

# Role and Rule: history and power on stage

## *abstracts*

**Carlo M. Bajetta (Université de la Vallée d'Aoste, Italy)**

*'Most peerless poetess': the manuscript circulation of Elizabeth's poems*

To Spenser Elizabeth was the "The most peerlesse poetesse". But, beyond flattery and royal eulogy, what was the image which the Queen gave of herself as a writer? How did her role as a monarch influence her contemporaries in their judgement of her literary achievements? What was the extent and of the circulation of her texts, and how were they known during her reign? Starting from surviving material evidence, this panel will try to address these questions, together with the more general issue of Elizabeth's idea of her own representation through writing.

**Paola Baseotto (University of Insubria, Italy)**

*Reason of State and Private Feelings: The Two Voices of Elizabeth's Two Bodies in her Letters to James VI of Scotland*

I propose to analyse Queen Elizabeth's representation of her own "two bodies" in her letters to James VI of Scotland dating from the period of the acute crisis occasioned by Mary Stuart's long imprisonment, controversial trial and execution.

The Elizabeth-James correspondence offers representative examples of Elizabeth's lifelong process of self-fashioning as a woman and as a monarch. It also offers significant evidence of her mastery use of rhetorical strategies in her conscious effort to rewrite her role in the Anglo-Scottish crisis.

In writing to the son of her cousin, Mary Stuart, the Scottish queen who was about to face trial and death on the scaffold, Elizabeth appropriates the rhetoric of affection, one moment presenting herself as a sister (she addresses him as "dearest brother" and signs some letters as "your most affectionate sister"), then as a mother (James is her "natural good son") and often as a friend (she offers James "friendship, love and care, stable amitie").

James plays Elizabeth's game: he declares he wishes to be "used and imployed by you [Elizabeth] as a louing mother would use hir naturall and deuoted chylde", addresses her as "my loving mother" and signs one of his letters as "your most louing and deuoted brother and sonn". Documentary evidence shows that at the same time as Mary Stuart's drama was speedily coming to its tragic close, Elizabeth and James were negotiating a league designed to unite England and Scotland with James's succession to the throne upon Elizabeth's death. Indeed, references to "our league" and the desire "to strengthen and unite this yle" are pervasive throughout the Elizabeth-James correspondence.

Shortly after Mary's execution, Elizabeth engages in a rhetorical construction of the image of a queen beset by counsellors, Parliament and public opinion strongly critical of her reluctance to take the life of a fellow prince. Her desire to separate herself from the execution of Mary is manifest. She describes her painful negotiation of reason of State and

private feelings: as a monarch, she is aware of the need “to sacrifice the life of the prisoner upon the plea of necessity” (from a letter to James); as a woman, she portrays herself as overwhelmed by grief (First Speech to Parliament, 1586). The queen who had described herself as endowed with “the heart and stomach of a king, and of a king of England too” (“Speech to the Troops at Tilbury”), appropriates the Renaissance cliché of feminine frailty and permeability to emotion to create the discourse of her innocence in the trial and execution of an anointed queen which had occasioned vehement protests and threats of invasion by Catholic monarchs.

**Zorica Bečanović-Nikolić (University of Belgrade, Serbia)**

*Political Communication in Shakespeare's History Plays: Modernist and Postmodernist Readings in a 'Conflict of Interpretations'*

This paper deals with different approaches to the political contents of Shakespeare's history plays in the modernist and postmodernist theoretical framework. While the modernist critics were undoubtedly aware of the complex political strategies transposed in drama, they mostly tended to analyze the presupposed dominant features of the Elizabethan 'discursive formation'. Postmodernist approaches to the history plays, within the wide theoretical scope which includes deconstruction, new historicism, cultural materialism, feminist criticism, Bakhtinian criticism and psychoanalysis, express a more skeptical attitude in interpreting political contents and emphasize different instances of implied marginal and subversive meanings in the history plays.

It will be argued that the hermeneutical concept of the 'conflict of interpretations' developed by Paul Ricoeur in *De l'interprétation: essai sur Freud* (1965) has its special instance in the understanding of the political aspects of Shakespeare's history plays in the twentieth century. The modernist critical approaches are, *mutatis mutandis*, closer to Ricoeur's concept of the 'hermeneutics of faith' and the postmodernist to the concept of the 'hermeneutics of suspicion', initiated in Western philosophy by Nietzsche, Marx and Freud. The paper will point to the exemplary modernist positions from the texts of E. M. W. Tillyard, Lilly Campbell, G. Wilson Knight, J. Dover Wilson, as well as to the postmodernist readings of Stephen Greenblatt, Stephen Orgel, Leonard Tennenhouse, Jonathan Dollimore, Alan Sinfield, Alexander Leggat, Graham Holderness, Terry Eagleton, Jean E. Howard, Phyllis Rackin, Christopher Pye.

In the conclusion, it will be argued that awareness of the disparity of emphasis in understanding political implications of 1, 2, 3 *Henry VI*, *Richard III*, *King John*, *Richard II*, 1 & 2 *Henry IV*, *Henry V* and *Henry VIII*, stimulates presentist approach in interpretation (cf. Hugh Grady, Terence Hawkes, *Presentist Shakespeares*, London and New York: Routledge 2007): what can early modern history plays tell the readers and the audiences at the beginning of the twenty-first century? How are we to understand their 'proto-theories' of political communication today, in our own political circumstances, partly common and global, and partly specific for each particular culture?

**Sandra Bell (University of New Brunswick at Saint John, Canada)**

***"A little touch of Jamie in the night": James VI and I and Henry V***

This paper would examine Shakespeare's Henry V and the many correspondences with the

interests and history of James VI and I. The Revels accounts record that Henry V—first performed in 1599—was presented to the court of James I on 1605. There is no record of how the play was received; unlike in the case of *The Merchant of Venice*, which was performed on February 10 of the same year, there was no demand for a repeat performance. Perhaps a play enacting the successes of a warrior king did not speak to James I, who developed a vision of himself as *Rex Pacificus*; on his accession to the English crown in 1603, James emphasized the harmonious union of hearts and minds between the traditionally antagonistic English and Scots, and in August of 1604, a peace treaty with Spain was signed. Shakespeare's Henry V is also interested in union, bringing together the English, Scots, Irish and Welsh in one army, as well as the union of French and English (though through rather more militant means than 'hearts and minds'); the unity, however tenuous, of different peoples is a concern of the play. Another topic of interest to James would have been the discussion of Salic law in 1.1, Henry's claim to the French throne through the female line, as James's claim to the English throne came through his great-grandmother (Henry VIII's sister Margaret married James V), which might have been a concern for the English in 1599, the year of the play's first performance; many articles dealing with plays written in the few years before 1603 connect the depiction of just about any type of political uncertainty to the tension surrounding Elizabeth's decline and the succession to the English throne. These are fairly general parallels between the action of the play and James's immediate situation, but Henry V might also have resonated at a personal level for the king, as there are a surprising number of details in the play which corresponded to the king's life in Scotland during the 1580s and 90s. In particular, three significant scenes in the play find parallels in James's Scottish reign: the treachery of Henry's councilor and 'bedfellow' Lord Scrope sounds similar to James's experience with Esme Stuart, Duke of Lennox and with George Gordon, Earl of Huntly; Henry's walk through his troops the night before the battle at Agincourt has a parallel in James's visits to his troupes in northern Scotland in a battle with Huntly, which is recorded in the letters; and Henry's wooing of Princess Catherine in the final act repeats some of the details recorded in James's wooing of Anne. While there are no records of how James responded to the performance, it is interesting to consider the king's possible readings of Shakespeare's play.

**Silvia Bigliuzzi (University of Verona, Italy)**

***(Un-)naming the King and the Discursive Fashioning of Power in Richard II***

My paper aims at discussing the linguistic and discursive strategies of the king's self-fashioning identity and power during both the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. A reading of Shakespeare's *Richard II* will offer precisely one such example, in line with the "mirror-for-princes tradition". Textual analysis will be set against the highly complex

Elizabethan ideological and political frame of reference, and the play will be examined alongside historical documents aimed at showing both interaction with, and distancing from, the theatrical event proper.

Thus, a double aim will be achieved:

- 1) the dialectics between the theatrical event – as highlighted in *Richard II* – and its historical context will be re-defined in an attempt at redrawing the boundaries of different, albeit interactive, textual typologies. Various levels of textual and extra-textual theatricality will therefore be explored;
- 2) the rhetoric of nullification, within *Richard II*, of the late-medieval kingly identity will be analysed alongside the affirmation of identity outside dominating cultural discourses.

### **Effie Botonaki (Aristotle University and the Greek Open University, Greece)**

#### ***Elizabeth's Masked Presence in the Jacobean Masques***

This paper will discuss masques in relation to James's succession of Elizabeth to the throne as it is very interesting to see how the masque writers that sought to please James handled the delicate issue of his succession. Elizabeth and her cult seem to be always present in the relevant masques though only in subtle ways: either by being notably absent or as a covert target of criticism. James is conventionally presented as a star or a sun and his reign as golden. However, since the previous reign could not be discarded as dark or unsuccessful, the masques' ardent attempts to glorify the new king's rule could not be based on the building of a contrast with the past, and led to vague, awkward or even self-contradictory claims. One of Elizabeth's "weaknesses" that was turned into a target was her single state. Thus, the first masques of James's reign, some of which were written to celebrate aristocratic weddings (e.g. *Barriers at a Marriage* and *The Lord Hay's Masque*), in celebrating married state, ended up making almost offensive comments about single women, especially those who *chose* to remain so; those who were present at the performance of these masques could not have failed to notice that these comments constituted an attack against the deceased Queen—a Queen they had until very recently served as favoured members of her court. Other masques refer to the British past as if Elizabeth had never existed. *The Masque of Queens*, for instance, bewilders the modern reader—as it no doubt bewildered the Jacobean spectator—with its omission of Elizabeth from a long string of mythological and actual Queens the masque glorifies and commemorates. Absences like this speak volumes about the insecurity James must have felt about the comparisons his subjects were inevitably making between himself and his predecessor, and can be linked to the growing public nostalgia for the Elizabethan reign in the latter Jacobean period.

### **Rosanna Camerlingo (University of Perugia, Italy)**

#### ***Just Wars, Just Laws. Tamburlain the Great and Henry V***

Critics have often associated Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* and Shakespeare's *Henry V* on the basis of the triumphant war conquest of the plays' both charismatic heroes. Indeed, both *Tamburlaine* and *Henry V* explicitly solicit the audience's identification with the heroes' only partly dubious conquest by appealing to its imagination. And yet the difference is quite

evident. Apart from the obvious dissimilar historical settings, Marlowe's Tamburlaine and Shakespeare's Henry differ as to the justification of their wars. This paper aims to show that Tamburlaine's justification of his conquest is grounded on a philosophy that combined England's enthusiasm for its initial expansion in the world and a new vision of the universe that enhanced a new social hierarchy. Behind the representation of cruel and paradoxical war actions, Marlowe proposes a global as well as a utopian unification of all the people on the basis of a new concept of nature, which he shared with the scientist Thomas Harriot, the courtier Walter Raleigh and the philosopher Giordano Bruno. Tamburlaine aims at invading the mind of all the spectators with this philosophy. Shakespeare's Henry's justification of his war is instead mainly juridical. What Shakespeare is here discussing through his profoundly unstable character is the possibility for the juridical bond to justify a war against another nation and to unify a nation at the same time. These issues had been debated ever since the "conquest" of America, starting with Francisco de Vitoria's *Relectio de Indiis*. In Shakespeare's time Alberico Gentili's pioneering work *de Jure belli* (1598) proposes to re-discuss the medieval rules of wars on the basis of the right of the people (*ius gentium*) and of the new emerging nations. Shakespeare's play seems to show that the war laws proposed by Gentili are not capable of unifying as the propagandistic and patriotic frame of Henry V would make the (inflamed) audience think.

**Joseph A. Campana (Rice University, US)**

***The Child's Two Bodies: The Ends of Succession in Macbeth***

This paper argues that the child constitutes a critical and overlooked political metaphor in considerations of early modern sovereignty, one to which the theater of Shakespeare's era was particularly attuned. Critics have long maintained that the works of Shakespeare, like those of his contemporary dramatists and chroniclers, display keen interest in the vicissitudes of sovereign power and their representation through the use of England's past. But his plays also were particularly attuned to the cultural power of representations of children at a moment in which notions of childhood were rapidly changing. Indeed, his plays feature more child roles than most of his contemporaries. The theater of Shakespeare thus evinces an understanding of the way the figure of the child constitutes the critical link between the deformation of monarchical sovereignty (and hereditary succession) and a new focus on sovereignty that rests in the people and the health of the population (as figured by the child). What I suggest, then, is that in the same way the king was said to possess a mortal body and a body politic, so too does the child; thus to fail to consider the staging of children in early modernity is to fail to understand the shifting networks of power in early modernity.

Shakespeare's tragedy *Macbeth* is pivotal in Shakespeare's larger project of mapping the transformations in sovereignty in early modern England. Many have seen the play as a political allegory of either the crisis of Succession in the waning years of Elizabeth or the crisis sparked by the failed union of England and Scotland in the reign of James. But what the writings of King James, from *Basilikon Doron* to his speeches to parliament, reveal is that the problems of union and succession were the same in as much they rest on the same

foundation: the integrity of the paternal body and its ability to create heirs and unify two kingdoms. The absolute paternal body James imagined was, however, undermined not only by the historical difficulty of unifying two historically divisive nations. More critically, perhaps, he struggled with the legacy of his own minority, referring to himself late in his life as “Craddle King.” The more James emphasized the divine paternity of sovereignty, the more he unwittingly activated histories in which child kings, from Richard II to Henry VI, undermine the political metaphors of monarchical sovereignty. *Macbeth* handily embodies this alternation between fallible children (and the glorious future to which they point) in a vision: the bloody babe and the crowned child.

Moreover, the play represents not just the failure of succession as a useful political notion; rather, it reveals Macbeth’s true purpose by the end of the play is to destroy entirely the idea of temporal and paternal succession. While killing children represents, for Lady Macbeth, the advancement of one line of succession over another, Macbeth seeks to bring about nothing less than the end of all temporal and paternal succession. To imagine the end of succession as a relay of sovereign power (as *Macbeth* does) is to pave the way for a shift in attention from the consolidation of monarchical lines of power to the revelation of emergent biopolitical structures (as explored in the works of Michel Foucault and Giorgio Agamben). To stage the child is to stage the emergence of the nation state its investment in the political bodies of children.

#### **Yu-Chun Chiang (University College London, UK)**

##### ***Queenship Revisited: Elizabeth I and Katherine of Aragon in All is True: King Henry VIII***

Among all of William Shakespeare’s English history plays, *All is True: King Henry VIII* (1613), on which Shakespeare collaborated with John Fletcher, is the only one where the playwrights staged Elizabeth I. As a baby girl on stage, the Queen does not have a line in the play, but is granted great expectations from the English people in the prophecy-like baptism speech by Thomas Cranmer, the Archbishop of Canterbury. However, this play is originally to show the ‘merciful construction of good women’ through the dramatization of Queen Katherine of Aragon (*HVIII*, Epilogue 10). Moreover, this ‘Tudor history play’ is staged and published in the reign of a Stuart King, James I. The political, religious, and gender agenda behind this play is intriguingly complicated, much more complicated than critics used to argue.

In *All is True*, Katherine and Elizabeth are associated via the symbolic image of a lily: in Act III, Scene i, Katherine states that she is like a lily, that ‘once was mistress of the field and flourished’ but will soon perish, while Cranmer compares the virgin Elizabeth to ‘a most unspotted lily’ and when she perishes, ‘all the world shall mourn her’ (3.1.151-2; 5.4.60-2). Representing royalty, this fleur-de-lis associates Elizabeth and Katherine, but the two queens does not only resemble each other at the level of royalty, but are also related through the playwrights’ representations of queenship. This paper intends to explore this relation by reading the text and contexts of *All is True* in early modern England. One instance of the contexts is the typological image of the biblical Queen Esther, applied to support the Catholic Katherine’s causes in defending her marriage and to endorse the Protestant Elizabeth’s power and legitimacy as a female ruler. Furthermore, both queens

made use of the rhetoric of weakness, appropriating feminine humility before authorities and simultaneously demonstrating the grace bestowed from God. The difference of queenship for a queen regnant and a queen consort is also significant in exploring the relation between Elizabeth and Katherine. I will argue that in *All is True*, Elizabeth, instead of the absent Mary, is the successor to Katherine's virtues, and Katherine's queenship, rather than Anne Boleyn's, is the model for Elizabeth I's governance of England. Such succession based on spirits and virtues, rather than blood ties or physical attributes, and such avoidance of 'embarrassing' parent-children relationships, are also adapted in James I's discourse about his legitimacy to inherit Elizabeth I's throne.

**Guillaume Coatalen (University of Cergy-Pontoise, France)**

*'Ma plume vous pourra exprimer': How does the Queen express herself in her French correspondence?*

The invaluable 2000 Chicago edition of Queen Elizabeth I's Complete Works offered many letters in their original language and spelling in its companion volume *Elizabeth I Autograph Compositions and Foreign Language Originals* (2003). For the first time, it allowed scholars to assess the queen's style in ancient and modern languages – surprisingly – a much neglected field of study. The present paper's aim is to concentrate on her epistolary style in French, based on published material and new letters found at the Bnf. While the bulk of her correspondence was transcribed and composed by royal secretaries, she wrote many of her most private letters in French. The first delicate task is to look into the parts she was directly responsible for. Her French epistolary prose will then be compared with her English and the French of native contemporaries, including Henri IV. Much remains to be done, and these are only preliminary remarks on a small fraction of letters out of more than 500. The sheer size, variety and scope of the French correspondence should encourage further study and the edition of more letters.

**Kristen Deiter (Carroll University, Waukesha, US)**

*Shakespeare's Tower of London: Representing Resistance*

In Shakespeare's six English history plays that represent the Tower of London, the Tower's dramatic meanings contradict the official royal image of the castle. This paper opens with a presentation of the crown's ideology of the Tower from 1579 to c.1634: a showplace of royal and spiritual authority, magnificence, and entertainment. During this period, twenty-four extant English history plays that represent the Tower were first produced or composed, and Shakespeare, having written one-fourth of them, was the most prolific author of the "Tower plays." I historicize Shakespeare's oppositional representations of the Tower in *1-3 Henry VI*, *Richard III*, *Richard II*, and *Henry VIII*. I then argue that Shakespeare was motivated to represent the Tower as oppositional to the crown because in 1583 two of his relatives, implicated in a Catholic plot on Elizabeth's life, were imprisoned and racked in the Tower and were executed or found dead in prison. Shakespeare was, most likely, the first playwright to represent the Tower spatially on the public stage, transforming Londoners' perceptions of the castle. He often represented the Tower as a place where the

monarch's actions warranted revenge, and many playwrights followed his lead.

**Janette Dillon (University of Nottingham, UK)**

*The Monarch as Represented in the Ceremony of Coronation*

Royal entries have been much studied in recent years; but the ceremony of coronation itself has received far less attention. Yet this ceremony is in a sense the primal scene of monarchical self-representation. In England the ceremony is documented from the eighth century, and the coronation ceremony as performed for Elizabeth I and James VI and I dates back almost unchanged to the fourteenth century. The monarch, as James particularly liked to emphasise, was understood to be God's deputy on earth; and in the practice of rule this was a discourse of elevation, one that highlighted the divine aspect of kingship and the superiority of kings and queens over their subjects. The coronation, however, as the ceremony which, by conferring full regal status upon the monarch, dwelt upon the meaning of monarchy, enacted a much more even-handed understanding of the paradox at the heart of monarchy. It represented the subjection of the monarch to God, and even to some extent the people, as much as his or her godlike aspect. This paper seeks to show how both the script and the material practices of coronation (in theatrical terms, its costumes, props, movements and spatial construction) shift between images of elevation and abjection in handling the paradoxical status and meanings of monarchy.

**Laura Di Michele (University of L'Aquila, Italy)**

*Shakespeare's Dramaturgy of Power in the Histories*

The paper addresses Shakespeare's writing of national identity as it is portrayed in the histories; more specifically, it aims at establishing a link between the linearity of the dramatic plotline and the discontinuity of the discourses of royal power emphatically signalled through the well-timed occurrence of triumphs, progresses, processions, trials, formal funerals and masques. The ensuing dramatic text appears as a network of different and often antithetical sounds, voices and styles of life, and in fact it is a struggling site where a relentless confrontation between 'marginal', threatening unorthodoxy and 'right' power and 'proper' place does happen.

The paper is broadly divided into two parts. The first part examines what I take to be Shakespeare's conscious concerns with dramatic art and its connections to power both in his Roman and English history plays. Early *Titus Andronicus* and late *Antony and Cleopatra* are discussed here as examples of their strong challenge to Renaissance aesthetics: the complex intersections – often to the point of blurring their limits - between the linearity of their dramatic-narrative plots and the dramatic-ideological interruptions/obstacles produced by rituals, ceremonies and diverse forms of spectacles are analyzed. The formation of an uneven theatrical texture is further investigated in the English histories of *1, 2, 3 Henry VI*, *Richard II*, and *Henry V*: the examination of those plays aims at showing how Shakespeare's continuous engagement with the construction-and-deconstruction of Englishness highlights his enactment of Tudor social prejudice, reveals how power really works, designs and organizes the textual space where national identity is represented.

The second part explores Shakespeare's visual culture with specific reference to *Henry IV*, *Richard II*, *Richard III* and *Henry VIII* as case studies illustrating the great playwright's stagecraft as to the dramatic functions characters-as-symbols, little plays, various types of spectacles and representations are invited to perform within the theatrical textuality. It is well known that emblems, masques, dumb shows, entertainments, tournaments, and trials were ingredients of a general visual culture which not only satisfied both aristocrats' sophisticated sensibility and humble playgoers' competence; they also contributed to help dramatists to insert visual/audiovisual pieces particularly apt to shed light on the plot and characters of their plays and to stimulate the audience's ability to make some sense of what they viewed on the stage. What the viewers saw on the theatrical stage – side by side with recognizable historical characters and the rehearsal of the making of national history – was something they could have seen at home or in the streets. The paper argues that it was upon that visual familiarity that Shakespeare could presumably have depended to plan the dramatic/theatrical texture of his history plays and to experiment with, dramatically and meta-dramatically, the pedagogical-political-aesthetic, communicative functions of his historical drama.

**Neslihan Ekmekçioğlu (Hacettepe University, Turkey)**

***Theatricality in Rule and Role***

The monarch is supposed to play with appearance and reality in order to be all powerful. As Machiavelli states in *The Prince*, men judge more by their eyes, so ordinary people are always deceived by appearances. The gap between the private and the public face has also attracted the imagination of Shakespeare. *Richard II* can be regarded as a mirror for Queen Elizabeth I and her political tendencies, pointing to the Essex Rising.

As Michel Foucault has indicated, the power of the monarch shares its forms with modes of theatricality: the sovereignty is a kind of display of power. The Queen's sceptre as the symbol of political power reflects the relationship between state and stage, Elizabeth and her subjects, authority and representation. Elizabeth has said: 'We princes, I tell you, are set on stages, in the sight and view of all the world'. The idea of kingship manifests itself through strategies of "privileged visibility". The monarch's self-representation mostly conceals a double identity. The sovereign appears both as '*person*' and '*persona*', showing its very being as a creature as well as a *persona ficta*. In the fissure between body and role, between politics and nature, another "I" appears in disguise. Polymorphy comes about as an ineluctable condition. Richard II claims: 'Thus play I in one person many people/ And none contented.' (*Richard II*, V, iv, 31-2) and also Elizabeth's own feelings are expressed on *Monsieur's Departure*.

The theatricality of the monarch is invariably designed to acquire and maintain political advantage. In this way, the very visibility of the self will cause a gap between self and mask, person and persona, between what is without and what is within, being and showing. As Kantorowicz mentions, the King's two bodies consolidate a polymorphic being, both mortal and divine, setting a pattern for a self which is all elusive and self-fashioning. As Greenblatt states, 'theatricality is power's essential mode' and 'the modern state is based on deceit, calculation and hypocrisy'. The political power is based upon a

play between displaying and hiding. Thomas Hobbes in *The Leviathan* defines *Person* as Face, but *Persona* as Disguise or outward appearance, counterfeited on stage, disguising the Face as a Mask. Questions emerging from this duality come to the mind: Where is, the monarch's inward sphere? Is it after all possible to conceive an inner self for the monarch? Is the essence of the monarch's political power an illusion? Or is it a game of mirrors? The monarch shapes himself/ herself through a play of multifaceted personae. Thus, Shakespeare's Richard II is torn between the monarch, the poet, the beggar and the fool. Richard 'looks like a King' but has not the spirit of one. Richard II stands as the opposite of Elizabeth who claims to have a man's spirit in the body of a woman. My paper will be dealing with the resembling and contrasting features of the two monarchs, Elizabeth and Richard II in their self-representation from the point of politics of power and sex, gender differences, the King's two bodies and the discrepancy between seeming and being.

**Andrew Fleck (San Jose State University, US)**

*'Teach You Our Princess English:' Linguistic Conquest in the Early Quartos and Performances of Henry V.*

On July 25, 1597, an unsuspecting Queen Elizabeth received Poland's special ambassador, Pawel Dialynski (or Paul de Jaline), for a public audience in the Presence Chamber. There the dashing young nobleman delivered a polished Latin oration condemning England's queen. Although she was nonplussed by this verbal ambush, the Queen delivered a spirited *ex tempore* reply in Latin, much to the pleasure of her English audience and the chagrin of the malapert Pole. The Queen's celebrated display of linguistic mastery—gained through arduous youthful study and polished in William Grindal and Roger Ascham's humanistic tutorials—renewed her people's sentimental attachment to their ageing regal polymath.

Nearly two years later at the opening of the Globe theater, William Shakespeare imagined another royal language lesson in the midst of his celebratory *Henry V*. After the fall of Harfleur, the scene shifts abruptly to an unspecified, secluded place in which a lively and inquisitive French princess and her French governess converse. In a long exchange conducted (almost) entirely in French, Katherine begins her study of English by asking Alice the English words for parts of the body. The heteroglossic scene, ending in its famous bawdy joke, represents the young princess as an apt scholar of English who quickly begins to learn the language she will inevitably have to speak with her future lord, young Harry of England.

Two acts later, Katherine makes her only other appearance in the play's final scene, as Henry remains alone with her to "plead his love-suit" in his "false French." Katherine's replies, spoken in "broken English," make her seem to be a future queen who has not fully internalized the lessons after the fall of Harfleur to her future husband. Or, so it would seem. In fact, the early quartos of *Henry V* present a slightly different picture. Whereas the Folio text of the play on which most critics rely for their readings of the rough wooing of Act Five presents a comical princess who shows many signs of not understanding Henry's advances, the early quartos present a princess who much more clearly understands her future husband. Recent criticism has dismissed the old pejorative label of "bad quartos"

for discussing the 1600 printing (and its 1608 and 1619 progeny), arguing instead that the short quarto version of Henry V may reflect instead the text as it premiered at the opening of the Globe. But although the quartos have taken on a new relevance for the stage history of Henry V, engagement with these newly validated texts has lagged behind.

My paper seeks to take the representation of Katherine in the quarto texts of Henry V seriously. In addition to placing the language lessons of the play within the context of humanist discourse on education for aristocratic women, I will argue that these early quartos suggest that the Katherine in the early performances of Henry V at the Globe may have resonated more strongly with views of skilful queenship as represented in the famous verbal sparring of England's graceful, multilingual queen.

**Jonathan Gibson (Royal Holloway, University of London, UK)**

*'The Queen's Fair Hands'*

The handwriting of Elizabeth I has recently been the subject of a number of publications, including material in the Chicago Collected Works and an important article by H. R. Woudhuysen. Building on this work, this paper will analyse Elizabeth's italic hands alongside contemporary views about handwriting and gender and in comparison with manuscripts written in italic by Elizabeth's contemporaries.

**Huw Griffiths (University of Sydney, Australia)**

*The Hands and Tongues of Sovereignty in King John*

Shakespeare's *King John* contains more uses of the word 'hand' than any other of his plays; this paper considers the relationship between sovereign power, speech and instrumentality in Shakespeare's *King John*, through an examination of the play's uses of 'hands' and 'tongues'.

This paper examines the particular crises in the functioning and representation of monarchy in *King John* – impossibly divided loyalties, the failures of oath-taking, the monarch's refusal of responsibility for his own actions, challenges to the absolute authority of the monarch. Shakespeare's play highlights, in particular, a disavowal of responsibility on the part of the monarch and a consequent exposure of the monarch's subjects to an arbitrary violence that cannot be regulated within systems of oath-taking that now only apparently maintain the political relations of sovereignty.

The death of Prince Arthur, the central event of the play is a crucial part of this understanding of the working of sovereign power through arbitrary violence. It is a death that occurs to the benefit of all other contenders for the English throne and yet is achieved without anyone, including Arthur himself, being directly responsible. His body, 'this ruin of sweet life' (4.3.65) can be seen as an example of what Giorgio Agamben has called 'bare life', the necessary object of sovereign violence, substantiating sovereign power, but reduced to mere physicality, excluded from political process.

With its focus on the human body, *King John* allows us to see what is at stake in the arrival of the Hobbesian mechanics of sovereignty. In the context of the work of both Giorgio Agamben and the later work of Michel Foucault on biopolitics, this paper argues for *King*

*John* as a play which confronts the deadlock of sovereign authority, in particular sovereignty's simultaneous claims to the efficacy of its own voice and a capacity to break its own oaths, as well as sovereignty's simultaneous assumption and disavowal of responsibility for the lives of subjects.

**Graham Holderness (University of Hertfordshire, UK)**

***'Unworthy Scaffolds': Sites of Royal and Divine Power in Jacobean England***

This paper explores the relations and interactions between various locations in which power was staged, represented, affirmed and constructed in the reign of James I. The aim is to analyse concrete examples in order to trace and account for interconnections between those different kinds of authority, that seem to have operated in parallel, jointly and severally, and even in opposition to one another across the national culture. Was theatre an organ of royal power or a site of opposition? Did images of divine power work to endorse or undermine royal authority? Did ritualised martyrdoms affirm or expose royal authority? Examples discussed will include performances of *Macbeth*, documented and conjectured (e.g. at Hampton Court in 1606); the trials and executions of the Gunpowder Plotters and the Jesuits, and the Plot itself as theatre of terror, 'the public performance of violent power'; the Hampton Court Conference of 1611; church liturgies, Catholic and Protestant, including representations of Christ as King and as Suffering Servant; and the relations between apocalyptic and the sublime in drama, terrorism, church liturgy and public execution.

**David Humphrey (Royal College of Art, London, UK)**

***Jewels as Complex Props in the Elizabethan World of Spectacle***

Certain rationales for the Elizabethan world of spectacle: from processions, progresses and pageants to masques and drama can be traced back through the Queen's father's respect and admiration for the courtly world of the Burgundian dukes between c.1364 and c.1477. King Henry VIII absorbed into his court world many of the practices and excesses found in the court worlds played out in Paris, Bruges, Dijon and Brussels under the Burgundians. He even instigated the purchase from the great financier Jakob Fugger of the most iconic jewel from the fabled Burgundian collection, the *Three Brothers* jewel, which, ironically perhaps, did not move into English possession until after Henry's death.

The Burgundian court operated in an environment thick with organisational systems, etiquette *et al* controlled by both obvious and tacit lexicons of allegorical, symbolic and iconic structure. Henry 'imported' aspects of that approach into his own court, but it was during Elizabeth's reign that English courtly life was more deeply animated by an equally complex and demanding silent language.

This paper considers the specific significance for viewers of the Elizabethan world of spectacle of jewels considered in the overall schemes of such events and in the often profound, personal significance and relevance jewels had for the wearers. Jewels operated at the level of complex props: part visual markers; part historical signposts; part locating devices in societal structures and part fantastically beautiful objects for personal

adornment. The focus is primarily on Elizabeth herself and the jewels she wore, but the paper also presents an innovative view that the various items worn by the *dramatis personae* of these events constituted an interconnected collection or the notion of a single piece of jewellery conceptually formed from the result of the combination of those individual pieces dispersed across the various members of the *dramatis personae*.

**Giovanni Iamartino (University of Milan, Italy)**

***Under Italian Eyes: Petruccio Ubaldini's Verbal Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I***

In Lewis Einstein's words, Petruccio Ubaldini (ca 1524-1600) is "an example of the better type of the Italian adventurers then to be found at every European court" (Einstein 1902: 190). Having arrived in England in 1545 as a soldier at Henry VIII's service, he spent most of his life there teaching the Italian language, editing Italian books, copying and illuminating manuscripts, writing historical essays, and working for Queen Elizabeth as an informer and an advisor.

It is above all as the author of historical essays and relations that Ubaldini may interest us: these were written, on the one hand, to provide the queen with information about Italy and, on the other hand, to update the Italian states and the Church on what had been happening in Britain.

My paper will consider these and the other works compiled by Ubaldini – both published and unpublished – in order to review what the Italian courtier writes to and about Queen Elizabeth. My aim is to read between the lines in order to discern his real thoughts and feelings, as well as the evolution of his ideas through the years, as attested above all in the three existing versions of the *Relazione delle cose del Regno d'Inghilterra*.

It is hoped that Ubaldini's Italian writings may contribute a few brushstrokes to the composite picture of Queen Elizabeth painted by her contemporaries, while at the same time provide useful material for the complex history of Anglo-Italian relations in the second half of the sixteenth century.

**William Ingram (University of Michigan, US)**

***Not Invited to the Party; A Monarch Missing from the Elizabethan Stage***

The so-called Tudor Myth allegedly promulgated by king Henry 7th, with its suggestion that his Welsh ancestry would bring in its train a new Arthurian age, had a mixed impact during the reign of his son and an attenuated shelf-life during the reign of his granddaughter in the later years of the sixteenth century. Though poets like Spenser and Milton found inspiration in the old tales of king Arthur for either historical poetry or outright fiction, the dramatists – whom one might have expected to join their fellow poets in capitalising on so rich a source of romantic material – on the whole ignored the Arthur story in their romance-plays and rejected him in their historical plays in favor of more recent historical kings with names like Henry or Richard. Even Shakespeare, who found useful theatrical material in mythological English history, apparently didn't find the Arthur narratives sufficiently attractive.

**Kristine Johanson (University of St Andrews, UK)**

*The Politics of Time: The Rhetoric of Nostalgia in The First Part of the Contention*

Of the limited body of scholarly work discussing the idea of nostalgia in early modern England, few critics engage in depth with *how* the concept was perceived at a time when the term 'nostalgia' did not yet exist. Indeed, the word was a neologism in 1688 when Johannes Hofer coined it in his medical dissertation to describe a 'disease' Swiss soldiers suffered in their military service. Hofer joined the Greek 'nostos' (to return home) and 'algos' (pain, or sorrow). The *OED* charts the evolution of the word from a strictly medical condition—it is initially an 'acute longing for familiar surroundings, esp[ecially] regarded as a medical condition; homesickness'—to the quasi-pejorative meaning behind the more modern understanding of the term, a 'sentimental longing *for* or regretful memory of a period of the past, esp[ecially] one in an individual's own lifetime; (also) sentimental imagining or evocation of a period of the past'. The introduction of 'nostalgia' under rational, medical inquiry meant that in the succeeding decades it represented not the emotional yearning with which modern society has come to associate it, but rather a very serious disease—one which, at the height of its fear, discouraged eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Europeans from leaving their countries.

The exclusion of the term nostalgia until the late seventeenth century in no way, however, precludes its very real, very political presence on the English Renaissance stage of the 1590s. What we understand as 'nostalgia' was dramatically represented as a complex admixture of elements of longing: from the concrete desire to reclaim a former, known peace to the real anxiety of yearning for one's homeland to the romanticization of a past one has never known but wishes to recreate, nostalgia on the early modern English stage consistently returns to a point of known or unknown origin to engage its audience in a reflection of temporal discrepancy and political action. Nowhere is this as pronounced as in the dramatic upheavals of Shakespeare's *The First Part of the Contention*. The play stakes its dramatic progression to the past, as the invocation of a rhetoric of nostalgia focuses attention on the instability not only of the political situation in Henrician England but to the construction of history itself. Indeed, from the play's very beginning we bear witness to the invocation of the past as a means of persuading auditors of the problems of the present government and thus the potential harm for the future. The Duke of Gloucester's speeches, the genealogy York cites to legitimize his claim to the throne, Cade's own claims and the Kentish rebels' actions all motivate, or are motivated by, a desire to reclaim the irreclaimable. As this paper argues, a rhetoric of nostalgia catalyzes political action on stage and creates for its auditors competing histories: both theatrical and onstage audiences are implicitly asked to weigh and judge crafted accounts of past and present. The rhetoric of nostalgia in *The First Part of the Contention* operates on the assumption that its auditors are critical attendees participating not only in an insistent examination of how history is constructed, but how their own 'times' compare to the history that surrounds them.

**Conny Loder (Greifswald University, Germany)**

*Shakespeare's King John: The Bastard, an Upstart Courtier with a Good Cause.*

One of Shakespeare's less discussed plays, *The Life and Death of King John*, reflects on monarchy and the role of the courtier in the setting of the 13<sup>th</sup> century. Today it is agreed that Shakespeare wrote this play in between the two tetralogies, and that it is predated by the anonymous *Troublesome Reign of King John*. In my paper the debate on which play was written first will play only a minor role; I will concentrate on the figure of the Bastard as a courtier and how this character matches aspects of Machiavelli's influential work, *The Prince*.

My paper will discuss how the Bastard progresses from the Faulconbridge family into the Royal family and how he, once part of this high society, sets about to contain the chaos that John has set loose. Initially the Bastard's career decision smacks of ambition, yet it does not result from careful planning but from an ad-hoc decision. In the first half of the play, the Bastard impresses with loud, cheeky and seemingly indifferent conduct, posing as the principle character of his own show. This conduct shows that the Bastard is only at the beginning is of his political, Machiavellian career, since it contradicts Machiavelli's image of *virtù* and of a model prince.

While the Bastard's counterpart in the anonymous *Troublesome Reign* is promised wealth to compensate his financial loss should he denounce his Falconbridge inheritance, the Bastard in Shakespeare's *King John* is promised honour and independence to be his own "Lord." Becoming a Lord marks the Bastard's transformation into a self-made man. Having seen through the artificiality of court etiquette, the Bastard jests about the high society he is now part of. Although his sneers reveal that he feels contempt for this society, his participation in this artificiality shows that the Bastard is pragmatic and willing to play whatever roll is required to achieve his goals.

In the course of the play the Bastard finds his own path. His loyalty belongs to the institution of the crown; he does not serve his king blindly. He rebukes John's actions, chides him and even takes over his sovereign's role as military leader. In the end, the Bastard fails to save his king, yet he saves England and closes the play with a patriotic call: England has nothing to fear if the country "to itself do rest but true" (5.7.118). This echoes Machiavelli's words in the last chapter of *The Prince*, calling for the ousting of the barbarians. Although the Bastard's rise to become John's right hand concludes in submission to the new English king and not in the Bastard's own succession of the throne, the Bastard's Machiavellian thinking, albeit subversive, was employed to stabilize the state, not to cause chaos. In his Bastard, Shakespeare offers a positive reading of Machiavelli at a time when most writers still vilified Machiavelli.

