields; as Patricia-Anne Lee argues, if Henry VI had been 'strong and dominating' or 'capable of effective rule', Margaret 'might well have become a conventional wife' both in history and in the play.[77] In the final part of the *Henry VI* trilogy, Shakespeare presents a Margaret of Anjou on battlefields with a transformation of her queenship. The following passages will analyse how Margaret, after disappointment, detestation, and humiliation on account of Henry VI's weak kingship, assumes regency spontaneously, abuses her royal authority, and eventually incurs debasement of her queenship.

'I here divorce myself': Margaret's 'Manliness' and Henry VI's 'Womanliness'

At the beginning of Act I, Scene i of *Henry VI, Part Three*, the King surrenders his son's inheritance to the Duke of York, disinheriting the Lancastrian family. To protect their son's inheritance, Margaret vents her anger and blatantly expresses her disappointment at the King in front of him and his court. She regrets her marriage with

---

[75] Banks, 'Warlike Women', p. 174.
[76] Ibid., pp. 174-175.
[77] Lee, 'Reflections of Power', p. 187.

Henry VI and blames him for his failure of being a husband and father (*3HVI*
1.1.216-226). When Henry VI explains that he has no choice but to forfeit Prince
Edward's inheritance, Margaret scolds him and feels ashamed of him for failing his
kingship ('Enforced thee? Art thou king, and wilt be forced?/ I shame to hear thee
speak!' *3HVI* 1.1.231-232). She analyses the situation practically and points out Henry
VI's naivety and credulousness when all the strong nobles ambitiously crave the crown
(*3HVI* 1.1.239-243). Margaret belittles Henry VI's cowardice, which makes him less
than 'a seely woman' (*3HVI* 1.1.244-246). Therefore, she determines not to rely on her
husband:

> QUEEN MARGARET And seeing thou dost, *I here divorce myself*
> > Both from thy table, Henry, and thy bed,
> > Until that act of Parliament be repealed
> > Whereby my son is disinherited.
> > > (*Henry VI, Part Three* 1.1.248-251, emphasis added)

Margaret 'divorces' herself from Henry VI since he no longer plays the role of a
husband, father, and a king appropriately, but she does not divorce herself from
queenship. She has already prepared strategies against the Duke of York's ambition and
she will defend her son's right to the English throne independently. Margaret, along
with Prince Edward, leaves Henry VI, who in return, feels pessimistic about her future,
indulges himself in the sorrow of losing supporters, and decides to 'write unto them and
entreat them fair' (*3HVI* 1.1.265-273). Margaret of Anjou divorces Henry VI, but not
her queenship; however, she forgets that her queenship is based on Henry VI's kingship.
Therefore, her undermining of Henry VI and assuming his authority lead to the ruin of
her own queenship.

Margaret's action is immediately reported in the following scene. A messenger
conveys the information to the Duke of York: '[t]he Queen, with all the northern earls
and lords,/ Intend here to besiege you in your castle./ She is hard by with twenty
thousand men,/ And therefore fortify your hold' (*3HVI* 1.2.49-52). Margaret's military
action is swift and the possessive modifier in 'the army of the queen', rather than 'the
army of Henry VI', is repeated here and in the following scenes, indicating Margaret's
leadership. Henry VI's inaction enforces her to claim and establish her autonomy;

however, once she divorces her cause from Henry VI's kingship completely and loses the attitude that a queen should have, she undermines and deviates from her own queenship. According to Lee, '[t]o examine this process by which a Lancastrian queen became the archetypal villainess of Shakespeare's drama is to trace the development of an icon of feminine power'.[78] However, reading Margaret's self-empowerment as excessive, aggressive, or 'villainous' without investigating how the Queen accommodates different roles under different circumstance would be entrapped by patriarchal stereotype.

Transformation of Margaret's Image: from a Queen to the French She-wolf

Margaret's image as Queen of England starts to be stigmatised and changes to that of the French she-wolf because she negates Henry VI's authority and thus sabotages her own queenship rather than her being powerful. In Act I, Scene iv, the war continues and Clifford and Northumberland capture the Duke of York and ask for Margaret's further direction (*3HVI* 1.4.66-67). Margaret first censures the Duke for his ambition and transgression of authority, she then shows no sympathy for the Duke's loss of his youngest son, Rutland, but humiliates him by wiping his tears with a napkin stained with Rutland's blood (*3HVI* 1.4.80-89). As the Duke of York still maintains his temper, Margaret mocks him, '*puts a paper crown on York's head*', taunts him, and '*knocks it from his head*' (*3HVI* 1.4.90-109 SD). This mockery is dramatic and ironic. Nevertheless, Margaret loses her queenly dignity as she does not show any sympathy or respect to the Duke of York, but plays tricks on him. Humiliating the Duke of York, according to Lee, Margaret takes revenge for her lover, the Duke of Suffolk.[79] However, reading Margaret's transformation of queenship, this thesis argues that Margaret is more eager to strive for the crown of England for her son than seeking vengeance for her adulterous lover – she may use these taunts to boost the spirit of her army. Yet once she does not treat the Duke of York as a duke, he would not view her as a queen, either. Margaret's cause is just – to defend Henry VI's authority and secure her son's inheritance; however, her action demeans his authority and her queenship. The humiliation and taunting make her deviate from what a queen would be expected to be – sympathetic, merciful, obedient to patriarchs, and acting as a bridge between the King

---

[78] Ibid., p. 184.
[79] Ibid., p. 216.

and his subjects.

Thus, Margaret's English queenship is transformed in this scene: she is now a 'she-wolf of France, but worse than wolves of France,/ Whose tongue more poisons than the adder's tooth' (*3HVI* 1.4.112-113). The Duke of York retaliates against Margaret's humiliation by attacking her transgression of gender behaviour codes and her meagre family background, again condemning the marriage between Margaret and Henry VI as false and harmful to England:

> YORK How ill-beseeming is it in thy sex
>
> To triumph like an Amazonian trull
>
> Upon their woes whom fortune captivates!
>
> But that thy face is visor-like, unchanging
>
> Made impudent with use of evil deeds,
>
> I would essay, proud Queen, to make thee blush.
>
> To tell thee whence thou cam'st, of whom deprived,
>
> Were shame enough to shame thee – wert thou not shameless.
>
> Thy father bears the type of King of Naples,
>
> Of both the Sicils, and Jerusalem –
>
> Yet not so wealthy as an English yeoman.
>
> (*Henry VI, Part Three* 1.4.114-125)

In this statement, the Duke of York no longer addresses Margaret as Queen of England, but calls her a 'she-wolf' and Amazonian whore. He further reminds Margaret of her low birth, which demeans her queenship, and arraigns Margaret for her ambition and her disqualification to be a woman: ''Tis beauty that doth oft make women proud –/ But, God he knows, thy share thereof is small'; 'O *tiger's heart wrapped in a woman's hide!*'; 'Women are soft, mild, pitiful, and flexible –/ Thou are stern, obdurate, flinty, rough, remorseless' (*3HVI* 1.4.129-130, 138, 142-143, emphasis added). The final modifiers, if attributed to a male ruler, would make a strong king. However, Margaret is accused because she does not conform to the conventional gendered behaviour codes and is more like a man than a woman. As Carol Chillington Rutter observes, 'Margaret expose[s] the hypocrisy of men making unnatural to women the violence they themselves ha[ve] naturalised to England' and interrogates the 'female stereotyping'

anticipated by the patriarchal society.[80] Before the end of this scene, Margaret joins Clifford to stab York, performing an action of killing as a soldier, rather than as a queen on stage. York's words influence the fashioning of Margaret's image not only in the later episodes of the play, but also in literature of later periods.

'The queen hath best success when you are absent': Margaret's Independence

Margaret's assumption of regency is further recognised by her English subjects; people trust and rely on her more than on Henry VI. In Act II, Scene ii of *Henry VI, Part Three*, Queen Margaret, Prince Edward and the King meet again in the town of York. Margaret reminds the King of the coming warfare and his promise of the elevation of Prince Edward, trying to secure her son's titles and rights (*3HVI* 2.2.56-57). When the messenger reports the Yorkists are coming, Clifford asks the King to leave the battlefields because 'the queen hath best success when you [Henry VI] are absent', indicating that Henry VI's uselessness is well recognised and Queen Margaret is the one upon whom they depend. In the meeting of the Yorkist and the Lancastrian on stage, Henry VI attempts to speak, but is constantly ignored (*3HVI* 2.2.117, 119-120). His kingship is ignored, too. Later, Edward, the new Duke of York, follows his father's route and slanders Margaret. He lists her weak royal nativity, small dowry, and her prior fornication with the Duke of Suffolk, debasing the value of her queenship from its origin and practice (*3HVI* 2.2.144-162). Hearing these accusations, Henry VI is unable to provide any protection for Margaret's queenship as he could not persuade the English court to accept his decision on marrying Margaret at the beginning of *Henry VI, Part Two*.

Henry VI's Imagination of Margaret and the 'Real' Margaret

Instead of further staging Margaret's military actions, Shakespeare dramatises what Henry VI experiences during the wars (*3HVI* 2.5 and 3.1). Henry VI perceives the development of the war between the royal families more like an observer than a king. In Act III, Scene i, he narrates that Margaret and Prince Edward go to France for aid, while Warwick might override their pursuit by a more appealing proposal of uniting the force of the French King and King Edward IV (the new Duke of York) (*3HVI* 3.1.28-34). Nevertheless, he comments on and praises Margaret's rhetoric:

───────────────

[80] Rutter, 'Of Tygers' Hearts', pp.188-189.

> KING HENRY For Warwick is a subtle orator,
>
>> And Louis a prince soon won with moving words.
>>
>> By this account, then, Margaret may win him –
>>
>> For she's a woman to be pitied much.
>>
>> Her sighs will make a batt'ry in his breast,
>>
>> Her tears will pierce into a marble heart,
>>
>> The tiger will be mild whiles she doth mourn,
>>
>> And Nero will be tainted with remorse
>>
>> To hear and see her plaints, her brinish tears.
>>
>>> (*Henry VI, Part Three* 3.1.33-41)

Margaret's image in Henry VI's mind still remains woman-like. Henry VI imagines how Margaret will take advantage of the rhetoric of womanly weakness to present her petition, though he also considers that it would be difficult for Margaret to win France's alliance, since Warwick would provide more advantageous offers to the French King (*3HVI* 3.1.42-54).

However, contrary to what Henry VI imagines, Margaret does not weep or mourn to gain the French King Louis's sympathy and his support. As has been discussed in 'Queens Abroad in Foreign Courts', Margaret maintains her dignity as Queen of England, while displaying her humility before the French King to ask for assistance in Act III, Scene iii of *Henry VI, Part Three*. Moreover, the result of Margaret's visit to France turns out to be surprisingly beneficial for the Lancastrians, as Edward IV sabotages the alliance by marrying Lady Elizabeth Gray and loses the support of the Earl of Warwick. Obviously, Henry VI's perception about his own queen is not accurate; Margaret is far more strategic than he expected: having neither his support nor instruction, she knows well how to manipulate her authority and her fragility as a queen independently.

'We will not from the helm to sit and weep': Rehabilitation of Queenship

After Margaret's success in the French court in Act III, Scene iii, she does not make an appearance on stage until Act V, Scene iv. The scene begins with a speech by Margaret and the first two lines reveal the practicality of her political thoughts: 'Great

lords, wise men ne'er sit and wail their loss,/ But cheerly seek how to redress their harms' (*3HVI* 5.4.1-2). In *Henry VI, Part Three*, the King presents his kingship via verbal performance, such as prophecy about Richmond, the future Henry VII (*3HVI* 4.6.68-76), and his comment on his own rule (*3HVI* 4.10.6-18). Henry VI states that he has ruled with 'pity, mildness, and mercy', rather than 'ambition, oppression, or revenge', and thereby he could not understand why people would love Edward more than him (*3HVI* 4.10.9-15). Unlike Henry VI, Margaret rules with efficiency. When she returns to England in Act V, Scene iv, she counts the resources the Lancastrians still possess to evaluate the situation and encourages her men: although they lost Warwick and Montague, they still have Oxford and Somerset; although they lost half of the army on the sea, the pilot lives (*3HVI* 5.4.4-5, 13-17). She compares the whole situation to sailing and encourages her soldiers to fight: 'We will not from the helm to sit and weep,/ But keep our course, though the rough wind say no,/ From shelves and rocks that threaten us with wreck' (*3HVI* 5.4.21-23). She further appraises the situation and warns them not to fly to the Yorkists' side (*3HVI* 5.4.33-35). Finally, she concludes that 'Why, courage then – what cannot be avoided/ 'Twere childish weakness to lament or fear', implicitly criticising Henry VI's weakness and undermining his kingship (*3HVI* 5.4.37-38).

Notwithstanding the fact that she is mocked by the Yorkists as Amazonian and as 'she-wolf' by the French, Margaret's speech demonstrates her knowledge of the situation and her inspiring rhetoric, both of which make her a military queen and a defender of the Lancastrian family. Margaret could have justified her actions as a true English and Lancastrian queen, but she despises Henry VI's kingship, so that she loses her case and eventually her queenship. In Margaret's case, Shakespeare shows the importance of using the right propaganda to appropriate one's cause and actions; Margaret strategically intervenes in the politics of Henry VI's court, but she is not strategic enough to fashion her image as a 'good' English queen in early modern England. The reason Margaret is not deemed a 'good queen' can be explained thus: '[valour] and learning increase the honour of a noblewoman, but if she lacks chastity she lacks everything and cannot be called honoured'.[81] It can be understood why Katherine of Aragon (chaste and loyal) and the Countess of Salisbury (chaste, obedient, loyal, and religious) are more praised. However, Margaret is a valuable model for

---

[81] Kelso, *Doctrine*, p. 24.

queens and even women because she 'experiments with alternative access to power', presents an example of '[p]lotting [substituting] for politics, sexual coaxing for rhetorical persuasion, cattiness for authority', and demonstrates a strategic survival through manipulating her virtues in different spaces at different times; even after she loses her queenship, she empowers herself through memory.[82]

3. 'Everyday in arms': Philippa Acting Regency in *Edward III*

Queen Margaret of Anjou loses her son in wars, while Queen Philippa 'carries' a baby with her onto the battlefields. Queen Philippa, as mentioned in the previous section on 'Queens' Begging', only appears on stage in the final scene of *Edward III*, but she has already been mentioned and created an image of a powerful queen helper in previous scenes. One of the elements of her powerful image is her military actions, which conflict with her pregnancy as reported in Act IV, Scene ii. In this scene, King Edward has already reconstructed himself by prioritising the well-being of the nation rather than his personal desire, forfeiting his pursuit of the Countess of Salisbury to return to state affairs. Lord Percy reports the news about Queen Philippa:

> PERCY The queen, my lord, comes here to your grace,
> And from her highness, and the lord vicegerent,
> I bring this happy tidings of success:
> David of Scotland, lately up *in arms*,
> Thinking belike he soonest should prevail,
> Your highness being absent from the realm,
> Is, by the fruitful service of your peers
> And *painful travail of the queen herself*,
> That *big with child*, was *everyday in arms*,
> Vanquished, subdued, and taken prisoner.
>
> (*Edward III* 4.2.37-46, emphasis added)

Lord Percy supplies the King with the latest news of the state, reporting how the Scottish King David had attempted to take advantage of his absence to seize the English crown, while Queen Philippa and Edward's magistrates frustrated King David's

---

[82] Rutter, 'Of Tygers' Hearts', p. 186.

ambition and in return captured him. In this description, it is obvious how Queen Philippa acted as a regent, the (visible) centre of power in the English court, when the King was indulging himself in his lust and ignoring his obligation as a king. Queen Philippa not only intervened in the government, but also successfully subdued military attacks and preserved the kingdom.

The Question of Queen Philippa 'in arms'

In addition, the last lines of Lord Percy's report provide an intriguing image of Philippa: the Queen is 'big with child' but still 'every day in arms'. It is obvious that Queen Philippa is pregnant, but whether 'every day in arms' is descriptive or metaphorical seems ambiguous. 'In arms' often refers to wear armour for military actions. Yet, Karen Hearn, analysing portraits by Marcus Gheeraerts and Anthony van Dyck, argues that in Elizabethan portraiture, if a woman holds her arms around her belly, it might indicate that she is pregnant.[83] Therefore, Philippa's being 'in arms' might be related to her being 'big with child', and Shakespeare depicts that a pregnant queen still engages herself in managing state business and directing her husband's courtiers to counter invasions. Yet, five lines before Queen Philippa's 'in arms', Percy just mentioned that King David was 'lately up in arms', which obviously, refers to his armour for warfares. If the two 'in arms' indicates the same, Percy's description provides another image of Queen Philippa: a pregnant queen in her armour leading the English court and fighting against the Scots on battlefields. The image of a woman big with child and in specially-made armour governing England is striking. The danger of pregnancy in early modern England was well known. Many women writers composed articles before their labour as their final will and legacy for their husbands and children. Both pregnancy and fighting wars on battlefields are matters of life and death. Had Queen Philippa lost her child or given a stillborn baby, her womb would have then been the battlefield fatal to a future royal heir.

A pregnant woman should be surrounded by a group of women exclusively and reside in this feminine community in private. However, Queen Philippa not only appears in public to manage state affairs, but even takes arms to fight against the Scottish men on the battlefields. What would be more feminine than a pregnant

---

[83] Karen Hearn and Rica Jones, *Marcus Gheeraerts II: Elizabethan Artist* (London: Tate Publishing, 2002), p. 42.

woman's body and what would be more masculine than fighting wars on the battlefields? What would be more private than the female community preparing for childbirth and what would be more public than the battlefield determining the fate of a country? In *Edward III*, Shakespeare provides us with such a dramatic and contradictory example in his representation of Queen Philippa.

VI. Space in Relation to the Theory of the Queen's Two Bodies

In Shakespeare's history plays, although queens' sexualities are not explicitly discussed or dramatised, their bodies are often associated with spatial terms.[84] In *Edward III*, Queen Philippa carries her pregnant body onto the battlefields, making her womb a dangerous space where the future royal heir also fights for its life. Women's wombs had both the positive image as a place nurturing a new life and the negative one as a place endangering the new life in early modern England. In *Henry VIII*, the King narrates how Queen Katherine of Aragon's womb was fatal to male heirs of the Tudor reign in order to justify his cause for their divorce. In contrast, the Old Lady reminds Anne Boleyn that the main purpose of her queenship is to exploit her youthful and healthy body to procreate sons for the King. In *Richard III*, the Duchess of York blames her womb as an ill-omened place, which gave birth to her ambitious and wretched son, Richard of Gloucester, but brought deaths to the world: 'O ill-dispersing wind of misery!/ O my accursed womb, the bed of death!/ A cockatrice hast thou hatched to the world,/ Whose unavoided eye is murderous' (*RIII* 4.1.52-55). Furthermore, in *Richard II*, the garden scene is said to take place in a feminine space and a garden has a subtle association with women's bodies.

The 'queens' bodies as space' was related to the metaphor of the monarch's body as the kingdom and to the theory of the monarch's two bodies, especially within the heated debates about female rule in late Tudor dynasty. At the time when Shakespeare composed the English history plays, considerations about the biological aspects of a queen's female body formed an important part in the discussions of Elizabeth I's queenship – the issue of the Queen's Two Bodies, in contrast to the theory of the King's Two Bodies as discussed in the General Introduction. According to the theory of King's

---

[84] Chris Laoutaris, *Shakespearean Maternities: Crises of Conception in Early Modern England* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008), p. 15.

Two Bodies, a king's body natural will decay, but his body politic will be succeeded by the next king. The argument is originally based on a contrast between the biological and spiritual existence of kingship in order to stabilise and secure the implementation of the political mechanism of monarchy.

Shakespeare's portrayal of kingship and the King's Two Bodies can be seen in *Richard II*. In the deposition scene of Act IV, Scene i, King Richard reviews the union of a monarch and his realm and explains how kingship descends and transmits from one monarch to another: 'For I have given here my soul's consent/ T'undeck the pompous body of a king,/ Made glory base and sovereignty a slave,/ Proud majesty a subject, state a peasant.' (*RII* 4.1.239-242). He argues that once his body politic is deposed, his kingly body is no longer holy and his kingship deceases. Thus, kingship is like a lease, which is not always valid, and his one is now expired and his credit is lost: 'An if my word be sterling yet in England,/ Let it command a mirror hither straight,/ That it may show me what a face I have,/ Since it is bankrupt of his majesty' (*RII* 4.1.254-257). After the deposition, Richard II meets his wife Queen Isabel for the last time on the street, and the queen reads the difference between Richard and his kingship: 'Thou map of honour, thou King Richard's tomb,/ And not King Richard!' (*RII* 5.1..12-13). For Queen Isabel, the anointed Richard II no longer exists. Therefore, the Richard she sees now is different from the man whom she was familiar with and is but an empty shell with the King's body politic being removed. The union of the body politic and body natural is related to the union between a king and his kingdom, which is often expressed in gendered terms. Therefore, Richard II protests that the deposition, which separates him from his kingship and from his queen, is a double divorce: 'Doubly divorced! Bad men, you violate/ A twofold marriage: 'twixt my crown and me,/ And then betwixt me and my married wife' (*RII* 5.1.71-73). The engendering of a nation is often involved when kings emphasise their dominion, subjugating the realm under their authority as a husband. However, a queen regnant has to create a different gender for the nation, so that she can marry it.

Queen Elizabeth I appropriated both the concept of King's Two Bodies and the idea of a monarch's marriage with the nation; she used the former in her early reign in order to negotiate her biological identity as a woman, and implemented the latter more eagerly around the early 1590s when she determined to marry none but England. Since queens consort in Shakespeare's English histories are married to their king husbands,

the idea of the Queen's Two Bodies associates queens consort with queens regnant and allows for a different interpretation of 'queenship'. First, it is important to learn how Elizabeth I interpreted her queenship in the light of the theory of the King's Two Bodies. To justify her female reign, Elizabeth I transformed this corporeal and spiritual contrast of kingship into a gendered one in order to explain her biological difference.[85] Although her body natural is of a woman, her body politic is of a man. This interpretation of the Queen's Two Bodies conformed female rule to patriarchal thinking, and did not favour or advance the concept of female rule or women's rights. The gendered attribution of virtues was a main factor that obstructed women in history. Shakespeare's queens in his English histories are often categorised into two types: the good queens, because they are more feminine – silent, chaste, obedient, privately inhabited, and the wicked queens, because they are militant, politically active, and daring to speak, assuming male attributes and their roles. In explaining the Queen's Two Bodies for a queen regnant, Elizabeth I had no other choice but legitimising her reign in patriarchal norms, but this reading troubled queenship.

To summarise, the idea of queenship and kingship in relation to body and space can be explained thus: the King's Two Bodies are constituted first by the body politic, which is related to the public, and its spirit exhibits and represents the whole kingdom and can be inherited through kings; thereby, it would not perish. Second, the body natural is the body private of a king, which is the corporal existence and would deteriorate with the monarch's health and decease with him. The anointing ritual in the coronation is the process of making a king holy and crowning the body politic to his body natural. However, the theory of Queen's Two Bodies requires one more element: gender. The body politic in the theory indicates not only a body public, but also a body that is de-feminised and becomes masculine, while the body natural in queenship refers to the body private and the body feminine of a female ruler.

However, Shakespeare's dramatisation of queens consort has provided a different interpretation of the Queen's Two Bodies. Queens' pregnant bodies as the arena for power struggle in politics and women's bodies have become the textual space and

---

[85] See researches on Elizabeth I's androgynous rule by Levin, *'The Heart and Stomach of a King'*, on Elizabeth I's female body politic by Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies*, and on imaging England in terms of gender under Elizabeth I's rule by Jacqueline Vanhoutte's 'Queens and Country?: Female Monarchs and Feminized Nations in Elizabethan Political Pamphlets', in *Elizabeth I: Always Her Own Free Woman*, ed. by Carole Levin, Jo Eldridge Carney, and Debra Barrett-Graves (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), pp. 7-19, to name but a few.

theatre to publish women's self-experience of their bodies and to form women's communities through the process of childbearing and childbirth. Chris Laoutaris criticises the conventional comment that motherhood is limited to the private realm and is deemed dangerous to the public; he argues that maternity 'centralises women's experiences of their own bodies at the specific cultural and temporal moment in which childbirth and maternal nurture occurs'.[86] Kathryn M. Moncrief and Kathryn R. McPherson observe that 'maternity – body public and private, physically embodied and enacted – must be considered performative and that the maternal body, as a result, functions as a potent space for cultural conflict, a site of imagination and contest'.[87] In the dramatisation of queens in Shakespeare's history plays, supposedly the most private and feminine physical existence – women's (queens') pregnant bodies – can be made public and highly political to the state: as it is either reported in the case of Queen Philippa in *Edward III* or is even seen in Queen Elizabeth Woodville in *Henry VI, Part Three* and in Anne Boleyn in *Henry VIII.* The original reading of the Queen's Two Bodies in parallel to that of the King's Two Bodies is not sufficient to understand the relation between gender and space for queens consort.

Therefore, as we saw in the General Introduction, this thesis on queenship argues that the Queen's Two Bodies could be read in a cultural way, which may be appropriated to both queens regnant and consort and can advance the idea of queenship from the biological restriction of rulership. Instead of appropriating the theory from the King's Two Bodies, the cultural reading of the Queen's Two Bodies observes queenship itself independently in a belief that there is a queenship that succeeds and descends like kingships. In this version of the Queen's Two Bodies, the body natural will decay in each queen, but the body cultural will be carried on and represented through the practice of queenship. The content of this body cultural in queenship adapts itself through time according to different propaganda. Furthermore, this body cultural consists of the virtues (the capital) that are shared by queens and re-presented in the tradition of typologies, to which Shakespeare's queens also contribute.

Chapter Four examines queens independently managing court affairs without their kings' presence either in the king's court or their own private court, and further queens'

---

[86] Ibid., p. 16.
[87] Kathryn M. Moncrief and Kathryn R. McPherson, eds., *Performing Maternity in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), p. 1.

performance on battlefields as an assistant, partner, representative for the Kings. It studies the less discussed plots of Queen Isabel in *Richard II*, Elizabeth Woodville in *Henry VI, Part Three*, and Katherine in *Henry VIII*, pointing out Isabel's belated growth as a queen in comparison with Richard II, Elizabeth's consistent concern for her children and defence of her queenship, and Katherine's attempt to maintain her authority and insistence of displaying her queenship in private. Chapter Four also discovers that in the conventionally most masculine space – the battlefields – Queens Eleanor and Margaret of Anjou present themselves with a less feminine image as soldier in contrast with King John's and Henry VI's kingship, while Philippa displays an astonishing contrast of image as a military and political leader and a pregnant queen. Shakespeare's dramatisations present the exceptionality of these queens and their transgression of the gender division either in the preaching of conduct books or in general practice in early modern England. When queens are or have to be independent, they display different virtues from silence, chastity, and obedience: perseverance, courage, and political strategy in managing the court and army. The independence of queenship incurs the comparison of kingship and queenship; different from the political inheritance of the imperishable body politic in kingship, this chapter argues for a succession of the body cultural among queens.

Conclusion of Part Two: The Practice of Queenship

'The Practice of Queenship' focuses on how queens use their private attributes represented in the public sphere and manipulate their public obligations in private space in order to manipulate or overturn political discourses. Instead of discussing queens in terms of their domestic roles in marital relations – daughters, wives, mothers, and widows – 'The Practice of Queenship' examines Shakespeare's queens consort in English history plays in terms of space.

'The Practice of Queenship' has analysed the practice of queenship in two chapters. 'Queens in Courts' includes queens in public processions in relation to their roles in royal spectacles, queens in royal and judicial courts, in Parliament, and even in foreign courts, where female entrance and interference are usually restricted. 'Queens away from court' encompasses royal visits, queens in their private chambers and domestic courts, queens in gardens, and queens on battlefields. The above discussions of queens in different spaces explore the problem of the division of public and private and the

element of gender in such division. Queens' private attributes — feminine emotions, mother-son/ husband-wife affections, domestic obligations, womanly virtues (silence, chastity, obedience) — are strategically displayed and appropriated in both public and private to empower queens, achieve political purposes, and demonstrate the authorities of queenship. Finally, the discussion further investigates the discrepancy of the arguments and applications of the King's Two Bodies and the Queen's Two Bodies in relation to power, gender, and space in the texts and contexts of Shakespeare's English history plays. The body cultural in the Queen's Two Bodies argues for a cultural inheritance of queenship through shared virtues and attributes among queens, creating a specific iconographical culture to memorialise queens in literary history.

Part Three: The Residue of Queenship

This thesis has examined how female characters become queens and practise their queenship in Shakespeare's English history plays. After queens lose their royal status, their most powerful asset to assert authority is memory. These 'unqueened' queens are dramatised as eye-witnesses, monuments, historians, and icons in history writings. Shakespearean memorialisation of queens forms a culture of queenship, which is further represented and appropriated in the histories and literature of later periods.

Playing different roles in the process of memorialisation, Shakespeare's English queens manipulate remembering and forgetting in early modern English literature. The previous chapter has discussed how women's bodies are perceived and used as spaces for biological and cultural reproduction. The following chapter argues that Shakespeare again granted English queens spaces, this time, in texts – writing histories about queens and through queens. Part III, 'The Residue of Queenship', only has one chapter. This relatively short discussion reflects the fact that Shakespeare did not portray the ending of queens in detail: the deaths of Eleanor in *King John* and Margaret of Anjou in *Richard III* are briefly reported; not much is dramatised after Blanche in *King John* and Catherine in *Henry V* are crowned queen; *Henry VIII* ends with Princess Elizabeth I's christening with implications for James I's succession, skipping Henry VIII's following four queens, and the reigns of Edward VI and Mary I. Chapter Five, 'Queens and Memorialisation', explores how Shakespeare's queens manipulate memories in the process of history writing: in other words, how they configure, present, appropriate, and preserve memories to access and maintain their queenship even after they are deposed, divorced, or widowed. In this early modern literary context, Shakespeare's depiction of queens reflects the contemporary values and virtues of queens regnant and consort in early modern England and sheds light on the depictions of queens in literary and historical practices of later periods.

Introduction

Unqueened queens in Shakespeare's English history plays either inscribe alternative histories on monuments to the general histories written by male chroniclers, or serve as monuments disseminating narratives that are marginalised or deliberately forgotten. The

engraving, erasing, or presenting of memories on monuments can be conceptualised through a metaphor of wax tablets common in the medieval period. The 'traffic of memories' dramatised in the plays can be explained by a twentieth-century psycho-social theory of the accessibility of information. Carruthers explains that 'every sort of sense perception ends up in the form of a phantasm' (Latin *simulacrum* or *imago*, a mental picture), and is stored in *memoria*, like wax tablets with inscriptions stocked in the warehouse of human brains.[1] Harald Weinrich describes the 'bottom' of the warehouse as 'a hole in memory', which, with all the memories stocked like various goods in the warehouse, is difficult to find – a mechanism of 'forgetting'. This metaphor implies that forgetting is the unfathomable and the unrecoverable in memory.[2] External visual, auditory, olfactory, gustatory, and tactile senses are metamorphosed into *images* to be amassed in human minds. In that light, effective retrievals of that visual information (memories) constitute the act of remembering, whilst failures in accessing it amount to forgetting. Edward S. Casey also states that,

> What counts in recollective remembering is accessibility. While forgetting is compatible with continuing availability or retention – as in the case of repressed memories, which are fully consolidated but out of reach – it is indistinguishable in practice from inaccessibility. To be inaccessible is to be forgotten, at least for the moment; and to forget is to render inaccessible – again, at least for the time being.[3]

According to Casey, the accessibility of memory is crucial to the distinction between remembering and forgetting. To understand how memory, oblivion, and recollection function, we may conceptualise them via the metaphor of wax tablets. Wax tablets were one of the ancient tools to record events; in addition, they were used as a metaphor for memory. Just as writing on wax tablets was easily erased, the writing of history could also be erased and rewritten. In terms of memory, to remember can be understood as the fetching of the wax tablets stored in *memoria* without much interference, whereas to

---

[1] Carruthers, *The Book of* Memory, pp. 18-19.
[2] Harald Weinrich, *Lethe: The Act and Critique of Forgetting*, trans. Steven Rendall (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997 and 2004), p. 4
[3] Edward S. Casey, 'Forgetting Remembered', *Man and World: An International Philosophical Review* 25 (1992), 281-311 (p. 289).

forget is to lose the accessibility to or to be unable to retrieve the tablets.[4] As Carruthers remarks, this combined reading of memory through the medieval conceptualisation of wax tablets and the twentieth-century cognitive theorisation of information accessibility has been rehabilitated recently.[5] It has started to be employed in Shakespearean studies, as the visualisation and objectification of memory and its transmission/traffic are often dramatised in Shakespeare's plays, especially his English histories. In this thesis, the transformation of sensory experiences into visual-pictorial or verbal information, the transmission of such information between people, and the storage and retrieval of the information are the keys to exploring the relation between queens and memorialisation in Shakespeare's English history plays.

The intensity and strength of memory depend on the number of different sensory data that are involved in producing the particular piece of memory: the more senses are involved, the easier it is to remember, as there are more clues for finding the correct wax tablet, which in turn contains a better variety of mental pictures from different sources. For instance, in Shakespeare's history plays, Margaret of Anjou is depicted as unable to forget how her husband, Henry VI, was slaughtered. Taking into account the sensory experiences she gathered on battlefields – the drumming, people screaming, the smells and colours of blood, the feeling of being wounded –her obsession with that particular piece of memory and the power it holds over her are not difficult to understand. Her memory is so sharp and strong that even after losing her title as a queen, she can use it as a weapon to fight like a soldier in the English court.[6] To release the *imago* in her *memoria*, Margaret uses oral narratives as a medium for accessing and displaying the wax tablet she carries. In addition to oral narratives, the inventions of writing and printing changed the way that memory was preserved and disseminated. Writing was at first a mnemonic tool that assisted people in keeping records of their memory, but its invention proved to have influenced oral tradition significantly. It allowed the rhetorical art of memory to forego meters and rhymes and in so doing increased the importance of prose culture.[7]

With the invention of printing, human *memoria*'s function as a storage place for memory diminished, and oral narratives and manuscripts were no longer the only ways

---

[4] For the theory of interference and forgetting, see ibid., pp. 288-290.
[5] Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, p. 19.
[6] Banks, 'Warlike Women', p. 177.
[7] Weinrich, *Lethe*, p. 73.

to disseminate knowledge. With the increasing use of printing, education was no longer the prerogative of a small group of aristocratic or religious males; women could benefit from printing, through which they could access the memories – wisdom and knowledge – in texts. Women also made use of written and printed documents to assist their memories and fortify their contribution to the formation of histories. In *Henry VIII*, Queen Katherine of Aragon pleads with the King to remember the validity of their marriage by re-invoking the international communication between their fathers and a dispensation from the Pope in 1509 to substantiate the testimony of her memory in the divorce dispute.

In early modern England theatre was a new and powerful medium for the production and reproduction of memory, and traffic in it. In his *Apology for Actors* (1612), Thomas Heywood includes the following defences of theatre:

> Thirdly, playes haue made the ignorant more apprehensiue, taught the vnlearned the knowledge of many famous histories, instructed such as cannot read in the discovery of all our *English* Chronicles [...] Playes are writ with this ayme, and carryed with this methode, to teach the subiects obedience to their King, to shew the people the vntimely ends of such as haue moued tumults, commotions, and insurrections, to present them with the flourishing estate of such as liue in obedience, exhorting them to allegeance, dehorting them from all trayterous and fellonious stratagems.[8]

In arguing against anti-theatrical polemics concerning the value of theatre, Heywood reasoned that theatre might preserve and re-present memory to educate the public. Theatre with its dramaturgy can transform printed or written histories and recreate them into lively sound and image that either refresh people's memory or educate them and create new memories. Theatre could use what Peter Burke defines as the five different media for the social organisation of transmitting memory: 1) oral tradition; 2) written records (such as memoirs); 3) images (pictorial or photographic, still or moving); 4)

---

[8] Thomas Heywood, *An apology for actors. Containing three briefe treatises. 1. Their antiquity. 2. Their ancient dignity. 3. The true vse of their quality* (London: N. Okes, 1612), *STC* (2nd ed.) 13309 and *ESTC* S106113, F3r-F3v.

ritual actions (commemoration activities); 5) space.[9] Shakespeare's history plays in particular include and epitomise all the five elements above, and in his dramatisation of queens, we see how queens implement memories or are implemented in memorialisation.

---

[9] Burke, 'History as Social Memory', pp. 47-49. For the transmission of 'social memory', see also 'The Ordering and Transmission of Social Memory' in James Fentress, and Chris Wickham, *Social Memory* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), pp. 41-86. Fentress and Wickham also mention how the 'articulation' of social memory is conducted via 'rituals' that are acted out to transmit manual skills. This corresponds with Burke's definition of 'ritual action' in his taxonomy of the art of transmitting memories. See Fentress and Wickham, 'The Ordering', p. 47.

Chapter Five: Queens and Memorialisation

I. Queens Memorialising

Queens in Shakespeare's English history plays preserve their queenship and appropriate memories to influence history writing differently depending on how they lose their titles as queens. Widowed queens defend the rights and legitimacy of their husbands and sons by re-invoking people's memories to solidify their authority. Divorced queens attempt to retrieve their titles by invoking histories of their marital lives to rehabilitate their marriages. In contrast with the action that widowed and divorced queens usually take, deposed queens seem to be relatively passive as their queenship relies on the profoundness of kingship, which, once abolished, can preserve neither the authority of the king nor that of the queen. This section on 'Queens Memorialising' will analyse how queens remember and seek to manipulate people's memories and the writing of history with the examples of Queen Isabel in *Richard II*, the Lancastrian Queen Margaret of Anjou, and her Yorkist rival queens in *Richard III*.

A. A Commissioned Historian: Queen Isabel in *Richard II*

The Deposition of Richard II and Queen Isabel

The deposition of Isabel's queenship is a corollary of Richard II's deposed kingship. In the deposition scene of Act IV, Scene i in *Richard II*, King Richard reviews his kingship, generating a comparison with Isabel's queenship. Among all queens in Shakespeare's history plays, Isabel is the only one who is deprived of her queenship purely for political reasons, unlike Margaret, who is widowed in *Richard III*, and Katherine, divorced, in *Henry VIII*. In Act V, Scene i, Richard II commissions Queen Isabel to be his chronicler, endorsing her alternative narrative against Bolingbroke's version of the royal deposition.

Marginalised Isabel in *Richard II*

Richard II is a play that not only discusses the appearance and substance of kingship, but also shows a queen performing her queenship from a marginalised space and time. In analysing the characterisation of Queen Isabel, or the dearth of it, Howard and Rackin argue that although female characters in *Richard II* come from the upper tier of the social hierarchy, they are 'delimited' within 'the private affective bonds of family

loyalty' and 'preoccupied by concerns for their male relations'.[10] Despite these constraints, I would argue, Shakespeare depicts Queen Isabel subtly. One instance is the transition from the garden scene (3.4) to the later farewell scene (5.1), during which Shakespeare presents the final episode of the Bildungsroman of Isabel's queenship: the Queen, in a similar vein to her King, intensifies her performance of her queenship in the very process of losing it.[11]

Re-reading the garden scene in *Richard II* from the perspective of memory may yield insight into the way the Queen forms her historical narrative and may amalgamate what Howard and Rackin state: 'the separation between the public, political concerns of men and the private, affective loyalties of women'.[12] As shown in the previous chapters, the garden scene illustrates how a secluded and private space can be transformed into a public forum for the discussion of national issues, and thus 'the separation', which Howard and Rackin argue for, is challenged. The garden, by way of Isabel's allusion to Adam and Eve (*RII* 3.4.74-77), can be read with the *hortus conclusus* for the Virgin iconographically.[13] Although Isabel does not 'bear a child as the Madonna did', as Regina Buccola and Lisa Hopkins argue, she 'does feel metaphorical growth within her, and speaks explicitly of pangs, midwives, and birth'.[14] This reading aligns Isabel's narratives with the iconography of the Virgin Mary and of Elizabeth I, positing an assertion of 'a spiritual dimension of kingship that the Lancastrians unsuccessfully deny', and thus generating a subversive discourse from a private, secluded, and marginal space.[15] The application of Mariology in the dramatisation of queenly characters indicates how memories of the Virgin have been secularised and blended with representations of the features of historical queens.

Isabel's Attempt to Re-establish Her Queenship

The growth of Isabel's queenship, on the eve of its loss, is not only elaborated through the language she uses and memories/histories she alludes to, but is also

---

[10] Howard and Rackin, *Engendering a Nation*, p. 140.
[11] Helen Ostovich traces the development of Isabel's identity from maid, wife and mother, to widow in 2.2, 3.4, and 5.1 in *Richard II,* and identifies this sequence as a 'triptych'. See Helen Ostovich, '"Here in this garden": The Iconology of the Virgin Queen in Shakespeare's *Richard II*', in *Marian Moments in Early Modern British Drama*, ed. by Regina Buccola and Lisa Hopkins (Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate, 2007), pp. 21-34 (p. 21).
[12] Howard and Rackin, *Engendering a Nation*, p. 141.
[13] Ostovich, 'The Iconography of the Virgin Queen', p. 21.
[14] See the 'Introduction' in Regina Buccola, and Lisa Hopkins, eds., *Marian Moments in Early Modern British Drama*, pp. 1-20 (p. 10).
[15] Ostovich, 'The Iconography of the Virgin Queen', p. 21.

demonstrated in the task she promises to undertake. At the beginning of Act V, Scene i, the Queen awaits Richard II on his way to 'Julius Caesar's ill-erected Tower' and laments the misfortune of her husband (*RII* 5.1.2). When Richard II appears and responds to her comments, he comforts her by defining their previous state as 'a happy dream' and encourages her to pursue a religious life in a convent for 'a new world's crown' (*RII* 5.1.18, 23-24). Richard II's advice seems to suggest that although they may lose their royal glory in this secular world, they will regain it under God's hands. This statement corresponds to the heavenly vision that the Princess Dowager Katherine of Aragon sees in Act IV, Scene i of *Henry VIII*, in which she finally feels content to believe that justice will be restored. For Richard II and Katherine, it seems that secular glory lost in the earthly kingdom will eventually gain its justice in Heaven – a contrast to the unrighteous deed of deposing kings and their queens. References to the nunnery further address and emphasise religious consolation, justice, and peace. This 'go to the nunnery' speech in *Richard II* (1595) would anticipate one of the iconic moments in *Hamlet* (1600), when Prince Hamlet admonishes Ophelia to stay away from the court and look for peace in God's arms, rather than be entangled in his project of revenge.

However, unlike Katherine's comfort from, or Richard's escapism to, religion, Queen Isabel performs her duty as a queen consort, attempting to encourage the deposed Richard to regain his courage and kingship:

> QUEEN What, is my Richard both in shape and mind
> Transformed and weakened? Hath Bolingbroke
> Deposed thine intellect? Hath he been in thy heart?
> [...]; and wilt thou, pupil-like,
> Take the correction, mildly kiss the rod,
> And fawn on rage with base humility,
> Which art a lion and the king of beasts?
>
> (*Richard II* 5.1.26-34)

Queen Isabel, who never comments on state affairs in the play, eventually tells Richard II that he should not allow Bolingbroke to act like his tutor and correct his former mistakes. Instead, he should, as the Queen advises, recognise his superior authority before his subjects. The Queen is now no longer a mere companion, but an inspiring

adviser for Richard II, prompting the King to change his address to her from 'fair woman' (*RII* 5.1.16) to 'good sometimes Queen' (*RII* 5.1.37). This change recognises the power and legitimacy of queenly advice and manner that may restore symbolic, if not titular, queenship even after their deposition. Unlike Margaret of Anjou, however, Isabel does not replace the King or step onto the battlefields to save her queenship. Her power lies in her tears. As McMillin notes, Isabel weeps in every scene that she appears – from her sympathy for the sick John of Gaunt, her worries about Richard II's warfare, her ignorance and concern regarding Richard's deposition, to her recognition of her role as a queen, and finally as a historian.[16] While her queenly career diminishes, her self-recognition as a queen grows.

The Commission of a Historian

Instead of taking Isabel's advice to rehabilitate his authority, Richard II accepts the reality of his fate. He seeks to alleviate the Queen's distress by commissioning her to disseminate stories and memories about him:

> RICHARD In winter's tedious nights, sit by the fire
> With good old folks, and let them tell thee tales
> Of woeful ages long ago betid;
> And ere thou bid goodnight, to quit their griefs
> *Tell thou the lamentable fall of me*,
> And send the hearers weeping to their beds;
> Forwhy the senseless brands will *sympathise*
> The heavy accent of thy moving tongue,
> And in compassion weep the fire out;
> And some will mourn in ashes, some coal black,
> *For the deposing of a rightful king*.
>
> (*Richard II* 5.1.40-50, emphasis added)

Richard II asks Isabel first to console herself by listening to stories, and then to tell (emotional/'lamentable') stories about him to invoke people's feelings and validate her version of history. He envisages a storytelling game for her, advising her to compete

---

[16] McMillin, 'Shakespeare's *Richard II*', pp. 40-52; Kerrigan, ed., *Motives of Woe*.

with others by giving them eyewitness reports about his downfall. Isabel would thus become an active player in the production and dissemination of history and evoke people's indignation at 'the deposing of a rightful king', providing a counter-narrative to Bolingbroke's version of replacing Richard II with an abler king (*RII* 5.1.50). However, according to Richard II's imagination, Queen Isabel's version of history would only be circulated in foreign lands rather than in England, and told only on winter nights, which marginalises his history to winter's tales – 'the female genre of domestic oral narrative'.[17] The effect of such a 'history' is like that of ancient tales or old wives' small talk which are treated more as stories to entertain rather than educate.[18] Lumped under the same genre as rumours, gossip and legends – variations of the domestic oral narrative – the queen's credibility is thus compromised and could only be a feeble attempt to undermine the authorities from a distant and marginal space.

It remains arguable whether such a minor discourse would be able to counter the grand narratives of able kingship propagandised by Bolingbroke; however, through dramatising such an unhistorical farewell scene, Shakespeare reminds his audience of the existence of counter narratives, no matter how insignificant they might be. As discussed in 'Part Two: The Practice of Queemship', McMillin's study suggests that Queen Isabel's tears and language of 'nothing' and 'namelessness' are succeeded by Richard II till his final moment on the stage.[19] Yet, I would like to argue further that the influence of Queen Isabel's tears and grief even extends to memory: through retelling Richard II's story, even if it is a winter's tale, the Queen evokes the same action and emotion – crying, tears, and sadness from her listeners, instigating sympathy from people, further causing their identification with Richard's situation and feelings, and generating a counter-discourse against Henry IV in their memory about the deposed Richard II. This scene also depicts Richard II's concern about history writing and Queen Isabel's final fulfilment of queenship by reciting memories about Richard II. Queen Isabel does not appear in the following plays of the second tetralogy, but the once forgotten history of Richard II returns to undermine Bolingbroke's authority, and the image and history of the deposed King keep haunting 'the usurper's court' until Henry

---

[17] Howard and Rackin, *Engendering a Nation*, p. 158.
[18] Fox, Adam, *Oral and Literate Culture in England 1500-1700* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), pp. 188-189.
[19] McMillin, 'Shakespeare's *Richard II*', p. 44.

V shifts the focus of domestic discords to the international expansion of the English crown.

B. A Living Monument: Margaret of Anjou in *Richard III*

<u>Margaret's Rhetoric in the Yorkist Court</u>

Unlike Queen Isabel, who returns to France after Richard II's deposition, Margaret of Anjou stays in England after Henry VI's death, serves as a living monument and transforms her individual memory of the Lancastrians to a social memory shared by the female community in *Richard III*. When Margaret appears in Act I, Scene iii, she has lost the appearance, manner, and authority of a queen, lurking behind the Yorkists, listening to their discordant conversations, and rebutting their statements in her 'asides'. For instance, she beseeches God to remove Elizabeth Woodville's 'small joy' of being England's queen, an 'honour, state and seat' that was originally attributed to her (*RIII* 1.3.110-112). She finally intrudes into the Yorkist court unexpectedly and unwelcomely without any queenly pomp or royal processions in public. The Duke of Gloucester, later Richard III, wonders at her appearance and questions her stay in England (*RIII* 1.3.164). His question is sensible: in historical records, Margaret had returned to France in 1476 and died in 1482 before Edward IV did (1442-1483).

Why does Margaret appear in the play of *Richard III*? Phyllis Rackin comments that Margaret is 'kept alive in the England of Richard III to rail at the Yorkists and remind the audience of the past crimes that make their present suffering justified'.[20] Penny Downie, the actress playing Margaret in *Henry VI* and *Richard III* in the RSC's 1988 production, observes that Margaret in *Richard III* 'brings with her all the memories of everybody's blackest deeds in the battles of the past, all that they've tried to sweep under the carpet'.[21] Margaret is the carrier of the past and the only surviving reminder of the Yorkists' 'usurpation'.

Ironically, in Act I, Scene iii, Margaret's appearance unites the discordant Yorkist court: as a queen of the overthrown dynasty and the alien of the incumbent reign, she abandons the royal etiquette and rhetoric of a queen, but chooses the language of vengeance. Losing all her military and political power, Margaret can only use her

---

[20] Phyllis Rackin, *Stages of History: Shakespeare's English Chronicles* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), p. 93.
[21] Penny Downie, 'Queen Margaret in *Henry VI* and *Richard III*', in *Players of Shakespeare 3: Further Essays in Shakespearian Performance by Players with the Royal Shakespeare Company*, ed. by Russell Jackson and Robert Smallwood (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 114-139 (p. 134).

cursing and malicious prophecy to undermine the legitimacy, harmony, and order of the Yorkist court. According to Howard and Rackin, Margaret is 'transformed into a bereaved and suffering prophet of divine vengeance for the crimes of the past'.[22] No one can stop or argue against her cursing; even Richard can only play with words like a child, trying to turn Margaret's malediction back on herself. Margaret's action and language seem unruly and cacophonic to the Yorkists, who have just celebrated their victories against the Lancastrians, and yet she does not lose her mind but presents her 'curses' and comments on the Yorkist court according to her memories. As Eggert argues, although Margaret becomes 'a creature entirely of language – one who is able only to curse', she is 'a hectoring Cassandra, doomed always to be right but never to be heeded, or as the Chorus of a Greek drama, who foreshadows and illuminates the main action but never directs it'.[23]

Margaret's language and rhetoric, if analysed from the perspective of memorialisation, are based on her individual memory and articulated with a discourse that encourages listeners to form a collective memory of the Lancastrian dynasty and thereby undermines the authority and legitimacy of the Yorkist crown. All of Margaret's statements in Act I, Scene iii of *Richard III* can be categorised into five types: first, her defence of the Lancastrian version of history; second, her reminiscences and comparison of her queenship with that of Elizabeth Woodville; third, her networking with nobles, either blaming their disloyalty or seeking alliance; fourth, her curses against her arch-enemy, Richard of Gloucester; finally, her warning and prophecy for the Yorkist court. All of these indicate her precise memory of each event, war, and relationship with every individual as if they were in a display of tablets. These tablets are not made of wax, which could easily be erased and overwritten; Margaret's tablets are made of stone, lasting permanently and resisting rewriting.

Margaret as a Monument

According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 'monument' originally means 'a tomb, a sepulchre'. One of its meanings is frequently used in Shakespeare's plays: 'a statue, building, or other structure erected to commemorate a famous or notable person or event', in particular 'an effigy; a carved figure, statue'.[24] Historically, Margaret moved

---

[22] Howard and Rackin, *Engendering a Nation*, p. 106.
[23] Eggert, *Showing Like a Queen,* p. 70.
[24] 'Monument' in *OED Online* [Accessed on March 21, 2010].

back to France and died there; Shakespeare dramatises her appearance and even more, her powerful revenging and prophetic language, making her a dramatic reminder and carrier of the history. She is memorialised by her memorialisation of the Lancastrian court; that is, she is partly remembered as a living monument in *Richard III*. Peter Sherlock states the importance of monumental memories in early modern England:

> Early modern English people agreed that monuments were powerful sites of memory, capable of instructing and defining the society in which they were located. Differences emerged in what shape society ought to take, and how monuments should therefore be modified in order to promote one vision over another. Where monuments were attacked or defaced, words were the target as often as images.[25]

Compared with oral histories or written chronicles, monuments are more concrete and accessible representations to the public. Therefore, in English religious reformations, defacing the old monuments and erecting new ones were effective and important actions to manifest the alteration of authorities. In *Richard III*, Margaret erects tombstones for the deceased members of the Lancastrian family, and she herself is an effigy, a living monument commemorating the former dynasty and walking around the Yorkist court on the Shakespearean stage.

Margaret's memorialisation focuses on the power that she used to enjoy, reminding the audience of the authority of the former dynasty and undermining the present court. Margaret presents a parallel history to the Yorkist version and exposes the ironic transience of political agony and political alliance in the court. Before Margaret enters the stage, Queen Elizabeth Woodville is defending her queenship against Richard of Gloucester's demeaning comments regarding her low birth (*RIII* 1.3.107-110). Richard of Gloucester undermines Elizabeth's queenship by instigating her to 'remember' what she is (*RIII* 1.3.131-133). Elizabeth Woodville's queenship, as discussed in 'The Pursuit of Queenship', depends upon Edward IV's kingship. Now the King is ill and the body politic of his kingship might transfer soon, endangering Elizabeth's queenship. She moans: 'As little joy, my lord, as you suppose/ You should enjoy, were you this

---

[25] Peter Sherlock, *Monuments and Memory in Early Modern England* (Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate, 2008), pp. 193-195.

country's king,/ As little joy may you suppose in me,/ That I enjoy being the queen thereof' (*RIII* 1.3.151-154). Elizabeth Woodville's complaints resonate with Margaret of Anjou's suffering: 'Ah, little joy enjoys the queen thereof,/ For I am she, and altogether joyless' (*RIII* 1.3.155-156); as John Kerrigan states, 'complaint is not always individuating', and Shakespeare uses the dynamics of a collective complaint to prepare a scene in which these 'female mourners are reconciled by shared loss' later in the play.[26] For Margaret, Elizabeth has already started to share her pain of being a queen and will soon identify with her rhetoric and her methods of writing history.

Margaret of Anjou's Reminiscence of Her Queenship

Margaret's defence of the former Lancastrian crown gradually lays emphasis on her own loss of queenship. At first, she rebukes the court for forgetting how her husband and son were slaughtered on the battlefield of Tewkesbury, and then addresses Elizabeth Woodville to provoke her sense of guilt and insecurity over losing her queenship as well (*RIII* 1.3.165-170, 185-211). She maps her own fate onto Elizabeth's prospect:

> QUEEN MARGARET
>> [*To* ELIZABETH] Edward thy son, that now is Prince of Wales,
>> For Edward my son, that was Prince of Wales,
>> Die in his youth by like untimely violence.
>> *Thyself, a queen, for me that was a queen,*
>> Outlive thy glory like my wretched self.
>> Long mayst thou live – to wail thy children's death,
>> And see another, as I see thee now,
>> Decked in thy rights, as thou art 'stalled in mine.
>> Long die thy happy days before thy death,
>> And after many lengthened hours of grief
>> Die, *neither mother, wife, nor England's queen.* –
>>> (*Richard III* 1.3.196-206, emphasis added)

Margaret deliberately emphasises the roles and identities that she and Queen Elizabeth share. Margaret's queenship is completely lost when her son, Edward Prince of Wales,

---

[26] Kerrigan, ed., *Motives of Woe*, p. 57.

dies. Her play with the shared names of their husbands and sons prompts Elizabeth to envisage her future misery. However, for the audience, this game might create an impression of the transience and mutability of the English crowns, and provoke the thought that whoever is on the throne, the difference is not very tangible. In Shakespeare's design of these lines, both the Yorkist and Lancastrian claims to the throne are undermined, revealing the absurdity of the discords among the nobles.

Margaret of Anjou's Rhetoric

Despite Richard's interference with Margaret's narratives, her accusation is made with clear historical references. Richard obstructs Margaret's attempt to confuse the value of history, turns her criticisms of the Yorkist court into irrational curses, and reverses her revilement back onto her. Yet she does not linger on to quarrel with him (*RIII* 1.3.213-237). Twice in Act I, Scene iii, Margaret directs her curse straight at Richard of Gloucester (*RIII* 1.3.213-237, 288-292). Although Margaret cannot take arms like a soldier anymore, her memory and description of previous warfare remind the English court and the audience of her prior military image.[27] Thus, she transforms the court into a battlefield and uses her curses as weapons. Each time she describes him with animal metaphors, reducing him to less than a common human being ('Stay, dog, for thou shalt hear me', 'thou elvish-marked, abortive, rooting hog', and 'Look when he fawns, he bites; and when he bites/ His venom tooth will rankle to the death') (*RIII* 1.3.213, 225, 288-289). This description is disseminated further among the other female characters in Act IV, Scene iv, generating a beastly impression about Richard's deformity. In fact, instead of engaging in a cursing duel with Richard, Margaret keeps shifting her focus back to Queen Elizabeth Woodville, associating herself with Elizabeth to engrave and display her queenship and its history through a succession of queenly traditions.

Margaret is a living monument, continuously reviewing histories for the Yorkist court and reminding them of their previous service in Henry VI's court to regain their loyalty and support. When Margaret speaks to the nobles, she clearly remembers how they served her and King Henry VI, enumerating their honours and shames as if reciting from the tablet of her memory. She addresses Rivers, Dorset, Lord Hastings, and Buckingham in turn, recollecting each noble's birth, background, their performance on

---

[27] Banks, 'Warlike Women', p. 177.

battlefields, and their networking with the Lancastrian family (*RIII* 1.3.207-211, 253-258, 278-282). Even though Margaret is widowed and is the only representative of the Lancaster family, she does not give up the hope of recruiting alliances and retrieving her power. Margaret manages to keep herself calm even during their defamations ('False-boding woman, end thy frantic curse' and 'Dispute not with her: she is lunatic') (*RIII* 1.3.245 and 253).

The Yorkists' accusation against Margaret, in fact, implies her power to manipulate memorialisation. In the meantime, Richard of Gloucester keeps referring to her as a witch in order to undermine all her statements ('Foul wrinkled witch, what mak'st thou in my sight' and 'Have done thy charm, thou hateful, withered hag', *RIII* 1.3.164, 212). Nevertheless Margaret manages to withstand their accusations of her insanity and defends her royalty by changing her identity to a prophetess:

> QUEEN MARGARET What, does thou scorn me for my gentle counsel,
> And soothe the devil that I warn thee from?
> O but remember this another day,
> When he [Richard] shall split thy very heart with sorrow,
> And say, 'Poor Margaret was a prophetess'. –
> Live each of you the subjects to his hate,
> And he to yours, and all of you to God's.
>
> (*Richard III* 1.3.295-301)

Serving as a living monument that displays the histories, glory, and shame of each individual in the past, Margaret's final statement further transforms her identity from a widowed queen, a 'witch', and a 'lunatic' to a provider of 'gentle counsels' and a foreseeing 'prophetess'. Although the nobles deny being swayed by Margaret to join her alliance and fortify their maledictions against her (*RIII* 1.2.302-303), Margaret's curses, her recollection of the Lancastrian past and queenship, and her 'prophecy' accelerate the sense of insecurity and the growing discord in the Yorkist court.

Reading Margaret from Two Views

In most modern criticisms, Margaret is perceived as a dramatically powerful queen, destructive to patriarchal authorities. In the end, however, she cannot but compromise

with the patriarchal paradigm, as the ending of Shakespeare's history plays need to follow historical facts.[28] However, from two different perspectives, we may synthesise arguments and strengthen Margaret's significance more powerfully and positively: one is the roles that she assumes, identifies herself with, or imagines in the play, as she is aware of her place in historical developments, and the other is the function that Shakespeare assigns her in the dramatic developments. Margaret perceives herself as a queen and a prophetess. With these two identities, she manipulates memorialisations retrospectively and preemptively. In addition, Margaret serves as a monument, a witness, and a historian that advises the audience to beware of authoritative narratives and alerts them to the existence of alternative histories and the importance of women's views and voices in history writing. Finally, in terms of women's collective memories in *Richard III*, Margaret evokes sympathy from Queen Elizabeth Woodville, induces the Queen to identify with her, and disseminates a specific version of Richard of Gloucester's history, which is originally circulated only within a female community, but eventually becomes a historically wrong but dominant impression about Richard III.

C. 'These Tell-Tale Women': the Yorkist Queens in *Richard III*

In Act IV, Scene iv of *Richard III*, Margaret's narrative forms a collective memory circulating among queens and cements a female community writing alternative histories against Richard III's discourse. Between Margaret's two appearances (1.3 and 4.4), two other scenes of queens are related to memory: in Act II, Scene ii, Queen Elizabeth Woodville forms a chorus with the Duchess of York to lament the death of Edward IV and Clarence; later in Act IV, Scene i, the Queen, the Duchess, and Lady Anne constitute a league against Richard III. This section on '"These Tell-Tale Women": the Yorkist Queens' discusses three scenes (2.2, 4.1, and 4.4) to see how the Yorkist queens lose their queenly title, create Richard of Gloucester's alternative image, lament together, and write a female narrative against Richard under Margaret's guidance. The residue of queenship of the Yorkist queens interferes in and manipulates memorialisations.

<u>The Duchess of York Revises Richard of Gloucester's Image</u>

Queens in Act II, Scene ii use oral narratives to rewrite history and reshape the

---

[28] For instance, see Miner, 'The Roles of Women in *Richard III*', in *The Woman's Part*, pp. 35-55.

memory of Richard III. At the beginning of this scene, the Duchess of York explains the death of Clarence to his two children and rectifies their impression of a caring and loving uncle Richard of Gloucester: 'Ah, that deceit should steal such gentle shapes,/ And with a virtuous visor hide deep vice!/ He is my son, ay, and therein my shame;/ Yet from my dugs he drew not this deceit' (*RIII* 2.2.27-30). This plot implies that although Richard creates himself a favourable image, his mother, the Duchess of York, acts as a '[custodian] of family history', transmits stories to the young, and counters Richard's discourse by providing a marginal narrative in the tradition of oral history.[29] Furthermore, the damage that the Duchess of York could do to Richard is worse than anyone else in the play. Who would be a better witness and provide truer verdicts of one's maleficence than one's own mother? The Duchess's identity as Richard's mother makes her narrative convincing. The Duchess uses her maternal authority to educate her grandchildren, judge Richard's deeds, and write his history.

Fatal Maternity and Detestation of Queenship

    In the second half of Act II, Scene ii, Queen Elizabeth Woodville informs the other female characters of the death of Edward IV and her identity shifts from a queen consort to a widowed queen mother. The Queen and her mother-in-law, the Duchess of York, lament their loss of male family members together.[30] The Duchess adopts Margaret's rhetoric, recounting her loss of her husband and sons in contrast with Elizabeth's mere loss of her husband; she reminds the Queen of her responsibility of looking after her sons. For the Duchess, human calamity is evaluated in comparative terms. However, Elizabeth is petrified by her husband's death and starts to map her fortune with that of Margaret, as Margaret 'prophesied'. Clarence's children also join their grandmother and aunt's lamenting chorus (*RIII* 2.2.72-78). As the strength of mourning intensifies in this quartet's reiteration, a different story about Richard's hypocrisy starts to circulate not only within the female circles but also spread to the younger generation. The female narrative counters Richard's narrative of justifying his kingship.

    At a first glance, Act IV, Scene i does not disclose any dramatic development of plots; however, it displays how the Yorkist queens react to the impact of dynastic change and the loss of queenship. At the beginning of this short scene, the Duchess of

---

[29] Fox, *Oral and Literate Culture*, p190.
[30] Kerrigan, ed., *Motives of Woe*, p. 58.

York meets Lady Anne and Queen Elizabeth on their way to visit the two princes in the Tower before Prince Edward's coronation. However, all three female nobles are prohibited from entering the Tower to see them despite their maternal ties and rights (*RIII* 4.1.19-25). Lord Stanley is not aware of the queens' ignorance about Richard III's succession to the throne, and salutes them with their new titles: the Duchess is now queen mother to two kings, whilst both Elizabeth and Anne are addressed as queen now. He further informs Anne to set off to Westminster Abbey for her coronation. Queen Elizabeth calls it the 'dead-killing news' and the new queen-to-be Anne loathes her advancement (*RIII* 4.1.35-36).

Understanding the development, Queen Elizabeth immediately warns her son, Marquis Dorset (Edward IV's stepson), to leave England for safety: 'Thy mother's name is ominous to children. [...]/ Go, hie thee! Hie thee from this slaughterhouse,/ Lest thou increase the number of the dead,/ And make me die the thrall of Margaret's curses' (*RIII* 4.1.40-45). Elizabeth cannot provide profits or protection anymore, but dangers only. The loss of her queenship makes her maternity fatal to her children. As a mother, the Duchess also remorses: 'O ill-dispersing wind of misery!/ O my *accursed womb*, *the bed of death*!/ A *cockatrice* hast thou hatched to the world,/ Whose unavoided eye is murderous' (*RIII* 4.1.52-55, emphasis added). The Duchess demeans her own maternity, writes Richard III's nativity narrative negatively, and even appropriates Margaret's rhetoric that dehumanises her own son.

Listening to her female in-laws' criticisms of her husband, Lady Anne does not defend him and even detests her imminent queenship. Compared with Anne Boleyn's 'unwillingness' to be queen in *Henry VIII*, Lady Anne's dislike of her queenship is more intense as she envisages no royal pomp but deadly and hellish images in her coming coronation: 'Anointed let me be with deadly venom,/ And die ere men can say "God save the Queen"' (*RIII* 4.1.61-62). Before the beginning of her queenship, Lady Anne has foreseen the end of it, knowing that Richard III will 'shortly be rid of' her to accomplish his ambitious plan (*RIII* 4.1.86). Lady Anne has un-queened herself by negating her queenship; she has perceived herself as a member of the female community that consists of widowed queens writing alternative narratives against Richard III. Queen Elizabeth and Lady Anne do not become enemies at their rise and fall of queenship, but instead, they share their pity and mourning for each other's fortune (*RIII* 4.1.87-88). Finally, the Duchess of York concludes the meeting of this

support group with foreseeing either the beginning or end of their queenship and her own death. Act IV, Scene i ends with Queen Elizabeth invoking the stones of the Tower to protect, witness, and engrave the fortune of her and her sons, seeking memorialisations of her wifehood and maternity in her queenship.

Rather than staging Parliament's decision to put Richard of Gloucester on the throne or the new King's coronation ceremony, Shakespeare dramatises such an unhistorical scene, depicting the first reactions of the Yorkist queens to the changes of English politics and revealing the swiftness and confusion of the dynastic successions. Strategically portraying the change happening to a minority group in the English court, Shakespeare not only creates dramatic effects by focusing on women's reading of Richard III, but also increases the significance of the queens' alternative histories and their manipulation of memorialisation. Richard III's usurpation of the throne is now memorialised through the voices of a group of lamenting, resenting, and cursing queens.

The Inheritance of Memorialisation

The final meeting of the queens' female community is in Act IV, Scene iv and the widowed Yorkist Queen Elizabeth Woodville inherits the widowed Lancastrian Queen Margaret of Anjou's rhetoric and her version of the memory about Richard III. At the beginning of this scene, Margaret, in her monologue, expresses how she has been watching the play of the Yorkist decline and is returning to France when the play approaches its 'bitter, black, and tragical' ending (RIII 4.4.7). Her monologue is interrupted by the entrance of the Duchess of York and Queen Elizabeth. She again conceals herself to watch these wretched Yorkist mothers. In Richard III, Margaret does not confront her enemies until losing her patience or finding the best time to intrude and disturb others' narratives. Her speeches are full of dark metaphors ('rotten mouth of death'; 'waning of mine enemies'; 'bitter black, and tragical' end, RIII 4.4.2, 4, 6-7) and her hiding in the dark consequently intensifies her witch-like image. Her rhetoric of revenge seeks the ancient justice of an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, counting the death of her husband and son, enumerating her revenge as if working on accounting, and paralleling her loss with those of the Duchess and Elizabeth Woodville (RIII 4.4.20-21, 40-44, 60, 63-70). This anachronistic dramatisation of Margaret's presence creates great dramatic effects: her gothic and haunting existence is 'like a voice from the dead, from a vantage point beyond that of the represented historical action' in

Richard III.[31]

Margaret's prophetess-like voice and her role as a mentor for the Yorkist Queens in Act IV, Scene iv validates her version of memorialisation. She catalogues the Plantagenet casualties to itemise Richard III's criminal and immoral history. This cataloguing narrative eliminates the contexts of each event; it seems to be factual and authentic at the first glance, but undeniably it presents an oversimplified and distorted history. Yet this narrative triumphs. By using a series of questions and answers, Margaret successfully transforms Queen Elizabeth's woe into hatred and becomes the spiritual leader of these mourning and cursing queens (*RIII* 4.490-104). She teaches Elizabeth her 'art of malediction':

> QUEEN MARGARET Forbear to sleep the nights, and fast the days;
> Compare dead happiness with living woe;
> Think that thy babes were sweeter than they were,
> And he that slew them fouler than he is:
> Bett'ring thy loss makes the bad causer worse.
> Revolving this will teach thee how to curse.
>
> (*Richard III* 4.4.118-23)

According to Margaret, to speak 'good malediction', one should turn one's life completely upside down, exaggerate the greatness of loss, and fantasise the wickedness of the enemy. This is not only the art of cursing, but also the effect that Margaret wants to bring to the Yorkist court – to turn their world upside down. Margaret sees the destruction of the Yorkist family, completes her revenge, and finds her descendant, Queen Elizabeth, to keep undermining the authority of Richard III ('Thy woes will make them sharp and pierce *like mine*', *RIII* 4.4.125 emphasis added).

The first part of Act IV, Scene iv (*RIII* 4.4.1-135) is scene of women and history: how women form a league of their own and how women record and narrate histories. Margaret is the founder and pioneering historian: although she disappears from thence, her agenda passes over to the Duchess of York and Queen Elizabeth, making two Yorkist queens blame and curse a Yorkist king, Richard III, and turn to support a Lancastrian successor, Richmond, the future Henry VII.

---

[31] Rackin, *Stages of History*, p. 93, note 17.

Although both historically and dramatically Margaret did not meet Richmond, critics have associated them in reading Shakespeare's appropriation of contemporary political contexts of the Tudor reign. Antony Hammond calls Margaret 'a crazed figure of impotence brought back from the past to represent the brutal, *un-Christian*, *Old Testament* concepts of retributive justice which Richmond effectively negates with his *New Testament* of forgiveness and reconciliation'.[32] Hammond argues that the negativity brought by Margaret is dissolved by the presence of Richmond and that they contrast with each other in religious terms. Yet Rackin insists that Margaret is a prophetess, who brings justice via curses, which are realised later against Yorkist usurpation. According to Rackin, Margaret is in line with Richmond, making everything ready for the glorious Tudor succession.[33] Therefore, contrary to Hammond's view, Margaret would not and should not be such a negative and dark figure within Tudor propagandistic contexts. However, to demonstrate Margaret's value and diminish her wretched image, Rackin emphasises a patriarchal discourse of order in her reading of Margaret, and thereby lessens the value of Margaret's queenship. I would argue that Hammond's dichotomy of Margaret's and Richmond's propaganda does not read Shakespeare's text profoundly enough but compromises with the Tudor myth hastily, neglecting Margaret's function in the construction of history and historical narratives. Rackin distinguishes Margaret from other woman characters according to her exceptional actions and sophistry, which are inappropriate to her female gender, but Rackin also attempts to preserve Margaret's value and dramatic importance by embedding her in the propaganda of the Tudor union, overlooking the inheritance of memorialisation within the queens' community and Elizabeth Woodville's subsequent contribution to the union of the families of the York and Lancaster through the marriage of her daughter and Henry VII.

In addition, Elizabeth Woodville's inheritance of Margaret's memorialisation illustrates Margaret's role as a living monument. Margaret, a living monument, not only commemorates the Lancastrian dynasty, the lives of her husband and son, but also engraves an epitaph for the Yorkist queens and king (Richard III) before their demise. Sherlock states that 'monuments were a vehicle for words' and as they 'could be easily embroidered with further epitaphs added to them after construction', early modern

---

[32] William Shakespeare, *King Richard III*, ed. by Antony Hammond, Arden Shakespeare, 2nd series (London and New York: Routledge, 1981), p. 109, emphasis added.
[33] Rackin, *Stages of History*, p. 176.

English people might erect 'a tomb in his or her lifetime and an inscription with the date of death was added later'.[34] Extending from Sherlock's statement, we can even argue that Margaret is a walking monument; unlike other immobile monuments, which require people to go to the particular site of memory, she brings the histories and memories to people, preventing them from forgetting or escaping the past. Reading Margaret from the perspective of her queenship, we may discern that she creates a subculture of the oral tradition of history in contrast with the male written narratives. As a living monument, Margaret carries subversive memories around the Yorkist court and demonstrates her power and former queenly authority simply through words.

A Mother's Malevolent Memorialisation of Her Own Son

In the second half of Act IV, Scene iv, the Duchess of York and Queen Elizabeth confront Richard III; they practise their art of malediction against and write their histories about him without Margaret. Reviewing the bitter history of her wicked son, the Duchess refers to her cursed womb and reduces Richard III to a toad – another example of the use of animal metaphors (*RIII* 4.4.138, 145). When the Duchess and Queen Elizabeth question Richard III as to the whereabouts of the people he has slaughtered, he calls them 'these tell-tale women' to disempower their words and orders drums and trumpets to be played aloud to submerge their curses and accusations, trying to use his kingly authority to censor their narratives (*RIII* 4.4.145-151). In contrast with the King's authority, the Duchess of York uses her maternal authority to ask for the right to speak. She first recounts Richard's life so far – from her pregnancy, his birth, childhood, puberty, adulthood, to his present age – and criticises his staggering unnaturalness and hypocrisy (*RIII* 4.4.166-175). The Duchess's description of Richard is a biography of a monster, rather than a legend of a hero. Undermining his mother's malediction, Richard refuses to listen further (*RIII*. 4.4.178-180). The Duchess makes her second request to speak and this time she curses and prophesies that Richard will be defeated, resented, and haunted by his enemies and ghosts, leaving a shameful history behind (*RIII* 184-196). In her two speeches, the Duchess summarises Richard's past and predicts his following maleficence and tragic ending in the future without a mother's good will. She acquires Margaret's rhetoric to dehumanise her own son, and even curses him, rather than giving him her blessing before he goes to war. It is 'these tell-tale

---

[34] Sherlock, *Monument and Memory*, p. 206.

women' who create an image of Richard III that is well remembered through time.[35]

The Competition of Two Histories

After the Duchess leaves the court, Richard III challenges and bewilders Elizabeth with his rhetoric to rewrite a new narrative about him and recreate his image not as the murderer of her two sons but the groom of her daughter. As in Lady Anne's case in Act I, scene ii, Richard III intends to use marriage to whitewash his past and fulfil his ambition again. At the beginning of their conversation, Elizabeth states that she has no more sons for him to kill – she can make no more threats to Richard – and will protect her only daughter from any miserable fate. When Elizabeth senses Richard III's intention, she defames her daughter's manner, virtues, and beauty and denies her royal lineage to save her from marrying Richard III. Queen Elizabeth negates any of her daughter's desirable virtues of a worthy queen (as discussed in the Pursuit of Queenship). She even changes her daughter's nativity narrative and history to save the young Princess from her uncle's hands. Richard III excuses himself for the two Princes' deaths and blames the stars, refusing to admit his crime. Queen Elizabeth responds with direct accusations of his evil nature (*RIII* 4.4.221.2-14). She has successfully inherited Margaret's art of malediction and replaced Margaret to serve as the monument that displays Richard III's deed.

Children have always been the central concern for Queen Elizabeth whether before she acquires, when she practises, or after she loses her queenship. Richard III might have noticed this when he witnessed how his brother successfully won the Queen by promising to take care of the children of her previous marriage and how the Queen worried about her royal children's future when Edward IV was on battlefields. Therefore, Richard III proclaims that he can do her good by providing advancement for her children, instigating the Queen's curiosity (*RIII* 4.4.228). Instead of refusing to listen to him, Elizabeth asks 'what state, what dignity, what honour' he could transmit to her children (*RIII* 4.4.233-234). Before Elizabeth relates the little Princes' demises to him again, Richard refers to 'the Lethe' (the river of forgetfulness) and asks her to

---

[35] According to *ODNB*, '[this] initial image of a king who seized power and ruled unjustly, best exemplified in the work of Polydore Vergil, gradually developed into a more elaborate picture of an ambitious man intent on clearing his way to the throne from at least 1471. This picture, most potently embodied in Shakespeare's tetralogy (of which *Richard III* is the shocking denouement), presented Richard's career as a series of calculating murders [...]'. See Rosemary Horrox, 'Richard III (1452–1485)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23500, accessed 7 Sept 2011], par. 35 ('Image and Reputation').

forget 'the sad remembrance of those wrongs', which she 'supposes' that he did (*RIII* 4.4.237-239).

Richard keeps denying his murders of the princes, exhibits his humility and respect for Queen Elizabeth, and encourages her to forgo/forget her version of history about him and rewrite her knowledge of him. He explicitly reveals his intention to marry the young Princess Elizabeth of York and expresses his 'love' for his niece (*RIII* 4.4.242-250). Richard knows that it is the mother, Queen Elizabeth Woodville, who decides her daughter's marriage; intriguingly, he thereby asks the Queen to teach him how to woo her daughter (*RIII* 4.4.254-257). Queen Elizabeth seizes this opportunity to speak and recounts the history of what Richard III has done:

> QUEEN ELIZABETH
>> Therefore present to her [the Princess] – as sometimes Margaret
>> Did to thy father, steeped in Rutland's blood –
>> A handkerchief which, say to her, did drain
>> The purple sap from her sweet brother's body,
>> And bid her wipe her weeping eyes withal.
>> If this inducement move her not to love,
>> Send her a letter of thy noble deeds.
>> Tell her thou mad'st away her uncle Clarence,
>> Her uncle Rivers – ay, and for her sake
>> Mad'st quick conveyance with her good aunt Anne.
>
> (*Richard III* 4.4.260-269)

Elizabeth specifies what Richard III should do to win her daughter with vivid images: presenting her a handkerchief stained with her brothers' blood and telling her about his deeds. Queen Elizabeth recounts Margaret's tyrannical and unqueenly deeds to mock Richard III and uses Margaret's rhetoric of cataloguing the deaths.

As if history replays itself, Richard III proclaims that he has done 'all this for love' of Elizabeth of York, removing his responsibility for the murders and usurpation, repeating his rhetoric of wooing Lady Anne in Act I, Scene ii. He then requests Queen Elizabeth to look toward the future and promises that he will amend the situation by returning the kingdom to her daughter, that is, his queen in his plan. If Queen Elizabeth

grants the marriage, he will compensate her loss of sons by giving her grandsons, securing her line in the royal genealogy (*RIII* 4.4.273.7-14). Richard III further guarantees family networking, royal glories, and happiness for Queen Elizabeth Woodville as his queen-mother-in-law (*RIII* 4.4.273.24-27, 273.30-37). Richard ascertains that this should satisfy Queen Elizabeth Woodville and she should fulfil what he requires: teaching her daughter and marrying her to him (*RIII* 4.4.237.38-49).

Richard III provides a different writing of history – oblivion of the past – and an unthinkable blueprint of the future; yet, Queen Elizabeth asks him how she should convey his intention to her daughter, questioning how history will write this future of identity confusion and suspicious incest between the uncle and niece. Richard III does not answer this question but asks Queen Elizabeth to allude to his kingly authority and demand that the young Princess should obey. The Queen invokes God's supreme authority and disobeys Richard III. Richard then entices her with queenly pomp and power, while the Queen points out the vanity of queenship directly. Richard elaborates his love for the young Elizabeth, and yet her mother mocks him by pointing out the transience of his love. Richard then emphasises that his love will last for the Princess's whole life, but Queen Elizabeth doubts the swiftness of one's life and Richard's changeable favour (*RIII* 4.4.276-285). Despite Richard's comment on Elizabeth's 'shallow and quick' reasons, the Queen continually refers to history to support her 'deep and dead' defence against his proposal of marrying her daughter (*RIII* 4.4.292 and 293-294). Richard returns to his kingly favour and manly love for the young Elizabeth, turning their conversation back to a previous argument (*RIII* 4.4.286-291). His attempt to whitewash the past fails and he can rewrite nothing but keeps stressing, '[t]hat is past' (*RIII* 4.4.295). He can find no one or use nothing to endorse his sincerity, but makes the oath upon 'the time to come' – the uncertain future (*RIII* 4.4.197-318).

As discussed in the previous sections, Richard III only looks forward, while women in *Richard III* are always looking back to the past – Margaret serves as a living monument, Lady Anne reviews and laments her marriage with Richard, the Duchess of York writes a monstrous birth narrative of Richard, and Queen Elizabeth succeeds Margaret's cataloguing historical narrative to record the loss of her queenship. Queen Elizabeth taunts and criticises rhetorical strategy and hypocrisy, stating that he cannot validate his future credibility because he has 'wronged in the time o'erpast' (*RIII* 4.4.319). Queen Elizabeth has so far gained the upper hand in the rhetorical game and

the defence of her version of history.

However, after hundreds of lines of argument, the audience might be surprised that Queen Elizabeth Woodville succumbs to Richard III's proposal. Between her final rebuttal and giving in, Richard III makes a short speech, in which it seems that he demonstrates his credibility and sincerity by cursing himself in terms of 'death, desolation, ruin, and decay' and swearing his love for the young Princess Elizabeth (*RIII* 4.4.328-348). This speech does not seem particularly powerful or persuasive. Not only are Richard III's curses weak and abstract compared with the queens' malediction, but his emphasis on his love for the young princess sounds superficial and unreliable. Nevertheless, after this speech, Queen Elizabeth questions herself whether she should be so tempted and persuaded that she forgets the past. Richard III grasps this opportunity and gains the Queen's consent to marry her daughter (*RIII* 4.4.350-361).

After Queen Elizabeth leaves the stage, Richard III criticises her as a 'relenting fool' and a 'shallow, changing woman'; however, she does not abandon her memories but still plays her role as a mother, a queen, and a monument strategically (*RIII* 4.4.362). According to the historical fact and dramatic result that Elizabeth of York eventually marries Richmond, Henry VII, rather than Richard III at the end, it is clear that Queen Elizabeth Woodville does not mean to satisfy Richard III's demand. In the whole conversation, Queen Elizabeth does not lose her standpoint until the final few lines. It is more likely that her final relinquishment is only a performance, as she knows that Richard III would not stop until he thought he had achieved his goal. If in Act I, Scene ii Richard seduced Lady Anne by his performance of stabbing himself, in Act IV, Scene iv, Queen Elizabeth in turns performs her subjugation to protect her daughter and her version of history from Richard's tyranny. Queen Elizabeth Woodville and her female community have learned from each other through the histories they are told, while Richard III still uses his old rhetorical strategies such as the causal reversal ('I did all this for love of her/you'), his quick rebuttal and sophistry, and his erasure of the past and empty promises for the future. In the next scene, Stanley informs us that the Queen has consented to her daughter's marriage with Richmond, uniting the families of York and Lancaster (*RIII* 4.5.17-19).

The Victory of 'these Tell-tale Women'

Richard III might have won the argument with Queen Elizabeth Woodville

temporarily, but the queens have disseminated their versions of memorialisations in the narratives of oral and written histories. In Act V, Scene i, during the wars between King Richard III and Richmond, the Duke of Buckingham recalls Margaret of Anjou's warning and curse and thereby recognises Margaret as a prophetess and loses his faith in the King (*RIII* 5.2.25-27). Furthermore, people in Richmond's camp keep using animal images to describe Richard III; for instance, Stanley and Richmond call him boar and dog (*RIII* 4.5.2, 5.3.7, and 5.8.2). Instead of Richard's ambition, it is the queens' expectation and Elizabeth Woodville's design for the future royal lineage that are fulfilled, and their histories about Richard and the memorialisation of their queenship that are kept in people's *memoria*.

II. Queens Memorialised

After losing their titles as queens, Margaret of Anjou, Elizabeth Woodville, and their female in-laws make use of memorialisation to maintain their power in the aftermath of queenship. Instead of controlling the writing of other people's alternative histories, Katherine of Aragon in *Henry VIII* focuses on how her own history will be written. *Henry VIII* is Shakespeare's final English history play and the only play that depicts Tudor reign directly in the Jacobean context. It encompasses approximately twelve years of Henry VIII's reign only but is embedded with momentous issues relevant to the whole early modern period. The content of the play is deeply concerned with the writing of history – Shakespeare and Fletcher applied a meta-discourse about the formation of histories in the play, illustrating how memories were constructed, reiterated, and preserved.

Henry VIII, a History Play

Among Shakespeare's other English history plays, *Henry VIII* was the only one that depicted the Tudor dynasty directly and it was not staged until 1613 when the Stuart King James I was on the throne. Comparing the contexts of Shakespeare's early history plays with that of *Henry VIII* may generate different readings of queenship. As the first tetralogy – *Henry VI*, *Part One* to *Three* and *Richard III* – were written in the early 1590s (c.a. 1590-1593), their popularity established Shakespeare's reputation as a playwright of history plays. Looking back to the wars between the Yorkist and the

Lancastrian families, the plays endorsed the legitimacy of the Tudors by reinforcing Richard III's negative image and placing the union of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York in a positive light. This dramaturgy influenced the portrayal of Margaret of Anjou; as discussed before, her unhistorical appearance in *Richard III* and association with the Tudor reign suggest an appealing reading of her as a living monument of the past and a prophetess of the future. Even though Shakespeare provided various perspectives in dramatising historical figures in the first tetralogy, the central propaganda supported the legitimacy of the Tudors. *Henry VIII* was composed collaboratively by Shakespeare and Fletcher in the early seventeenth century, when England had returned to the governance of a male ruler for a decade. The immediacy of writing a history of the previous reign, even merely touching the birth of the previous monarch, Elizabeth I, might be too close in time and in memory and create a dangerous reflection on the incumbent Jacobean reign. The portrayal of Katherine of Aragon, a devoted Catholic and Spanish Queen, and the depictions of Anne Boleyn and Princess Elizabeth would generate associations with the sensitive relationship between Elizabeth I, James I, and his mother, Mary, Queen of Scots. Therefore, the queenship represented through the female characters in the play not only told stories about the Tudors, but also provided criticisms and praise of kingship and queenship, which subtly reflected on the Stuarts.

In addition, *Henry VIII* was the final English history play by Shakespeare and thus might function as a conclusion of the history plays and of his career. The former Queen Elizabeth was already a part of history and Shakespeare's career as a playwright was also stepping into history; all memories were infused into the composition of *Henry VIII*. In presenting 'memories' and 'histories' in *Henry VIII,* Shakespeare and Fletcher portrayed the characters' concern about how they would be remembered in history. Textually, the construction of histories is a shared theme in all of Shakespeare's history plays, and yet in *Henry VIII*, dramatic characters directly discuss and try to control how their histories will be written more consciously. For instance, before his execution, the Duke of Buckingham reviews his life through the alterations of his titles, compares his father's fate with his, counsels people by using his own history as an example, and finally asks to be remembered: 'when you would say something that is sad,/ Speak how I fell' (*HVIII* 2.1.135-136).

Three Queens in *Henry VIII*

The title of *Henry VIII: All is True* implies the relationship between 'histories' and 'truths'. Harald Weinrich observes that *Aletheia*, a Greek word meaning 'truth', is formed by a prefix of 'a-' ('not') and 'lethe' ('the river of forgetting') and thereby interprets 'truth as the 'unforgotten'' or the ''not-to-be-forgotten'''.[36] Weinrich further suggests that 'for hundreds of years Western philosophical thought, following the Greeks, sought truth on the side of not-forgetting and thus of memory and remembrance'.[37] As discussed in the previous section on 'Queens Memorialising', Margaret of Anjou and her comrades in the female community constantly reiterate their versions of history to make their memorialisation well accepted, remembered, and articulated. 'Queens Memorialised' focuses on Katherine of Aragon's residue of queenship and argues that *Henry VIII* presents parallel narratives of three queens – Queen Katherine of Aragon, Queen Anne Boleyn and Princess Elizabeth (the future Elizabeth I). Shakespeare and Fletcher used different aspects of the 'art of memory' to portray Queen Katherine of Aragon, Anne Boleyn, and Princess Elizabeth, such as descriptive accounts, performative gestures and actions, and ceremonies.[38] Katherine gains dramatic power and space by being a dominant and virtuous queen; Anne, with her apparent silence, constitutes an important element in spectacles; Elizabeth, being a baby, is addressed with prophecies, which endorse her and James I's future successions. Cranmer's prophecy for Princess Elizabeth at her christening is a dramatic device that writes the future through the playwrights' recollection of the past. In *Henry VIII*, Shakespeare and Fletcher revealed how history continued chronologically with time elapsing, while the process of 'writing history' was reading the past anti-chronologically. Textually and contextually, *Henry VIII* is a perfect example through which one can explore the relationship between queens and memorialisation inside and outside the play and summarise Shakespeare's representation of queenship in his English dramatic histories.

'Let me be used with honour': Katherine of Aragon in *Henry VIII*

Memorialising Queenship

In *Henry VIII*, Katherine of Aragon endeavours to validate her memories, preserve

---

[36] Weinrich, *Lethe*, p. 4.
[37] Ibid.
[38] For 'the art of history', see the discussion of Burke's five different media of transmitting memory in the introduction of Part III: The Residue of Queenship (Burke, 'History as Social Memory', pp. 47-49).

her queenship, and fashion a friendly history for herself. As early as in her divorce trial in Act II, Scene iv, Katherine beseeches Henry VIII to ratify her memory and avoids engaging with the hostile official hearing and its attempt at rewriting the status and history of her marriage. She tries to invoke the King's 'remembering' of her as a good, obedient, and loyal wife for more than twenty years:

> KATHERINE Sir, *call to mind*
>> That I have been your wife in this obedience
>> Upward of twenty years, and have been blessed
>> With many children *by you*.
>>> (*Henry VIII* 2.4.32-35, emphasis added).

Recollecting her housewifery, calculating the years, and reminiscing about the children they lost, Katherine tries to prove that her royal marriage with Henry VIII is *de facto*. To increase the dramatic effect and strengthen Katherine's cause, Shakespeare and Fletcher rewrote Raphael Holinshed's record of Katherine's testimony. In Holinshed's *Chronicles*, Katherine pleads with Henry VIII that

> I haue beene your wife these twentie yeares and more, & you haue had *by me* diuerse children. If there be anie iust cause that you can alleage against me, either of dishonestie, or matter lawful to put me from you; I am content to depart to my shame and rebuke: and if there be none, then I praie you to let me haue iustice at your hand.[39]

The similarity of the dramatic lines and historical narratives indicates that Shakespeare and Fletcher referred to Holinshed closely. Therefore, the obvious change of 'many children *by you*' to '*by me* diuerse children' is the playwrights' application of dramatic licence in favour of Katherine's cause to Henry VIII's 'conscience', supporting Katherine's queenship and her memory. Furthermore, in Katherine's self-defence, she recollects how Henry VII and King Ferdinand of Spain 'gathered a wise council' to 'debate this business' and asked a dispensation from the Pope to verify the lawful

---

[39] Holinshed, 'Henrie the Eight, Sonne and Successor to Henrie the Seuenth' in *The Chronicles,* Vol. 3, p. 907, emphasis added.

marriage between Henry VIII and Katherine, who was 'sometimes [his] brother's wife' (*HVIII* 2.4.42-51, 178). Katherine might have used letters between their fathers and documentation of the dispensation from the Pope to substantiate her memories and prove the validity of her marriage. The memories about Katherine being a wife, a mother, and an adviser should have been stored in the *memoria* of Henry VIII and of the English people, so that her marriage is both *de facto* and *de jure*. Notwithstanding, Henry VIII keeps posing his silence, negligence, and even deliberate forgetfulness, undermining Katherine's attempt to memorialise her queenship.

'Histories'

Katherine's version of memories about her marriage is banished from Henry VIII's court, but she learns from Griffith, her Gentleman Usher, about the possibility of alternative histories. In Act IV, Scene ii, the discussion about the history of Wolsey between Katherine and Griffith implies the possible co-existence of two different but equally valid sets of memories and suggests the subtle negotiation in the formation of histories. At the beginning of this deathbed scene, Katherine's weariness and drowsiness suggest the decline of her physical and spiritual energy and authority in the English court and imply the imminent banishment of her queenship into the oblivion of the official memory.[40] Although she might be forgotten by the English court, she does not forget it. She inquires about the aftermath of Wolsey's dismissal, and Griffith reports the Cardinal's fall, repentance, and demise. Though she claims to treat Wolsey 'with charity' as she proclaims, the Princess Dowager concludes that his life is the antithesis of the life of a good cleric (*HVIII* 4.2.33-44). Responding to Katherine's criticism, Griffith reasons, 'Man's evil manners live in brass, their virtues/ We write in water' (*HVIII* 4.3.45-47). After Katherine's consent, Griffith 'speak[s] [Wolsey's] good', recounts his humble birth, praises his scholarship, rhetoric, and ambition, and names his political, academic, and religious contributions, engraving an alternative epitaph for Wolsey. Griffith's justification makes Katherine and the audience re-evaluate the Cardinal's history and understand the possibility of various conflicting but equally valid versions of histories.

In the discussion about Wolsey, Katherine's version is not the exclusive or the most

---

[40] See Sullivan's analysis of the significance of lethargy and sleep in relation to oblivion in Chapter One, "Embodying Oblivion' in *Memory and Forgetting*, pp. 25-43.

authoritative one regardless of the hierarchical difference between a former Queen of England and a Gentleman Usher. This is also illustrated in the previous history plays: how queens' minor, marginal, or alternative histories might undermine and influence grand narratives in history writing, as with Queen Isabel's winter tale of Richard II's deposition and the dehumanised version of Richard III created by the queens' community. In Shakespeare and Fletcher's dramatisation, Katherine's acceptance of an alternative history of Wolsey implies her virtuous generosity as a worthy Queen, resonating with the Epilogue's proclamation of 'the merciful construction of good women' (*HVIII* Epilogue 10). The co-existence of two different accounts of the Cardinal indicates the writing of 'histories', rather than 'the history'. As this was the methodology applied in chronicles by Holinshed and other early modern historiographers, Shakespeare and Fletcher were aware of the existence of sundry narratives and various kinds of evidence, and thereby they presented different voices and 'histories' in their dramatisations of English histories, echoing the subtitle of 'all is true'.[41]

The possibility of different memories of Wolsey suggests that Katherine might elicit different versions of memories about herself to contest Henry VIII's official version. Katherine asks for 'an honest chronicler' to write her history after her demise: she intends to be 'remembered' as the loyal, caring, and loving wife of Henry VIII, mother of Princess Mary, Queen of England. In addition to these publicised and well-known identities, she also seeks the image of a mistress kind to her servants, since in her will, she makes a petition to Henry VIII that her attendants 'may have their wages duly paid' so that they may have 'something over to *remember me* [her] by' (*HVIII* 4.2.131-158, 150-151, emphasis added). Throughout the play, Katherine has been asking people to remember: she used to ask the Duke of Buckingham's Surveyor to recount his memory faithfully, truly, and kindly, and tried to defend the Duke by reminding Henry VIII of the history between the Duke and the Surveyor. She asked Henry VIII to remember their history in the divorce trial, and now she asks people to remember her queenship after she dies.

History Writings in *Henry VIII*

---

[41] Regarding composing historical narratives with information from 'sundries places and shires of England', see William Harrison, 'Epistel Dedicatorie' in the volume of *An Historicall description of the Iland of Britain* in Holinshed's *The Chronicles*, A2r-A2v.

The idea of 'an honest chronicler' is intriguing in this play. Griffith has provided a kind, sympathetic, and positive history of Wolsey, stressing his contributions, rather than revealing the Cardinal's immoral and illegal doings. What Katherine desires might be similar: she intends to have a favourable version of history, rather than one that honestly points out the relation between her infertility, the religious reformation, and the divorce. Shakespeare and Fletcher might have been aware of their double roles as playwrights and historians: they dramatised the difficulty and dilemma of history writing through the competition of different versions of memories to attain the status of 'truth'. The meta-discourse of history writing is represented in different characters' desires for good histories and for being remembered kindly.

However, being written unkindly in history is one concern, while being forgotten is another. Katherine's anxiety of oblivion is alleviated by a heavenly dream vision of her reception into God's grace by six dancing spirits (*HVIII* 4.2.82.1-15). In dramatic representations of Katherine of Aragon and Elizabeth I, both historical queens are depicted as having had dreams about the reception of angels in Heaven. One of the possible sources of Katherine's dream vision in *Henry VIII* is Heywood's *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody*, published in 1605 with a subtitle, *The Trouble of Queen Elizabeth*. In the play, the young princess Elizabeth also dreams of angels defending her and presenting her with a Bible; like Katherine in *Henry VIII*, Elizabeth in *If You Know Not Me* is also comforted by the dream and believes it to be 'the "inspiration" of "heaven"'.[42] Furthermore, dramatically in *Henry VIII*, Shakespeare and Fletcher further paralleled the divorced Spanish Queen Katherine to the newborn Princess Elizabeth with the lily, the symbol of royalty, virginity, and purity, which eventually extended to the issue of their fertility and ageing and became an attribute that should be applied carefully.

As for the memorialisation of her deathbed moment, Katherine receives the most detailed dramatisation of any Queen in Shakespeare's English history plays. In *Henry VIII*, Shakespeare and Fletcher created an unhistorical dream vision for Katherine of Aragon to suggest that even though she could not preserve her titular queenship in Henry VIII's court, she would be granted justice and glory in Heaven. The playwrights simultaneously guaranteed her a favourable memory in their dramatisation.

In addition, analysing the final moment of presenting maternity in paintings and

---

[42] McMullan's 'Introduction', in Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*, p. 135.

effigies, Laoutaris states that 'death-bed speeches and mothers' blessings are often presented as natural extensions of the maternal or nurturing role'.[43] According to Laoutaris, the reassurance of the mother's role, a praise of Christian virtues, and an expectation for God's grace like a mother's protection and care – to forgive and be forgiven – are all features of the deathbed speech. It also needs to be witnessed so that it may display 'one's elect status'.[44] The deathbed situation constructed the scenario in which early modern mothers wrote their final messages and left their legacies; furthermore, it was often narrated in diaries, depicted in portraits, and moulded in sculptures and on tombs to commemorate the mothers' final moment and memorialise their maternity. Textualising the deathbed moment in various media became part of the 'death-ritual' to 'convey the spiritual, emotional and ideological contours of the maternal posture in new and dramatic ways'.[45] In comparison with early modern mothers' death-bed speeches, Katherine of Aragon's final will expands her motherhood from her concerns for Princess Mary to her cares about her servants and ladies-in-waiting, suggesting the motherhood in her queenship for the whole England.

Historically, Katherine was not buried in Westminster Abbey, but in Peterborough Cathedral with Prince Arthur. Her funeral was held with the ceremony appropriate for a Princess Dowager in 1536. In the engraving on her tomb stone there is a pomegranate, which was her coat of arms commemorating the Spanish conquest of Granada, and on the gate of her chapel in the Cathedral, she is titled 'Queen of England'. Both in early modern or modern times, historically or dramatically, Katherine of Aragon is memorialised through her queenship.

Memorialising Typological Queenship

In studying Shakespeare's portrayal of queenship in his English history plays, this thesis argues that the playwright writes a new definition of the Queen's Two Bodies, especially for queens consort: despite the deterioration of queens' body natural, a body cultural is succeeded among queens and embodied in their virtues when practising their roles as queens; it eventually establishes the memorialisation of an iconography of queenship. The queen's body natural encompasses the biological aspect, such as the sexuality of queenship, their biological function as the conveyor of royal reproduction.

---

[43] Laoutaris, *Shakespearean Maternities*, p. 231.
[44] Ibid., p. 231.
[45] Ibid., p. 19.

The queen's body cultural argues the succession of queens' virtues between queens consort and even queens regnant both in literature and in history. For instance, despite the fact that Elizabeth I did not procreate any child biologically, she was still spiritually, culturally, and politically the mother of England and the predecessor of James I. Elizabeth I became a type for literary depictions of women, especially queens.

Typology was originally used as a method of interpreting the Holy Scripture: reading figures in the Old Testament as types and finding parallel figures in the New Testament as their antitypes. Therefore, all the figures and episodes in the New Testament are predestined in the Old Testament. However, the parallels between types and antitypes are not a full copy of history. As Robert E. Reiter explains, when Jesus is typified as Job, it does not mean that their experiences, histories, virtues, or features are completely identical. In typology, types and antitypes are established through the premise that the types are models appearing in the Old Testament – they are historical, independent, and valid in their own existence, while the antitypes 'typify' their types only 'in certain and rather restricted aspects'.[46] The emphasis on specific feature of the type is a reminder for the antitypes of the missions they should complete or virtues they should preserve or acquire.

Typological readings find similarities in types and their antitypes regarding their parallel incidents or features (characteristics and virtues) to create historical and theological significance through the reiterations and elision of histories. When typologies are used, the contexts are simultaneously elided, and thereby, they 'enable events that are unconnected to create relevance for each other in an alternative relationship with a historically intervening divinity'.[47] Extending from this concept, typology is not limited to using biblical figures as types. This thesis argues that the use of typology is a method of memorialisation. It revives the memory of distant historical, mythical, and biblical figures (the types), and subsequently add the recollected attributes of the types to the antitypes, increasing their historical importance. Typology is itself a genre for memorialisation and its formation is through the action of memorialising.

In his dramatisation of English queenship, Shakespeare strategically appropriated the characteristics in the iconography of Elizabeth I's queenship, whether of which were

---

[46] Robert E. Reiter, 'On Biblical Typology and the Interpretation of Literature', *College English* 30 (1969), 562-571 (p. 563).
[47] Vivienne Westbrook, 'Paratextual Typologies in Reformation Contexts', *Sun Yat-Sen Journal of Humanities* 17 (2003), 117-133 (p. 117).

adapted and renovated from previous typological figures or innovated by Elizabeth I herself. For instance, Margaret of Anjou in Shakespeare's first tetralogy elaborates how aristocratic women choose whom to marry, and make use of royal marriage to elevate themselves. The appearance of the baby Princess Elizabeth in Shakespeare's and Fletcher's *Henry VIII* invokes various discussions, including arguments about the representation and re-evaluation of Elizabeth I's rulership in the reign of James I, and arguments about the application of such representations and parallels in comparison with the contemporary Stuart court. The Stuart contexts implied in the play are opined in three sets of relationships to Queen Elizabeth: 1) between Elizabeth I and James I in terms of the inheritance of the English throne and the issue of legitimacy; 2) between Elizabeth Tudor and Elizabeth Stuart, which originates directly from their shared first name and from the historical context that *Henry VIII* was part of the Stuart princess's wedding celebration; 3) between Elizabeth I and Anne of Denmark, especially in terms of their patronage of art (literature, music, drama, painting, etc).[48] The final association generates an interesting comparison and contrast between the two queens, despite one being a queen regnant in the play and the other a queen consort in history. All of these are concerned with domestic and international politics in the Stuart court. This is, of course, because the play was first staged, or at least first recorded as performed in a Jacobean context in 1613. However, these Tudor-Stuart associations and interpretations can be re-examined from a different perspective by reading the attributes shared by Elizabeth I and Katherine and inherited through the body cultural in their queenship in *Henry VIII*.

Shakespeare's and Fletcher's *Henry VIII* is the only play that dramatises Queen Katherine and Elizabeth and even sets up parallels between them at the same time. In the scene when Cranmer presents his prophecy for the future Queen Elizabeth I, who is now but an infant princess in the play, he also compares Elizabeth I to a lily. According to Cranmer,

---

[48] Tracy Lee van der Leeuw compares Elizabeth I and Anne of Denmark through their versatility and interest in dancing and their support of drama and masque in *Dancing Queen, Elizabeth I and Anna of Denmark: Dance, Masques, and the Queen's Role*, Ph.D. thesis, advised by John Watkins (Minnesota: University of Minnesota, 2003). Interestingly, Susan Frye analyzes the relationship between Katherine of Aragon and Anne of Denmark, two queens consort, implicated in the representation of Katherine in the play of *King Henry VIII*. See Frye, 'Queens and the Structure of History in *Henry VIII*' in *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works: The Poems, Problem Comedies, Late Plays*, ed. by Richard Dutton and Jean E. Howard (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003; paperback 2006), pp. 427-444.

> She shall be, to the happiness of England,
>
> An aged princess; many days shall see her,
>
> And yet no day without a deed to crown it.
>
> Would I had known no more; but she must die,
>
> She must, the saints must have her; yet a virgin,
>
> A most unspotted lily shall she pass
>
> To th'ground, and all the world shall mourn her.

(*HVIII* 5.4.56-62)

When Katherine mentions lily, she addresses it as the mistress of the field, while Cranmer elaborates Elizabeth being the 'happiness of England', the sole determinant of the fortune of England. Using a lily in Princess Elizabeth's baptism might refresh the audience's memory about the famous Italian Renaissance painting: Leonardo Da Vinci's 'The Annunciation' (1472-1475). In this painting, the archangel Gabriel holds a Madonna lily to symbolize and praise the virginity of the Holy Mother.[49] As mentioned earlier, Katherine compares herself to a withered lily: though, aged and disfavored, she is still THE queen of England. In Cranmer's speech, Princess Elizabeth is compared to a lily because of the virtue of virginity. Yet, in Katherine's speech, 'the mistress of the field' may also refer to Queen Elizabeth I's role as the mistress, the bride of England; while in the speech of Elizabeth's baptism, 'aging' is also a topic shared by Katherine. Aging, chaste with no sexual lust, and infertile, both Katherine and Elizabeth face the problem of a lack of procreation. From the idea of virginity to the issue of infertility, the image of the Virgin and Mother is both powerful and dangerous for both queens.

McMullan notices that Katherine and Elizabeth in both the play and in history face the same crisis: the infertility of male royal heirs for the Tudor succession.[50] Michael Dobson and Nicola J. Watson even addresses the situation as 'post-menopausal' and it presents a dead-end for the future of the Tudor dynasty.[51] Carney argues that procreating royal heirs, especially male ones, are the principal mission for all queens.[52] Both

---

[49] In Edmund Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, Elizabeth is not a replacement or a successor of the Virgin Mother, but an alternative, another type of, queen of virginity and virtues in Protestant England in competition with the Virgin Mary in Roman Catholicism. For more about discussions of the cultural representations of Elizabeth I and the Virgin Mary, see Hackett's *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen*.

[50] McMullan, 'Introduction', in *King Henry VIII*, p. 129.

[51] Michael Dobson and Nicola J. Watson, *England's Elizabeth: An Afterlife in Fame and Fantasy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 45.

[52] Carney, 'Queenship in Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*', pp. 189-202.

Katherine of Aragon and Elizabeth I failed to provide an effective, biological inheritor of the Tudor dynasty: Katherine did not give birth to healthy sons for Henry VIII, and Elizabeth I establishes herself to be the virgin queen. Yet, both of them succeeded: because historically Katherine did have a daughter, Mary I, who ended up to be the first queen regnant in the Tudor dynasty, and Elizabeth I had a non-consanguineous but legal heir, James I.[53] Historically, Queen Anne Boleyn and Queen Mary I also face the issue of infertility of male heirs; however, Shakespeare and Fletcher do not dramatise or implicate these 'royal frustrations' in the play, and furthermore, it seems that dramatically, Katherine of Aragon is arranged a successor to her virtue in the play of *King Henry VIII*, that is, the baby Princess Elizabeth.

Conclusion of Part Three: the Residue of Queenship

Throughout his English history plays, Shakespeare dramatised and memorialised various aspects of queenship, displaying different types of images of queens – virtuous but defiant, lamenting but powerful, angry but dignified, and divorced but honoured to name a few – and constructing a cultural pattern of queenship. For instance, in *Henry VIII*, Katherine exhibits an example of 'good women' who defy secular authority and secure her own version of history. In *Richard III*, most queens recount what happened to their children so that they are writing their history through their maternity, like early modern aristocratic women are commemorated by their maternal roles. However, the difference between the mothers' legacies and the queens' memorialisations is that the former is produced with the expectation of the mothers' deaths, while the latter is generated upon the death of the children. Because of the loss of the royal children, these queens can only accomplish their maternal duties by imagining nurturing their children according to their previous memories, by invoking people's memories about their children, and by treating the whole kingdom as their children and educating it with the queens' versions of memories/histories. In queenship, I would argue that Shakespeare creates a reversed version of 'mother's legacy', rewriting the relationship between early modern women and memorialisation for queens who lose and outlive their children. Therefore, the inheritance of mothers' legacies is not carried out by the queens' children, but by the fellow queens or a new generation of queens, creating a succession

---

[53] Kim H. Noling, 'Grubbing Up the Stock: Dramatising Queens in *Henry VIII*', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 39.3 (1988), 291-306.

of queenship.

In *Shakespearean Maternities*, Laoutaris argues that women made use of the remembrance for mothers to justify their desire to be commemorated – motherhood was the mark of their honour.[54] Yet for many of Shakespeare's English queens, their honour does not rely solely upon their motherhood, but rather on their roles as advisers, defenders, and even soldiers during their queenship. What this thesis argues is that queens' attempts and actions to remember and to be remembered as queens (rather than as daughters or mothers) are accomplished by involving themselves in the process of memorialisations – either playing the role of historians or serving as living monuments.

---

[54] See Laoutaris's analysis of Elizabeth Hoby Russell registering her own commemoration through the voice of a mother in ibid., p. 229.

Conclusion

Queens in Shakespeare's English history plays form a small group of characters that only a few critics have read together as a whole. This thesis has studied all the queens in Shakespeare's English history plays in detail to see how Shakespeare represents queenship. It recognises the feminists' dilemma posed by their search for Shakespeare's support for women and their findings of the playwright's dramatisation in accordance with historical facts. It argues that in the patriarchal contexts, Shakespeare's representations of queenship demonstrate how queens make use of the resources to hand to challenge and transgress the boundaries of gender division in private and public. It also proposes that queens intervene in the process of history writing and are memorialised in the establishment of an iconography of queenship.

Existing literature has focused on examining queens as daughters, wives, mothers, or widows – identities that are largely based on women's biological and social relation attached to men in domestic terms. Although there have been discussions of queens who serve as soldiers or ambassadors in the place of their weak kings/husbands or in assistance to their natal fathers, these findings inevitably conclude that these queens would revert to their domestic roles and be removed from the centre of the courts after serving the purposes of helping to reestablish patriarchal authority. However, these discussions underestimate the queens' self-empowerment through assuming the roles of queens consort, regent, and even regnant at different points in time as well as in different public and private spaces. In Shakespeare's English history plays, the careers of queens not only shed light on questions about the purpose, definition, and significance of women's existence, but also illustrate women's wider social value, function, and network in early modern England.

There have been intermittent readings and analyses of queens and their roles in Shakespeare's English history plays. While some studies seek to configure Shakespeare's relationship with women, such as his relation to, or perceptions of, Elizabeth I, others attempt to establish whether the playwright himself was a misogynist or a proto-feminist. That aside, as Shakespeare' English history plays were largely based on early modern historical chronicles, another trend has been to view him as a historiographer and to search for explanations where the plots depart from historical facts. This thesis recognises Shakespeare's interest in history writing, exemplified as it

were by his dramatisation of queens' intricate relationships and their manipulation of
memory and history. Instead of researching Shakespeare's personal gender and religious
inclinations, this thesis examines the roles of queens using a parallel comparison of the
playwright's contemporary thoughts and twentieth-century concepts of virtues, space,
and memorialisation.

Using modern theories to examine an early modern society has its risks. Modern
theorists might be accused of underplaying the discrepancies of political, sociological,
economic, and cultural elements at different times. The obvious pitfall is to
overemphasise modern theories as the main texts while using early modern literature as
the contextual illustrations. This thesis confers equal weight to early modern arguments
and modern theories with reference to queens' attributes, such as virtues and cultural
capital, the fluidity of space, and the accessibility of memory and monuments in reading
Shakespeare's texts and contexts. By doing so, it seeks to introduce new ways to
analyse queens in Shakespeare's history plays and to unlock the potential to counteract
conventional patriarchal thinkings.

'Part One: The Pursuit of Queenship' explores how women in Shakespeare's
English history plays cultivate, display, and implement virtues to increase their value
and accommodate themselves to the acceptance, acquisition, and rejection of queenship
in the marriage market of different situations and of different political needs. Reading
how a woman seeks or fails to become a queen helps elucidate the correlation of early
modern English education, family network, and marriage as portrayed in Shakespeare's
histories. This section understands queens' virtues as cultural capital, which may be
engendered from, and applied in, education, family network, and marriage. This
economic analysis of queenship does not entail a materialistic reading/rendering.
Rather, it is an extension of Pierre Bourdieu's studies of social anthropology and Gayle
Rubin's observations of women in the marriage market, from both of which this thesis
sets out to read queens' virtues (silence, chastity, wisdom, political knowledge, human
relationship, ability to govern) as a form of capital in pre-capitalist early modern
society. It is not women but the resources – education, family network, and marriage –
which are materialised. Whether in times of disorder or of conformity, royal marriages
are used as a tool to achieve a new order. Instead of exploring how kings or princes
pursue their future brides, the section emphasises what kinds of rhetoric and actions

female characters apply to accept, pursue, or reject queenship in Shakespeare's English history plays. These queens-to-be display their virtues – chastity, silence, obedience, training in languages, and even political insights– in the process of becoming queens. They are not static objects on the marriage market or in the pursuit of queenship, but potentially powerful future queens who manipulate their virtues and resources to survive in the interaction with patriarchal authority.

'Part Two: The Practice of Queenship' further investigates how, after being granted royal status, queens exhibit their personal feelings, manipulate the performance of private selves, and practise their virtues in political, domestic, and military spaces. These queens' exceptional practice in various spaces undermines the conventional gender code of space. In Shakespeare's dramatisation, womanly virtues, such as silence, chastity, and obedience, are interpreted and implemented differently by these English queens. While women are advised to avoid appearing in public – not to mention speaking or acting in public – queens are public figures: their appearance is required and their exemplary behaviour must be seen, discussed, and imitated. The spaces allocated to wives and mothers are domestic, but queens, whilst playing the roles of wives and mothers, are performing these duties under the eyes of the public. In this section, we have seen how queens voice the views and act in public, in private, and in the spaces in-between. Their presence, very much like that of kings', creates a fluidity for the nature of space: it has the power of making a public space private by raising the royal families' domestic issues, and expressing their personal feelings, such as wifely or parental affections, anger, and sorrow in public courts. Conversely, they can make a private occasion public by expressing their opinions on court politics in their private chambers or in the garden, as Queen Isabel does in *Richard II*, or demonstrating their queenly authority in their private courts, as Katherine of Aragon does in *Henry VIII*. Furthermore, Shakespeare even presents us with queens on battlefields, wearing armour, leading troops, and governing the state, particularly in the intriguing case of Queen Philippa in *Edward III*. In a way queens consort are like their kingly husbands: their bodies are both public and private. The King's Two Bodies which comprise the body natural and the body politic may explain a political, spiritual, juristic, and even economic transition of the authority and legitimacy of kingship. However, this thesis advances the concept of 'body cultural' in the Queen's Two Bodies for queens consort to explain a non-political, but cultural inheritance of queenship – the queenly virtues

and models. This body cultural – one kind of inheritance of queenship – engenders a specific iconographical memorialisation of queens. Queens remember, and are remembered, through other queens, which leads to the final stage of queenship: memorialisation in 'The Residue of Queenship'.

Anne J. Duggan states that queens consort might be strong or weak but they are important in the memorialisation of the royal family; their significance in 'the maintenance of the *memoria* of their families cannot be easily eliminated.[1] 'Part III: The Residue of Queenship' examines this very relation between queens and memorialisation as they become the witnesses, historians, and monuments in writing history and in being written about in history. This section is comparatively short, reflecting the dearth of Shakespeare's portrayal of queens after they lose their queenly titles. However, the playwright illustrates how queens are commissioned to write an alternative history to counter the grand narrative, as happens when Queen Isabel is asked to relay Richard II's version of his deposition. Queens also compose their own accounts of history, which would first circulate within their own female communities in the form of oral history, then spread to the younger generations, and eventually create a different and well-known narrative concerning a historical figure or incidents. The queens in *Henry VI, Part Three* illustrate the genesis of an alternative history of Richard III and its influence. Finally, Shakespeare also dramatises how queens are concerned about how they will be memorialised as Katherine of Aragon in *Henry VIII* seeks a friendly and positive history for herself to avoid being obliterated from history.

Findlay states that 'performance physically enacts the play's journey or narrative through space and time'.[2] Hence, Shakespeare's dramatisation of queens is itself a commemoration of queens through presenting queen characters physically on stage and re-presenting their history in the space of three hours. This research on Shakespeare's dramatic representations of queenship is also a memorialisation of queens. Starting with reading and analysing Shakespeare's English history plays closely, it has studied queens in the chronological order of the queens' lives, focusing on their relations to virtue, space, and memorialisation. We may conclude that not only does Shakespeare's dramatisation of English queens reflect the power structure of marriage, education, and familial networking, but it also depicts queens' manipulation of space, in addition to the

---

[1] Duggan, ed., *Queens and Queenship*, pp. xxi-xxii.
[2] Findlay, *Playing Spaces*, p. 5.

ambiguous divisions of the public and the private and the writing of a female version of history.

This thesis challenges the common perception of powerful but wicked, weak but virtuous, queens in Shakespeare's English history plays. A close reading of Shakespeare's dramatisation along with the historical chronicles and the context of early modern England reveals how Shakespeare, unlike his contemporary historians or playwrights, paid special attention to the characterisation of queens. The thesis distinguishes and recognises the similarities and discrepancies between queens consort and queens regnant. It introduces an economic perspective on virtue to argue how queens apply this cultural capital to empower themselves through the means and process of marriage, education, and family networking. It proposes the idea of the body cultural as a specific method of memorialisation of queenship. Like kingship, queenship is looking for a tradition that validates an authority that could be passed down among queens. This authority is less politically based than culturally formed. It recognises Shakespeare's attempt to memorialise queens throughout medieval and early modern England in his plays. The idea of the body cultural and the study of queenship and memorialisation may contribute to the iconographical and typological studies of queenship and the writing of women's history. Despite the queens' ultimate subjugation to patriarchal authority in the plays and in historical reality, Shakespeare's dramatised queens are shown strategically to manipulate passive power in performing their virtues in different spaces to memorialise, and be memorialised, in literature and in history.

Works Cited

- Primary Works

Anon, *A New Enterlude Drawen Oute of the holy Scripture of Godly Queene Hester, Verye Necessary, Newly Made and Imprinted, Etc. B.L.* (London: Wyllyam Pickerynge & Thomas Hacket, 1561), *ESTC* S106101.

Aylmer, John, *An harborowe for faithfull and trewe subiectes* (Strasbourg, 1559; Amsterdam, 1972), *STC* (2nd ed.) 1005 and *ESTC* S100367.

Baldwin, William, *The Mirror for Magistrates* (1559), ed. by Lily B. Campbell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938).

Elizabeth I, *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, ed. by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2000).

---, *Elizabeth I: Translations 1544-1589*, ed. by Janel Mueller, and Joshua Scodel (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2009).

---, *Elizabeth I: Translations 1592-1598*, ed. by Janel Mueller, and Joshua Scodel (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2009).

---, *Queen Elizabeth I: Selected Works*, ed. by Steven W. May (New York: Washington Square Press, 2004).

Foxe, John, *Actes and Monuments of These Latter and Perillous Days [...]* (London, 1563), *STC* (2nd ed.) 11230 and *ESTC* S113097. *(John Foxe's* Actes and Monuments *Online*, University of Sheffield, http://www.johnfoxe.org/).

Hall, Edward, *The vnion of the two noble and illustre famelies of Lancastre & Yorke, beyng long in continuall discension for the croune of this noble realme: with al the actes done in both the tymes of the princes, both of the one linage & of the other....* (London: Rychard Grafton, 1550), *STC* (2nd ed.) 12723. *ESTC* S120059.

Harrison, William, 'Epistel Dedicatorie' in the volume of *An Historicall description of the Iland of Britain* in Holinshed's *The Chronicles*, A2r-A2v.

Heywood, Thomas, *An apology for actors. Containing three briefe treatises. 1. Their antiquity. 2. Their ancient dignity. 3. The true vse of their quality* (London: N. Okes, 1612), *STC* (2nd ed.) 13309 and *ESTC* S106113.

Holinshed, Raphael, *The Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland.* (London : Printed by Henry Denham, at the expenses of Iohn Harison, George Bishop, Rafe

Newberie, Henrie Denham, and Thomas Woodcocke, 1587), *STC* 13569 and *ESTC* S93013.

---, 'Henrie the Eight, Sonne and Successor to Henrie the Seuenth', in *The Chronicles*, (London: Henry Denham, 1587), Vol. 3, pp. 799-978.

Knox, John, *The first blast of the trumpet against the monstruous regiment of women* (Geneva, 1558; Amsterdam 1972), *STC* (2nd ed.) 15070, *ESTC* S108129.

Leslie, John, *A defence of the honour of the right highe, mightye and noble princesse Marie, queene of Scotlande and dowager of France [...]* (London: 1569), *ESTC* S108490.

Raleigh, Walter, *The History of the World* (London: Walter Burre, 1614), *ESTC* S116300.

Shakespeare, William, *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. by Stephen Greenblatt, et al. (New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1997).

---, *King Edward III*, ed. by Giorgio Melchiori, *The New Cambridge Shakespeare* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

---, *King Richard III*, ed. by Antony Hammond, Arden Shakespeare, 2nd series (London and New York: Routledge, 1981).

---, *The Taming of the Shrew*, ed. by Brian Morris, Arden Shakespeare, 2nd series (London and New York: Methuen, 1981).

---, and John Fletcher, *King Henry VIII (All is True)*, ed. by Gordon McMullan, Arden Shakespeare, 3rd series (London: Thomson Learning, 2000).

Sidney, Philip, *The Defence of Poesie* (London: [by Thomas Creede] for William Ponsonby, 1595), *STC* (2nd ed.) 22535 and *ESTC* S119205.

Smith, Thomas, *De Republica Anglorum* (London: 1583), *ESTC* 117628.

Vives, Juan Luis, *De Institutione Feminae Christianae, Liber Primus: Introduction, Critical Edition, Translation and Notes*, ed. by C. Fantazzi and C. Matheeussen (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996).

---, *Opuscula Aliquot Vere Catholica. Introductio Ad Sapientiam. Satellitium Sive Symbola. De Ratione Studii Puerilis Epistolae II* (Apud P. Scholeffer: Argentorati, 1521).

---, *The Instruction of a Christen Woman*, ed. by Sheila ffolliott and Betty S. Travitsky, 1529 edn (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2002).

• Secondary Works

Adelman, Janet, *Suffocating Mothers: Fantasies of Maternal Origin in Shakespeare's Plays, Hamlet to The Tempest* (New York: Routledge, 1992).

Airaksinen, Timo, 'Against All the Odds: Machiavelli on Fortune in Politics', in *Niccolo Machiavelli*, ed. by Donskis, pp. 3-14.

Alford, Stephen, *The Early Elizabethan Polity: William Cecil and the British Succession Crisis, 1558-1569* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

Aughterson, Kate, ed., *Renaissance Woman: A Sourcebook, Constructions of Femininity in England* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995).

Axton, Marie, *The Queen's Two Bodies: Drama and the Elizabethan Succession* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1977).

Banks, Carol, 'Warlike Women: "reproofe to these degenerate effeminate dayes"?', in *Shakespeare's Histories*, ed. by Cavanagh, Hampton-Reeves, and Longstaffe, pp. 169-181.

Barkley, Harold, *Likeness in Line: An Anthology of Tudor and Stuart Engraved Portraits* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1982).

Barrett, Erin Gabrielle, *Art and the Construction of Early Medieval Queenship: The Iconography of the Joint Royal/ Imperial Portrait and the Visual Representation of the Ruler's Consort*, University of London, 1997 (Ph.D. Thesis).

Belsey, Andrew, and Catherine Belsey, 'Icons of Divinity: Portraits of Elizabeth I' in *Renaissance Bodies: The Human Figure in English Culture C. 1540-1660*, ed. by Lucy Gent and Nigel Llewellyn (London: Reaktion, 1990), pp. 11-35.

Bernard, G.W., *Anne Boleyn: Fatal Attractions* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2010).

Berry, Philippa, *Of Chastity and Power: Elizabethan Literature and the Unmarried Queen* (London: Routledge, 1989).

Betteridge, Thomas, and Anna Riehl, eds., *Tudor Court Culture* (Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 2010)

Bourdieu, Pierre, 'The Forms of Capital', in *Sociology of Education: A Critical Reader*, ed. by Alan R. Sadovnik (New York: Routledge, 2007), pp. 83-95.

---, and Jean-Claude Passeron, *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. trans. Richard Nice (London: Sage, 1977, 1990).

Buccola, Regina, and Lisa Hopkins, eds., *Marian Moments in Early Modern British Drama* (Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate, 2007).

Burke, Peter, 'History as Social Memory' in *Varieties of Cultural History* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997), pp. 43-59.

Carney, Jo Eldrige, 'Queenship in Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*: The Issue of Issue', in *Political Rhetoric, Power, and Renaissance Women*, ed. by Carole Levin and Patricia A. Sullivan (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995), pp. 189-202.

Carr, E. H., *What is History?* [1961] 1st ed., (Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave, 2001).

Carruthers, Mary, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture* [1990], 1st ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

Casey, Edward S., 'Forgetting Remembered', *Man and World: An International Philosophical Review* 25 (1992), 281-311.

Cavanagh, Dermot, Stuart Hampton-Reeves, and Stephen Longstaffe eds., *Shakespeare's Histories and Counter-Histories* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2006).

Clement, Jennifer, 'The Queen's Voice: Elizabeth I's *Christian Prayers and Meditations*', *Early Modern Literary Studies* 13.3 (January, 2008), 1.1-26. [http://purl.oclc.org/emls/13-3/clemquee.htm, accessed 28 September, 2009].

Cole, Mary Hill, *The Portable Queen: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Ceremony* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999).

Collinson, Patrick, 'Elizabeth I (1533-1603)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online edn, Oxford University Press, Oct 2006 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8636, accessed 28 September, 2009].

---, *Elizabethan Essays* (London: Hambledon, 1994).

Connolly, Annaliese and Lisa Hopkins, eds., *Goddesses and Queens: The Iconography of Elizabeth I* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).

Dillon, Janette, *Theatre, Court and City, 1595-1610: Drama and Social Space in London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

Dobson, Michael, and Nicola J. Watson, *England's Elizabeth: An Afterlife in Fame and Fantasy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

Dollimore, Jonathan, and Alan Sinfield, eds., *Political Shakespeare: New Essays in Cultural Materialism* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press,

1985).

Donskis, Leonidas, ed., *Niccolo Machiavelli: History, Power, and Virtue* (Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2011)

Doran, Susan, *Monarchy and Matrimony: A Study of Elizabeth I's Courtship* (New York and London: Routledge, 1996).

---, and Thomas S. Freeman, eds., *The Myth of Elizabeth* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

Downie, Penny, 'Queen Margaret in *Henry VI* and *Richard III*', in *Players of Shakespeare 3: Further Essays in Shakespearian Performance by Players with the Royal Shakespeare Company*, ed. by Russell Jackson and Robert Smallwood (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 114-139.

Duggan, Anne J., ed., *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe: Proceedings of a Conference Held at King's College London, April 1995* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 1997).

Eggert, Katherine, *Showing Like a Queen: Female Authority and Literary Experiment in Spenser, Shakespeare, and Milton* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000).

Elston, Timothy G., 'Transformation or Continuity? Sixteenth-Century Education and the Legacy of Catherine of Aragon, Mary I, and Juan Luis Vives', in *High and Mighty Queens'of Early Modern England: Realities and Representations*, ed. by Carole Levin, Debra Barrett-Graves, and Jo Eldridge Carney (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 11-26.

Espinosa, Ruben, *Masculinity and Marian Efficacy in Shakespeare's England* (Surrey: Ashgate, 2011).

Ezell, Margaret J. M., *The Patriarch's Wife: Literary Evidence and the History of the Family* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987).

Fentress, James, and Chris Wickham, *Social Memory* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992).

Findlay, Alison, *Playing Spaces in Early Women's Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

---, *Women in Shakespeare: A Dictionary* (London: Continuum, 2010).

Flather, Amanda, *Gender and Space in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Royal Historical Society and The Boydell Press, 2007).

Foakes, R. A., 'Introduction' in William Shakespeare's *King Lear*, ed. by R. A. Foakes,

Arden Shakespeare, 2nd series (London: Thomas Nelson and Son Ltd, 1997), pp. 1-151.

Fox, Adam, *Oral and Literate Culture in England 1500-1700* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000).

Friedman, Alice T., 'The Influence of Humanism on the Education of Girls and Boys in Tudor England', *History of Education Quarterly*, 25 (1985), 57-70.

Frye, Susan, *Elizabeth I: The Competition for Representation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

Garber, Marjorie, 'Out of Joint', in *The Body in Parts*, ed. by Hillman and Mazzio, pp. 23-51.

Goodland, Katherine, *Female Mourning in Medieval and Renaissance English Drama: From the Raising of Lazarus to King Lear* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005).

Habermas, Jürgen, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. by Thomas Burger (Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1991).

Hackett, Helen, *Shakespeare and Elizabeth: The Meeting of Two Myths* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2009).

---, 'Review of *Elizabeth I: Translations*, Ed. By Janel Mueller and Joshua Scodel (University of Chicago Press, 2009), in *Journal of the Northern Renaissance*, 2009. (http://www.northernrenaissance.org/reviews/emElizabeth-I-Translationsem-ed-by-Janel-Mueller-and-Joshua-Scodel-University-of-Chicago-Press-2009-br-Reviewed-by-Helen-Hackett/12.)

---, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen: Elizabeth I and the Cult of the Virgin Mary* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1995).

Hageman, Elizabeth H., and Katherine Conway, eds., *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England* (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2007).

Hamilton, Donna B., *Shakespeare and the Politics of Protestant England* (New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992).

Harris, Barbara J., *English Aristocratic Women, 1450-1550: Marriage and Family, Property and Careers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

---, 'Women and Politics in Early Tudor England', *The Historical Journal* 33.2 (1990), 259-281.

Healy, Margaret, *Richard II: William Shakespeare*, *Writers and Their Work* (Plymouth: Northcote House, 1998).

Hearn, Karen, ed., *Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England 1530-1630* (London: Tate Gallery, 1995).

---, and Rica Jones, *Marcus Gheeraerts II: Elizabethan Artist* (London: Tate Publishing, 2002).

Helmholz, Richard H., 'Abjuration *Sub Pena Nubendi* in the Church Courts of Medieval England', *Canon Law and the Law of England* (London: Hambledon Press, 1987), pp. 145-55.

---, 'Marriage and Divorce' in *The Oxford History of the Laws of England: Volume I: The Canon Law and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction from 597 to the 1640s* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), pp. 521-564.

Hicks, Michael, 'Anne (1456–1485)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2006 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/556, accessed 18 July 2011].

Hillman, David, and Carla Mazzio, eds., *The Body in Parts: Fantasies of Corporeality in Early Modern Europe* (New York and London: Routledge, 1997).

Hiscock, Andrew, *The Uses of This World: Thinking Space in Shakespeare, Marlowe, Cary and Jonson* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2004).

Hogrefe, Pearl, *Women of Action in Tudor England: Nine Biographical Sketches* (Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1977).

Holland, Peter, 'On the Gravy Train: Shakespeare, Memory and Forgetting', *Shakespeare, Memory and Performance*, ed. by Peter Holland (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 207-234.

Hopkins, Lisa, *Writing Renaissance Queens: Texts By and About Elizabeth I and Mary, Queen of Scots* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2002).

Horrox, Rosemary, 'Edward IV (1442-1483)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8520, accessed 20 Nov 2008].

---, 'Richard III (1452–1485)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23500, accessed 7 Sept 2011].

Houlbrooke, Ralph A., *The English Family 1450-1700* (London: Longman, 1984).

Howard, Jean E., and Phyllis Rackin, *Engendering a Nation: A Feminist Account of Shakespeare's English Histories* (London: Routledge, 1997).

Ives, Eric, *The Life and Death of Anne Boleyn* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004).

James, Susan E., 'Katherine [Katherine Parr] (1512–1548)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4893, accessed 31 March 2011].

Jansohn, Christa, ed., *Queen Elizabeth I: Past and Present* (Münster: LIT Verlag, 2004).

Jenkyns, Richard, *Westminster Abbey* (London: Profile Books, 2004).

Jinkins, Michael, and Deborah Bradshaw Jinkins, *The Character of Leadership: Political Realism and Public Virtue in Nonprofit Organizations* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1998).

Johnson, Jacqueline, 'Elizabeth of York: Mother of the Tudor Dynasty', in *Rituals and Rhetoric of Queenship: Medieval to Early Modern*, ed. by Liz Oakley-Brown & Louise J. Wilkinson, pp. 47-58.

Jones, Emrys, *Space and Place*, in *The Estyn Evans Lecture* (Belfast: Department of Geography, The Queen's University of Belfast, 1976).

Kantorowicz, Ernst H., *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1957).

Kaufman, Gloria, 'Juan Luis Vives on the Education of Women', *Signs* 3 (1978), 891-896.

Kelly-Gadol, Joan, 'Did Women Have a Renaissance?' in *Becoming Visible: Women in European History*, ed. by Renate Bridenthal and Claudia Koonz (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1977), pp.137-164.

Kelso, Ruth, *Doctrine for the Lady of the Renaissance* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1956).

Kennedy, Gwynne, *Just Anger: Representing Women's Anger in Early Modern England* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2000).

Kerrigan, John, ed., *Motives of Woe: Shakespeare and 'Female Complaint', A Critical Anthology* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002).

King, John N., 'Patronage and Piety: The Influence of Catherine Parr' in *Silent but for the Word: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works*, ed. by Margaret Patterson Hannay (Kent, Ohio: The Kent State University Press, 1985), pp 43-60.

---, 'Queen Elizabeth I: Representations of the Virgin Queen', *Renaissance Quarterly* 43 (1990), 30-74.

---, *Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and Art in an Age of Religious Crisis* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1989).

Klein, Stacy S., *Ruling Women: Queenship and Gender in Anglo-Saxon Literature* (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2006).

Knowles, James, '"Infinite riches in a little room": Marlowe and the Aesthetics of the Closet', in *Renaissance Configurations*, ed. by McMullan, pp. 3-29.

Laoutaris, Chris, *Shakespearean Maternities: Crises of Conception in Early Modern England* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008).

Leahy, William, '"You Cannot Show Me": Two Tudor Coronation Processions, Shakespeare's *King Henry VIII* and the Staging of Anne Bolyen', *EnterText: An Interactive Interdisciplinary E-Journal for Cultural and Historical Studies and Creative Work* 3.1 (2003), 132-144.

Lee, Patricia-Anne, 'Reflections of Power: Margaret of Anjou and the Dark Side of Queenship', *Renaissance Quarterly* 39 (1986), 183-217.

Lefebvre, Henri, *The Production of Space*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991).

Lemetti, Juhana, 'Virtue in Hobbes: Seen from a Machiavellian Point of View' in *Niccolo Machiavelli*, ed. by Donskis, pp. 79-89.

Levin, Carole, *Dreaming the English Renaissance: Politics and Desire in Court and Culture* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

---, '"I Trust I May Not Trust Thee": Women's Visions of the World in Shakespeare's *King John*', in *Ambiguous Realities: Women in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, ed. by Carole Levin and Jeanie Watson (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987), pp. 219-234.

---, *'The Heart and Stomach of a King': Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994).

Levine, Nina S., 'The Case of Eleanor Cobham: Authorizing History in *2 Henry VI*', *Shakespeare Studies* 22 (1994), pp. 104-121.

---, *Women's Matters: Politics, Gender, and Nation in Shakespeare's Early History Plays* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1998).

Logan, Sandra, 'Making History: The Rhetorical and Historical Occasion of Elizabeth Tudor's Coronation Entry', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 31:2 (2001), 251-82.

Maguire, Laurie E., '"Household Kates": Chez Petruchio, Percy and Plantagenet' in *Gloriana's Face: Women, Public and Private, in the English Renaissance*, eds. by S. P. Cerasano and Marion Wynne-Davies (New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992), pp. 129-165.

Malay, Jessica, 'Like a Queen: The Influence of the Elizabethan Court on the Structure of Women-Centered Households in the Early Modern Period', in *Tudor Court Culture*, ed. by Betteridge and Riehl, pp. 93-113.

Malcolmson, Cristina, and Mihoko Suzuki, eds. *Debating Gender in Early Modern England, 1500-1700* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).

Mazzio, Carla, 'Sins of the Tongue', in *The Body in Parts*, ed. by Hillman and Mazzio, pp. 53-79.

McIntosh, Marjorie Keniston, 'Sir Anthony Cooke: Tudor Humanist, Educator, and Religious Reformer', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 119 (1975), 233-250.

McMillin, Scott, 'Shakespeare's *Richard II*: Eyes of Sorrow, Eyes of Desire', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 35, pp. 40-52.

McMullan, Gordon, ed., *Renaissance Configurations: Voices/Bodies/Spaces, 1580-1690* [1998], 1st ed. (New York: Palgrave, 2001).

McNeal, Thomas H., 'Margaret of Anjou: Romantic Princess and Troubled Queen', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 9 (1958), 1-10.

Mears, Natalie, *Queenship and Political Discourse in the Elizabethan Realms* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

Melchiori, Giorgio, *Shakespeare's Garter Plays: Edward III to Merry Wives of Windsor* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1994).

Micheli, Linda McJ., '"Sit by Us": Visual Imagery and the Two Queens in *Henry VIII*', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 38 (1987), 452-466.

Miner, Madonne M., '"Neither Mother, Wife, nor England's Queen": The Roles of Women in *Richard III*', in *The Woman's Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*,

ed. by Carolyn Ruth Swift Lenz, Gayle Greene, and Carole Thomas Neely (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1980), pp. 35-55.

Moncrief, Kathryn M., and Kathryn R. McPherson, eds., *Performing Maternity in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007).

Morin, Karen M., and Jeanne Kay Guelke, 'Introduction: Women, Religion, and Space – Making the Connections' in *Women, Religion, and Space: Global Perspectives on Gender and Faith*, ed. by Morin and Guelke (New York: Syracuse University Press, 2007), pp. xix-xxxi.

Mullaney, Steven, 'Civic Rites, City Sites: The Place of the Stage', in *Staging the Renaissance: Reinterpretations of Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama*, ed. by David Scott Kastan and Peter Stallybrass (New York and London: Routledge, 1991), pp. 17-26.

Müller, Sabine Lucia, 'Ageing out Catholicism: Representing Mary Tudor's Body' in *Rituals and Rhetorics*, ed. by Oakley-Brown and Wilkinson, pp. 238-251.

Nelson, Janet L., 'Early Medieval Rites of Queen-Making and the Shaping of Medieval Queenship' in *Queens and Queenship*, ed. by Duggan, pp. 301-315.

Noling, Kim H., 'Grubbing Up the Stock: Dramatising Queens in *Henry VIII*', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 39.3 (1988), 291-306.

Oakley-Brown, Liz, and Louise J. Wilkinson, eds., *Rituals and Rhetoric of Queenship: Medieval to Early Modern* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009).

OED (*Oxford English Dictionary Online*) June 2011, Oxford University Press, UCL Library Online Sources: Database (http://dictionary.oed.com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/)

---, 'Monument, n.', [Accessed on March 21, 2010].

---, 'Renaissance, n.'[Accessed on August 29, 2011].

---, 'Virtue, n.' [Accessed on August 18, 2011].

Orlin, Lena Cowen, *Elizabethan Households: An Anthology* (Washington, D. C.: The Folger Shakespeare Library, 1995).

---, *Locating Privacy in Tudor London* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

---, *Private Matters and Public Culture in Post-Reformation England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994).

Ormrod, W. M., 'Montagu, William, first earl of Salisbury (1301–1344)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19001, accessed 18 July 2011].

Ostovich, Helen, '"Here in this garden": The Iconology of the Virgin Queen in Shakespeare's *Richard II*', in *Marian Moments*, ed. by Buccola andHopkins, pp. 21-34.

Pacheco, Anita, ed., *A Companion to Early Modern Women's Writing* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002).

Parsons, John Carmi, 'The Queen's Intercession in Thirteenth-Century England' in *Power of the Weak: Studies on Medieval Women*, ed. by Jennifer Carpenter and Sally-Beth MacLean (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995), pp. 147-177.

Patterson, Annabel, *Reading Holinshed's Chronicles* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994).

Piesse, A. J., '*King John*: Changing Perspectives', in *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History Plays*, ed. by Michael Hattaway (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 126-140.

Polinitz, Aysha, 'Humanism and Court Culture in the Education of Tudor Royal Children', in *Tudor Court Culture*, ed. by Betteridge and Riehl, pp. 42-58.

Pomeroy, Elizabeth W., *Reading the Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I* (Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1989).

Rackin, Phyllis, *Stages of History: Shakespeare's English Chronicles* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990).

Reiter, Robert E., 'On Biblical Typology and the Interpretation of Literature', *College English* 30 (1969), 562-571.

Richards, Judith M., *Mary Tudor* (London and New York: Routledge, 2008).

Roberts, Sasha, 'Shakespeare "creepes into the womens closets about bedtime": Women Reading in a Room of Their Own' in *Renaissance Configurations*, ed. by McMullan, pp. 30-63.

Rubin, Gayle, 'The Traffic in Women: Notes on the "Political Economy" of Sex', in *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, ed. by Rayna R. Reiter (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975), pp. 157-210.

Rutter, Carol Chillington, 'Of Tygers' Hearts and Players' Hides', in *Shakespeare's Histories*, ed. by Cavanagh, Hampton-Reeves, and Longstaffe, pp. 182-197.

Sams, Eric, ed., *Shakespeare's Edward III* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996).

Saul, Nigel, 'Anne [Anne of Bohemia] (1366-1394)' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/555, accessed 19 Sept 2008].

Sawday, Jonathan, *The Body Emblazoned: Dissection and the Human Body in Renaissance Culture* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995).

Schwarz, Kathryn, *Tough Love: Amazon Encounters in the English Renaissance* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2000).

Shahar, Shulamith, *The Fourth Estate: A History of Women in the Middle Ages*, trans. Chaya Galai (London: Routledge, 1983, 2002).

Shenk, Linda, *Learned Queen: The Image of Elizabeth I in Politics and Poetry* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

Shephard, Amanda, *Gender and Authority in Sixteenth-Century England: The Knox Debate* (Keele: Keele University Press, 1994).

Sherlock, Peter, *Monuments and Memory in Early Modern England* (Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate, 2008).

Sillitoe, Peter, '"Where the Prince Lieth": Courtly Space and the Elizabethan Progresses', in *Tudor Court Culture*, ed. by Betteridge and Riehl, pp. 75-92.

Slater, Eliot, *The Problem of* The Reign of King Edward III*: A Statistical Approach* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

Slights, Camille Wells, *The Casuistical Tradition in Shakespeare, Donne, Herbert, and Milton* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981).

Smith, Hilda L., 'Humanist Education and the Renaissance Concept of Woman' in *Women and Literature in Britain 1500-1700*, ed. by Helen Wilcox (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 9-29.

Smith, Julie Ann, 'The Earliest Queen-Making Rites', *Church History* 66 (1997), 18-35.

Somerset, Anne, *Ladies-In-Waiting: From the Tudors to the Present Day* (London: Phoenix, 1984 and 2005).

Spackman, Barbara, 'Machiavelli and Gender' in *The Cambridge Companion to Machiavelli*, ed. by John M. Najemy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 223-238.

Spiller, Ben, 'Warlike Mates? Queen Elizabeth, and Joan La Pucelle in *1 Henry VI*', in *Goddesses and Queens*, ed. by Connolly and Hopkins, pp. 34-44.

Stafford, Pauline, *Queens, Concubines and Dowagers: The King's Wife in the Early Middle Ages* (London: Leicester University Press, 1983, 1998).

---, *Queen Emma and Queen Edith: Queenship and Women's Power in Eleventh-Century England* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1997).

Stern, Tiffany, *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

Stone, Lawrence, *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979).

Strong, Roy, *Coronation: From the 8th to the 21st Century* (London: Harper Perennial, 2005, 2006).

---, *Gloriana: The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1987).

Sullivan, Garrett A., Jr., *Memory and Forgetting in English Renaissance Drama: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Webster* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

Summer, Saralyn Ellen, *"Like Another Esther": Literary Representations of Queen Esther in Early Modern England* (Georgina, 2005) (Ph.D. thesis).

Taylor, Michael, 'Shakespeare in History and History in Shakespeare' in *Shakespeare Criticism in the Twentieth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 163-193.

Tennenhouse, Leonard, 'Strategies of State and Political Plays: *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Henry IV*, *Henry V*, *Henry VIII*', in *Political Shakespeare*, ed. by Dollimore and Sinfield, pp.109-128.

Tillyard, E. M. W., *Shakespeare's History Plays* [1944], 1st ed., (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986).

Travitsky, Betty S., and Anne Lake Prescott, eds., *Female and Male Voices in Early Modern England: An Anthology of Renaissance Writing* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000).

Vanhoutte, Jacqueline, 'Queens and Country?: Female Monarchs and Feminized Nations in Elizabethan Political Pamphlets', in *Elizabeth I: Always Her Own Free Woman*, ed. by Carole Levin, Jo Eldridge Carney, and Debra Barrett-Graves (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), pp. 7-19.

Vickers, Brian, '*Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* with John Fletcher', in *Shakespeare, Co-Author: A Historical Study of Five Collaborative Plays* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 333-432.

Warnicke, Retha M., 'Private and Public: The Boundaries of Women's Lives in Early Stuart England', in *Privileging Gender in Early Modern England*, ed. by Jean R. Brink (Kirksville, Missouri: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1993), pp. 123-140.

Watkins, John, *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England: Literature, History, Sovereignty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2002).

Watson, Foster, ed., *Vives and the Renascence Education of Women*. (London: Edward Arnold, 1912).

---, ed. *Vives on Education: A Translation of the* De Trandendis Disciplinis *of Juan Luis Vives* (Cambridge: University Press of Cambridge, 1913).

Wei, Yu-wen Teresa, 'The Religious and Gender Politics of Obedience in *Edward III*', *NTU Studies in Language and Literature* 13 (2004), 1-22.

Weinrich, Harald, *Lethe: The Act and Critique of Forgetting*, trans. Steven Rendall (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997 and 2004).

Weis, René, 'Shakespeare and English Renaissance Drama', in *Bloomsbury Guides*, ed. by Wynne-Davies, pp. 37-56.

West, Russell, *Spatial Representations and the Jacobean Stage: From Shakespeare to Webster* (New York: Palgrave, 2002).

Vivienne Westbrook, 'Paratextual Typologies in Reformation Contexts', *Sun Yat-Sen Journal of Humanities* 17 (2003), 117-133 (p. 117).

Whitelock, Anna, 'Mary Tudor: the First Queen of England', in *Rituals and Rhetorics*, ed. by Oakley-Brown and Wilkinson (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009), pp. 59-73.

Wiesner, Merry E., 'Women's Defense of Their Public Role', in *Women in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: Literary and Historical Perspectives*, ed. by Mary Beth Rose (New York: Syracuse University Press, 1986), pp. 1-27.

Williams, Gwyn, 'Suffolk and Margaret: A Study of Some Sections of Shakespeare's *Henry VI*', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 25 (1974), 310-322.

Wynne-Davies, Marion, ed., *Bloomsbury Guides to English Literature: The Renaissance* (London: Bloomsbury, 1994).

Yates, Frances A., *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975).

Zeeveld, W. Gordon, 'The Influence of Hall on Shakespeare's English Historical Plays' in *ELH* 3.4 (1936), pp. 317-353.