

“This Prison Where I Live”: Authority and Incarceration in Early Modern Drama

Dana Omirova

Thesis submitted to the faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
In
English

Katharine Cleland
Su Fang Ng
Kenneth Hodges

May 13, 2020
Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: Drama, Early Modern Theatre, Imprisonment, Divine Right, Shakespeare,
Marlowe, Fletcher

Copyright © 2020 Dana Omirova
Unless otherwise stated

“This Prison Where I Live”: Authority and Incarceration in Early Modern Drama

Dana Omirova

ABSTRACT

The image of the prison looms large in early modern literature. By the sixteenth century, the prison was as much a part of everyday life as the public theatre. Although scholars have recently focused on the prison as a site of cultural production, the depictions of fictionalized prison have not received much attention. Early modern drama in particular frequently resorts to prison as the setting for political struggle, inviting further discourse on authority and its sources. In this thesis, I argue that the prison's liminality allows early modern playwrights to explore the nature of royal privilege. I analyze Marlowe's *Edward II*, Shakespeare's *Richard II*, Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, and Fletcher's *The Island Princess* through the cultural and historical lens of imprisonment, determining that the prison is a space where relations and power dynamics between the king and his subjects can be questioned and subsequently condemned, upheld, or transformed.

“This Prison Where I Live”: Authority and Incarceration in Early Modern Drama

Dana Omirova

GENERAL AUDIENCE ABSTRACT

Much like modern art and popular culture, sixteenth-century English drama comments on both everyday life and political climate of its time. One image that appears frequently in the works of Shakespeare and his contemporaries is the prison. In many plays, the prison appears as a crucial backdrop for political struggle. Setting the action within a prison allows the playwright to ask a series of questions regarding the nature of authority and privilege. In this thesis, I analyze Marlowe's *Edward II*, Shakespeare's *Richard II*, Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, and Fletcher's *The Island Princess*, focusing on the figure of the royal prisoner.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge and thank the faculty at Virginia Tech who have supported me through the lengthy process of writing this thesis. First, I would like to thank my thesis director Dr. Katharine Cleland, who agreed to work with me on this project back when it was just a sliver of a very different idea. Dr. Cleland fulfilled the impossible task of keeping me accountable while offering much needed reassurance, and I owe the completion of this thesis to her kindness. I would also like to thank my readers, Dr. Su Fang Ng and Dr. Kenneth Hodges, whose input was invaluable at different stages of the project. Dr. Ng set the highest standards for me as a scholar while also providing most generous guidance, helping me rise to the occasion and grow as a result. Dr. Hodges has provided much needed perspective, teaching me to treat my own work with respect. Finally, I would like to thank the friends and family who reached out and kept me sane as I was finishing my degree in the middle of a pandemic. Without you out there, this work would not have been possible.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION: PRINCES, PRISONS, AND PLAYS	1
CHAPTER 1: "WHERE LORDS KEEP COURTS AND KINGS ARE LOCKED IN PRISON": PUBLIC OPINION AND DIVINE RIGHT IN MARLOWE'S <i>EDWARD II</i>	6
CHAPTER 2: THE PRISON AS A "SCHOOL OF VIRTUE" IN SHAKESPEARE'S <i>RICHARD II</i>	29
CHAPTER 3: "IN DEATH I AM A KING STILL": ISLANDS, PRISONERS, AND DIVINE AUTHORITY IN SHAKESPEARE AND FLETCHER	48
CONCLUSION	68
BIBLIOGRAPHY	69

Introduction: Princes, Prisons, and Plays

Early modern prison literature has attracted increasing scholarly attention in the past few decades. The 2009 special issue of *Huntington Library Quarterly*, “Prison Writings in Early Modern England,” defined prison literature as a distinct genre during the early modern period.¹ Despite efforts to contain them, prison writings were notorious for circulating freely, permeating early modern society and culture.² Considering the scope and complexity of this literature, Molly Murray argues that “the early modern prison was a site of culture, one that ought to be considered alongside the court and the university as a place of significant textual, and literary, production.”³ Indeed, reading literature produced in prisons against the backdrop of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English

¹ *Huntington Library Quarterly* 72, no. 2 (2009).

² See Thomas S. Freeman, “The Rise of Prison Literature,” in *Huntington Library Quarterly* 72, no. 2 (2009): 141. Freeman lists a large number of prominent early modern authors who wrote from their incarceration experience, such as Thomas More, Thomas Dekker, Ben Jonson, Thomas Wyatt, George Chapman, and others.

³ Molly Murray, “Measured Sentences: Forming Literature in the Early Modern Prison,” in *Huntington Library Quarterly* 72, no. 2 (2009): 150.

judicial practices has proven to be a fruitful area of inquiry.⁴ What scholars have yet to consider, however, is how much influence prisons had on literature beyond their walls.

The prison loomed large in the early modern imagination, and early modern playwrights used prisons as sources of inspiration for their storylines. Thomas Freeman considers both prison literature and drama to be “England’s most characteristic cultural forms in the period.”⁵ The comparison between the two genres need not stop here: the social conditions that enabled the rise of one influenced the other. Although early modern dramas frequently feature prisons, both as settings and as metaphors, literary portrayals of prisons have yet to be given the critical treatment they deserve. E.D. Pendry and Ruth Ahnert are among the few scholars to call attention to the prison’s role in drama.⁶ Ahnert concludes that dramatic portrayals of the prison are inherently political as the plays “look back to the uncertainties of the past, respond to contemporary concerns about justice, authority and freedom, and look forward to further upheavals.”⁷ Both Pendry and Ahnert, however, consider the relationship between prisons and drama more generally rather than considering the role of the prison in individual plays. In this thesis, I aim to address this scholarly gap by examining several well-studied early modern plays—Marlowe’s *Edward II*, Shakespeare’s *Richard II*, Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*, and Fletcher’s *The Island Princess*—through the cultural and historical lens of imprisonment.

⁴ At least one of the issue’s contributors has since developed her argument in a monograph: see Ruth Ahnert, *The Rise of Prison Literature in the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

⁵ Freeman, 133.

⁶ See Eric D. Pendry, *Elizabethan Prisons and Prison Scenes, vol. 1 & 2* (Salzburg: Institut für Englische Sprache und Literatur, Universität Salzburg, 1974). Pendry’s work forms the foundation of the present study, even though he surveys prison in drama very broadly. See also Ruth Ahnert, “The Prison in Early Modern Drama,” in *Literature Compass* 9, no. 1 (January 1, 2012): 34–47. Ahnert argues that prisons in drama should be considered in light of their historical counterparts, which directly inspires my own arguments concerning individual plays.

⁷ Ahnert, 46.

In particular, I will focus on these plays' portrayals of royal prisoners and their prisons. Royalty during the medieval and early modern periods were not exempt from incarceration, although the circumstances and conditions of their imprisonment remained unique. Surveying late sixteenth-century drama, Pendry notes that many plays follow a pattern in which a prison is "both the setting for and a symbol of the downfall of princes, good or bad" (286). But is the *de casibus* tradition alone to account for the playwrights' penchant for placing princes in prison? The imprisonment of kings and queens created a paradox perfect for stage tragedy. Under normal circumstances, a prison had a very specific purpose: to maintain the existing power structure by detaining or punishing those who broke the law. The monarch was in charge of the law, and therefore of the prisons. A prison should uphold the structure; place the monarch in prison and the structure is shaken, its inadequacies laid bare. Considering the controversial nature of royal imprisonment, particularly during a time of anxiety over the succession and rising absolutism, it is notable that the subject appears so frequently on the public stage, whether in historical or fictional accounts.

Early modern prisons occupy the space between accusation and trial, making the prisoner take on a liminal status between innocent and guilty.⁸ In the case of monarchs, the prison's liminality provokes further questions concerning the nature of their royal identity. For a royal prisoner the liminal state comes from the usurpation of the body politic while the body natural still lives. Liminality invites instability, such as in the case of Shakespeare's Richard II oscillating between the two states:

Sometimes am I king;

⁸ Pendry, 265

Then treasons make me wish myself a beggar,
And so I am. Then crushing penury
Persuades me I was better when a king;
Then am I kinged again, and by and by
Think that I am unkinged by Bolingbroke.

(5.5.32-37)⁹

However, instability also offers a chance for the king to protest his state, making that the prison a site of resistance. The prisoner therefore is far from helpless. As Pendry notes, political incarceration in drama often serves as a preface to regicide;¹⁰ evidently, the king's body poses danger even in prison. Therefore, playwrights can explore royal imprisonment as an extension of political struggle rather than a mere consequence of a monarch's defeat or deposition. The prison thus becomes the perfect place for the playwright to explore issues of divine authority and legitimacy.

In this thesis, I argue that the prison's liminality allows early modern playwrights to explore the nature of royal privilege. Indeed, playwrights portray the prison as a space where the relations and power dynamics between the king and his subjects could be questioned and subsequently condemned, upheld, or transformed. Chapters 1 and 2 discuss two late Elizabethan plays that examine the not-so-distant past and the subject of deposition. Chapter 1 deals with the prison in Christopher Marlowe's *Edward II* as a site of both safety and degradation. Marlowe's prison allows the deposed King Edward to retain his authority only to reveal that power does not reside in select individuals. Marlowe's characters do not defy the divine right of kings, but rather use it to justify their

⁹ *King Richard II*, ed. Charles R. Forker (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2002).

¹⁰ Pendry, 287

own ambitions. Chapter 2 focuses on William Shakespeare's *Richard II*, which borrows from Marlowe yet arrives at a very different conclusion. The play addresses the conflict between the king and his counsel by introducing the prison as a site of education. Shakespeare's prison puts Richard through a trial that reaffirms his divine right, but also suggests merit as a crucial component in kingship. Chapter 3 shows how the early modern fascination with prisons extends beyond historical plays and into dramatizations of contemporary events. It reads two Jacobean plays, Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and John Fletcher's *The Island Princess*, against each other to examine captor-captive relations and issues of royal legitimacy in the context of England's emerging colonialist ambitions. The prison in these plays helps raise the dramatic stakes, but by the end the rightful monarchs are fully restored and vindicated. However, the underlying problems of kingship do not disappear; instead, they take on a distinctly global angle.

Chapter 1

“Where Lords Keep Courts and Kings are Locked in Prison”:

Public Opinion and Divine Right in Marlowe’s *Edward II*

Until recently, critics often read Marlowe’s *Edward II* in terms of either queer romance or failure of kingship.¹¹ In these readings, the king’s body - or bodies - were the primary subject of scholarly debate. In focusing on the body, however, scholars have not fully acknowledged the potential that spaces can contribute to our understanding of the play. A spatial approach can look beyond the iconic episodes: as Emma Katherine Atwood puts it, “contemporary critics have been blinded by the red-hot spit.”¹² While Atwood looks at spaces within the play broadly conceived, Peter Sillitoe’s reading concerns a single particular space that he claims defines the play’s conflict: the court.¹³ For Sillitoe, the court serves as the stage where the debates over monarchical authority play out. Indeed, Marlowe’s court operates under constant threat of

¹¹ On the play’s earlier judgmental readings and a subsequent shift towards queer and feminist theories, see Robert A. Logan, “Edward II,” in *Christopher Marlowe at 450*, ed. Sarah Munson Deats and Robert A. Logan (Routledge, 2016), 137-156.

¹² Emma Katherine Atwood, “‘All Places Are Alike’: Marlowe’s *Edward II* and English Spatial Imagination,” *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 43, no. 1 (2013): 50.

¹³ Peter Sillitoe, “‘Where Is the Court but Here?’ Undetermined Elite Space and Marlowe’s *Edward II*,” *Literature Compass* 1, no. 1 (2004): 1-15.

treason, leading to summary justice - or injustice - exercised upon any perceived overstepping of boundaries. What complicates the court's situation further is the need to take popular opinion into consideration. Fear of rebellion and insurrection renders executing one's political opponents unviable, often leaving imprisonment as a less radical option for punishment. I would therefore attribute key status to another space that is present or evoked throughout the play: the prison.

Imprisonment in *Edward II* is far from uncontroversial. As explained in the thesis's introduction, the imprisonment of royalty appeals to the core of contemporary debates over authority. Imprisoning a priest or a prince challenges the idea of their superior divine rights to exercise power, replacing ideology-rooted divine sanction with a ruling philosophy grounded in realism. As Thomas Cartelli argues, the play "presents a decidedly direct and demystified portrayal of power politics at work, showing political positions to be little more than transparent extensions of the personal desires and ambitions that motivate them."¹⁴ Yet at the same time as the emphasis on political realism makes Edward II's imprisonment possible, it allows his allies to rally around his name in absentia. The king's unjust imprisonment, once publicly known, reinvents him as a martyr-like figure and allows his allies to ignore any previous moral missteps.

In this chapter, I will argue that even as the prison undermines Edward's divine ruler status, it allows him to retain and command personal authority from within its bounds. The prison throughout the play thus does not just serve as a site of captivity but also as a site of political activity. Despite early modern prisons evolving to include fixed sites and structures, Marlowe shows the prison to be a liminal space between liberty and captivity, safety and danger. As a downside, the prison ultimately fails to carry out its principal purpose of safeguarding its prisoner by allowing an assassin to penetrate its porous boundaries.

¹⁴ Thomas Cartelli, "Edward II," in *The Cambridge Companion to Christopher Marlowe*, ed. Patrick Cheney (Cambridge: CUP, 2004), 158.

Defining the space of the early modern prison is problematic because there was no unified standard for prisons until centuries later. Between the differences in location, size, and reputation of the prison, and the socio-economic status of the prisoner as well as the gravity of his crime, the conditions and experiences varied greatly.¹⁵ The prison setting's treatment in drama is even more fluid due to the limited nature of staging. The problem with defining the prison space is therefore similar to the one Peter Sillitoe tackles in describing the court as a performative space. Sillitoe looks at the court in its multiplicity of meanings including "a group of people, an institution of royal, political and legal authority, a physical place and a stage-space,"¹⁶ all of which figure in *Edward II*. Therefore, I will not limit my own discussion to the scenes that take place in prison or that mention particular prison locations. I will also examine the state of being "taken prisoner" or being "imprisoned." In this way, the war scenes throughout the play become prison scenes without taking place in cages or dungeons. Within the play, *prison as a place* is a designated location that is often permeable and adaptable, with its main goal to detain and sometimes punish, sometimes safeguard its inhabitants. The prison acts as a liminal space that separates the prisoner from the wider world before trial and sentencing can occur. Crucially, according to Pendry, "prison was not a place of punishment but a place of detention before trial" and thus did not by itself signal whether its inhabitants were guilty or

¹⁵ On the general history of medieval and early modern prisons, see Ralph Bernard Pugh, *Imprisonment in Medieval England* (Cambridge University Press, 1968); Eric D. Pendry, *Elizabethan Prisons and Prison Scenes*, Vol. 1&2 (Salzburg: Institut für Englische Sprache und Literatur, 1974); Sean McConville, *A History of English Prison Administration* (Routledge, 2015). On the prison in early modern drama, see also Ruth Ahnert, "The Prison in Early Modern Drama," *Literature Compass* 9, no. 1 (January 1, 2012): 34–47. Additionally, on the history of the Fleet see Alexander Harris, *The Economy of the Fleete: Or An Apologeticall Answeare of Alexander Harris (late Warden There) Unto XIX Articles Sett Forth Against Him by the Prisoners* (Camden Society, 1879), and Margery Bassett, "The Fleet Prison in the Middle Ages," *The University of Toronto Law Journal* 5, no. 2 (1944): 383–402; on the history and symbolic meaning of the Tower, see John Whitcomb Bayley, *The History and Antiquities of the Tower of London: With Memoirs of Royal and Distinguished Persons, Deduced from Records, State-papers, and Manuscripts, and from Other Original and Authentic Sources* (United Kingdom: T. Cadell, 1825); and Kristen Deiter, *The Tower of London in English Renaissance Drama: Icon of Opposition* (Routledge, 2011).

