Single Combats in Shakespeare's History Plays

Atsuhiko Hirota(廣田篤彦)

I

In *Antony and Cleopatra*, Caesar says when challenged by Antony:

> Let the old ruffian know
> I have many other ways to die; mean time
> Laugh at his challenge. (IV.i.4-6)[1]

This remark is doubly interesting, since, first, it denies the notion of personal heroism which is deeply associated with chivalric ideal of honour, and second, it denies one of the most spectacular kinds of performance on stage. The frequency of single combats and duels in Shakespearean plays confirms their popularity on stage. These combats directly originated from the swordplay which was sometimes performed on the same stage. About the nature of sword play, Craig Turner and Tony Soper say:

> Playing the prize..., like bearbaiting and boar hunting, is thought a typically Elizabethan pastime. A young Fencer, after due application to the local English Masters of Defense, would be asked to show his skills in front of a crowd as a way of earning his own certification.... We know these were very popular shows and often occurred on theatre stages.[2]

As swordplay was a part of "plays", it is natural that Shakespeare included such a popular element as swordplay in his plays since early in his career, especially when we think of the nature of the Elizabethan playhouses. Glynne Wickham observes:

> ...what Burbage and his fellow-actors were called upon by their financier to build in Shoreditch and on the Bankside, and what they did build, were playhouses in the literal and traditional sense of that word — houses for plays; i.e. for recreation, for 'feats of activity', for entertainment including stage-plays.[3]

Most of the single combats in Shakespeare's history plays are, however, performed by noble men. This suggests another association of combats and duels: the tradition of courtly combat as knightly activity. This tradition goes back to the Middle Ages. It apparently originates from the practical military training, but its high decorative mode easily associated itself with pageantry. According to E. K. Chambers, this association started under the reign of Edward III:

> ...when Edward III associated [the] same Round Table with the foundation of his chivalric order of Garter, pageantry had already begun to cast its mantle over the medieval exercises of knightly feats of arms. As the actual practice of warfare dissociated itself more and more from the domination of the mail-clad horseman, the spectacular tendency had naturally grown.[4]

The court of Elizabeth is known to have been inclined to medievalism. If, as Frances A. Yates observes, Elizabeth was identified with the classical notion of Atsraea, the court around her abounded with medieval conventions.[5] Jean Wilson cites the mingling of classicism and medievalism in the court poetry and says:

> Identifying Elizabeth as they did with the lady of Romance, it was natural for her contemporaries to attempt to honour her in an appropriate fashion. At court this was done in the numerous jousts held in her

> honour, especially in the series of Accession Day Tilts.[6]

Medievalism in the Elizabethan tournament is clear in the fact that the Elizabethans used the revised version of the rules of courtly combat laid down for Edward III.[7]

The association of courtly combats with the ideals of Arthurian chivalry like the Round Table must have been especially important for the Tudors. For instance, Chambers records the archery show of Prince Arthur with his Knights of the Round Table displayed before the Queen in 1587.[8] No matter what was the mythical association, it is obvious that such revival of medievalism was an anachronism. Wickham says:

> No one in Tudor England could seriously claim participation in Tournaments to be an essential part of a gentleman's training for his own or his country's defence. ... As a creative force, then, the Tournament's services to drama were complete by the time that gunpowder was invented. Nevertheless, by retaining its popularity throughout the sixteenth century, it did much to preserve alive traditional conventions of staging a dramatic spectacle in the open air before an audience in which all ranks of society were represented.[9]

Thus seen, the tradition of courtly combat is by no means unassociated with stage performance. This is especially apparent in the case of "barriers". Since this form of courtly joust is fought on foot, it was least important, and as such it was easiest to be transferred into a form of entertainment. Chambers says:

> The less serious exercise of the barriers was sometimes conducted by torchlight, and even within doors, on the floor of a banqueting house. Thus it could be introduced, in a purely mimetic form, as an episode in a mask, or even a play.[10]

This is exactly what happens in *Hamlet*. Because of the spatial restraints, combats performed within plays were most likely those on foot. If so, those single combats are essentially imitations of relatively unimportant sort of the courtly combat.

Observing the liminal character of the theatre, David Scott Kastan says:

> Shakespeare's theatre was oddly liminal — geographically, socially, and politically. Located in a Liberty, it was both part and not part of the City, which no doubt was appropriate for the home of a commercial acting company that was both dependent and not dependent upon its aristocratic patron; and the actors themselves, deemed to be rogues, vagabonds, and beggars by the 1572 *Acte for the punishement of Vacabondes and for Relief of the Poore & Impotent* (...), were elevated to gentlemen, formally members of the Royal Household, when the company became the King's Men.[11]

Presentation of single combat is one of the elements of the popular theatre which reflects this liminal character. With both popular and courtly traditions, single combats in Shakespeare's plays present a complex problem. First, there is always a danger of being regarded as imitation of lower, commercial versions even if the notion of honour is at stake in the play. Second, actors who play the roles of noblemen belong to the popular tradition of swordplay. In this essay, I would like to consider how single combats in Shakespeare's history plays were presented in the conflict and balance of these things, and examine what the outcomes of these combats are in relation to the problem of authority. To begin with, I would like to look at the trials by combat. They are by origin the best occasions for the divine justice to be presented. Shakespeare presents two cases in his history plays, but both of them are problematic. The one in *Richard II* is not realized, and the issue of the other, in *Henry VI, Part II*, depends on drinking. Then I will look at the combats on battlefields. They are primarily associated with the notion of heroism and honour, but elements contradicting to these high ideals seem to be included, too. And finally, I would like to think about the presentation of fencing matches as a part of entertainment, such as can be seen in *Hamlet*, in the light of other combats.

II

An aspect of single combat on stage is seen through those for trial. Phyllis Rackin observes:

> Trial by combat is a ritual based upon the assumption that right makes might, an assumption that underlies the authority of the whole feudal system, including the authority of God's anointed king.[12]

Shakespeare presents two cases of trial by combat in history plays; the one in *Richard II* and the other in *Henry VI, Part II.* Both cases are, to say the least, problematic, especially when considered in association with providential authority.

Richard II begins with a scene of quarrel between Bullingbrook and Mowbray. Mowbray demands the trial in combat:

> Mine honour is my life, both grow in one,
> Take honour from me, and my life is done.
> Then, dear my liege, mine honour let me try;
> In that I live, and for that will I die. (I.i.182-85)

Honour is at stake . Mowbray demands the king to let him try his honour. Then, after Bullingbrook's refusal to his offer of reconciliation, Richard finally says:

> We were not born to sue, but to command,
> Which since we cannot do to make you friends,
> Be ready, as your lives shall answer it,
> At Coventry upon Saint Lambert's day.
> There shall your swords and lances arbitrate
> The swelling difference of your settled hate.
> Since we cannot atone you, we shall see
> Justice design the victor's chivalry.
> (196-203)

Richard declares that the justice will be presented by God, and that it will be done according to the code of chivalry. Gaunt's vision of the ideal English reveals that the ideal for an English king is to be a champion of Christianity and chivalry:

> This blesses plot, this earth, this realm, this England,
> This nurse, this teeming womb of royal kings,
> Fear'd by their deeds as far from home,
> For Christian service and true chivalry,...
> (II.i.50-54)

This idealistic vision of English king is, however, a nostalgia. In the play, Richard is called a "Landlord of England" and he confesses inability to exercise his royal authority by calling for a trial by combat.

The trial scene begins formally. Lord Marshal demands the combatants to speak truly on "knighthood" and speak "like a true knight."(I.iii.14 and 34) But suddenly Richard throws down his warder, which symbolizes his authority, and interrupts the combat. Rackin says about Richard's interference:

> In preventing the symbolic ritual of chivalry, Richard attacks the source of the only authority that makes him king. He also alienates Shakespeare's audience, for they, no less than the characters, have been waiting to see the tournament Richard now interrupts, depriving them of the anticipated pleasure of seeing on stage a historical spectacle and the anticipated comfort of having their own doubts resolved by a clear, tangible demonstration of God's will.[13]

If, as Rackin says, expectation on the side of audience to single combat was strong, its absence must have been undesirable in terms of commercial performance of the play. Hence, there must have been a strong reason to intervene the combat. Rackin observes:

> Trial by combat is a crucial ritual in the scheme of divine right because, like the theory of divine right itself, it rests on the assumption that God takes a hand in human events, ensuring that might derives from right, that power derives from authority, and not the other way around.[14]

Thus, the king's interference in the trial by combat works to show the denial of divine authority by the king himself, whose authority derives from it.

The trial by combat between Peter and Horner in *Henry VI, Part II* is very different. Craig A. Bernthal explains the difference:

> The weapons are not the swords of chivalrous combatants but staves with sandbags fastened at the ends, suggesting that the combat resembled a Punch and Judy contest or a pillow fight rather than, for instance, the chivalrous duel Bolingbroke and Mowbray are prepared to fight in *Richard II*.[15]

The farcical character of this scene is strengthened by Peter's fear to fight and the drunkenness of the contestants. The outcome of this combat is that Peter strikes Horner down, and Horner dies after confessing his treason. This seems to guarantee the intervention of God's will. Benthal compares this scene with the histories of Holinshed, Hall and John Stow and observes:

> In all three histories the apprentice indeed vanquishes his master, but that is where the similarity between the sources and the play ends; in all of the histories, the apprentice is a lying scoundrel.[16]

Then he concludes: "...(1) that God *is* in charge and that traitors will be punished and (2) that one's primary loyalty is to the king."[17] But there seems to be a room to doubt the presence of divine justice in this scene. York says to the triumphant Peter: "Fellow, thank God, and the good wine in thy master's way."(II.iii.95-96)[18] Especially, as we will see, later in the play when Iden overcomes Cade, the latter's hunger, which, according to Rackin, is not in Hall, is emphasized.[19]

We have seen two cases of the trial by combat in Shakespeare's history plays. The one in *Richard II* is not realized, and Richard's interference indicates the denial of divine authority by the king, which in turn undermines his own authority. The other is in *Henry VI, Part II*. There, Peter defeats his master who dies confessing his treason. Here, the divine intervention seems to be confirmed, but it is also apparent that his victory largely depends on Horner's drunkenness, and this throws doubt on the presence of divine justice. Thus, we may conclude that the scenes of trial by combat do not guarantee the divine providence; they rather can be seen as suggesting its absence.[20]

III

Henry VI, Part I is a play filled with various pageantry elements. In this play Shakespeare presents two occasions of single combats between Talbot and Pucelle, but both of them are interrupted. Talbot is described as an embodiment of the chivalric ideals, and from Nashe's remark we can see that he was the centre of the focus of contemporary audience:

> 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 (at several times), who, in the tragedian that represents his person, imagine they behold him fresh bleeding![21]

Nostalgia for the chivalric past is realized in Talbot. