WARRIOR WOMEN IN EARLY MODERN LITERATURE

Jessica Grace Oxendine

Dissertation Prepared for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

May 2013

APPROVED:

Jacqueline Vanhoutte, Major Professor
Diana Benet, Committee Member
Robert Upchurch, Committee Member
David Holdeman, Chair of the Department of English
Mark Wardell, Dean of the Toulouse Graduate School

Oxendine, Jessica Grace. Warrior Women in Early Modern Literature. Doctor of Philosophy (English), May 2013, 220 pp., 1 illustration, bibliography, 173 titles.

Fantasies about warrior women circulated in many forms of writing in early modern England: travel narratives such as Sir Walter Ralegh's *The Discoverie of Guiana* (1595) portray Amazon encounters in the New World; poems like Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* (1596) depict women's skill with a spear; and the plays of Shakespeare, John Fletcher, and others stage the adventurous feats of women on the battlefield. In this dissertation, I analyze the social anxieties that emerge when warrior women threaten gender hierarchies in the patriarchal society of early modern England. The battlefield has traditionally been a site for men to prove their masculinity against other men, so when male characters find themselves *submitting* to a sword-wielding woman, they are forced to reimagine their own masculine identities as they become the objects acted upon by women. In their experience of subjectivity, these literary warrior women often allude to the historical Queen Elizabeth I, whose reign destabilized ideas about gender and power in the period. Negative evaluations of warrior women often indicate anxiety about Elizabeth as an Amazon-like queen. Thus, portrayals of warrior women often end with a celebration of patriarchal dominance once the male characters have successfully contained the threat of the warrior woman through marriage or death. I argue that these depictions of containment indicate a common desire to maintain patriarchal superiority during and after Elizabeth's reign.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The UNT community has granted me copious support and encouragement throughout the writing of this project, and I am deeply grateful for the professors, colleagues, and friends who have influenced me over the years. Most especially, I am indebted to Dr. Vanhoutte, whose extensive comments and rigorous expectations have had a profound impact on all of my scholarly work. I am also grateful for Dr. Upchurch's kind and thoughtful advice throughout this project—on topics ranging from literature to horses—and for Dr. Benet's wonderful patience and charming wit. Additionally, the working lunches and coffee breaks with Christian Worlow, who also kindly and helpfully read versions of most chapters, made the process of writing much easier.

My family has always been an inspiration for me, and I am grateful for all of the Oxendines, Otts, Evanses, and Allens for their continual encouragement throughout the project. In particular, the love and support of Tom and Shirley Oxendine, my extraordinary parents, have enriched so much of my life, and I can never repay their generosity. Likewise, Ruth Evans taught me some of the most profound lessons about life and family. Finally, I am blessed to have a wonderful husband, Chris Ott, who managed to put up with me during the entire process of writing this dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Fantasies about warrior women circulated in many forms of writing in early modern England: travel narratives such as Sir Walter Ralegh's *The Discoverie of Guiana* (1595) portray Amazon encounters in the New World; popular balladry transmits tales of women assuming male attire to fight wars; poems like Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* (1596) depict women's skill with a spear; and the plays of Shakespeare, John Fletcher, and others stage the adventurous feats of women on the battlefield. These accounts suggest both fantasies and anxieties surrounding the subversion of traditional gender roles—anxieties probably evoked by the early modern period's many strong female leaders, both in England and elsewhere, and the many controversies about gynocracy. During the reigns of Mary I and Elizabeth I, men like John Knox, Anthony Gilby, John Ponet, and John Aylmer publicly debated the legitimacy of women's rule, and one of their many arguments involved women's ability to command armies during conflicts with other countries, for, according to Knox, only "monstruous" women "learned the feates of warre."[1] Mary circumvented this concern through marriage; Elizabeth avoided war until absolutely necessary. These queens knew that English subjects—men like Knox, Ralegh, and Shakespeare—might construe forays onto the battlefield as overly ambitious, even monstrous, engagements for the female gender. When these English subjects imagine warrior women in their literary works, they often allude to the larger issue of female rule, for warrior women and unmarried queens both experience agencies akin to men in the time period. In this dissertation, I analyze how literary representations of warrior women in the works of Spenser, Shakespeare, Fletcher, and Ralegh indicate social anxieties about masculine women who threaten gender hierarchies in early modern England's patriarchal society.

Literary representations of warrior women often interrogate the nature of masculine and feminine roles in society and question whether the boundaries separating those roles are as definitive as people like Robert Greene and other writers of conduct manuals wished to believe. Debates about appropriate behavior for women abounded in early modern England and arose partially out of a response to female rule and partially out of the changing economic, social, and political atmosphere of the Renaissance.[2] In depicting warrior women in literary works, male writers promote fantasies about women who might exist not only as objects of male desire but also as subjects who potentially reside on the same social and intellectual levels as men.[3] If women can enter the masculine field of battle and command armies to victory, then perhaps they can partake in companionate relationships with men in other spheres. But these writers also call attention to the danger of women's advancement into combat zones: in battle, men might find themselves *submitting* to warrior women. Thus, literature about warrior women discloses as much about men as about women, for these female characters force men to redefine their own masculine identities.

Unlike most current scholarship on subversive early modern women, this dissertation discusses portrayals of women in martial rather than political encounters. Feminist scholars who focus on socially subversive women tend to analyze women who enter the political sphere, most notably, the council chamber, as Katherine of Aragon does in Shakespeare's *Henry VIII* (1613) and Margaret of Anjou does in his *Henry VI* plays (1590-92).[4] Most of these scholars treat the battlefield as an extension of the political arena. For instance, Jean E. Howard and Phyllis Rackin discuss women in "what are now considered 'untraditional' roles—as generals leading victorious armies on the battlefield and as political actors who exercise significant power in the conduct of state affairs."[5] But Howard and Rackin generally conflate politics and war as commensurate

spheres equally affected by women's subversion. While Margaret's entrance into the council chamber directly relates to her actions on the battlefield, treating one usurpation of male space as equivalent to the other ignores subtle but important differences in the way authors represent femininity and masculinity when women stab with swords rather than with words. Furthermore, martial and political undertakings are not mutually inclusive. Katherine of Aragon, for instance, never enters the masculine space of the battlefield or assumes warrior characteristics, and Spenser's Britomart fights for amorous rather than political ambitions. Little critical attention has been given to the battlefield as a separate, albeit sometimes related, space for women to occupy. The writers of poetry and drama often depict warrior women on the battlefield not as an extension of their infringement of the council chamber but as a distinct appropriation of male space.

While chronicling warrior women who transgress against masculine and feminine roles, the male writers who circulate representations of female violence tend to reassert patriarchal dominance in the conclusions of their texts. This dissertation focuses on the way these texts ultimately suppress warrior women's more subversive qualities, for eliminating the threat that warrior women pose simultaneously reasserts patriarchal superiority. Two comprehensive studies—one historical account by Antonia Fraser and one literary account by Kathryn Schwartz—examine warrior women, but they do not consider the male writers' depictions of containment.[6] Fraser's *The Warrior Queens* explains the complex history of warrior queens on the battlefield from the ancient Greeks through the Renaissance and into the modern period, targeting the literary and historical accounts that circulated fantasies about these women.[7] Boadicea, for instance, existed both as a woman in history and as a legend that shaped perceptions about martial women in England's early periods. Historical accounts of her in

Tacitus's works, discovered in a monastic library in the fourteenth century and later translated into English, provided source material for Fletcher's *The Tragedy of Bonduca* (c. 1610-14), a play that turned history and legend into entertainment. While Fraser discusses Boadicea's legend in terms of its perennial nature, I investigate the appropriations and adaptations that the legend undergoes to meet the patriarchal ideals of an early modern audience. As I suggest in chapter IV, Fletcher and Spenser use the legend of Boadicea to make political statements about gynocracy in England.

Unlike Fraser's more historical examination of warrior women, Schwartz in *Tough Love: Amazon Encounters in the English Renaissance* provides a literary analysis of women on the battlefield but ignores their ultimate transition into less anxiety-provoking roles. Discussing a variety of genres, including travel narratives, masques, poetry, and drama, Schwartz studies the "imaginative power of the Amazons," expressed through the many accounts of them, and particularly questions the issue of their eroticism in "representations of socially deviant sexual identity."[8] Where Schwartz concentrates exclusively on references to Amazons, I extend this study to all warrior women in early modern literature, for allusions to Amazons generally imply a range of meanings not associated with all sword-wielding women. The term "Amazon" refers not only to their status as warriors but also to a way of living outside the boundaries of known civilization in communities of only women. Most of the women of my study are depicted in societies among men, and thus they become an anomaly rather than a rule in their particular social group. By beginning chapter II with a discussion of Amazons in Ralegh's *The Discoverie of Guiana*, I assert that part of the anxiety about these warrior tribes lies in the troubling potential for European women to "turn" Amazon. Ultimately, the geographically isolated Amazons of the New World offer little threat to patriarchy, but what their accounts symbolize to English society

does, particularly during the reign of an unmarried queen. Writings about warrior women often allude to Elizabeth, sometimes praising and sometimes criticizing her monarchy. Negative evaluations of warrior women often indicate anxiety about Elizabeth as an Amazon-like queen. Thus, the need to contain warrior women manifests out of a common desire to maintain patriarchal superiority during and after Elizabeth's reign. This dissertation focuses on the social and political circumstances of early modern England that affect representations of female subjectivity and female containment. While Schwartz concentrates on Amazons as figures of erotic desire, I focus on male fantasies and anxieties surrounding warrior women, whose appearance on the battlefield alters portrayals of both the male and female bodies.

Following philosophers like Nietzsche and Foucault, scholars have interpreted male and female bodies as sites of cultural production, with feminist scholars tending to emphasize the "production" as an exclusively male act. In *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism*, Elizabeth A. Grosz argues that "all knowledges and social practices have thus far represented the energies and interests of one sex alone."[9] Attempting to define a new theoretical framework for evaluating "corporeal feminism," Grosz argues

> if bodies are inscribed in particular ways, if these inscriptions have thus far served to constitute women's bodies as a lack relative to men's fullness, a mode of incapacity in terms of men's skills and abilities, a mode of women's naturalness and immanence compared with men's transcendence, then these kinds of inscription are capable of reinscription, of transformation, are capable of being lived and represented in quite different terms, terms that may grant women the capacity for independence and autonomy, which thus far have been attributed only to men.[10]

Grosz challenges the binaries of male/female, culture/nature, and subject/object to argue that women are capable of their own inscription, that they too produced cultural meanings assigned to the male and female bodies.[11] Working along a similar premise and concentrating specifically on the early modern period, Theodora A. Jankowski argues in *Pure Resistance: Queer Virginity in Early Modern Drama* that women who avoid traditional male domination over the female body are sexually subversive.[12] In this category, she includes women who either choose to remain virgins or choose their sexual partners outside of the normal social regulations for women. Male domination, she argues, manifests in the act of penetration, whereby fathers and husbands in the early modern period decided when a woman's physical body—her hymen—should undergo sexual penetration. Both Jankowski and Grosz explain women's transgression against normal social controls by undercutting the traditional view of the female body as always subsumed by male authority.

In early modern literature, the warrior woman transgresses in just this way—she subverts male dominion over her own body, typically by maintaining virginity or exploiting her own sexuality, in a way that presses against social norms. But, I argue, the warrior woman also moves beyond these attempts to control her own body by inscribing and penetrating the bodies of men with her sword, her words, or her commands. She manipulates male bodies on the battlefield. Thus, she enters into the cultural production that assigns meaning to the bodies of both genders. Shakespeare's Margaret, for instance, assumes control over her own body, both sexually and martially; she stabs York in a phallic gesture that assigns her the masculine role; and she commands the army, dismissing her own husband, now effeminized, from the field. Upon penetrating the male domain of battle, Margaret and other warrior women force men to

reinterpret notions of masculinity and femininity in a way that affects not only the male characters' perceptions of women but also the male characters' perceptions of themselves.

The writers discussed in this dissertation often depict female characters whose identity formation directly opposes their biological status as women. Scholarly investigations of male and female embodiment tend to agree that the term "sex" refers to the natural and biological sex of a man or woman and the term "gender," in a broad sense, refers to the socially acted upon body that develops meaning through its relationship to the world around it.[13] A person's gender reflects both the constructed identity of the individual and the reaction society has toward that construction. Current scholarship, in particular, has centered on the fluidity of gender roles as certain behaviors once considered appropriate for only one sex are performed by both with equal social acceptability. Even with this fluidity, however, scholars like Simone de Beauvoir and Luce Irigaray have attempted to define what it means to be "woman" or "man" and to determine how those designations affect the way individuals experience the world through their gendered bodies.[14] Representations of warrior women, today and in the early modern period, question the division between male and female gender performance.

In the Renaissance, gender constituted a decisive way to differentiate between individuals, for unlike social class or religion, gender could be ascertained by bodily—and thus seemingly authoritative—distinctions between men and women.[15] Therefore, as Stephen Greenblatt argues, "male writers of the period regarded gender as an enduring sign of distinction," wherein hierarchies could be substantiated through women's inherent inferiority.[16] Greenblatt explains that "all bodies contain both male and female elements...[, for] there are not two radically different sexual structures but only one—outward and visible in the man, inverted and hidden in the woman."[17] Renaissance belief in the "one-sex model"—a term that scholars

like Thomas Laqueur use to define the early modern conception of women's genitalia as inverted forms of men's sexual organs—suggests that warrior women's deviation from traditional gender roles not only goes against social behavioral norms but also against biological imperatives that physically define the female gender's inferiority according to early modern authorities.[18] Greenblatt explains that "one peculiar consequence of [the one-sex model] was that normal women had to submit to the weaker internal principle, to accept a certain debility, in order to achieve full female identity, an identity that itself entailed submission to a man; women were *by definition* the weaker sex."[19] The literature generally presents women who violate gender roles as unnatural because these female characters ignore the corporeal indicators of their implicit weakness. Warrior women, as I show in chapter III, often use disguise—through clothing or armor—to overcome their body's "debility." In doing so, they subvert biological and social mandates for female behavior, but the body underlying their disguise is always revealed in a way that ultimately reasserts gender distinctions.

If Sarah Colvin and Helen Watanabe-O'Kelly are correct in claiming "there is no masculinity" but "only non-femininity," then the most obvious proving ground for defining "maleness" is the battlefield, a location traditionally regulated by male desires and actions.[20] Under normal circumstances, the battlefield not only distinguishes between the genders, with a person's presence indicating his maleness, his non-femininity, but the battlefield also enables others to evaluate a man's performance of masculinity against other men. Because masculinity is an ever-shifting social construct always defined against its opposite, men in the early modern period found in war and war-like activities a way to define their identities and agencies against other men and women.[21] For this reason, tilts provided a popular and non-lethal proof of masculinity outside of the battlefield: the physical boundaries between men performing in the tilt

and women viewing from the sidelines reinforced gender distinctions. Actual and simulated combat allowed men to define masculine behaviors in contrast to the tasks normally associated with femininity. Thus, warrior women threaten one of the means of establishing male identity. If masculinity depends upon the separation of male and female tasks, then how can men confirm their superiority, which derives partially from gender, when confronted with swashbuckling women? Literary representations of warrior women depict the struggle men experience when they must reimagine how to prove their masculinity when women perform alongside and against men in war.

The literature of the period consistently portrays the efforts of male characters to contain these women within the patriarchal system. Authors often use literary warrior women to allude to the strong female rulers in England and elsewhere, so portrayals of containment indicate male writers' desire to limit the scope of female sovereignty in the early modern period. Male writers generally promote two acceptable outcomes for the warrior women's intrusion of the battlefield: (1) the woman is finally contained within the patriarchal system, usually through marriage, in a way that allows her to continue as a warrior but under the jurisdiction of men, or (2) the woman develops the reputation of monstrosity, where her excess of sexuality directly relates to her excess of masculine traits on the battlefield, and she usually suffers dire, sometimes mortal, consequences.

These attempts at containment generally involve considerations of genre: on the one hand, comedies portray warrior women's transition from martial to marital experiences and thus remove the threat to patriarchy by concluding with their submission to husbands. For instance, in Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1595), Hippolyta becomes absorbed into Theseus's Athens through a marriage that confirms her compliant role in patriarchal society. On the other

hand, history plays often show warrior women to have tragic ends that eliminate the threat they pose through the death of the women or of the family for which she fights. For instance, Fletcher's Bonduca commits suicide when her army finally succumbs to Roman advances, and the threat she poses to Rome's masculine sovereignty finally ceases. These two fates—marriage or death—suggest men's anxieties about women who can successfully usurp one of the most exclusively male experiences—fighting and killing other men. While the ample literary attention given warrior women demonstrates a particular fantasy circulating at the time, the women's fate is always affected by the anxieties of the male writers who circulate that fantasy.

Through donning armor, wielding swords, wearing breeches, and riding horses, warrior women assign themselves to masculine roles and inscribe their own bodies with meaning. In my second chapter, I employ Foucault's theories of power and subjectivity to argue that the Amazons described in works by Ralegh, Thomas Heywood, and William Painter create their own systems of power that allow them to experience subjectivity. Unlike women in English society, the Amazons live in tribes that are socially, geographically, and economically separate from men. This isolation gives them the opportunity to redefine the power relationships they have with men in outside communities while also lessening the threat such a redefinition might pose to English masculinity. For example, the geographical distance between the New World and England allows Ralegh to depict Amazons as an imaginative possibility rather than a real threat to patriarchy. As this distance lessens, however, representations of Amazons become fraught with anxieties about their ability to assume masculine roles in warfare. For instance, Radigund's city in Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* very much resembles an English community that has become Amazonian, and the need to subjugate this martial city of women suggests that their threat to patriarchy directly relates to their proximity to communities that seem English.

Amazons in *The Faerie Queene* infiltrate the world of chivalric knights and erode the boundaries separating men and women.

When warrior women enter the battlefield as either participants or commanders, they violate more than the social systems that regulate traditional gender categories; in battle, warrior women potentially penetrate men with swords, leave their own bodies open for such penetration, and command men to kill or be killed. These women experience subjectivity by acting like men. In chapters 3 and 4, I analyze how genre affects the way writers conceive of these women's subjectivity. The characters discussed in these two chapters threaten patriarchal order but are finally contained either through comic endings that subsume the woman into the marriage economy—and the male penetration that requires—or tragic endings that dramatize the woman either dying or losing her family. I focus in chapter III on Hippolyta in Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and Britomart in Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*—characters whose skills in battle uphold systems of patriarchy and who eventually submit to marriages that diffuse the threat they pose to society. While these female characters still press against social norms, they do not exceed their place by openly challenging patriarchal systems. In contrast, I transition in my fourth chapter to women who do challenge patriarchal systems—as Margaret and Joan in Shakespeare's *Henry VI* plays and Bonduca in Fletcher's *The Tragedy of Bonduca* do—and who pose such great threats to social order that only loss of power or death can contain them.

Not surprisingly, warrior women are portrayed not only in terms of their feats on the battlefield but also in terms of their sexual relationships and the ways those relationships conform or fail to conform to marriage obligations of the period. As Jankowski argues in *Pure Resistance*, women who assume control over their sexuality act against patriarchal norms.[22] Thus, virgins and whores, both of whom remove themselves from the marriage economy, are

portrayed as sexually transgressive in Protestant England. Where Jankowski distinguishes between virgins and whores, I show that warrior women tend to fall under the categories of chaste and unchaste. Interestingly, the chaste warrior women defend patriarchy with their feats on the battlefield, and, therefore, they belong to the category of women discussed in my third chapter, those who are contained within traditional comic endings. The unchaste warrior women disturb systems of patriarchy in both their desires on the battlefield and in their sexual relationships with men, and they fit into the category of women discussed in my fourth chapter, those who suffer dire consequences. The literature defines both groups as much in terms of their marital status as their martial one.

Although Hippolyta and Britomart behave like men on the battlefield, they affirm the masculinity of their mates in a way that upholds a patriarchal worldview. Britomart, for instance, defends the Knights of Maidenhead, a group that protects knights and ladies from harm, and upholds the chivalric code that permeates the epic, assigning to her body the properties associated with the masculine characteristics of honor and justice. She is the antithesis of feminine behavior—the rescue of a beloved is the quintessential act of the medieval-style male knight. Yet Britomart is responsible for saving her beloved, Artegall. Although the reversal of gender roles challenges the masculinity of other knights, reducing them to "shadowes," Artegall maintains his masculine honor even in the face of such a masculine woman. [23] As the only one who can defeat Britomart, he reestablishes the gender hierarchy in the same way that Shakespeare's Theseus contains his Amazon love in the Athenian system of patriarchy: both men "woo" with their "sword[s]."[24] As Madelon Gohlke notes, the sword becomes a metaphor for phallic penetration and emphasizes the violence necessary to maintain male dominance.[25] Artegall and Theseus safeguard patriarchy by defeating the warrior women first through battle

and next through marriage. Where scholars like Gohlke discuss the nature of man's violence, I show the warrior woman's role in maintaining the very system that propagates her own subjugation.[26] Britomart's survival as a warrior woman directly relates to her role as a defender of patriarchy, a role that saves her from developing the monstrous reputations associated with women who overstep the spaces allotted their gender. Britomart stands for chastity, one of the key virtues for women of the period, and this reputation, along with her submission to Artegall on her quest of love, saves her from the negative portrayals allotted to other warrior women in the period. Furthermore, she establishes her conformity by demolishing female rule in Radigund's city and replacing the women with men more appropriate for the position. Thus, Britomart's efforts to restore and to maintain masculine privilege mitigate her challenge to masculinity.

Unlike Britomart and Hippolyta, who press against the boundaries of social norms but reaffirm social frameworks in the process, the warrior women described in my fourth chapter assume masculine characteristics in a way that not only assigns men with feminine characteristics but also subverts the ideals of patriarchy relied upon in early modern society. These warrior women cannot be contained—sexually or otherwise—within marital structures, and their promiscuity and their swordsmanship emasculate men on both sides of the battle lines. Joan la Pucelle and Margaret in Shakespeare's *Henry VI* plays and Bonduca in Fletcher's *The Tragedy of Bonduca* demonstrate the "monstruous" qualities that warrior women potentially develop in male-ordered societies. When "Captain Margaret" banishes Henry VI from the field of battle because she and her men "prosper best of all" without her husband's presence, she demonstrates the effeminizing that occurs when a woman exceeds her gender.[27] Henry, unable to establish power over his wife, is cast in the feminine role as Margaret redefines perceptions of

his status as King of England, a title that includes the necessity of defending the kingdom from the disasters that abound during the Wars of the Roses. His failure is partially the result of Margaret's successful rewriting of her own body with the masculine characteristics that should be Henry's—she indeed steals "the breech from Lancaster" (*3 Henry VI* 5.5.25). By blurring gender binaries, Margaret contaminates the patriarchal order depended upon in the English monarchy. Anxieties about her actions, and the actions of other fighting women like Joan and Bonduca, permeate the literature about warrior women and lead male writers to contain these women within their dire outcomes.

The death or loss that these "monstruous" warrior women undergo directly relates to the failure of marriage to contain them within the patriarchal system. The early modern period relied upon the institution of marriage to regulate female sexuality—a necessity to ensure a man's heir was indeed his biological son. Women who had sex out of wedlock endangered their family lineages and proved the incapacity of their husbands to manage domestic affairs. Literary accounts of unchaste women perhaps indicate a larger anxiety about the ability of marriage—and men—to satisfactorily contain the "weaker Sex."[28] Margaret and Joan epitomize men's uneasiness about women's excessive sexual natures, for these women eliminate men's ability to use the women as commodities by having relationships outside the marriage bed. When Margaret takes Suffolk as her lover, she violates the loyalty she should have toward her king and husband. Similarly, Shakespeare explicitly alters history by turning Joan into a figure of aberrant sexuality, a sexuality he ties to her exploits on the battlefield. These warrior women remove themselves from the marriage economy and subvert traditional social frameworks. Fletcher and Shakespeare finally contain these women, but only through tragic circumstances: Bonduca commits suicide in a Cleopatra-like attempt to retain sovereignty over her person; Joan exits the

stage as an English prisoner en route to a fiery stake; and Margaret loses her husband and, more importantly, her son and heir to her enemy's swords. Their overwhelming audacity throughout the plays suggests only such horrifying conclusions could end these women's martial forays.

By depicting extreme acts of violence performed on and by warrior women, the literature of the early modern period not only demonstrates a reversal of the meanings associated with women's bodies but also suggests that the anxiety surrounding these women lies in their abilities to penetrate the male body or open the female body for others to penetrate. In my fifth chapter, I examine literary moments of violence—when a woman kills or is killed—alongside historical moments of female violence, and I argue that this ultimate corporeal inscription signals a breakdown in patriarchal systems that would subsume women under male dominance. In the literature, acts of female violence against male bodies often take place off-stage or, in non-dramatic works, outside the narrative. But when a warrior woman like Margaret "slaughter[s]" York with her "ireful arm" on stage, she becomes the man, the one who penetrates, while his body is reinterpreted in terms of the female, the body that is opened by the sword (2.1.57). Acts of violence performed by women raised anxieties in early modern England: women who killed their husbands were accused of petty treason and burned at the stake. Betrayals against immediate superiors demonstrated an upheaval in the system that perpetuated male dominance. The pamphlets and ballads about murderous women often present female violence as unnatural, particularly because it opposes women's biological status as mothers and nurturers. By comparing such "historical" events in pamphlets and ballads to the literary warrior woman's act of killing, I argue that the women's violence often reflects on their domestic roles; furthermore, the political, social, and marital institutions designed in part to contain subversive women fail to sufficiently restrain them from taking acts of bodily inscription into their own hands.

The fantasy surrounding warrior women suggests anxieties about the nature of masculinity and femininity in the early modern period. Throughout this dissertation, I demonstrate that these anxieties arose from the fear of women's control over male and female bodies. The act of killing another person or commanding troops either to kill or be killed is one of the most empowering acts a person can perform, whether by man or woman. The warrior women who insert themselves into such masculine spaces subvert the systems that perpetuate female subjugation. And, worse, they instruct other women how to gain agency with a blade.

CHAPTER II

IMAGINING THE AMAZON: MASCULINE DISCOURSE ABOUT WARRIOR WOMEN

In early modern literature, male characters often condemn women who act like Amazons: for instance, Shakespeare's Margaret of Anjou faces York's derision for behaving like an "Amazonian trull"; and his Joan la Pucelle evokes fear from Charles, the Dauphin of France, who squeals, "Stay, stay thy hands! Thou art an Amazon."[1] For Charles, the Amazon becomes a threatening figure because she potentially defeats men in battle and abuses their masculine pride. For York, Amazons transgress normal gender roles by choosing their own sexual partners outside of marriage, and he conflates Margaret's martial actions with sexual deviance. These two examples demonstrate the extent to which writers drew upon different aspects of Amazonian mythology to discuss female subjectivity.

With their ability to replace men in most economic, political, and social roles, Amazons are imagined as the ultimate threat to patriarchal authority. The revival of their mythos in early modern society demonstrates budding anxieties about the capability of women to fill male roles, as they do in Sir Walter Ralegh's *The Discoverie of Guiana* (1595), William Painter's *A Palace of Pleasure* (1575), and Thomas Heywood's *The exemplary lives and memorable acts of nine the most worthy women in the world* (1618), three texts about Amazon tribes that I consider in this chapter. In creating their own political, social, and economic systems, Amazons perform tasks equivalent to men in early modern England, and they even control procreation when they choose their own sexual partners and thereby use men as objects under their authority. In this chapter, I use Foucault's concepts about subject formation to show that representations of Amazons explore the ways in which women can develop agency in early modern England. The most extreme anxiety about the warrior women discussed in later chapters of this dissertation lies in

the potential for all warrior women to turn Amazon—that is, to so completely overpower men that they are no longer needed in society, as Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* (1596) illustrates. Radigund transforms a chivalric city in Faery Lond, a locale meant to allegorically represent Elizabethan England, into an Amazon kingdom that places men in subordinate roles. I argue that the Amazons emerge in the early modern imagination in response to anxieties about female sovereignty; the closer representations of Amazonian societies come toward resembling English civilization, the more anxiety-ridden these representations become, culminating in a temporary breakdown of patriarchy in *The Faerie Queene*—a breakdown that lasts until Britomart violently reasserts gender hierarchies.

Discourses about Amazons often evoke representations of Elizabeth I as a warrior queen, and they are particularly prevalent during the Spanish Armada's invasion and during James I's reign when English subjects nostalgically looked back on the reign of the stalwart queen. Although she never referred to herself as an Amazon, probably because the myth portrays dangerous ideas about female power, Elizabeth, at times, was portrayed as a warrior. For instance, James Aske in *Elizabetha Triumphans* (1588) applauds Elizabeth as "the Amazonian Queene" who successfully defends her country from the battlefield of Tilbury.[2] Aske's praise of Elizabeth, however, contradicts other representations of Amazons, as Mary Villeponteaux observes. As potential figures for Elizabeth, Amazons, according to Villeponteaux, "were almost always portrayed positively on stage," but works like Painter's *Palace of Pleasure* also depict the darker side to these representations, where Amazons become "monstrous" figures who overpower men and murder male children.[3] In this chapter, I show how representations of Amazons offer differing interpretations of gynocracy in England, where Elizabeth demonstrated the very real possibility for women to participate in the processes of subject formation.[4]

Imagining Elizabeth as the most supreme Amazon Queen, Ralegh demonstrates writers' discursive ability to rewrite Elizabeth's myth to suit political purposes. According to Ralegh, Elizabeth ruled as the "greatest commaunder" even over the "Empire of the *Amazones*."[5] Because Amazons present a danger to masculine authority, they often appear in writings that concentrate on masculine attempts to conquer the unknown world in which Amazons reside. Ralegh, for instance, elevates his own position as an explorer of and writer about the New World. He places himself in an authoritative position over the Amazon myth: as the man who brings to European audiences stories about Amazons, Ralegh exercises discursive power over depictions of Amazonian mythology, which he presents as reality, and over the representations of Elizabeth that he includes. His attempts to rewrite these myths show that, as Michael Hattaway says of Spenser's Radigund, Amazons represent "a challenge to male hegemony" that must be contained through the masculine inscriptive power of representation.[6]

In this chapter, I concentrate on three conceptions of women who hold power: 1) the traditional portrayal of Amazons in Ralegh's *The Discoverie of Guiana*, in Painter's *A Palace of Pleasure*, and in Heywood's *The exemplary lives and memorable acts of nine the most worthy women in the world*; 2) the mythologizing of Elizabeth as a warrior queen in the texts of Ralegh and Anne Bradstreet and in an engraving by Thomas Cecil; and 3) Spenser's revision of the Amazonian myth in Radigund's city. By using Foucault's conceptions of power relations, I show that by replacing men with women in the performance of most activities, including battle, Amazons develop a unique form of subjectivity. While Ralegh, Heywood, and Painter insist upon Amazons' ability to establish their own forms of power, they also demonstrate the power of representation that the writers hold over Amazonian mythology. *The Discoverie of Guiana*, for instance, demonstrates Ralegh's ability to revise English conceptions of Amazons in the New

World in a way that comments on female government. This critique becomes even more pronounced with Spenser, who usually champions gynocracy but chooses to include a narrative about the disastrous effects of female rule.

1. The Amazon Threat: Women's Subversive Potential in the Works of Ralegh, Painter, and Heywood

When Ralegh, Painter, and Heywood characterize Amazonian subjectivity, they imagine women whose feminine traits have been emptied out and replaced by masculine attributes. These women differ from early modern women in both social organization and individual physicality. They prove capable in battle, in economic exchanges, and in political affairs, rivaling men in their competence. Using Foucault's discussions about subject-formation, I show in this part how the power dynamics in early modern England influenced representations of Amazon societies. The male writers who perpetuated the quasi-historical, quasi-mythical accounts of these warrior women imagined them in terms of male applications of power: living in a society that privileged male subjectivity and female objectivity, these writers produced Amazon societies from a patriarchal point of view. Louis Montrose argues that "the matriarchal, gynocratic Amazons are the radical Other figured but not fully contained by the collective imagination of European patriarchy"; I extend Montrose's argument to show that Ralegh's reinterpretation of Greek Amazonian stories elevates his own position as explorer and writer through his unique ability to know the Amazons, to write their stories, and to connect England to the New World through his account.[7] Thus, the Amazonian myth mitigates fears about female rule by situating it outside the bounds of civilization. Discussing geography, Kathryn Schwarz connects the Amazon myth to a fantasy for New World wealth, arguing that "as mythical objects, Amazons can never be found,

identifying the edge of knowable space by remaining just beyond it. But for explorers they are also linked to all the objects that *can* be found, from gold to cannibals to women to land."[8] But Schwarz's analysis does not account for the writers' insistence upon the historicity of Amazons, which, I argue, allows Ralegh, Painter, and Heywood to regain control over the very women they present as autonomous. Amazons remain unknowable until explorers and writers can traverse the geographical and, in the case of Painter and Heywood, chronological boundaries separating European audiences from these tribes of women. Through discourse, Ralegh, Painter, and Heywood affirm their superiority over European readers by their superior knowledge of what goes on at the boundaries of civilization. Thus, they exercise masculine inscriptive power even as they insist upon Amazonian subjectivity.

The gendered power dynamics in works about Amazons relate to theoretical discussions of duality and of subjectivity, two concepts that modern feminists use to examine the cultural production that assigns meanings to male and female bodies. The Cartesian model has expressed men and women in terms of duality, with men related to *mind* and women to *body*. Such a relationship promotes the idea of men as rational subjects and women as corporeal objects—a relationship that historically insists upon one (the man) holding power over the other (the woman). Theories of duality have led feminist scholars and activists in at least three directions: 1) some feminists feel women must appropriate *mind* over *body* to become subjects like men; 2) some embrace women's bodies as essential to femininity, with femininity and masculinity occupying equal but different parts of society; and 3) some eliminate the mind-body duality entirely, stressing that the body is not *my* body—an object that belongs to me—but rather is *me*.[9] The commonality in these theories lies in women's desire to become *subjects*, a word that refers to thinking individuals acting in the world rather than objects that are acted upon. The subject

experiences autonomy. Rather than separating the mind from the body, as modern feminists advocate, Amazons eliminate the male sex entirely. They thereby develop as subjects without appealing to the methods that feminists propose for modern women. Because no man acts upon them, either from within their tribe or from without, Amazons exist in a separate but seemingly equal relationship with the male tribal culture of the New World. Their separate but equal status represents a proto-feminist form of female subjectivity arrived at through extreme alienation from societies of men.

Because subjectivity is historically situated in the male, the male writers imagine Amazons as masculine women, particularly in the way these women assign meaning to their own bodies and to their own social structures. To understand gendered power dynamics, many scholars have turned to Foucault, whose pivotal works on power, which include *Discipline and Punish*, *The History of Sexuality* part 1, and "The Subject and Power," interrogate the means by which "human beings are made subjects."[10] As previously mentioned, power relationships between individuals inevitably turn one person into the subject and one into the object; this relationship exists because discourses (like the dialogue between a doctor and patient) or institutions (like the prison) have established the sovereignty of one person over another (for example, a jailer over a prisoner, a teacher over a student, or—historically—a man over a woman).[11] Often, this control manifests in social understandings about the body, about activities that body can perform, and/or about discourses relating to those activities. For instance, the priest maintains power in the confessional because he has the ability to probe an individual's inner thoughts and actions, to assess their acceptability, and to sanction or assign punishment.[12] Those actions involve regulations on the body, like restricting procreation to married couples or limiting excessive alcohol. Although Foucault generally avoids discussions of gender, he

provides a framework for understanding how women in the early modern period might have understood their place in society. Like the priest in the confessional, men established the laws concerning both genders and judged the social acceptability of certain behaviors for women and for men; thus, men exercised power over women. At times, these controls manifested in specific laws, like those pertaining to women's dress or to their ability to hold certain offices.[13] At other times, these controls were embedded in their society, where men and women gossiped about uncivil behavior or shunned individuals who failed to meet certain standards, as Norbert Elias argues in *The Civilizing Process*.[14] Thus, the legal and social spheres influence the way individuals act by motivating certain behaviors and by judging those behaviors.

Widespread ideas about the female body in the early modern period affected the way writers conceptualized Amazons. The bodies of men and women, according to Foucault, are "imprinted by history" and become "the inscribed surface of events."[15] At any given time and place in history, societies give particular meanings to individuals' bodies. Commonplaces associated with issues like patriarchy, chastity, maternity, and physicality determined the way people in the early modern period understood gender hierarchies. Society justified male superiority through ideas about female weakness, particularly in women's incapacity during menstruation or pregnancy, their perceived physical weakness while wearing movement-constraining corsets or while riding sidesaddle, or their corporeal duty to create legitimate sons who would continue the family line. Conversely, the relative superiority of the male body, which could enter political and martial engagements, move about freely in both city and country, or enter professions like law or blacksmithing, became the obvious site of authority in the period.

Unlike most historical women living in early modern England, Amazons in literary texts transgress normal gender roles not by altering patriarchal structures but by eliminating them;

thus, Amazons develop their own Foucauldian form of subjectivity. Resisting the male-female duality proves difficult in societies that privilege patriarchy because no single individual determines who holds power; rather, a "technique, a form of power" dictates which group rules over another:

> This form of power applies itself to immediate everyday life which categorizes the individual, marks him by his own individuality, attaches him to his own identity, imposes a law of truth on him which he must recognize and which others have to recognize in him. It is a form of power which makes individuals subjects.[16]

If this "form of power" grants subjectivity only to men, then women cannot become subjects without first forcing the form of power to extend to them, too. The female characters I discuss in this chapter successfully alter the way others, including the early modern readers of literary works, understand women's roles in society. Ralegh, Heywood, and Painter imagine the Amazons creating their own government, their own social structure, and their own customs in a way that composes a form of power unique to their desires.

Heywood depicts the Amazons forging a newly structured society through violence and through the reversal of traditional gender roles; this new society proves necessary to these women's deployment of power in the early modern literary imagination. Heywood describes how these women, before becoming Amazons, live in patriarchal societies where they show obedience toward their husbands and prefer male children. However, when many of their husbands and sons die in battle, the women arm themselves for war, avenging their lost families and protecting their society. Upon experiencing these masculine duties, they develop a thirst for power so great that they kill any remaining men and constitute their society of women. In telling this myth of Amazonian origins, Heywood passes implicit judgment on male and female roles:

after experiencing the subjectivity involved in masculine actions like war and leadership, how could women return to their roles as objects under male control? According to his version, men clearly have the more sought-after position, one desired by both sexes. Heywood does not imagine the women obtaining agency alongside men; rather, the women must replace the men to form their own social organization, their own forms of power, and their own codes of normal behavior.

Heywood's origin myth offers a startling scenario: if Amazons arise out of patriarchal societies, then early modern women might turn against their fathers and husbands given the right circumstances. These *circumstances* may have appeared imminent: throughout Europe, women like Mary Tudor, Elizabeth Tudor, Mary of Guise, and Mary Stuart had come to occupy an unprecedented number of ruling positions. In the years leading to the Renaissance, countries outside of England witnessed several women involved in military engagements: Caterina Sforza fought against Cesare Borgia; Isabella d'Este controlled Mantua's military while her husband was imprisoned; and Captain Jean de Dunois, the Bastard of Orléans, supposedly "formed a brigade of 350 women to build fortifications."[17] Isabella I of Castile, Catherine of Aragon's mother, was also said to encourage troops with her presence in full armor on the battlefield.[18] In London, Shakespeare's history plays staged Margaret's and Joan's feats in war.[19] Gynocracy in England spurred literary interest in strong women throughout history, especially after the Spanish Armada plunged Elizabeth into a martial role. Historical warrior women prevailed as exceptions to masculine authority, for although they understood the agency that mythical Amazon women seize, they rarely overturned patriarchal normalcy. For example, Shakespeare shows Margaret defending her son's inheritance and Joan fighting for French victory—both motivations that defend the forms of power in English history. Moreover, women like Elizabeth

managed to change the forms of power to extend to them in a way that corresponds to Foucault's conceptions of power: the form of power "categorize[d]" Elizabeth as an "individual" and others "recognize[d]" her subjectivity. Elizabeth's status as an *exception* was confirmed when a male monarch regained England's throne without any readily apparent change to women's overall position in society. Although patriarchy endured the martial actions of these women, the possibility of Amazons emerging from a population of English queens and wives problematizes accounts of warrior women during the period.

Amazons make economic and political decisions necessary to form a society of autonomous women. Ralegh depicts them as consciously making decisions—even about potentially private concerns like reproduction—for the well-being of their society. For instance, Ralegh describes Amazons' desire "to increase their owne sex and kinde," with "kinde" referring not only to gender but also to the "kinde" of society belonging to them (65). Because Amazon societies generally lack men, the only way to increase their population is to breed females. Additionally, they acquire wealth through autonomous relationships with other tribes. For instance, their money comes from the sale of "greene stones," which allows them to amass a "great store of…plates of golde" (65). In this system of government, the women experience agency in economic exchange with patriarchal societies. They seem to maintain a system of reciprocity with other tribes, whereby neither Amazons nor male tribes experience agency over the other. Their separation from other societies allows them to emerge as subjects, developing their own form of power equal to the one experienced by men in surrounding areas.

Amazon societies treat procreation much like they treat economic exchanges: they engage in a system of reciprocity with men that works for both sides. Amazons collaborate with men from other tribes to maintain their matriarchal lineage. Unlike the joint roles of English

married couples, Amazons forge sexual relationships that allow them to continue as independent and autonomous leaders of their own societies. In England, marriage assumed a male courtship, a contract between father and husband-to-be, and a wedding to finalize access to the bride. Men sought wives who could provide companionship, maintain a proper household, and produce male heirs to perpetuate the patriarchal lineage. In contrast, Amazons seek no male companion, no marriage, and no male heir. Only the woman has any meaning in their society. Ralegh's Amazons "accompanie with men but once in a yeere, and for the time of one moneth," during which the Amazon queen chooses her mate while the "rest cast lots for their *Valentines*" (63). Except for the queen, Amazons remove attraction and companionship from consideration with their random selection of mates. Similarly, the African and Asian Amazons of Painter's and Heywood's texts "[hold] the masculine sex in meere contempt," eliminating men from their society except when necessary for reproductive purposes.[20] By denying or killing their mates, Amazons reduce men to objects needed for a single purpose and soon dismissed. In sexual encounters, Amazons experience agency, for they control the uses of men's bodies much like men control women's bodies in early modern patriarchal societies.