**Stephen Longstaffe (University of Cumbria, UK)**

*"The plebeians revise the uprising": What the Actors Made of Shakespeare's Jack Cade*

The paper will argue that the differences between the Q and F texts of the Cade scenes in Shakespeare's *2Henry VI* indicate substantial revision, and that furthermore these revisions were the work of actors rather than Shakespeare himself. Broadly speaking, recent textual scholarship agrees that behind the First Folio text of 1623 (F) lies (at whatever remove and

with whatever degree of contamination and/or revision) a writer's MS, and that behind the *First Part* (Q1594, 1600, 1619) lies (at whatever remove and with whatever degree of contamination) a performance. My thesis, simply stated, is that F's (and Shakespeare's) literariness is not simply a matter of style or writing for publication. It also involves an attitude to its subject matter (commons political action); attention to Q's text can reveal a theatrical counter-project to the self-fashioning of the literary dramatist, one registering and resisting several kinds of emergent theatrical and political exclusions – in Richard Helgerson's 1992 formulation, 'the alienation of the clown from the playwright, of the players' theatre from the authors' theatre, of the people from the nation and its canonical self-representations.' Q's revisions of Shakespeare's F text – which contain many markers of intelligent adaptation for performance – embody in one of its most coherent forms a shared subject position diametrically opposed that of the writer. The representation of a popular rising at this point in theatrical history provides a brief but suggestive intersection between player, plebeian, and clown.

One of the most obvious links between Q and performance is that it is a funnier text than F, though the laughter is by no means innocent. What is at stake, I want to argue, is not merely technique; it is not just a case of the clowns introducing *more* laughter, but a different kind of laughter, one based in the carnivalesque. I want to argue that the politics of these alterations is linked to laughter, in setting up the conditions for laughing with rather than at Cade (and by extension, repudiating Shakespeare's hostile portrayal of commons political consciousness and action).

The link between real world commons disorder and carnival is well established. Inversion, parody, and degradation were what commons did when they periodically claimed a political voice. So for verisimilitude's sake, the rising has to be carnivalesque. But this carnivalesque portrayal, far from making the rising unattractive to its audience, could help to legitimate it. The rising does not simply display the carnivalesque, sprawling on a pin, for the approbation of its audience; it both shows them and involves them in a carnivalesque spectacle. Also, the carnivalesque, like commons history, refuses closure. There is no plot to real world commons social disorder as a phenomenon – individual instances may be recuperable as comic, but there is never closure, as 1381 inspires 1450 inspires 1497 inspires 1536 inspires 1547 and so on. The fact that these risings 'failed' mattered a great deal to propagandists of order, but very little to each new generation of commons, whose own history repeated itself, on and off the London stage, as carnival.

**Jessica L. Malay (University of Huddersfield, UK)**

*Shakespeare's Tudor Sibyl: Queen Margaret in Richard III.*

In *Richard III* Queen Margaret (wife of Henry VI) is often portrayed as a mad and embittered woman, a marginalized figure who can rail and curse but possesses no agency and is easily dismissed by the other characters. In Act 1, scene 3 Dorset remarks, "Dispute not with her; she is lunatic" (1.3.254) while Buckingham replies to Richard III's inquiry: "What does she say?" with "Nothing that I respect, gracious lord." (1.3.295-6). Yet, despite the dismissive attitudes given voice in this scene, anxiety builds as the scene progress. After Margaret leaves, Buckingham admits, "My hair doth stand on end to hear her

curses" (1.3.304). Rivers agrees. How then does one reconcile the ostensibly dismissive response to Margaret's railings with the obvious anxiety her words produce? Certainly contemporary political prophetic discourse is alluded to in this scene. More than this however, Margaret's words and demeanor display qualities of the far more disquieting and authoritative prophetic discourse of the ancient sibyls. These figures, appropriated from classical and early Christian texts, continued to circulate widely in a variety of texts in the late 16<sup>th</sup> century. In this paper I will discuss the characteristics which allow an identification of Margaret as a sibylline figure. I will also consider the anxieties these prophetic figures elicited in Shakespeare's works how these anxieties contribute to the construction of the character of Margaret and her position within the dramatic text.

**Alexandra May, University of York, UK**

***Compiling a Queen; the Elinor Sequence and Peele's Edward I***

This paper will focus on George Peele's *Edward I*, first performed around 1591. Detailed analysis of the extant play forces the conclusion that, sometime prior to the printing of Q1 in 1593, the playtext itself has been drastically altered, and the sequence of 'the sinking of Queen Elinor' has replaced previous material. So clumsily have these interpolations been added, that the text as it now exists is unperformable. The Elinor sequence was clearly an important one, and this paper will try to ascertain the resonances of placing this haughty matricidal Spanish queen on the stage at this moment.

More than this, *Edward I* demonstrates Peele's skill at intertwining many different strands of history, both recent and ages-old, and winding them up with ballad material, folk myth, and local specificity, to create a character and a plot which, whilst composed only of the past, articulates exactly the present. Queen Elinor is a construct of 1591, but she is amalgamated from aspects of the ballad Queen Eleanor of Aquitaine who was famous for her supposed adulteries; the Queen Eleanor of Provence who was so unpopular as to have her royal barge attacked by the people of London as she passed under London bridge, and who was rescued only by the qualms of the rebel Lord Mayor; and Eleanor of Castile, who was hated by the people but loved so passionately, so the story goes, by her husband, that on her death he marked the stopping points of her funeral procession with gigantic stone crosses, including Charing Cross.

This paper will use historical context to understand Peele's character, working hard to uncover the hidden linkages between the Elinor sequence and early modern London. In the interpolations, Elinor murders the Lady Mayoress, and then denies it, whereupon the anger of God causes the ground to open up and swallow her at Charing Cross in a confusion of dates and significance. The Elinor sequence is a remarkable one, poised as it is to expose and explain new ways of thinking about composite historiography, and to bring to our attention the dialogue between civic pride and royal authority. Murdering the mayoress would always be a semiotically-powerful action for a monarch, but Elinor does so in a manner which involves her attacking the very motherhood of her victim, at a time when Elizabeth was now quite definitely no longer marriageable, and Peele's character flaunts her own Spanish arrogance and pride, only three years after the Spanish Armada. More intriguing still is the realisation that Peele wrote the Lord Mayor's pageant of 1591.

His play situates itself at a locus for a discussion of the relationship between power and the people, between London rebels, and the might of the monarchy.

**Rory McKeown (University of Toronto, Canada)**

*"This masque was cried incomparable": Royal Entries and the Form of Pageantry in All Is True*

Shakespeare's late plays are a puzzle to those who would classify them generically, and *All Is True* (*Henry VIII*) is no exception. In subject matter, it is the culmination of the histories, meditations on royal power and English identity. In its dramaturgy, it shares much with the late romances, reflecting the masques and pageantry of the Jacobean court, which served to present and reify royal power. Much recent criticism of the play has focussed fruitfully on the pageantry that informs the play. I wish to consider in particular one form, or genre, of pageantry that informs the play: the royal entry. For the question of genre is crucial. Douglas Bruster argues that if "form is "real" in this sense, having an identifiable shape, texture, extension, or duration, it also *does things*" (42). Building on Bruster's argument, Marissa Greenberg examines the interplay of forms, noting that "early modern playgoers paid their pennies in anticipation of a particular dramatic arc and denouement" (129). The forms that the play invokes, then, are crucial to understanding its engagement with royalty.

Most of the forms suggested by critics looking for formal parallels apply more directly to the procession of secondary characters: Buckingham, Wolsey, and Katherine become figures illustrating the transience of glory, passing across the stage as the pass through the arc of Fortune's Wheel. But where does that leave the King? What "principles, patterns, and conventions" (Greenberg, 129) would have influenced an early modern audience in their understanding of Henry? In this paper, I argue that the King's trajectory in the play bears striking similarities to the physical trajectory of a monarch in a royal entry. The monarch, entering London for the first time, would be welcomed by a series of allegorical tableaux put on for them; these pageants were sponsored by the guilds of the city, and their allegorical function was naturally supportive of the City's interests. But Anne Lancashire, commenting on an entry of Richard II and his queen notes that Richard Maidstone's account of the king and queen speculating about the meaning of the 1392 Cheapside pageant suggests that interpretation was a major source of interest for the audience.

The point can be taken further: the *king's* interpretation would be of particular interest to the audience. David Bergeron casts light on royal influence on the planning, noting that Elizabeth provided materials for her 1559 entry: "Elizabeth is thus not only a recipient of the pageant, spectator and "actor" in it, but also a provider.... She is accordingly part patron of this drama" ("Elizabeth" 5-6). Henry's role in *All Is True* is also curiously dual. At first, he is the passive observer of shows at court, interpreted for him by his counsellors. At most, he is a participant in the rich pageantry of the Field of the Cloth of Gold – devised by Wolsey. As the play progresses, Henry, like a monarch glimpsed first from far off, then steadily moving to the centre of the City, assumes a greater role. He stage manages his confrontation with Wolsey, before finally passing judgement on him, and engineers the

rescue of Cranmer. From being the subject of interpretation, Henry becomes the locus of interpretive authority, as he moves toward the centre of the play's action. The conventions of the royal entry provide the framework for reading royal power in *All Is True*.

**Clare McManus (Roehampton University, UK)**

*Elizabeth in the East Indies*

With the European crises of the 1620s, the fissures in the politics of dynastic alliance and diplomacy become visible. Symbolised by the queen consort - the woman who moves between the courts and nations of Europe - the epitome of this system and of its growing instability as far as English audiences of the 1620s are concerned is the exiled Elizabeth of Bohemia, daughter of James VI and I and former Electress of the Palatinate.

The theatre of the late Jacobean period engaged vigorously with its rapidly changing circumstance, and this paper will analyse the gendered theatricalisation of this response. I will concentrate on *The Island Princess* (1621), John Fletcher's mediation, via tragicomedy, travel narrative, romance and epic, of the English, European and global idea and experience of female rule. His heroine Quisara is at once Elizabeth of Bohemia, her mother Anna of Denmark and the ever-dominant Elizabeth I. Located on the Indonesian Spice Islands of Ternate and Tidore, which Fletcher mediates through the Stuart masquing tradition and through a Hispanic imperial geography, *The Island Princess* demonstrates how the figure of the royal woman stands at the centre of both late Jacobean theatrical practice and European structures of rule.

**Kavita Mudan (Linacre College, University of Oxford, UK)**

*'A queen in jest?': Queenship and Historical Subversion in the First Tetralogy*

Shakespeare's rendering of the later fifteenth century in the *Henry VI* plays and *Richard III* appears on the surface to be a dramatisation of the Tudor version of history, particularly that of Edward Hall. However, the departures he makes from Hall often serve to subvert that particular vision of the fifteenth century. One of the areas in which he departs most often is in his depiction of women, particularly queens, culminating in the absence of Elizabeth of York from the supposed union of the houses of York and Lancaster at the end of *Richard III*.

This paper explores how the character of Queen Elizabeth Woodville, who appears in the third part of *Henry VI* and *Richard III*, becomes a locus for these moments of subversion. This is due in part to contradictions within the source material itself -- Hall's account draws on two different early sixteenth-century histories, the *Anglica Historia* of Polydore Vergil and Thomas More's *History of King Richard III*, whose characterisations of Elizabeth are very different. More makes Elizabeth the centre of resistance to the usurping Richard of Gloucester, while Vergil dismisses her as inconstant and meddling and shifts the focus to Margaret Beaufort, mother of Henry VII. Hall ultimately follows Vergil, framing More's clever and complex narrative within the larger movement of Vergil's history toward the union he compares in his introduction to that of godhead and manhood.

Rather than smoothing out these contradictions, Shakespeare draws attention to them,

turning narration into dialogue in order to highlight the fictive nature of historical rhetoric. Vergil's version of Elizabeth becomes Richard's flawed perspective, while her own words and actions follow More. Even when he moves beyond where More's narrative ends, Shakespeare does not revert to Vergil as chroniclers before him did. He excises Margaret altogether, leaving Elizabeth to double-cross Richard using the same equivocal language that made her queen in *Henry VI Part III*.

What does this signify? When Shakespeare was writing the first tetralogy, it was becoming increasingly clear that Elizabeth I was unlikely to have children, and that the Tudor line so celebrated in Hall's chronicle was coming to an end. The ending of *Richard III*, from which women are completely absent, belies Henry VII's promise of a fruitful future. In the representation, particularly of Elizabeth Woodville, Shakespeare uses the multivocality of drama to question Hall's providential narrative, and by extension the accuracy and relevance of Tudor history.

### **Yvonne Oram (independent scholar)**

#### ***No Country for Old Women?***

On the Early Modern stage older female rulers are almost always stereotypically imaged in relation to a husband (alive or dead) or to grown children. In this they share the dramatic fate of the majority of other mature female characters who are presented as wives, mothers or stepmothers and widows and are thus contained and controlled by domesticity.

Yet historians show that older women lived active, public lives. An ageing woman was Queen of England, followed by a mature Queen consort, and their aristocratic contemporaries had considerable political influence at Court. Older women were essential in key areas of the nation's economy – agriculture, manufacturing, trade - were active in the law and finance and influential in their local communities. There were mature women teachers, doctors, writers, translators and so on. None of this ageing female autonomy is shown on the contemporary stage and opportunities for presenting this - when the female in question is a Queen or powerful ruler – are generally ignored. For instance, although Gertrude is proclaimed by her new husband as 'Th'imperial jointress of this warlike state,' (*Hamlet*, 1.2.9) Shakespeare focuses entirely on her behaviour as widow, wife and, most crucially, mother.

In this paper I will outline the "reality" of older women's lives in the Early Modern period, then discuss examples of the stereotypical presentations of the ageing female ruler on the Early Modern stage. Here characters considered include Katherine, a wife who rocks the royal boat, in *All Is True (Henry VIII)* by William Shakespeare and John Fletcher, and problem Queens/mothers such as Gertrude in *Hamlet* and Eugenia in *Lust's Dominion or The Lascivious Queen*, attributed to Thomas Dekker. It is unsurprising that the majority of stereotyped male-authored stage images of the older woman reflect male concerns about her potential strength and influence. Her propensity for inappropriate female behaviour, such as disobedience and sexual incontinence, is seen as exacerbated by the ageing process itself, marking her out as different from other insubordinate females. Especially problematic is the older woman's outspokenness which often advocates disobedience to and subversion of male governance.

I conclude by engaging with Shakespeare's Cleopatra and the Queen in John Fletcher's *Bonduca*, the only ageing female rulers who subvert the stage stereotyping of the day. Bonduca is marked out as a "bad" mother and Cleopatra has celebrity status as 'Egypt's widow' (*Antony and Cleopatra*, 2:1:37) but on stage both operate freely beyond the conventions of marriage and family. They are also authoritatively outspoken – distinguished by their access to the extensive language which is power on stage and which gives a character dramatic focus. With these characters, we see Early Modern playwrights celebrating the creative power of the older woman running a country.

### **Stephen Orgel (Stanford University, US)**

#### *I am Richard the Second*

My title invokes Queen Elizabeth's characterization of herself in the last year of her reign, an especially startling one, given the popular modern perception of her glory. But Elizabeth's version of herself was always double-edged. Throughout her long reign, she consciously fashioned both her public performances and her image to produce a persona that would be loved rather than feared—this was perhaps her most effective antidote to the doubts surrounding the legitimacy of her accession to the throne. The narrative constructed around her gradually transformed her from the most eligible heiress on the European marriage market to the permanently virginal heroine of a chivalric romance, surrounded by knights dedicated to courting her favor. This was effective for an increasingly small constituency in the commonwealth and beyond it, and in the final stage of the enterprise, in fact, was self-defeating as a political strategy. It proved, however, spectacularly successful as a way for subsequent eras to idealize her.

### **Diego Pirillo (Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Italy)**

#### *"Uno Imperatore sia Monarcha e signore di tutto il mondo": Queen Elizabeth as Universal Monarch in John Florio's Firste Frutes*

Recent studies, taking up on the proposal launched by Patrick Collinson, have contested the traditional notion of 'Tudor Despotism.' Instead Elizabethan England has been defined as a form of 'Monarchical Republic,' a state that felt autonomy but that also held fast to a constitutional hereditary right of a single ruler. Elizabethan political practice, in fact, often saw an interplay between the Queen and other powers that had their own independent view on foreign affairs, such as the Council and the Parliament. Nonetheless, at the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, an increasing number of books were being published in England representing Elizabeth as a 'universal monarch' whose empire extended even to the New World and the oceans: this was exemplified by John Dee's works reconstructed in the classic study of William Sherman. Deeply involved in this creation of Elizabethan imperial ideology were also John Florio and the Italian community in London. The aim of this paper is to investigate the representation of the Elizabethan monarchy that emerges from Florio's *First Frutes*, an issue that was only briefly addressed by Frances Yates in *Astrea*. Several chapters in Florio's dialogue are constructed using explicit quotations from Antonio de Guevara's *Relox de Principes*, in order to develop the image of the English

Queen as a 'universal monarch' and to represent her relation to the subjects as a 'corpus mysticum,' a key notion in Guevara's political theology. Florio's references to Guevara are indicative of the circulation of the political thought of the *Siglo de oro* in early modern England. In many cases in fact the Elizabethan imperial ideology had foreign roots, and was created, as the research of Anthony Pagden and David Armitage had shown, by reformulating the Spanish conception of the empire. Moreover, this image of the English sovereign was wide-spread in the Italian community in London. Indeed, it was probably because of his intellectual exchange with Florio that also Giordano Bruno, in the *Cena de le ceneri*, his first dialogue published in London, chose to address Elizabeth as 'unica imperatrice di questa terrestre sfera.'

**Paul Quinn (University of Sussex, UK)**

***King John: History, Martyrology and Succession Drama***

The 16<sup>th</sup> century construction of the reign of King John as an example of England's pre-Reformation Protestant past is well known. The further refinement of that construction found on the late Elizabeth stage has also been discussed at length. In *The Troublesome Reign* and in *King John*, the reign of John is not simply presented as evidence of the historic existence of English 'Protestantism', rather on the stage, John's reign is constructed so as to mirror the great Reforming moments of the reigns of Henry VIII and Elizabeth I. John becomes a phantasmagoric mixture of the two Tudor monarchs.

What has received little or no attention is Shakespeare's transformation of John into a Foxean-style Marian martyr. *Acts and Monuments* is a key source for Shakespeare's play, but, in his description of the death of John, Shakespeare moves beyond Foxe's account of the reign of John and instead turns to Foxe's account of the Marian martyrs. The play's Protestant champion burns, following the same pattern as Foxe's mid-sixteenth century martyrs. John is a victim of the Roman Church.

This portrayal of John as Protestant martyr has an impact on the question of succession that runs throughout the play. If the date of 1595/6 commonly attributed to the staging of *King John* is correct, the play is contemporaneous with the 'unspoken' succession debate of which 'Doleman's' *A Conference about the next succession of the crown of England* (1595) was a part. Shakespeare's play offers a number of successors to John all of whom have a contemporary resonance with the candidates discussed by Doleman. In part, Shakespeare's play is a paean to bastardry. John's legitimacy is in question, and yet he is the Protestant bulwark against Rome. The question posed by Shakespeare's play, mirroring the contemporary debate, is which of the possible candidates – native and foreign – is a suitable successor for England's legitimate/illegitimate defender. It is a debate heightened by the question of religion, implicit in any 16<sup>th</sup> century Protestant consideration of John, but underscored by Shakespeare's reading of Foxe.

This paper will demonstrate the transformation of John into a version of the Marian martyrs and will discuss how, if the 1595/6 date is correct, it is possible to view the play as being dependant upon, and reflective of, the forbidden but on-going debate surrounding the possible successors of Elizabeth I.

**Glenn Richardson (Saint Mary's College, Twickenham, UK)**

***Masques and Tournaments: The Rule and Roles of Henry VIII***

Henry VIII was the first English monarch to present himself 'on stage' at his own court in masques. The Revels accounts for the first decades of his reign make clear that early-Tudor masques involved elaborate staging and costumes and usually presented propagandistic allegories and characters drawn from mythic British history, especially King Arthur, and from chivalric romances.

This paper will argue that the masque was a genuine innovation at the court of Henry VIII but one which owed much to the example of the court of Francis I of France, which was itself developing and transmitting new forms of dance entertainment borrowed from Italian princely courts. It also argues a strong connection between masques and tournaments. It is clear from contemporary sources that these two types of performance were carefully choreographed to focus audiences' attention on the king's physical strength and agility as a young man.

Like the tournaments they often followed, court masques enabled Henry to present himself as an exceptional incarnation of youthful royal virtue and emphasised the power of the Tudor dynasty. The paper shows how, like his illustrious daughter Elizabeth, Henry VIII enjoyed being the centre of theatrical entertainment and was, in a very real sense, the performer of his own script.

**Monica Santini (University of Padua, Italy)**

***"Young gentlemen that rather desire to do well than know how to perform it"***

***Queen Elizabeth's Representation of Essex's Failures in Ireland (July-September 1599)***

Queen Elizabeth's public letters display the same rhetorical refinement as her speeches and are therefore instrumental in understanding how she builds her public persona and negotiates power with her courtiers and officials, especially in times of trouble. This paper will focus on some letters Elizabeth wrote during the so-called Irish crisis, one of the thorniest questions of the last part of her reign, which was rendered even more difficult by the insolence and disobedience of her own officials.

In the late 1590s, when the earl of Tyrone's rebellion in the north of Ireland had degenerated into a nation-wide war (the Nine Years War, 1594-1603), more and more attention and resources were diverted from the continental conflicts to Ireland and the Queen herself had to abandon her traditionally soft attitude towards the Irish rebels and the unsuccessful policies of her English administrators in Ireland. Robert Devereux, second earl of Essex, was one of Elizabeth's less docile courtiers and one of her best commanders. When he became Lord Deputy of Ireland in the autumn of 1598 their relationship was already strained so that his military campaign in Ireland, which started in March 1599, became crucial to his definitive fall from Elizabeth's grace. Despite an army of 16,000 men, Essex failed to defeat the Irish rebels and in September 1599 had to hurry back to England where he met Queen Elizabeth for the last time.

During the whole Irish campaign Essex did not receive any encouragement from Elizabeth, who, conversely, had been quite supportive during his equally unfortunate

campaign in Spain in 1597. In a series of letters written between July and September 1599 the Queen harshly criticized Essex's conduct, especially his incapacity to advance against Tyrone in the north, his high and unjustified expenditure, his acting on his own initiative when creating new knights and arranging truces. In addition, she blames the young commander for blemishing her own reputation in the eyes of other Princes. Through a rhetorical analysis of such letters I intend to show how the Queen handled a matter of urgent prominence in which her own image as a monarch was at stake. I will therefore focus on the patterns she uses to express her constant preoccupation with the "ears of the world" and on the strategies she adopts to stand her own ground with the most unruly and ill-fated of her favourites.

**Hande Seber (Hacettepe University, Turkey)**

*The Petrarchan "Self-fashioning" of Queen Elizabeth I*

The Petrarchan love convention lived its glorious age during the last two decades of the reign of Queen Elizabeth I. Elizabeth I inspired the poets, who through their use of Petrarchan vocabulary established the cult of celebrating, glorifying and idealizing their Virgin Queen. In the Petrarchan tradition the lover has the power of words in representing the beloved who is his object of adoration; he establishes his own subjectivity as the male poetic persona who explicitly expresses his fulfilment and frustration, adores his beloved from a distance and silences her through idealization. It was not only the poets who used Petrarchism, but also the Queen herself adopted it – in her own way – as a means in her "self-fashioning" (in Stephen Greenblatt's term) and as a strategy in her relations with her male courtiers. It is commonly agreed that the Queen used the Petrarchan tradition politically especially during the last period of her reign, established a distance between her courtiers and herself, made them feel powerful while indeed she had all the authority and control. Although Elizabeth I's speeches are primarily studied in terms of her self-fashioning, her two poems, "On Monsieur's Departure" and her answer in "Verse Exchange Between Queen Elizabeth and Sir Walter Raleigh" are equally significant in her self-presentation and her use of the authoritative voice. Her public and her private selves are conflated, she uses the gendered discourse of the Petrarchan love convention, accommodates herself within the tradition, casting herself both as the object and subject of the poem, distances herself from her courtiers, reminds them of her superior status, asserts her power and control over them all.

In "On Monsieur's Departure," thought to be written after her last formal suitor Duke of Alençon, through the use of the Petrarchan contraries, stating that "from myself another self I turned," Elizabeth I complains about the yearnings of her heart but acknowledges her duty to repress them for she is the Queen and should not be conquered by love. Being both the subject and the object of the poem she has the control of the Petrarchan vocabulary, speaks and complains as a Petrarchan lover, changes the conventional gender of the speaker. She thus asserts her control both over love and over the poetic convention, and her own choice despite all its consequences. A more strong self-assertion is evident in the verse exchange where she answers the Petrarchan complaint of Sir Walter Raleigh who blames fortune for his loss of favour. The Queen expresses her superiority over him and

“Fortune.” She reminds him that she is above fortune, for it can only rule earthly ones devoid of virtue. Both poems bear the similar self-justification and self-assertion evident in her speeches. Through her own way of using the Petrarchan convention, Elizabeth I fashions herself as remote, authoritative, desirable, unattainable, chaste and superior. The “self” from whom the Queen complained to have “turned” is no one but the Virgin Queen – the *role* she fashioned to *rule* her country for forty four years.

**Astrid Stilma (Canterbury Christ Church University, UK)**

***'The Catalogue of Good Kings': Instructing King James VI & I in his 'English Heritage'***

My starting point is Dekker's description of King James's entry in London, *The Magnificent Entertainment* (1604). Echoing the literature of welcome that proliferated in the wake of James's 1603 accession, and incorporating in places the various rising concerns of the early years of his English reign, the pageantry for the royal entry drew on English history in its attempt to represent to James the way(s) in which his new subjects would like him to play his role as monarch. The emphasis was mainly on Henry VII: James's claim to the English throne rested on his Tudor ancestor, and it was hoped that James would do for Scotland and England what Henry had done for Lancaster and York: to unite two warring houses and avoid civil war. However, some pageants (most notably that of the Dutch merchants) emphasised other role models, such as the reformational Edward VI and particularly Elizabeth I. The interpretation of the message performed in such pageants is, of course, constructed by the spectator, who might agree, disagree, disregard, fail to understand or misinterpret. In this case the audience consisted not only of the king but also of his entourage and of the London populace watching the king's performance in his role as spectator. By holding up earlier monarchs as mirrors, these pageants were delivering a multi-layered message to James and his people about good government, as well as voicing concerns about the ways in which James seemed to be performing so far. They variously invited the members of their audience (royal or otherwise) to identify with historical 'peacemaker figures' or with rulers who had been militant (according to their popular reputation, at least) in the defence of Protestant England – a rather pressing concern in 1604, the year of the Anglo-Spanish peace treaty. Investigating the use of English monarchs as examples in the praise, advice and – occasionally – criticism of James, I address Dekker's *Entertainment* and various other early Jacobean pageants, some of James's published writings and speeches, and plays written for the public stage, for example early nostalgic representations of Elizabeth such as Heywood's *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody* (1605) and Dekker's *The Whore of Babylon* (1607).

**Laura Tosi (University of Venice Ca' Foscari, Italy)**

***Mirrors for Female Rulers: Elizabeth I and the Duchess of Malfi***

What does a female ruler see or want to see when she looks at herself in the mirror? A mighty monarch? A beautiful woman? Mirrors have a peculiar way of validating identity: we use them to find reassurance about what we look like and often wonder whether inner changes or emotions can manifest themselves in outward appearance. As works on both

the use of real mirrors and mirror metaphors in England can testify, in the Elizabethan age there was an unprecedented availability of glass mirrors: as Herbert Grabes has observed, “it was only with the greatly increased distribution of glass mirrors after 1590 that the utensil took on conventional status as a starting point for literal or metaphorical exploration”. Although mirror-titles abound in the Middle Ages, the marked frequency with which references to the mirror can be detected between 1550 and 1660 is quite remarkable - this appears to have been mainly an English phenomenon, undoubtedly connected with the fascination with perspective and optical effects, and which resulted in the creative re-use of a strongly conventionalized image in all its acceptations by Elizabethan and Jacobean dramatists.

The aim of my paper is to investigate the way two female rulers, the real Elizabeth I and Webster’s fictional Duchess of Malfi, establish a personal encounter with the mirror bearing in mind that Queen Elizabeth, “mirror of Grace and majesty divine”, in Spenser’s words, inevitably represented both the real and the model mirror in which theatrical female or male rulers had to look at themselves.

When we look at an *exemplary* image in the mirror we do not expect to see a faithful reflection of a real person. So, as Debora Shuger has argued, “the gazing subject becomes irrelevant because [...] the mirror is really a painting”. Is the portrait an answer to the mirror in the same way as the emergence of the self portrait may be linked to the new improved mirrors of the sixteenth century? Elizabeth was ambivalent to say the least towards mirrors: as legend goes, she had all the mirrors removed from her apartments while her state portraits proliferated so that the only mirrors in which the queen could contemplate herself for many years were the pictorial representations over which she exercised strict control. Choosing state portraits that would defy the transitoriness of one’s reflection and the inevitable decay of one’s body over the more private mirrors could mean privileging one’s public identity over the private one. If, we can easily infer, this was Queen Elizabeth’s choice, Webster’s Duchess appears to head in the opposite direction. When the ruler of Malfi is courting Antonio she invites him to see her as *different* from an artistic representation in the funereal monument of her first husband: unlike the painting in the gallery mentioned by the maid Cariola, which freezes the Duchess in a royal posture empty of life, her mirror registers the experience of aging, a situation which Queen Elizabeth apparently never encountered in her mature age.

As Elizabeth can be seen to frame Webster’s play as the exemplary female governor, the Duchess threatens the entire patriarchal order by refusing to transform herself into an artistic and political icon: the Duchess cannot end as *Eliza triumphans* as her court denies her the flattering glasses of courtiers.

**Sara Trevisan (University of Padua, Italy)**

*Lady of the Lake or Queen of the Ocean? Female Power in Prince Henry’s Barriers and Tethys’ Festival*

This paper proposes a comparative analysis of Queen Anne’s role in two Jacobean entertainments: *Prince Henry’s Barriers* by Ben Jonson; *Tethys’ Festival or the Queen’s Wake*, by Samuel Daniel.

Both of them were staged in the year 1610, in January and June respectively, for the celebration of Henry's appointment as Prince of Wales. At that time, the strain between James's and Henry's Courts was already evident; partly independent from both, Queen Anne's provided a third point of mediation. These dynamics of power clearly surface in Jonson's and Daniel's entertainments.

The officialization of Henry's institutional role apparently brought forth an evolution in the staging of queenship: indeed, it marked a change from the earlier, sharply displaced representations of the Queen – e.g., as an Amazon or black woman – to a tentative integration of her role within the “mythology” of the Stuart monarchy. While Jonson faced this task as James's official Court poet, Daniel did it as one of Queen Anne's favourite intellectuals.

In Jonson's *Barriers*, direct and comparative textual evidence suggests that the figure of the Lady of the Lake, a water fairy or nymph, may have been intended as Anne's dramatic persona, aiming to reconcile her queenship with the Stuart order, by blending the Elizabethan fairy world, Stuart Arthurian mythology, and Prince Henry's imperialistic and chivalric imagination. The armed opposition of the Amazon queen to James is neutralised, and Anne's role is absorbed into an ancillary, motherly figure of romance, bestowing a shield to her foster child, the knight Moeliades (Henry), and thus promoting and adhering to the patriarchal asset of the Stuart genealogy.

Daniel's *Tethys' Festival*, commissioned and performed by Queen Anne, seems to be an answer to Jonson's *Barriers*, from the point of view of both content and form. Here, Anne impersonates the sea goddess Tethys, wife to Neptune (King James) and mother to the nymphs representing English and Welsh rivers (her ladies-in-waiting). As was often the case, the figure of Tethys is here conflated with that of the nymph Thetis, Achilles's mother, who, in the *Iliad*, gives her son a shield (in the masque, it is a sword), and knows he is destined to be glorious. As water nymph, sea goddess, and *summa* of the nation's rivers, Anne empowers the role of queenship with the help of both classical mythology and Elizabethan iconography: while celebrating the maritime and imperialistic views of Henry, as well as the relevance of her own motherly figure, she abandons the patriarchal world of romance and expressly brings her power back to that of her predecessor, Elizabeth I, often represented as a cartographic “geo-body” embracing the entire kingdom. Though not belonging to a single masque cycle, these entertainments seem nevertheless to be thematically related as for the iconography and rhetoric of female power, and provide interesting examples, both from the King's and the Queen's standpoints, of the renegotiation of queenship in royal entertainments in the momentous years of Prince Henry's ascendancy.

**Cristina Vallaro (Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore-Milano, Italy)**

*The Empire and the Moon Symbolism in the Kenilworth and Elvetham Pageants*

Elizabeth's summer progresses were an essential aspect of the propaganda which allowed her to be seen by her subjects on many public occasions. During her progresses Elizabeth was welcomed by her hosts a few miles away their residences because her arrival had to be celebrated through a series of allegorical rituals: she had to be seen and greeted by the

people of the county and then she had to cross the threshold which both introduced her into a microcosm built-up of symbols related both to herself and the hosting lord, and made her similar to the Roman victorious leaders who used to march under triumphal arches built expressly for their success. All this supports the imperial ambition of the Tudors and finds evidence in some drawings, like Zuccaro's, poems and engravings where Elizabeth is portrayed between two columns, a clear allusion to Roman triumphal arches and Emperor Charles V's devise.

The Kenilworth and the Elvetham pageants are two examples of entertainments held to praise the Queen in two different moments of her reign. The Kenilworth one was held in 1575 when Elizabeth was still trying to establish the legitimacy of her crown and the Earl of Leicester chose to welcome his beloved reminding her of her Arthurian ancestry and of her imperial ambitions. The pageants show how Elizabeth was loved by all the pagan gods who had given her the best of their peculiar features and she is addressed as a beautiful and wise creature, whose virtues deserve to be world-wide known.

Elizabeth's celebration as the Moon goddess came out explicitly after 1588, when the victory over Spain transformed her reign into a new Golden Age and her chastity became the peculiar trait of a vestal Queen, praised as Cynthia, Diana or Delia in a series of sonnet sequences, a new literary fashion flourished under the petrarchan conventions of courtly love. Held in 1591, the Elvetham entertainment turned out to be further evidence of Elizabeth's greatness and divine nature. Her host, the unfortunate Earl of Hertford enlarged his house and transformed his garden to welcome the Queen who would restore him back to her favours. A moon-crescent-shaped pond was built in the garden and was chosen as the main setting for the entertainment during Her Majesty's visit. The pageant at Elvetham House pivots around Elizabeth as the Moon goddess and, being played both in the water and in the wood, drives the audience back to Elizabeth as Cynthia and Diana. She is addressed as a goddess and is given a rich jewel, which recalls to our mind Paris' choice both in the famous 1569 canvas by Hans Eworth (*Elizabeth I and the Three Goddesses*), and the poem, *Cynthia*, which opens Barnfield's homonymous 1595 sonnet sequence.

After 1588 her uniqueness was celebrated and she became an earthly creature whose goddess-like charm had made her ancestry's ambitions of power and fame real all over the world.

**Matthew H. Wikander (University of Toledo, Ohio, US)**

***Rubens, the Court Masques, and Royal Martyrdom***

In this paper, I point to numerous stylistic and thematic similarities between two of Pieter Paul Rubens's major court commissions of the 1620s and 30s, "The Life of Marie de Medici" and "The Apotheosis of King James" (the Whitehall Banqueting House ceiling) and the Jones/Jonson—Jones D'Avenant masques of the same period. The masques for King James and the Whitehall Ceiling, for example, share numerous iconographic and mythological references to the monarch's sapience and Solomonic "light scientiall." Like the D'Avenant masques for Charles and Henrietta Maria, the "Life of Marie de Medici" stresses the queen's mother's fecundity and grace, while placing within her reach instruments of royal power, as can be especially seen in the panels depicting the death and

apotheosis of Henri IV and Marie's ascension to the regency. Recent work has drawn attention to Henrietta Maria's importing not only French "preciosite" but also a serious interest in her mother's political agendas to the English court, and Rubens, with his commissions in both courts represents a stylistic bridge between the two. I argue that attention to the "Life of Marie de Medici" allows us to see a feminized King James in the Whitehall Ceiling, suggesting that this "loving nourish-father" of his people is, like Marie, gendered both male and female in the representation of his power. Finally, I draw connections between the idea of royal self-sacrifice in the masques and Rubens's representation of martyrdom, "The Coronation of Saint Catherine" (the "Toledo Rubens," now owned by the Toledo, Ohio, Museum of Art) and between these works and "Eikon Basilike."

**Richard Wilson (Cardiff University, UK)**

*The Method in the Madness: Hamlet and the Rules of Art*

John Dowland's defiant career as a composer at the court of King Christian IV of Denmark offers an uncanny parallel and musical metaphor for the artistic challenge that Hamlet also presented to emerging absolutist power: 'Call me what instrument you will, though you can fret me, you cannot play upon me'. At the start of the seventeenth-century, the play records, English entertainers were tempted by the state bureaucratisation of art in the new monarchies of Christian and his four sisters, and 'the tragedians of the city' opened up a lucrative touring network via Elsinore that rescued them from commercial competition. So read in the context of the imminent annexation of England by Christian's brother-in-law King James VI, Hamlet seems 'mad' in its objection that 'Denmark's a prison'. Shakespeare's great refusal of Danish 'caviar' was underwritten, however, by the belief his drama expresses in 'the general' of that 'whole theatre of others' – the Globe audience – heard offstage throughout. It was because Hamlet 'pleased all' that Shakespeare was free to reject the royal road taken by so many other performers and pronounce 'Something is rotten in the state of Denmark'. For the 'method in his madness' was the opposing absolutism of a democratic art that 'Caps, hands, and tongues applaud[ed] to the clouds'.

**Barbara Wooding (Birkbeck College, London, UK)**

*Absolute in All Things: The Dramatic Function of some Authoritarian Figures in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon*

'So absolute in all things/ And yet retain such cruel tyranny.' These words are spoken, not by a maiden threatened with imminent rape by one of John Fletcher's tyrants, but by a prince hopelessly in love with Erote, the beautiful, queen regent of Candy. This paper traces the development of royal and other authority figures within the Beaumont and Fletcher canon, from the much analyzed lustful tyrants of *The Maid's Tragedy* and *King and No King* to the wide range of rulers in later Jacobean plays. The paper begins with a brief overview of each of the major plays to be discussed: *The Maid's Tragedy*, *King and No King* and *Bonduca*, a Fletcher solo, all from circa 1611, *The Queen of Corinth* 1617-19, *The Laws of Candy*, circa 1620 and *The Sea Voyage* of 1622. Apart from the first, these plays are rarely performed and perhaps less familiar plays of the period.

The paper then discusses the dramatic function of the authoritarian figures, rather than the political analogies which are more frequently discussed. This emphasis is intended to highlight the role of the tyrant as a development of the evil to be overcome in the *Psychomachia* in what remains a morally charged drama. The intention is to look at the plays as texts for performance, investigating The King in *The Maid's Tragedy*, Arbaces, also a monarch, in *King and No King*, Bonduca, the queen of the Icenae, Erota, the queen regent in *The Laws of Candy*, the eponymous Queen of Corinth, and Rosalia, the queen of the female polity in *The Sea Voyage*. The aim is to demonstrate the variety of characters, especially royal characters created, the relationship between these power roles and those they govern, their interaction with outsiders, and how the dramatists subvert audience expectation.

I suggest that the investing of royal authority in a boy's role extends the much commented upon erotic frisson in Jacobean plays and, challenging the claim that women are expected to be either whores or models of passive acquiescence, proceed with an analysis of *The Queen of Corinth* and *The Sea Voyage* to show later Fletcher collaborations as demonstrably not misogynistic but positively proto-feminist. The polities set up under female rulers in these two plays are contrasted with the more traditional view of female characteristics evidenced in *Bonduca* and in *The Laws of Candy*, a non-Fletcher play which nevertheless found its way into the Beaumont and Fletcher *Folio*.

In examining this tiny selection of plays of the period from the many still available to us, I hope to demonstrate that they are at least worthy of consideration for performance.