¹⁶ Sillitoe, 3.

innocent.¹⁷ *Imprisonment as a state* is imposed by an authority in order to limit or control one's freedom of action and movement. Therefore, imprisoning a person - whether by placing them in a designated prison or not - attests to the prisoner's dangerousness, whether as a mere social "undesirable" or an active political opponent. On top of that, released early modern prisoners lost little to no reputation for their time in detention, particularly if the imprisonment was due to political or religious causes.¹⁸ Due to this lack of stigma as well as the prisoner's treatment being in large part dependent on their ability to pay for better living conditions, the prison was more likely to uphold its inhabitant's social status rather than bring them down.

The confusion of historically grounded detail and abstract or poetic concepts of imprisonment in *Edward II* represents precisely what Pendry describes as early drama's amalgamation of allegorical and realistic.¹⁹ Therefore, analyzing the play through early modern fascination with prisons enriches our reading of Marlowe by offering both a historical and a symbolic framework. The play is ripe with mentions of real prisons, their names, locations, and conditions, but the prison metaphor additionally encapsulates its central political and ideological conflict. When Kent exclaims: "Oh, miserable is that commonweal/ Where lords keep courts and kings are locked in prison!" (5.3.63-4),²⁰ both the realistic and the allegorical meanings of his lament are worth scrutinizing.

In *Edward II*, Marlowe first addresses the question of whether a king can be lawfully detained in the first place. The ability to depose an anointed ruler was hotly debated during both the medieval and early modern periods. Edward's deposition set a precedent in English history,

¹⁷ Pendry, *Elizabethan Prisons and Prison Scenes*, 265.

¹⁸ Pendry, 264.

¹⁹ Pendry, 285.

²⁰ All citations from the play refer to "Edward II" in *Dr. Faustus and Other Plays*, eds. David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen (Oxford: OUP, 2008).

as no prior king was removed from his office while still living. Rulers, however, were occasionally held captive to gain leverage during conflict. During the War of the Roses, royal hostageship became “a means of control as well as the methods by which captors attempted to circumvent notions of kingship and achieve permanence for their usurped authority.”²¹ For Marlowe, the king’s deposition is doubtlessly crucial, yet it takes place within the broader framework of his loss of freedom and autonomy in the hands of political opponents.

Tracing the king’s imprisonment reframes the play to ask what his loss of liberty entails. Patrick Cheney suggests that *Edward II* participates in a “broader discourse of republican freedom,”²² with Marlowe teasing at possibilities of a more parliamentary form of government that would reign in the monarchy. Then, if the play is to be read as an early critique of absolutist monarchy and the divine right to rule, what alternative source of authority does Marlowe propose? Cheney points us in the direction of a republican parliament headed by the existing aristocratic faction. I would rather suggest that the divine right as a force in the play is unseated by public opinion more broadly conceived. Both the king and the rebelling aristocrats vie for popular support that proves crucial at the end, particularly as the monarchy is restored under Edward III.

In order to examine the relationship between imprisonment and popular support, we need to look beyond Edward II himself. Through tracing all scenes that take place inside of or evoke the prison, we can see how it is first established as a liminal yet clearly politicized space in the king’s encounter with Bishop of Coventry. Their conflict out the liminality existing within the king and the bishop as they are imbued with divine as well as secular identities. With the

²¹ Alex Brondarbit, “Commanding the Crown: Royal Hostages in the Wars of the Roses, 1455–83,” in *Medieval Hostageship c. 700-c. 1500* (Routledge, 2016): 174.

²² Patrick Cheney, *Marlowe's Republican Authorship: Lucan, Liberty, and the Sublime* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2009): 160.

introduction of Mortimer as a political opponent, the prison becomes a token in the struggle for the popular vote as well as a space for reprieve that can be either granted or withdrawn. The play comes to its climax with Edward's imprisonment and subsequent assassination, which serve to attest to the king's lingering importance in spite of his disempowerment.

Challenging the divinity of priests and princes

Marlowe portrays prisons as political sites from the beginning: an early scene in Act 1 features the king ordering the imprisonment of the Bishop of Coventry in retaliation for Gaveston's banishment. Here, Marlowe dramatizes the account of the bishop's downfall found in Holinshed's 1577 *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, which the playwright follows closely. Notably, Holinshed makes no mention of the king torturing or humiliating the priest even while he presents the attack as personal:

When the Lord Treasorer Walter de Langton Bishop of Couentrie & Lichfielde (tho|rough
whofe complaint, Peers de Gaua|ton had bin banished the lãd) was going towards
West|minster, to make preparation for the same buri|all, he was vpon commandement from
the newe King arrested, committed to prifon, and after, deliuered to the handes of the
fayde Peers,[...]e Bishop Couentrie [...]mitted [...]on. bee|ing then returned agayne into
the Realme, who sente hym from Castell to Castell as a prifoner. Hys landes and
tenementes were feyfed to the Kyngs vfe, but his mouables were giuen to the forefayde
Peers.²³

Marlowe's additions of Coventry's torture and humiliation make explicit Holinshed's implication that the king was motivated by personal hatred towards Coventry as well as by

²³ Raphael Holinshed, *The Firste Volume of the Chronicles of England, Scotlande, and Irelande* (London, 1577), 847. *Early English Books Online*.

loyalty to Gaveston. In the play, Gaveston wishes to exact revenge on Coventry who was “the only cause” of his exile immediately upon his return to King Edward’s court (1.1.178).

In reality, there is historical evidence suggesting that the bishop’s prototype Walter Langton, bishop of Coventry, Lichfield, and Chester, has made many enemies during his term as Edward I’s Lord Treasurer and chief minister, and the new king’s attack on him had the backing of multiple long-standing grievances. Alice Beardwood reports that in bringing Langton to trial, the official justification “states that the king felt compelled to do justice to the innumerable complaints against the treasurer and to vindicate his father's reputation,” and that

the list of complainants and debtors in this enquiry lends support to this statement for it shows that Langton was not the oppressor of the lowly but the antagonist and moneylender to men of rank and official position.²⁴

Therefore, unlike the play suggests, the king’s personal dislike would not have been sufficient to bring down a man of Langton’s significance. Instead, the king would need to rely on the due process of the law paired together with a favorable public opinion.

In bypassing due process in the bishop’s sentencing, both Marlowe and Holinshed imply that the king had much more absolutist power than fourteenth century chronicles suggest, with Marlowe going even further in allowing for a priest to be humiliated. Moreover, as both Marlowe and Holinshed write from a post-Reformation standpoint, they consequently downplay the challenges of accusing a bishop of crime against the state. In the medieval period that the play is set in, a direct attack on a Catholic clergyman would have been much more controversial. Historically, Langton was prosecuted as the late king’s treasurer, his role as a bishop being of secondary concern. The most serious accusations laid against Langton were champerty and

²⁴ Alice Beardwood, “The Trial of Walter Langton, Bishop of Lichfield, 1307-1312,” *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 54, no. 3 (1964): 5.

maintenance which he eventually admitted to, both of secular nature.²⁵ Moreover, although the trial went on for years and Langton was eventually released and reinstated as Edward II's treasurer, he had more trouble than support from the Pope.²⁶ In other words, historically the king had to separate the secular and religious offices to successfully imprison and put to trial a Roman Catholic bishop. In Marlowe's interpretation, however, the separation of the secular from the divine proves more problematic.

Marlowe's portrayal of the duality of human and divine embodied in the priest harkens back to medieval ideas of the king as a "mixed person". Kantorowicz evokes the Norman Anonymous' concept of a *persona mixta* able to embody several states simultaneously, whether secular or holy.²⁷ Unlike the theory of the king's two bodies, the concept of a mixed person included but was not limited to princes:

What matters here is only the *persona mixta* in the religio-political sphere where it was represented chiefly by bishop and king, and where the "mixture" referred to the blending of spiritual and secular powers and capacities united in one person. Dual capacity in this sense was a feature customary and rather common with the clergy during the feudal age when bishops were not only princes of the Church but also feudatories of kings.²⁸

This concept arose from legal rather than dramatic needs, yet it informs the play's central conflict. Just as the concept of a mixed person enables a king-priest or a knight-bishop to embody several identities, it raises the question whether these identities can be separated for legal purposes. Medieval precedent suggests that would be a possibility. While Kantorowicz

²⁵ Beardwood, 36.

²⁶ Beardwood, 10, 14.

²⁷ Ernst Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016): 42.

²⁸ Kantorowicz, 43.

argues that “the case of Odo of Bayeux who... was tried by the Conqueror as an earl, and not as a bishop”²⁹ is an extreme one and not representative of the day’s philosophy, the parallel Marlowe draws between the king and the clergyman appears deliberate once we establish that the two character’s “mixed” offices have similar properties.

When confronted with an attack on a “mixed person”, Marlowe’s characters refuse to separate the divine from the secular, since a divine cause opens the possibility for earthly retaliation. While Marlowe’s Coventry, unlike his prototype Langton, is explicitly backed by the church, the church’s retaliation is led primarily by the promise of material gain. The Archbishop of Canterbury appears in the scene following Coventry’s arrest, notifying the Pope of the injustice done to a fellow clergyman. While Canterbury appeals to divine retribution in his actions against the king by stating that “God himself is up in arms/ When violence is offered to the church,” he betrays his own rather material investment by adding that the matter concerns him “near” as Gaveston has usurped the bishopric of Coventry - a valuable part of Church property (1.2.40-5). Whether intentionally or not, Marlowe replicates the main subject of dispute during Langton’s lengthy trial, which concerned the Lord Treasurer’s extensive properties, lands, and movables, and did not bother with his moral character.

Thus, Marlowe seeks a compromise between the ideological and the practical solutions to dealing with a misbehaving bishop. As a clergyman, Coventry remains nominally divine and thus untouchable, yet as the king’s subject, he must be punished for the monarch to maintain dominance. Since the play does not deal with the aftermath of the bishop’s accusation, imprisonment becomes his ultimate punishment. While an indefinite prison sentence could equal eventual death, it was deemed less violent than a direct attack on the body and could therefore

²⁹ Kantorowicz, 43.

act as an intermediary form of punishment. The same scene foreshadows Edward's fate, both in the ways the king and the priest are subjugated as well as in the fact that their high status and connections protect them from certain kinds of violence. The king at first proposes to torture and humiliate the priest, suggesting they should "throw off his golden mitre, rend his stole,/ And in the channel christen him anew" (1.1.186-7). In view of these threats, the bishop's position as a representative of the Church is able to protect him from a direct assault. The Duke of Kent makes the case that the king should "lay not violent hands" on the priest out of fear that "he'll complain unto the see of Rome" (1.1.188-9). This comment, coming from moderate Kent, highlights a duality in the bishop's status. There is a certain "reverence of these robes" (1.1.179) owed to the clergy, and an attack on God's representative would be viewed as a blasphemous act in itself. Yet neither the king who proposes to "christen" the priest in the channel nor Gaveston who suggests the bishop should "complain unto the see of Hell" (1.1.190) are shy of blasphemy, showing their irreverence towards the bishop's holy station. What protects Coventry is a much more prosaic appeal to "the see of Rome", as any attack on the priest would incur the wrath of his more powerful friends and superiors.

The Bishop of Coventry's fate reveals an ambiguity towards divine authority: while his status protects him from certain kinds of violence, it is not by itself sufficient. Instead of causing bodily harm to the priest, Edward confers Coventry's life and property to Gaveston, who then decides that the bishop "shall to prison, and there die in bolts" (1.1.196). Gaveston clearly intends the prison to be punitive by itself, yet still wants to see the priest dead, even if he is eventually deterred from sullyng his hands with reverend blood. In this case, the prison is clearly a compromise between letting the enemy live or die, becoming a space to contain the offending body indefinitely while neither inflicting overt violence nor allowing a possibility of

redemption. In this suspended state, Coventry leaves the pages of the play never to be seen again. However, his name will be taken up by the Archbishop to build a cause against King Edward.

The bishop, even overpowered and stripped of property and dignity, is still treated like a political prisoner who exerts a potential threat. The king offers Gaveston to choose where Coventry should be incarcerated, offering to send him “to the Tower, the Fleet, or where thou wilt” (1.1.199). The ambiguity of this sentence suggests a gap in the prison system, as there was no clear protocol for a priest. Both suggested prisons in Marlowe’s time would evoke the potency of royal authority. Seventeenth-century warden Alexander Harris describes the Fleet “as “the King's owne proper prison next in trust to his Tower of London, and as that is his fort in the east, soe was this one in the west of the citty and chamber of his kingdome.”³⁰ This account implies that the two prisons were close, if not equal, in symbolic meaning, and the Fleet was next to the Tower itself in its ability to inspire awe. Edward does decide on sending his enemy to the Tower, signaling that the Tower represents a harsher sentence. Historically, Holinshed is right to state that the bishop was moved “from Caftell to Caftell as a prifoner,”³¹ as Walter Langton before trial was at first “imprisoned at Wallingford, a castle of Gaveston's at one time and that he was moved from place to place,” and later moved to Windsor Castle.³² Yet even “subjected to indignities, deprived of his own servants and kept in the custody of strangers,” throughout the investigation Langton was not constantly imprisoned, but came and went under an oath to the king, enjoying certain freedoms and privileges.³³ For Marlowe, sending the bishop to the Fleet instead of the Tower would equal allowing these very freedoms, as by the end of the sixteenth

³⁰ Harris, *The Oeconomy of the Fleete*, 23.

³¹ Holinshed, 847.

³² Beardwood, 11.

³³ Beardwood, 11, 13-14.

century the Fleet had a reputation for being a prison for the high-born and well-off members of society. As such it was “considered to offer a social status, comfort and privilege unique among prisons.”³⁴ Moreover, the Fleet’s prisoners were frequently allowed to go outside the walls to conduct their business, as long as they were accompanied by a ward and could pay the proper fees.³⁵ Such freedoms would not be tolerated within the Tower, further explaining the king’s choice. However, as the following incident with Mortimer in the Tower shows, stricter rules do not necessarily result in a more efficient prison.

Commanding popular opinion

The play shows how even as a form of non-violent sentence, imprisonment of a politically active figure could divide the popular opinion. The moment when Mortimer Junior first begins threatening the king with removal of his favorite is also an opportune moment to nip Mortimer’s rebellion in the bud. The exchange between Edward and Gaveston discussing Mortimer’s threat foreshadows the way Mortimer himself will use the king in the future. Gaveston proposes to commit rebellious Mortimer to the Tower (whether or not that implies further execution), which seems an appropriate response to a threat amounting to an act of treason. Edward, who has been less than concerned with public opinion regarding his own self, protests against imprisoning Mortimer. He declares: “I dare not, for the people love him well” (2.2.234). Kristen Deiter has argued that this portrayal of the Tower as an entity not fully under royal control reflects contemporary dissatisfactions with the ruling Tudor monarchy and plays to the popular desires to see the common man in power.³⁶ However, the design of the play is not to portray Mortimer as the populist hero; rather, this exchange reveals that physical confinement

³⁴ Pendry, 208.

³⁵ Pendry, 210; Bassett 400.

³⁶ Deiter, 88-90.

did not necessarily stop a political opponent from exerting influence and rallying supporters. Recognizing this, Gaveston proposes to take the next step to silence Mortimer, which is to “have him privily made away” (2.2.235). The “privacy” that the prison bestows takes on an ominous meaning, suggesting there would be no witnesses to foul play. The king rejects, or rather dismisses this idea, telling Gaveston to “let them [rebellious Mortimer and Lancaster] go” (2.2.238), and turns his attention towards newcomers to his court.

Whether the king’s dismissal stems from fear of popular rebellion, moral aversion to covert murder, or lack of political foresight, this scene sets several precedents for the way politics operate in the realm of Marlowe’s play. First, popular opinion sways easily towards the oppressed, just as Edward fears, given sufficient time. Imprisonment could thus easily have the opposite of the desired effect, empowering rather than weakening the opponent. Second, as legitimately sanctioned public execution of well-known opposition leaders would serve to gather too much negative attention, authorities have to resort to extra-legal forms of judgement in the forms of court-martials and assassinations, which appear later on.

Prisons have the power to bring out the fluctuating, unfixed nature of popular opinion, but they are themselves shown to be malleable structures with permeable boundaries. Once Mortimer is taken prisoner in Act 3 and finally condemned to the Tower, he all but declares that the physical confines mean nothing to him, exclaiming:

What, Mortimer, can ragged stony walls

Immure thy virtue that aspires to heaven?

No, Edward, England's scourge, it may not be;

Mortimer's hope surmounts his fortune far. (3.4.36-9)

The “ragged stony walls” indeed prove of little worth once Mortimer reappears in the next scene scarcely fifty lines after being led away. In a feat of phenomenal escape artistry, Mortimer uses a potion to put his guards to sleep and simply walks out of the Tower to join Kent under the cover of night. Mortimer claims that there was no other mechanism in place to prevent his escape except for several guards: “The warders all asleep,/ I thank them, gave me leave to pass in peace” (4.1.15-6). In other words, his prison confinement was defined neither by chains nor by fortress walls, but by the will of the king who ordered him imprisoned and the cooperation of common people hired to guard him. In this instance, Mortimer triumphs thanks to the king’s inability to have absolute command over his subjects, who are themselves easily influenced. Once again, Mortimer shows an ability to avoid imprisonment by manipulating people, demonstrating the arbitrary nature of prison’s power to contain an individual with its physical properties alone.

The Tower’s vulnerability exploited by Mortimer is not exaggerated. Medieval prisoners were notoriously prone to escaping, whether they broke out forcefully, walked out thanks to their keeper’s negligence, or purchased their release from the detaining officer.³⁷ Marlowe closely recites Holinshed’s account of the sleeping drink, but other records paint an even more impressive escape feat that Mortimer executes:

He [Roger Mortimer] and one of his servants made a *potum ingeniosum*, otherwise described as *perstiferum*, with which they drugged the guards to sleep. While the *potum* was having its effect, Mortimer and his companions smashed a wall which connected their prison with the king’s privy kitchen. Thence they managed to enter a ward of the

³⁷ Pugh, 218.

castle (*custodiam castris*) and from it gained access to another ward by means of a rope ladder. Thus they reached the Thames where a boat awaited them.³⁸

With all these glaring weaknesses of the Tower made explicit, escaping from prison still did not guarantee freedom. Even though prisons often failed to prevent escapes, the successful escapees would still suffer consequences. Since prisons were mainly meant to detain those accused of crime until trial, by escaping the suspect effectively admitted to the crime. Thus Mortimer, accused of treason along with his fellow rebel lords, would through his actions admit his guilt and be deemed traitor after his escape.³⁹ Ironically, by the end of the play Mortimer comes to suffer a traitor's fate he has condemned himself to prior to his fall.

Mortimer's case illustrates the implicit danger of breaking out of prison, which in itself acts as a place of reprieve from immediate death and offers temporary safety to its inhabitants. Even when the king orders Mortimer sent to the Tower he wants the rebel "safe bestowed" (3.4.33). The "safe" here may indicate the safety of the captors as well as that of the prisoner, since the rest of Mortimer's accomplices are summarily executed. Gaveston's capture on the battlefield also shows that imprisonment can in fact be a relative guarantee of safety. Before Arundel as the king's messenger requests that Gaveston be delivered to the king, Mortimer and his faction have summarily sentenced Gaveston to death. By allowing Pembroke to escort the "prisoner" (2.5.86) - although there is no formal prison nor need for one after sentencing - to see the king and back, Mortimer has extended Gaveston's lifespan by placing him on death row. Gaveston is not physically in a prison, yet he is imprisoned for the duration of this trip. Pembroke and Arundel entrust their prisoner to several soldiers and a horse-boy, and the

³⁸ Pugh, 221-222.

³⁹ Pugh, 228-229.

arrangement proves ineffective. “Weaponless must I fall, and die in bands?” asks Gaveston once he is ambushed by Warwick, who never intended to allow this diversion (3.1.3). Whether he is chained up or the bands are metaphorical, Gaveston is restrained and unable to escape. His prisoner status was meant to offer him temporary protection and safe passage to London and back again to be executed, yet a forceful break-out by Warwick ends his life prematurely.

Then, if a prison sentence offers safety, the act of denying prison and executing summary justice takes on more significance as a marker of authority. When the newly crowned Edward III accuses Mortimer of his father’s murder and thus of high treason, he orders Mortimer to be drawn, hanged, and quartered on the spot:

Bring him unto a hurdle! Drag him forth,
Hang him, I say, and set his quarters up,
But bring his head back presently to me. (5.6.52-54)

Mortimer’s sentence fulfills the curse that the deposed Edward laid on him upon reading a letter directing another change of jailers: “So may his limbs be torn, as is this paper!” (5.1.142). There is urgency in the new king’s bequest indicating his willingness for a summary execution, with no detention period or trial in between. Within the same scene Mortimer is beheaded (offstage), and young Edward offers “this wicked traitor’s head” (5.6.100) to his murdered father. Although real Mortimer was not confronted head on, but instead captured in an ambush, tried, and later executed,⁴⁰ his fate suffers a sort of poetic justice worthy of fiction. Real Mortimer was convinced “by notoriety” due to his ill-fame with the common public.⁴¹ Mortimer previously relied on public opinion as a political device to legitimize his regime and the deposition of

⁴⁰ Natalie Fryde, *The Tyranny and Fall of Edward II 1321-1326* (Cambridge: CUP, 2004): 225.

⁴¹ John G. Bellamy, *The Law of Treason in England in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge: CUP, 2004): 29, 54.

Edward II. The new king's "declaration in parliament that the crimes of the accused were notorious and manifest to all" sufficed to condemn Mortimer as "a traitor and enemy of the king."⁴² Remembering Mortimer's prior escape, this would make his final and fatal accusation of treason. In Marlowe's version of events, however, any conviction relying on the public's judgement would be too unpredictable, as popular support is shown to be a volatile force throughout the play. In order to establish his own regime, Edward III has to take the mistakes of his predecessors into account and command authority to the people rather than draw support from them. Thus, the new king has to refuse Mortimer a chance of recuperating while in prison. After all, the prison served as a backdrop for crucial events involving the previous king, and thus placing a political opponent on this stage would only empower him.

Prison as a political stage

Although the imprisonment of the Bishop of Coventry and Lord Mortimer are full of legal nuance, King Edward's own spell in prison is the most complicated case due to the prevalence of myths and legends surrounding it. Fryde in particular argues that no contemporary chronicles record Edward's ill-treatment or a violent manner of death, excepting that he was indeed moved between several castles.⁴³ However, by the time Holinshed's account was published, the story of the king's captivity has accumulated unsavory detail evoking sympathy for the prisoner:

...they lodge the miserable prifoner in a chāber ouer a foule filthie dūgeon, ful of deade carion, truſting ſo to make an ende of him, wyth the abhominable ſtinche thereof: but he bearing it out ſtrongly, as a man of a tough nature, cōtinued ſtill in life, ſo as it ſeemed he

⁴² Bellamy, 54, 66.

⁴³ Fryde, 201-202.

was verie like to scape that daunger, as he had by pur|ging eyther vp or downe, auoyded the force of such poyson as had beene ministred to him sun|drie tymes before, of purpose fo to ridde him.⁴⁴

Whether the prison where the king was held could be as abominable as described above remains unknown. Both Killingworth/Kenilworth and Berkeley were private castles with emergency prison accommodation available should the need arise.⁴⁵ There is reason to believe that Edward has been fed and treated well at Berkley at least until his unsuccessful escape attempt.⁴⁶

The stench-filled swamp of a dungeon that Marlowe elaborates on is much more characteristic of the conditions in certain sixteenth-century prisons than those Edward could have inhabited. For example, the Fleet's Bolton's ward described by former prisoners as "a loathsome dungeon, thorough which all sewers doe run" and "a place for froggs or Toades not Christian men."⁴⁷ These contemporary descriptions, although the conditions they portray are highly irregular, likely influenced the appearance of sewers in the play. Edward complains that "the dungeon where they keep me is the sink/ Wherein the filth of all the castle falls" (5.5.56-7), and that he is forced to continually stand in that "mire and puddle" (5.5.58). As this type of dungeon was a deviation from the norm at best and meant to contain the lowest types of prisoners who could not pay for better quarters at worst, this location choice reflects not only the villainy of Edward's captors but also how far from his royal station he has fallen. Although Edward is not fully submerged - Matrevis recounts leaving his prisoner only "up to his knees in water" (5.5.2) - within ten days his limbs grow numb. This torture combined with an earlier scene of forcing the

⁴⁴ Holinshed, 883.

⁴⁵ Pugh, 129.

⁴⁶ Fryde, 200.

⁴⁷ Harris, 135.

king to shave with ditch water echo Edward's threats to "christen" Coventry in the channel. Yet by focusing on Edward's misery together with a desperate will to live, the scene is more likely to evoke sympathy for the captive rather than a twisted sense of triumph.

The detailed descriptions of Edward's condition draw attention to the intentional physicality of his imprisonment. Marlowe was among the first Elizabethan playwrights to bring out the material aspects of the prison on the stage in *Tamburlaine Part I*, in which the final scenes called for a movable cage large enough to fit a person. Earlier, the prison was just another setting that the flexible set-less stage could easily accommodate. There is evidence that early modern plays could rely on trap doors to portray prison dungeons,⁴⁸ and some modern editors of *Edward II* choose to add a stage direction indicating the king emerging from said dungeon. However, even though a contemporary production of the play did not call for elaborate props or explicit sets, the physicality of the foul dungeon that both Edward and his jailers describe verbally would suffice to evoke similar sensations in the audience.

On top of the miserable condition of Edward's quarters, his imprisonment is accompanied by more covert types of torture aimed at breaking his will and speeding his death. Although he is given "bread and water," he is "starved for want of sustenance", instead surviving on a diet of "heart-breaking sobs" (5.3.63, 20, 21). On top of that, his jailers deploy continual drumming noises to rid Edward of sleep. Starvation and sleep deprivation (with the drumming bordering on psychological torture) appear to be decidedly more modern methods than the medieval rack, although in this case Matrevis and Gurney torture their charge not for the purposes of interrogation, but in trying to devise a death that will not leave any signs of violent struggle. Dessen argues that employing sadistic torture in this scene harken back to Edward

⁴⁸ Alan C. Dessen, *Elizabethan Stage Conventions and Modern Interpreters* (Cambridge: CUP, 1984): 98.

torturing Coventry, and that “such a link could heighten for the viewer Edward's own contribution to his present degradation, a responsibility he himself is not prepared to admit.”⁴⁹ Yet torture in Marlowe’s time was frowned upon by legal writers even for the purposes of extorting information;⁵⁰ in other words, every detail of Edward’s treatment in prison is highly irregular and therefore striking.

Although Edward acknowledges that his mind is “distempered” under these irregular circumstances, the brutal injustice of his treatment reminds Edward of his kingly position and allows him to reassert authority. He does so by imagining his prison cell to be his court. Sillitoe argues that as the court itself is a moveable concept, “when Edward is imprisoned he is not only the anointed monarch, but is actually the embodiment of the English court, the symbolic space accompanying him”.⁵¹ Far from Edward’s own imagination, the idea of the court following the anointed king everywhere he goes is explicitly shared by other characters. When Edward’s jailors interrupt Kent’s attempt to rescue his brother, they order Kent to be sent back to Mortimer’s court, to which Kent replies: “Where is the court but here? Here is the king,/ And I will visit him” (5.3.59-60). Therefore, as the court resides with the king, in his final semi-lucid moments Edward resorts to his old habits of gift-giving in order to win over his courtiers. Despite sensing Lightborn’s malintent and being in no position to exert generosity, Edward knows no better than present the assassin with his last remaining jewel (5.5.84). It is unclear whether the jewel is a leftover of Edward’s former grandeur or the mysterious “this” that queen Isabel sends her imprisoned husband (5.2.72). Edward’s intent in giving it away, however, is crystal clear: “If thou harbour’st murder in thy heart,/ Let this gift change thy mind and save thy

⁴⁹ Dessen, 125.

⁵⁰ Timothy A. Turner, “Torture and Summary Justice in ‘The Spanish Tragedy,’” *SEL* 53, no. 2 (2013): 279-281.

⁵¹ Sillitoe, 3.

soul,” he tells Lightborn (5.5.87-88). He adds: “Know that I am a king,” and asks confusedly for his missing crown (5.5.89-90). These showy gestures, whether magnanimous or desperate, do not help save Edward. What they show is that he remains unchanged in his ways even going through the worst extremes.

Edward’s strategy of clinging onto his kingly identity to the end is not purely sentimental. As we have established earlier, prison does nothing to change its prisoner’s status regardless of the conditions he is kept in. Thus, even hidden from the outside world after putting on a show of deposition, Edward remains king in prison. When the ambassadors come for Edward’s crown, he declares that “two kings in England cannot reign at once” (5.1.58). Moreover, he explicitly states that he will “not resign, but whilst I live be king” (5.1.86). His word choice matters here as the historical Edward’s deposition failed to derive legitimacy from the Parliament, but was instead achieved by Mortimer and Isabella’s faction manipulating the public opinion in their favor.⁵² We can then say that public opinion rather than a formal status determined whether Edward was still king, and within the play, there is little doubt that he very much was. Besides Edward’s own conviction, both his allies and his enemies placed value on his status. “As long as he survives,/ What safety rests for us, or for my son?” (5.2.387) asks Queen Isabella, suggesting to Mortimer that Edward, even deposed, remains a threat to their regime. Her concerns are based on rumors that Kent is planning to help his brother escape, and that several other lords like Berkeley and Leicester are sympathetic to Edward’s cause. Although Edward is imprisoned and cannot act out of his own will, his name would be sufficient for a baronial uprising similar to the one that brought Mortimer to power. However, although at first Mortimer agrees to plot the murder for Isabella’s sake, he later comes to believe that regicide is in his own interests. Mortimer

⁵² Fryde, 195-200.

suppresses Kent's attempts to rescue the king and is proud of being feared more than loved in a show of Machiavellian malice (5.4.52). Yet he becomes aware that "the king must die, or Mortimer goes down", because "the commons now begin to pity him" (5.4.1-2). Mortimer fears that popular support that helped depose the king may just as well reinstate him. Edward is suspended in prison yet remains king as long as he lives, whether *de jure*, *de facto*, both, or neither.

Then, Edward's final moments reaffirm his kingship in a way that has nothing to do with legal deposition or doctrines of divine right. In fact, Marlowe subverts the idea that divine law can decide the fate of princes long before Edward is captured and imprisoned. When he is being forcibly taken, Spenser attempts to console the king by saying that "so will the angry heavens" (4.7.73). Edward refutes this idea. "Nay, so will hell and cruel Mortimer," says he. "The gentle heavens have not to do with this" (4.7.74-5). In the world that the playwright has crafted, power is concentrated in human agents' hands. The will of the heavens and the title of the king are simply ruses that individuals and groups evoke in order to accrue power and justify their means.

Until the end of the play, Marlowe remains ambivalent in his criticism: he does not defend the king's divine right to rule, but neither does he side with his oppressors. Marlowe shows popular support to be a tremendous political force but critiques its volatility with a more authoritarian monarch re-established at the end. Instead of critiquing the existing ideology, he forces his characters and his audience to admit that ideology is powerless in the face of wealthy, ambitious individuals manipulating popular support. In the midst of this ambiguity, focusing on the prison aspects offers a compelling possible interpretation. The play narrates that the absolute divine right is flawed, but so are populism and oligarchy. The audience is led to the prison, a traditional and symbolic site of unfreedom. And yet, it is within its bounds that the political

theatre unfolds, and ideologies are confronted. Perhaps what we are meant to see is that there can be no action and no change without first confronting the most rigid and unsightly aspects of a ruling regime to then correct them. Perhaps there is a seed of an argument for a more self-critical, even republican, as Cheney would call it, government. The play would then rise beyond its former labels as a *de casibus* narrative, a critique of an incapable ruler, or a tragic queer romance, and evolve into an exposé on a new era of political thought.

Chapter 2

The Prison as a “School of Virtue” in Shakespeare’s *Richard II*

“I have been studying how I may compare/ This prison where I live unto the world” (5.5.1-2).⁵³

These words open King Richard II’s only soliloquy in the play. In these lines, the words “study” and “prison” come together unexpectedly. Caught between the pathos of the deposition scene and the still upcoming violence of murder, Richard’s prison contemplation offers an odd moment of peace and quiet. What is more, I believe that this episode crucially marks the transformation from Richard the king to Richard the individual made possible by his very predicament. The prison is the first place in which Richard finds himself completely alone, away from the eyes of the court, from friends as well as foes. Thus, Richard’s journey from the royal “we” to an independent “I” is nothing short of an educational process, one that comes to completion once Richard has the time and space necessary for reflection. The loss of the “we” is then not wholly a personal loss. This chapter will serve a dual purpose. One, it is to explore the relationship between imprisonment and education that was often acknowledged in Shakespeare’s time. Two, to trace the process of Richard’s own education (or, to borrow from John of Gaunt,

⁵³ All citations from the play refer to *King Richard II*, ed. Charles R. Forker (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2002).

“undeafening”) as to what it means to be a solitary individual whose mind and body are not one and the same with an entire country.

Was transforming and re-educating prisoners either a goal or a realistic outcome of the early modern penal system, as reflected in contemporary popular imagination? Historians have long pointed to Bridewell Hospital as one of the earliest European experimental correctional facilities, indicating a top-down government support for prisons as transformative spaces.⁵⁴ Bridewell was mainly meant to solve London’s vagrancy problem by keeping the undesirables such as beggars and prostitutes off the streets. Imbued with a large dose of Protestant rhetoric promoting “good works,” the facility “operated on the philosophy that reformation of the offender could best be obtained by the discipline gained through learning a trade and developing useful work habits.”⁵⁵ Bridewell “patients” had the choice of either working for their keep or getting tortured into submission. However, on a mass scale, Bridewell’s efforts in reforming prisoners through piety and forced labor was less than effective, with prisoners escaping, revolting, or simply refusing to work on a regular basis. While the 1601 Act for the Relief of the Poor distinguishes between the terms “House of Correction” and “common Gaol,” either establishment was meant to keep the unemployed isolated from the rest of society.⁵⁶ And although Bridewell was mainly referred to as a “Hospital” or a “House of Correction,” the correction came less from the vocational training offered to the “patients” and more from regular whippings. The idea that prison and (re)education could coexist was thus in place in sixteenth-

⁵⁴ On the history and ideology of Bridewell, see Torsten Eriksson, *The Reformers: An Historical Survey of Pioneer Experiments in the Treatment of Criminals* (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1976), 8-10; Paul Griffiths, "Building Bridewell: London's Self-Images, 1550-1640," in *Local Identities in Late Medieval and Early Modern England* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007): 228-248; Sean McConville, *A History of English Prison Administration* (Routledge, 2015): 22-48.

⁵⁵ Leonard A. Roberts, "Bridewell: The World's First Attempt at Prisoner Rehabilitation Through Education," in *Journal of Correctional Education* 35, no. 3 (1984): 83.

⁵⁶ 43 Eliz. I c.2

century England, but Bridewell's example would only apply to those on the very bottom of the socio-economic ladder. The poor were jailed for being poor and had to receive an education so they could pay their way out and back into society. In the meantime, those who could afford a comfortable lifestyle even in prison had no such barrier to re-entry. One could say an early modern prison that set out to re-educate the masses was doomed to failure.

On an individual level, however, imprisonment could look drastically different. Education and transformation often accompanied a prison spell for certain privileged individuals. Members of the upper classes, particularly those incarcerated for their political views and allegiances, could easily use their time in prison to seek justification for their state or even enlightenment. These experiences shared by a relatively small number of inmates have found proliferation in popular culture. According to Ruth Ahnert, early modern playwrights assert the existence of "the power of the individual prisoner to harness the prison for their own purposes, and to redefine its significance by the activities they practice therein".⁵⁷ Here, Ahnert refers to two separate practices performed by real prisoners: styling themselves as religious martyrs, and producing marginalia along with other forms of prison literature. The list of individuals reportedly enlightened during their incarceration would consist almost entirely of politically active nobility.

Across class divides, as E.D. Pendry points out, there are many instances of contemporary authors comparing the prison to a school or university, particularly among middle-class poets. Although the comparison was often done as a joke, the prison-school metaphor was just as often used to describe the relationship between suffering, contemplation, and virtue.⁵⁸ Let

⁵⁷ Ruth Ahnert, "The Prison in Early Modern Drama," in *Literature Compass* 9, no. 1 (2012): 42.

⁵⁸ E. D. Pendry, *Elizabethan Prisons and Prison Scenes* (Salzburg: Institut für Englische Sprache und Literatur, Universität Salzburg, 1974): 270-278.

us consider one such example. Among literary works extolling the prison as a space for contemplation, the most prominent comes from John Taylor's 1623 pamphlet "The Praise and Vertue of a Iaile, and Iaylers". Taylor the Water Poet's work is frequently glanced over by Shakespearean criticism, with scholars like Clifford Dobb finding value in Taylor's cataloguing of contemporary places and habits but seeking no further relevance.⁵⁹ However, it is Taylor's attitude towards imprisonment rather than his exhaustive list of the day's establishments that I wish to emphasize. Taylor's prison accolade proclaims a certain kind of virtues to be reaped from incarceration:

I thinke a Iaile a Schoole of vertue is,
A house of study and of contemplation,
A place of discipline and reformation,
There men may try their patience...⁶⁰

Taylor's poem post-dates Shakespeare's play, and has been accused of "belletristic" and "paradoxical" rhetoric that is not necessarily indicative of a real prison experience.⁶¹ At the same time, it is not a stretch for Taylor to describe the jail as "a glasse wherein old men may see,/ The blemish of their youths deformity;/ And young men quickly may perceiue from thence,/The way to wisdom and experience"; in other words, an opportunity to reflect on the mistakes of one's past in preparation for the future. Taylor continues to make his case that the hypothetical prisoner learns to distinguish real friends and values from false ones:

It shewes the fleeting state of earthly pelfe,
It makes him wisely learne to know himselfe,

⁵⁹ Clifford Dobb, "London's Prisons," in *Shakespeare Survey Volume 17: Shakespeare in His Own Age*, ed. Allardyce Nicoll (Cambridge: CUP 1964): 87-100.

⁶⁰ John Taylor, "The Praise and Vertue of a Jayle, and Jaylers", 1623, A3a-A3b.

⁶¹ Phillip Shaw, "The Position of Thomas Dekker in Jacobean Prison Literature," in *PMLA* 62, no. 2 (1947): 366-91.

The world vnto his view it represents,
To be a Map or masse of discontents,
It shewes his fained friends like Butter-flies,
That dogg'd his summer of prosperities:
And in a word it truly doth set forth
The world, and all that's in it nothing worth.

The most valuable lessons that the poet claims can be gained from spending time in prison are learning to better know oneself and one's place in the world. The philosophy and attitude towards imprisonment described by Taylor works well to either reflect or support those of Shakespeare, whether or not many real contemporary prisoners were able to glean such valuable lessons. Taken together, these works reveal a greater potential to what a prison experience could be, at least in theory.

In this chapter, I will argue that Shakespeare makes Pomfret castle Richard's personal "school of virtue" intended to re-educate the monarch rather than condemn him for his faults. While Richard dismisses most advice given him in good faith, his gradual change towards questioning his actions is accompanied by language of punitive "correction." Richard's solitary confinement removes prior distractions and completes his education, demonstrating the prison's potential as a transformative space.

A King in Need of Education

In order to examine Richard as a character, it is necessary first to acknowledge the degree to which Ernst Kantorowicz's theory of the king's two bodies informs our reading of the play.⁶² Today, the concepts of the king's body politic and body natural as interwoven yet separate

⁶² Ernst Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1957; repr. 2016).

entities are accepted with little questioning. However, scholars opting to focus on either body soon may find themselves trapped in this binary. A fuller understanding of the transition Richard undergoes throughout the play is impossible without allowing that the two bodies may, in fact, be multiple. Donovan Sherman informs:

The deposition does not cleave one body from another but locks the king into the space between bodies and roles. Richard's remains trap him within the breach of transition, without the promise of coalescence: not the condition that signals fleshy, artificial, empty weakness, not the sovereign and divinely invested being, but the act of making this binary into a spectrum and occupying the middle ground within it.⁶³

This introduction of a spectrum of bodies where there previously was a duality challenges the idea that any one scene or moment in the play is decisive in Richard's transformation from a divine ruler into a mere mortal. While scholars have mostly looked to the deposition scene for a culmination of this personal-political divide, a broader spectrum enables several other scenes to come to light and serve as the play's turning points. The bodies' divorce may begin as early as Richard's arrival in Ireland where he abandons the royal "we" for a while and culminate with Richard's prison soliloquy or with his death.

Most scholarship on the play addresses the relationship between the divine and the human in one way or another. Some scholars view the relationship as a downward spiral in which Richard's former kingship and glory unravel, insisting that the play ends with Richard in a great state of discord. Others see the conflict resolved in a newfound sense of unity, with Richard able to transcend his circumstances. The side critics take seems to depend on whether they find Richard's character sympathetic in the first place. Commenting on Kantorowicz, David

⁶³ Donovan Sherman, "'What More Remains?': Messianic Performance in 'Richard II,'" in *Shakespeare Quarterly* 65, no. 1 (2014): 33.

Norbrook states that “the whole orientation of the reading assumes that Richard is a ‘unified’ figure in the first part of the play and that his descent into disunity is wholly tragic.”⁶⁴ This notion - that throughout the play Richard loses a previously imagined “wholeness” or “unity” - is one that my reading will challenge. Recently, critics have been continuously emphasizing Richard’s theatricality in the moments of crisis. Richard Halpern accuses Richard (as well as Shakespeare himself) of exercising “rhetorical jujitsu” and “ostentatious speeches of mourning rather than coherent dramatic action,”⁶⁵ implying that Richard’s excessive performativity is a poor stand-in for the loss of political power. Sherman likewise ascribes a negative tone to Richard’s performances, claiming that he is “in search of a way to perform himself into occlusion, invisibility, even nonbeing.”⁶⁶ James Philips continues this line of thinking that focuses on the king’s downward motion by claiming that “Shakespeare’s Richard... seemingly wishes to learn just how far he can go, just how much he can fail as a human being, before the aura and sanctity of the crown no longer saves him.”⁶⁷ However, Philips’ also argues that Richard fails as an absolutist monarch, and that “a king who abdicates, who draws a distinction between his person and the office of kingship, between his weakness and its duties, compromises the absoluteness of kingship.”⁶⁸ If Shakespeare’s Richard was never “absolute” to begin with, did he ever represent the elusive unity of the bodies politic and natural? On the contrary, Patricia Canning suggests that instead of losing fragments of his royal identity, Richard at the Parliament “attempts - albeit unsuccessfully - to unite the double-body of the king in the act of shattering the

⁶⁴ David Norbrook, "The Emperor's new body? Richard II, Ernst Kantorowicz, and the politics of Shakespeare criticism," in *Textual Practice* 10, no. 2 (1996): 348.

⁶⁵ Richard Halpern, "The King's Two Buckets: Kantorowicz, Richard II, and Fiscal Trauerspiel," in *Representations* 106, no. 1 (2009): 72.

⁶⁶ Sherman, 30.

⁶⁷ James Philips, "The Practicalities of the Absolute: Justice and Kingship in Shakespeare’s Richard II," in *ELH* 79, no. 1 (2012): 165.

⁶⁸ Philips, 170.

glass, as the mirror represents the relation of resemblance that links them.”⁶⁹ Charles Forker agrees that the final scene at Pomfret “ends by restoring some sense of wholeness to the king’s identity.”⁷⁰ In other words, it is likely that the deposed Richard strives to create “oneness” rather than mourn its passing.

To weigh in on this debate between unity and disunity, I propose that Richard throughout the play moves across the spectrum in which his dissonant multiplicity of self gradually turns towards a newfound oneness. The pivots of this change are Richard’s encounters with unwelcome advice that challenges his previous behavior and demonstrates his need for further education. This section will examine several of these encounters before culminating in Richard’s prison soliloquy.

At the opening of the play, Richard is at the height of his power as well as ignorance. He conceives of himself as a monarch who represents and therefore embodies all of his English subjects.⁷¹ Despite the pomp and the liberal use of the royal “we”, Richard could not be further from his people and his lands. He refers to the common folk as “slaves” (1.4.27) and has no qualms ordering his lands to be farmed for extra revenue. As a king, Richard is doubly unsavvy when it comes to multitudes: he lacks the economic foresight to connect the revenues extracted to real war expenses, but he also fails to recognize the people he claims to represent have their personal needs. He shows no regard to the hardships additional taxation would place on the populace. Richard’s downfall is largely due to his inability to connect and sympathise with his

⁶⁹ Patricia Canning, “‘For I Must Nothing Be’: Kings, Idols, and the Double-Body of the Sign in Early Modern England,” in *Critical Survey* 24, no. 3 (2012): 21.

⁷⁰ Charles R. Forker, “Unstable Identity in Shakespeare’s Richard II,” in *Renascence* 54, no. 1 (2001): 13.

⁷¹ A similar aspect of this argument has been articulated by Ema Vyroubalová and James Robert Wood in “Propping up the King’s Two Bodies in Richard II,” *Early Modern Studies Journal* 4 (2011). They state that the play “is less about the king’s body politic per se than about the dependence of his body politic not only upon the physical body of the monarch but also on the living bodies and physical possessions that make up the kingdom” (2).

subjects. He treats the common people with derision and negligence as opposed to Bolingbroke, who is able to weaponize his popularity.⁷² Realising that Bolingbroke is capable of something he is not, Richard treats the already exiled Bolingbroke with suspicion bordering on jealousy. Moreover, Richard's stubbornness cannot be easily blamed on his favorites' influence.⁷³ Believing himself to be absolute, Richard simply rejects behaviours and values he finds alien, and refuses to acknowledge his own shortcomings.

John of Gaunt becomes the first person Richard encounters to openly resist the king's ignorance and suggest that Richard must learn to govern better. On his deathbed and therefore unafraid of the consequences, Gaunt wishes to expose Richard's need to educate himself about the nature of common humanity from which he's been removed his entire life. As opposed to Richard's haughty attitude towards the land as a source of gold, Gaunt famously elevates "this blessed plot, this earth, this England" (2.1.43) above the merely material land that Richard claims is his to farm. Gaunt considers his advice to be more than just words. Firstly, they are his dying words, commonly believed to convene truth and even prophecy about the future.⁷⁴ Secondly, these dying words are likened to "deep harmony" and "music at the close" (2.1.6,12), implying that they have music-like power to impact a person on a level beyond reasoning, striking to the core of his emotions. With his "sad tale" Gaunt hopes to "yet undeaf [Richard's] ear" (2.1.16). York, however, advises Gaunt to spare giving the king any advice, "for all in vain comes

⁷² Jeffrey S. Doty, "Shakespeare's Richard II, 'Popularity,' and the Early Modern Public Sphere," in *Shakespeare Quarterly* 61, no. 2 (2010): 195-197.

⁷³ Paul Gaudet, "The 'Parasitical' Counselors in Shakespeare's Richard II: A Problem in Dramatic Interpretation," in *Shakespeare Quarterly* 33, no. 2 (1982): 142-54. Gaudet argues that blaming the parasitical court for Richard's behaviour has little to no textual evidence: "Instead of showing us a weak king, manipulated into wrong choices by parasitic minions, Shakespeare has focused on errors that the headstrong Richard insists on making for himself" (146).

⁷⁴ For a discussion of Gaunt's dying words and their influence on contemporary literature see Ted Tregear, "Music at the Close: Richard II in the Elizabethan Anthologies," in *Studies in Philology* 116, no. 4 (2019): 696-727.

counsel to his ear” (2.1.4). Any good counsel that could help Richard govern better is blocked out by flattery coming from his inner circle. York insists that the king is too vain to have good sense on his own, and being too blunt will only anger him. Gaunt still forges ahead, telling Richard that “a thousand flatterers sit within thy crown,/ Whose compass is no bigger than thy head” (2.1.96); Gaunt accuses Richard of being not only weak-willed, but small-minded as well. It is then no surprise that dying Gaunt is unable to make Richard heed his warning. Richard rejects the advice, but it penetrates deep enough to make him retaliate by seizing the lands Gaunt held in such high esteem.

Richard’s near-death experience during his tour of Ireland, however, provides Richard with further education by exposing his fragile humanity. His journey is delayed long enough for the Welsh recruits to suspect the king’s demise, and the joy Richard expresses on arrival attests that his death by sea was a possibility. As a result, Richard’s demeanor towards both land and subjects temporarily changes. Having landed, Richard addresses “dear earth” (3.2.6) in the most heartfelt manner. Gaunt’s lesson may have taken root, as Richard goes further and ensouls the soil, stating that “this earth shall have a feeling, and these stones/ Prove armed soldiers” (3.2.24-5). Although Richard ascribes his land and people more value here than he did previously, he still does so in an egotistical, self-serving manner. He asks the earth itself to come to life and rebel against “the sovereign’s enemies” (3.2.22), defining its whole existence in service of the sovereign’s goals. Faced with news of the real military situation, however, Richard gradually comes to question his connection to multitudes of his subjects. Salisbury reports that Richard’s delay cost him “twelve thousand fighting men” once the Welsh withdrew their support (3.2.70). Richard either mishears or inflates the number in his response, but draws an explicit connection between the number of men he has just lost and himself. He goes pale and explains it thus:

But now the blood of twenty thousand men
Did triumph in my face, and they are fled;
And till so much blood thither come again,
Have I not reason to look pale and dead? (3.2.76-9).

In this moment, Richard believes that the soldiers leaving his side are not only weakening his body politic, but bleeding out his body natural. Previously, Richard believed himself to be inviolable as a whole, confident that “not all the water in the rough rude sea/ Can wash the balm off from an anointed king” (3.2.54-5). Facing the martial math changes his entire demeanor. In light of such bad news, Richard is quick to give into doubt. He pretends to recover immediately yet continues to use “I” instead of “we” for a few more lines. Trying to compensate for the loss, Richard proclaims: “Is not the King’s name twenty thousand names?/ Arm, arm, my name!” (3.2.85-6). However, twenty thousand names is a poor substitute for twenty thousand men. Richard, having lost so many fighters he equated with his own blood, wishes to stretch out and multiply what he has left: his own name and identity.

Richard’s forceful separation from his subjects and his newfound isolation teach him to pay attention in situations he would have previously dismissed as unpleasant. Richard responds to Scroop, a bearer of bad news, with “mine ear is open and my heart prepared” (3.2.93). Richard’s willingness to listen to the truth is a first callback to Gaunt’s prophecy and a sign of change in Richard himself. He either realizes for the first time or is willing to acknowledge to his followers that he is, after all, only human: “I live with bread like you, feel want,/ Taste grief, need friends. Subjected thus,/ How can you say to me I am a king?” (3.2.175-7) As the number of Richard’s supporters dwindles, he becomes more and more aware of his identity and accompanying limitations.

Richard's education on the Irish coast is incomplete, but it prompts him to develop further self-awareness: the more isolated Richard grows, the more reason he has to keep learning on his own. After Richard is overtaken at Flint castle and brought back to London, he spends some time in confinement, most likely at the Tower.⁷⁵ Although Shakespeare does not follow Richard there, we can infer that imprisonment had a sobering effect on him. Richard is displeased with being summoned to the parliament too soon as he needs more time to come to terms with his position. Here, Richard is the first to evoke the language of school combined with that of punishment:

I hardly yet have learned
To insinuate, flatter, bow and bend my knee.
Give Sorrow leave awhile to tutor me
To this submission. (4.1.165-8)

The process of learning to submit is clearly painful for Richard. However undesired it may be, the harsh tutoring is bearing some fruit. As the concept of "teaching someone a lesson" at the time was already eponymous to giving a beating,⁷⁶ Richard anticipates further punishment for failing to succumb to a personified and externalized Sorrow, one that he will later acknowledge to be, in fact, both personal and internal ("my sorrow hath destroyed my face"; "my grief lies all within" (4.1.291,295)). Richard is both the schoolboy at fault and the whip-bearing master punishing him for his shortcomings.

⁷⁵ Shakespeare stages Richard conveyed to the Tower but leaves ambiguous whether he actually spent any significant time there. Historically, Richard was committed to the Tower ever since his return to London and stayed there throughout the parliamentary proceedings. See Nigel Saul, *Richard II* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997): 417.

⁷⁶ See Lynn Enterline, *Shakespeare's Schoolroom: Rhetoric, Discipline, Emotion* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012): 49.

To reconcile these conflicting identities, Richard imagines himself as neither pupil nor teacher, but the text itself: "I'll read enough/ When I do see the very book indeed/ Where all my sins are writ, and that's myself" (4.1.273-5). This desire for a sense of internal unity manifests when Richard questions his previous assumptions about being a personification of his people. Looking into a mirror, Richard asks: "Was this face the face/That every day under his household roof/ Did keep ten thousand men?" (4.1.292). Having previously equated foot soldiers with drops of his own blood, Richard comes to understand that a single "face" cannot, in fact, contain these multitudes. He lets the face in the mirror fall and shatter, destroying that illusion. Having read the "book" that is himself, Richard discards it - but not until he has learned a lesson. Post-deposition, instead of addressing the common people as subjects or slaves, Richard thanks them as his "countrymen" (5.2.20). He accepts that he has become a subject, one of many, and yet has not lost himself: in fact, in some ways he proclaims to be "greater than a king" (4.1.305).

The Queen acknowledges Richard's transformation to be a lesson. Even as she chastises her husband and the very idea of a king's submission, she uses the language of correction:

What, is my Richard both in shape and mind

Transformed and weakened? Hath Bolingbroke

Deposed thine intellect? Hath he been in thy heart?

...And wilt thou, pupil-like,

Take the correction mildly, kiss the rod

And fawn on rage with base humility, ...? (5.1.26-8,29-31)

For the Queen, the lesson of humility is strictly negative and takes away from one's pride and intellect. She likens Richard to a lion and "the king of beasts" (5.1.34) who cannot stoop to an inferior position. Richard's rebuke reminds her that he was a king of men, not beasts. Those who

deposed him may be beast-like, but yielding to them is not a sign of a feeble mind. Parting from the Queen, Richard evokes Sorrow one last time (5.4.102), resolving that this harsh tutor is still more eloquent than Richard himself.

Solitary confinement and the “school of virtue”

Richard’s final scene deserves special attention, as it brings all of his previous lessons into focus. The physical space of the prison contributes to Richard’s removal from his former ties. Shakespeare portrays Richard’s removal from the Tower to Pomfret, or Pontefract Castle, as a sudden change, whereby Richard is dramatically “doubly divorced” (5.1.71) from his crown and his wife. An aspect of this divorce the playwright doesn’t highlight is Pomfret’s geographical location. Keeping the former king in the Tower of London, in the very heart of the country, for a prolonged time would have been politically unwise. On the other hand, by sending Richard further north to Yorkshire, Bolingbroke as the new king could reasonably expect that “with the passage of time the memory of [Richard’s] rule would fade and affection for his person weaken.”⁷⁷ Pontefract was one of the Lancastrian castles occasionally used to detain high-born hostages, such as James I of Scotland.⁷⁸ Such private castles would operate as prisons in times of emergency yet remain fairly autonomous, so the exact conditions and treatments afforded to prisoners would be entirely up to the discretion of the lord of the castle. It is unlikely that the play’s contemporary staging would indicate the prison differently from any of the other settings. Shakespeare does suggest a less than comfortable designated accommodation, with Richard musing on the futility of pulling apart the “flinty ribs” of his “ragged prison walls” (5.5.20-1).

⁷⁷ Saul, 424.

⁷⁸ R. B. Pugh, *Imprisonment in Medieval England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968): 128.

Richard's removal from the court is, however, not simply physical, but social, as he is denied contact with the outside world. "No man never comes" into Richard's cell save for a keeper who brings the prisoner food "to make misfortune live" (5.5.70-1). Solitary confinement remained a constant feature in both medieval and early modern prison administration for practical reasons, as it was typically reserved for important state prisoners rather than run-of-the-mill offenders.⁷⁹ Richard's existentialist thoughts are thus fostered by this externally imposed solitude just as much as they are born inwardly of his brain and soul. He is left alone to face these thoughts and not friends, foes, or flatterers. At the same time, Richard acknowledges that his "studying" proved impossible in complete solitude, forcing him to play the other inhabitants himself. The marked difference from Richard's earlier attempts to project himself onto a multitude of his subjects is that his thoughts are not homogenous: some are likened to "things divine" while others to "silly beggars", some wish to flee the prison and others find ease in inaction.

To Richard as a solitary prisoner the learning process is as difficult and possibly fruitless as it is inescapable, which means he spends a lot of effort on persuading himself this learning is necessary. "I cannot do it. Yet I'll hammer't out" (5.5.5), Richard resolves, where "it" is his attempt to draw parallels between his prison and the larger world, thereby rationalising his own predicament. His prison soliloquy evokes learning with strong, pointed verbs throughout, with the rational "study", "compare", and "prove" complemented by a more rhetorical "persuade". This rhetorical undercurrent cannot be ignored since, as Lynn Enterline argues, the conventions of a classical rhetorical education crucially inform the way Shakespeare's characters express emotion. Since Richard is alone in his confinement, the crux of his exercise lies in re-populating

⁷⁹ Pugh, 334.

the prison's microcosm with anthropomorphized thoughts in the *prosopopoeia* manner.⁸⁰

Richard conceives his thoughts to have the brain and the soul as parents, gendering the brain as feminine and the soul as masculine. His thoughts are products of both the brain and the soul, of reason combined with and inseparable from emotion. The learning Richard undergoes appears to be of a decidedly humanistic nature. As his thoughts are born both rational and emotional they can plot and flatter, bear misfortune and feel pride, simulating real and flawed people for Richard to interact with. The exercise is abstract enough that Richard never pretends it to be real, the goal always being to "play...in one person many people" (5.5.31).

Whether or not Richard's lessons are in vain remains ambiguous. When Richard resolves to "be eased with being nothing" (5.5.40-1), he could be accepting the futility of his studies. Alternatively, if "nothing" is to be read as a pun on "noting"⁸¹ - the acts of noticing and/or writing down notes - the passage transforms and asserts Richard's intent to cope with his solitary confinement by rethinking his existence so far. Read this way, Richard resolves to learn from his experience rather than wish himself into nonbeing. Moreover, this line becomes the final pivot in Richard's education as he fully opens to receive it.

Once Richard learns to accept that even the people his own consciousness has conjured are never one and the same, simple, or "contented," he suddenly can hear music coming from elsewhere.⁸² Going back to Gaunt's evocation of dying truth, his "music at the close" was meant to "undeaf" the King's ear previously "stopped with other, flatt'ring sounds" (2.1.12,16,17).

⁸⁰ On rhetorical moves traced back to grammar schools, see Enterline, 124. Here, Enterline argues that Shakespeare's characters such as Lucrece rely on "a series of *prosopopoeia* to ease her mind" and channel her woe.

⁸¹ Canning, 16. Canning suggests "nothing" to be read as "noting" based on the word's phonetic spelling, and that Richard's "gradual transformation into 'nothing' can be understood semiotically." Richard performs himself into a "textual" entity to align himself closer to the Word of God and aspire for divinity in martyrdom. Although my interpretation is more secular than Canning's, I agree insofar as the detail's importance.

⁸² On music as an allegory for memory, see Pierre Iselin, "Myth, Memory, and Music in Richard II, Hamlet and Othello," in *Reclamations of Shakespeare*, ed. A. J. Hoenselaars (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1994): 173-186.

Having stopped listening to others' voices and finally listening to himself, Richard can hear his own music that "will make wise men mad" (5.5.63). The hardest realisation to swallow is that Richard had the physical and intellectual ability to hear it his entire life, yet failed to:

And here have I the daintiness of ear
To check time broke in a disordered string,
But for the concord of my state and time
Had not an ear to hear my true time broke. (5.5.45-8)

If music here is to be read as "truth", it is an internal, personal version of truth that Richard has finally realized was broken. Having lived his entire life embodying the ideas of the kingship and the nation, he has not realized how broken and incomplete those ideas left him as a private person.

By viewing the prison as a space enabling Richard's humanistic education, we can once again draw a parallel to the virtues John Taylor alleged a few decades after the play has been written. First of all, both Taylor's virtuous jail and Shakespeare's royal prison allow for deeper self-reflection than under normal circumstances. Taylor's jail helps one to "wisely learne to know himselfe" by demonstrating "the fleeting state of earthly pelfe," and "truly doth set forth/ The world, and all that's in it nothing worth". Richard is able to comprehend the fleeting state of his own earthly self, expressing how "I wasted time, and now doth Time waste me" (5.5.49). Richard's resolution right before hearing the distant music is that "nor I nor any man that but man is/ With nothing shall be pleased till he be eased/ With being nothing" (5.5.41-2). Taylor's jail is also "a glasse wherein old men may see,/The blemish of their youths deformity." Although looking into a mirror Richard sees "no deeper wrinkles yet" (4.1.277), the longer he looks the

more he is able to look back on his former deeds and misdeeds. A prisoner's removal from society can therefore create a different perspective on one's past.

Additionally, those in jail are said to "know, If they haue any friends aliue or no," and the jail can expose "fained friends" to be "like Butter-flies,/ That dogg'd his summer of prosperities". Although Shakespeare addresses the real conspiracy to rescue and reinstate the king, he undercuts it with Richard's former confidante Aumerle begging for mercy and disowning his involvement once the plot is discovered. Those co-conspirators who remained loyal to Richard are then murdered on the king's orders. The only person bearing goodwill to Richard who sees him in prison is a groom, whom Richard addresses with affection as a "noble peer" and a "gentle friend"; indeed, no other friends of his remain alive.

Finally, the prison clarifies the distinction between things earthly and divine. Taylor calls on prisoners to "proue if they haue fortitude,/ By which all crosses stoutly are subdude", nodding to martyr figures called to rejoice in the face of their trials.⁸³ Furthermore, Taylor states that the jail "these things vnto a wisemans iudgement brings,/ A hate to earth, and loue to heavenly things". Succumbing to his assassins, Richard calls for his soul to ascend to heaven while his "gross flesh sinks downward here to die." Dying, he is resolved he is no longer a king with two bodies or an embodiment of a nation, but a single soul with no body at all. This is the moment of the final separation between the king's divine and earthly natures, but also a moment of ultimate, unquestioned unity of his own self as portrayed by the mounting soul.⁸⁴

Prisons and schools were both inextricable from daily life in Shakespeare's London, and on further examination, *Richard II* is a play intensely concerned with both. Shakespeare's prison

⁸³ Karl F. Thompson, "Richard II, Martyr," in *Shakespeare Quarterly* 8, no. 2 (1957): 159–66.

⁸⁴ Whether or not Richard achieves salvation is less significant to this essay than his own belief that he does. For more nuance, see Laura Estill "Richard II and the Book of Life" in *SEL Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 51, no. 2 (2011): 283–303.

goes beyond acting as a backdrop for a tragedy. The prison is a space that allows Richard to transcend his misconceptions of self: it is not in itself a punishment, but a key element to his journey, a paradoxical “school of virtue” that can provide a unique education. Where Foucault argues that the school is always a prison, Shakespeare may be suggesting the opposite: that at a certain point in time, the prison could be a school. This suggestion that a monarch can and should be educated in humility both adds to and takes away from the play’s perceived dangerousness. On the one hand, it could help justify the idea that inadequate rulers should be resisted, as echoed in the play’s alleged role in the Essex Rising of 1601.⁸⁵ On the other hand, the educational moral aligns the play closer to the allegorical and thus less threatening traditions of the *Mirror for Magistrates*.⁸⁶ A prison is a perfect place to bring the king down low, yet Shakespeare allows Richard to transform and ascend once again, from his cell straight into heaven. Following the playwright’s lead, the audience is then motivated to look for virtue in rather dark and unexpected places.

⁸⁵ See Paul E. J. Hammer, “Shakespeare’s *Richard II*, the Play of 7 February 1601, and the Essex Rising,” in *Shakespeare Quarterly* 59, no. 1 (2008): 1–35.

⁸⁶ See Paul Budra, *A Mirror for Magistrates and the de casibus Tradition* (Toronto: U of Toronto Press, 2000).

Chapter 3: “In Death I Am a King Still”: Islands, Prisoners, and Divine Authority in Shakespeare and Fletcher

Two plays set on remote islands, Shakespeare’s *The Tempest* and Fletcher’s *The Island Princess*, have power struggles and political disputes at their core despite being comedies.⁸⁷ The two plays involve exotic locations and characters of various national origins that do not, however, conceal intrinsically English interests. In particular, these distant island enclaves serve as microcosms of contemporary debates involving competing sources of authority. In these settings, playwrights can question the ways the divine right of kings, a presiding policy of the Jacobean court, is challenged when kings step into territories claimed by non-monarchical governments. Such clashes of authority come to a head in scenes of imprisonment. While taking a royal prince captive, usually for ransom, is a long-established practice, this act only carries full legitimacy when done in the name of another ruler. This is not the case in these plays, as both Prospero and the governor of Ternate have unstable claims over their respective territories, not to mention over other royals. I argue that imprisonment fails to restrain royals, here Ferdinand and the King of

⁸⁷ All Shakespeare citations in this chapter refer to “The Tempest” in *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Greenblatt et. al (New York and London: Norton & Company, 2016). Fletcher citations refer to *The Island Princess*, ed. Clare McManus (London: Arden Early Modern Drama, 2013). References to Grotius are based on *Hugo Grotius Mare Liberum 1609-2009: Original Latin Text and English Translation*, transl. Robert Feenstra (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

Tidore, due to the threat coming from self-appointed magistrates who have no legal power according to the doctrines of divine kingship.

Royal prisoners deserve particular attention due to the perceived sanctity of their persons, which is an obstacle the usurper must overcome to succeed. Alex Brondarbit discusses at length the medieval English practice of taking the monarch captive which became widespread during the Wars of the Roses. Brondarbit argues that holding a royal hostage during periods of domestic strife was done not for ransom, but to supplant the king's authority. This authority, as Ernst Kantorowicz postulates, stems from the king's body politic that represents an immortal statesman, and not the king's body natural that is mortal and can thus be imprisoned, tortured, or murdered. However, according to Brondarbit, by physically confining the king long enough and using his absence for political gain, the captors could eventually usurp the body politic from the living monarch and reassign it to themselves. By exercising control over the royal prisoner, the captors could "circumvent notions of kingship and achieve permanence for their usurped authority."⁸⁸ The king could not be killed unless such transfer of power had taken place, making imprisonment a necessary compromise.

While both *The Tempest* and *The Island Princess* portray captors as royal usurpers striving for legitimacy, it is necessary to distinguish between global conflict these plays stage and domestic hostageship that Brondarbit describes. In cases of English kings imprisoned by their own subjects, the usurpers could still rely on blood claims for partial justification. Domestically, both the captor and the prisoner operated within the same political and religious discourse. Both sides were aware of the rules to play by, even if one side actively aimed to

⁸⁸ See Alex Brondarbit, "Commanding the Crown: Royal Hostages in the Wars of the Roses, 1455–83," in *Medieval Hostageship c. 700-c. 1500: Hostage, Captive, Prisoner of War, Guarantee, Peacemaker*, ed. Matthew Bennet and Katherine Weikert (Routledge, 2017), 174.

thwart them. Within a European context, a royal abroad might expect to be captured and held for ransom by a fellow prince who would need to acknowledge the status of their prisoner to take full advantage of that position. However, as seventeenth-century Europeans were travelling further away from their continent and encountering new cultures, even the highest of authorities ran the risk of foreign nationals being ignorant of their authority. In the case of Shakespeare and Fletcher, the “native” rulers intentionally refuse to recognize their captives’ royal authority, as the captives’ “foreign” status overshadows their nobility.

Jacobean playwrights had to acknowledge the complexities created by their overseas settings, yet they could not present both sides of the foreign vs. native ruler conflict as righteous. Upon James’ succession, his foreign birth was a subject of criticism and an additional handicap to his legitimacy. In this wake, religious fitness became a much more prominent criterion for determining a just ruler.⁸⁹ Consequently, plays dealing with seemingly equal claimants to power would need to rely on moral character as a decisive factor in resolving the conflict. In *The Tempest*, a happy ending is made possible by a mutual reconciliation and alliance-making between the captor and the captive, reassuring goodness and nobility in both. *The Island Princess* is less subtle in that it relies on blackening the usurper to exalt the captive king to near martyrdom. Both plays, however, make it explicit that two competing bearers of authority cannot coexist simultaneously.

By staging conflicts between native islanders and foreigners whose authority is derived from elsewhere, Shakespeare and Fletcher indirectly participate in seventeenth-century disputes over the freedom of the seas that were crucial to global European encounters. Prison scenes in these plays foreground the clashes between different kinds of authority, with self-appointed

⁸⁹ Gertrude Catherine Reese, “The Question of the Succession in Elizabethan Drama” in *Studies in English* 22 (1942): 59–85.

magistrates representing the right to rule by conquest as opposed to hereditary royalty representing the natural and divine rights. I will read the plays and the clashes of authority they represent alongside Hugo Grotius' 1609 tract *Mare Liberum*, or *The Freedom of the Seas*, notable among other contemporary documents for its support of the native's rights to their own lands against the rights of Europeans by conquest or discovery. Grotius' account is somewhat controversial in its defense of the natives' right to sovereignty, as his countrymen of the Dutch East India Company did not aim for the same moral high ground. Kerry Ward writes that

the use of forced migration by criminal transportation and political exile was one of the methods of control used by the VOC in establishing its legal right to rule within its jurisdiction and to manage its international relations with foreign powers. The performative practices of legality were implicitly and necessarily backed by military power and the threat of violence for their enforcement.⁹⁰

Grotius' account complicates the authority debate, as it draws attention away from the plays' moral justifications towards their realpolitik-heavy subtext, as well as situates the debate within a wider global network.

The Tempest

Written and performed around 1611, *The Tempest* remains an object of debate to this day. While scholars have presented many competing interpretations of Prospero, a common unifying theme is his ability to command authority, whether by divine law or brutal force. Two prominent ways of reading the magician's behavior involve grounding the play in either the New World, which offers to view Prospero as a European colonizer, or in the Mediterranean, which instead suggests Prospero should be seen as a traveler or a privateer. Notably, both of these possibilities

⁹⁰ Kerry Ward, *Networks of Empire: Forced Migration in the Dutch East India Company* (Cambridge: CUP, 2009), 182.

highlight the tensions Prospero inhabits due to his many dividing roles. While Deborah Willis unequivocally assumes the play to be pro-colonialist, she discusses the complexities of Prospero's political identity: "*The Tempest* registers tensions between Prospero's role as colonist-magician and his role as duke; it self-consciously explores problematic aspects of Prospero's rule on the island; and it raises questions about his view of Caliban"⁹¹. Willis comes to the conclusion that "at the same time, the play declares Prospero's restoration of Milanese political order to be unequivocally legitimate," deriving the authority from divine sources.⁹² In a stark contrast, Richard Wilson's reading of Prospero evokes not a settler, but "a king of pirates"⁹³ - a much more mobile figure inhabiting the grey zone between state-sanctioned enforcer and independent fortune-making privateer. The definition of the "king" of pirates creates a paradox by itself, as a pirate's dominion is established mostly via conquest and has little to do with the will of heaven. Even without invoking piracy, Jeffrey Doty is able point to a class divide and argue that "*The Tempest* ultimately refuses to ratify Prospero's coercive exercises of power" by looking at the magician's relationships with his servants.⁹⁴ Therefore, similar to David Scott Wilson-Okamura asking for "criticism that does justice to the play's Mediterranean setting without neglecting the obvious references to Atlantic exploration and colonization,"⁹⁵ I will attempt to contest the legitimacy of Prospero's island rule by appealing to Grotius' tract.

From the beginning of the play, the uncontrollable sea serves to reveal the arbitrariness of authority claimed by magistrates. Far away from the shores on which power is more clearly

⁹¹ See Deborah Willis, "Shakespeare's *Tempest* and the Discourse of Colonialism," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 29, no. 2 (1989): 277-289.

⁹² Willis, 280.

⁹³ Richard Wilson, "Voyage to Tunis: New History and the Old World of *The Tempest*," in *ELH* 64, no.2 (1997): 334.

⁹⁴ Jeffrey S. Doty, "Experiences of Authority in *The Tempest*," in *Shakespeare and the Politics of Commons: Digesting the New Social History*, ed. Chris Fitter (Oxford: OUP, 2017), 251.

⁹⁵ David Scott Wilson-Okamura, "Virgilian Models of Colonization in Shakespeare's *Tempest*," in *ELH* 70, no. 3 (2003): 709.

defined, man-made hierarchies begin to crumble down. The Boatswain in a moment of crisis refuses to listen to Gonzalo, making the point that power granted to magistrates by the state counts little against the power of nature. The Neapolitan elites cling to their right to command, while for the Boatswain as a commoner, the true power would mean to “command these elements to silence, and work the peace of the present,” no less. On board a sinking ship, a commoner can mock his superior for his powerlessness. “Use your authority!” he taunts Gonzalo, the king’s counsellor. “If you cannot, give thanks you have lived so long, and make yourself ready in your cabin for the mischance of the hour, if it so hap.” (1.1.19-23) The sea thus serves to cut off human magistrates from the sources of authority they derive from the laws and the land. However, while the sea subverts traditional hierarchy by placing the most capable person in charge, the replacement is temporary, extended over the duration of crisis.

Once shipwreck brings Neapolitans to the island, their authority is challenged anew by the rules of the land they find themselves in. While Prospero assumes command over the newcomers, the question remains which source does Prospero derive authority from on “his” island.

Despite Prospero’s birthright and status as the true Duke of Milan, his claims to princely authority have been compromised by his deposition and subsequent exile. As a “prince of power” (1.2.54), Prospero has continuously devalued his high position by neglecting his duties in favor of study, making his brother Antonio a de-facto ruler. Even in his account of the story to Miranda, however, Prospero does not choose to emphasize his capacities as a ruler, occasionally slipping into admitting his neglect of all “worldly ends” (1.2.89). The disconnect between Prospero and the matters of state leads to the rise of Antonio. As a courtier, Antonio is described as “perfected how to grant suits,/ How to deny them, who t’advance, and who/ To trash for

overtopping” (1.2.81), which shows him to be a prince both prudent and capable, if somewhat Machiavellian. In order to exonerate his own oversights, Prospero relies on blackening Antonio’s character, calling his brother “perfidious”, “false”, “evil”, and simply “bad” (1.2.68, 77, 93, 119). Whether or not Antonio as a “false” regent had legal right to subject Milan to Naples as a tributary state, his decision to exile Prospero and Miranda is a natural move to cement Antonio’s rule, grounded in cold reason rather than morality.

There is, however, a slight implication of Prospero retaining his true princely claim to Milan due to either divine means or his moral superiority. When Miranda asks why the usurpers did not murder them, Prospero answers that “they durst not,” (1.2.14) implying their captors’ fear of regicide. He offers two explanations that can be read as merely reasonable or as evidence for Prospero’s protection by the divine right of kings. The first one is the love of the common people; the second is an unwillingness of the usurping faction to “set a mark so bloody on the business” (1.2.140-1). Either reason clearly disavows princely murder.

Moreover, Prospero attributes his and Miranda’s miraculous delivery from doom as “by Providence divine” (1.2.159), which Prospero can use to support not only his rightfulness as the Duke, but his claim to the island. Prospero retorts to supernatural providence once again when referring to his conveniently beached enemies. At the same time, Prospero acknowledges Gonzalo as a human agent who aided his safe delivery, and himself participates in the shipwreck through the aid of Ariel. Therefore, Prospero credits divine interference for acts clearly initiated by human agents. He also transfers the princely privilege he had in Italy onto his newfound island abode.

The next step for Prospero is justifying his lording over Caliban. The grounds for that claim would have been widely disputed in the seventeenth century. Grotius denies European

visitors or settlers the right to possess the land on the grounds of its native inhabitants' lack of Christian faith. He claims that to declare heathens unable to possess property would constitute an "act of thievery and rapine no less than it would be if perpetrated against Christians."⁹⁶ However, Grotius' claim did not represent the less than uniform opinions of his contemporaries. Freitas in *De Iusto Imperio Lusitanorum Asiatico* argues that by papal bull, Europeans are justified in waging war against heathen natives who "are by divine law forced to submit to him in order to receive faith and baptism."⁹⁷ In this dispute, "divine" right can be seen as an expression of "natural" law, or yet another *casus belli* to benefit one's nation.

Therefore, Prospero's rule over the island originates in conquest, making force - military or magical - a defining factor over the natives' claims. However, as the island was formerly occupied by Sycorax and Caliban, Prospero triumphing over the natives does not indicate that his right superseded theirs. Caliban is the one to stoutly protest his subjugation: "This island's mine by Sycorax my mother, which thou takest from me," claims he (1.2.332-3). While Caliban exists outside of traditional European jurisdiction, his inheritance right appears most natural.

According to Grotius, Prospero should be denied the ownership in Caliban's favor on two counts. First is the already mentioned innate right the natives have always had to their land: "Natives of that region – though they were in part idolaters, in part Mohammedans, and sunk in grievous sin – nevertheless enjoyed public and private ownership of their own property and possessions, an attribute which could not be taken from them without just cause."⁹⁸ Moreover, Grotius envisions the native people themselves as "not... chattels, but free men possessed of full

⁹⁶ Grotius, 7.

⁹⁷ Monica Brito Vieira, "Mare Liberum vs. Mare Clausum : Grotius, Freitas, and Selden's Debate on Dominion over the Seas," in *Journal of the History of Ideas* 64, no. 3 (2003): 370.

⁹⁸ Grotius, 6.

social and civil rights.”⁹⁹ For Grotius, there is no sufficient justification for taking a native’s right to property away against his will.

The second, and perhaps the more important reason, is Prospero’s failure to rule by conquest. Here, Grotius contests the colonial idea of obtaining property by discovery, as he claims that discovery “consists, not in perceiving a thing with the eye, but in actual seizure... only in cases where movable articles are seized, or immovable property is marked off by boundaries and placed under guard.”¹⁰⁰ These specifications may appear suspiciously meticulous, but just as the Portuguese did not station garrisons in the East Indies, Prospero himself is only a “master of a full poor cell” (1.2.20). Although he prospects the island and makes use of its natural resources - water, plants, “veins o’the earth” (1.2.255) - he does not build any walls or set any guards, allowing unbarred access to his gd, house, and other property. His physical and political presence on the island lacks a strong enough foundation to rule.

Final refutation of Prospero’s claim to the island as well as the unstable nature of rule by force are revealed in Prospero’s interactions with Ferdinand, the heir to the kingdom of Naples. Ferdinand is justified in believing his father the king dead, and thus believing himself to be “the best of them that speak this speech” (1.2.428), or the new prince. The belief that the death of the old king’s body natural, although erroneous in this instance, immediately makes Ferdinand the ruling prince without any ceremony adheres to Ernst Kantorowicz’s idea that in English medieval and early modern political thought, the king’s body politic never, in fact, died:

The individual king may die; but the King who represents sovereign Justice and was represented by the supreme judges, was not dead; he continued his jurisdiction

⁹⁹ Grotius, 13.

¹⁰⁰ Grotius, 6.

ceaselessly through the agency of his officers even though his natural body had passed away.¹⁰¹ (Kantorowicz 418)

Although in reality succession process was fraught with nuance, Ferdinand is not mistaken to assume his father's mantle without preamble.

What is more, Ferdinand is indirectly endorsed as a ruler with a divine claim to his throne. Upon seeing him for the first time, Miranda calls him "a thing *divine*, for nothing natural I ever saw so noble" (1.2.417-8). Ferdinand does responds to her language of religious worship characteristic of romance, but more importantly, he reinforces his own superior "divine" position in the following exchange. Referring to his father's demise, Ferdinand exclaims: "Myself am Naples" (1.2.433). Not only does Ferdinand confirm the transfer of the King's body politic onto himself, but he evokes the saying Carlyle has famously attributed to Louis XIV of France: "'L'état, c'est moi (The State? I am the State)".¹⁰² Whether or not the saying itself had a reliable source, it mirrors well the idea of the king's absolute divine right as well as the inability to divorce the person from the state.

In accusing Ferdinand of treason, Prospero therefore contests Ferdinand's princely authority, an act which would be impossible in Italy. On the island, legitimate claims whittle down to big army diplomacy as Ferdinand's word is only as good as Prospero's. What Prospero's accusation leveled at Ferdinand shows best is the arbitrariness of authority. Knowing full well he is dealing with a legitimate prince, Prospero claims: "Thou dost here usurp/ The name thou ow'st not, and hast put thyself/ Upon this island as a spy, to win it/ From me, the lord on't" (1.2.452-5). The magician might have never intended to harm Ferdinand, but in the spectacle of imprisonment, the audience represented by Miranda never truly questions Prospero's

¹⁰¹ Kantorowicz, *King's Two Bodies*, 418.

¹⁰² Thomas Carlyle, "Chapter 1.1.II" in *The French Revolution: A History* (London, 1837).

right to command a fellow prince. In fact, Miranda believes her father to be able to put Ferdinand on “trial” (1.2.166). Prospero’s success lies in his use of rhetoric legitimizing himself as the undisputed lord of the island, and de-legitimizing Ferdinand as a “traitor” and an “imposter” (1.2.459, 68, 76).

Ferdinand’s behavior in light of the accusations only serve to reaffirm the nobility of his character, implying his princely moral superiority and the ability to transcend earthly hardships. He struggles against Prospero, showing the willingness to “resist such entertainment till/ Mine enemy has more power” (1.2.463-4). In this moment, he does not acknowledge Prospero’s power based on his claim to be the island’s lord. Once overpowered by magic, however, Ferdinand shows resilience. Prospero threatens harsh physical treatment: “I’ll manacle thy neck and feet together,” he offers. He promises an indigestible menu: “Sea-water shalt thou drink; thy food shall be/ The fresh-brook muscles, wither’d roots and husks/ Wherein the acorn cradled” (1.2.460-3). Captured, Ferdinand ceases to struggle, but instead makes a point of showing himself to be as unaffected as possible:

My spirits, as in a dream, are all bound up.
My father's loss, the weakness which I feel,
The wreck of all my friends, nor this man's threats,
To whom I am subdued, are but light to me,
Might I but through my prison once a day
Behold this maid: all corners else o' the earth
Let liberty make use of; space enough
Have I in such a prison. (1.2. 486-92)

The romance plot and Ferdinand's infatuation with Miranda provide only one angle on why the prince would speak of his imprisonment as "light" and having "space enough". Ruth Ahnert proposes that Protestant stoicism played a large role in Tudor theatre's glorification of the prisoner,¹⁰³ and that the prison served as a "symbolic site of retribution; as a place that epitomized the ills of society; as a prompt to rethink the legislation of such institutions; as a conceptual space of constriction; and as a means of invoking sympathy or admiration for those who suffered its hardships."¹⁰⁴ The space that imprisonment provides for Ferdinand is also the space for much needed reflection as he grieves his father and his friends. Moreover, despite his pitiable state Ferdinand still believes Prospero to be but a man, and himself able to command the weight of his burden and the size of his cell at will. In this conflict, Ferdinand retains his claim to authority derived from the divine doctrine of kingship, while Prospero has to rely on force and deception - and ultimately, ransoming Ferdinand for reinstatement of his dukedom - in order to maintain his own.

At the same time as Prospero imprisons Ferdinand, he only does so in pursuit of a higher goal, which is to regain legitimacy as a Duke of Milan and expand his power through Ferdinand and Miranda's dynastic marriage. Therefore, from Prospero's perspective, the challenge to Ferdinand's sovereignty is only a ruse. For Ferdinand, however, the threat is real. He insists that regardless of his condition, he is a king who "would no more endure...slavery" than death. It is the play's comedic genre that puts an end to the authority debate before it can fully develop.

Although *The Tempest* sidelines Prospero and Ferdinand's conflict in favor of the romance plot, it raises questions for further inquiry. Namely, that much of the play's criticism tends to highlight the power inequalities between Prospero and the rest of the cast while ignoring

¹⁰³ Ahnert, "The Prison in Early Modern Drama," 41.

¹⁰⁴ Ahnert, 46.

that power's fickleness. Richard Strier, for example, applies his term "virtuous disobedience" to Ariel just as he does to Ferdinand, ignoring the inherent difference between the stations of a servant and that of a captive prince (10).¹⁰⁵ Although Prospero benefits greatly from the play's resolution, he only further subjects his dukedom of Milan to Ferdinand's Naples through dynastic marriage. Enslaving a prince proves harder for Prospero than enslaving a supernatural spirit; politically, Prospero is far from invulnerable. Shakespeare thus de-legitimizes attempts to assault a prince, privileging one's moral authority over physical force.

The Island Princess

A whole decade separates the happy ending of *The Tempest* from that of the *Island Princess*. Meanwhile, drama has undergone a shift that allowed characters without tragic character flaws to undergo extensive suffering. Clare McManus frames Fletcher's play as a rewriting of *The Tempest*;¹⁰⁶ however, compared to its light-hearted predecessor, *The Island Princess* feels heavier due to its being a tragicomedy. While Fletcher ultimately resolves the play's conflict peacefully, he raises the stakes to highlight the gravitas of certain scenes. Prospero only threatens bodily harm to his prisoner with no real intent behind his words, while the Governor's actions bring the King dangerously close to death and only fail due to outside interference.

The Governor of Ternate is a peculiar figure whose national, religious, and racial difference is used against his legitimacy. What is more, the precise nature of this demonizing difference matters little. Some scholars maintain the Governor's identity as an islander. Ania Loomba emphasizes the importance of the Governor's disguise as a Moorish priest which allows

¹⁰⁵ Richard Strier, "I am Power: Normal and Magical Politics in *The Tempest*," in *Writing and Political Engagement in Seventeenth-Century England*, ed. Derek Hirst and Richard Strier (Cambridge: CUP, 1999), 10.

¹⁰⁶ Claire McManus, "Introduction," in *The Island Princess*, ed. Clare McManus (London: Arden Early Modern Drama, 2013), 1.

him to stir nationalist, anti-colonial, and religious sentiments in the King. Loomba points to the “priest’s” religion as being a “mixture of animism and devil worship” as opposed to Islam.¹⁰⁷ Clare McManus, however, argues that the play’s clearly “Mahometan” tropes double as stands-in for Catholicism, the English go-to marker of “otherness.”¹⁰⁸ Other scholars came to consider the Governor a possible European agent as well. Michael Neill reads the play as representing an Anglo-Dutch conflict, in which “Fletcher expands the role given to the King of Tidore’s traditional enemy, the King of Ternata, transforming him from rivalrous prince to Machiavellian villain, and renaming him “Governor” - a title surely calculated to remind viewers of Ternata’s current subservience to Dutch power, and so to suggest a congruence between his political ambitions and the machinations of the Hollanders.”¹⁰⁹ Carmen Nocentelli acknowledges the complexity of “*Don Governor*” by concluding that he is “both a native Moor and a Spanish official, a convergence conveniently legitimizing the overthrow of Islamic influence and Spanish rule.”¹¹⁰ As far as the Governor’s place within the play is concerned, he is a villainous “other” brought down by the heroes regardless of his precise allegiance. The “other” proves himself unworthy of rule on the basis of his crimes, committed out of deference to either rivaling governments or the Devil himself.

Whether a Muslim native islander or a Catholic European, the Governor holds the power on Ternate by force and not by blood. The play uses the fact to further delegitimize his right to rule, as according to the King of Tidore, “[the Governor’s] father and himself have both usurped [the island of Ternate] and kept it by oppression” (5.5.84). The king of Bacan uses the

¹⁰⁷ Ania Loomba, “‘Break her will, and bruise no bone sir’: Colonial and Sexual Mastery in Fletcher’s *The Island Princess*,” in *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 2, no.1 (2002): 68-108.

¹⁰⁸ McManus, 23-24.

¹⁰⁹ Michael Neill, “‘Material Flames’: The Space of Mercantile Fantasy in John Fletcher’s *The Island Princess*,” in *Renaissance Drama* 28 (1997): 113.

¹¹⁰ Carmen Nocentelli, “Spice Race: *The Island Princess* and the Politics of Transnational Appropriation,” in *PMLA* 125, no. 3 (2010), 582.

Governor's lower status to humiliate him, calling him a "fort-keeping fellow", a "banddog", and treating him as less than human: "Away, thing,/ And keep your rank with those that fit your royalty" (1.3.64-7). The Governor's "rank" here is both a foul smell and an inferior social position due to his non-royal origins. The Governor has to evoke "merit" in his defense, which Bacan as a hereditary monarch can afford to spurn (1.3.73-5). The Governor's entire courtship of Princess Quisara can be seen as an attempt not only to expand his influence, but also to legitimize his status as a ruler: yet his courtship is undesired and forceful, and later devolves into blackmail.

However, the Governor's right to rule by conquest matches Grotius' description of proper right by seizure. Unlike *The Tempest's* Prospero, who can only claim a cell for his island property along with two servants and a single female subject to rule over, the Governor is a master of a trading nation, whose dwellers are referred to as citizens, implying a full-fledged town at the Governor's disposition. The King mentions he was held in a "town and castle" (5.5.84), and Armusia's excursion discovers the prison and the treasury/armory/harem as standalone buildings (2.2.28-9). Moreover, the Governor commands an active military presence on Ternate: act 2, scene 3 shows him debating with a Captain whether they should employ troops against the Portuguese. By right of seizure, the Governor's position on the island can be reproached, but cannot be ignored or made light of.

Therefore, in acknowledging the Governor's power, the play has to subvert it by appealing to his moral failings. Specifically, the Governor's foil is the King of Tidore, whom he keeps imprisoned on Ternate. Unlike the Governor, the King possesses both a legitimate hereditary claim to his own throne as well as a martyr-like strength of character. The Governor

claims to have treated the captured King nobly until spurned by his sister; in response, the Governor revenges himself onto his prisoner:

For, where before I used him like a king
And did those royal offices unto him,
Now he shall lie a sad lump in a dungeon,
Laden with chains and fetters, cold and hunger -
Darkness and lingering death for his companions. (1.3.208-12)

In changing his mind and betraying a prince whom he previously treated like a guest, the Governor betrays the basic rules of hospitality, particularly as he holds the King for ransom and not out punishment for any crime. The King points out this breach of hospitality when he accuses the Governor of dropping the initial “shadow of captivity” in favor of “a most inhumane and unhandsome slavery” once the captor reveals his true colors (2.1.91, 96).

The Governor keeps his promise of “chains and fetters” and “cold and hunger”, revealing that, unlike Prospero, he is willing to harm his captive out of pure spite. Prospero only threatens to bind Ferdinand’s “neck and feet together”; the King is actually kept in a dungeon, laden with chains. Where Prospero talks of poisonous “sea-water” and “fresh-brook mussels” in order to intimidate his captive, the Governor does feed the King - but so little as to maintain life in him while at the same time making it unbearable. Moreover, seeing that the King will not bend to his will, the Governor orders even harsher measures, hoping to break the prisoner’s spirit:

...Give him no liberty,
But let his bands be doubled, his ease lessened:
Nothing his heart desires but vex and torture him;
Let him not sleep; nothing that’s dear to nature

Let him enjoy” (2.1.115-9).

Moreover, the Governor orders the guards to not let the King sleep, adding outright torture to his already brutal treatment. At the same time as he continuously tortures the King, the Governor does not dare to sully his hands with regicide. The Governor is motivated by revenge he wishes to exact on the Tidore royal family for his humiliation and “humble” them (2.1.121), so he insists that the King must stay alive for that purpose.

The King, however, thwarts his captor’s plans in several ways, reinforcing his nobility in the process. The King is able to command willpower and charisma even while starved and imprisoned, winning over his captors and rescuers alike. The guards assigned to keep the King notice that the King never gives in to despondency: he “gives no ill words, curses nor repines not,/ Blames nothing, hopes in nothing we can hear of/ And, in the midst of all these frights, fears nothing” (2.1.17-9). Even the King’s physical appearance does not reflect his harsh treatment: the guards observe “his eyes not sunk and his complexion firm still;/ No wilderness, no distempered touch upon him” (2.1.39-40). Furthermore, he keeps his head raised high, “smiles upon his miseries” (2.1.14), and even sings, stirring sympathy bordering on awe in his captors. The influence a manacled, emaciated man can command onto foreign subjects assigned to keep him in prison is in itself remarkable.

The King’s ability to maintain high spirits is one form of defiance he employs, with the other being his readiness to embrace death and suffering before succumbing to torture. The prison guards confess to each other that they “ne’er saw before a man of such a sufferance” (2.1.2-3), and that the King “sank down to his sorrows” with the same ease “as some men to their sleeps (2.1.131-3). To the Governor’s face, the King taunts his jailer by promising to laugh in the face of torture (2.1.103). The King claims that the sufferings cannot bend him, including the

“stroke of death” which he despises (2.1.80-2). He refuses to allow the fear of death possess him, as that would allow the Governor to overtake him. Moreover, the King’s makes his death sound preferable to living in misery - not as an attempt to escape, but as another way to thwart his oppressor’s plans. “When he is dead, he is free,” note the king’s jailers ordered to keep him alive (2.1.140). Moreover, the King evokes his divine sanctity and inviolability of his office: “In death I am a king still and condemn ye” (2.3.69).

The King’s defiance of the Governor is personal, yet it evokes a martyr-like denunciation of a tormenting examiner.¹¹¹ The King calls his captor a “tyrant” (2.1.74), and defines his own station as that of moral triumph:

Governor: Are you so valiant, sir?

King: Yes, and so fortunate:

For he that holds my constancy still conquers (2.1.87-8).

Furthermore, the King further dismantles the Governor’s claim to authority based on his moral failings. According to this description, the Governor is not only cowardly, thieving, cruel, and dishonest - he is “barbarous” (2.1.108). While the King cannot become an actual Protestant martyr due to his lack of faith, he stands in for a martyr figure by opposes a tyrannical ruler who, as established earlier, represents either a Catholic or a Muslim invader.

The King’s undisputed claim to Tidore is reinstalled once he returns to his island, painting him as a figure possessing ultimate authority in the realm of the play. Thus, the native ruler’s birthright is reinforced even in the face of a potentially colonizing European power, begging the question whether the divine right to rule applies to non-Christian monarchs. And

¹¹¹ See John R. Knott, *Discourses of Martyrdom in English Literature, 1563-1694* (Cambridge: CUP, 1993), 54.

while the King is decidedly non-Christian, the play's Europeans readily interpret his return in religious terms:

Pinheiro: The King's come home again - the King.

Rui Dias: The Devil!

Pinheiro: Nay, sure he came i' God's name home: he's returned, sir. (2.6.41-2)

Whether the King actually derives his authority from a local deity or Pinheiro resorts to a familiar analogy, the Portuguese - and thus the audience - perceive the King's return as rightful. In addition, his return is accompanied by "general gladness" and "mirth" symbolizing the common people's sympathies (2.6.101, 102). Both religion and popular opinion seem to favor his return. On a realpolitik scale, the King's homecoming disrupts some of the Portuguese presence on Tidore, but it leaves the island's political fabric mostly intact. Princess Quisara is dismissed but not displaced: she is no longer the King's regent, but his heiress. The King is able to re-assume control with minimal effort, but to a drastic effect: the returned Governor can no longer attack him directly, resorting to flattery and deception. If the King needed any more reaffirmation, by the end of the play he imprisons the Governor and seizes Ternate into his hands.

By giving the Governor a firmer claim to Ternate and placing the King of Tidore into physical danger, Fletcher raises the stakes in the conflict between two sources of power: that by divine sanction and that by force. He further complicates the conflict by having the "native" and the "foreigner" switch sides, remaining ambiguous as to whether national allegiance determines the ruler's legitimacy. While Fletcher does not prescribe islanders with a religious affiliation, he makes Protestant-like virtue, piety, and martyrdom into signifiers of moral superiority.

In these works, both Shakespeare and Fletcher reinforce a right to rule originating in divine - if not quite explicitly Christian - authority, and denounce tyrannous rule based on deceit and oppression, sharing the values presented by other contemporary plays. At the same time, in faraway setting playwrights are more willing to stretch the definition of “divine” and side against unlawful seizure of territory. This sympathetic, almost lax attitude towards native islanders does not quite align with aggressive expansionist nationalism that critics detect often in early modern English dealings abroad. Returning to the questions postulated by Grotius himself, we can see an existing doubt as to the universality of any one country’s or individual’s right to rule:

Can the vast, the boundless sea be the accessory of one kingdom alone, and that not the greatest? Can any one nation have the right to prevent other nations which so desire, from selling to one another, from bartering with one another, actually from communicating with one another? Can any nation give away what it never owned, or discover what already belonged to someone else? Does a manifest injury of long time create a specific right?¹¹²

Both playwrights answer with an implicit “no,” as peaceful resolution in their works calls for alliance and collaboration instead of domination.

¹¹² Grotius, fol. 4 verso

Conclusion

The texts explored in this thesis fictionalize the experiences of royal prisoners. There is an obvious disconnect between historical and fictionalized realities. However, here I must agree with E.D. Pendry that “the artistic meaning which the playwright gave to prison, like any other institution of his day, was derived less from his own perception than from the commonplace thoughts, concrete and abstract, which he shared with his fellows but which are now unfamiliar to the modern reader.”¹¹³ While the plays do not accurately reflect what the prison meant for imprisoned royals, they do reflect what the authors imagined the prison could or should be, whether a political arena, an extension of the court, a space to safely voice discontent, or a school to instruct a ruler gone astray. Imagining royal prisoners helped authors grapple with complex ideas concerning divine right, absolutism, and the nature of the monarchy. The prison is a symbol of control, yet due to its liminal nature the prison creates a space for the prisoner to resist being controlled. Reading well-known drama through the lens of imprisonment demonstrates how playwrights are willing to speak in support of the monarchy even as they criticize its shortcomings. This fascination with dramatizing the imprisoned king precedes the actual imprisonment and execution of Charles I by many decades, giving modern scholars the opportunity to consider how Elizabethan and Jacobean portrayals of royal authority and imprisonment inform and potentially anticipate the regicide. Looking forward, applying the study of prisons to other dramatic texts can yield further insights into early modern culture.

¹¹³ Pendry, 264

Bibliography

- Ahnert, Ruth. "The Prison in Early Modern Drama." *Literature Compass* 9, no. 1 (2012): 34–47.
doi:10.1111/j.1741-4113.2011.00860.x.
- Ahnert, Ruth. *The Rise of Prison Literature in the Sixteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Atwood, Emma Katherine. "'All Places are Alike': Marlowe's Edward II and English Spatial Imagination." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 43, no. 1 (2013): 49-70.
- Bassett, Margery. "The Fleet Prison in the Middle Ages." *The University of Toronto Law Journal* 5, no. 2 (1944): 383–402.
- Bayley, John Whitcomb. *The History and Antiquities of the Tower of London: With Memoirs of Royal and Distinguished Persons, Deduced from Records, State-papers, and Manuscripts, and from Other Original and Authentic Sources*. United Kingdom: T. Cadell, 1825.
- Beardwood, Alice. "The Trial of Walter Langton, Bishop of Lichfield, 1307-1312." *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 54, no. 3 (1964): 1-45.
- Bellamy, John G. *The Law of Treason in England in the Later Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Brondarbit, Alex. "Commanding the Crown: Royal Hostages in the Wars of the Roses, 1455–83." In *Medieval Hostageship c. 700-c. 1500: Hostage, Captive, Prisoner of War, Guarantee, Peacemaker*, edited by Matthew Bennet and Katherine Weikert, 174-188. Routledge, 2017.
- Budra, Paul. *A Mirror for Magistrates and the de casibus Tradition*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000.

- Canning, Patricia. "'For I Must Nothing Be': Kings, Idols, and the Double-Body of the Sign in Early Modern England." in *Critical Survey* 24, no. 3 (2012): 1-22.
- Carlyle, Thomas. *The French Revolution: A History*. London, 1837. Project Gutenberg, www.gutenberg.org/files/1301/1301-h/1301-h.htm.
- Cartelli, Thomas. "Edward II." In *The Cambridge Companion to Christopher Marlowe*, edited by Patrick Cheney, 158-173. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Cheney, Patrick. *Marlowe's Republican Authorship: Lucan, Liberty, and the Sublime*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Deiter, Kristen. *The Tower of London in English Renaissance Drama: Icon of Opposition*. Routledge, 2011.
- Dessen, Alan C. *Elizabethan Stage Conventions and Modern Interpreters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Dobb, Clifford. "London's Prisons." In *Shakespeare Survey Volume 17: Shakespeare in His Own Age*. Edited by Allardyce Nicoll, 87-100. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.
- Doty, Jeffrey S. "Experiences of Authority in The Tempest." In *Shakespeare and the Politics of Commoners: Digesting the New Social History*, ed. Chris Fitter, 236-252. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Doty, Jeffrey S. "Shakespeare's Richard II, 'Popularity,' and the Early Modern Public Sphere." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 61, no. 2 (2010): 195-197.
- 43 *Eliz. I c.2*.
- Enterline, Lynn. *Shakespeare's Schoolroom: Rhetoric, Discipline, Emotion*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.

- Eriksson, Torsten. *The Reformers: An Historical Survey of Pioneer Experiments in the Treatment of Criminals*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1976.
- Estill, Laura. "Richard II and the Book of Life." *SEL: Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 51, no. 2 (2011): 283–303.
- Gaudet, Paul. "The 'Parasitical' Counselors in Shakespeare's Richard II: A Problem in Dramatic Interpretation." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 33, no. 2 (1982): 142–54.
- Griffiths, Paul. "Building Bridewell: London's Self-Images, 1550–1640." In *Local Identities in Late Medieval and Early Modern England*, 228-24. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Grotius, Hugo. "Mare Liberum." In *Hugo Grotius Mare Liberum 1609-2009: Original Latin Text and English Translation*, translated by Robert Feenstra. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Fletcher, John. *The Island Princess*, edited by Clare McManus. London: Arden Early Modern Drama, 2013.
- Forker, Charles R. "Unstable Identity in Shakespeare's Richard II." *Renascence* 54, no. 1 (2001): 3-22.
- Freeman, Thomas S. "The Rise of Prison Literature." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 72, no. 2 (2009): 133-146.
- Fryde, Natalie. *The Tyranny and Fall of Edward II: 1321-1326*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Halpern, Richard. "The King's Two Buckets: Kantorowicz, Richard II, and Fiscal Trauerspiel." *Representations* 106, no. 1 (2009): 67-76.
- Hammer, Paul E. J. "Shakespeare's Richard II, the Play of 7 February 1601, and the Essex Rising." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 59, no. 1 (2008): 1–35.

- Harris, Alexander. *The Œconomy of the Fleete: Or An Apologeticall Answeare of Alexander Harris (late Warden There) Unto XIX Articles Sett Forth Against Him by the Prisoners*. London: Camden Society, 1879.
- Holinshed, Raphael. *The Firste Volume of the Chronicles of England, Scotlande, and Irelande*. London, 1577. *Early English Books Online*, http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:29044:925.
- Iselin, Pierre. "Myth, Memory, and Music in Richard II, Hamlet and Othello." In *Reclamations of Shakespeare*. Edited by A. J. Hoenselaars, 173-186. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1994.
- Kantorowicz, Ernst. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016.
- Logan, Robert A. "Edward II." In *Christopher Marlowe at 450*, ed. Sarah Munson Deats and Robert A. Logan, 137-156. Routledge, 2016.
- Loomba, Ania. "'Break her will, and bruise no bone sir': Colonial and Sexual Mastery in Fletcher's The Island Princess." *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 2, no.1 (2002): 68-108.
- Marlowe, Christopher. "Edward II." In *Dr. Faustus and Other Plays*, edited by David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- McConville, Sean. *A History of English Prison Administration*. Routledge, 2015.
- Murray, Molly. "Measured Sentences: Forming Literature in the Early Modern Prison." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 72, no. 2 (2009): 147-167.

- Neill, Michael. "'Material Flames': The Space of Mercantile Fantasy in John Fletcher's 'The Island Princess.'" *Renaissance Drama* 28 (1997): 99–131.
doi.org/10.1086/rd.28.41917337.
- Norbrook, David. "The Emperor's New Body? Richard II, Ernst Kantorowicz, and the Politics of Shakespeare Criticism," in *Textual Practice* 10, no. 2 (1996): 329-357.
- Knott, John R. *Discourses of Martyrdom in English Literature, 1563-1694*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Nocentelli, Carmen. "Spice Race: The Island Princess and the Politics of Transnational Appropriation." *PMLA* 125, no. 3 (2010) 572-588.
- Pendry, Eric D. *Elizabethan Prisons and Prison Scenes, vol. 1 & 2*. Salzburg: Institut für Englische Sprache und Literatur, Universität Salzburg, 1974.
- Philips, James. "The Practicalities of the Absolute: Justice and Kingship in Shakespeare's Richard II." *ELH* 79, no. 1 (2012): 161-177.
- Pugh, Ralph Bernard. *Imprisonment in Medieval England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.
- Reese, Gertrude Catherine. "The Question of the Succession in Elizabethan Drama." *Studies in English*. 22 (1942) 59–85.
- Roberts, Leonard A. "Bridewell: The World's First Attempt at Prisoner Rehabilitation Through Education." *Journal of Correctional Education* 35, no. 3 (1984): 83-85.
- Saul, Nigel. *Richard II*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Shakespeare, William. *King Richard II*. Edited by Charles R. Forker. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2002.

- Shakespeare, William. "The Tempest". In *The Norton Shakespeare*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Suzanne Gossett, Jean E. Howard, Katharine Eisaman Maus, Gordon McMullan Greenblatt. New York and London: Norton & Company, 2016.
- Shaw, Phillip. "The Position of Thomas Dekker in Jacobean Prison Literature." *PMLA* 62, no. 2 (1947): 366-91.
- Sherman, Donovan. "'What More Remains?': Messianic Performance in 'Richard II.'" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 65, no. 1 (2014): 22-48.
- Sillitoe, Peter. "'Where Is the Court but Here?' Undetermined Elite Space and Marlowe's Edward II." *Literature Compass* 1, no. 1 (2004): 1-15.
- Strier, Richard. "I am Power: Normal and Magical Politics in The Tempest." In *Writing and Political Engagement in Seventeenth-Century England*, edited by Derek Hirst and Richard Strier, 10-30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Taylor, John. *The Praise and Vertue of a Iayle, and Iaylers*. London, 1623.
- Thompson, Karl F. "Richard II, Martyr." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 8, no. 2 (1957): 159-66.
- Tregear, Ted. "Music at the Close: Richard II in the Elizabethan Anthologies." *Studies in Philology* 116, no. 4 (2019): 696-727.
- Turner, Timothy A. "Torture and Summary Justice in 'The Spanish Tragedy.'" *SEL* 53, no. 2 (2013): 279-281.
- Vieira, Monica Brito. "Mare Liberum vs. Mare Clausum : Grotius, Freitas, and Selden's Debate on Dominion over the Seas." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 64, no. 3 (2003): 361-377. doi:10.1353/jhi.2003.0043.
- Vyroubalová, Ema, and James Robert Wood. "Propping up the King's Two Bodies in Richard II." *Early Modern Studies Journal* 4 (2011).

Ward, Kerry. *Networks of Empire: Forced Migration in the Dutch East India Company*.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Willis, Deborah. "Shakespeare's Tempest and the Discourse of Colonialism." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 29, no. 2 (1989): 277–289. www.jstor.org/stable/450475.

Wilson, Richard. "Voyage to Tunis: New History and the Old World of The Tempest," *ELH* 64, no.2 (1997): 333-57.

Wilson-Okamura, David Scott. "Virgilian Models of Colonization in Shakespeare's Tempest." *ELH* 70, no. 3 (2003) 709–737. www.jstor.org/stable/30029896.