The violence Amazons commit against their male children suggests that their reversal of traditional gender roles leads them to disassociate from their maternal role. In societies from Ancient Greece to modern day China, the male child has experienced an elevated position of privilege over the female child, at times leading to infanticide or abortion of female children. In early modern accounts, Amazons, however, normally eliminate male children: Heywood argues that "all the male children borne unto them they strangled" (101); Ralegh and Painter depict Amazons taking male children to their fathers except when they "by chaunce…kept any backe," in which case, they "murdred them, or else brake their armes and legs in sutch wise as they had

no power to beare weapons, and serued for nothynge else but to spin, twist, or to doe other feminine labour."[21] Amazons reduce men to women's roles, a scenario that Spenser chronicles in *The Faerie Queene*'s depiction of Radigund's city of Amazons, where only the men perform the tasks of "spinning …[and] twisting linnen."[22] Painter, according to Villeponteaux, "makes the perversion of the maternal role central to the definition of what an Amazon is."[23] As Amazons resist the roles of nurturer and child raiser, at least pertaining to male children, they negate the primary bodily experience associated with women: motherhood. One of women's primary biological functions is to give life, so Amazons' dismissal of half their progeny goes against their biological nature. Without male children, the women pass subjectivity on to their daughters, making them the only—and, therefore, strongest—sex.

After eradicating the male child, Amazons are often depicted as marking the female child with decidedly masculine characteristics through the mutilation of one breast. Traditional stories, those like Painter's and Heywood's, describe Amazons as severing the right breast in order to better use a bow, their preferred weapon: they "perceyued that their breastes did very much impech the vse of that weapon [the bow], and other exercises of armes, [so] they seared vp the right breasts of their yonge daughters" (Painter 160).[24] This marking of the child demonstrates a physical blurring of gender. Amazons deny femininity through the severed breast and affirm it through the intact one. The breast they keep serves the womanly function of providing milk to young; the one they sever enhances the manly use of the bow. Interestingly, Ralegh repudiates any breast mutilation among his New World Amazons, showing that this particular practice, which accompanies accounts of Amazons in Asia and Africa, is not universal.[25] Yet Ralegh's mention of their breasts shows how inculcated their fantasy is with this type of bodily change and how open their accounts are to revision.

From a young age, Amazons are taught to fashion themselves with masculine attire and weapons that change the way outsiders view their bodies. For example, Heywood describes Camilla as being

> Brought up in the Woods, and Forrests, and fed with the milke of wilde beasts… [and] growing to maturity, cast aside the action of those common exercises, whose practise belong to women, as the Needle, the Web, and the like, but cloathing herselfe in the skinnes of savage beasts, she followed Hunting and the Chase, using the Iavelin, the Bow and Quiver, and to outstrip the Hart in running, and in the warres…. (97)

Much of this description casts Camilla as savage, learning her abilities at arms from an early age among wild animals. Her clothing marks her as masculine not only because she wears men's clothing but also because the clothing renounces the skills allotted to women in early modern societies. She clothes herself not in items she has sewn but with skins of animals she has killed. Furthermore, her use of weapons to hunt prepares her for the war between Turnus and Aeneas in Virgil's *The Aeneid*. Like many of the other Amazon warriors in the works of Painter, Heywood, and Ralegh, she is portrayed as having masculine attire and abilities.

Unlike male warriors, however, Amazons have the ability to appear either masculine or feminine to accomplish their desires. Quoting Valerius Flaccus, Heywood shows how Penthesilea changes her appearance to defeat men in battle:

> And from her steede sharpe arrows shoote
> to gall her armed foes:
> No sooner was the battaile done
> …Her golden helme laid by,

But whom by armes she could not take,

she captiv'd with her eye. (104)

Penthesilea can combat men with weapons *and* with beauty. When she removes her "golden helme," she makes an active choice to captivate her enemies with her feminine allure, but her first choice, according to this passage, is the use of weapons. The duality of feminine beauty and warrior strength also appears in *The Faerie Queene* when Radigund's "sunshynie helmet" comes off during the fight with Artegall, causing him to abandon the battle and to become her thrall, for he "to her yeelded of his owne accord" (5.5.17). The verb "captiv'd" in Heywood's passage similarly suggests the willing defeat of those who fight Penthesilea. The chivalrous knight, as Spenser's Artegall exemplifies (see chapter III), can battle the sword and the bow but cannot destroy a woman once her visage is revealed. Amazons have the alarming ability to use traits related to both genders in order to accomplish their desired victory.

Ralegh, Heywood, and Painter define these women's societies by the way they differ from those of early modern England; the writers concentrate on the traditional expectations of women in English society rather than altering their examination to correspond with Amazonian values and social structures. They describe Amazons' relationships with men, their childrearing customs, and their breast mutilation—all subjects related to their gender and made remarkable through comparisons with women in England. Although Amazons generally assume masculine characteristics through their warrior natures, their male attire, and their outright sovereignty, reports of them focus more on their denial of traditional feminine roles than on their assumption of masculine roles. The writers contrast Amazons with the known and expected in early modern society, where women transitioned from their fathers' control to their husbands' with the marriage contract.[26] Early modern expectations of women revolved around the proper control

over women's bodies—the control of a father over his daughter and of a husband over his wife legally and sexually. By not defining themselves by these standards, Amazons exist not only outside of the geographical boundaries of the civilized world but also outside of the patriarchal social structures that civilization produced.

The discourses the writers created to describe Amazons demonstrate an attempt to secure patriarchy's continuance within the known world, a world geographically and culturally separated from that of the Amazon warriors across the globe. Ralegh, Painter, and Heywood insist upon the historical veracity of Amazons, even attacking those who doubt the authenticity of their accounts. Heywood, for instance, harps on the "stupids" who in their "ignorance" think "that never in the world was Amazon" (94). For Ralegh, belief in Amazons was akin to belief in New World gold. He needed European audiences, especially Elizabeth, to read his accounts as historical fact so that he could garner support among the queen's court and more funds for future trips. Thus, he links Amazons to his search for El Dorado, a truth that exists but has yet to be fully discovered. In historicizing these women, these writers attempt to *know* the Amazons, to understand them, and to control the way Amazonian society transfers into text and into the early modern imagination. The writers unquestionably act as subjects over their texts—the objects—that they transform through language. Thus, writing Amazon history is an attempt to possess them and to incorporate them into the masculine historical record, one that promotes patriarchy over Amazonian gynocracy as the social order of the time.

By insisting that Amazons exist, the writers establish their own subjectivity over European readers through their unique ability to track these women across the globe. Heywood's and Painter's Amazons live in Africa or Asia, just beyond the borders of known civilization; Ralegh's Amazons thrive in the New World, a newly discovered but not yet known site of

possibility. Placing them there gives writers a sense of mastery over these women that others in the European world lacked: Ralegh *knew* of the Amazons, like El Dorado, because he spoke to locals personally; Europeans could *learn* of the Amazons through Ralegh, giving him a place of subjectivity over that knowledge and over those who garnered knowledge from him. Their questionable status in history causes many people to view Amazons as myths, a situation that allows the male writer to use 'sightings' and rumors of them to his own advantage. The possibility of them being there allows travelers to freely reinvent the nature of Amazonian societies, as Ralegh does when he claims that unlike other "histories" about Amazons that involve breast mutilation, the New World Amazons do not partake in such practices (63). In being "desirous to vnderstand the truth of those warlike women," Ralegh expresses the same sentiments as other explorers and, more importantly, his readers, who must separate fact from fiction and choose to believe Ralegh's second-hand account or not (63). Without seeing actual Amazons, Ralegh, like others, may subsume the mythology of them within his own inscriptive power—and the continuation of mythology through written language is a powerfully inscriptive (and masculine) force.

2. Elizabeth I as Amazon

Amazonian myths promoted a vision of female sovereignty that uneasily alludes to Elizabeth, though much scholarly debate attempts to show the overtly dangerous implications of figuring Elizabeth as an Amazonian queen. As antithetical figures to early modern social structures, Amazons, according to Celeste Turner Wright and Montrose, evoked a mythology about dangerous women—husband murderers and child killers—who, even in the most positive accounts, never became a figure appropriated by Elizabeth. Wright argues that

> The [female] sex is by nature irascible through an excess of bile; and hence the Amazons, lacking male guidance, observed no sort of decorum….No characteristic of the classical Amazons is more frequently noted than their cruelty. Small wonder, therefore, that Elizabeth herself is apparently never called an Amazon even by those contemporaries who admire the beauty and courage of the type; the complaint might have been misconstrued.[27]

Likewise, Montrose concurs that Amazon "associations must have been too sinister to suit the personal tastes and political interests of the Queen."[28] Elizabeth aligned herself with other martial figures, like Deborah and Diana, in her Cult of the Virgin Queen, but seemingly avoided any connections to the warlike women who had recently reentered the English imagination in histories about antiquity and travel narratives about the New World. Although Elizabeth never called herself an Amazon, her subjects used myths about the Amazons to make political statements during and after her reign, notably in the travel narrative of Ralegh, an engraving by Cecil, and a poem by Bradstreet. As Winfried Schleiner notes, figurations of the queen as a warrior were strongest during the decade after the Spanish Armada attacked, when England had need of imagining her as a sovereign warrior queen.[29] By questioning what the figure of the Amazon contributes to the myth of Elizabeth as a warrior queen, I suggest that imagining the queen as an Amazon creates dangerous implications about female rule in England. Clearly, the safest time to make connections between Elizabeth and Amazons occurred after the queen's death.

In representations of them, Amazons have the capacity to rewrite power relationships between men and women through their ability to redefine the way early modern society understood their gendered roles. Uniquely, accounts of these women show them experiencing

subjectivity through their geographical separation from patriarchal societies, for even the tribes of men in the New World live separately from the Amazons. Elizabeth, on the other hand, lived among the men she ruled, developing as a subject in spite of her circumstances. Although not technically a warrior in the way of the Amazons, Elizabeth underwent the same revision to the meanings associated with her. I propose that, in the case of Elizabeth, the blurring of gender binaries becomes necessary to the deployment of a martial reputation, and although she never carried a sword into battle, her image was revised to reflect current political needs to see her as a warrior, as an Amazon if need be—with all of the connotations of self-determination and even cruelty that image entails.

In *The Discoverie of Guiana,* Ralegh invites comparison between Elizabeth and the Amazons:

> Her Maiesty hereby shall confirme and strengthen the opinions of al nations, as touching her great and princely actions. And where the south border for *Guiana* reacheth to the Dominion and Empire of the *Amazones,* those women shall heereby heare the name of a virgin, which is not onely able to defend her owne territories and her neighbors, but also to inuade and conquere so great Empyres and so farre remoued. (221)

For the most part, Ralegh's succinct discussion of the Amazons in *The Discoverie of Guiana* is a "digress[ion] from [Ralegh's] purpose," yet, of all the people he describes in detail, he notably evokes these warrior women in a passage about Elizabeth and places her above them. Equally able to "defend…territories" and "inuade…Empyres," the historical queen and the quasi-mythical Amazons represent the blurring of gender roles that necessarily occurs when women hold power over men (63). In his laudatory vision, Ralegh insists upon Elizabeth's superiority over the tribe of women and paints her as the most supreme Amazon, the conquering warrior

who defeats the New World, not in deed but in name, the discourse elevating her over all New World wealth and mystery.

Like the Amazons, who appear in mythological stories that only explorers like Ralegh can discover and bring to European readers, Elizabeth, in Ralegh's vision, appears as a "name" that the Amazons might hear from various travelers to their realm. Rather than having significance to European powers, the name of Elizabeth conveys meaning to the Amazons. Naming was a powerful tool that European powers used to claim areas of the New World. Discussing the naming of Virginia after Elizabeth, Montrose argues that "Elizabeth participates in an emergent colonist discourse that works to justify and, symbolically, to effect the expropriation of what it discovers."[30] Elizabeth "denies the natural right of possession to indigenous peoples" through discourses that "write" upon the land through naming it.[31] The naming of Virginia has as much to do with European powers as with local tribes, for as the land becomes an object to be claimed, it becomes something that England can own and that thereby cannot be owned by Spain and other European countries. Naming was part of the conquest over land. Interestingly, the Amazon River was named for the illustrious women who may or may not have lived at its end, so the Amazons became part of New World geography. In Ralegh's account, the discourse of naming relates to sovereignty rather than geography. *Elizabeth* becomes the myth, the one who can be known only through the accounts of others—accounts carried over the ocean by *men*. In Ralegh's statement, these men contain this myth of the Virgin Queen, figuring her as an Amazonian queen when it suits the purpose of the storyteller. In the *Discoverie of Guiana*, she is both historical and mythological. Representations of her prove capable of mutation, giving immediacy to certain situations that necessitated the myth of an Amazon-like queen.

Far from being only an object under masculine authority, Elizabeth consciously evoked a myth of herself as a warrior when the Spanish Armada attacked, and as the myth grew, it was appropriated by others who exaggerated her martial characteristics. After years of supporting Protestant revolts in the Netherlands and in France and accepting treasure and merchandise stolen from Spanish ships by Sir Francis Drake, Elizabeth finally incensed Philip II of Spain enough for him to send his famous Armada against England. Though much of the fighting was expected to occur in the ocean, Elizabeth's admirals feared the Spanish fleet could sail up the Thames River to assault London. Elizabeth's lieutenant general, the Earl of Leicester, stationed an army at Tilbury in preparation for such an event and invited the queen to rally the troops there.

Critics debate the extent of the queen's involvement at Tilbury, but most agree that on August 9, 1588, Elizabeth delivered a speech that presented her as the martial defender of her people.[32] Some biographers claim that Elizabeth rode a grey horse while carrying a truncheon.[33] A now much disputed legend proposes that the queen wore armor. Some of the reports of Elizabeth at Tilbury clearly came from eyewitnesses, but others perhaps derived from second-hand accounts, making their accuracy questionable. What is commonplace among them, however, is the desire to picture Elizabeth as masculine. Elizabeth's first biographer, William Camden (1551-1623), fashions "the Queen with a masculine Spirit…riding about through the Ranks of Armed men drawn up on both sides of her, with a Leader's Truncheon in her Hand, sometimes with a martiall Pace."[34] Thomas Deloney describes her as arriving in "princely robes" that befit "being King HENRY'S royal daughter."[35] James Aske characterizes her as "marching kinglike-on" with "the courage of her Sire" as she surveys the "warlike show" of the mock battles her soldiers performed for her.[36] These accounts fashion Elizabeth as a warrior king, not

only with the female body natural of a woman standing on the field but also with the male body politic of a warrior. Camden, Deloney, and Aske envision her martial inheritance from her father, whose warrior spirit seems in this moment to imbue his normally peaceful daughter.[37]

The accounts of Camden, Deloney, and Aske are consistent with the identity Elizabeth constructed: she aligned herself with Henry, deriving from him her right to rule and her fortitude in military encounters. Even in her youth, she claimed to be "indebted to [Henry] not as an imitator of [his] virtues but indeed as an inheritor of them."[38] Her speech at Tilbury accentuates her martial undertaking:

> … I am come among you…resolved in the midst and heat of the battle to live and die amongst you all, to lay down for my God and for my kingdom and for my people mine honor and my blood even in the dust. I know I have the body but of a weak and feeble woman, but I have the heart and stomach of a king and of a king of England too—and take foul scorn that Parma or any prince of Europe should dare to invade the borders of my realm. To the which rather than any dishonor shall grow by me, I myself will venter my royal blood; I myself will be your general, judge, and rewarder of your virtue in the field.[39]

By "com[ing] among" her soldiers, Elizabeth aligns with martial queens like Margaret and Boadicea, for the speech linguistically presents her not just as a commander but also as a warrior who engages in the "heat of battle." The warrior women in English history often had contradictory reputations in the early modern period. For example, Margaret and Boadicea both appear in Wright's list of "female worthies"—those praiseworthy women who appear as characters in masques and celebrations for Elizabeth.[40] Margaret and Boadicea also appear as voracious, murderous characters in contemporary plays. Elizabeth's appearance on the field

potentially draws upon both reputations. In reality, Elizabeth never fought and barely commanded her soldiers, assigning Leicester to that role, but the speech avows her commitment to the battle, as though she intends to give her "royal blood" to protect England from invasion. Although Elizabeth presented herself as a peaceful ruler for much of her reign, she altered that image when her people and her country needed a martial "king."

The idea of Elizabeth as a warrior woman elicited much contention among her contemporaries. Before her reign, political treatises expounded the inherent complications of gynocracy during times of war, for writers like John Knox were bothered by the possibility that any queen could be both woman and warrior. Writing against the regiments of Mary Tudor and Mary of Guise, Knox condemns "monstruous" women who "made expenses vpon weapons and learned the feates of warre, hauinge more pleasure to fight, then to mary and be subject to man."[41] George Buchanan, in *History of Scotland*, writes, "'tis no less unbecoming a Woman to pronounce Judgment, to levy Forces, to conduct an Army, to give a Signal to the Battle, than it is for a Man to teiz Wool, to handle the Distaff, to Spin, or Card, and to perform the other Services of the weaker Sex."[42] While Knox attacks women who physically enter the foray of battle, Buchanan denounces women who act as commanders, explicitly excluding women from all aspects of war. One of the major duties of a king involved commanding the armies, so the expectations associated with Elizabeth's role created a paradox. As king, she must command; as woman, she must not. The general anxiety surrounding the "weaker Sex" arose from the gender-specific roles that excluded women from wielding swords as vehemently as men from embroidering fabric. In order to lead successfully during war, Elizabeth had to grapple with gender expectations that popular political writers used to regulate the queen's female body.

Metaphorically situating her war-like abilities into a male body politic mitigated the role of her female body natural during war, but this separation of her roles into two bodies disregards allusions to Amazons and the ability of the female to acquire martial characteristics. Carole Levin argues that Elizabeth's "multi-layered self-presentation" on the field of Tilbury and elsewhere creates "two images of the queen, one male, the other female."[43] Although the male body politic resided within her as the unseen part she inherited from Henry, the female body natural visibly connoted powerlessness.[44] Levin focuses on Elizabeth's dual nature as male and female monarch, but an examination of Elizabeth as an Amazon adds another layer to the complex meanings Elizabeth assigned to her body. Separating the male body politic and the female body natural—giving Elizabeth two bodies—situates the martial powers in the male part of her. Yet comparing her to an Amazon incorporates her martial prowess in the feminine body, turning her into a warrior woman. The myth of the Amazon in connection to Elizabeth heightens the sense of female agency that she experiences while transforming representations of her as a warrior woman into potentially subversive moments of Amazon-like power.

The construction of Elizabeth's identity occurred simultaneously inside and outside of her control. For example, Elizabeth used the goddess Diana to promote an idea of her as the Virgin Queen, a connection that led to the moon becoming a symbol for Elizabeth, while during the same period writers like Shakespeare and Lyly embellished this image, critiquing and praising it in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1595) and *Endymion* (1588). Helen Hackett discusses this type of fashioning in conjunction with the cult of the Virgin Mary, claiming that "whether or not Elizabeth was in control of her own deployment in the spectacle, she certainly was deployed as a symbol."[45] After the Armada's defeat, Elizabeth used the event as propaganda, asserting the storms were God's will for His Protestant nation.[46] She aligned herself

with the victory to take credit for converting England to Protestantism. *The Armada Portrait*, for instance, features the queen with her commanding hand on a globe and depicts scenes from the naval battle in the background. At times, her citizens used and revised this image to suit their political agenda, finding advantage in the idea of Elizabeth as a warrior woman.

Although Elizabeth never presented herself as an Amazon, her people imagined her with Amazonian traits, particularly during James's reign when the political environment caused subjects like Cecil to use her martial image to promote his own political agenda. Cecil's engraving, *Truth Presents the Queen with a Lance* (1622), portrays Elizabeth wielding weapons and wearing an armored breastplate, thus conveying a fantasy of the queen as a warrior woman.[47] Julia M. Walker compares this engraving to other posthumous images of Elizabeth to show "how powerful a political icon the queen remained" in the years following her death.[48] Walker recalls other moments when the queen assumes warrior attributes, such as church engravings constructing Elizabeth as a figure for the biblical Judith, but confines her argument to showing how such a representation "moves beyond the boundaries of the conventional" and focuses on appropriations of Elizabeth's image during James's reign.[49] By reimagining the late queen with martial attributes, Cecil elicits an idea of Elizabeth as a conquering warrior who rivals, perhaps exceeds, James in the management of England. The engraving insists upon judging James by the standards evident in Elizabeth's reign, especially in political and religious inclinations. In the engraving, the queen represents the victory of the Protestant faith over Catholic idols. Elizabeth's warhorse tramples the seven-headed beast of Revelation, a figure for Catholic Spain, as Elizabeth receives a lance from Truth, representing the "true" religion. The engraving's background, a depiction of the Spanish Armada, reminds viewers of Spain's invasion of and defeat in English waters. Cecil created the engraving during marriage

negotiations between James's son, Charles, and the Spanish Infanta, so it serves as propaganda to remind the public of England's religious and military triumph over Spain in the previous reign.

Deploying Elizabeth's image as a symbol for martial prowess, Cecil calls attention to the disparity between Elizabeth and James: Elizabeth refused marriage to Philip and fought against his subsequent invasion whereas James sought a marriage to assure peace with Spain. In this context, Elizabeth appears as a martial defender of England against Spain, and James becomes a weak substitute on the English throne. After the reigns of two women, some Englishmen longed for another stout-hearted Henry VIII and found James disappointing in his lack of virility. Cecil's politically minded engraving accomplishes two goals: 1) it mocks James's masculinity through its comparison to Elizabeth's martial undertakings; and 2) it reminds Englishmen that the real enemy is Spain. By figuring Elizabeth as a warrior, Cecil demonstrates the mutability of the queen's image.

Cecil's construction of Elizabeth as a warrior woman invests her memory with Amazon-like agency over kings. In the engraving, Elizabeth's gender takes on an androgynous quality through the blending of masculine and feminine characteristics. Her body appears undeniably female, with her womanly face, long flowing hair, and full skirt that covers her lower body as she sits sidesaddle. Her attire and props belong mostly to men, for the armored breastplate, the sword, shield, and helmet, and even the magnificent warhorse seem fit for a battlefield. Notably, the armored breastplate is modified for her womanly breasts and neckline, enhancing the androgynous quality of her body. Although the engraving does not explicitly connect her to Amazons, it does present her with the subjectivity of a female warrior. She appears much like Penthesilea, with the ability to conquer with strength or beauty. Unlike the Amazons, Elizabeth rules over male subjects, and the engraving suggests her agency over kings. The Armada's defeat

places England in a superior position to Spain, thereby symbolically instilling Elizabeth with power over Philip. According to Montrose, Philip insisted that the Armada was an extension of his body, positing the invasion of England as the rape of Elizabeth.[50] If Montrose is right, then the opposite occurred: Elizabeth took personal credit for thwarting Philip's advancement into England. In this scenario, Elizabeth becomes the martial defender of England, something James, at least according to the message of Cecil's engraving, fails to respect when he enters negotiations with Spain. Cecil's engraving suggests the queen has more martial prowess than either Philip or James.

Cecil's engraving has power because it suggests the agency of a deceased queen, one who grows in the imagination of those who use her as a symbol. Like Ralegh, who carefully constructs information about the New World, Cecil promotes a fantasy of the queen as a warrior long after her death, thereby rewriting the previous reign to suit his own agenda. He evokes a martial tradition for women that Elizabeth consistently fits within. As Wright observes, Elizabeth resides among lists of "female worthies" that generally require martial prowess for inclusion.[51] Penthesilea and Camilla, two famous Amazons, often appear in these lists. For instance, Heywood includes Penthesilea alongside Elizabeth in his *Exemplary Lives*. In choosing certain women over others, Heywood invites comparison between them, linking the martial prowess of women like Deborah, Penthesilea, Artemisia, Boadicea, Ethelfleda, and Margaret to Elizabeth. Although the queen's exact role at Tilbury remains unknown today, evidence during and after her reign imagines her as a warrior woman, and some evidence even links her to the dangerous tribes of Amazon warriors.

After Elizabeth's death, Anne Bradstreet penned a laudatory poem about Elizabeth's reign that envisions the late queen as a great conqueror who proves women's capacity to rule

over men. Bradstreet concentrates on Elizabeth's military feats to align her with other kings, showing that "from all the Kings on earth she won the prize": "Her victoryes in forreign Coasts resound, / Ships more invincible than *Spain*'s, her foe / She wrackt, she sackt, she sunk his Armado."[52] Presenting the queen as a "dread Virago," Bradstreet imagines Elizabeth as a warrior by emphasizing the "stately troops," "sea-men," and "captains" that she commanded. Indeed, Bradstreet presents Elizabeth's very essence as martial, for the "rude untamed *Irish*" floundered when "before her picture the proud *Tyrone* fell" (360). Tyrone, an Irish leader, submits as though he recognizes no alternative but surrender to the more royal image of Elizabeth. Like her name, Elizabeth's image evokes power. Bradstreet uses the anecdote with Tyrone to argue that women can prevail alongside men, for Elizabeth "hath wip'd off th' aspersion of her Sex" by leading a life with "no fit Parallel" (359). Here, Bradstreet recalls Plutarch, who wrote parallel lives for the great heroes and kings of Greek and Roman history, but Elizabeth, according to Bradstreet, has no one who can parallel her greatness.

Using Elizabeth as a symbol of proto-feminism, Bradstreet calls attention to the anxiety surrounding warrior women, for they prove that others can usurp the masculine position. Bradstreet questions if Elizabeth's worth can extend to all women:

> Now say, have women worth? or have they none?
> Or had they some, but with our Queen is't gone?
> Nay Masculines, you have thus taxt us long,
> But she, though dead, will vindicate our wrong.
> Let such as say our Sex is void of Reason,
> Know tis a Slander now, but once was Treason. (361)

Although Elizabeth accepted her own exceptionalism, never advocating the position of *all* women, she offered women like Bradstreet the opportunity to argue for women's "reason." Bradstreet pronounces the political nature of women's place in society by calling any attacks against women "Treason" during Elizabeth's reign. Elizabeth attempted to show the dual nature of her body, as though she had the masculine qualities of a prince, but Bradstreet focuses on Elizabeth's female body, seeing the queen as a model for women. She presents the problem with Elizabeth's reign: men saw the queen as an exception rather than a rule. A society of Amazons, however, presents the possibility for multiple women to live in the same manner as men. Yet Bradstreet raises the status of women by praising Elizabeth, even to the point of comparing herself with the poets who have also sung praises to the queen. She claims neither "*Spensers* poetry" nor "*Cambdens* learned History" can successfully describe the "glory" of Elizabeth (358). Although Bradstreet laments the "rudeness" of her own poetry, she aligns with the "throng" of male poets who write about the queen. Bradstreet reimagines Elizabeth not as a singular exception but as an exceptional example of what many women can accomplish. Elizabeth's unparalleled qualities "vindicate" women who also seek greatness.

Like Ralegh's elevation of Elizabeth over the Amazon tribes in the New World, Bradstreet claims Elizabeth surpasses the great women of history:

> *Semiramis* to her, is but obscure,
> More infamy than fame, she did procure.
> She built her glory but on *Babel*s walls,
> Worlds wonder for a while, but yet it falls.
> Fierce *Tomris*, (*Cyrus* heads-man) *Scythians* queen,
> Had put her harness off, had she but seen

Our Amazon in th' Camp of *Tilbury*,

Judging all valour and all Majesty

Within that Princess to have residence… (360)

The text uses warlike women for comparison, proclaiming Elizabeth's martial ability through her alignment with others who succeeded in warlike deeds. Tomris and particularly Semiramis, two warrior queens, continued in legends in the early modern period, so even though their "worlds wonder" fell, their fame carried forward. Importantly, they were famous for their actions in war; in this comparison, England's defeat of the Armada takes precedence in Elizabeth's reign as her greatest military achievement. By calling Elizabeth "our Amazon in th' Camp of *Tilbury*," Bradstreet aligns the queen with the warlike women of legend. Moreover, she emphasizes one of the more troubling features of Elizabeth's reign: as an unmarried woman commanding her troops to war, Elizabeth seemed much like the Amazons in Ralegh's New World—only this Amazon also ruled over men. And if Elizabeth is an Amazonian queen at Tilbury, what does that do to the masculinity of the soldiers fighting for her? Most of the reports of Elizabeth at Tilbury praise her warlike virtue, but gynocracy also led to the troubling proposition that women could overrun English government.

3. Warring Women: Radigund and Britomart in the Quest for Patriarchal Superiority

Female rule's contaminating potential appears obvious in *The Faerie Queene*, where even Spenser's most profound praise of gynocracy juxtaposes with his portrayal of Radigund and her city of Amazons. On the surface, *The Faerie Queene* is intensely complimentary of Elizabeth's rule, especially in his depictions of Gloriana and Belphoebe. Stallybrass argues that Spenser accounts for the exceptionalism of these women, whom "the heauens…lift to lawfull

soueraintie," by suggesting that some women are profoundly different from others.[53] Radigund, it seems, is not such an exception. Book 5 offers a startling injunction against gynocracy that cannot easily be separated from the female rule in early modern England. Villeponteaux argues that Radigund represents an "unnatural" side of Elizabeth. The trope of motherhood that Elizabeth consistently used to show her relationship with her people is antithetical to Amazonian customs, which show the mutilation and destruction of male children.[54] Although Spenser avoids comparing Radigund to his Virgin Queen, he denounces "the crueltie of womenkynd" who surpass "mans well ruling hand," clearly marking Radigund's city as a place where his readers can judge the merits of female rule (5.5.25). Like Villeponteaux, I suggest that Radigund indeed offers a critique of Elizabeth's reign. But here I focus on how such a critique demonstrates the impotence of men who would fight against warrior women like Radigund.

The Faerie Queene allegorically represents England as a land of opportunity for chivalrous knights and ladies; however, book 5 transforms those same knights into "thralls" that symbolically link to the men under Elizabeth's control. Under Gloriana's leadership, men in *The Faerie Queene* thrive: they freely traverse the land, combatting evil, proving their honor, and forging great reputations. Artegall is one such man: as the model of justice, he sets out at the Faerie Queene's behest to make his mark on the world. In describing the relationship between figures of justice, Spenser defines the character of Elizabeth as supreme and Artegall as her "instrument":

> Dread Souerayne Goddesse, that doest highest sit
> In seate of iudgement, in th'Almighties place,
> And with magnificke might and wondrous wit
> Doest to thy people righteous doome aread,

That furthest Nations filles with awfull dread,

Pardon the boldnesse of thy basest thrall,

That dare discourse of so diuine a read,

As thy great iustice praysed ouer all:

The instrument whereof loe here thy *Artegall*. (5.Proem.11)

In this passage, Spenser inserts himself as a character—the "basest thrall" who tells of the queen's "great iustice." In a way, this character compares to Artegall, for they both exist as instruments to praise the queen, who sits above them as the highest form of justice. If Faery Lond represents England and Gloriana represents Elizabeth, then Artegall becomes one of many figures for Spenser, for the knight trying to win his queen's favor. Artegall uses his sword to defend justice in Gloriana's kingdom; Spenser uses his pen to elevate Elizabeth's rule.

Conversely, while the city of Radegone also compares to England with its female queen, this representation offers a warning about the dangers of gynocracy that incorporates Spenser's desires for social mobility. In the city of Amazons, Artegall becomes Radigund's "thrall," a word reused from Spenser's description of himself in relation to Elizabeth (5.5.17). Under Radigund's rule, Artegall must perform tasks that please her and has no ability for advancement except through her. Likewise, courtiers in early modern England needed Elizabeth's favor for social advancement. Indeed, *The Faerie Queene* was Spenser's ploy to gain favor with his queen, and in the text, Spenser imagines at least two outcomes: 1) Spenser's queen might be like Gloriana, sending him off to prove himself with her blessing, or 2) she might be like Radigund, leaving him to tasks unfit for his masculinity. Although men also faced the problem of gaining approval from male monarchs, they tended to internalize this issue with Elizabeth, probably because they

viewed subordination to a woman as a sign of weakness. Thus, *The Faerie Queene* presents dichotomous views on gynocracy and on men's ability to thrive during Elizabeth's reign.

Like Ralegh's discursive control over New World Amazons, Spenser's allegorical devises allow him to employ the inscriptive power of writing to elevate his own position with Elizabeth. If writing deploys the relationship between a human subject over a textual object, then Spenser's insertion of Elizabethan topics into *The Faerie Queene* is an attempt to control those topics, particularly with his focus on female rule. Not only does he control the topics he raises within the text, but he also tries to manipulate other's perceptions of him through his writing. *The Faerie Queene* becomes Spenser's device for gaining subjectivity within the Elizabethan social setting. However, unlike Elizabeth, whom he writes into his text as the dedicatee and as the figure for supreme justice, the figure of Gloriana exists outside of the text and, therefore, outside of the discursive ability to control her image. She never appears as a character but only as a supreme ruler and as an idea of perfect monarchy. Spenser's choice to omit discourse about the Faerie Queene makes her unreachable, unknowable to the audience.

Spenser's defamatory account of Amazons, unlike the admiring descriptions of them in the writings of Ralegh, Painter and Heywood, suggests their potential threat to patriarchy proves too great when their rule extends to knights. The tribal nature of the New World and the geographical distance of Africa and Asia provide an appropriate location for a band of women to thrive, yet the England-like Faery Lond perhaps too closely approximates the geography and culture of Spenser's world to praise a city of Amazons existing within it. Furthermore, the characters Radigund subdues, the esteemed Knights of Maidenhead to which Artegall belongs, resemble romantic visions of knighthood from English history and literature and allude to Elizabeth's virginity. By relocating the Amazons from the unknown world to one peopled with

knights and abounding in patriarchal notions, Spenser removes the fantastic elements of Amazonian mythology to show the more dangerous qualities of female rule.

Perhaps because Spenser's account involves knights rather than tribal men in a distant world, Spenser depicts Amazons as motivated by a desire to destroy the male gender. Heywood traces Amazonian beginnings to a patriarchal society and depicts their eradication of men as a result of their desire for subjectivity. Heywood's account suggests that Amazons, though bloodthirsty for power, carry no specific malice toward men. Spenser's Radigund, however, builds her city of women to avenge the wrongs performed by her lost love, Bellodant:

> [She] wooed him by all the waies she could:
> But when she saw at last, that he ne would
> For ought or nought be wonne vnto her will,
> She turn'd her loue to hatred manifold,
> And for his sake vow'd to doe all the ill
> Which she could doe to Knights… (5.4.30)

Radigund does not simply desire subjectivity; she wants to destroy the will of all knights. As one of the primary symbols of patriarchy, knights are the enemy of purely matriarchal societies. Before becoming Amazon, Radigund exhibits signs of her more radical philosophies about love: *she* woos Bellodant, an action that is contrary to traditional gender roles; and *she* wants him to "be wonne vnto her will," a foreshadowing of her desire for subjectivity in relationships with men. In her efforts to defeat knights, Radigund becomes the enemy of patriarchy.

The vilification of Amazon societies in *The Faerie Queene* occurs because men lose their masculine identity when ruled by a woman like Radigund. Artegall discovers Radegone through Turpine, a man he saves from the Amazon's "cruell hands" (5.4.23). Unlike Artegall, Turpine

chooses death over disgrace, and the women are attempting to execute him when Artegall intervenes. Upon hearing Turpine's experience with Radigund, Artegall questions how a Knight of Maidenhead could fall to such a state:

> Sir *Turpine*, haplesse man, what make you here?
> Or haue you lost your selfe, and your discretion,
> That euer in this wretched case ye were?
> Or haue ye yielded you to proude oppression
> Of womens powere, that boast of mens subiection? (5.4.26)

Artegall implies that Turpine's circumstance can only derive from the loss of subjectivity and, therefore, masculinity. If he loses "discretion," a word that closely resembles "reason"—one of the essential parts of masculinity—then he loses the primary component of his "selfe." Other accounts of Amazons describe the women living separate from men in a way that allows both to experience subjectivity. Through Radigund, *The Faerie Queene* warns that "womens powere" equals "mens subiection." As Radigund develops as a subject, Turpine, and later Artegall, must submit to her power primarily because she has the military advantage over them. Therefore, she controls the actions their bodies can perform: they can wear women's clothing and perform women's tasks, or they can die. Both options emphasize the bodily changes they undergo when a woman obtains superiority over men. As Radigund grows into an autonomous character, the men lose their identities as men.

Spenser rewrites the Amazon myth to present the potential danger of female rule to patriarchal societies. On the surface, Elizabeth offered no enduring threat to patriarchy, for the country peacefully transferred to male rule upon her death. However, as Bradstreet's poem shows, Elizabeth does provide women with an example of female sovereignty that they would

not soon forget. This chapter has shown that one of the anxieties about warrior women lies in the potential for them to transform patriarchal societies into gynocracies and to uphold feminine rather than masculine privilege. The next two chapters of this dissertation show how male writers attempt to contain these dangerous implications of warrior women either through marriage or though death.

CHAPTER III

AFFIRMING PATRIARCHY: CHASTE REPRESENTATIONS OF WARRIOR WOMEN

The warrior women discussed in chapter II deny their femininity as they focus on their status as "warriors" rather than as "women." In this chapter, I follow warrior women's progression from the battlefield to the bridal chamber—a transition that causes their identities as gendered subjects to supersede their autonomy as warriors. In Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1595) and Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* (1596), Hippolyta and Britomart straddle a line that separates the subjectivity they experience in single life and the imminent objectivity they will encounter in marriages that inculcate them into the patriarchal hierarchy. As *A Midsummer Night's Dream* begins, Hippolyta stands at the brink of marriage, having already relinquished her weapons and her Amazonian identity, but her reputation from classical literature informs her transition from warrior to wife. *The Faerie Queene* follows Britomart's progression from the longing girl viewing her future beloved in the mirror to the armor-hardened warrior unseating Sir Guyon from his horse to the patient woman who waits for Artegall's return. In this chapter, I suggest that marriage offers warrior women a way to ultimately conform to the edicts of patriarchy in early modern England.

As I show in chapter II, patriarchy affected the way audiences understood representations of warrior women, and patriarchy in Protestant England also influenced ideas about marriage, the expected goal for young women and the traditional ending of the comedic genre. In following comic form, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* ends with marriage, the very conclusion the audience must have envisioned. The genre of *The Faerie Queene* is more complex in terms of readers' expectations about character arc, as distinctions between the text's women show: characters like Belphoebe and Gloriana represent Elizabeth I, which necessitates their continued virginity;

Radigund stands for the perils of female rule, which leads to her decapitation; and Britomart embodies chastity, which—given Protestant England's preference for marriage over virginity—determines her transition from maidenhood to wifehood. In following the traditions of epic, romance, and allegory, *The Faerie Queene* infuses the character of Britomart with the heroic significance of the epic, the romantic vision of a quest, and the allegorical connection to chastity. But like Hippolyta, the text also presents her as a comic lover overcoming blocks on the path to marriage. The comic structure of Britomart's and Hippolyta's plots—specifically, the marriages that reinforce masculine authority—informs the subjectivity they experience as warriors by eventually containing the more radical aspects of their characters.

Targeting Hippolyta's and Britomart's transgression of behavioral norms for women, critics have focused on these women's deviancy and their exceptionalism but have not considered the significance of the *temporary* subjectivity that leads to their ultimate submission to male authority. Scholars who examine warrior women's complex negotiation between feminine and masculine ideals discuss Hippolyta and Britomart in terms of subversive desire. For example, Kathryn Schwarz argues that Amazons like Hippolyta and Amazonian characters like Britomart "[disrupt] the relationship between hetero- and homosocial conventions."[1] Martial women simultaneously partake in male homosociality between knights and in heterosociality as they become the objects of male desire.[2] I would add that Shakespeare's and, to an even greater extent, Spenser's focus on these characters' sexuality shows how completely they accept patriarchy: in relentlessly defending their bodies, these women conform to traditional mandates for women. Therefore, any ambiguity about femininity or masculinity that occurs as a result of these women's martial actions returns to proper order by the works' conclusions.

Schwarz's discussion of how men respond to masculine women recalls Peter Stallybrass's influential reading of women's literal and metaphorical containment in early modern society. Stallybrass argues that as a commodity of exchange between men, women's bodies "must be subjected to constant surveillance."[3] Importantly, Stallybrass examines two distinct attitudes that view individual women either as members of a subordinate gender or as part of a class within the female gender. Viewing women as a class raises the possibility for individual exceptions, like the fictional Hippolyta or Britomart and the historical Elizabeth: "To emphasize class is to differentiate *between* women, dividing them into distinct social groups."[4] However, categorizing women within these social groups still emphasizes gender hierarchies: "In societies where heterosexuality and marriage are prescribed, those privileges can only be conferred back on *men*."[5] As bodies exchanged among men, women of status grant meaning to men. Overwhelmingly, scholars have viewed Britomart and Hippolyta either as objects within a patriarchal system or as exceptions to that system who, by their very exceptionalism, reinforce it. Here, I show that Britomart's and Hippolyta's exceptionalism grants them the *capacity* for masculine power as long as their *use* of power corresponds with accepted terms of patriarchy—a feat the historical Elizabeth managed as she simultaneously ruled over men and upheld masculine privilege.

Shakespeare and Spenser evoke distinct aspects of Elizabeth's reign by showing Hippolyta's continued desire for gynocracy and Britomart's consistent approval of patriarchal frameworks that correspond to those of early modern English society. All of the female characters in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* openly defy masculine authority: Titania challenges Oberon by keeping the changeling child; Hermia eludes her father and Theseus by escaping Athens; and Helena rushes after Demetrius against his wishes and against decorum. Hippolyta's

confrontation with masculine authority occurs before the play begins, when Theseus defeats her in battle. Although Titania, Hermia, and Helena reintegrate into society, Hippolyta, I argue, subtly critiques masculine rule in Theseus's Athens. In Hippolyta's desire for gynocracy, the play compliments Elizabeth's rule, especially in its many allusions to the moon, often associated with Elizabeth's reign.

Shakespeare and Spenser completed *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Faerie Queene*, respectively, when Elizabeth was in her 60s, clearly past childbearing age, and these texts are partially concerned with the implications of Elizabeth's long and enduring reign. Thus, the texts offer multiple interpretations of gynocracy. Louis Adrian Montrose argues, "the texts of Spenser and other Elizabethan courtly writers often fragment the royal image, reflecting aspects of the queen 'in mirrours more then one' (*FQ*, 3.Proem.5)."[6] The Proem beginning book 3 of *The Faerie Queene* notably excludes Britomart as a mirror for Elizabeth, promoting Gloriana or Belphoebe to that role instead, but the scholarly consensus explains Spenser's choice to disconnect Britomart and Elizabeth by examining the vastly different pursuits of each. While Gloriana and Belphoebe champion gynocracy, Britomart upholds patriarchy in what Mary Villeponteaux refers to as one of Spenser's "lapses" in his praise for female rule.[7] But in fact, the trajectory of Britomart's plot, I argue, corresponds to the trajectory for England that Spenser promotes. Like Britomart, England experienced a time of female sovereignty—when Elizabeth reigned supreme—but the country eventually returned to patriarchal power, which the queen, who upheld masculine privilege throughout her reign, never undermined or expelled. Through her alleged lineage from Britomart, Elizabeth inherits a tradition of martial protection of patriarchy. By examining Britomart's transition from warrior to wife, I show in this chapter that

her affirmation of male rule lessens her threat to patriarchy and corresponds to the political situation in England at the time.

Far from being passive recipients of social and paternal controls, Britomart and Hippolyta define the way the social body perceives and manages women's physical bodies. I begin this chapter by discussing Hippolyta as a comic heroine who conforms to the expectations of womanly behaviors but critiques patriarchal insistence upon a male king like Theseus. Following this, I discuss Britomart's acquisition of weapons and her deployment of martial characteristics as essential components in her development of subjectivity. Though she blurs gender roles, Britomart eventually transitions into a wifely role, which allows her to exist within a patriarchal system that insists upon female submission. In the third part of this chapter, I argue that the violence transforming Hippolyta and Britomart into suitable wives indicates Theseus's and Artegall's confirmation of gender hierarchies and of patriarchal superiority.

1. An Amazon Wife in Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream*

With its focus on marriage and lovers' quarrels, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* seems an odd play for an Amazon. As I demonstrate in chapter II, Amazonian lore insists upon the inability to locate these women within known civilization, yet Shakespeare places one in Classical Athens. The play's comic nature begs the question: can a woman be both wife *and* Amazon? And if scholars like Montrose and Jacqueline Vanhoutte are right in identifying multiple allusions to Elizabeth in the play, then how might the comic structure incorporate representations of the Virgin Queen through an Amazon? Vanhoutte astutely argues that "in its weary reference to the waning moon, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* records a common fantasy of the aging Elizabeth I as an impediment to masculine desires and prerogatives—a vision of

Elizabeth as comic obstacle."[8] While the moon may well frustrate masculine desire, I wish to focus instead on feminine desire. As Queen of the Amazons, Hippolyta experiences subjectivity until her ultimate containment within a patriarchal system—with the genre of comedy, of course, reinforcing patriarchy in marriages. Yet she subtly responds to her newfound position with an expressed desire for gynocracy. Hippolyta's uneasy fit in the comic genre suggests her disenchantment with masculine authority in Theseus's Athens and her desire for the female rule in Elizabeth's England.

In the character of Hippolyta, Shakespeare breaks with comic forms in a way that emphasizes social rather than parental or patriarchal controls. Northrop Frye posits the New Comic form as one that "presents an erotic intrigue between a young man and a young woman which is blocked by some kind of opposition, *usually parental*, and resolved by a twist in the plot."[9] This "young man" generally achieves "a heroic triumph" once he successfully thwarts his opposition, the comic block, and wins his desired outcome, usually established in a wedding or festivity at the play's conclusion.[10] If, as occasionally happens, the comic block is someone other than the father, then the hero's opponent tends to act as father-surrogate, or "someone who partakes of the father's closer relation to established society" as a "rival" of some sort.[11] *A Midsummer Night's Dream* precisely follows the comic formulae—but only in its treatment of Hermia and Helena, not in its treatment of Hippolyta. By examining the way Hippolyta breaks from comic form, I wish to show how she structures her life in a way that frees her from masculine controls, at least until the marriage that binds her to the traditional patriarchal system. In emphasizing these comic forms, I am not suggesting that Hippolyta's character arc should be read only in terms of comedy. After all, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* only allots to Hippolyta two percent of the play's lines, concentrating instead on the four young lovers' more traditional

comic stories. Reading in terms of comic forms, however, reveals her capacity for subjectivity when compared to the more traditional comic women.

While *A Midsummer Night's Dream* focuses on the journeys of four young lovers, Theseus and Hippolyta become part of the comic structure in remarks made in the first scene. Theseus metaphorically positions himself as a lover overcoming a comic block deriving not from a male overseer but from older women:

> Now, fair Hippolyta, our nuptial hour
> Draws on apace. Four happy days bring in
> Another moon. But, O, methinks how slow
> This old moon wanes! She lingers my desires
> Like to a stepdame or a dowager
> Long withering out a young man's revenue.[12]

In his allusion to the moon, Theseus, hardly young at this point in his life, imagines himself as a "young man" whose "desires" are thwarted by "a stepdame or a dowager." As Vanhoutte points out, Theseus transforms in his own metaphor into the young lover of comedy.[13] As such, he anxiously awaits his forthcoming marriage and all of the "pomp," "triumph," and "reveling" it will bring (1.1.20). He embodies Frye's notion of the young lover's "heroic triumph" to win his woman and celebrate the union with festivities at the play's closing. For Theseus, however, the comic block lies not in a father figure or a rival lover—he already "won" his future wife before the play begins—but in the "moon," which he metaphorically calls a "stepdame" or "dowager."[14] This allusion to the moon also references Elizabeth. In each case—stepdame, dowager, or queen—the moon is an aging woman. Instead of a father or father surrogate, Theseus must

overcome a woman to reach his heroic triumph. And this battle against the female moon, of course, mirrors his earlier conquest over Hippolyta and her society of women.

For Hippolyta, the male comic block is replaced by more flexible relationships with women: her society of Amazons, which Theseus must overcome to claim his bride. According to popular accounts like the ones I discuss in chapter II, Hippolyta's Amazons convene with men for reproduction and for battle, killing, maiming, or sending them away once their usefulness expires. Instead, Hippolyta forms relationships with women outside of male control. Scholars have noted the comic tendency to replace homosocial bonds with heterosexual marriages, as Shakespeare's Hermia and Helena or Rosalind and Celia show. The myths about Hippolyta infuse Shakespeare's character with a personal subjectivity far beyond these comic heroines.[15] As I illustrate in chapter II, the great anxiety surrounding Amazons in the early modern period reveals the troubling proposition that women can live outside of patriarchal structures, as Hippolyta does until Theseus forces her to Athens. Because his future wife lacks a father figure, Theseus must contend with powerful women in the place of the often male comic block—and fighting alongside the powerful Amazon tribe is Hippolyta herself, whom Theseus must defeat before taking her as his bride.

Sources chronicling Amazonian lore, which informed audience's perceptions about Hippolyta and vary drastically in different accounts, demonstrate the level of personal subjectivity she experiences as Queen of the Amazons.[16] In Virgil's *The Aeneid*, for example, Hippolyta and her Amazons are described as "galloping, pounding along the Thermodon's banks, fighting in burnished gear"—a portrayal that emphasizes their freedom and agency.[17] In Greek mythos, Ares notes Hippolyta's fortitude in war and rewards her with a girdle that renders her nearly undefeatable. She is deemed so powerful that Hercules is sent to take the girdle as part

of his twelve labors; according to most sources, the ensuing battle leads to Hippolyta's death. Although Shakespeare only alludes to Hippolyta's relationship with Hercules, the literature and art demonstrate early modern interest in this battle, which arguably colors the representation of Hippolyta in Shakespeare's play, especially if the girdle constituted part of her costume.[18] By accentuating fighting prowess, the girdle builds upon her legend for masculine activities like war. Shakespeare downplays such legends, portraying Hippolyta's and Hercules's relationship as amicable, but the audience's familiarity with her girdle and of her warrior strength adds to her character in *A Midsummer Night's Dream.* Her mythic power lies not in a feminized notion of obedience and domestic propriety but in the masculine realm of war.

Theseus's marriage to Hippolyta necessitates the dissolution of her Amazonian society and her incorporation into Athenian society. For most comedies, Northrop Frye argues, "the theme…is the integration of society, which usually takes the form of incorporating a central character into it."[19] For Hippolyta, however, society must disintegrate before she can move into Theseus's Athens, which must effectively assimilate her by the end of the play. In the hierarchical world of Athens, her agency, and its source in Amazonian society, must transform into submission to male authority. Shakespeare's primary source for Hippolyta, Chaucer's *The Knight's Tale*, depicts Theseus's destruction of Amazonian society prior to marrying Hippolyta: "with his wysdom and his chivalrie, / He conquered al the regne of Femenye, / That whilom was ycleped Scithia, And weddede the queene Ypolita."[20] Discussing *The Knight's Tale*, Simon Shepherd interprets Theseus's victory over the Amazons as "a taming of lust," a necessity given the "connection of Amazons with lust."[21] Such a reading concentrates on negative perceptions about women's emotions, for according to early modern stereotypes, any society made up solely of women must embody overabundant passions. In contrast, Shakespeare's version focuses on

Theseus's passion against Hippolyta's diffidence: the moon frustrates his "desire,…withering out a young man's revenue," while she imagines the nights "quickly dream[ing] away the time" (1.1.8). While *A Midsummer Night's Dream* only mentions the individual violence between Theseus and Hippolyta—"I woo'd thee with my sword, / And won thy love doing thee injuries" (1.1.16-17)—as though the conflict arose only between the two lovers, Chaucer's version demonstrates the assault on her entire social group: he destroyed "*al* the regne of Femenye" (my emphasis). By focusing on the individual violence, Shakespeare allows Hippolyta to dream of a world that still exists, for her Amazons freely live without her after she leaves.

Remarks made while Theseus and Hippolyta hunt subtly suggest that she longs for the independence she felt prior to Theseus's wooing. In some mythical accounts, Theseus joined Hercules on the quest for Hippolyta's girdle, though Plutarch finds these sources unreliable, and *A Midsummer Night's Dream* does not promote this version of the story. Instead, Shakespeare's Hippolyta nostalgically remembers her past association with Hercules and Cadmus through comparisons between their hounds and Theseus's:

> I was with Hercules and Cadmus once,
> When in a wood of Crete they bayed the bear
> With hounds of Sparta. Never did I hear
> Such gallant chiding…. (4.1.116-19)

Brushing aside Theseus's wishes to show off his excellent hounds, unmatched "in Crete, in Sparta, nor in Thessaly," Hippolyta reminisces about earlier hounds, those belonging to other men, whose baying seems to her better music (4.1.130). This mild comparison between the hounds suggests Hippolyta finds Theseus unequal to Hercules, a man who seems *worthy* of the Amazon's attentions rather than *forced* upon her. In her critique, she views Theseus unfavorably,

and, by extension, she finds her newfound position as bride inferior to her earlier existence. In the company of Hercules and Cadmus, Hippolyta was still Queen of the Amazons: she was equal in the hunt. And it is this society that she longs for once it falls apart.

In sharp contrast to Theseus's complaints about the moon's old age, Hippolyta uses imagery of the hunt and of the moon to elevate femininity. Responding to Theseus's "desire," Hippolyta claims

> Four days will quickly steep themselves in night
> Four nights will quickly dream away the time;
> And then the moon, like to a silver bow
> New bent in heaven, shall behold the night
> Of our solemnities. (1.1.7-11)

For Theseus, the moon's waxing and waning, as Vanhoutte and Montrose have suggested, may refer to the elderly Elizabeth as she "wanes" too long on the throne.[22] For Hippolyta, though, the moon is an audience that "shall behold" the wedding. Her simile compares it to the huntress, Diana: as a "silver bow / New bent in heaven," the moon garners the strength and potential of the goddess, which Elizabeth also used in her Cult of the Virgin Queen. The line's connection to Elizabeth would become more intense if she, like the moon, beheld the play. If Stevie Davies is correct in connecting the "silver bow" to Hippolyta's bow, then its "new" bend perhaps indicates the unfamiliar course Hippolyta's life takes in Athens.[23] Davies observes Theseus's and Oberon's negative evaluations of the moon: Theseus complains of the "old moon" and warns Hermia of the "cold fruitless moon" she would find in a nunnery; Oberon also calls it a "cold moon," one that, according to Davies, is "frigid or sterile."[24] In contrast, Hippolyta, I would add, sees the moon as very much alive. Indeed, it appears to have purpose as it watches human events

with seeming interest. Perhaps the bow's bend indicates its readiness to strike, for the drawn bow tends to form a deeper arc. Hippolyta's more positive view of the moon suggests her attachment to things female: to the night, to Diana, and to Elizabeth.

As a symbol for femininity, the moon also alludes to the virgin life of Elizabeth, particularly in Oberon's speech about the "imperial vot'ress":

> [I saw] flying between the cold moon and the earth
> Cupid, all armed. A certain aim he took
> At a fair vestal virgin thronèd by the west,
> And loosed his love-shaft smartly from his bow
> As it should pierce a hundred thousand hearts.
> But I might see young Cupid's fiery shaft
> Quenched in the chaste beams of the wat'ry moon,
> And the imperial vot'ress passèd on,
> In maiden meditation, fancy-free. (2.1.155-64)

The passage emphasizes the violence of love through its description of Cupid's bow and "fiery shaft," the arrow. "All armed," Cupid uses weapons to conform these women into suitable mates for men, calling the motivation for such a change "love." Cupid's arrows mirror the violence that Theseus uses to transform Hippolyta into his wife. Unlike Hippolyta, though, the "imperial vot'ress" escapes, continuing a life much like the one Hippolyta experiences among her Amazons—a life "in maiden meditation, fancy-free." Quenching love's "fiery" passion, the "wat'ry moon" protects the "imperial vot'ress" from marriage. When Hippolyta praises the "silver bow" of the moon, she imagines *this* moon, not the "cold" one of Oberon's passage. She sees in the moon an escape from Cupid's enslavement: if it can protect the "imperial vot'ress,"

then perhaps it can protect all women who wish to continue in "chaste" life. In Hippolyta's fantasy, the moon contains a "bow" of its own, a weapon to fight against Cupid's "bow" and "fiery shaft." The moon becomes a symbol for virginity in Oberon's speech, as its connotations with Diana and with Elizabeth foretell. Therefore, Oberon's and Theseus's critiques of the moon pronounce judgment against women who hold onto their virginity when they should marry. The men and women of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* assess the moon according to their own desires for marriage.

While watching the "rude mechanicals" perform, Hippolyta's desire for gynocracy emerges through allusions to Elizabeth—allusions that Theseus and Demetrius interpret through their own patriarchal points of view. At the beginning of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, the moon's age was in question as Theseus and Hippolyta interpret the four days and nights until the wedding differently. During the play-within-the-play, however, the moon's gender causes concern as the characters debate the appropriateness of Starveling acting as Moonshine:

Starveling, *as Moonshine*	This lanthorn doth the hornèd moon present.
Demetrius	He should have worn the horns on his head.
Theseus	He is no crescent, and his horns are invisible within the circumference.
Starveling, *as Moonshine*	This lanthorn doth the hornèd moon present. Myself the man i' th' moon do seem to be.
Theseus	This is the greatest error of all the rest; the man should be put into the lanthorn. How is it else "the man i' the' moon"?

Demetrius	He dares not come there for the candle, for you see, it is already in snuff.
Hippolyta	I am aweary of this moon. Would he would change. (5.1.252-65)

Starveling imagines the moon in theatrical terms: he "seem[s] to be" inside the moon while the lanthorn represents his own "hornèd" person. The man and the lanthorn conflate into one image, that of a moon. He asks for a suspension of disbelief so that the audience can interpret his role as he does. Demetrius and Theseus, however, comment on the literal scene before them. They separate the man from the moon—"He [Starveling] is no crescent"—and indicate that the man (Starveling) should wear the cuckold's horns. Through their dialogue, the moon becomes female and Starveling becomes her cuckolded lover.

As Theseus and Demetrius re-imagine the man and the moon as separate entities, they comment on the legitimacy of female rule through the moon's allusion to Elizabeth. The sexual tone of the passage and references to cuckoldry suggest Theseus's assertion that the "man should be put into the lanthorn" refers to sexual intercourse. If the moon is replaced with Elizabeth, then Theseus's comment suggests his male-centric view that Elizabeth should find a husband to be the man in Elizabeth. In the next line, Demetrius shows he understands Theseus's comment but finds fault with the interpretation. For one, the candle "is already in snuff." A candle "in snuff" has already burned through most of its wax—it is an aging candle just as Elizabeth was an aging queen. According to Demetrius, Starveling cannot enter the lanthorn because the burning candle frightens him away, much like Elizabeth eschewed any potential husbands. Demetrius suggests that Elizabeth, now in her 60s, is "in snuff" and cannot perform the lover's role that Theseus desires for her. Another interpretation of Demetrius's line emphasizes the impotence of any man

attempting to bed the Virgin Queen: the candle, a phallic image, has burned down, implying the sexual incapacity of Elizabeth's would-be lovers—*this* is the moon that quenches Cupid's "fiery shaft," suggesting even Cupid's impotence against the powerful queen. In this banter about the moon, Theseus and Demetrius contemplate differing political views of Elizabeth's rule: Theseus, true to his character as a male monarch and conqueror, desires a mate to rule in Elizabeth's stead; Demetrius, as a subject and courtier, understands the impotence men feel when confronted by such a queen.

Remarking on Starveling's performance, Hippolyta reveals her longing for a society of women. If, like Starveling, she understands the moon in a theatrical sense, then her response suggests aversion for her current situation: in being "aweary" of "this moon"—Starveling—she wishes "he would *change*" (my emphasis). The word "change" denotes a substitution, a replacement, and/or an exchange of one thing for another.[25] The moon typically refers to Elizabeth, but Hippolyta is clear that this moon is a man (she calls it "he"). She could simply wish for a change of actor, or, I would argue, she could desire the actor to change genders. In *Cymbeline*, the word "change" refers to altering masculine and feminine roles: Pisanio encourages Innogen to "forget to be a woman; change / command into obedience, fear and niceness… / …into waggish courage"; and in a later scene, Innogen declares she would "change [her] sex to be a companion with [her brothers]."[26] Of course, the word "change" occurs throughout Shakespeare's writings with other usages, yet the recurrent issue of gynocracy and the moon's allusion to Elizabeth suggest the line refers to Hippolyta's distrust of a man acting as the moon. In continuing the idea of the moon as the queen, Hippolyta longs for a female monarch to replace Starveling as the moon.

Moreover, if Hippolyta is responding to Theseus's interpretation rather than Starvelings's, then Hippolyta could wish that "*this* moon" (my emphasis)—the monarch currently wielding power, Theseus—"would change" into a woman (like Elizabeth). The line is complicated because it is not clear whether she refers to Starveling as the moon or the lanthorn as the moon or whether she understands the moon in purely metaphorical terms to refer to the monarch of the time. What is clear, however, is that she wishes "he"—a male—to "change," and, given the connection made to the monarch, this change potentially demonstrates her longing for female government, like the one she experiences among her society of Amazons. If, as I suggest in chapter II's discussion of Ralegh's *The Discoverie of Guiana*, Elizabeth represents the most supreme Amazonian queen, then Hippolyta perhaps desires an England ruled by Elizabeth rather than an Athens ruled by Theseus.

Shakespeare praises female rule throughout the play, most particularly in his portrayal of Hippolyta's desire for a female monarch and in his depictions of Titania, the Faery Queen meant to represent Elizabeth, but Shakespeare also portrays the containment of these female characters. Titania, for instance, submits to Oberon's requests for the changeling child. Likewise, Hippolyta concedes to Theseus's greater authority in Athens. Shakespeare's focus on Hippolyta and Theseus's marriage procures Hippolyta's survival in the literary imagination of the period. Through her warrior attributes, she subverts patriarchal ideologies that subsume women, but, unlike Shakespeare's Margaret or Spenser's Radigund, she generally conforms to the standards for women by the end of the play. Theseus's triumph over her corresponds to Frye's conception of comedies as focusing on the "heroic triumph" of the male lover through marriage. Thus, the threat Hippolyta embodies as a warrior woman—a threat originating in Amazon societies that encourage women to overcome men in battle—diminishes through Theseus's victory and his

control over her person. The literature of women fighting on the battlefield generally portrays anxieties over women's ability to redefine social structures, and the consequences for women who continually overcome male controls are generally dire. Shakespeare's Margaret, for instance, loses power and watches her family fall apart, and Shakespeare's Joan of Arc is burnt at the stake (see chapter IV). Spenser's Radigund is killed in battle (see chapter II). Such women suffer because they perpetuate ideas about women that the culture of the early modern period found unacceptable. Hippolyta, however, escapes these disastrous fates through her eventual containment. Therefore, she is permitted to continue, to live on in the literature as Theseus's wife and possession. Yet even as Shakespeare contains the Amazon queen, he leaves his audience with a vision of her dreaming of gynocracy.

A Midsummer Night Dream's conclusion in marriage establishes patriarchal normalcy after the long night of chaotic abandonment, where women woo men and fairies cast spells. Although most comedies follow storylines akin to Hermia's and Helena's, with the women experiencing a short period of agency until marriage, Hippolyta enjoys years of freedom until Theseus's—and the play's—final containment of her. Hippolyta's transition from warrior to wife, subject to object, suggests women can experience agency through men's absence, a situation analogous to Britomart's short span of agency as a warrior woman existing outside of male control. Through Hippolyta and Britomart, Shakespeare and Spenser flatter Elizabeth: Hippolyta through allusions to the moon—and, therefore, to Elizabeth—and Britomart through the martial defense of patriarchy that Elizabeth inherits through line of descent.

2. Fashioning Knighthood in Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*

Like Hippolyta, Britomart lives "in maiden meditation, fancy-free," until she receives a

wound by "the false Archer, which that arrow shot / So slyly, that she did not feele the wound."[27] Cupid hits his mark. Unlike the maiden queen praised in these works, Hippolyta and Britomart succumb to the "fiery shaft" that binds them to Theseus and Artegall. Davies discusses the "dream-world" of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* as the "most directly Spenserian of Shakespeare's plays," particularly with its "image of Gloriana" in the setting and characters.[28] The "image of Gloriana" that Spenser provides is much more direct than Shakespeare's allusions to Elizabeth through Hippolyta's praise of the moon or Oberon's speech about the "imperial vot'ress" or even Titania's quarrel with feminine submission (2.1.169). Spenser includes figures of Elizabeth, like Belphoebe and Gloriana, to praise gynocracy and to garner the queen's notice and support. Where Britomart corresponds to the "mirrours more then one" representing Elizabeth has been the topic of much scholarly debate (3.Proem.5). For example, Villeponteaux argues that Spenser "carefully separate[es] Elizabeth from a martial tradition," for Spenser demonstrates "an uneasiness with a narrative situation in which an extremely powerful female knight threatens our sense of patriarchy and suggests, through her unacknowledged representation of Elizabeth, that the queen's rule does the same."[29] Whereas Villeponteaux suggests the transition from Britomart's "warlike armes" to Elizabeth's "pollicy" indicates Spenser's desire to isolate the two women, I show how Spenser, by including Britomart as a predecessor to Elizabeth, creates in his heroine a "martial tradition" that fails to easily disassociate from the figure of the queen.

I concentrate in this part on Elizabeth's warlike inheritance from Britomart, for Spenser *does* make this connection: he discusses Britomart's "glorie," "chastitie," and "vertue rare" as "goodly deedes [that] do well declare" her as

Well worthie stock, from which the branches sprong,

That in late yeares so faire a blossome bare,

As thee, O Queene, the matter of my song,

Whose lignage from this Lady I deriue along. (3.4.3)

By including Britomart in Elizabeth's lineage, Spenser promotes an idea of the queen as a martial defender of England. But the threat Britomart poses, I argue, subsides with the comic ending of her journey. Britomart's transformation from warrior to wife models the transition Elizabeth was expected to take in ruling England: a move from female sovereignty to masculine privilege as English subjects temporarily experienced a female monarchy only to return to male control after her reign. Spenser establishes multiple ways of representing Elizabeth: the Faerie Queene offers a perfect vision of gynocracy; Radigund presents the dangers of women's sovereignty (see chapter II); and Britomart represents the provisional nature of female rule in England. The political body, always represented as male, resided for a short time in a female monarch, allowing that monarch to experience sovereignty until the body politic returned to a man. Likewise, Britomart experiences short-lived subjectivity until returning to patriarchal authority. In her transitional experience, Britomart demonstrates martial prowess in her fortitude in battle and in her choice of armor, which aligns her with the English monarchy and shows her appropriateness as Elizabeth's ancestor. By blurring gender roles, Britomart follows the chivalric codes of male knights, which places her in the masculine role of protecting ladies, pursuing battles, and defending the monarch. In these moments, she embodies female sovereignty, employing her agency against men and women alike. Her later transformation into motherhood coincides with her relinquishment of weapons and suggests a return to male leadership.

Britomart, upon viewing Artegall's image in a mirror, falls into a devastating love sickness that moves Glauce to devise a cure, first trying feminine techniques but then developing a plan that emphasizes masculine devices for resolving problems. Unable to dismiss the "shade" of Artegall through soothing words or motherly caresses, Glauce first turns "vnto the Church" for help (3.2.28). Early modern conduct manuals promote submission to authorities, including ecclesiastical authorities, as women's primary form of handling adversity.[30] However, Glauce's turn to this conduit only proves the "holy herse" an "idle verse," so she investigates another womanly form of overcoming Britomart's love sickness: herbs and chants (3.2.48). Glauce's "earthen pot" of many herbs, "drops of milk and blood" and her performance of bodily motions like spitting and turning in particular directions correspond to the potions that "wise women" administered. Both attempts to revive Britomart suggest Glauce's determination to find the cure in a socially ordained manner for women: Glauce lacks the power within her to alter Britomart's condition, so she seeks assistance from without—from God, from herbs, and then from Merlin. Although Merlin provides assistance in the form of information, he fails to satisfy Glauce's desire to cure Britomart, leaving the women to define their own destiny and to perform their own actions. Merlin drives them to alter their feminine means of overcoming adversity. To cure Britomart, they must become like men. In presenting the failure of traditionally feminine modes of addressing conflicts, Spenser provides motivation for Glauce and Britomart to seek alternative means and saves them from undue scandal: they transgress their gender roles *not* because they desire power, as is the case with the Amazons I discuss in chapter II, but because circumstances force the change upon them, much like circumstances in Tudor England temporarily necessitated a woman on the throne.

Attired as warriors, Britomart and Glauce demonstrate their ability to pass as masculine subjects. After traditional womanly channels for healing Britomart fail, the two women look to themselves for answers, finding that an altered outer form can help them accomplish what they could not while dressed as women:

> That therefore nought our passage may empeach,
> Let vs in feigned armes our selues disguize,
> And our weake hands (need makes good schollers) teach
> The dreadful speare and shield to exercize:
> Ne certes daughter that same warlike wize
> I weene, would you misseeme; for ye beene tall,
> And large of limbe, t'atchieue an hard emprise,
> Ne ought ye want, but skil, which practize small
> Wil bring, and shortly make you a mayd Martiall. (3.3.53)

Remaining in womanly garb, Glauce argues, will "empeach" their "passage," but dressing as knight and squire allows them to pursue their quest. She recognizes that masculinity is a performance, certainly one benefited by height (she calls Britomart "tall") and stature (Britomart is "large of limbe"), but one that Britomart can develop through costume and "practize small." Glauce argues that masculinity derives not from biological sex but from learned behavior. In fact, Britomart lacks *nothing* but technique, for Glauce tells her "ne ought ye want, but skil." For Glauce, gender and gender performance seem indistinguishable, yet she does recognize the distinction between gender roles, which force Britomart and Glauce to perform masculinity to gain subjectivity.

Again, the text emphasizes the "need" Britomart has to learn the art of masculinity, which frees her from early modern stigma against overreaching women. Through "feigned armes" and "disguize," Britomart and Glauce appropriate the ability to freely move throughout Britain and Faery Lond as subjects seeking to fulfill their own destinies. But they fulfill these destinies because, at this particular time, Britain needs Britomart to travel to Faery Lond to find and rescue her preordained husband. This temporary need in Spenser's Britain corresponds to the political situation in Elizabethan England, where advocates and detractors of gynocracy debated the appropriateness of Mary's and Elizabeth's reigns. Constance Jordan argues that two major theories about female rule abound in the literature of Elizabethan England: 1) the conservative position held that "woman is created inferior…and has no authority with respect…to any man"; and 2) the liberal position believed that "a woman is capable of behaving in a virile manner and therefore of governing men."[31] Defending female rule, John Aylmer argues that Elizabeth is an exception. He claims that Saint Paul's prohibition against women as Heads of the Church in fact responded to specific women in one church who had become unruly.[32] *Some* women, according to Aylmer, could have power in church, and *some* women could have power in government. Aylmer counters railings from men like John Knox by arguing that female rule is not "monstrous" just because it is unusual. The exception, according to Aylmer, occurs because *God* places her on the throne, and His "hande" in the succession means "she can not be feable," for God created her to rule.[33] Like Aylmer, Spenser understood the concept of an exception, and he creates in Britomart a woman who performs the roles of men without sacrificing her natural role as a woman.[34]

The habergeon Britomart wears only begins her transformation; her acquisition of armor and weapons, the true accoutrements of knights, develop further her character's symbolic

significance. Her armor derives from a Saxon virgin, Angela, who becomes a symbol for the ancient days of warrior women. For Britomart, the armor serves several functions, each defining one aspect of her identity. As Angela's armor, it serves the symbolic function of aligning Britomart to the Saxon world, thus uniting the people of Britannia in Britomart.[35] It also evokes the epic significance of armor through details of its past. In earlier epics, the origin of a character's armor gave it value: the god Hephaestus forged Achilles's armor; Vulcan made Aeneas's. Continuing this tradition, Spenser grants Artegall the arms of Achilles. Likewise, Britomart's armor gains significance through the glory of its history, connecting Britomart to the qualities of Angela in war and in chastity and situating her as the heir to a specifically feminine history of martial prowess. Both women's names are drawn from the people they represent: according to Glauce, Angela led a section of the Saxon people who, "for her sake / And loue," called themselves Angles; Britomart, who in Spenser's epic plays a momentous role in the future of her people, represents Britain in name (3.3.56). Britomart's procurement of armor provides more than a disguise; it positions her in the legendary history of early Britain and signifies the continuing importance of a unified British people, a legacy that Elizabeth inherits. Through the armor's historical significance, Britomart takes her place among epic heroes who procure armor through legendary means and who instill that armor with even greater meaning.

Moreover, the shields that Britomart and Glauce acquire symbolize the impenetrability of the English nation. Britomart's shield bears "a Lion passant in a golden field," a marked likeness to Brutus's "lion *passant gules* (red), in a field *or* (gold)."[36] According to English histories, Brutus, a descendant of Troy, traveled from Rome to found the British peoples.[37] The herald on Britomart's shield symbolically links her to the early hero, a connection that Elizabeth attains through her lineage to Britomart. Similarly, Glauce carries a "shield three-square," which, as A.

C. Hamilton notes, is the shield carried by English kings (3.1.4).[38] Glauce appears "to couch vnder" the shield, "as if that age badd [her] that burden spare" (3.1.4). Just as Glauce carries the burdensome weight of the shield, she also carries the future of England's kings through the legacy of Britomart. It seems fitting that she would "couch vnder" such a heavy burden. The shields of Britomart, emblematic of Britain's past, and of Glauce, prophetic of England's future, arm these women with the weight and the strength of their nation and of a future that leads to Elizabeth. Both shields prove unassailable throughout the course of *A Faerie Queene* and represent the ability of Englishmen to deflect invasions of their country.[39] Like her armor, Britomart's shield links her to England in a way that hearkens to the heroic exploits of undefeatable warriors. It aligns her with other warrior women in history, like Bunduca, Guendolen, and Martia, whom Glauce glorifies to show the exemplary ability for women to perform the same adventurous exploits as men.[40]At this point in her story, Britomart experiences agency akin to the male epic heroes—with the same profound implications, the continuance of a nation.

With armor that grants her impenetrability, Britomart acquires a spear that grants her martial prowess symbolically through connections to Britain's past and literally through its magical capabilities. The spear was forged by Bladud, who created it "by Magick art of yore" (3.3.60). According to Geoffrey of Monmouth, Bladud, a British king, founded the city of Bath and built temples to the virgin goddess Minerva, a fitting pagan model for the chaste Britomart.[41] Representing her British heritage, the weapon and the armor combine to unite the different sects of England, a unification that comes to fruition in Elizabeth. Furthermore, the "potent magic spear," as Villeponteaux calls it, is a "powerful phallic symbol that at the same time connotes her woman's chastity."[42] The phallic spear grants Britomart masculine abilities, especially clear in

its penetration of Marinell. Marinell's "cruddy blood" surrounding "th'orifice" of his wound suggests penetrating his virgin body resembles the process of defloration to which Britomart will submit once married. The wound represents his passage from virginity to marriage, for the wound fulfills a prophecy that previously had kept him away from women. His next step once healed involves marriage to Florimell. In driving Marinell into the female role, Britomart blurs gender distinctions between female and male knights and transforms from disguising like a knight to acting like one. The magic spear imbues her character with masculine intention and ability.

Once armed, Britomart performs feats that incorporate her into a chivalric tradition, encouraging comparisons between her and other male knights in the epic. The chivalric code for knights contained three major points of honor: duty to country, protection of ladies, and prowess in battle. Throughout *The Faerie Queene*, the male knights rank their abilities through these three points, generally conceding that Arthur ranks highest for his loyalty to the Faerie Queene, his protection of women like Una and Amoret, and his ability to win in battles against monsters and knights alike.[43] For men, chivalry is tantamount to developing a positive reputation and to obtaining glory, a driving desire of knights in the epic. For instance, the text claims that Arthur and Guyon "hunt for glory and renowmed prayse" when they first encounter Britomart (3.1.3). For women, honor derives through chastity. Characters often try to distinguish between chaste and unchaste women, and they use items like Florimell's belt, which falls off anyone who is unchaste, to determine which women are worthy of praise.[44] As the embodiment of chastity, Britomart conforms to one of the most important tenants of womanly honor; additionally, she upholds the chivalric codes that men in the epic follow. By performing masculine tasks,

Britomart engages in a rare form of subjectivity for women. She manipulates perceptions about her own body in a way that revises the chivalric codes of male knights.

Following the tenets of male chivalry, Britomart sacrifices for her country to fulfill the destiny that Merlin predicts for her. Merlin foretells the "famous Progenee" of "renowmed kings, and sacred Emperours" that Britomart's "wombe" carries (3.3.22). The destiny of Britomart corresponds to the future of Britain, making the successful fulfillment of her quest tantamount to the British monarchy's culmination in Elizabeth and the "vniuersall peace" she offers (3.3.23). To carry out this "heuenly destiny," Britomart must complete three stages: 1) she must find Artegall, 2) she must "submit [her] ways vnto his will" (3.3.24), and 3) she must have a child, her "wombes burden," with Artegall to continue the line (3.3.28). Her "warlike armes" and her submission to Artegall and to motherhood are both necessary to England's future. Her mission is both amorous and political, for although she loves Artegall, her quest has higher stakes than personal affection. In this way, *The Faerie Queene* presents Elizabeth's reign as the pinnacle of monarchy, the desired end of Britomart's struggle. While Britomart performs martial duties for her country by protecting the citizens from evil, her progeny becomes her most important contribution to Britain's people.

Corresponding to the chivalric tradition of medieval romances and of Chaucer's *The Canterbury Tales*, Spenser's knights adhere to a strict code of behavior that includes martial prowess, which, Spenser shows, proves their masculinity:

> O goodly vsage of those antique tymes,
> In which the sword was seruaunt unto right;
> When not for malice and contentious crymes,
> But all for prayse, and proofe of manly might,

The martiall brood accustomed to fight:

Then honour was the meed of victory,

And yet the vanquished had no despight;

Let later age that noble vse enuy,

Vyle rancor to avoid, and cruel surquedry. (3.1.13)

The sword, in Spenser's definition, proves an individual's "right"—his or her "justice, goodness or reason."[45] Knights and kings commonly believed that a sword could determine a person's "right."[46] In *The Faerie Queene*, the sword's "proofe" often extends to the right of the monarch, of the country, and of ladies because knights gain individual honor by fighting for others. These knights, particularly the Knights of Maidenhead, an order of knights made up by Artegall, Arthur, and others, represent more than the individual, and their swords become emblematic of a movement from the personal to the political or religious. For example, Redcrosse fights against Malecasta's knights to prove Una's honor, transferring the power of his sword to her. In this transference, the sword stands not only for personal victory but also for the higher virtues of honor and nobility—it becomes "proofe of manly might" while "honour" becomes "the meed of victory." As the sword confers honor upon the victor and upon those he (or she, in the case of Britomart) represents, it proves the "vanquished had no despight." Thus, the battles between knights become proving grounds for masculinity and righteous intentions. It is into this tradition that Britomart successfully inserts herself when she engages other knights, including the steadfast Guyon, and defines herself by reference to the chivalric code more normally reserved for men.

Spenser's language of "manly might" includes Britomart in the chivalric tradition. In encounters with Marinell and with Paridell, Britomart's "might" comes into question: for

instance, Marinell threatens her with violence if she fails to "retyre" while she still has "might" (3.4.14). Unaware of her gender, he assumes the knight approaching pursues the same goals as other male knights he encounters: the desire for glory and "manly might" according to the codes of chivalry. Conforming to Marinell's assumptions, Britomart engages him, first with words—"Fly they, that need to fly"—and second with her spear, which delivers a near fatal blow. Not only does she accept the duel, but she also differentiates between herself and those who would flee, as other women in *The Faerie Queene* generally do when confronted with danger. Florimell, for instance, is one who "need[s] to fly," but Britomart proves she can defend her honor through right of conquest. Britomart differentiates between those who stay to defend their honor (usually men, like Guyan) and those who flee (usually women, like Florimell), siding with the former. Like male knights in the text, she defines her honor through right of conquest.

The "might" of manhood, mentioned again by Paridell in connection with Britomart, supersedes the more subtle aspects of Britomart's womanhood. Upon seeing her for the second time and seemingly with knowledge of her gender, Paridell describes her as a man: "This knight too late his manhood and his might, / I did assay, that me right dearly cost, / Ne list I for reuenge prouoke new fight" (4.1.35). Once again, "manhood" and "might" become synonymous with Britomart. Hamilton's note claims that "since Paridell was present when Britomart revealed herself 'To be a woman wight' (III ix 21.8), he may regard her as male because he regards manhood and might as masculine."[47] Alternative readings suggest Spenser may have forgotten that Paridell had knowledge of Britomart's gender or Paridell may consciously falsify her gender to preserve his own dignity in front of Blandamour. It would be consistent with Paridell's character to use guile to save his reputation. But even if this is the case, Paridell's lie becomes proof of Britomart's ability to embarrass men in combat. Earlier in the text, Paridell uses

masculine pronouns to describe Britomart because her disguise is so thorough. Paridell seems to recognize people's behavior as a fundamental marker of gender, showing that Britomart enters the field as an equal to men.

Through her abilities, Britomart transforms assumptions about her female body by deriving honor from her opponents. When Britomart unseats Guyon from his horse or delivers to Marinell a near fatal wound, she revises the reputations of both victor and vanquished, effectively robbing the men of their prior glory by transferring it to herself. Guyon, upon seeing another knight and unaware of her gender, "besought" the chance to engage the stranger but found "great shame and sorrow" in his defeat, for "neuer yet, sith warlike armes he bore…he fownd him selfe dishonored so sore" (3.1.5, 7). Guyon's undefeated state heightens the glory Britomart gains through victory, just as Marinell's conquests, for "an hundred knights of honorable name / He had subdew'd," embellish Britomart's victory over him. Early epic heroes, like Achilles and Aeneas, derive honor by fighting against valiant opponents. This trend continues in the early modern period in works like Shakespeare's *1 Henry IV*, where Hal uses "a garment all of [Hotspur's] blood" to "scour [Hal's] shame," essentially taking the honors that Hotspur has won for himself when Hal slays his enemy.[48] Britomart models this masculine assumption of honor through defeating Guyon and later Marinell in single combats that transfer the glories won by these men onto her. Britomart assumes male glory just as easily as she acquires male attire—as Glauce predicts, gender performance comes naturally for Britomart through "practize small." Allegorically, female chastity overcomes temperance and male chastity. The glory bolsters her character's allegorical significance.

Britomart's reputation for masculine honor gives her greater autonomy than the majority of women in the epic. Most women, including Una, Florimell, Amoret, and even Duessa, need

male champions to protect and to perpetuate their honor as women. In disputes over the women's honor, these champions substitute for their ladies, their combat skills extending to the women for whom they fight. Even a woman as true as Una needs the Redcrosse knight to defend her honor.[49] In return, Una enhances Redcrosse's glory through her reputation for chastity and faith and through his possession of her. Britomart, however, remains outside of this exchange between knights and ladies, defining her own honor rather than permitting a man to do it for her. With no champion interceding for her, Britomart forms alliances with other knights, like Redcrosse, Guyon, and Arthur, developing these relationships through her own merit rather than through her reputation for chastity, contrary to women like Amoret and Florimell. With no intermediaries acting on her behalf, Britomart mirrors the independence that Spenser's queen found on the English throne, though Elizabeth's conquests replaced martial with political strength.[50] Britomart even performs the role of a male champion in jousts, "restor[ing] / The prize, to knights of Maydenhead" through her victories. Not only does she become the champion of knighthood, but she also distinguishes herself from women through her protection of Amoret in a representation of the amorous code of chivalry that involves duty to ladies.

By winning and protecting Amoret, Britomart replaces Scudamour in his lady's defense and in her bed. Unable to enter Busirane's castle, Scudamour relies on Britomart to rescue his lady, whom Busirane stole during the hours between marriage and consummation. Britomart's success causes Amoret to yield to her new protector:

> Before fair *Britomart*, she fell prostrate,
> Saying, Ah noble knight, what worthy meede
> Can wretched Lady, quitt from wofull state,
> Yield you in lieu of this your gracious deed? (3.12.39)

Because of the "prowess" Britomart shows, Amoret offers herself as "vassall," an honor given to male knights who rescue ladies. Her offer of servitude and of payment—"what worthy meede…can wretched Lady…yield you"—suggests her loyalty is divided between the knight she should honor as a husband, Scudamour, and the knight she should honor as a victor, Britomart. Amoret rightly expresses anxiety over this divided loyalty, recognizing the "blame her honor should attaint" if she is found with this knight rather than her husband. On their journey, Britomart protects Amoret from the amorous challenges of other knights. While visiting a castle, a "iolly knight" declares "fairest *Amoret* was his by right" and proceeds to joust with Britomart over the lady, losing badly when Britomart knocks him from his horse (4.1.11). The winner of these jousts maintains lodging within the castle, with his "loue" or "lemman," while the losers "lye without the dore" (4.1.9). By winning the joust, Britomart gains access to Amoret within the castle, but such access would destroy Amoret's maidenly reputation. Therefore, Britomart removes her helmet, thus unveiling herself and saving Amoret from the scorn of sleeping with a "man" other than her husband. This unveiling satisfies Amoret's fear:

> And eke fayre *Amoret* now freed from feare,
> More franke affection did to her afford,
> And to [Britomart's] bed, which she wont forbeare,
> Now freely drew, and found right safe assurance theare. (4.1.15)

In winning the joust, Britomart not only replaces Scudamour as defender of Amoret's honor, but also as her companion in bed.

While sleeping in the same bed and riding around the country together, Amoret and Britomart form homosocial bonds much like the ones among Amazons. Schwarz argues that Britomart stands at the center of different forms of desire—she "appear[s] as a man among men

or as a man with a woman or as a woman with a man or as a woman with whom other women go to bed."[51] *The Faerie Queene* must eliminate these multiple forms of desire before Britomart can commit to one heterosexual relationship: indeed, as Schwarz points out, she "must lose Amoret before she can find Artegall."[52] Britomart and Hippolyta experience similar freedoms in their associations with women—freedoms that dissolve once they enter into relationships with men. Like Hippolyta, Britomart forfeits her ties with women before marrying Artegall. Her destruction of Radigund's city—a place that privileges relationships among women—symbolizes Britomart's transition from homosocial bonds to heterosexual marriage. In eliminating Radigund's Amazonian society, Britomart establishes herself as the defender of patriarchy, which necessitates her submission to masculine authority. Until that time, though, Britomart's relationship with Amoret at times parallels the homosocial bonds among Amazons and at times demonstrates Britomart's capacity to act like a male knight, one who protects Amoret according to the masculine code of chivalry.

Britomart establishes herself as a subject not only through her capacity for self-definition but also through her ability to treat women like Amoret as objects, an ability that forces others to perceive her as having the qualities of the male gender. The disparity between men's and women's acquisition of selfhood suggests that the codes of knights and ladies permeating *The Faerie Queene* construe gender according to rigid definitions. These definitions relegate women to the roles of lovers, wives, and objects to male knights. Yet Britomart proves these structures of gender relationships are more malleable than might at first appear: the relationship between Britomart and Amoret appears like one between a knight and lady. As news of their relationship spreads across Faery Lond, Britomart develops a reputation of masculinity that causes others to assume her body capable of performing men's roles.

When Duessa and Ate accuse Britomart of being Amoret's lover, they demonstrate the extent to which Britomart's representation of a male knight transforms social notions about her body. Britomart's disguise allows Duessa and Ate to create a plausible story about a romantic relationship between Britomart and Amoret: "I saw him haue your *Amoret* at will, / I saw him kisse, I saw him her embrace, / I saw him sleepe with her all night his fill" (4.1.49). Jealous of Britomart, Duessa and Ate attempt to anger Scudamour so that he challenges Britomart in combat. Their representation of Britomart suggests she believably passes as a knight, complete with male desires (to have her "fill") and sexual organs (to "haue *Amoret*"). Their depiction demonstrates the extent to which Britomart has constructed perceptions of her body—so well that she can develop a reputation of transgressive male sexuality. Fraser Easton argues that "disguise as a man was one of the most persistent symbols of female exceptionalism," and he distinguishes between two types of cross-dressing: 1) female husbands—women who married women and incorporated into their disguise "sexual function (a *sexual* body)"; and 2) female warriors—women who dressed as men for work or for war and based their disguise on a "sexual anatomy (a *sexed* body)."[53] Naturally, the "imitation of the sexual body of a man was sure to be mocked, censured or even criminalized," but the *sexed* body, Easton argues, "was rarely censured."[54] Although Easton's focus is plebian women of the eighteenth century (he does include the early modern period as the beginning of such patterns), the distinction he creates between crossdressing motifs is applicable to Britomart: though Spenser's heroine may evoke female exceptionalism in her cross dressing, she evinces the anxieties about female imitation of men's "*sexual* body" in her relationship with Amoret. The rumors Ate and Duessa spread indicate Britomart almost goes too far in her male disguise, a transgression that may result in the criminalization of her behavior.

Although it lacks veracity, Duessa's story corresponds with Britomart's usual handling of her body: she pretends to have the physical qualities that Ate and Duessa claim for her. Before revealing her gender, she performs the role of a lusty knight:

> Who for to hide her fained sex the better,
> And maske her wounded mind, both did and sayd
> Full many things so doubtfull to be wayd,
> That well she wist not what by them to gesse,
> For other whiles to her she purpos made
> Of loue, and otherwhiles of lustfulnesse,
> That much she feard his mind would grow to some excesse. (4.1.7)

The passage claims that Britomart acts lustful to disguise her gender and to hide her "wounded mind." The wounds in *The Faerie Queene* often correspond to gender, with men's wounds typically in the thigh and women's in the left side, but occasionally wounds refer to intellectual versus corporeal incapacity, with a wound to the head indicating loss of reason (see, for instance, 2.5.4).[55] The injury to Britomart's mind corresponds to her femininity—caused by love sickness, the wound weakens her senses. Attempting to overcome this weakness, Britomart exaggerates her disguise with male lust and "excesse," a word often associated with the excess of humours in young men of the period but also with women who overreach the bounds of typical feminine behavior.

Although Britomart lacks the ability to actualize her feigned lust for Amoret, she substitutes the penis with the sword as she penetrates the bodies of opposing knights. As Britomart develops the traits of a masculine knight, she further complicates notions of her gender through the way she alters male bodies. The sword and the spear, in the most literal sense, are

objects used to penetrate bodies, giving them a phallic aspect. Social understanding of the bodies of both genders defines the act of penetration as masculine: men penetrate women through sex and other men through combat. Lacking the ability to accomplish the former, Britomart proves quite capable of performing the latter. Her capacity to perform this act demonstrates that she can substitute for men on the battlefield in a literal sense (she has the ability) and in a metaphorical sense (she has the tools to penetrate and thus assume the role of men). As Britomart almost ventures too far in her disguise and performance of masculinity, she marks her status as an exception to traditional gender roles.

By connecting Britomart's lineage to Elizabeth, Spenser promotes a vision of his queen as the foreordained sovereign of England who, through her noble line, inherits the ability to rule in the place of a man. The early modern period placed the control over a person's life in the hands of men,[56] yet Britomart successfully manipulates male bodies, gaining authority over men and women through her ability to treat others as objects. Elizabeth inherits this ability as she rules over men and women alike, sending men to fight for her causes, determining when her courtiers could wed, or choosing the worship style of her citizens. Although Spenser excludes Britomart from the "mirrours more than one" representing Elizabeth, he shows that women can perform masculine roles in the defense of England and that this martial and political power can coincide with the defense of patriarchy.

Spenser must have hoped that Elizabeth, like his fictional Britomart, would enjoy sovereignty but promote patriarchal superiority, never undermining the position of men over women in the period. In his allusions to Elizabeth, Spenser is consistent with most male writers who sought ways to represent Elizabeth as an exception to traditional gender roles. Shakespeare's Oberon, for instance, emphasizes Elizabeth's exceptionalism when, unlike the

"hundred thousand hearts" who succumb to Cupid's arrow, the "imperial vot'ress passèd on, / in maiden meditation." By presenting Elizabeth as an exception, the male writers protect the adherence to traditional gender roles in England, for they limit the ability of other women to use her as an example of female agency. Therefore, Spenser depicts one of his figures for Elizabeth, Britomart, defending patriarchy. To successfully marry Artegall, Britomart must yield to the greater subjectivity of her husband, foregoing the freedom she once experienced and conforming to the feminine behavior expected of women.[57] Though she never engages knights in battle or uses a sword to save the honor of ladies, Elizabeth presents herself as a warlike queen when necessary to her reign but allows men to act in her stead. For instance, the Armada's imminent invasion of England presented Elizabeth with an occasion where a martial queen might benefit the country, so Elizabeth delivered a speech about her resolve "to live and die" among her people as "general, judge, and rewarder of [their] virtue in the field" but gave control over the army's proceedings to her "general," the Earl of Leicester (see chapter II).[58] Like Spenser's depiction of Britomart, Elizabeth never represents the general category of women as agents; instead, Elizabeth defends masculine privilege. However, Britomart's transition into wifehood, which contains her within the patriarchal system, occurs through male violence against her.

3. Warring Lovers

Both *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Faerie Queene* depict the violence necessary for warrior women's relocation from the battlefield to the bedroom. Scholars like Madelon Gohlke and Frances E. Dolan argue that marriage inherently contains a certain level of violence as the marriage unit subsumes one person as an object to the other.[59] Building on their premises, I suggest that the violence of Theseus and Artegall is necessary to reasserting patriarchal

authority through marriage. Like Cupid's arrows, Theseus's and Artegall's swords must transform Hippolyta and Britomart, respectively, into objects of love. These women, as I have indicated, almost go too far in their portrayals of masculinity, and their necessary reincorporation into hierarchal society requires Theseus's and Artegall's violent defense of patriarchy to prove men's ultimate superiority over these women's bodies. Early modern literature about warrior women promotes patriarchal organizations of society and exhibits anxiety over women who potentially challenge that system. The texts show Hippolyta's and Britomart's successful demonstration of women's potential but also their ultimate submission to comic endings.

Theseus and Artegall violently subdue their wives to prove that masculine superiority is inherent to gender relations, not an unwarranted distinction that society simply confers upon them. Indeed, they must disprove Glauce's assertion that gender and gender performance are essentially the same by proving their sovereignty over their future wives in battle. Literature often depicts love and war as intertwined, for even Cupid uses arrows to engender love in his victims. *Much Ado About Nothing* describes the "merry war betwixt Signor Benedick and [Beatrice]" as "a skirmish of wit" and presents the battle both characters have with falling in love. *Taming of the Shrew* represents this battle in a much more hierarchal manner, for Kate must submit to Petruccio for a successful resolution of the play. Like *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, these plays are comedies, and they indicate the hierarchy of gender relationships in marriage. Like Beatrice and Kate, Hippolyta initially fails to conform to society's standards for women, but Hippolyta uses actual rather than linguistic weapons to ward off marriage. In a physical battle, the winner becomes much more obvious, for wounds indicate proof of superior skill. Thus, Hippolyta and Britomart would pose an even greater threat to gender hierarchies if they could defeat Theseus and Artegall in combat. Moreover, without a final battle to prove masculine

superiority over their wives, Theseus and Artegall may marry women who perform masculinity better than their husbands, a situation that would endorse transgressive desire. Theseus's and Artegall's victories mitigate these concerns about gender roles.

The conquest of Hippolyta suggests the violence necessary to defend patriarchal hierarchies by connecting a man's martial and sexual conquests. As the ultimate proof of man's virility, sexual intercourse determines Hippolyta's final transformation into an object under Theseus's control, for it is the consummation that completes marriage unions and, thus, legally places the man in charge. Imagining combat in sexual terms initiates the bedroom scene on the battlefield and indicates an early transformation from subject to object. When Theseus describes his violent "woo[ing]" of Hippolyta, he already controls her even though four days must pass before their marriage:

> Hippolyta, I wooed thee with my sword
> And won thy love doing thee injuries,
> But I will wed thee in another key,
> With pomp, with triumph, and with reveling. (1.1.17-20)

Like Oberon's description of "all armed" Cupid, Theseus conflates the language of love and war as wooing becomes associated with swordplay and "love" with "injuries." Theseus understands Hippolyta much as he understands plunder: the right he possesses over her corresponds to the property he gains through conquest. As Gohlke shows, the sexual nature of his language enforces her submission:

> These lines, in which the sword may be the metaphoric equivalent of the phallus, in which love may be either generated or secured by hostility, and in which the two partners take up sadistic and masochistic postures in relation to one another, are not irrelevant to

> the concerns of the play. They may be seen to reverberate in the exaggerated submission of Helena to Demetrius, in the humiliation of Titania by Oberon, in the penetration by violence of the language of love.[60]

Indeed, violence secures Theseus's right to marry Hippolyta, as Gohlke argues; moreover, that violence continues through the wedding day as Theseus's victory over her persists through his possession of her body in marriage. Although Theseus intends to marry Hippolyta "in another key," the wedding, with its "pomp," "triumph," and "reveling," sounds very much like the same key in which he wooed his Amazon: with a "triumph" in bed that mirrors the "triumph" in battle.[61]

Similar to Theseus's martial conquest, Artegall's violent appropriation of Britomart's techniques to win agency over the bodies of others develops through the sexually suggestive battle that ends in the partial undressing of them both:

> Lightly he started vp out of that stound,
> And snatching forth his direfull deadly blade,
> Did leape to her, as doth an eger hound
> Thrust to an hynd within some couert glade,
> Whom without perill he cannot inuade.
> With such fell greedines he her assayled,
> That though she mounted were, yet he her made
> To giue him ground, (so much his force preuayled)
> And shun his mightie strokes, gainst which no armes availed. (4.4.12)

The ensuing conflict then causes her helmet to fall off, revealing her gender in her only forced unveiling of the epic. Before this, Britomart chose when to display her masculine disguise or her

feminine reality, but now Artegall appropriates that control by forcibly removing her helmet. His removal of her helmet, of course, also mirrors the undressing that occurs on the wedding night. The passage's sexual language emphasizes the relationship between the martial and marital unions: the "direfull deadly blade" represents the phallic member; the "eger…thrust" linking Artegall to the hound marks him as a lusty predator and Britomart as his prey; his desire to "inuade" her body mirrors the sexual act; the "greedines" with which he "assayle[s]" her provokes the image of lust; and his prevailing "force" and "mightie strokes" indicate his conquest over her body. That these images evoke the sexual act suggests the violence imagined in suppressing this warrior woman. Like Hippolyta, Britomart begins her transformation into wifehood with a battle that visually proves her femininity (through the helmet's unveiling of her gender) against the superior masculinity of Artegall (for the removal of his helmet reveals his maleness). Britomart's disguise falls away as the revelation of her actual gender forces her reincorporation within the gender hierarchy.

Theseus and Artegall demonstrate the violence with which patriarchy must be defended. The subjectivity that Hippolyta and Britomart enjoy fragments as their bodies come under (real rather than disguised) men's control. Gohlke argues that the sword represents the phallus in its ability to violently penetrate these women's bodies.[62] But Artegall's and Theseus's swords do more than symbolize the men's sexual organs; they also mirror the weapons used by Britomart and Hippolyta to establish agency over men. Just as Britomart and Hippolyta threaten male subjectivity through the holes they potentially create in male bodies, Artegall and Theseus threaten the women's subjectivity using the same means: weapons instead of sexual organs. Yet unlike Britomart, who feigns male sexual desire but lacks the ability to fulfill such desire, Artegall threatens with multiple forms of violence—both martial and marital penetration.

Unlike the women of my next chapter, Hippolyta and Britomart eventually conform to patriarchy and, consequently, survive to fulfill womanly roles. Shakespeare and Spenser fashion them as warriors without fully threatening the existence of masculine superiority. By alluding to Elizabeth in these characters, Shakespeare and Spenser praise gynocracy but also show the violence with which patriarchy must be defended. Hippolyta demonstrates a longing for female government in Athens, a fitting praise for Elizabeth's rule in England. Britomart foregrounds Elizabeth's potential to hold a masculine position even with a female body.

CHAPTER IV

WIELDING THE SWORD: MONSTROUS ACCOUNTS OF WARRIOR WOMEN

Continuing the discussion of how genre affects portrayals of warrior women, I turn in this chapter from the comic and romantic genres to historical plays.[1] In earlier chapters of this dissertation, I argue that differing methods of containing warrior women lessen the threat they pose to patriarchal authority. The Amazons discussed in chapter II dwell in distant lands and offer little direct threat to English society. The female characters I discuss in chapter III, Britomart and Hippolyta, enter marriages that subsume their more subversive qualities. Conversely, in this chapter, I discuss accounts of warrior women who do not submit to masculine authority and who do not live in foreign lands like the New World. Instead, these female characters represent women's martial potential in *English* history. Shakespeare's *Henry VI* plays (c. 1590-92) and John Fletcher's *Bonduca* (1610-14) depict women who redefine conceptions of English masculinity as they command and combat Englishmen on the battlefield. Joan la Pucelle, Margaret of Anjou, and Bonduca each represent the exceptionalism of warrior women who serve as precedents for Elizabeth's reign.

In the characters of Joan, Margaret, and Bonduca, Shakespeare and Fletcher explore the possibility for women to substitute for men—and even for *kings*—in roles traditionally held only by men. All three women assume command over armies. Joan and Bonduca engage enemy forces onstage. Margaret even kills a man. The plays grant masculine authority to these women and depict their ability to change the course of English history. For instance, Joan enters the battlefield amidst the French army's crushing defeat, after the soldiers have become "dogs, cowards, dastards" who have fled the English "lions."[2] After first turning the French Dauphin into a "prostrate thrall," she leads his army to victory over Talbot's English forces, thereby

altering the war's momentum. Like Joan's replacement of the Dauphin in martial affairs, Margaret's substitution for Henry VI on the battlefield revises perceptions about men's ability to perform their inherent duties as men.[3] Margaret assumes Henry's place in battle, his seat in Parliament, his right to her body, and his purpose as king. Nations at war tend to present conflicts in terms of the territory or the items they protect—the women and children at home and the country that deserves the men's sacrifice. Instead of Henry, Margaret tries to protect the throne and her son's inheritance. Likewise, Bonduca rides a chariot into battle to defend the British isle against invading Roman forces.[4]

As these women refuse subsumption into the patriarchal hierarchy, they portray the dangerous side of female sovereignty, and, as with Britomart and Hippolyta, they raise anxieties about men's ability to contain women. Britomart and Hippolyta reintegrated into patriarchy in their submission to Artegall and Theseus, respectively (see chapter III). But marriage cannot contain the women discussed in this chapter: Joan calls attention to the Dauphin's impotence when she refuses his sexual advances; Margaret takes Suffolk as a lover and rejects Henry from her bed; and Bonduca has no apparent interest in marriage. After failing to control these women in marriage, men turn to violence: Joan burns at the stake; Margaret watches Richard and Edward kill her son; and Bonduca commits suicide after Suetonius's brutal attack leaves her no other option. In chapter III, I establish that violence is often necessary to reassert patriarchal authority over warrior women; in this chapter, I investigate the dire circumstances of female characters who refuse such an inclusion in the patriarchal system.

Shakespeare's *Henry VI* plays and Fletcher's *Bonduca* portray the subversive nature of warrior women in history plays, where the women onstage offer a glimpse into English history and provide instruction for women in contemporary society.[5] Often somewhat fictionalized

accounts drawn from authors like Holinshed and Tacitus, history plays develop an audience's impression of past monarchs and of English history, at times representing these monarchs as flawed in a way that potentially diminishes contemporary sovereign authority.[6] Because Joan, Margaret, and Bonduca represent real people, they demonstrate not just a fictionalized account of women's agency, but also an historical representation of women overrunning the English government. This proposition may have seemed quite real during Elizabeth's reign, when a woman substituted for a male monarch much like Joan, Margaret, and Bonduca replace men in martial and political endeavors. In a way, Elizabeth's queenship authenticates the historical records that these plays endorse, for she proves women's capacity to rule as exceptions.

Reading women like Margaret, Joan, and Bonduca as anomalies in a world of masculine desires has occupied much of the scholarly discussions about these history plays, but such readings focus on their political overachievements, not their martial accomplishments. Scholars have highlighted these female characters' subversive treatment of patriarchy and monarchy.[7] For instance, Jean E. Howard and Phyllis Rackin call Margaret "a danger to Henry and a threat to his kingship," and Leah Marcus claims that Margaret in Part 3 "leads a bloody feast of misrule."[8] Discussing the historical legacy that informs Fletcher's depiction of Bonduca, Jodi Mikalachki argues that Bonduca's general, Caratach, "was a figure of exemplary manliness, invoked to counterbalance the overwhelmingly female savagery of [Bonduca], and to re-establish British masculinity."[9] Howard, Rackin, Marcus, and Mikalachki all focus on the cruelty with which Margaret and Bonduca usurp political power and view the battlefield as an extension of the political arena. Instead, I concentrate on Margaret and Bonduca not as political overachievers but as warriors.

By fighting alongside men, these warrior women insert themselves into England's overtly *masculine* history. As Rackin notes, women's attempts to rewrite the "masculine historical record" threaten the "masculine voice of history"—a voice that must deal with "women and the subversive forces they represent before men can properly take their places as heroes in history."[10] Margaret and Bonduca present striking anomalies to the process of this masculinist history, a history that marginalizes women to focus on the "heroic legacies of the fathers" and the "failures and triumphs of the sons."[11] The battlefield has traditionally been a site for men to define their masculinity against other men. By examining Bonduca's, Margaret's, and Joan's intrusion into this masculine location, I analyze the redefinitions of masculine and feminine roles that occur when women become involved in combat.

1. A Tiger's Heart: Shakespeare's Warrior Queen

As I suggest in chapter III, genre influences representations of warrior women. While comedies like *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1595) depict women's containment in marriage, historical dramas reveal warrior women's subversive potential under the guise of historical truth. History plays convey the narrative of past events in a way that informs the audience's perception of history. The effect of this dramatization is so powerful that Thomas Heywood in his *Apology for Actors* (c. 1612) praises historical dramas that "have made the ignorant more apprehensive, taught the unlearned the knowledge of famous histories, instructed such as cannot reade in the discovery of all our English chronicles."[12] Shakespeare's histories portray the heroic narrative of England's past so extensively that critics like Coleridge have compared their scope to Homer and Virgil and attributed to the plays the epic significance that comes with such comparison.[13] Shakespeare's and Fletcher's history plays provide audiences not with a regurgitation of

Holinshed or Tacitus but with the dramatists' reflections on the chronicles through choices that are "subjective…but by no means arbitrary."[14] These choices often involve comparisons between historical and contemporary figures, as scholars have noted about Shakespeare's representation of King John as a commentary on the reign of Henry VIII.[15] Thus, historical dramas amass significance through their portrayal of history to a popular audience and through their political statements about contemporary society.

During the Renaissance, historical dramas about warrior queens may have reflected political and social anxieties about Elizabeth's rule. Plays about women like Margaret and Bonduca reveal the possibility for historical instruction to influence contemporary society, for these women's existence in the past indicates the prospect for others to exist in the future. The battlefield in *Bonduca* represents an earlier history, a "record of antique times" when "wemen wont in warres to beare most sway," as Spenser nostalgically describes the period in *The Faerie Queene*.[16] For Spenser, "the bold *Bunduca*, whose victorious / Exployts made *Rome* to quake," provides precedent for his famous heroine, Britomart, in her warlike activities (see chapter III).[17] This precedent, however, also presents a dilemma: if Britomart can learn from Bonduca, then the actions of early warrior women can be re-enacted in later periods, just as Spenser depicts Elizabeth inheriting her martial defense of England from his fictional heroine. Figures like Britomart can continue this pattern as other women learn from her exploits how to overpower men in combat. Likewise, the staging of Shakespeare's *1 Henry VI* calls attention to the imitative quality of theater: Joan's exit as an English prisoner marks Margaret's initial entrance onto the stage, so the choreography of the scene emphasizes the play's substitution of one warrior woman for another. The mimetic power of literature was commonplace in the early modern period, with Stephen Gosson arguing that theater leads audiences toward vice (1579) and Sidney defending

its ability to teach virtue (1595). From warrior women like Margaret and Bonduca, then, female audiences might develop martial urges. Although warrior women in romances and comedies also might influence audiences in this way, they represent the writer's imaginative fiction, thereby creating a less subversive portrayal of warrior women than the history plays that purport to show historical reality. The real warrior women that history plays dramatize produce the troubling possibility that such martially subversive women might emerge in contemporary society.

History plays often depict warrior women not only joining men in battle, but also substituting for high-ranking men in command positions, as Joan's radical usurpation of masculine authority illustrates. Joan enters the stage amidst disheartened French leaders who have great need of the "deep prophecy" and Godly support that she offers (1.3.34). Their defeated emotional state grants Joan an opportunity to gain royal favor. To test her worth, Charles the Dauphin engages her in "single combat," proclaiming that "if [she] vanquishest, [her] words are true" (1.3.74-5). This combat recalls divine right conquests that establish the truth of one participant over the other, as exemplified by the duel between Mowbray and Bolingbroke in Shakespeare's *Richard II*. In that play, Richard interrupts the duel because he fears the truth coming out. In *1 Henry VI*, Joan overpowers the Dauphin easily. Acknowledging his defeat as proof that God approves Joan, Charles relinquishes his own command to become her "prostrate thrall," physically lowering himself as he exchanges the rank of "sovereign" with that of "servant" to Joan (1.3.90, 96). Exercising her new authority, Joan responds for Charles when René asks about their strategy in the war (1.3.96, 105). If she can answer for the Dauphin, then she commands the troops and the course of the war with England, her victory in single combat leading to her position as acting general over an entire army of men.

Joan overcomes rigid social controls over acceptable behavior for genders and classes in a way that alters perceptions about the men she overpowers: if she can turn the Dauphin into a "prostrate thrall," then the soldiers beneath him similarly must redefine their masculinity against an overwhelmingly masculine woman. René calls attention to the conflict between Joan's position and her gender when he posits her as a champion for the French: "Woman, do what thou canst to save our honours" (1.3.129). At this point in the play, their "honours" may well need saving, but René fails to see the irony in establishing a woman as the savior of male honor. Her command reaches beyond the Dauphin to the French nobility and then to the common soldier. So she not only transgresses social expectations of gender but also of class, her status as a shepherd's daughter emphasized through her father's presence late in the play.[18] Indeed, she "exceed[s]" her "sex" in more than physical ability; she develops the social and political power to treat men as pawns on the battlefield (1.3.69).

Against Joan, Charles proves martially and sexually impotent in a way that recalls Elizabeth's courtiers, who often felt jilted when seeking the queen's favor (see chapter III). At first, Joan introduces herself as a possible lover to the Dauphin, claiming he will find fortune if he "receive [her] for [his] warlike mate" (1.3.71). The combination of "mate" and "warlike" suggests the violence that she sees within their union. Within six lines, she raises her sword against him, threatening him with martial penetration. Allusions to battle and sex intertwine as the sword substitutes for phallic penetration and as she expresses masculine intentions against his body. To counteract the sudden redistribution of power, the Dauphin attempts to transform their relationship back into one where he performs the masculine penetration—after losing to her martially, he wants her sexually: "Impatiently I burn with thy desire" (1.3.87).[19] But Joan, unlike Hippolyta or Britomart, appears equally capable of thwarting martial *and* sexual advances.

Although she alludes to her potential as a lover, perhaps foreshadowing the promiscuous reputation she gains later in the play, she frustrates any sexual desire the Dauphin has toward her:

> I must not yield to any rights of love,
> For my profession's sacred from above.
> When I have chased all thy foes from hence,
> Then will I think upon a recompense. (1.3.92-95)

In thwarting the Dauphin's advances, Joan becomes sexually subversive in the control she maintains over her own body. Theodora A. Jankowski argues that women who abandon traditional male domination over the female body are sexually subversive. In this category, she includes women who either choose to remain virgins or choose their sexual partners outside of the normal social regulations for women.[20] Joan's denial of the Dauphin indicates her superior power over him. If Leah Marcus is correct in finding "insistent parallels between Elizabeth and Joan," then this moment of male impotence aligns the two, for writers often turned Elizabeth into the unattainable object of male desire.[21] Shakespeare's Oberon discusses this attribute of Elizabeth in his speech about the "imperial vot'ress" who avoids Cupid's arrow.[22] Virginity allowed Elizabeth to disassociate from the commodity of exchange between men. Likewise, professing a desire for virginity allows Joan to focus on her abilities with a sword rather than her position as a woman.

By choosing war, Joan influences the way English soldiers interpret their own masculinity. During a battle at Orléans, she leads French forces to victory, causing the mighty Talbot to lament his English soldiers' apparent inadequacy in battle:

> Where is my strength, my valour, and my force?

Our English troops retire; I cannot stay them.

A woman clad in armour chaseth men.

Here, here she comes. [To Joan] I'll have a bout with thee.

Devil or devil's dam, I'll conjure thee.

Blood will I draw on thee—thou art a witch—

And straightway give thy soul to him thou serv'st. (1.7.1-7)

After engaging Joan, Talbot survives only because she decides his "hour is not yet come" (1.7.13). Talbot's description focuses not on the French army—made up almost exclusively of men—but on the sole "woman clad in armour" who causes Englishmen to lose "strength," "valour," and "force." Talbot notes that Joan creates confusion about gender roles. Traditionally, love causes men to "chaseth" women while battle causes men to "chaseth" men. Women who reverse these roles tend to represent subversive desire, as Venus does when she "like a bold-faced suitor 'gins to woo" her love interest in Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis*.[23] Venus, at least, reverses the roles in a relationship that includes women. Joan, on the other hand, inserts herself into the military relationship between male soldiers and becomes the aggressor. Talbot's image of Joan singlehandedly chasing retreating English forces emphasizes the magnitude of English defeat.

Because losing to a woman in battle often causes men to relinquish their masculine identity, Talbot conjures alternative means for Joan to succeed, choosing to redefine her femininity rather than his masculinity. He calls her a "witch" and a "devil or devil's dam," all terms that implicate her in nefarious affairs that exonerate his army's retreat. If she indeed uses witchcraft, then the English maintain their masculinity and their honor, for how could mere men defeat an agent of the devil? Interestingly, Talbot cannot conclude if she is the devil or his dam,

an indecision that brings up questions about her femininity. On the one hand, the devil offers an image of masculinity as he exercises sovereign power over his kingdom in hell. On the other hand, his dam presents an image of femininity in her embodiment of motherhood, even if the offspring is a devil. By likening Joan to the devil or his dam, Talbot attacks both her femininity and her humanity in the hopes of safeguarding the masculinity of the English army. To some degree, he succeeds. Shakespeare's Joan, unlike Bonduca or Margaret, engages in witchcraft, offering her "body, soul, and all" to fiends in exchange for England's defeat (5.3.22). Shakespeare characterizes Joan as an agent for something far more powerful than she is, thereby making England's retreat less effeminizing.

Joan's pursuit of men in battle provides an opportunity for Englishmen to accuse her of wanton sexuality. As the dialogue between Charles and Joan suggests, distinctions between sexual and martial desire often collapse. Likewise, editors have observed the sexual language in Joan's and Talbot's exchange, where "bout" refers to a martial and sexual "bout" and where the French word "Pucelle" (virgin) sounds much like the English word "puzzel" (slut).[24] Her unnatural thirst for battle leads to a reputation for promiscuity, for overwhelming passions control both forms of desire. Accusations about her promiscuity materialize when she admits (perhaps falsely) to being "liberal and free" with several men (5.6.82). English ideas about her warlike spirit reconstitute her as a sexual antagonist.

By rewriting Joan's character to include sexual licentiousness and devil worship, Shakespeare produces a revisionist history play that bolsters English nationalism while diminishing her historical role on the real battlefields of France. The historical Joan died a virgin, at least according to doctors who checked her body prior to execution.[25] Shakespeare's Joan tries to avoid the fiery stake by claiming she carries a child, whose father might be Charles, Alençon,

or René, though the play never shows with certainty whether Joan remains a virgin or not. Shakespeare alters the historical record when he depicts her sexuality with ambiguity. Suspicion about her sexuality and piety mitigate the power of this French warrior woman. The French championess cannot uphold ideals of sexual purity and Godly favor on the English stage, for that would insult the Englishmen who fight against her. She *cannot* be the heroine of an English drama. By adding unsavory aspects to her character, Shakespeare focuses *1 Henry VI* on Talbot and the masculine heroic warrior. And Shakespeare's revisionist history works, for a contemporary of Shakespeare's, Thomas Nashe, posits Talbot as the play's hero:

> How would it have joyed brave Talbot (the terror of the French), to think that after he had lain two hundred years in his tomb, he should triumph again on the stage, and have his bones new embalmed with the tears of ten thousand spectators (at least), who in the tragedian that represents his person imagine they behold him fresh bleeding.[26]

Talbot's "triumph" on the stage represents the play's victorious revision of English history, for though Talbot dies tragically in battle before Joan, he remains the hero who upholds English honor. In reality, Joan's army reclaims most of the French territory won by Henry V, but Shakespeare downplays her role to focus on Talbot's victories. Similar to Ralegh's explorations to the New World (see chapter II), Shakespeare brought to early modern audiences a version of events that concentrates on his own theatrical agenda. Thus, Shakespeare promotes an image of Joan as a monstrous warrior woman, with a rabid sexuality to match her martial spirit.

In *1 Henry VI*, Shakespeare toys with the idea of a warrior woman but devalues her mimetic and symbolic potential by depicting her as a devil worshiper; in *3 Henry VI*, Shakespeare advances a warrior woman as a viable contestant for the heroic role. When Henry VI disinherits his son to appease the ambitious noblemen who vie for the throne, his wife

advocates war and, with Clifford by her side, seizes control over her husband's army. Margaret's and Clifford's shared duties limit the heroic potential of both characters, for neither of them fully develops as a singular leader of their army. Unlike most Shakespearean histories, *3 Henry VI* lacks an obvious hero. Henry VI is too weak. York fights against the titular character. Clifford never assumes absolute power, and Margaret is a woman. These characters compete for the vacant hero position. The possibility of a woman filling this position disrupts the overtly masculine record of English history, where women remained on the sidelines in deference to the men's more significant actions in politics and in battle. Margaret subverts the masculine record when she assumes Henry's position in the management of the nation.

In *3 Henry VI,* Shakespeare depicts the confusion that occurs on the battlefield when a woman contends for the heroic role. Margaret's army subdues Warwick's forces, whose reputations suffer because they lose to a woman. Warwick attempts to understand his defeated soldiers' apparent loss of passion:

> But whether 'twas the coldness of the King,
> Who looked full gently on his warlike queen,
> That robbed my soldiers of their heated spleen,
> Or whether 'twas report of her success,
> Or more than common fear of Clifford's rigour—
> Who thunders to his captains blood and death—
> I cannot judge; but, to conclude with truth,
> Their weapons like to lightning came and went;
> Our soldiers', like the night-owl's lazy flight. (*3 Henry VI* 2.1.122-30)

Warwick toys with three possibilities to account for his soldiers' defeat, two of which involve Margaret. The first possibility concerns Margaret's womanly role. Warwick wonders if the soldiers feel empathetic toward Margaret because Henry "look[s] full gently" on her. This option calls attention to the role Margaret *should* have in the country: as a woman and as a queen, the army should protect her. Instead, Warwick drives his army to destroy her in a battle that reverses men's traditional roles as protectors of women.

In the second possibility, Warwick considers his army's response to Margaret's assumption of masculine characteristics as she leads her troops to battle. This option suggests that the soldiers might fear the "warlike queen" and her army's "report of success." If Margaret can successfully incite fear in her enemies, then she has perhaps developed heroic status, like Talbot and other Shakespearean heroes. In *1 Henry VI*, for instance, the mention of Talbot's *name* causes men to abandon their weapons and flee the battlefield (2.2.83). Although Margaret never reaches the height of Talbot's success, she does enter into Warwick's considerations about his army's defeat.

The third possibility juxtaposes with the second to show what armies ought to fear: a powerful commander like Clifford. But Clifford is no Talbot. In sharing his victories with Margaret, Clifford offers a poor substitute for the masculine heroes of Shakespeare's other history plays. Although he feels that Clifford should evoke fear, Warwick only presents this option as the "more than common fear," playing on definitions of "common" to suggest this is a normal and appropriate reason for an army to lose but also that "common" soldiers are more likely to fear a male hero. Warwick's options demonstrate the extent to which Margaret has entered into discussions about the battle, for she presents an anomaly, and Warwick attempts to understand how soldiers might respond to her differently than to her male counterpart, Clifford.

Warwick toys with the possibility that his soldiers have been "robbed…of their heated spleen" because she is a woman.[27] As the note in the *Norton* edition suggests, "spleen" refers to the "fiery passion" that makes men effective soldiers.[28] Soldiers who lack spleen are deficient in one of the essential substances that make them men. The army's lack of "spleen" suggests one of the problems with martial women is that subordination to them diminishes men's ability to be men.

Just as Warwick advances two theories about Margaret, one involving her performance of masculinity and one involving her performance of femininity, Margaret also understands her dual gender performance while on the battlefield. Unlike Joan, who remains single, Margaret marries and produces an heir, two factors that draw attention to her femininity. While on the battlefield, she must forge an identity consistent with her role as commander. She tries to disassociate with her feminine roles—the roles of wife, mother, and queen—to focus instead on her role as a warrior. Therefore, she removes the primary indicator of her subordinate position: Henry, her husband and king. After she demands that Henry leave the battlefield, she allows Clifford to explain why: "the Queen hath best success when you are absent" (2.2.73-4). Henry hinders Margaret's ability to develop agency because he represents the figure who *should* wield power. To command the armies, Margaret must transition into Henry's masculine role.

While questioning Henry's masculinity, Margaret specifically associates the duties of men with war and finds her husband lacking in the qualities necessary for kingship. She compares her husband's ambitions to Suffolk's: "I tell thee, Pole, when in the city Tours / Thou rann'st a-tilt in honour of my love / …I thought King Henry had resembled thee" (*2 Henry VI* 1.3.54-7). Finding Suffolk's "courage, courtship, and proportion" admirable, Margaret assumes that the king reigning over such a nobleman would share equivalent masculine qualities (1.3.58). Importantly, these qualities manifest through tilts, the primary testing ground for battle skills

outside of war. Continuing her perusal of the king, Margaret explains his pursuits in terms of the martial undertakings he has given up:

> But all his mind is bent to holiness,
> To number Ave-Maries on his beads.
> His champions are the prophets and apostles,
> His weapons holy saws of sacred writ,
> His study is his tilt-yard, and his loves
> Are brazen images of canonized saints. (1.3.52-64)

According to his wife, the king has replaced champions, weapons, and tilts with holy objects, saints, and study, and the tone of her comparison, including her use of the conjunction "but" to begin the passage, indicates her disapproval of these replacements. Comparing the king's pursuits in scripture to the tilts and battles that she views as vital to the monarchy emphasizes the gap between Henry's manner of ruling and her conception of kingship. For Margaret, kings should emanate masculinity, and the most obvious proving ground of masculinity is the battlefield. Henry's failure to meet her expectations creates a vacuum that Margaret tries to occupy first by taking Suffolk as her champion and next by using weapons against Henry's enemies. Thus, she fulfills her own idea of kingship, substituting for her husband in the activity she deems most masculine: battle.

The desire to substitute for Henry is not limited to Margaret; Suffolk and other nobles realize that the king's inaction presents them with the opportunity to take action. In the cliffhanger ending *1 Henry VI,* Suffolk voices his desire to rule through Margaret: "Margaret shall now be queen and rule the King; / But I will rule both her, the King, and realm" (5.7.107-8). In essence, Suffolk wants to replace Henry in Margaret's bed and in royal control of England.

But Margaret understands the danger of overreaching nobility and spends much of *2 Henry VI* attempting to bolster Henry's kingship, and, consequently, her queenship. She eliminates Gloucester and his wife and establishes allies with men in power. By *3 Henry VI*, however, Margaret begins making decisions for the king. As the nobles vie for the throne, Margaret proves that someone other than the king can run Parliament and control the armies: conversing with the nobles, York claims "the Queen this day here holds her Parliament," implying that control over the country has transferred to Margaret, and as the battle ensues between the Houses of York and Lancaster, she sends her husband from the field. Taking Henry's place compounds the already tense situation between the king and his nobles. When the nobility acts upon their greed for power, they merely highlight the chaos that occurs when the king no longer claims sovereignty. Margaret's usurpation of her husband's position shows the weakening of England's monarchy and teaches the nobility that they too can seize power.

The major problem with the reversal of gender roles in Margaret and Henry's marriage lies in the mismanagement of the country that occurs when the head of state vacates the masculine role. His weakness as a king leads to the mismanagement of the nation—his solemn duty—just as transference of that management to Margaret suggests his inability to perform his kingly or manly duties. Cynthia Herrup has noted the tendency in royal marriages of the king to act as the head of justice while the queen provides a sense of mercy and kindness.[29] The rigid gender roles maintain stability not only within the marriage but also among the nobility and subjects of the realm. In the *Henry VI* plays, Margaret enacts justice, particularly in her execution-style punishment of York, while Henry stands for piety and mercy. Even bringing Margaret into England generates doubts as to his successful administration of the nation: the heavy taxes levied to pay for her trip and the gift of Maine and Anjou to Margaret's father

severely weaken his "own lands," which are "bargained for and sold" on her behalf (1.1.129, 230).

The early modern period, at least until the Tudor Queens, imagined England as a feminine nation in need of a masculine overseer. Mary and Elizabeth handled this trope by showing the land as an extension of their own bodies, the political bodies encompassing both monarch and nation.[30] In the *Henry VI* plays, the relationship between the land and the monarch gets complicated, for Henry should manage a feminized nation, but instead, Margaret does. In substituting for Henry, she becomes a disruptive force that hinders the proper management of England. She, like Joan, depreciates the patriarchal prerogative so necessary to monarchal hierarchies. Margaret is female and French—two characteristics that preclude her from commanding English forces. When she seizes sovereign power, Margaret contaminates the English monarchy.

Shakespeare's Margaret, much like his Joan, develops a sexual reputation that further degrades her position as queen. She not only has an affair with Suffolk but also prohibits her husband's access to her body. In this way, she follows the pattern commonly seen among warrior women: those women who cannot be contained on the battlefield also cannot be contained in the bedroom. Henry is incapable of performing the violence that Theseus and Artegall use to subdue their warrior wives (see chapter III), so Margaret is allowed to choose who can and who cannot enter her bed. Upon hearing the deal between Henry and York that would deprive her son, Prince Edward, of the throne, Margaret renounces her husband: "But thou preferr'st thy life before thine honour. / And seeing thou dost, I here divorce myself / Both from thy table, Henry, and thy bed" (*3 Henry VI* 1.1.248-49). In divorcing Henry from her bed, Margaret manipulates private matters in their relationship to her advantage. The language she uses alludes to church law that

"permitted marital separation 'from bed and board' in cases of adultery, heresy, and cruelty."[31] Usually, these cases only involved the man separating from the woman. While debating the lawful reasons for divorce, John Rainolds in 1609 argues that "our Saviour Christ alloweth *him* whose wife committeth fornication to put her away and marry another."[32] No stipulation allows for the wife's dismissal of her husband, so Margaret's rejection of Henry assigns to him the wifely role, the subordinate object.

The *Henry VI* plays offer an alternative example of how divorce cases should work. Gloucester reacts to his wife's witchcraft and treason against the king by "banish[ing] her [from his] bed and company" (*2 Henry VI* 2.2.207). Gloucester's wife, like Margaret, attempts to control the monarchy by overreaching the boundaries of womanly behavior. Unlike Henry, however, Gloucester discards his wife. Early modern conduct manuals cited obedience and silence as the preferred methods for women to maintain balance and unity in marriage, and Gloucester's wife fails in this regard even though she is, according to Gloucester, "noble," implying that she should understand her placement in both patriarchal and monarchal hierarchies. Her offence justifies her punishment. Conversely, Margaret punishes Henry, reversing gender distinctions that place the man and king in the authoritative position. Henry's response to Margaret after she withdraws his sexual rights—"Stay, gentle Margaret, and hear me speak"—is met with her repudiation of his right to speak: "Thou hast spoke too much already" (1.1.58-59). In this reversal of gender roles, Henry becomes the one who must remain silent, the one who must prove obedience to the spouse, and the one who must seek his wife's approval for his actions.

Warrior women tend to emasculate the men around them, especially those men who fail to adequately contain the women through marriage or battle. Margaret proves uncontainable

even in her adulterous relationship with Suffolk, where her virility calls attention to Suffolk's inadequacies as a man. Desiring sovereignty even in amorous affairs, Margaret manipulates power dynamics in her relationship with Suffolk so that his character becomes the one associated with femininity. For instance, when Suffolk accepts his banishment from England, Margaret calls him a "coward woman and soft-hearted wretch" who lacks the "spirit to curse [his] enemies" (*2 Henry VI* 3.2.309-10). This line foreshadows Margaret's ahistorical return in *Richard III*, when she certainly has the spirit to curse Richard and his family. The "spirit" Suffolk lacks refers not only to the passion she expects out of Suffolk but also to the semen that marks his masculinity.[33] In essence, she accuses him of lacking male parts, making him the "coward woman" of her chastisement. Ironically, he later returns to Margaret without male parts, for his decapitation only leaves his head to "lie on [Margaret's] throbbing breast" with no body attached that she "should embrace" (4.4.5-6). The trajectory of Suffolk's character suggests his steadily weakening state, for he moves from the epitome of manhood in Margaret's early description of his tournaments, to the "coward woman" who cannot even curse, to an infant-like head held at Margaret's breast. Ostensibly, his relationship with Margaret causes this transformation, suggesting the surmounting nature of her warrior spirit. Suffolk's musings about Margaret ruling the king while he rules her appear only partially correct: Margaret does rule the king, but Suffolk fails to notice Margaret's power extends beyond Suffolk's ability to control (5.7.107-8). In her relationship with Suffolk, she transitions from adulterous lover to perverse mother in this strange image of Suffolk's head at her breast.

On the battlefield in *3 Henry VI*, Margaret portrays Shakespeare's early interest in martial motherhood, which he develops further in *Coriolanus* (1608). Margaret initially fights to defend the inheritance of her son, Prince Edward, and her eventual relinquishment of weapons occurs

when Edward dies, eliminating the cause of her martial ambitions. Immediately following his death, Margaret advances into the role she occupies in *Richard III*, when she curses instead of wounds her enemies:

> *[George] stabs [Prince Edward, who dies]*
>
> Margaret O, kill me too!
>
> Richard Marry, and shall.
>
> *[He] offers to kill her*
>
> King Edward Hold, Richard, hold—for we have done too much.
>
> Richard Why should she live to fill the world with words? (*3 Henry VI* 5.5.41-44)

This scene is the culmination of Margaret's dual gender performance throughout the play. Whereas combat is the most quintessentially masculine duty, childbirth is the most intrinsically feminine undertaking. By performing both, Margaret assumes the most qualitative roles of each gender. Along a similar line of argumentation, Janet Adelman and Coppélia Kahn have discussed martial mothering in *Coriolanus*, a play that shows a mother's insistence upon her son's martial inheritance from her body.[34] To experience subjectivity, Coriolanus must separate from his mother, Volumnia, whose body, as Kahn argues, seems entirely responsible for her son's abilities.[35] Indeed, Volumnia tells Coriolanus, "Thy valiantness was mine, thou sucked'st from me."[36] Like Volumnia, Margaret likely engenders her son's stalwart behavior, for Henry lacks the skill (though the play exposes the possibility that Suffolk rather than Henry sired Prince Edward). Where Volumnia transfers "valiantness" to her son, Margaret enacts it on the battlefield alongside Prince Edward. Margaret conflates the roles of warrior and mother, for she

only performs the former for the sake of the latter. For Margaret, motherhood proves powerful enough to drive martial undertakings and to surrender from them.

King Edward, formerly Earl of March and Duke of York, responds to Margaret's plea for the sword in a way that indicates another anxiety over warrior women: violence against all women—even *warrior* women—challenges the position of men as protectors of women and children. King Edward, claiming "we have done too much," acknowledges their divergence from a masculine code that should protect Prince Edward, the child whom they do kill, and Margaret, the woman whom Richard wants to kill. Prince Edward's body on the stage reinforces Margaret's role as a mother just as her attempted sacrifice after his death reminds audience members of the inheritance she fights to defend. Men's primary role on the battlefield lies in protecting their families and their people. Discussing Shakespeare's *Henry V*, Howard and Rackin posit the protection of French women as the reason for the French city of Harfleur's surrender.[37] Henry V threatens the "fresh fair virgins" and "flow'ring infants" that Englishmen would rape or kill during a raid of the city.[38] The governor opens the city gates to save the women and children who expect his protection, either with war or surrender. Many of these gender expectations still exist today, showing how thoroughly engrained these roles are across different societies. Fighting alongside women and killing women goes against some of men's primary objectives in combat. Women on the battlefield cause men to act in ways that contradict their usual behavior, and any military action against Margaret breaches masculine codes of chivalry.

Warrior women defy social commonplaces defining proper behaviors for men and women. Fighting against women causes men to deny their roles as protectors of women while also sacrificing their manliness if they lose. Margaret acts as general over English armies, wields

a sword, and undergoes judgment based on her questionable sexuality—all because she cannot be contained by the patriarchal system that usually promotes marriage as the preferred method for controlling wives. Although Henry fails to manage his wife, the play finally contains her by dramatizing the loss of her family and her relinquishment of weapons. This change in Margaret's character is consistent with patriarchal attempts to contain warrior women's subversive qualities, for most male writers depict the eventual containment of female characters whose agency competes with men's. In the end, Margaret conforms to a more womanly method of voicing discontent: the curses she spews in *Richard III*. Cursing women are a commonplace within early modern literature, so Margaret's ahistorical occurrence in *Richard III* as a cursing woman shows the degree to which she has been contained within the patriarchal system, though her appearance subverts historical chronology in a way that suggests she still threatens Richard's monarchy. Importantly, her transition back into the patriarchal system is accomplished through combat—only with violence can her opponents defeat her martial (though not her verbal) fortitude. In chapter II, I show how marriage transforms Britomart and Hippolyta into "acceptable" warrior women; Margaret must also transform, but hers is more destructive because marriage fails to bridle her spirit. Once beaten, however, she relinquishes the masculine characteristics that have dominated her character throughout the play, showing a newfound femininity when she "swoon[s]" immediately after giving up the sword, much to the surprise of her captors (5.5.43).

2. Bodies at War: Bonduca's Valiant Defense of the British Isle

In early modern England, staging women in positions of power inevitably conjured visions of Elizabeth and the worthy women who acted as precedents for her reign.[39] These precedents often appear in celebrations of female rule that emphasize these women's martial and

moral fortitude, as exemplified in Thomas Heywood's *The Exemplary Lives and Memorable Acts of Nine the Most Worthie Women of the World* (1640) and John Ferne's *The Blazon of Gentrie* (1586). For instance, Heywood praises women like Deborah, Bonduca, Penthesilea, Margaret, and Elizabeth for actively defending their people rather than passively obeying masculine authority, quite unlike conduct manuals like Robert Greene's *Penelope's Web* (1601) that encourage women's obedience. By including Elizabeth alongside other martial women, Heywood and Ferne call attention to her warlike defense of England while suggesting correlations between Elizabeth and women like Margaret and Bonduca.[40] Such comparisons carry over to representations of Bonduca on the early modern stage. In using previous warrior women to allude to Elizabeth, Fletcher, Shakespeare, and other writers call attention to the mimetic potential of theater, where women like Margaret, Joan, and Bonduca instruct early modern audiences about the exceptionalism not just of their current monarch but of past women as well.

In dramatizing Bonduca's defense of the British isle against invading Roman forces, Fletcher turns the play into a political commentary about Elizabeth's battle against the Spanish Armada. Although scholars have discussed similarities between Elizabeth and Bonduca, their studies have largely been on social anxieties about the transition from a strong queen to a weak king, as occurs in the shift from Elizabeth to James.[41] In these readings, the strong male character of Caratach, ostensibly the hero of Fletcher's play rather than Bonduca, represents people's desire for a masculine monarch. This focus on James largely ignores the clear similarities between Elizabeth's and Bonduca's wars against the invading forces of Spain and Rome, respectively. In Fletcher's play, Bonduca, Queen of the Iceni, defends Britain against assailing Roman forces determined to "measure out more ground / To adde to *Rome.*"[42] The play

begins halfway through the war but provides background that describes the inciting incident that led Bonduca to battle: the Romans confiscate her property, whip Bonduca, and rape her two daughters. Bonduca rallies an army, appointing Caratach as her general, and wins several battles against the Romans, whose general, Suetonius, barely manages to feed his army, let alone defeat the unruly British soldiers on their own soil. Although much of the tragedy looks grim for the Roman forces, they finally manage to overcome Bonduca's army and watch as she defiantly commits suicide with her daughters atop a city's battlements.

At first glance, Bonduca's drama seems quite different from the historical record of Elizabeth's defense against the Armada, but three comparative moments demonstrate the political implications of Bonduca's narrative. First, Bonduca appoints a general to serve as intermediary between the queen and soldiers much like Elizabeth designates Leicester to command for her at Tilbury (see chapter II). In accentuating Caratach's involvement, Fletcher incorporates early modern ideas about gender roles by distancing the queen from her army. Second, *Bonduca* metaphorically equates its queen's body with the nation's body much like representations of Elizabeth metaphorically mapped the English isle onto her body.[43] Chronicle histories, as Rackin has noted, often substitute the history of the monarch for the history of the nation, the actions, desires, and outcomes of each king or queen transcending into the providential destiny of England.[44] Moreover, the associations between the monarch and the nation have led scholars like Susanne Scholz, Richard Helgerson, and Louis Montrose to read the feminized England, a territory that must be managed and defended, as a geographical body metaphorically figured onto Elizabeth's body, the geopolitical body politic residing within the body natural of the monarch.[45] Such discourses about the queen's body extend to her virginity as a marker of England's "inviolable boundaries": Montrose argues that "the security of the island

realm, the strength and integrity of the English body politic, are thus made to seem mystically dependent upon the strength and integrity—the intact condition—of the queen's body natural."[46] Through this logic, Spain's invasion of English territory equates to Philip II's metaphorical rape of Elizabeth's body.

Bonduca, likewise, depicts its queen as intrinsically connected to the British isle—only this rape is figured quite literally with Bonduca's daughters. The play's representation of the British revolt focuses not on collective defiance against Roman occupation but on individual female bodies that Romans violate—bodies that, as it turns out, possess the capacity to fight back. The violation of the individual mobilizes a nation, the tribes joining Bonduca's army connecting Roman abuse against her to the larger collective abuse against the British peoples. The successes and failures of Bonduca correspond to those of Britain as well. On the stage, Bonduca substitutes for the body of Britain in a way that hearkens to Elizabethan geopolitical discourses about the queen's body.

Third, like the storms that racked the Armada, nature plays a vital role in subduing the Romans, even if only temporary. Working outside of his source material, Fletcher describes Romans who find British lands more inhospitable than the people: the island offers no food for the Romans while the British armies have food in abundance. Like Fletcher's Romans, the Spanish invading Elizabeth's England found natural forces more hostile than their enemies, the storms wrecking most of the Armada in what many attributed to divine providence. If Bonduca's physical body substitutes for the nation, then Fletcher's play becomes profoundly political through its discourses about starvation, for the land seems magically to transform for its queen, much like England's waters thwarted the Spanish fleet.

Fletcher presents Roman starvation as the main cause of British victory. After much discussion in the Roman camp about groaning bellies—a problem that leads Judas and others to sneak into the British camp for food—Petillius presents to General Suetonius the risk of "murmurs, mutinies, nay, rebellions" because the soldiers desire sustenance from other, more hospitable countries:

> Now, and they want but Mustard, they're in uproars:
> No oil but Candy, Lucitanian figs,
> And wine from Lesbos, now can satisfie 'em:
> The British waters are grown dull and muddy,
> The fruit disgustful: Orontes must be sought for,
> And Apples from the happie Isles: the truth is,
> They are more curious now in having nothing,
> Then if the sea and land turn'd up their treasures:
> This lost the Colonies, and gave *Bonduca*
> (With shame we must record it) time and strength
> To look into our Fortunes…. (1.2.167-78)

The barrenness of the island causes Petillius to dream of other locations in the Roman Empire, like Orontes in the east, Lucitania in modern day Spain and Portugal, and Lesbos in the Aegean Sea, all of which can sustain them. These are lands and peoples that Romans can control. Bonduca and the British land mysteriously conjoin to fight against invasion. As the Romans dehydrate on muddy water and starve on distasteful fruit, Bonduca's soldiers gain "time and strength," a major advantage in the war. The strength they gain directly relates to the food the

land offers them, so much so, in fact, that Caratach graciously feeds Judas and several other Roman soldiers when they are caught stealing food in the British camp.

After Bonduca's death, the land turns against British soldiers in a reversal of fortune that suggests the land only sustains its people while its queen survives. If Bonduca's individual body represents the British nation, then the death of the former indicates the demise of the latter. After Bonduca's suicide, Caratach and his nephew retreat, and in a mad exclamation about the ruin Bonduca's death has caused, Caratach claims that "the Land [she] hast left a wildernesse of wretches" (5.1.15). The Romans plot to capture Caratach by luring him with food in direct opposition to the way British soldiers catch Judas: when asked what "victuals" Caratach has, Judas, now free, responds,

> Not a piece of Bisket,
> Not so much as will stop a tooth; nor water,
> More then they make themselves: they lie
> Just like a brace of bear-whelps, close, and crafty,
> Sucking their fingers for food. (5.2.112-17)

The final image is one of British soldiers eating themselves. Without its queen, the land immediately turns against the soldiers, siding with the Romans who now possess it. Discussions about food dominate much of the play, so the reversal of fortunes suggests an association between the bodies of the land and of the monarch. The poison that destroys Bonduca's body seems to annihilate the land as well.

Connecting Bonduca's and Britain's bodies, however, does present a problem: the queen's body is accessible to others, so, by extension, the country is open to invasion. In propaganda under Elizabeth's reign, the virginity of the queen correlated to the impenetrability

of the island. *Bonduca*, however, emphasizes the sexuality of the queen as both Romans and British comment on her excessive "widows lust" (2.2.77). Moreover, the Roman scourging of her body opens that female body for others' view. Writing about women on the scaffold, Frances E. Dolan argues that executions contributed to women's "subject-formation" because they created a space for women's bodies to be openly seen and for women's voices to be openly heard—and even *recorded*.[47] Likewise, Bonduca becomes visible to the Romans who witness her punishment, but unlike the women being executed, Bonduca survives to stand against those very Romans who beat her. Her body conveys openness and accessibility. Because her body metaphorically extends to the island realm, Britain becomes exposed, susceptible to Roman invasion of its shores.

Bonduca and her daughters come dangerously close to mirroring the actions of Amazons like Penthesilea and Radigund in their conflation of sex and battle (see chapter II). After craftily luring a Roman soldier with a promise of marriage, Bonduca's daughters try to kill him in an act that suggests part of the anxiety about warrior women lies in their ability to use sexuality against soldiers in battle. Like the Amazons I discuss in chapter II, these women use whatever means necessary to subdue their enemies. Freeing the soldier in question, Caratach chastens them: "Out, / Out ye sluts, ye follies; from our swords / Filch our revenges basely? / … / You should have kept your legs close…" (3.5.65-71). Bonduca's daughters always reflect upon the mother, appearing as extensions of Bonduca's own body: they are her only heirs, and they act alongside her in all endeavors, from chariot warfare to joint suicide. So the wantonness of the daughters extends to the mother, whose sexuality also tarnishes her reputation. Furthermore, the family structure—a mother and two daughters—mirrors the societies of Amazons who only allow the female children to survive. The fighting techniques and family life of Bonduca and her daughters

demonstrate that the major anxiety about Amazons—that they can potentially infiltrate European society—can become reality. As part of *British* history, Bonduca and her daughters provide mimetic value to English women. Like Britomart, whose lineage to Elizabeth instilled a martial tradition in the queen, Bonduca provides early British precedent for warlike defense of the island realm. But presenting Bonduca as a figure for Elizabeth has its dangers, for the sexuality of Bonduca and the failure of her battle with the Romans causes anxiety about the methods with which these women maintain power. Caratach voices outrage against warrior women who debase what he considers the noble art of warfare with sexually charged games.

In a discussion with Bonduca about warfare, Caratach suggests that male contestants on the battlefield always occupy unstable gender roles. Bonduca insists upon the "blushing shame of [Roman] souldiers," those "*Romane* Girls," who twice fled the field when confronted by "a weak woman" (1.1.2, 11, 17). Although her statement seems to construe gender according to performance, Bonduca uses it more as an insult than as a determiner of gender roles. By expounding the victory of a "woman" over "Girls," Bonduca conflates everyone, winners and losers, to feminine roles. Thus, she fails to understand the complicated nature of masculinity on the battlefield—a fault in Bonduca that Caratach tries to correct. He describes the act of fighting in terms of marital relationships where the victor becomes the man and the loser the woman:

> Witnesse these wounds, I do; they were fairly given.
> I love an enemy: I was born a souldier;
> And he that in the head on's Troop defies me,
> Bending my manly body with his sword,
> I make a Mistris. Yellow-tressed *Hymen*
> Ne'er ty'd a longing Virgin with more joy,

Then I am married to that man that wounds me:

And are not all these *Romane*? (1.1.56-63)

Caratach sexualizes the relationship between enemy soldiers to emphasize the masculine and feminine qualities of each. The passage evokes an image of homoerotic desire on the battlefield as two men use phallic swords and vaginal wounds to determine who will become the "Mistris" in this marriage union between soldiers. Moreover, Caratach appears to relish the possibility that he might be feminized by another: the wounds are "fairly given" through the "bending" of Caratach's "manly body." As Hymen, god of marriage ceremonies, binds two people together until death parts them, so combat unites two soldiers until only one remains. Unlike marriage, where the participants have stable gender roles to perform, battle forces the combatants to oscillate between the feminine and masculine roles until the victor establishes his masculinity over the other. Thus, Caratach's wounds initially place him in the feminine position: he is penetrated by the opponent's sword. But Caratach eventually "make[s] a Mistris" of his lover/enemy when his sword proves the more valiant. The penetration that leads to death produces the final establishment of the conqueror's masculinity, affirming the position of the victor over the vanquished.

Caratach's representation of combat as a sexual act extends to the entire army and assigns the victorious army the role of sexual aggressor and the defeated army the role of fleeing virgin. Chastising Bonduca for calling the Romans girls, Caratach describes battles that the British have lost, when, like the Romans, British soldiers have been "dishearted" and have run like "the virgin from the high sett ravisher" (1.1.87, 89). Caratach's metaphor associates women with fleeing and men with ravishing, and he emphasizes the interchangeability of these roles when he reminds Bonduca that the army associated with womankind has, at times, been his own: when Bonduca

begs Caratach to "let [her] think [the British] conquer'd," Caratach responds, "Do; but so think, as we may be conquer'd" (1.1.136-37). As Caratach risks becoming the "Mistris" every time he engages in single combat, so his army risks becoming feminized every time it engages enemy forces. Caratach's simile about the virgin fleeing a ravisher recalls the rapes of Bonduca's daughters that yield the very literal delineation of masculine and feminine roles. During the rapes, Romans clearly possess the masculine position, but Caratach shows that even these roles are malleable, for they reverse when the Romans lose, though the reversal is less literal and more metaphorical. The simile about the fleeing virgin alludes to another chase: the popular stories about virgins fleeing gods or heroes who threaten sexual violence in works like Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. In these stories, a sympathetic third party intervenes and transforms the virgin into some other, now inviolable, entity like a tree or an animal. The one to transform is always the one fleeing; in this case, the army fleeing changes, not into an animal, but into the "Mistris," the female. Ovid's virgins change through outside involvement; Caratach's army alters in direct response to its own actions. Therefore, each army has the potential for one role or the other, demonstrating that the metaphorically gendered roles that the armies assume relate not to any preordained notion of higher or lower status but to the actions each army performs on that particular day.

If, as Caratach suggests, gender roles on the battlefield are malleable, then Bonduca can presumably become the husband in a union with enemy soldiers. When Caratach and a male enemy fight, according to Caratach's metaphor, the victor proves his masculinity while the loser lapses into femininity. If, however, Bonduca defeats an enemy, then the gender dynamics conflict with the power dynamics between the victorious and the defeated. Either Bonduca assumes the male role, feminizing the actual man she defeats, or she maintains her female role

while the male enemy becomes less powerful than she. Ostensibly, this demotion would leave him genderless, neither male nor female. Bonduca's remarks about gender confuse Caratach's metaphor further, as she shows that gender is not only unstable but also indefinable. Her insistence on her enemies' femininity suggests she acknowledges Caratach's definitions of gender roles on the battlefield. After British victory, for instance, Bonduca characterizes the Romans with womanly attributes: they are "Girls" whose "bodies sweat with sweet oils, loves allurements, / Not lustie Arms" (1.1.9-10). She imagines their bodies physically changing in response to their actions on the field. The men's sweat, an indicator of their exercise in battle, transforms into the perfumed oils that women use. Indeed, they have become the wife in the marriage between soldiers, but that role places Bonduca in the role of husband even as she insists that "a woman" beat the soldiers. For her, a woman on the battlefield turns everyone into "Girls." Her enemies cannot gain masculinity by killing her, for fighting a woman offers no honor in warfare. Thus, warrior women confuse relationships based on gender or power.

Bonduca's sexuality and her activity in combat combine to create in her the feared image of the uncontainable woman. Neither the assault on her person, nor the rape of her daughters, nor the attack of Roman forces stops Bonduca from attempting her desires, and this spirit emerges further in the manner of her death. With British defeat imminent, Bonduca climbs upon the battlements of the city, presumably in the gallery above the stage, and looks down upon the Romans, who ask that she "yeeld" (4.4.8). Her response—"I am unacquainted with that language, Roman" (4.4.9)—suggests the irrepressible nature of her spirit. Her final words and actions represent a reversal of earlier harms performed against her, as the Romans acknowledge: "see the Icenian Queen in all her glory / From the strong battlements proudly appearing, / as if she meant to give us lashes" (4.4.6-8). She no longer behaves as the passive recipient of the

Roman lash but faces the opposing army from the "battlements," a word choice that reflects her warlike nature, and she at least looks as though she might reciprocate the Roman assault on her body. Instructing her daughters on the necessity of their deaths, she reveals a common conception of kingship: "the lives of Kings rest in their Diadems, / Which to their bodies lively souls do give, / And ceasing to be Kings, they cease to live" (4.4.40-42). Loss of sovereignty equals loss of life—the body politic and body natural reside as one. Her previous experience under Roman control included lashes and rapes, so Bonduca determines to abstain from any future involvements through suicide.

The Romans who stand outside the city walls have created a "mighty breach," which Bonduca, in her final act as a commander over British soldiers, orders Nennius to "stick in [his] body": she wants him to use his own body to plug the hole and to "then be sure to die" (4.4.80, 82). His agreement indicates the loyalty he feels toward his queen. If attacks on cities are metaphorically linked to the rape of the city and monarch, as scholars have suggested, then Bonduca's situation turns quite literal given the precedent of her daughters' rapes and the possibility for her own rape if Romans succeed. Nennius prevents the metaphorical rape of the city. When he uses his body to block the breach, he demonstrates the masculine duty of Englishmen: as Jacqueline Vanhoutte writes, "the protection of England defines English masculinity, but England requires in return a great deal of blood sacrifice."[48] The British block the Romans' masculine penetration with a male body, the "blood sacrifice" maintaining British honor. Nennius also ensures that Bonduca remains unassailable until death, for the sacrifice of blood is not limited to men in this play—Bonduca and her daughters take the masculine position by sacrificing their own lives as well.

In her suicide, Bonduca recalls Shakespeare's Cleopatra, who also uses death as an escape from Roman occupation. Bonduca's "Diadems" invoke the "diadem" that Cleopatra wears in death, the language from the earlier play appearing in the later one.[49] Like Cleopatra, Bonduca gains Roman honor through suicide. Vanhoutte argues that suicide compels Caesar to consider Cleopatra as a "political agent."[50] Like Caesar, Suetonius admits that Bonduca "was truly noble, and a Queen" only after her death, even though his actions until that point are to strip her of royalty (4.4.156). In death, both Cleopatra and Bonduca cease to directly threaten patriarchal authority, for their deaths resonate as the necessary end of these women's overbearing accomplishments in masculine political and martial arenas. However much Fletcher may borrow from Shakespeare in presenting his heroine's death, one notable difference remains: Cleopatra is Queen of Egypt, geographically, politically, and socially distinct from early modern ideals; Bonduca is a British queen, one of the early examples of "female worthies" in a tradition that includes Elizabeth. Further implicating Bonduca as a figure for Elizabeth, Catherine Loomis argues that plays about female corpses in the Jacobean period show figurations of the late queen.[51] In its figuration of Elizabeth in the character of Bonduca, the play suggests that female rulers possess the capacity for martial endeavors for the defense of the nation. Indeed, the play upholds gynocracy even in Bonduca's death, for that death invokes the Roman idea of honorable suicide rather than the Christian notion of self-slaughter. While protecting their nations, both the literary Bonduca and the historical Elizabeth experience sovereignty over the lives and deaths of men in subversive moments that challenge male superiority.

Through suicide, Bonduca simultaneously evades containment and performs her own containment. It is her final act of resistance. Although the Romans fail to quell her spirit, the play finally does, turning the historical drama into a tragic discussion of a warrior woman fighting

against patriarchy. And it is this patriarchy that the last scene of the play celebrates: after British defeat, Caratach joins the Roman forces, and "all that's excellent in man" is allowed to prevail (5.3.183). The world transforms to one of masculine desires once the warrior woman's reign finally ends.

The warrior women of this chapter depict the dangerous implications of queens on the battlefield in patriarchal societies. As Margaret substitutes for her husband and as Bonduca substitutes for the nation, they challenge the masculinity of men surrounding them, particularly during battle. The plays ultimately report their loss of power—Bonduca by killing herself and Margaret by abandoning the battle—but the success with which they enter the masculine arena suggests the failure of patriarchy to contain them to womanly roles. As I suggest in chapter III, warrior women who conform to a patriarchal organization of society survive as wives; those who fail to conform, like Margaret and Bonduca, suffer tragically. Although Margaret survives, her ahistorical reappearance in *Richard III* shows her without family and without hope for better fortunes. She survives only to curse those who destroy her. The harder warrior women press against social norms, the harder they fall by their plays' end. In this chapter, I have focused on ideas of substitution: on the ways in which Margaret and Bonduca replace men. I now turn to another form of substitution: in chapter V, I interrogate women's violent attacks on male bodies as warrior women substitute for men in killing others and in penetrating bodies.

CHAPTER V

PENETRATING THE BODY: VIOLENCE AND AGENCY AMONG WARRIOR WOMEN

In previous chapters, I have considered the way literary representations of women on the battlefield depict social constructions of gender in the genres of romance, comedy, and history. In doing so, I have demonstrated society's desire to preserve the patriarchal order, to subsume the warrior woman into marriages, and to contain her through violent means. But what if warrior women did roam the streets of London and cavort about the countryside brandishing their swords? Building upon my discussions of literary warrior women, I turn in this chapter to historical examples of female violence to show the contemporary reactions popular audiences had toward *contemporary* women who turned to weapons to establish agency. To this end, I draw on pamphlets, ballads, and plays about female domestic violence and revisit Shakespeare's Margaret of Anjou—a woman who openly stabs men in combat situations[1]—to show that many of the same tropes and much of the same language occurs in accounts of female murderers as in literature about warrior women. For instance, the word "tiger" appears in narratives about both types of women, and it usually conveys the unnatural and animalistic tendencies of women who kill. Accounts of female violence against male bodies represent the early modern period's aversion to women's attempts to seek agency outside of traditional means for their gender, for although most women who kill have male conspirators, the women receive harsher social judgment from their peers and harsher punishments in court, especially when a man dies as a result of a woman's blade.

Like the works discussed in the last three chapters, accounts of female violence show the writers' efforts to contain these women's more disruptive qualities. The writers use indictments against these women's humanity—calling them "tigers"—and descriptions of the women's

executions to caution readers about the consequences of murder. Such efforts to contain these female murderers suggest the writers were anxious that their female audience might learn the wrong messages from their texts—that they might, rather than understand the consequences of murder, discover how to obtain agency through violent means. In this chapter, I argue that portrayals of domestic murder demonstrate the possibility that martial women might infiltrate early modern society. As I suggest in chapter II, the real threat posed by Amazons lies in the possibility of Amazon-like women entering English society; here, I show that pamphlets and ballads about female violence indicate a potential realization of the Amazonian threat, at least among certain members of society. This realization drives pamphlet and ballad writers to contain the threat by showing society's negative reaction to female violence. To show the possible effects of warrior women's instruction, I end this chapter with an analysis of Thomas Middleton and Thomas Dekker's *The Roaring Girl* (1611), which exposes the mimetic value of theater as Moll, the titular character, is portrayed as roaming the streets of London and teaching men lessons with her sword—and teaching women lessons about female agency as well.

Overwhelmingly, critical discussions of female violence in the early modern period have focused on witchcraft and domestic crimes against members of the household.[2] Although witches personify commonplace anxieties over the most powerless members of society—impoverished old women—rising up through devil worship and magic, the transgressions they purportedly committed bear little resemblance to those of warrior women.[3] Therefore, I omit from this chapter discussions of witches to focus instead on documented court cases that involve women committing violent acts against men's bodies, particularly involving knives or physical objects rather than witchcraft, poison, or infanticide, the traditional crimes ascribed to women in the period.[4] Often, women's violence is depicted as domestic, for the crime generally involves a

relative, usually a husband. The historical examples I draw upon describe women committing what Garthine Walker and Jenny Kermode call "'male' crime": those crimes that involve an active malefactor and, often, a passive victim (crimes like murder or highway robbery, for instance).[5] Like warrior women, the perpetrators of these crimes act like men.

In developing an idea of female violence, I am indebted to two scholars, Frances E. Dolan and Walker, who have made notable additions to the study of gender and violence in the period. By examining the pamphlets, ballads, and plays about domestic crime, Dolan argues that gender affected the way early modern society judged crimes.[6] If she is right in positing gender as a major component in shaping cultural understandings about violence, then these understandings should extend to the battlefield, where, as I have suggested throughout this dissertation, gender *matters*, for it shapes the way martial actions are perceived by a society that admonishes women who commit physical acts of violence. Like Dolan, Walker finds the *contexts* of each crime significant to uncovering social perceptions about groups of people, particularly women, the primary basis for her study. She is interested in both those who commit and those who report on crime, claiming that

> by analyzing narrative sources, historians are able to do more than reveal information about a crime, criminality and the legal process. They may open windows through which we may view aspects of the wider culture and ways of thinking and doing in early modern society. Hence, the history of crime becomes a broader cultural history of the period.[7]

Indeed, the pamphlets and ballads that survive demonstrate the sensationalism of women committing acts of violence and uncover social anxieties over the nature of womanhood. Like Dolan and Walker, I use the history of crime as a basis for revealing the way early modern

popular culture understood women who used weapons. The ballads and pamphlets that ordinary citizens read provide insight into the interests and fears that circulated throughout society—interests that eventually influenced both the way writers conceived literary works and the way popular and elite audiences understood those works. The anonymously written *Arden of Faversham* (1592) perfectly illustrates the way historical incidents of domestic crime influence popular literary forms, for the play is based upon historical events Holinshed included in his *Chronicles*. In chapter III, I suggest that the subversive nature of warrior women intensifies when the narratives depict actual events, which have the potential to reoccur in contemporary society. Here, I continue this discussion to show the relationship between history and literature, for as history influenced literary forms, those forms affected the society that received them. Thus, literature about warrior women existed within a social system of people who were trained to understand female violence in specific ways.

Pamphlets, ballads, and domestic tragedies show the contentious reactions people had toward female murderers. These reactions undoubtedly arose because of the hierarchical nature of Renaissance England, where courts judged female and male murderers differently. Although most examples of domestic murder include both men and women, the pamphlets recording these events focus primarily on the nature of womanhood, rather than manhood, and denounce women's violence through moral warnings meant to persuade others toward proper respect not just for life but also for class and gender hierarchies. For instance, although Alice Walker in *The Crying Murther* (1624) works with multiple male accomplices, she is represented as the most abhorrent of them. The text even uses animalistic language to describe her behavior: she acts "like a dog unto the ancient vomit of her stubbornness and denial."[8] Pamphlets often use animal metaphors to show the base nature of female violence. Removed from the category of "woman,"

she becomes a "dog," just as other pamphlets call women like Walker "tigers" or "beasts." The language of these pamphlets shows that female violence does more than subvert gender categories: it separates these women from the rest of humanity. Anne Sanders in the anonymously written *A Warning for Fair Women* (1599) announces that she is "a woman, and in that respect / [is] well content [her] husband shall controule [her]," a passage that emphasizes the hierarchal division between Anne and her husband while accentuating the magnitude of her crime—she passively consents to her husband's murder—against the person she claims has superiority over her.[9] Often, descriptions of female violence transform the domestic sphere into a battlefield between the sexes, with adulterous sex frequently portrayed as the motivation for women to become killers.

Representations of female violence modify gendered power dynamics by portraying women's agency over men's bodies and men's lives. Through comparing historical and literary examples of women stabbing men, I argue that this ultimate exhibition of power, which leads to the death of the male body, signals a breakdown in patriarchal systems that would subsume women under male dominance. Thus, martial figures like Margaret become particularly subversive because they participate in the circulation of social anxieties about female violence. I concentrate in the first part on female violence in pamphlets and ballads and argue that the public distribution of these texts reveals a popular interest in the spectacle of gender subversion that occurs when women use blades. Furthermore, the circulation of this material informs popular understandings of warrior women. In the second part, I compare remarkably similar scenes in *Arden of Faversham* and in *3 Henry VI* that depict women stabbing men. Only the contexts of these scenes designate Alice as a murderer and Margaret as an executioner. Although Margaret acts on behalf of England's king, a fact that politicizes her actions, the play emphasizes her role

as a mother, wife, and daughter, as a woman who kills York in what is, in many ways, a domestic as well as political dispute between distant cousins—one that affects an entire nation. In the third part of this chapter, I use Thomas Middleton and Thomas Dekker's *The Roaring Girl* as a model for the anxieties that sword-wielding women provoke in a society deeply concerned with masculine women and feminine men. In this play, Moll uses a sword to write upon Laxton's male body, thus making visible her superiority over his corporeal existence. Moll, like warrior women, obtains power by stabbing a man in what is certainly the most irrevocable and conclusive way of overpowering another.

1. Warrior Women or Murderous Wives?

The writers of pamphlets, ballads, and plays about contemporary crime participate in the production of social norms through the judgments they pass on female violence. Texts that represent certain actions as taboo circulate ideas about appropriate behaviors for given groups of individuals, usually defined by social class or gender. These texts often sensationalize women who commit male crimes, which were particularly dramatic because of their rarity. J. A. Sharpe explains that while women only performed 7% of non-domestic killings in the early modern period, they were involved in 42% of the domestic murders.[10] Women tended to commit crimes against family members more often than crimes against strangers.[11] When women did commit non-domestic murder, they drew the attention of pamphlet and ballad writers who sought sensational material to boost sales. These writers knew that audiences bought scandalous stories about female violence not only because such stories were rare but also because they were startling in their lurid details of a subordinate gender group resisting social superiors. The writers treated male and female accomplices to the same crime differently, generally emphasizing the

barbarism of the women. They portrayed women who committed violent crimes as unnatural and inhuman. Likewise, the court system judged women differently for similar crimes. For instance, sexual crimes like prostitution and, during the civil war years, adultery were exclusively female crimes primarily because men were not judged by the same standards as women. The pamphlets and ballads reproducing and circulating scandalous accounts instruct public audiences by promulgating feelings of sympathy for the victim and of condemnation for the perpetrator. Part of this instruction includes the dissemination of gendered behaviors, thus encouraging audiences to react differently to women than to men committing an equivalent crime. Through their negative judgments on women's violence, the pamphlet and ballad writers intend to discourage women from vice, but they also inadvertently expose the potential for women to gain agency through brutal acts.

A pamphlet called *The Most Crvell and Bloody Mvrther* (1606) demonstrates the attitudes that early modern society had toward women committing violent acts. The pamphlet describes nine men and one woman invading the home of Anthony James, a yeoman, and his pregnant wife, Elizabeth James. After looting the house for valuables, the men kill Anthony but take pity on the poor Elizabeth. The female criminal, however, scoffs at such remorse and takes matters into her own hands:

> So drawing out her knife (an act too terrible to report, but the most damnable that ever was heard of, executed by a woman), she ripped her up the belly, making herself a tragical midwife, or truly a murderess, that brought an abortive babe to the world, and murdered the mother.[12]

The pamphlet emphasizes the unnaturalness of women's violence. Women typically give life, but this woman creates a perverse opening to the womb, ripping the baby out before he is capable of

supporting his own life. The pamphlet writer insists that this tragedy cannot have been performed by a woman, but by a "beast," her transgression effectively removing her from the gendered category to which she previously belonged.

The term "beast" shows the woman's lack of humanity, and as the pamphlet continues, other violent women transform into animalistic or diabolic figures. Anthony James and his wife have two young children, a boy and a girl, whose suffering at the hands of the woman and her accomplices exposes the alleged unnaturalness of female violence. At first unwilling to murder the children, the men and woman split up, some taking the loot while the woman and two men transfer the children into the care of an innkeeper's wife, Annis Dell. Annis and her son, George, kill the boy and cut the tongue from the girl to ensure her silence. For four years, the girl, also named Elizabeth, wanders the countryside begging for food, but upon returning to the crime scene, she miraculously speaks, revealing Annis and George as her brother's murderers. Although the first woman and nine men are never found or named, Annis and George are convicted by the assize courts in Essex and executed. While the pamphlet describes the heinous crimes of ten men (including George), its true focus is on the two women, or, more precisely, the "monstrous female (for no woman)," the "devilish Devil," the one with no "spark of womanhood," the "bloody tigress" who murders and thereby commits acts against nature.[13] The pamphlet passes judgment on these women's characters, claiming their transgression against humanity negates their status as humans.

In calling the women "tigers," the pamphlet recalls numerous instances when the word expresses the unnatural tendencies of literary characters, especially warrior women. For instance, York famously calls Margaret a "tiger's heart wrapped in a woman's hide."[14] He implies that Margaret's inner being is inconsistent with her outer form. The "heart" is often associated with

womanly feeling. For instance, in *As You Like It*, Rosalind intends to "suit…in all points like a man" by keeping her "hidden woman's fear" locked away "in [her] heart."[15] Rosalind realizes that to perform masculinity, she must contain the womanly part of her, and she specifically locates that part in her "heart." In *3 Henry VI*, York also interprets the heart as a site of womanly emotion, but he argues that Margaret has no feminine heart to hide. A tiger's heart lies in its place. York questions not only Margaret's femininity but also her humanity.

Further attacking women's femininity, literary references that align women with tigers particularly denounce women's roles as mothers. For instance, Thomas Norton and Thomas Sackville's *Gorboduc* equates tigers with unnatural motherhood. After her youngest son, Porrex, murders her eldest, Videna delivers a soliloquy showing her resolve to disinherit the delinquent son:

> …I thee refuse for mine,
>
> Murderer I thee renounce, thou are not mine:
>
> Never, O wretch, this womb conceived thee,
>
> …
>
> Ruthless, unkind, Monster of Nature's work.
>
> Thou never sucked the milk of woman's breast
>
> But from thy birth the cruel Tiger's teats
>
> Have nursed…[16]

She switches roles with a tiger, contending that Porrex gains his murderous disposition not from her milk, but from the animal. But just as he is a "Monster of Nature," so she is the unnatural agent of Porrex's death. She fails to see the perversity of her own role: in proving capable of murdering Porrex, she becomes the tiger of her own metaphor, for it seems Porrex's ability to

kill did come from his mother. As Porrex's murderer, she acts not like a mother but like the tiger she insists raised him.

Metaphors about tigers often occur in conjunction with killing, but they have different meanings for both genders. For women, references to tigers often imply that women's feminine parts have been emptied out and replaced by inhuman characteristics. For men, such references are used to assert masculinity. For instance, Shakespeare's Henry V commands his army to "imitate the actions of the tiger": "stiffen the sinews, conjure up the blood, / disguise *fair nature* with hard-favoured rage."[17] The passage suggests that battle goes against human nature, so the soldiers should find a more suitable creature to "imitate": the "tiger," with its unmerciful desire to kill. Henry views the tiger as a positive inspiration for his soldiers. Likewise, in *Coriolanus,* Menenius accuses Coriolanus of having "no more mercy / in him than there is milk in a male tiger."[18] Although he denounces Coriolanus's intolerance, Menenius aligns Coriolanus with the tiger in his analogy: just as the male tiger has no milk, Coriolanus has no mercy. The analogy calls attention to Coriolanus's masculinity, for mercy is a trait usually reserved for women.[19] As a marker of masculinity, the tiger also symbolizes unnatural femininity, for women who act like tigers—and like men—transgress gender binaries. By suggesting that women act like a tiger, the pamphlets and literature align female violence with animalistic tendencies for killing.

When the pamphlet calls Annis a "tiger," it draws upon all of the negative associations between women and tigers, and it particularly evokes an idea of women as unnatural mothers. The pamphlet presents Elizabeth James as the quintessential woman: she is pregnant with her third child, takes care in the "education and bringing up" of her children, practices "diligent care…to save what her husband br[ings] home," and in all things is "obedient" to her husband.[20] The pamphlet juxtaposes this behavior with women's violence, showing that the act of killing

reverses the natural role of women. Annis involves her own son, George, in the murder of Elizabeth's son, and George dies alongside Annis on the scaffold as a direct result of his mother's instruction. Thus, Annis's role as mother is contradictory: she is both mother to a son and murderer of another's son. The pamphlet suggests a causal relationship between the assumption of Annis's role as murderer and the demise of her role as mother. The correlation between Annis's two roles resembles *Gorboduc*'s depiction of Videna, who ceases to be a mother when she murders her own son. As mother, she gives him life; as murderer, she takes that life. The fundamentally feminine role of women lies in their ability to give and to sustain humanity, as they do in childbirth and in providing food for their children. Videna denies this role when she kills her own son, and Annis forgoes her future as George's mother when she kills a child.

Literary writers used similar animalistic language to describe warrior women as the pamphlet writers used to depict female murderers; this language shows the consistency with which early modern writers understood and portrayed ideas about female violence. Both warrior women and female murderers are portrayed as unnatural members of the female gender. Attacks on these women question their motherhood because the actions of giving birth and taking life are so contradictory. Even positive accounts of warrior women must carefully handle the issue of childbirth: for instance, Britomart gives up her weapons once she becomes pregnant (see chapter II). Furthermore, a mother's role often involves more than simply *birthing* a child; it also includes *teaching* a child appropriate behaviors, including proper conduct with respect to the child's gender. As a murderer, Annis teaches her son to murder. If killing can be taught, as shown with Annis and George, then perhaps the female murderer can contaminate society with her unnatural ways—just as representations of the female warrior might influence early modern

women's ideas about killing. In attempting to dispel this mimetic potential, the pamphlets and ballads about female violence attempt to redefine the women who commit heinous acts against others.

In questioning the womanhood of these killers, the pamphlet participates in what has become a very modern debate about the nature of women's bodies. Although "woman" refers partially to biological sex, the idea of "woman" generally represents only a subset of the population of biological women. For example, Sojourner Truth, in asking "Ain't I a Woman?," questions whether the category of "woman" actually includes *all* women: "That man over there says that women need to be helped into carriages, and lifted over ditches, and to have the best place everywhere. Nobody ever helps me into carriages, or over mud-puddles, or gives me any best place! And ain't I a woman?"[21] In many ways, Truth's question points to a universal problem with understanding the way gender affects individuals' embodied experiences, a problem that extends to women in the early modern period. Remnants of a chivalric code affected the way men saw their relationships with women: in return for their silence, obedience, and chastity, women came under men's protection, yet this protection did not extend to *all* women. Women on the fringes—those who worked, who begged for food, who carried swords and dressed as men—occupied a liminal space outside of the general category of "woman."[22] Thus, the pamphlets turn to animalistic imagery to distance women who commit crimes from the category of "woman," but they also call attention to the problem female violence raises: it demonstrates disunity between ideas about a gender and the actions of that gender.

Women who act upon their desires to kill subvert social order, for they establish agency in their relationships with men outside of the legal and social frameworks that define appropriate behavior. Thus, criminal and warrior women who kill men demonstrate the instability of

hierarchal societies that attempt, sometimes unsuccessfully, to maintain control over certain members of society. The interest in female murder arises in the contradiction between perceptions regarding women's feminine nature and the extreme act of violence.[23] The act of killing, both for female murderers in usually domestic crimes and for female warriors in battle, remains the ultimate way of proving agency over another person. Stabbing another person writes the perpetrator's authority onto the skin, muscles, and organs of the victim. It redefines the victim's body. *The Most Crvell and Bloody Mvrther* describes Elizabeth James in terms of her experience as a pregnant woman. The murderess removes that designation by cutting the infant from her body, thus transforming her womb into a tomb. The female murderer reduces Elizabeth to a body that the murderer can act upon and control, for death is the ultimate transformation of an individual's embodied experiences. Control over a person's life and death remains the ultimate power one individual can have over another. By claiming that power, women subverted what the early modern period saw as the natural state of womanhood, especially when their blade entered the bodies of *men*.

Although female murderers commonly received more attention in pamphlets and ballads than male murderers, the interest in such crimes involved more than commonplaces about women's natural roles as mothers: the hierarchical nature of early modern England meant that *any* crime against a person of superior social or gender category went against God's plan. Two notable examples, *The Crying Murther* and *Murder upon Murder*, demonstrate the class and gender hierarchies that pamphlet and ballad writers included in their texts. In *The Crying Murther*, three men and one woman, Alice Walker, supposedly murder the curate at Old Cleeve, Somerset, a man by the name of Mr. Trat. Unlike many pamphlets that focus on the methods and motivations of the killers, *The Crying Murther* elaborates on the Godly character of the victim:

> And first concerning the person murdered: he was a levite [deacon], consecrated unto the Lord to do Him service in the tabernacle of his congregation; one that had many years since put on the breastplate of Urim and Thummim [the breastplate of the high priest discussed in Exodus], and girded himself with the linen ephod…[24]

After extolling Mr. Trat's virtues as one of God's elect, the pamphlet recalls the Biblical instruction of David: "Touch not mine anointed, nor do my prophets any harm."[25] The Biblical reference suggests not all murders are judged equally among a society as hierarchically based as that of Renaissance England. Crimes against God's anointed, like Mr. Trat, represent a greater transgression than crimes against, say, a person of low status or of bastard birth. In another example, the ballad *Murder upon Murder* describes a farmer and prostitute who arbitrarily murder men of various social rankings: "Nor birth nor blood they did regard, / Yet death for blood is their reward."[26] The emphasis these two texts place on the status of the victim indicates the crime gains in magnitude and in sensationalism, and thus public interest, based on the discrepancy between the social classes of the victims and the murderers.

In the early modern period, female crime not only incited different social stigma than male crime, but it also carried different legal sentences, for the *nature* of the murderer and the *relationship* between the murderer and the victim factored into legal discussions.[27] In 1351, the laws regarding petty treason included the murder of a superior by a subordinate, as the legal documentation of Sir Edward Coke describes:

> If the wife procure one to murder her husband, and he doth it accordingly, in this case the wife being absent is but accessory, and shall be hanged and not burnt, because the accessory cannot be guilty of petit treason, where the principall is not guilty but of murder: and the accessory must follow the nature of the principall: but if he that did the

> murder had been a servant of the husband, it had been treason in them both, and the wife should have been burnt.[28]

Along with the problems of moral sin and social transgression, killing a member of superior class or gender was treasonous according to political and legal applications of punishment in the period, a fact that demonstrates particular anxieties about women and servants rising up against their superiors. Legal definitions of petty treason remained consistent throughout the early modern period, with women who killed their husbands burning at the stake because their crime was against the man authorized to wield power in the relationship.

Writers of pamphlets and ballads used female crime to appeal to audiences seeking sensational stories occurring throughout the English nation—much like writers of plays used stories of Margaret and Bonduca to entertain their audiences. Like the literary works about warrior women, pamphlets and ballads about female murderers concentrate on the containment of these women in the conclusions of their texts. This containment usually takes the form of a public execution, where the woman not only suffers physically for her crime but also feels the social ostracism, the public humiliation that goes along with murder. The writers inserted into their accounts negative judgments against these women, for they hoped to instruct other women not to follow similar paths. The instruction demonstrates an acute awareness of the mimetic potential of their texts. The writers tried to ensure that they portrayed the *right* message to their audience—that they discouraged vice rather than encouraged violence. Their focus on legal punishments and their use of bestial language warn female audiences of the consequences of violently seeking agency. If the women become less human for committing these acts, then fewer people would likely find mimetic value in the pamphlets.

2. A Tiger in the Kitchen

Like the female murderers described in pamphlets and ballads, warrior women in literary works undergo social stigma for their actions on the battlefield. The literature about warrior women, like Shakespeare's Margaret, often presents their performance of war as a domestic issue, a tendency that differentiates them from their male counterparts on the battlefield. Margaret, for instance, fights to defend her son's inheritance, which, as I suggest in chapter IV, her husband fails to protect, leading to her choice to take up arms. Her struggle against York, her cousin by marriage, accentuates the domestic quality of her role: women more commonly kill family members rather than strangers, and Margaret's role is presented in terms of familial strife. While York also fights to ensure his family's inheritance, he presents his struggle as political, showing that the "rebellion" against the monarchy under Richard II robbed him of his "inheritance" (1.1.134, 78). Moreover, York establishes his claim for sovereignty through means appropriate for his gender; Margaret, like the murderous women in early modern pamphlets, turns to inappropriate means for women to establish agency. Thus, she transgresses in much the same way as the murderesses in early modern domestic tragedies, like Alice in *Arden of Faversham*. Both Alice and Margaret lash out against male superiority through violence, and though Margaret participates in legally sanctioned acts of war, she kills York in an execution-like manner that mirrors Alice's murder of Arden.

The main distinction between female murderers and female warriors lies in the *circumstances* of their actions. The murderess hides her crime from authorities, knowing that society condemns her. The warrior woman performs her act openly, on the battlefield, usually in the defense of a nation (in the case of Bonduca) or of an ideal (in the case of Britomart). Society generally condones the warrior woman who kills. However, I suggest that the stigma of killing

still influences the audience's reactions to warrior women, primarily because they break equivalent social restrictions as women who murder, especially because both write their superiority onto the bodies of men. Thus, I suggest that the *circumstances* distinguishing the two fail to mitigate the troubling image of women murdering men onstage. Although responsibility for Arden's and York's deaths first diffuses among a large group (like the army in *3 Henry VI* or the posse of murderers in *Arden of Faversham*), it eventually comes to rest upon the individual women who strike. In both cases, the bodies of the dead men continue to tell the story of the women's deeds, emphasizing the unnaturalness of those deeds and warning of the collapse in social order.

The domestic subject of *Arden of Faversham* has led scholars to draw conclusions about gender and class structures, about women's legal position, about sensationalism in drama, and about popular anxieties concerning women's chastity, but none of these scholars have used its depiction of female violence in the domestic sphere as a way of understanding non-domestic violence between women and men in the political sphere.[29] Dolan claims that Alice "manipulates possible versions of the murderous wife narrative" to elicit sympathy over fabricated abuse against her and to "avoid blame for her adultery."[30] Alice's adultery with Mosby, a servant of another household, ultimately stems from her desire to choose a husband, but she fails to understand that she can no more choose Mosby as her husband than Mosby can choose to become a master rather than a servant.[31] Alice's murder of Arden, therefore, becomes an "ultimate, violent refusal of subsumption" into the marriage union.[32] Dolan argues that it is impossible for both members of a marriage union to possess complete autonomy: one must always subsume the other, and it is usually the woman whose sense of self disappears. The only way for the wife to develop as an individual, according to Dolan, is through imagining the death

of her husband, with her desire for wearing the breeches leading to violence against the husband.[33] Dolan's readings of marriage are useful for understanding the complexity of relationships, even non-marital ones on the battlefield. Margaret and York, for instance, cannot both maintain autonomy because they both seek to fill essentially the same position in the English monarchy. As I show in chapter IV, Margaret substitutes for Henry's kingship while York vies for that same position. Where Margaret's desire for sovereignty contaminates the hierarchal balance in the monarchy, Alice's desire for Mosby corrupts the hierarchal balance in the household. Unlike Alice, the warrior woman often fights against political rather than domestic subsumption, but her battle is often figured as domestic, thus emphasizing the relationship between violence and self-assertion in these plays.

At the moment of Arden's death, *Arden of Faversham* presents Alice as a bloodthirsty murderess who wishes to silence her husband through violence in a reversal of male and female roles in marriage. The play follows Alice's multiple schemes to kill her husband, all of which are comically unsuccessful until she finally invites hired murderers into her own home. As Arden entertains Mosby with a game, Black Will steps up behind the table and strangles Arden with a towel while Mosby and Shakebag strike with knives. Unsatisfied with their progress, Alice snatches a knife and stabs Arden with the final blow, shouting, "What, groans thou?—Nay, then, give me the weapon— / [*Striking*] Take this for hind'ring Mosby's love and mine."[34] The domestic scene of the murder, which happens in Arden's house, draws attention to the transgression Alice performs against the established norms of wifely behavior. Peter Stallybrass argues that anxieties surrounding women often manifest in the openings that women control: the openings of their homes and of their bodies.[35] Not only does she give Mosby access to her body, but she also allows murderers access to her husband's body by opening her house to murderers.

Dolan has suggested that most domestic violence, including murder, begins with male violence: either the husband beats his wife, perhaps eventually killing her, or the wife responds to an abusive husband by killing him.[36] In *Arden of Faversham*, however, the wife instigates violence. Alice's accusations about her husband's violence are merely ploys to gain conspirators in the murder's fulfillment so that she can develop sovereignty in all of her relationships.

The control Alice seeks in her domestic union mirrors that of Margaret in her marriage to Henry. Alice cites her love for Mosby as the reason for her murderous disposition toward Arden. Likewise, Margaret maintains a lover, and though she never considers killing her husband, she also never submits to the control a husband should have over his wife's body. Stallybrass posits the *husband* as the master over openings in the *wife's* body, but Alice and Margaret both try to control their husbands' speech—and, in so doing, the openings of their husbands' mouths. For instance, the passage above indicates that Arden's "groans" incite Alice to action. She stabs him to silence this form of speech. Likewise, Margaret divorces Henry from her bed and then silences his protests, for he "hast spoke too much already" (see chapter IV; 1.1.259). Both women enjoy relationships outside of the marriage bed, and they both silence their husbands in a way that subverts gender roles. While most conduct manuals from the period promote wifely obedience and silence even toward unruly men, Alice and Margaret transform the marriage roles, silencing their husbands instead.

Like the pamphlets and ballads about female murder, *Arden of Faversham* singles Alice out as unnatural and inhumane, especially in the fury with which she kills Arden. After Mosby and Shakebag strike, Alice stabs her husband in a sudden outrage of passion, which her servant notices: when Alice grabs the knife, Michael exclaims, "Oh, mistress!" (14.240). The scene must have encouraged audience members to respond much like Michael, for the only woman onstage

stabbing the already (presumably) bloody body of her husband must have created a striking image. The moment distinguishes her from the men surrounding her: the men respond coldly, almost methodically, Shakebag even mentioning the "ten pound in his sleeve" as he brings down the knife (14.237). Alice, however, performs with passion, drawing negative attention to herself as the only woman onstage.

Alice shows that women *can* develop agency through violence, but they *cannot* actualize this agency with the same social understanding of their roles because people react differently to female rather than male murderers. Although Alice's involvement in the murder is similar to that of Shakebag, Mosby, and Black Will, she experiences more judgment—from Michael, from the courts, and, presumably, from the audience—because of her gender and because of her relationship with the victim. Thus, the play confirms gender expectations through the reactions others express toward her involvement. In this way, the play presents her character much as the pamphlets and ballads describe female murderers.

Like the woman in *The Most Crvell and Bloody Mvrther,* Alice surrounds herself with men so that she shares the guilt for the murder with an entire group, a situation similar to that which occurs in military environments. In socio-psychological terms, the practice of using groups rather than individuals to carry out a guilt-inducing action is called "diffusion of responsibility": each individual believes another member of the group performed the task or, at the very least, performed the task *first*, so the primary responsibility always resides with someone else. For example, the United States military in the early twentieth century occasionally used firing squads for executions. At these times, blanks were often loaded into one or more of the firing squad's rifles so that none of the shooters knew if his actions caused the person's death. This notion was a familiar one in the early modern period, as evidenced by plays like

Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*. The conspirators *all* stab Caesar so that they *all* share responsibility for his death. Furthermore, they kill him in the Senate building in an effort to endow their act with the authority of the entire Roman people and republic. In theory, the diffusion of responsibility allows Brutus, Cassius, and others to kill Caesar without the feelings of personal responsibility; in practice, however, they find that their complicity in the plot joins them in a shared guilt rather than relief from it. Likewise, Alice joins a group in the murder of her husband. Although not made up of soldiers, as it is for Margaret, Alice's group diffuses responsibility for the crime amongst its members.

By displacing blame for Arden's death onto a group, onto Arden, and onto society, Alice attempts to free herself from remorse, but she fails adequately to disassociate from the murder because her role too fully transgresses legal and social regulations. Usually, her attempts to diffuse responsibility over the group have comic effect, especially because the plot seems to include everyone in Faversham with the exception of Arden and his friend Franklin, as Mosby notes in an admonition toward Alice: "I take it passing ill / You would be so forgetful of our state / To make recount of it to every groom" (1.576-79). By the time of the murder, Alice, Mosby, Greene, Shakebag, Black Will, Michael, Susan, and Clarke all carry some culpability for their part in the plot, and even Bradshaw becomes an unwitting accomplice by carrying an incriminating letter, for which he hangs at the play's end. Throughout, the characters share culpability with each other. At times, they even attempt to displace responsibility on Arden himself, as Alice does when she asserts that Arden's "misgovernment" causes her dislike of him and when she craftily assures Greene of her husband's abuse (13.113). Greene, in turn, blames Arden for taking his land, treating the crime not as a revenge murder but as a restoration of propriety, as though the land returning to him excuses his involvement. Thus, the various

accomplices all disperse blame in order to lessen their own role. In a way, Michael is the only one who seems to understand his part in the crime, but he decides the reward is worth the consequences: "Tush, so it be known that I shall marry [Susan] in the / morning, I care not though I be hanged ere night" (14.293-94). Alice and Mosby may initiate the crime, but they surround themselves with others who share in its fulfillment.

Furthermore, Alice blames society for its expectations of her as a wife—expectations to which she fails to adhere. She professes that society's regulations upon her love and her body account for her need to kill Arden:

> Yet nothing could enforce me to the deed
> But Mosby's love. Might I without control
> Enjoy thee still, then Arden should not die;
> But seeing I cannot, therefore let him die. (1.274-77)

Dolan reads this passage as evidence of Alice's association between violence and desire, as she "uses violence to reassert her subjectivity and to reshape the role of wife."[37] I would add that she transfers blame from herself onto society's rules against adultery: if she *could* "enjoy" Mosby "without control," then Arden need not die. For her, social and marital regulations preventing her desire inevitably lead to Arden's murder. In this way, she places responsibility on the way society judges her adultery.

Once everyone's involvement in the crime materializes, however, they all see the dispersion of responsibility disappear as each suffers punishment as individuals. The guilty parties may understand their role in terms of the aggregate, but the law views each as individual participants in the murder. The punishment each murderer receives reasserts the distinction between Alice and the other murderers:

Bear Mosby and his sister to London straight,

Where they in Smithfield must be executed;

Bear Mistress Arden unto Canterbury

Where her sentence is she must be burnt. (4.5.38-41)

The sentences separate rather than merge the individual roles in the group. Alice's attempts to lessen her crime prove successful only until Arden's death; after that, the individuals face the repercussions alone, the physical locations and the types of executions demonstrating the way society views Alice's crime differently than that of the others.

Further establishing Alice's individual guilt, Arden's body names her as its murderer, a naming that demonstrates the failure of death to fully silence Arden's "groans." Upon Alice's approach, the body starts to bleed, as though it wishes to show her malfeasance:

The more I sound his name, the more he bleeds.

This blood condemns me and, in gushing forth,

Speaks as it falls and asks me why I did it.

Forgive me, Arden! I repent me now…. (16.4-7)

Arden's speaking body alludes to a common motif in the early modern period and before. In Shakespeare's *Richard III*, for instance, Anne uses Henry's bleeding body as evidence of the "inhuman and unnatural" murder that Richard causes: "Dead Henry's wounds /
Ope their congealed mouths and bleed afresh."[38] According to Anne, Richard's "presence" causes the body to bleed from "cold and empty veins where no blood dwells."[39] Superstition in the period claimed that a murdered body would supernaturally name its perpetrator.

The bleeding, and thus communicating, body provides an outside sign of the deeds performed upon it. The fear murderers had over being detected sometimes caused them to kill or

mutilate the bodies of victims. *The Cruell and Most Bloody Murther* describes Annis Dell's removal of Elizabeth's tongue to prevent her speech. Although she decides not to kill the girl, Annis wishes to silence the violence performed against Elizabeth's family. Like Alice, Annis fails. The girl's sudden ability to name her perpetrators after years of silence is similar to the superstition about bleeding bodies, where supernatural forces allow the tongue-less girl to name her family's murderers. Hamlet nicely summarizes this superstition: "For murder, though it have no tongue, will speak with most miraculous organ."[40] According to early modern literature, the victims of murder will not be silenced. Although Alice is sure to silence Arden's "groans," she cannot staunch his bleeding: voiceless, the body speaks. Alice's immediate repentance demonstrates the acuteness with which she feels her individual guilt. The confession suggests a personal feeling of remorse that goes beyond the power of the group to defend her actions. Just as Arden's death is individual and singular, so is her part in the plot and in the stabbing. The body's ability to respond only to her bespeaks the personal betrayal she has performed against her own husband.

In representing the subversive nature of female violence, *Arden of Faversham* follows the pamphlets and ballads about women's crime: all emphasize the women's role in a way that calls attention to the unnatural brutality of the "weaker Sex."[41] Likewise, Shakespeare's *3 Henry VI* draws upon gender expectations to accentuate Margaret's role in York's death. Unlike Alice, Margaret shares the responsibility for York's death with an entire army, which represents the Plantagenet side in matters of war. The circumstances of Margaret's actions theoretically prohibit any *legal* response by York's offspring or others. However, the approbation cannot undo the spectacle of a woman fiercely executing a man on the early modern stage. The stigma of killing rests with Margaret and Clifford, who evoke different reactions from other characters

because of their genders. On the battlefield, Margaret transgresses gender expectations, and her reputation suffers accordingly.

The *Henry VI* trilogy demonstrates a gradual emphasis on the domestic nature of the Wars of the Roses. On the one hand, *1 Henry VI* portrays feats by great heroes performing military deeds on the battlefields of France (though, of course, the idealized version would include England winning massive territories in France). On the other hand, *2 Henry VI* and *3 Henry VI* turn to matters at home and the problems of civil war. Shakespeare refigures these wars in terms of the domestic turmoil they cause. After Margaret banishes Henry from the battlefield, the king comes across soldiers who have inadvertently killed their own relatives. One soldier unknowingly kills his father, discovering his transgression against familial ties only after removing the dead man's helmet. Another accidentally kills his own son. Such is the peril and spectacle of civil war: Englishmen fight Englishmen in "erroneous, mutinous, and unnatural" battles (2.5.90). The father-killing soldier echoes Christ on the cross as he laments, "Pardon me, God, I knew not what I did" (2.5.69). In referencing these words, the soldier compares the civil war to the crucifixion: an entire populace agreed to the crucifixion just as an entire army supports the war against York and his descendants. The individual must take responsibility for his or her actions against Christ just as this soldier assumes the guilt of killing his own father. Such moments draw out the domestic components of this war.

The play emphasizes Margaret's role in corrupting the natural order on the battlefield by calling attention to the domestic nature of the war and turning Margaret into a contaminating force that encourages soldiers to place loyalty to their country over their family. The soldiers suffer when their divided loyalty causes them to perform atrocious acts against their own fathers and sons for Margaret's political maneuverings. But for Margaret, the war is always as much

domestic as it is political: she fights against her cousin by marriage to preserve the right of her son to rule. When Henry VI passively accepts York's children in the line of succession, he provokes Margaret, who starts the war to protect Prince Edward's inheritance. Her domestic troubles seep into the populace as soldiers destroy their own families to save hers. In a way, the play is about broken families, and Margaret is seen as the primary cause of the turmoil the soldiers face.

Although Margaret fights for her own son, she seems incapable of maternal instincts when she condones Clifford's killing of Rutland, York's young son. Like Annis in *The Most Crvell and Bloody Mvrther*, Margaret participates in Rutland's slaughter in a way that is "more inhuman, more inexorable, / O, ten times more than tigers of Hyrcania" (1.4.155-56). York twice compares Margaret to tigers, and, like the pamphlets about female murder, the play emphasizes Margaret's cruelty. For instance, she presents York a handkerchief covered in Rutland's blood (1.4.80). The handkerchief, a domestic prop "stained" with familial blood, symbolizes the disintegration of kinship relations in the royal lineage (1.4.80). Margaret allows the death of her nephew, a boy whose blood includes him in the royal succession should the rest of his family die. The nature of Margaret's femininity changes when she allows Rutland to be killed and when she kills York.

The play characterizes Margaret much the same way as pamphlets about domestic crime characterize female murderers: as an inhuman "tiger" that performs unnatural deeds. York calls Margaret a monster, an "inhuman" "she-wolf…/ ill-beseeming" of her "sex" (1.4.112-13):

> O tiger's heart wrapped in a woman's hide!
> How couldst thou drain the life-blood of the child
> To bid the father wipe his eyes withal,

And yet be seen to bear a woman's face?

Women are soft, mild, pitiful, and flexible—

Thou stern, obdurate, flinty, rough, remorseless. (1.4.138-43)[42]

Margaret's countenance disagrees with her behavior, for women, according to York, cannot perform such brutal acts against a "child." Rutland's age forces viewers to consider Margaret's purpose on the battlefield: if it is indeed to defend the rightful king, then killing soldiers would be enough. By allowing Rutland's death, Margaret transgresses the normal role of mothers to protect children. York suggests a detachment between Margaret's physicality—her external female body—and her inner essence—her tiger-like comportment. The play presents her as merciless in its depiction of York's demise as she revels in the death of his son. Such actions negate the inherently female experience of motherhood.

However domestic and familial moments of this war seem, the overall goal of the battle affects an entire nation, a situation that distributes responsibility over a multitude. Henry's office as God's anointed king designates his opponents as rebellious traitors, as *An homily against disobedience and wilful rebellion* (1571) suggests: subjects who "themselves take armour" and "wickedly…assemble companies and bands of rebels…make, not war, but rebellion."[43] In *2* and *3 Henry VI*, however, both sides consider the opposition rebels, since Henry and York both claim a pure line of descent. Both armies claim to fight for the "rightful" king. Although murder is against God's commandments, the homily explains that the battlefield sanctions killing, even the killing of kings, through the Biblical story of David's desire to kill King Saul. Knowing the act would be rebellion against God's anointed king, David conjures reasons why Saul might die lawfully:

> The Lord keep me, saith David, from doing that thing, and from laying hands upon my lord, God's anointed. For who can lay his hand upon the Lord's anointed, and be guiltless? As truly as the Lord liveth, except that the Lord do smite him, or his days shall come to die, or that he go down to war, and be slain in battle…[44]

David recognizes the battlefield as a site where people can legitimately kill others without suffering God's wrath. In *3 Henry VI*, Northumberland claims that "it is war's prize to take all vantages, / And ten to one is no impeach of valour" (1.4.60-61). In theory, the soldiers can take enemy lives without feeling remorse, even if ten soldiers fight against one. In practice, these soldiers suffer the consequences, for the men fighting in the Wars of the Roses kill their own families. The individual conscience carries the responsibility for taking life, regardless of the group mentality that often accompanies armies at war.

Margaret, in stabbing York on the battlefield, invokes the same diffusion of responsibility present at Arden's stabbing, for Margaret uses the battlefield location to legitimate her actions. After mocking him and placing a paper crown upon his head, Margaret and Clifford both contribute to taking York's life:

Clifford	Here's for my oath, here's for my father's death.
	[*He stabs* YORK]
Queen Margaret	And here's to right our gentle-hearted King.
	[*She stabs* YORK]
York	Open thy gate of mercy, gracious God—
	My soul flies through these wounds to seek out thee. (1.4.176-79)

Like Alice, Margaret stabs after her accomplice and shares the blame with him. Unlike Alice, Margaret shares in the diffusion of responsibility not just with Clifford but with the entire

Plantagenet army (though, of course, an entire army cannot appear onstage; it is, nonetheless, imagined as being present). Therefore, the circumstances of the battle—and of York's rebellion—legitimate her actions, at least to the Plantagenet side.

York's supporters comprehend his death very differently, for they single out Clifford and Margaret, focusing on the latter, in a way that shows the judgments against women are harsher than those against men. Bringing news of York's death to Edward and Richard, the messenger rails against Margaret's vengeful slaughter of York:

> By many hands your father was subdued,
> But only slaughtered by the ireful arm
> Of unrelenting Clifford and the Queen,
> …
> The ruthless Queen gave him to dry his cheeks
> A napkin steeped in the harmless blood
> Of sweet young Rutland, by rough Clifford slain. (2.1.56-63)

As the army's commander, Margaret sanctions her own enterprise against York and turns his execution into a casualty of war, but the messenger redefines her actions by imagining the act as a murder. The only woman on the battlefield, Margaret becomes a scapegoat for all of the murderous crimes the Plantagenet army commits. For instance, York incriminates Margaret for Rutland's death, even though Clifford actually killed the boy. They implicate her because she complicates gender relations on the battlefield. She ensures that York and Rutland die not as honorable soldiers but as men dishonored by a woman. York's death promotes a troubling image: he is tied up in the style of an execution—and Margaret performs the role of both judge

and executioner. Although her role is similar to most men's in the play, other characters, especially among York's supporters, interpret her differently than the men she fights alongside.

By singling out Margaret and Clifford, the messenger argues that York dies not on the battlefield at the hands of an army but "only" by the "ireful arm" of two individuals. The adjectives used to describe Margaret characterize her more harshly than Clifford: he is "unrelenting," a term with both positive and negative connotations. An "unrelenting" man is necessary and respected in combat situations. Margaret is "ruthless," a word with only negative meanings. A "ruthless" woman lacks compassion and mercy, two qualities esteemed in women. Even while performing the same acts, Margaret and Clifford garner different responses from others. The "many hands" needed to capture York saves his honor—the dishonor of a woman killing him on the battlefield would be tremendous—but those hands disappear when the messenger describes York's death, attributing the blame only to Clifford and Margaret and revealing their participation quite differently.

York's body transforms into evidence of the deeds performed against it. At his death, York imagines the wounds as a gateway for his soul, one that mirrors the "gate of mercy" into heaven. He anticipates death as a release from worldly endeavors as he focuses on the way the wound opens space for his spirit to fly. Margaret and Clifford, however, focus on the gaping body that marks the end of York's ability to rebel. They send his head to hang over the town of York as evidence of the rebellion's end, but that evidence tells of more than York's death: it bespeaks the horrors performed by the queen who separated the head from the body, who marked her authority onto its flesh, and who then sent that flesh out to show the world of York's defeat by a woman. This is the second dismembered body to result from Margaret's emasculating force. Suffolk's disembodied head, cradled at Margaret's breast, turns into a perverse infant, a marker

of his emasculation (see chapter IV). York's and Suffolk's heads signifies disruption within the political environment as the head of state fails to rule its citizen body.

3. Warrior Women on the Streets of London

Early modern literature often constructs warrior women in terms of their domestic roles by focusing on their successes and failures as wives and daughters. In chapter 4, I suggest that portrayals of women like Margaret and Bonduca are often subversive because the women refer to someone in history. Thus, their transgressions expose the ability of *real* women in English history to find mimetic value in their representations—and these women might inform others in contemporary society of the agency they could acquire through violence. Likewise, the pamphlets and ballads about female murderers show, not what women in history were capable of performing, but what women in contemporary society were able to effect. In the Jacobean period, playwrights became more interested in depicting scenes throughout London instead of in the royal court, and these representations of English city life sometimes show the effect of theater's mimetic potential. In *The Roaring Girl*, Thomas Middleton and Thomas Dekker combine themes about warrior women and ideas about contemporary society to introduce a new kind of warrior—a street fighter, one whose representation at least suggests the possibility for theater to turn into reality. Moll's character has a "cultural referent, the 'real' Moll," who demonstrates martial women's ability to live in English society.[45] The play draws upon audience members' awareness of the real Moll, who was well known in court for charges of theft and perhaps even appeared in a few ballads of her own.[46] The epilogue even promises her recurrence: "the Roaring Girl herself, some few days hence, / Shall on this stage give larger recompence."[47] Moll appears as a streetwise Margaret, buying rather than "steeling the breech" and battling for

womankind rather than for the crown (*3 Henry VI* 5.5.25).[48] *The Roaring Girl* refocuses the warrior woman motif away from the royal court and the activities of queens like Margaret and Elizabeth and onto the common woman who runs amok in early modern society.

One of Moll's actions on the streets includes stabbing Laxton in a scene that shows patriarchy's failure in containing martial women. For the most part, scholars have concentrated on *The Roaring Girl*'s subversive reversal of gender roles, as Marjorie Garber does when she notes the play's "omnipresent references to castration, emasculation, penises and testicles worn (like clothing; extra "yards," "codpieces," "trinkets") by women rather than men."[49] In the fight with Laxton, Moll becomes the male aggressor while Laxton transforms into the feminine object of her sword. Battling to defend women's honor, Moll reverses commonplace ideas about women as objects under masculine authority. Likewise, Howard argues that ideas about women's "struggle, resistance, and subversive masquerade" are important to understanding women like Moll, who "asserts a freedom extraordinary for a woman."[50] Drawing upon arguments of Moll's riotous nature but disagreeing with the effect of Moll's ultimate subversion, Jane Baston argues that the play "counter[s]" Moll's threat to patriarchy in the play's ending, where "Moll's actions, words, and appearance are no longer threatening."[51] However, the play's ending, I argue, fails in containing all of Moll's subversive power, for Laxton never returns to the stage after his fight—did he die?—and Moll never succumbs to marriage but continues to wander the streets like a London-dwelling Amazon.

The Roaring Girl's duel between Moll and Laxton exemplifies the instability of gender definitions in early modern culture. Moll, the roaring girl who switches between female and male attire, takes offense when the insidious Laxton asks that she meet him for a sexual rendezvous outside of London's city proper, so she arrives dressed in male garb and initiates a duel on behalf

of all women whom Laxton might offend in like manner. The appropriately named Laxton cannot adequately defend himself against Moll's sword, which is consistently viewed as a phallic object; thus, the scene consciously shifts masculine and feminine characteristics onto the oppositely sexed character in a way that transforms the audience's and other characters' perceptions of his male body. Defining what it means to be male, Alphonso Lingis argues that "masculinity denotes appearance,…demeanor and behavior," traits visible in "speech, gestures, postures, and garb," but that maleness represents traits determined by physiology:

> The distinctive male traits—penis and penetration in copulation, greater size (20 percent on average) than females, and different pattern of, and on average greater, muscularity than females—materialize sexual and social behaviors.[52]

The major problem with Laxton is he either entirely lacks or finds himself unable to perform the attributes that should distinguish him as male: his name indicates lack of male genitalia and his defeat both prohibits any sexual copulation and renders his body weaker, less muscular, less capable, than Moll's female body.

Moll's dress and behavior suggest the performed nature of gender roles. Even though Laxton anticipates her dress in a "shag ruff, a frieze jerkin, a short sword, and a safeguard,"[53] he exhibits astonishment when the sword becomes more than an adorning article to complete her masculine attire:

> *Enter Moll like a man*.
>
> ….
>
> Moll Stay! *She puts off her cloak and draws.*
>
> Laxton What, wilt thou untruss a point, Moll?

Moll Yes, here's the point that I untruss. 'T has but one

tag; 'twill serve enough to tie up a rogue's tongue. (3.1.36-62)

For Moll, the male clothing is not just an outward statement about her inward gender identity; it provides functionality that allows her to use a sword in combat. Although editors generally gloss the stage direction "*like a man*" as "dressed like" a man,[54] the scene shows how the clothing, including the sword, imbues her character with masculinity in more than just looks: she acts "like a man." Of course, the passage draws its humor from the reversal of gender roles, with Moll uncloaking to reveal a "point" against a man named *Laxton*, a situation that places Moll in an ambiguously gendered position in relation to Laxton. Indeed, the entire scene seems to test gender performance, with Moll outperforming both Laxton and Trapdoor in tests of their ability to prove masculinity in a street fight. Later in the scene, she notes that Trapdoor "seems / A man without" but decides to "try what he is within," as though the inner and outer portrayal of masculinity might be at odds. She blurs gender binaries when it becomes clear to the audience that she, like the warrior women in earlier literature, has the sharper "point."

Understanding the authority imbued into her sword, Moll imagines it as a pen with the potential to inscribe Laxton's body, encoding it with both the baseness of his life and the loss of his masculinity in defeat:

….But howe'er

Thou and the baser world censure my life,

I'll send 'em word by thee, and write so much

Upon thy breast, 'cause thou shalt bear't in mind

Tell them 'twere base to yield where I have conquered. (3.1.107-11)

Texts of the early modern period generally connect women's ability to write with their needlework, a tradition that comes from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and its story of Philomela and Procne. Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus* alludes to this tradition when Lavinia suffers the removal of her tongue *and* her hands so that she cannot write her rapists' names with her needlework. The needle, a feminine object, gives voice to women whose voices were cruelly taken by men. In *The Roaring Girl*, however, Moll appropriates the object used by men to remove women's voices, the sword that cuts out their tongues, to replace needles as writing utensils. Rather, she proposes to "write so much / upon [Laxton's] breast" that the "baser world" would feel her condemnation for his lusty desires toward women. She objects to Laxton's use of women and uses the sword to mark that objection upon his body.

Laxton responds to Moll's proposition by granting her domination over his body, an act that transforms power dynamics by placing him in the role of the wife:

> Laxton I yield both purse and body.
>
> Moll Both are mine and now at my disposing.
>
> Laxton Spare my life! (3.1.124-26)

In giving his body to her disposal, he allows her to write upon him, to carve into his breast that which she desires. She now gives his body meaning, and he is left with begging that she allows that body to live. She notes with condemnation the reversal of gender roles this creates:

> Base is that mind that kneels unto her body,
>
> As if a husband stood in awe on 's wife!
>
> My spirit shall be mistress of this house
>
> As long as I have time in't. (3.1.138-41)

She suggests subversion in the Cartesian model of mind/body dualism: the mind should never kneel to the body, and the man should never kneel to the wife. Laxton's obeisance toward her is unnatural in early modern gender relations. She emphasizes the problem with warrior women: they often force the husband to "st[an]d in awe on 's wife" rather than the opposite. She acknowledges this unnaturalness to make an argument for single life, where she can live as "mistress" of her body without a master. She imagines her body as a domestic zone, a "house," where she is the sole ruler. Even her expression of agency is figured in terms of the domestic sphere.

Although defeated in battle, Laxton shows that Moll can only be "like" a man because the expectations he has of her gender performance conform to society's expectations of womanly behavior. Like Alice and Margaret, Moll undergoes different judgments about her activities than men, which indicates that patriarchy continues to influence works about martial women. When she promises to "serve an execution upon [Laxton]" unless he "draw" to defend himself, Laxton responds, "Draw upon a woman? Why, what dost mean, Moll?" (3.1.72). Although the staging of Moll blurs gender binaries because a boy plays a woman who plays a man, a fact that potentially adds to the complexity with which an audience might understand notions of gender expressed in the play, Laxton's passage draws attention to Moll's supposed biological sex rather than her performed gender.[55] The dress, it seems, does not make a man, as she suggests with regards to Trapdoor. Laxton argues that he cannot draw upon a woman because socially ordained codes of behavior and honor made such an act indecorous, even if that woman *looks* like a man. Laxton's argument recalls preoccupations with warrior women's place on the battlefield, which forces men to contradict their inherent roles as men by drawing upon a woman (see, in particular, chapter IV). But Laxton's argument also calls attention to his own inability to perform the male

role, for his seemingly gallant refusal to draw upon Moll is, in reality, a sign of his fear of Moll's skill with a blade. Instead of fighting her, he emphasizes her womanhood in an attempt to contain her actions to appropriate behaviors for women, but he fails. She refuses to abide by the social expectations of her gender.

In renouncing marriage at the play's conclusion, she also defies the expectations of comedy. *The Roaring Girl* follows the comic formulae in its depiction of Mary Fitzallard and Sebastian Wengrave, who overcome the comic block, Sebastian's father, by the play's end. With the marriage of Mary and Sebastian, the play parallels *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Faerie Queene*. But unlike Hippolyta and Britomart and Mary, Moll refuses subsumption in marriage. The play fails to contain Moll through any of the means discussed in this dissertation. Rather than living in distant lands, like the Amazons discussed in chapter II, Moll lives in London. Unlike Britomart and Hippolyta in chapter III, Moll has no Artegall or Theseus violently asserting masculine privilege over her. And instead of dying in the play's conclusion, as Bonduca does, Moll lives on "in maiden meditation, fancy free."

In her unmarried state, Moll recalls other exceptional women, like the Amazons and like Elizabeth, who potentially threaten patriarchy. But as the numbers of exceptional women grow, they start to lose their exceptionalism—instead, they become examples that other women can follow. The play presents the problem of historical precedent, for martial women like Margaret exist not only in earlier times but also on the early modern streets, as Moll shows. Thus, the threat to patriarchy continues, reimagined as a female brawler. Indeed, the warrior woman, like Moll, might "give larger recompence" "some few days hence" (Epilogus 35-6).

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

Fantasies about warrior women are not limited to the early modern period. In the last two decades, the movie industry, which today has replaced the theater industry as the most popular dramatic form, has produced films that consider women's ability to serve in modern military situations. Movies like *G.I. Jane* (1997), *G.I. Joe: The Rise of the Cobra* (2009), *The General's Daughter* (1999), *Starship Troopers* (1997), and its sequel *Starship Troopers: Marauder* (2008) all depict women in modern and futuristic combat. The most recent rendition of *Battlestar Galactica* (2004-2009), a science fiction television show focused largely on military operations onboard a battleship, includes as its most experienced Viper pilot Captain Kara "Starbuck" Thrace, a female character that in the 1978 version of *Battlestar Galactica* was male. *Star Trek: Voyager* (1995-2001), likewise, adds Kathryn Janeway to the list of otherwise male *Star Trek* captains. Now more than ever, writers, directors, and producers are filling what once were considered male roles with female actors. These movies reflect a segment of society's changing perceptions about women's involvement in warfare. But this segment, the movie industry and particularly the science fiction genre, is transitioning at a faster pace than the community represented in the films about military women. In concluding this dissertation, I would like to suggest that many of the modern perceptions about warrior women—including today's continued emphasis on containing women's bodies—were inherited from the early modern period. Moreover, these perceptions demonstrate the mimetic potential of women like Margaret and Bonduca and Elizabeth I, who act as precedents for the warrior women who followed them.

Just as the warrior women portrayed in early modern drama demonstrate masculine characteristics, warrior women in today's popular movies have all but eliminated their feminine

qualities. In *G.I. Jane*, for instance, Demi Moore's character at first struggles to fit in with the other male trainees of the U.S. Navy Special Warfare Group—that is, until she shaves her head.[1] In a crucial scene, Moore's character determines that the best way to relate to men is to look like them. Watching her long dark hair fall to the ground, the audience feels the change in her character as she eliminates one of the primary markers of gender difference. Warrior women in popular movies do not fight like Amazons—that is, they rarely use *both* feminine and masculine means of overcoming adversity (see chapter II); instead, they fight only like men, eradicating the feminine as much as possible. Yet Moore's character does mimic another trait of the Amazon: she cuts her feminine hair much like Amazons, according to some narratives, cut one breast. Like certain early modern representations of warrior women, portrayals of military women in today's society blend masculine and feminine characteristics when they engage in combat.

Yet even as today's depictions of warrior women in movies shows the emptying of feminine qualities, the underlying message conveyed by the drama portrays an inherent reluctance within the military to accept warrior women into its ranks—as discussions about rape in *G.I. Jane* show. During a training exercise in *G.I. Jane*, a Command Master Chief threatens to rape Moore's character to show the dangers of including women in military operations.[2] Rape is presented as an extreme form of torture that enemies can use to extract information from female soldiers. Just as telling, though, is the argument that the rape of female soldiers can be used to extract information from *male* soldiers. As I discuss in chapter IV, male soldiers fight to protect those weaker than they are, usually women and children. Watching a female soldier enduring rape or physical brutality may force men to choose between the mission and the woman. If women join the front lines, then they potentially challenge men's primary roles as protectors. Thus, violence performed upon women's bodies may force men to reconsider their roles as men.

Movies and television shows about women in the armed forces demonstrate how ideas about women have changed since the early modern period, but they also show the continuities in social concerns about women on the battlefield. As *G.I. Jane* illustrates, people today still at times imagine women occupying an uneasy place in military situations, particularly because soldiers on both sides of the battle lines react differently to women than they do to men (see chapter V). The movie industry tends to promote two ideas about warrior women: 1) movies show women's uneasy fit into military environments to call attention to social issues (*G.I. Jane* and *The General's Daughter*), and 2) movies show futuristic ideas about women that eliminate distinctive markers between male and female bodies (*Starship Troopers, Starship Troopers: Marauder,* and the television series *Battlestar Galactica*). Rather than showing women's assimilation into the military *as women*, the more futuristic portrayals depict women whose roles are barely indistinguishable from men's. In *Starship Troopers: Marauder* and in the more recent *Battlestar Galactica* series, for instance, women and men not only perform equivalent tasks but also shower and dress alongside each other.[3] In these scenes, both men and women ignore the differences between their naked bodies. Here, too, the women display the qualities of both genders, for just as their breasts mark them as women, their hardened muscles mirror the men's. The science fiction genre often imagines a futuristic world where warrior women have *almost* evolved into men.

Movies about military women offer a fantasy of what the military may become if women continue to join the ranks with men. Thus, they offer a mimetic appeal for those women who wish to acquire agency through combat situations. However, the real situation for women in the United States military is far from the imaginative world of *Battlestar Galactica*. In reality, the acceptance of women in many roles traditionally dominated by men is not complete, for gender

bias influenced by patriarchy still thwarts women's ability to become warrior women alongside men on the battlefield. Currently, women make up fourteen percent of the United States Army. The struggle for these women to hold the same positions as men has been extensive. In January 2013, the US military finally lifted a ban on women serving in combat units—a major advancement in women's rights. Yet even with these remarkable improvements, some of the major concerns about warrior women still resound, especially the preoccupation with containing women's bodies as they perform in military engagements.

Though the situation is changing for women, the focus is still on controlling the feminine aspects of women's bodies. Writing for *Time* magazine, Mark Thompson remarks on the Pentagon's Human Performance Resource Center's advice for women to "eliminate menstruation because it can be inconvenient and even burdensome in austere environments."[4] The Pentagon suggests continual use of contraceptives to limit women's menstrual cycle. The report continues, "because many more women are being deployed to combat zones and perform many of the same tasks that men do, informing women in the military of successful ways to suppress menstruation is becoming increasingly important."[5] To perform the "same tasks that men do," women must physically become more like men; they must limit the natural functions of their female bodies to simulate the male body. Indeed, the questions today about women's military capabilities focus on the ability of female bodies to engage in equivalent tasks as male bodies: can women run as far? Can they carry as much gear? Can they save a male soldier from the field? Can they perform during menstruation? As these questions suggest, the ideal soldier is clearly male. To enter into situations of equal combat readiness, women must meet this masculine ideal, which includes suppressing the inconvenience of menstruation.

Likewise, military generals have made controversial attempts to control women's reproduction. In 2009, Major General Anthony Cucolo III advocated court martial and imprisonment for women who became pregnant while serving in Iraq.[6] In some ways, this policy change demonstrated a step forward for women: like men, women should fulfill oaths to their countries, and they should not shirk their duties by becoming pregnant. To prevent women from using pregnancy as an escape from the military, Cucolo issued punishments. Cucolo's policy recalls Shakespeare's Joan la Pucelle, who feigned pregnancy to avoid a fiery death. Like Joan's captors, Cucolo viewed pregnancy as an excuse, though the Cucolo's punishment for his soldiers, of course, excluded the stake. With his policy, Cucolo sought to contain women's bodies, though, in fairness, Cucolo also wished to punish men who impregnated women; thus, he equally contained the corporeal activities of his soldiers. Critics were so widespread that Cucolo eventually rescinded his policy. Although these critics show a forward-thinking reaction to women's involvement in the military, they must continue to overturn the ideas of men like Cucolo in their efforts to defend women's rights to military engagements. In 2012, for instance, the Air Force dismissed a woman named Rebecca Edmonds for becoming pregnant outside of wedlock and trying to raise the child as a single mother.[7] These ideas about controlling female bodies, and the products of those bodies, very much resemble the early modern ideas of containment. Though women's roles in the military have greatly advanced, they still undergo regulation that controls the activities of those women.

The U.S. Army's *Guide to Female Soldier Readiness* (2010), a supplement book written that helps female soldiers and their commanders understand the additional requirements of women entering armed forces, is careful to inform the male commanders that "pregnancy is not a disease or affliction."[8] Unlike the soldiers in Iraq, many female soldiers not in combat situations

live normal lives that include having children, but their commanding officer must determine their usefulness during a woman's natural and biological function of pregnancy: "The maximum use of a pregnant Soldier may require some *creative thinking* or temporary internal reassignments within a unit."[9] It seems the pregnant soldier can still be "worthwhile" as long as the commanding officer can define a role for her. Today, warrior women must deny their natural roles, controlling both their pregnancies and their menstruations.

Although the limitations placed on female soldiers' bodies today have striking parallels to the early modern period's containment of warrior women's bodies, representations of women in combat offer mimetic value for men and women with military careers. Women like Margaret and Joan were anomalies, staged partially for the sensational material they provided; women like Channing Day, a British soldier who died in Afghanistan in October of 2012, work alongside hundreds of female soldiers deployed in modern wars. That militaries have handbooks about handling female soldiers speaks to their presence in military operations. The female soldiers today owe their positions in the military to the ones who fought in the past—those who demonstrated women's capacity to fight alongside men. Histories about female soldiers and representations of warrior women in literature inspire audiences, perhaps encouraging audience members to join the military ranks. The instructive qualities of warrior women to future generations trace back to Elizabeth and the precedent she offered subsequent generations.

Elizabeth joined the ranks of women in history who have changed the way the world understands female subjectivity. She never presented herself as an advocate for women's rights, but other women chose to use her for women's agendas. For instance, Anne Bradstreet, as I indicate in chapter II, used Elizabeth as an example for women to follow. Queens after Elizabeth, like Victoria and Elizabeth II, found the transition to a female ruler a little easier, for the

exemplary nature of Elizabeth's reign proved that gynocracy could work. Female commanders, arguably women like Margaret Thatcher, whose fortitude as a political leader during war earned her the nickname "Iron Lady," continue to demonstrate the potential for women to lead countries during armed conflicts. They, like Elizabeth, will go down in history for their mimetic potential as warrior women.

NOTES

Notes on chapter I

[1] John Knox, *The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrvovs regiment of women* (Geneva: J. Poullain and A. Rebul, 1558), 19.

[2] See Robert Greene's *Penelope's Web* (1601), Jane Anger's *Her Protection for Women* (1589), Sir Thomas Elyot's *The Defence of Good Women* (1540), and Joseph Swetnam's *The Araignment of Lewde, idle, forward, and unconstant women* (1615). For more on the debate about women's roles, see Linda Woodbridge, *Women and the English Renaissance: Literature and the Nature of Womankind, 1540-1620* (Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1984).

[3] In "On Friendship," Michel de Montaigne claims that the most meaningful relationships are between two people of equal intellect. Because he views women as inferior to men, he argues that only two men can develop perfect friendships. The fantasy about warrior women potentially offers an alternative to Montaigne's view. Michel de Montaigne, "On Friendship," in *Essays*, trans. J. M. Cohen (London: Penguin Books, 1958), 91-105.

[4] See, for instance, Phyllis Rackin, "Women's Roles in the Elizabethan History Plays," in *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History Plays*, ed. Michael Hattaway (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2002), 71-85; Jean E. Howard and Phyllis Rackin, *Engendering a Nation: A Feminist Account of Shakespeare's History Plays* (London: Routledge, 1997); Pamela Joseph Benson, *The Invention of the Renaissance Woman: The Challenge of Female Independence in the Literature and Thought of Italy and England* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State U P, 1992); and Theodora A. Jankowski, *Women in Power in the Early Modern Drama* (Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1992).

[5] Howard and Rackin, *Engendering a Nation*, 24.

[6] A few other scholars are worthy of mention. Dianne Dugaw looks specifically at warrior women in popular balladry. She has collected a substantial number of ballads that mention women crossdressing to go to war as soldiers or to sea as pirates. Unlike the women of my study, the warrior women in balladry tend to hide their female identity. The fact that so many women are mentioned in balladry in the period indicates that the fantasy of warrior women circulated widely. Simon Shepherd writes about references to Amazonian warriors in the early modern period. His somewhat disorganized approach does provide interesting close readings of how Amazons made their way into references to roaring girls, tavern wenches, and other women who subvert the boundaries of the women's sphere. See Dianne Dugaw, *Warrior Women and Popular Balladry, 1650-1850* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1989); and Simon Shepherd, *Amazons and Warrior Women: Varieties of Feminism in Seventeenth-Century Drama* (New York: St. Martin's P, 1981).

[7] Antonia Fraser, *The Warrior Queens* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1989).

[8] Kathryn Schwarz, *Tough Love: Amazon Encounters in the English Renaissance* (Durham: Duke U P, 2000), 3, 7.

[9] Elizabeth A. Grosz, *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism* (Bloomington: Indiana U P, 1994), xi.

[10] Ibid., xiii.

[11] For another scholar working along a similar theoretical framework but with early modern texts, see Cristina León Alfar, *Fantasies of Female Evil: The Dynamics of Gender and Power in Shakespearean Tragedy* (Newark: U of Delaware P, 2003).

[12] Theodora A. Jankowski, *Pure Resistance: Queer Virginity in Early Modern English Drama* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2000).

[13] Several theoretical discussions on gender inform my readings of early modern texts: Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1999); Sherry B. Ortner, *Making Gender: The Politics and Erotics of Culture* (Boston: Beacon P, 1996); Katie Conboy, Nadia Medina, and Sarah Stanbury, eds., *Writing on the Body: Female Embodiment and Feminist Theory* (New York: Columbia U P, 1997); Nancy Tuana et al, *Revealing Male Bodies* (Bloomington: Indiana U P, 1992); and Janet Price and Margrit Shildrick, eds, *Feminist Theory and the Body* (New York: Routledge, 1999).

[14] Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, trans. Constance Borde and Sheila Malovany-Chevallier (New York: Vintage Books, 2011); and Luce Irigaray, *This Sex Which is Not One* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell U P, 1985).

[15] The early modern period did, however, try to manufacture outward signs to distinguish between social classes. See, for instance, Anne Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory* (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2000).

[16] Stephen Greenblatt, *Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1988), 76.

[17] Ibid., 77.

[18] See Thomas Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard U P, 1992).

[19] Greenblatt, *Shakespearean Negotiations*, 79.

[20] Sarah Colvin and Helen Watanabe-O'Kelly, eds. *Women and Death 2: Warlike Women in the German Literary and Cultural Imagination since 1500* (Rochester: Camden House, 2009), 3. Colvin and Watanabe-O'Kelly's discussion of warrior women in German literature argues not that masculinity must be constantly proven but that femininity must always reinforce gender

roles, with the duties of women working in direct opposition to those of men such that the performance of certain duties establishes gender distinctions.

[21] Discussing masculinity in modern British and American literatures, Kathy J. Phillips argues for four "theoretical assumptions about masculinity": masculinity is "a social construct;" it "shifts over time;" it "is multiple, providing for masculinities;" and these "masculinities are contradictory" (10). Although Phillips focuses on modern literature, her definitions for masculinity appropriately apply to early modern studies. Kathy J. Phillips, *Manipulating Masculinity: War and Gender in Modern British and American Literature* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).

[22] Jankowski, *Pure Resistance*.

[23] Edmund Spenser, *The Faerie Queene*, ed. A. C. Hamilton (Harlow, England: Pearson and Longman, 2001), 3.1.45. All references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically.

[24] Shakespeare, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, in *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997), 1.1.16. All references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically.

[25] Madelon Gohlke, "'I wooed thee with my sword': Shakespeare's Tragic Paradigms," in *The Woman's Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*, ed. Carolyn Ruth Swift Lenz, Gayle Greene, and Carol Thomas Neely (Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1980), 150-68.

[26] See also Frances E. Dolan, *Marriage and Violence: The Early Modern Legacy* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2008).

[27] Shakespeare, *3 Henry VI*, in *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997), 2.6.75, 2.5.18. All references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically.

[28] George Buchanan, *History of Scotland* vol. 2 (London: H. Parker, 1733), 56.

Notes on chapter II

[1] Shakespeare, *3 Henry VI* and *1 Henry VI*, in *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997), 1.4.115, 1.3.83, respectively.

[2] James Aske, *Elizabetha Trivmphans* (London: Thomas Orwin, 1588), 23.

[3] Mary Villeponteaux, "'Not as women wonted be': Spenser's Amazon Queen," in *Dissing Elizabeth: Negative Representations of Gloriana*, ed. Julia M. Walker (Durham: Duke U P, 1998), 213-14.

[4] Several scholars focus on the way English subjects fashion Elizabeth's image to suit their personal or political needs. See, for instance, Susan Frye, *Elizabeth I: The Competition for Representation* (New York and Oxford: Oxford U P, 1993); Louis Montrose, *The Subject of Elizabeth: Authority, Gender, and Representation* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2006); Helen Hackett, *Virgin Mothers, Maiden Queen: Elizabeth I and the Cult of the Virgin Mary* (New York: St. Martin's P, 1995); and Julia M. Walker, ed., *Dissing Elizabeth: Negative Representations of Gloriana* (Durham: Duke U P, 1998).

[5] Sir Walter Ralegh, *Discoverie of Guiana*, ed. Joyce Lorimer (London: Ashgate, 2006), 31. All references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically.

[6] Michael Hattaway, "'Seeing things': Amazons and Cannibals," in *Travel and Drama in Shakespeare's Time*, ed. Jean-Pierre Maquerlot and Michèle Willems (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1996), 182.

[7] Louis Montrose, "The Work of Gender in the Discourse of Discovery," *Representations* 33 Special Issue: The New World (Winter 1991): 25.

[8] Kathryn Schwarz, *Tough Love: Amazon Encounters in the English Renaissance* (Durham: Duke U P, 2000): 51.

[9] See Katie Conboy, Nadia Medina, and Sarah Stanbury, eds., *Writing on the Body: Female Embodiment and Feminist Theory* (New York: Columbia U P, 1997); Nancy Tuana et al, *Revealing Male Bodies* (Bloomington: Indiana U P, 1992); and Janet Price and Margrit Shildrick, eds, *Feminist Theory and the Body* (New York: Routledge, 1999).

[10] Michel Foucault, "Subject and Power," in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*, ed. and trans. Colin Gordon (New York: Pantheon, 1980), 777.

[11] Frances E. Dolan argues that hierarchy inevitably occurs in relationships, even in gay and lesbian couples. One person always becomes the more powerful. Dolan claims this comes from the Biblical idea that marriage is hierarchical. See Frances E. Dolan, *Marriage and Violence: The Early Modern Legacy* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2008).

[12] See Michel Foucault, *History of Sexuality: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage Books, 1978).

[13] See, for instance, discussions of sumptuary laws in Anne Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory* (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2000).

[14] Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations*, ed. Eric Dunning, Johan Goudsblom, and Stephen Mennell (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1994).

[15] Michel Foucault, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History," in *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow (London: Penguin, 1991), 83.

[16] Foucault, "Subject and Power," 781.

[17] Simon Shepherd, *Amazons and Warrior Women: Varieties of Feminism in Seventeenth-Century Drama* (New York: St. Martin's P, 1981), 31.

[18] See William Thomas Walsh, *Isabella of Spain: The Last Crusader, 1451-1504* (New York: R. M. McBride & Company, 1930).

[19] The list of warrior women throughout history is long and includes famous figures like Deborah, Boadicea, Zenobia, Brunhilde, Aethelflaed, Matilda of Tuscany, Eleanor of Aquitaine, Isabella of France, and Isabel of Fife. These women thwarted masculine prerogative and served as precedents for Elizabeth and for the warrior women in early modern literature.

[20] Thomas Heywood, *Exemplary Lives and Memorable Acts of Nine the most Worthy Women in the VVorld: Three Iewes, Three Gentiles, Three Christians* (London: Thomas Cotes, 1640), 100. All references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically.

[21] William Painter, *The Palace of Pleasure* (1575), ed. Joseph Jacobs, vol. 1 (1890; rpt., New York, 1966), 159-61. All references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically.

[22] Edmund Spenser, *The Faerie Queene*, ed. A. C. Hamilton (Harlow, England: Pearson and Longman, 2001), 5.5.22. All references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically.

[23] Villeponteaux, "'Not as women wonted be,'" 214.

[24] Heywood describes a similar phenomenon: "the female they preserved, and brought them up in the practise of Armes, searing of their right paps, least otherwise it might be an impediment unto them to the use of the Bow or the Speare." Heywood, *Exemplary Lives*, 101.

[25] Joyce Lorimer, ed., *Discoverie of Guiana* (London: Ashgate, 2006), 65n1.

[26] See Kari Boyd McBride, ed., *Domestic Arrangements in Early Modern England* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne U P, 2002).

[27] Celeste Turner Wright, "The Amazons in Elizabethan Literature," *Studies in Philology* 37.3 (Jul. 1940): 449.

[28] Louis Adrian Montrose, "'Shaping Fantasies': Figurations of Gender and Power in Elizabethan Culture," *Representations* 2 (Spring 1983): 76.

[29] Winfried Schleiner, "'Divina Virago': Queen Elizabeth as an Amazon," *Studies in Philology* 75.2 (Spring 1978): 164.

[30] Montrose, "The Work of Gender in the Discourse of Discovery," 8.

[31] Ibid.

[32] See Janet M. Green, "'I My Self': Queen Elizabeth I's Oration at Tilbury Camp," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 28.2 (Summer 1997): 421-45; Susan Frye, "The Myth of Elizabeth at Tilbury," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 23.1 (Spring 1992): 95-114; and Carole Levin, *The Heart and Stomach of a King: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1994).

[33] Mattingly, *The Armada* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1959), 349; and J. E. Neale, *Queen Elizabeth I: A Biography* (New York: Doubleday, 1957).

[34] William Camden, *The history of the most renowned and victorious princess Elizabeth, late Queen of England* (London: E. Flesher, 1675).

[35] Thomas Deloney, "The Queen's visiting of the Camp at Tilbury, with her entertainment there," in *Thomas Deloney his Thomas of Reading and Three Ballads on the Spanish Armada*, ed. Charles Roberts Aldrich and Lucian Swift Kirtland (New York: J. F. Taylor and Company, 1903), 194. Thomas Deloney was a famous ballad writer in the period, and his ballads describing the queen at Tilbury comprise one of two poetic sources of her visit there. The other writer to detail the events at Tilbury is James Aske in *Elizabetha Trivmphans*. Scholars

agree that neither of these sources should be read as completely historical as they sometimes show more interest in providing poetic and fantastical readings of Elizabeth than true history. However, most scholars do agree that Aske was an eyewitness to the events at Tilbury while Deloney's presence there is debatable (Levin, *Heart and Stomach*, 143-45). Aske, *Elizabetha Trivmphans*.

[36] Aske, *Elizabetha Trivmphans*, 2, 19, 21.

[37] For a discussion of Henry VIII's warrior spirit in tourneys and in France, see G. R. Elton, *England under the Tudors* 3rd edition (London: Routledge, 1991), esp. chap. 4.

[38] Elizabeth I, *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, ed. Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2000), 10.

[39] Ibid, 325-6. Several versions of Elizabeth's speech survive; the one quoted here is according to BL., MS Harley 6798, art. 18, fol. 87.

[40] See Celeste Turner Wright, "The Elizabethan Female Worthies," *Studies in Philology* 43.4 (Oct. 1946): 628-43.

[41] John Knox, *The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrvovs regiment of women* (Geneva: J. Poullain and A. Rebul, 1558), 19.

[42] George Buchanan, *History of Scotland* vol. 2 (London: H. Parker, 1733), 56. Buchanan was a tutor to James VI of Scotland and a spokesman against the right of women to rule. The quote I mention has a startling parallel with the fifth book of Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* when Radigund forces Artegall and other knights to dress in women's clothes and weave cloth. See James E. Phillips, Jr., "The Woman Ruler in Spenser's *Faerie Queene*," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 5.2 (Jan. 1942): 211-34.

[43] Levin, *The Heart and Stomach of a King*, 148, 125.

[44] Ibid., 125

[45] Hackett, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen*, 2.

[46] One popular inscription on commemorative medals claimed, "*fevit Deus et inimici dissiparunt"* ("God blew upon the waters and dispersed His enemies"). Quoted from Wallace MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I* (London: Edward Arnold, 1993), 241.

[47] For information on the engraving's composition date and the politics that surrounded its conception, see Julia M. Walker, "Bones of Contention: Posthumous Images of Elizabeth and Stuart Politics," in *Dissing Elizabeth: Negative Representations of Gloriana*, ed. Julia M. Walker (Durham: Duke U P, 1998), 252-76.

[48] Walker, "Bones of Contention," 252.

[49] Ibid., 260.

[50] Louis Montrose, "The Elizabethan Subject and the Spenserian Text," in *Literary Theory/Renaissance Texts*, ed. Patricia Parker and David Quint (Baltimore: John Hopkins, 1986).

[51] Wright, "The Amazons in Elizabethan Literature," 449.

[52] Anne Bradstreet, "In Honour of that High and Mighty Princess, Queen Elizabeth," in *The Works of Anne Bradstreet in Prose and Verse*, ed. John Harvard Ellis (Charleston: Abram E. Cutter, 1867), 359. All references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically.

[53] Peter Stallybrass, "Patriarchal Territories: The Body Enclosed," in *Rewriting the Renaissance: The Discourses of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Margaret W. Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan, and Nancy J. Vickers (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1986), 126.

[54] Villeponteaux, "'Not as women wonted be,'" 214-25.

Notes on chapter III

[1] Kathryn Schwarz, *Tough Love: Amazon Encounters in the English Renaissance* (Durham: Duke U P, 2000), 2.

[2] Ibid., 217.

[3] Peter Stallybrass, "Patriarchal Territories: The Body Enclosed," in *Rewriting the Renaissance: The Discourses of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Margaret W. Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan, and Nancy J. Vickers (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1986), 126.

[4] Ibid., 133.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Louis Adrian Montrose, "'Shaping Fantasies': Figurations of Gender and Power in Elizabethan Culture," *Representations* 2 (Spring 1983): 55. Furthermore, Montrose connects female agency in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* with political and cultural concerns in Elizabeth's reign, particularly society's views on Amazons. He comments on the "androcentric culture" in which "men are in fact dependent upon women: upon mothers and nurses, for their birth and nurture; upon mistresses and wives, for the validation of their manhood" (36). See also -----, "Spenser and the Elizabethan Political Imaginary," *ELH* 69.4 (Winter 2002): 907-45.

[7] Mary Villeponteaux, "Displacing Feminine Authority in *The Faerie Queene*," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 35.1 (Winter 1995): 53.

[8] Jacqueline Vanhoutte, "Elizabeth I as Stepmother," *English Literary Renaissance* 39.2 (Spring 2009): 319-20.

[9] Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays* (1957; repr., New York: Atheneum, 1966), 44 (my emphasis).

[10] Ibid.

[11] Ibid., 164-65.

[12] Shakespeare, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, in *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997), 1.1.1-6. All references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically.

[13] Vanhoutte, "Elizabeth I as Stepmother," 318.

[14] Ibid., 317-18.

[15] Great examples of homosocial bonds include the those between Hermia and Helena in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and between Rosalind and Celia in *As You Like It*. See Denise A. Walen, "Constructions of Female Homoerotics in Early Modern Drama," *Theatre Journal* 54.3 (Oct. 2002): 411-30; and Janet Adelman, "Male Bonding in Shakespeare's Comedies," in *Shakespeare's 'Rough Magic': Renaissance Essays in Honor of C. L. Barber*, ed. Peter Erickson and Coppélia Kahn (Newark: U of Delaware P, 1985), 73-103.

[16] Shakespeare's main sources for Hippolyta's character are Chaucer's *The Squire's Tale* and Plutarch's *Life of Theseus*. For a description of how Shakespeare uses Plutarch see Schwarz, *Tough Love*, chap. 6.

[17] Virgil, *The Aeneid*, trans. Robert Fagles (New York: Penguin Books, 2006), 11.779.

[18] The story of Hippolyta's girdle, though absent from Shakespeare's play, informed the text through its popular appearances in literature and art from the period. For a discussion of Hippolyta and her girdle in Elizabethan literature, see Celeste Turner Wright, "The Amazons in Elizabethan Literature," *Studies in Philology* 37.3 (Jul. 1940): 433-56. For information about Hippolyta in Renaissance art, see, for instance, Sabine Poeschel, "Rubens' 'Battle of the Amazons' as a War-Picture: The Modernization of a Myth," *Artibus et Historiae* 22.43 (2001): 91-108. As Poeschel argues, Hippolyta's girdle is found in the artwork of Otto van Veen and of

Peter Paul Rubens, among others, as well as on sarcophaguses of the period. Artwork of this kind suggests recurring interest in Hippolyta throughout the period. Among other popular sources, Shakespeare might have known the tale from Ovid's story of Hercules and its brief mention of "the golden belt of Thermodon" (the Amazons fought Hercules along the Thermodon River). Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, trans. Arthur Golding (1567), reprinted with introduction by John Frederic Nims (Philadelphia, Paul Dry Books, 2000), 9.233.

[19] Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism*, 43.

[20] Chaucer, *The Knight's Tale*, in *The Riverside Chaucer*, ed. Larry D. Benson, 3rd ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1987), 865-68.

[21] Simon Shepherd, *Amazons and Warrior Women: Varieties of Feminism in Seventeenth-Century Drama* (New York: St. Martin's P, 1981), 16.

[22] Vanhoutte, "Elizabeth I as Stepmother," 319-20; Louis Adrian Montrose, *The Subject of Elizabeth: Authority, Gender, and Representation* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2006), 241.

[23] Stevie Davis, *The Feminine Reclaimed: The Idea of Woman in Spenser, Shakespeare, and Milton* (Lexington: U of Kentucky P, 1986), 121.

[24] Ibid.

[25] *Oxford English Dictionary*, v. "change."

[26] Shakespeare, *Cymbeline*, in *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997), 3.4.154-55, 3.7.85. Although the first line seems to contradict the normal movement from male to female gender roles, the editors of *The Norton Anthology* note that "command" here means the command that a princess has over others. Innogen is relinquishing her role as princess for one as a boy who must have "obedience" (3004n1).

[27] Edmund Spenser, *The Faerie Queene*, ed. A. C. Hamilton (Harlow, England: Pearson and Longman, 2001), 3.2.26.

[28] Davis, *The Feminine Reclaimed*, 121.

[29] Villeponteaux, "Displacing Feminine Authority in *The Faerie Queene*," 58.

[30] Conduct manuals from the early modern period generally advocate that women use obedience and submission to gain agency in marriage relationships. In Robert Green's *Penelope's Web* (1601), for instance, Penelope insists that total submission becomes a form of empowerment. Wives who suffer with patience, she claims, will eventually be rewarded with their husbands' reformation. Other conduct manuals generally affirm this position. See, for instance, William Whately, *A Bride Bush* (1919) and William Gouge, *Of Domesticall Duties* (1622).

[31] Constance Jordan, "Woman's Rule in Sixteenth-Century British Political Thought," *Renaissance Quarterly* 40.3 (Autumn 1987): 421-51.

[32] John Aylmer, *An harborowe for faithfull and trewe suiectes*, EEBO Editions (Strasborowe: 1559), sig G4.

[33] Ibid., sig B3.

[34] See James E. Phillips, Jr., "The Woman Ruler in Spenser's *Faerie Queene*," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 5.2 (Jan. 1942): 211-34.

[35] Hamilton, *The Faerie Queene*, 321n60:2. See also Carrie Anna Harper, *The Sources of the British Chronicle History in Spenser's "Faerie Queene"* (New York: Haskell House, 1964).

[36] Hamilton, *The Faerie Queene*, 289n4:9.

[37] Raphael Holinshed, *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland* Vol. 1 (1577, rev. 1587), ed. Henry Ellis (London: J. Johnson, 1807), vol. 1.

[38] Hamilton, *The Faerie Queene*, 289n4:4.

[39] The women prove unassailable except in key moments when their vulnerability signifies something greater, like chastity (see Mihoko Suzuki, *Metamorphoses of Helen: Authority, Difference, and the Epic* (Ithaca: Cornell U P, 1989), chap. 6). Although Glauce never engages in battle, she also never suffers wounds; even when Scudamour desires her death, he is unable to perform the blow that would kill her.

[40] See Spenser, *The Faerie Queene*, 3.3.54-56.

[41] At the time of its founding, Bath was called Kaer Badon. King Bladud also taught necromancy throughout Britain but, Icarus-like, fell to his death when wings he had crafted failed. He is most famous, however, for his son, King Leir, popularized in Shakespeare's *King Lear*. Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The History of the Kings of Britain*, trans. and ed. by Michael A. Faletra (Toronto: Broadview Editions, 2008), 63.

[42] Villeponteaux, "Displacing Feminine Authority in *The Faerie Queene*," 54

[43] For the relationship between *The Faerie Queene* and Elizabethan chivalry, see Ivan L. Schulze, "Notes on Elizabethan Chivalry and *The Faerie Queene*," *Studies of Philology* 30.2 (Apr. 1933): 148-159. For Elizabethan chivalry, see Frances A. Yates, "Elizabethan Chivalry: The Romance of the Accession Day Tilts," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 20.1/2 (Jan.-Jun. 1957): 4-25. Neither of these sources focus on Britomart's inclusion within the chivalric code.

[44] See, for instance, 4.5 when the true Florimell's belt is passed between women to prove their chastity. It falls off false Florimell, proving her wantonness, but remains on Amoret, the emblem of married chastity.

[45] *Oxford English Dictionary*, n. "right."

[46] The duel in Shakespeare's *Richard II* exemplifies the custom of fighting to prove the truth of an issue. In this play, Mowbray and Bolingbroke fight to decide which side speaks the truth: "By that sword I swear / which gently laid my knighthood on my shoulder, / I'll answer thee in any fair degree / Or chivalrous design of knightly trial" (1.1.78-81). Shakespeare, *Richard II*, in *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997).

[47] Hamilton, *The Faerie Queene*, 416n35:1.

[48] Because everyone in the play attributes honor to Hotspur, Hal takes advantage of his opponent's value and uses it to dress himself as honorable:

Prince: I will redeem all this on Percy's head
And in the closing of some glorious day
Be bold to tell you that I am your son,
When I will wear a garment all of blood
And slain my favors in a bloody mask
Which, washed away, shall scour my shame with it.

Shakespeare, *1 Henry IV*, in *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997), (3.2.132-37).

[49] Redcrosse's defense of Una's honor is in book 3 canto 1. In other episodes, men generally become champions for women, defending their honor, their land, or their freedom. See, for instance, Arthur's defense of Alma in book 2, when he slays Maleger to free her; and Artegall's mission, awarded to him by the Faerie Queene, to assist Irena. Even false women realize the need for masculine assistance: Duessa, for instance, consistently finds a paramour as her champion, moving between Sansfoy, Redcrosse, and Paridell.

[50] See Villeponteaux, "Displacing Feminine Authority in *The Faerie Queene*."

[51] Schwartz, *Tough Love*, 172.

[52] Ibid.

[53] Fraser Easton, "Gender's Two Bodies: Women Warriors, Female Husbands, and Plebian Life," *Past and Present* 180 (Aug. 2003): 133.

[54] Ibid.

[55] See Hamilton, *The Faerie Queene*, 324n15:8; and Suzuki, *Metamorphoses of Helen*, chap. 6.

[56] Even court records from the period show anxiety over allowing women to testify in court against men, demonstrating a profound distrust of women in masculine roles and of women who have the potential to ruin the reputations and lives of men.

[57] The word "successful" is important here. In chapter IV, I discuss women who continue to perform the masculine role even in relationships with men, but these relationships are unsuccessful, as are the outcomes of these women's stories.

[58] Elizabeth I, *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, ed. Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2000), 325-26.

[59] Madelon Gohlke, "'I wooed thee with my sword': Shakespeare's Tragic Paradigms," in *The Woman's Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*, ed. Carolyn Ruth Swift Lenz, Gayle Greene, and Carol Thomas Neely (Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1980): 150-68; and Frances E. Dolan, *Marriage and Violence: The Early Modern Legacy* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2008).

[60] Gohlke, "'I wooed thee with my sword,'" 151.

[61] Although "triumph" can refer to "a state of pomp or magnificence" during the early modern period, it more often denoted a triumph in war, as it does in Shakespeare's Roman

histories when conquering heroes triumph over their enemies or celebrating in triumph because of the victory. *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "triumph."

[62] Gohlke, "'I wooed thee with my sword,'" 150-68.

Notes on chapter IV

[1] The term "monstrous" in this chapter's title comes from John Knox's *The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women*. The term is also used to describe Bonduca and her daughters in Fletcher's play.

[2] Shakespeare, *1 Henry IV*, in *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997), (1.3.2, 6). All references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically.

[3] Though, of course, Margaret originates in France, her actions on the battlefield of England have little effect on the French nation and only really demonstrate concerns with English masculinity. The French, after all, are already perceived as feminine in Shakespeare's plays, so Margaret's ability to blur gender binaries in an English rather than French nation suggests masculinity is not as tightly defined as noblemen like York perceive.

[4] The naming of Boadicea has a complicated history, and a range of variant spellings are used to describe her, including Boadicea, Boodicia, Bunduica, Bunduca, Bonduica and Voadicea. Antonia Frasier prefers using two names to describe the Iceni Queen, one that refers to the historical woman and one that refers to the legend that arose in later histories. See Antonia Fraser, *The Warrior Queens* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1989), 3-13.

[5] For a discussion about the mimetic and educational quality of theater, see David M. Bergeron, "Pageants, Masques, and History," in *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History Plays*, ed. Michael Hattaway (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2002), 41-56.

[6] In the fourteenth century, the works of Tacitus (c. 55-117) were discovered in a monastic library and later translated into English, providing source material for many of the great chronicle histories and historical dramas of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In 1591, Sir Henry Sevile published a translation of Tacitus's *Histories*, popularizing the Roman author's works for use as source material for historical dramas. Several histories chronicling the lives of English kings appeared in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, suggesting a desire to transmit historical information from one period to another: see, for instance, Edward Hall, *The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Families of Lancaster and York* [1548] (London, 1809); Raphael Holinshed, *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland* Vol. 1 (1577, rev. 1587), ed. Henry Ellis (London: J. Johnson, 1807); John Stowe, *Chronicles of England from Brute unto the Present Yeare of Christ 1580* (London, 1580); and William Camden, *Britannia*, trans. Philémon Holland (1616).

[7] See, for instance, Phyllis Rackin, "Women's Roles in the Elizabethan History Plays," in *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History Plays*, ed. Michael Hattaway (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2002), 71-85; Jean E. Howard and Phyllis Rackin, *Engendering a Nation: A Feminist Account of Shakespeare's History Plays* (London: Routledge, 1997); and Theodora A. Jankowski, *Women in Power in the Early Modern Drama* (Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1992).

[8] Howard and Rackin, *Engendering a Nation*, 85. Leah S. Marcus, *Puzzling Shakespeare: Local Readings and Its Discontents* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1988), 94. Howard and Rackin further claim that the "extraordinary venom directed against Margaret…and the gratuitous

cruelty with which Shakespeare invests her character…reveal both her convenience as a scapegoat for the chaos around her and also the theatrical capital that could be made by staging the cultural fantasy of the monstrous Amazonian woman" (94).

[9] Jodi Mikalachki, *The Legacy of Boadicea: Gender and Nation in Early Modern England* (London: Routledge, 1998), 103.

[10] Phyllis Rackin, *Stages of History: Shakespeare's English Chronicles* (Ithaca: Cornell U P, 1990), 147. This is particularly true of Shakespeare's histories. The first scene of *1 Henry VI* dramatizes the funeral of Henry V, who Leslie Fielder has described as "that most phallic of English kings." The funeral of Henry V encourages the audience to compare the heroic identity of Henry VI to his most revered father. Shakespeare's later histories demonstrate the same complexity between Henry V and his father, who serves as a very different type of comparison. In the later plays, women's roles diminish substantially as the relationships between fathers and sons take precedence.

[11] Phyllis Rackin, *Stages of History*, 147. For more on masculine identity in Shakespeare's history plays, see Coppélia Kahn, *Man's Estate: Masculine Identity in Shakespeare* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1981).

[12] Thomas Heywood, *An Apology for Actors* (1612), reprinted with introduction by John Payne Collier (London: 1841), 52.

[13] Michael Hattaway, "The Shakespearean History Play," in *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History Plays*, ed. Michael Hattaway (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2002), 10.

[14] Dominique Goy-Blanquet, *Shakespeare's Early History Plays: From Chronicle to Stage* (Oxford: Oxford U P, 2003), 8.

[15] See Frances A. Shirley, ed., *"King John" and "Henry VIII": Critical Essays* (New York: Garland, 1988).

[16] Edmund Spenser, *The Faerie Queene*, ed. A. C. Hamilton (Harlow, England: Pearson and Longman, 2001), 3.2.2.

[17] Spenser, *The Faerie Queene*, 3.3.54.

[18] Scholars generally posit two reasons why Joan's exceptionalism becomes acceptable in Shakespeare's play: 1) her ability to effeminize French men merely confirms stereotypes about the French during the period and 2) her rise to power establishes her as a foil to Elizabeth, who also demonstrated men's impotence.

[19] For the nature of masculine versus feminine violence, see Frances E. Dolan, *Marriage and Violence: the Early Modern Legacy* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2008).

[20] See *Pure Resistance: Queer Virginity in Early Modern English Drama* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2000).

[21] Marcus, *Puzzling Shakespeare*, 89.

[22] Shakespeare, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, in *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997), 2.1.163.

[23] Shakespeare, *Venus and Adonis*, in *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997), 6. See also Jonathan Bate, "Sexual Perversity in 'Venus and Adonis,'" *The Yearbook of English Studies* 23 (1993): 80-92; and Kahn, *Man's Estate*.

[24] Greenblatt, *The Norton Shakespeare*, 456n1.

[25] For an excellent historical account of Jeanne d'Arc, see the introduction of Jankowski, *Pure Resistance*, esp. 1-4.

[26] Thomas Nashe, *Pierce Penniless his Supplication to the Devil*, 1592, reprinted in Chambers 1923, 4, 238-39.

[27] Of the four humors in Elizabethan medicine, the spleen is associated with choler and typically represents aggression and violence. The preeminent work on the humors in early modern literature is Gail Kern Paster, *Humoring the Body: Emotions and the Shakespearean Stage* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2004).

[28] Greenblatt, *The Norton Shakespeare*, 316n.

[29] Cynthia Herrup, "The King's Two Genders," *The Journal of British Studies* 45.3 (July 2006): 505.

[30] For Mary's and Elizabeth's treatment of this trope, see Jacqueline Vanhoutte, *Strange Communion: Motherland and Masculinity in Tudor Plays, Pamphlets, and Politics* (Newark: U of Delaware P, 2003), esp. chapters 1 and 2; and Susanne Scholz, *Body Narratives: Writing the Nation and Fashioning the Subject in Early Modern England* (New York: St. Martin's P, 2000).

[31] Stephen Greenblatt, *The Norton Shakespeare*, 306n.

[32] John Rainolds, "Of the Lawfulness of Marriage Upon a Lawful Divorce," in *Sexuality and Gender in the English Renaissance: An Annotated Edition of Contemporary Documents*, ed. Lloyd Davis (New York: Dover Publications, 1945), 92 (my emphasis).

[33] Consider, for instance, Shakespeare's use of "spirit" in Sonnet 129: "Th' expense of spirit in a waste of shame / Is lust in action" (lines1-2). Stephen Booth remarks that "spirit" may refer to "bodily fluid," for some anatomists in the early modern period argue that a vein connects the heart to the sexual organs, so the speaker's "expense of spirit" corresponds to the waste of love and sex. See Stephen Booth, *Shakespeare's Sonnets* (New Haven: Yale U P, 1977), 441-42.

[34] Janet Adelman, *Suffocating Mothers: Fantasies of Maternal Origin in Shakespeare's Plays, "Hamlet" to "The Tempest"* (New York: Routledge, 1992); and Coppélia Kahn, *Roman Shakespeare: Warriors, Wounds, and Women* (London: Routledge, 1997).

[35] Kahn, *Roman Shakespeare*, 147-51.

[36] Shakespeare, *Coriolanus*, in *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1997), (3.2.129).

[37] Howard and Rackin, *Engendering a Nation*, 5.

[38] Shakespeare, *Henry V*, in *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1997), (3.3.91).

[39] For a compelling discussion about the attacks and defenses of women in early modern England, see Linda Woodbridge, *Women and the English Renaissance: Literature and the Nature of Womankind, 1540-1620* (Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1984).

[40] For a discussion of "female worthies," see Celeste Turner Wright, "The Elizabethan Female Worthies," *Studies in Philology* 43.4 (Oct. 1946): 628-43.

[41] Julie Crawford, "Fletcher's *The Tragedie of Bonduca* and the Anxieties of the Masculine Government of James I," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 39.2 (Spring 1999): 357-81; Claire Jowitt, "Colonialism, Politics, and Romanticism in John Fletcher's *Bonduca*," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 43.2 (Spring 2003): 475-94.

[42] John Fletcher, *The Tragedie of Bonduca*, in *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon* vol. 4, ed. Fredson Bowers (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1966), 1.1.166-67. All references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically.

[43] Literary scholars have discussed connections between the body of England and the body of the monarch in the case of Elizabeth, particularly surrounding the attack of the Spanish

Armada. I wish here to focus on how the relationship between nation and monarch changes when warrior women substitute for the monarch in historical dramas. For discussions of the connection between nation and monarch, see Vanhoutte, *Strange Communion*; Richard Helgerson, "The Land Speaks: Cartography, Chorography, and Subversion in Renaissance England," in *Representing the English Renaissance*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt (Berkeley: U of California P, 1983), 327-361; Scholz, *Body Narratives*; Carole Levin, *The Heart and Stomach of a King: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1994); Louis Montrose, "The Elizabethan Subject and the Spenserian Text," in *Literary Theory / Renaissance Texts*, ed. Patricia Parker and David Quint (Baltimore: John Hopkins, 1986).

[44] Rackin, *Stages of History*, 1-39.

[45] See Scholz, *Body Narratives*; Helgerson, "The Land Speaks," 51-85; and Louis Montrose, *The Subject of Elizabeth: Authority, Gender, and Representations* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2006).

[46] Montrose, *The Subject of Elizabeth*, 147.

[47] Frances E. Dolan, "'Gentlemen, I Have One Thing More to Say': Women on Scaffolds in England, 1563-1680," *Modern Philology* 92.2 (Nov. 1994): 157.

[48] Vanhoutte, *Strange Communion*, 138.

[49] Shakespeare, *Antony and Cleopatra*, in *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997), 5.2.332.

[50] Jacqueline Vanhoutte, "Antony's 'Secret House of Death': Suicide and Sovereignty in *Antony and Cleopatra*," *Philological Quarterly* 79.2 (Spring 2000): 153-75.

[51] Catherine Loomis, *The Death of Queen Elizabeth I: Remembering and Reconstructing the Virgin Queen* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

Notes on chapter V

[1] Although some texts *imply* women's actions on the battlefield, they do not describe scenes of women killing men. This chapter focuses on *explicit* acts of women's violence produced onstage (in the case of drama) or described in the text (in the case of poetry or prose works).

[2] On witchcraft, see Brian P. Levack, *The Witch-Hunt in Early Modern Europe* (Harlow, England: Pearson Longman, 2006); Brian P. Levack, ed. *The Witchcraft Sourcebook* (New York: Routledge, 2004); Alan Charles Kors and Edward Peters, *Witchcraft in Europe, 400-1700: A Documentary History* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1972); Stuart Clark, *Thinking with Demons: the Idea of Witchcraft in Early Modern Europe* (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1997); Heidi Breuer, *Crafting the Witch: Gendering Magic in Medieval and Early Modern England* (New York: Routledge, 2009). On domestic violence, see Frances E. Dolan, *Marriage and Violence: The Early Modern Legacy* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2008); and J. A. Sharpe, "Domestic Homicide in Early Modern England," *The Historical Journal* 24.1 (1981): 29-48.

[3] J. A. Sharpe has done much to dispel longstanding myths about witches and witch hunts in the period. He argues that the modern understanding of a "witch craze" that overwhelmed much of England during Elizabeth's and James's reigns has been significantly exaggerated. For his work on witches, see *Instruments of Darkness: Witchcraft in Early Modern England* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1997). For larger discussions on crime that include segments on witchcraft and specifically female violence, see his *Crime in Early Modern England, 1550-1750* (London: Longman, 1999), esp. 154-60; and his *Crime in Seventeenth-Century England: A County Study* (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1983).

[4] Sharpe, *Crime in Early Modern England*, 157.

[5] Jennifer Kermode and Garthine Walker, eds., *Women, Crime and the Courts in Early Modern England* (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1994), 4-5.

[6] Frances E. Dolan, *Dangerous Familiars: Representations of Domestic Crime in England, 1550-1700* (Ithaca: Cornell U P, 1994), 3.

[7] Garthine Walker, *Crime, Gender and Social Order in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2003), 5.

[8] *The Crying Murther*, reprinted in *Blood and Knavery: A Collection of English Renaissance Pamphlets and Ballads of Crime and Sin*, ed. Joseph H. Marshburn and Alan R. Velie (Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson U P, 1973), 56.

[9] *A Warning for Fair Women*, ed. Charles Dale Cannon (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1975), lines 655-6.

[10] Sharpe, "Domestic Homicide in Early Modern England," 36.

[11] Ibid.

[12] *The Most Cruel and Bloody Murder*, reprinted in *Blood and Knavery: A Collection of English Renaissance Pamphlets and Ballads of Crime and Sin*, ed. Joseph H. Marshburn and Alan R. Velie (Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson U P, 1973), 25.

[13] Ibid., 28-29.

[14] Shakespeare, *3 Henry VI*, in *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997), 1.4.138. All references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically.

[15] Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, in *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1997), 1.3.110-13.

[16] Thomas Norton and Thomas Sackville, *Gorboduc* (John Day, 1570), 4.1.65-74.

[17] Shakespeare, *Henry V*, in *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1997), 3.1.6-8 (my emphasis).

[18] Shakespeare, *Coriolanus*, in *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1997), 5.4.23-24.

[19] For a discussion of gender and mercy in royal courts, see Cynthia Herrup, "The King's Two Genders," *The Journal of British Studies* 45.3 (July 2006): 505.

[20] *The Most Cruel and Bloody Murder*, 23.

[21] Sojourner Truth, *Ain't I a Woman?*, in *Writing on the Body: Female Embodiment and Feminist Theory*, ed. Katie Conboy, Nadia Medina, and Sarah Stanbury (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), 231-32.

[22] See, for instance, the introduction of Katie Conboy, Nadia Medina, and Sarah Stanbury, eds., *Writing on the Body: Female Embodiment and Feminist Theory* (New York: Columbia U P, 1997), esp. 3-5.

[23] Several pamphlets and ballads describe the act of women killing men with horror: see *A Warning for Bad Wives* (1678), which describes Sarah Elstonin killing her husband with scissors; *A Briefe Discourse of Two Most Cruell and Bloudie Murthers* (1583), which shows Mrs. Beast plotting with a servant to kill her husband; and *Murther upon Murther*, which portrays a man and a prostitute murdering people throughout the streets of London.

[24] *The Crying Murther*, 44.

[25] Ibid.

[26] *Murder upon Murder*, reprinted in *Blood and Knavery: A Collection of English Renaissance Pamphlets and Ballads of Crime and Sin*, ed. Joseph H. Marshburn and Alan R. Velie (Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson U P, 1973), 70.

[27] For a remarkable analysis of women and petty treason, see Dolan, *Dangerous Familiars*, esp. ch. 1.

[28] Sir Edward Coke, *The Third Part of the Institutes of the Laws of England* (London: Printed for E. and R. Brooke, 1797), 19.

[29] See Viviana Comensoli, *'Household Business': Domestic Plays of Early Modern England* (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1996); Frances E. Dolan, "The Subordinate('s) Plot: Petty Treason and the Forms of Domestic Rebellion," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 43.3 (Autumn 1992): 317-40; Malcolm Gaskill, "Reporting Murder: Fiction in the Archives in Early Modern England," *Social History* 23.1 (Jan. 1998): 1-30; MacDonald P. Jackson, "Shakespeare and the Quarrel Scene in *Arden of Faversham*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 57.3 (Autumn 2006): 249-93; Leanore Lieblein, "The Context of Murder in English Domestic Plays, 1590-1610," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 23.2 (Spring 1983): 181-96.

[30] Dolan, *Dangerous Familiars,* 52.

[31] Discussing Mosby, Mihoko Suzuki draws on the legal positions of women and servants in early modern England to argue that domestic tragedies tend to displace conflict between classes onto conflict between genders. Insofar as *Arden of Faversham* shows the uprising of both a woman and a servant against a man of higher status, the play, she argues, participates in circulating anxieties about class and gender hierarchies. Mihoko Suzuki, "Gender, Class, and the Social Order in Late Elizabethan Drama," *Theatre Journal* 44.1 (Mar. 1992): 31-45.

[32] Dolan, *Dangerous Familiars,* 56.

[33] Dolan, *Marriage and Violence*, esp. ch. 3.

[34] *Arden of Faversham*, in *English Renaissance Drama: A Norton Anthology*, ed. David Bevington et al. (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2002), 14.238-39. All references to *Arden of Faversham* are to this edition and shall be cited parenthetically.

[35] Peter Stallybrass, "Patriarchal Territories: The Body Enclosed," in *Rewriting the Renaissance: The Discourses of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Margaret W. Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan, and Nancy J. Vickers (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1986), 123-42.

[36] Dolan, *Dangerous Familiars*, 1-25.

[37] Ibid., 55.

[38] Shakespeare, *Richard III*, in *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt, et al. (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1997), 1.2.55-56.

[39] Ibid., 1.2.58-59.

[40] Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, in *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt, et al. (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1997), 2.2.570-71.

[41] George Buchanan, *History of Scotland* vol. 2 (London: H. Parker, 1733), 56.

[42] Scholars often posit this passage as evidence of Margaret's cruelty. Patricia-Ann Lee argues that understanding the "process by which a Lancastrian queen became the archetypal villainess of Shakespeare's drama is to trace the development of an icon of feminine power" (184). Patricia-Ann Lee, "Reflections of Power: Margaret of Anjou and the Dark Side of Queenship," *Renaissance Quarterly* 39.2 (Summer 1986): 183-217. For the masculinizing of Margaret, see Kathryn Schwarz, "Fearful Simile: Stealing the Breech in Shakespeare's Chronicle Plays," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 49.2 (Summer 1998): 140-67. For the way Margaret situates in

Shakespeare's history making, see Phyllis Rackin, "Anti-Historians: Women's Roles in Shakespeare's Histories," *Theatre Journal* 37.3 Staging Gender (Oct. 1985): 329-44.

[43] *An homilie against disobedience and wylfull rebellion* (London: Richard Jugge and John Cawood, 1570).

[44] Ibid.

[45] Marjorie Garber, "The Logic of the Transvestite: *The Roaring Girl*," in *Staging the Renaissance: Reinterpretations of Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama*, ed. David Scott Kastan and Peter Stallybrass (New York and London: Routledge, 1991), 222.

[46] For a discussion on the ways in which Moll navigates London's social spaces, see Kelly J. Stage, "*The Roaring Girl*'s London Spaces," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 49.2 (Spring 2009): 417-36. For a discussion of Moll's celebrity, see Katharine Eisaman Maus, introduction to *The Roaring Girl*, in *English Renaissance Drama: A Norton Anthology*, ed. David Bevington et al. (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2002), 1371-1376.

[47] Thomas Middleton and Thomas Dekker, *The Roaring Girl*, in *English Renaissance Drama: A Norton Anthology*, ed. David Bevington et al. (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2002), Epilogus 35-6. All references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically.

[48] For discussions of the London scene in *The Roaring Girl*, see Theodore B. Leinwand, *The City Staged: Jacobean Comedy, 1603-1613* (Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1986).

[49] Garber, "The Logic of the Transvestite," 225.

[50] Jean E. Howard, "Crossdressing, The Theater, and Gender Struggle in Early Modern England," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 39.4 (Winter 1988): 437.

[51] Jane Baston, "Rehabilitating Moll's Subversion in *The Roaring Girl*," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 37.2 Tudor and Stuart Drama (Spring 1997): 318, 332.

[52] Alphonso Lingis, "A Man," in *Revealing Male Bodies*, ed. Nancy Tuana et al. (Bloomington: Indiana U P, 1992), 146.

[53] A shag ruff is a woolen collar, a frieze jerkin is a course jacket, and a safeguard is a riding shirt. All of these items were typically worn by men.

[54] David Bevington et al., *English Renaissance Drama*, 1404n.

[55] Garber notes the complicated gendering of Moll's actor: "*Should* [Moll] untie her codpiece point, of course, the audience would see more than it had perhaps bargained for, since the wearer of the codpiece, the player dressed as Moll the roaring girl, would have been a boy actor." Garber, "The Logic of the Transvestite," 223.

Notes on chapter VI

[1] Danielle Alexandra and David Twohy, *G.I. Jane*, directed by Ridley Scott (Burbank, CA: Caravan Pictures and Hollywood Pictures, 1997).

[2] The rape of female soldiers has become a common issue, and movies like *G.I. Jane* and *The General's Daughter* present differing social commentaries about rape in the military. In *The General's Daughter*, a female student at West Point is gang raped by multiple male trainees during a night mission. See Nelson DeMille, Christopher Bertolini, and William Goldman, *The General's Daughter*, Simon West (Burbank, CA: Paramount Pictures, 1999). Furthermore, news stories about the U.S. military show that rape *by fellow soldiers* has become a major concern for women. See Naomi Wolf, "A Culture of Coverup: Rape in the Ranks of the US Military," *The Guardian*, June 14, 2012, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/jun/14/culture-coverup-rape-ranks-us-military; and Nichi Hodgson, "Women Raped While in the US Military Are Denied Abortions," *The Guardian*, May 32, 2012,

http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2012/may/28/women-raped-us-military-abortions.

[3] Edward Neumeier, *Starship Troopers 3: Marauder*, directed by Edward Neumeier (Burbank, CA: Sony Pictures, 2008); and Michael Angeli, "Six Degrees of Separation," *Battlestar Galactica*, season 1, episode 7, directed by Robert M. Young, aired February 18, 2005 (Burbank, CA: NBC Universal Television, 2004).

[4] Mark Thompson, "Another Sign This is Not Your Father's Army," *Time*, Oct. 30, 2012, http://nation.time.com/2012/10/30/another-sign-this-is-not-your-fathers-army.

[5] Ibid.

[6] See Sarah Netter and Luis Martinez, "Senators Demand General Rescind Order on Pregnant Soldiers," *ABC World News*, Dec. 22, 2009, http://abcnews.go.com/WN/general-backs-off-threat-court-martial-pregnant-soldiers/story?id=9399604#.UKMlz4foTX9; and "Commander to Rescind a Provision on Pregnancy," *New York Times*, Dec. 25, 2009, http://www.nytimes.com/2009/12/26/us/26military.html.

[7] See Kathleen Johnston and Kyung Lah, "Single Mom Challenges Dismissal from Air Force," *CNN*, Oct. 26, 2012, http://www.cnn.com/2012/10/24/us/us-air-force-mom/index.html.

[8] United States Army Public Health Command, *A Guide to Female Soldier Readiness*, Technical Guide 281 (June 2010), 13.

[9] Ibid. (my emphasis).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Warning for Fair Women. Edited by Charles Dale Cannon. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1975.

Adelman, Janet. "Male Bonding in Shakespeare's Comedies." In *Shakespeare's 'Rough Magic': Renaissance Essays in Honor of C. L. Barber*, edited by Peter Erickson and Coppélia Kahn, 73-103. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1985.

Adelman, Janet. *Suffocating Mothers: Fantasies of Maternal Origin in Shakespeare's Plays, "Hamlet" to the "Tempest."* New York: Routledge, 1992.

Alfar, Cristina León. *Fantasies of Female Evil: The Dynamics of Gender and Power in Shakespearean Tragedy*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2003.

An homilie against disobedience and wylfull rebellion. London: Richard Jugge and John Cawood, 1570.

Arden of Faversham. In *English Renaissance Drama: A Norton Anthology*, edited by David Bevington et al., 421-481. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2002.

Aske, James. *Elizabetha Trivmphans.* London: Thomas Orwin, 1588.

Aylmer, John. *An harborowe for faithfull and trewe suiectes*. EEBO Editions. Strasborowe: 1559.

Baston, Jane. "Rehabilitating Moll's Subversion in *The Roaring Girl*." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 37, no. 2 Tudor and Stuart Drama (Spring 1997): 317-335.

Bate, Jonathan. "Sexual Perversity in 'Venus and Adonis.'" *The Yearbook of English Studies* 23 (1993): 80-92.

Beauvoir, Simone. *The Second Sex.* Translated by Constance Borde and Sheila Malovany-Chevallier. New York: Vintage Books, 2011.

Benson, Pamela Joseph. *The Invention of the Renaissance Woman: The Challenge of Female Independence in the Literature and Thought of Italy and England*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992.

Bergeron, David M. "Pageants, Masques, and History." In *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History Plays*, edited by Michael Hattaway, 41-56. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Booth, Stephen. *Shakespeare's Sonnets.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977.

Bradstreet, Anne. "In Honour of that High and Mighty Princess, Queen Elizabeth." In *The Works of Anne Bradstreet in Prose and Verse*, edited by John Harvard Ellis, 357-362. Charleston: Abram E. Cutter, 1867.

Breuer, Heidi. *Crafting the Witch: Gendering Magic in Medieval and Early Modern England*. New York: Routledge, 2009.

Buchanan, George. *History of Scotland.* Vol. 2. London: H. Parker, 1733.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1999.

Camden, William. *Britannia.* Translated by Philémon Holland. 1616.

-----. *The history of the most renowned and victorious princess Elizabeth, late Queen of England.* London: E. Flesher, 1675.

Chaucer. *The Knight's Tale.* In *The Riverside Chaucer,* edited by Larry D. Benson, 37-66. 3rd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1987.

Clark, Stuart. *Thinking with Demons: the Idea of Witchcraft in Early Modern Europe.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Coke, Sir Edward. *The Third Part of the Institutes of the Laws of England.* London: Printed for E. and R. Brooke, 1797.

Colvin, Sarah, and Helen Watanabe-O'Kelly, eds. *Women and Death 2: Warlike Women in the German Literary and Cultural Imagination since 1500*. Rochester: Camden House, 2009.

Comensoli, Viviana. *'Household Business': Domestic Plays of Early Modern England.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.

"Commander to Rescind a Provision on Pregnancy." *New York Times*. Dec. 25, 2009. http://www.nytimes.com/2009/12/26/us/26military.html.

Conboy, Katie, Nadia Medina, and Sarah Stanbury, eds. *Writing on the Body: Female Embodiment and Feminist Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.

Cox, John D., and David Scott Kastan, eds. *A New History of Early English Drama.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.

Crawford, Julie. "Fletcher's *The Tragedie of Bonduca* and the Anxieties of the Masculine Government of James I." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 39, no. 2 (Spring 1999): 357-81.

Crying Murther, The. Reprinted in *Blood and Knavery: A Collection of English Renaissance Pamphlets and Ballads of Crime and Sin*, edited by Joseph H. Marshburn and Alan R. Velie, 40-57. Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1973.

Davis, Stevie. *The Feminine Reclaimed: The Idea of Woman in Spenser, Shakespeare, and Milton.* Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1986.

Deloney, Thomas. "The Queen's visiting of the Camp at Tilbury, with her entertainment there." In *Thomas Deloney his Thomas of Reading and Three Ballads on the Spanish Armada*,

edited by Charles Roberts Aldrich and Lucian Swift Kirtland, 193-201. New York: J. F. Taylor and Company, 1903.

Dolan, Frances E. "'Gentlemen, I Have One Thing More to Say': Women on Scaffolds in England, 1563-1680." *Modern Philology* 92, no. 2 (Nov. 1994): 157-78.

-----. "The Subordinate('s) Plot: Petty Treason and the Forms of Domestic Rebellion." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 43, no. 3 (Autumn 1992): 317-40.

-----. *Dangerous Familiars: Representations of Domestic Crime in England, 1550-1700.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994.

-----. *Marriage and Violence: The Early Modern Legacy.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.

Dugaw, Dianne. *Warrior Women and Popular Balladry 1650-1850.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Easton, Fraser. "Gender's Two Bodies: Women Warriors, Female Husbands, and Plebian Life." *Past and Present* 180 (Aug. 2003): 131-74.

Elias, Norbert. *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations*. Edited by Eric Dunning, Johan Goudsblom, and Stephen Mennell. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1994.

Elizabeth I. *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*. Edited by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Elton, G. R. *England under the Tudors.* 3rd ed. London: Routledge, 1991.

Fletcher, John. *The Tragedie of Bonduca*. In *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon,* edited by Fredson Bowers, 150-259. Vol. 4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

Foucault, Michel. “Nietzsche, Genealogy, History.” In *The Foucault Reader,* edited by Paul Rabinow. London: Penguin, 1991.

-----. “Subject and Power.” In *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*, edited and translated by Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon, 1980.

-----. *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison.* Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage/Random House, 1995.

-----. *History of Sexuality: An Introduction*. Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage Books, 1978.

Fraser, Antonia. *The Warrior Queens.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1989.

Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. 1957; repr. New York: Atheneum, 1966.

Frye, Susan. “The Myth of Elizabeth at Tilbury.” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 23, no. 1 (Spring 1992): 95-114.

-----. *Elizabeth I: The Competition for Representation.* New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Garber, Marjorie. “The Logic of the Transvestite: *The Roaring Girl*.” In *Staging the Renaissance: Reinterpretations of Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama,* edited by David Scott Kastan and Peter Stallybrass, 221-34. New York and London: Routledge, 1991.

Gaskill, Malcolm. “Reporting Murder: Fiction in the Archives in Early Modern England.” *Social History* 23, no. 1 (Jan. 1998): 1-30.

Gohlke, Madelon. “‘I wooed thee with my sword’: Shakespeare’s Tragic Paradigms.” In *The Woman’s Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*, edited by Carolyn Ruth Swift Lenz, Gayle Greene, and Carol Thomas Neely, 150-68. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1980.

Goy-Blanquet, Dominique. *Shakespeare's Early History Plays: From Chronicle to Stage.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Green, Janet M. "'I My Self': Queen Elizabeth I's Oration at Tilbury Camp." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 28, no.2 (Summer 1997): 421-445.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

-----. *Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Grosz, Elizabeth A. *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994.

Hackett, Helen. *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen: Elizabeth I and the Cult of the Virgin Mary.* Basingstoke and London: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1995.

Hall, Edward. *The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Families of Lancaster and York* [1548]. London, 1809.

Harper, Carrie Anna. *The Sources of the British Chronicle History in Spenser's "Faerie Queene."* New York: Haskell House, 1964.

Hattaway, Michael. "'Seeing things': Amazons and Cannibals." In *Travel and Drama in Shakespeare's Time*, edited by Jean-Pierre Maquerlot and Michèle Willems, 179-92. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

-----. "The Shakespearean History Play." In *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History Plays*, edited by Michael Hattaway, 3-24. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Helgerson, Richard. “The Land Speaks: Cartography, Chorography, and Subversion in Renaissance England.” In *Representing the English Renaissance,* edited by Stephen Greenblatt, 327-61. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.

Herrup, Cynthia. “The King’s Two Genders.” *The Journal of British Studies* 45, no. 3 (July 2006): 493-510.

Heywood, Thomas. *An Apology for Actors* (1612). Reprinted with introduction by John Payne Collier. London, 1841.

-----. *Exemplary Lives and Memorable Acts of Nine the most Worthy Women in the VVorld: Three Iewes, Three Gentiles, Three Christians.* London: Thomas Cotes, 1640.

Holinshed, Raphael. *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland.* Edited by Henry Ellis. London: J. Johnson, 1807.

Howard, Jean E. “Crossdressing, The Theater, and Gender Struggle in Early Modern England.” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 39, no. 4 (Winter 1988): 418-40.

Howard, Jean E., and Phyllis Rackin. *Engendering a Nation: A Feminist Account of Shakespeare’s History Plays.* London: Routledge, 1997.

Irigaray, Luce. *This Sex Which is Not One.* Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Jackson, MacDonald P. “Shakespeare and the Quarrel Scene in *Arden of Faversham*.” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 57, no. 3 (Autumn 2006): 249-93.

Jankowski, Theodora A. *Pure Resistance: Queer Virginity in Early Modern English Drama.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000.

-----. *Women in Power in the Early Modern Drama.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992.

Johnston, Kathleen, and Kyung Lah. “Single Mom Challenges Dismissal from Air Force.” *CNN*. Oct. 26, 2012. http://www.cnn.com/2012/10/24/us/us-air-force-mom/index.html.

Jones, Anne Rosalind and Peter Stallybrass. *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Jordan, Constance. "Woman's Rule in Sixteenth-Century British Political Thought." *Renaissance Quarterly* 40, no. 3 (Autumn 1987): 421-51.

Jowitt, Claire. "Colonialism, Politics, and Romanticism in John Fletcher's *Bonduca*." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 43, no. 2 (Spring 2003): 475-94.

Kahn, Coppélia. *Man's Estate: Masculine Identity in Shakespeare.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.

-----. *Roman Shakespeare: Warriors, Wounds, and Women.* London: Routledge, 1997.

Kermode, Jennifer, and Garthine Walker, eds. *Women, Crime and the Courts in Early Modern England.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994.

Knox, John. *The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrvovs regiment of women.* Geneva: J. Poullain and A. Rebul, 1558.

Kors, Alan Charles and Edward Peters. *Witchcraft in Europe, 400-1700: A Documentary History*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972.

Laqueur, Thomas. *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992.

Lee, Patricia-Ann. "Reflections of Power: Margaret of Anjou and the Dark Side of Queenship." *Renaissance Quarterly* 39, no. 2 (Summer 1986): 183-217.

Leinwand, Theodore B. *The City Staged: Jacobean Comedy, 1603-1613.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1986.

Levack, Brian P. *The Witch-Hunt in Early Modern Europe.* Harlow, England: Pearson Longman, 2006.

Levack, Brian P., ed. *The Witchcraft Sourcebook.* New York: Routledge, 2004.

Levin, Carole. *The Heart and Stomach of a King: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994.

Lieblein, Leanore. "The Context of Murder in English Domestic Plays, 1590-1610." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 23, no. 2 (Spring 1983): 181-96.

Lingis, Alphonso. "A Man." In *Revealing Male Bodies*, edited by Nancy Tuana et al., 146-54. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992.

Loomis, Catherine. *The Death of Queen Elizabeth I: Remembering and Reconstructing the Virgin Queen.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

MacCaffrey, Wallace. *Elizabeth I.* London: Edward Arnold, 1993.

Marcus, Leah S. *Puzzling Shakespeare: Local Readings and Its Discontents.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Mattingly, Garrett. *The Armada*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1959.

McBride, Kari Boyd, ed. *Domestic Arrangements in Early Modern England*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2002.

Middleton, Thomas, and Thomas Dekker. *The Roaring Girl.* In *English Renaissance Drama: A Norton Anthology*, edited by David Bevington et al., 1371-1451. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2002.

Mikalachki, Jodi. *The Legacy of Boadicea: Gender and Nation in Early Modern England.* London: Routledge, 1998.

Monmouth, Geoffrey. *The History of the Kings of Britain*. Translated and edited by Michael A. Faletra. Toronto: Broadview Editions, 2008.

Montaigne, Michel. *Essays*. Translated by J. M. Cohen. London: Penguin Books, 1958.

Montrose, Louis Adrian. "'Shaping Fantasies': Figurations of Gender and Power in Elizabethan Culture." *Representations* 2, no. 2 (Spring 1983): 61-94.

-----. "Spenser and the Elizabethan Political Imaginary." *ELH* 69, no. 4 (Winter 2002): 907-46.

-----. "The Elizabethan Subject and the Spenserian Text." In *Literary Theory/Renaissance Texts*, edited by Patricia Parker and David Quint, 372-96. Baltimore: John Hopkins, 1986.

-----. "The Work of Gender in the Discourse of Discovery." *Representations* 33 Special Issue: The New World (Winter 1991): 1-41.

-----. *The Subject of Elizabeth: Authority, Gender, and Representation.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.

Most Cruel and Bloody Murder, The. Reprinted in *Blood and Knavery: A Collection of English Renaissance Pamphlets and Ballads of Crime and Sin*, edited by Joseph H. Marshburn and Alan R. Velie, 19-39. Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1973.

Murder upon Murder. Reprinted in *Blood and Knavery: A Collection of English Renaissance Pamphlets and Ballads of Crime and Sin*, edited by Joseph H. Marshburn and Alan R. Velie, 65-73. Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1973.

Nashe, Thomas. *Pierce Penniless his Supplication to the Devil*. 1592. Reprinted in Chambers, 1923.

Neale, J. E. *Queen Elizabeth I: A Biography.* New York: Doubleday, 1957.

Netter, Sarah, and Luis Martinez. "Senators Demand General Rescind Order on Pregnant Soldiers." *ABC World News*. Dec. 22, 2009. http://abcnews.go.com/WN/general-backs-off-threat-court-martial-pregnant-soldiers/story?id=9399604#.UKMlz4foTX9

Norton , Thomas, and Thomas Sackville. *Gorboduc.* John Day, 1570.

Ortner, Sherry B. *Making Gender: The Politics and Erotics of Culture*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1996.

Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Translated by Arthur Golding. 1567. Reprinted with introduction by John Frederic Nims. Philadelphia: Paul Dry Books, 2000.

Painter, William. *The Palace of Pleasure* (1575). Reprinted and edited by Joseph Jacobs. New York, 1966.

Paster, Gail Kern. *Humoring the Body: Emotions and the Shakespearean Stage.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Phillips, Jr., James E. "The Woman Ruler in Spenser's *Faerie Queene*." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 5, no. 2 (Jan. 1942): 211-234.

Phillips, Kathy J. *Manipulating Masculinity: War and Gender in Modern British and American Literature.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Poeschel, Sabine. "Rubens' 'Battle of the Amazons' as a War-Picture: The Modernization of a Myth." *Artibus et Historiae* 22, no. 43 (2001): 91-108.

Price, Janet, and Margrit Shildrick, eds. *Feminist Theory and the Body*. New York: Routledge, 1999.

Rackin, Phyllis. "Anti-Historians: Women's Roles in Shakespeare's Histories." *Theatre Journal* 37, no. 3 Special Issue: Staging Gender (Oct. 1985): 329-344.

-----. "Women's Roles in the Elizabethan History Plays." In *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History Plays*, edited by Michael Hattaway, 71-85. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

-----. *Stages of History: Shakespeare's English Chronicles.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Rainolds, John. “Of the Lawfulness of Marriage Upon a Lawful Divorce.” In *Sexuality and Gender in the English Renaissance: An Annotated Edition of Contemporary Documents*, edited by Lloyd Davis, 89-105. New York: Dover Publications, 1945.

Ralegh, Sir Walter. *Discoverie of Guiana*. Edited by Joyce Lorimer. London: Ashgate, 2006.

Rose, Mary Beth. “Women in Men’s Clothing: Apparel and Social Stability in *The Roaring Girl*.” *English Literary Renaissance* 14, no. 3 (Autumn 1984): 367-91.

Schleiner, Winfried. *‘“Divina Virago’*: Queen Elizabeth as an Amazon.” *Studies in Philology* 75, no. 2 (Spring 1978): 163-80.

Scholz, Susanne. *Body Narratives: Writing the Nation and Fashioning the Subject in Early Modern England.* New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2000.

Schulze, Ivan L. “Notes on Elizabethan Chivalry and *The Faerie Queene*.” *Studies of Philology* 30, no. 2 (Apr. 1933): 148-59.

Schwarz, Kathryn. “Fearful Simile: Stealing the Breech in Shakespeare’s Chronicle Plays.” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 49, no. 2 (Summer 1998): 140-67.

-----. *Tough Love: Amazon Encounters in the English Renaissance.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2000.

Shakespeare. *1 Henry IV.* In *The Norton Shakespeare*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, Katherine Eisaman Maus, 1147-1224. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997.

-----. *1 Henry VI*. In *The Norton Shakespeare*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, Katherine Eisaman Maus, 435-506. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997.

-----. *2 Henry VI*. In *The Norton Shakespeare*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, Katherine Eisaman Maus, 203-290. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997.

-----. *3 Henry VI*. In *The Norton Shakespeare*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, Katherine Eisaman Maus, 291-369. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997.

-----. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. In *The Norton Shakespeare*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, Katherine Eisaman Maus, 805-863. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997.

-----. *Antony and Cleopatra*. In *The Norton Shakespeare*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, Katherine Eisaman Maus, 2619-2708. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997.

-----. *As You Like It*. In *The Norton Shakespeare*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, Katherine Eisaman Maus, 1591-1657. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997.

-----. *Coriolanus*. In *The Norton Shakespeare*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, Katherine Eisaman Maus, 2785-2872. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997.

-----. *Cymbeline*. In *The Norton Shakespeare*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, Katherine Eisaman Maus, 2955-3046. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997.

-----. *Hamlet*. In *The Norton Shakespeare,* edited by Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, Katherine Eisaman Maus, 1659-1759. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997.

-----. *Henry V*. In *The Norton Shakespeare,* edited by Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, Katherine Eisaman Maus, 1445-1523. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997.

-----. *Richard II*. In *The Norton Shakespeare,* edited by Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, Katherine Eisaman Maus, 943-1014. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997.

-----. *Venus and Adonis*. In *The Norton Shakespeare,* edited by Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, Katherine Eisaman Maus, 601-634. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997.

Sharpe, J. A. "Domestic Homicide in Early Modern England." *The Historical Journal* 24, no. 1 (1981): 29-48.

-----. *Crime in Early Modern England, 1550-1750.* London: Longman, 1999.

-----. *Crime in Seventeenth-Century England: A County Study.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

-----. *Instruments of Darkness: Witchcraft in Early Modern England.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997.

Shepherd, Simon. *Amazons and Warrior Women: Varieties of Feminism in Seventeenth-Century Drama.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981.

Shirley, Frances A., ed. "*King John" and "Henry VIII": Critical Essays.* New York: Garland, 1988.

Spenser, Edmund. *The Faerie Queene*. Edited by A. C. Hamilton. Harlow, England: Pearson and Longman, 2001.

Stage, Kelly J. "*The Roaring Girl's* London Spaces." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 49, no. 2 Special Topic: Tudor and Stuart Drama (Spring 2009): 417-36.

Stallybrass, Peter. "Patriarchal Territories: The Body Enclosed." In *Rewriting the Renaissance: The Discourses of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Margaret W. Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan, and Nancy J. Vickers, 123-42. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

Stowe, John. *Chronicles of England from Brute unto the Present Yeare of Christ 1580.* London, 1580.

Susan Frye. *Elizabeth I: The Competition for Representation.* New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Suzuki, Mihoko. "Gender, Class, and the Social Order in Late Elizabethan Drama." *Theatre Journal* 44, no. 1 (Mar. 1992): 31-45.

-----. *Metamorphoses of Helen: Authority, Difference, and the Epic.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989.

Thompson, Mark. "Another Sign This is Not Your Father's Army." *Time*. Oct. 30, 2012. http://nation.time.com/2012/10/30/another-sign-this-is-not-your-fathers-army.

Truth, Sojourner. *Ain't I a Woman?* In *Writing on the Body: Female Embodiment and Feminist Theory*, edited by Katie Conboy, Nadia Medina, and Sarah Stanbury, 231-32. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.

Tuana, Nancy, William Cowling, Maurice Hamington, Greg Johnson, Terrance Macmullan, eds. *Revealing Male Bodies.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992.

United States Army Public Health Command. *A Guide to Female Soldier Readiness*. Technical Guide 281 (June 2010).

Vanhoutte, Jacqueline. "Antony's 'Secret House of Death': Suicide and Sovereignty in *Antony and Cleopatra*." *Philological Quarterly* 79, no. 2 (Spring 2000): 153-75.

-----. "Elizabeth I as Stepmother." *English Literary Renaissance* 39, no. 2 (Spring 2009): 315-35.

-----. *Strange Communion: Motherland and Masculinity in Tudor Plays, Pamphlets, and Politics.* Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2003.

Villeponteaux, Mary. "'Not as women wonted be': Spenser's Amazon Queen." In *Dissing Elizabeth: Negative Representations of Gloriana*, ed. Julia M. Walker, 209-25. Durham: Duke University Press, 1998.

-----. "Displacing Feminine Authority in *The Faerie Queene*." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 35, no. 1 (Winter 1995): 53-67.

Virgil. *The Aeneid*. Translated by Robert Fagles. New York: Penguin Books, 2006.

Walen, Denise A. "Constructions of Female Homoerotics in Early Modern Drama." *Theatre Journal* 54, no. 3 (Oct. 2002): 411-30.

Walker, Garthine. *Crime, Gender and Social Order in Early Modern England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Walker, Julia M. "Bones of Contention: Posthumous Images of Elizabeth and Stuart Politics." In *Dissing Elizabeth: Negative Representations of Gloriana*, edited by Julia M. Walker, 252-76. Durham: Duke University Press, 1998.

Walsh, William Thomas. *Isabella of Spain: The Last Crusader, 1451-1504.* New York: R. M. McBride & Company, 1930.

Woodbridge, Linda. *Women and the English Renaissance: Literature and the Nature of Womankind, 1540-1620.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984.

Wright, Celeste Turner. "The Elizabethan Female Worthies." *Studies in Philology* 43, no. 4 (Oct. 1946): 628-43.

Yates, Frances A. "Elizabethan Chivalry: The Romance of the Accession Day Tilts." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 20, no. 1/2 (Jan.-Jun. 1957): 4-25.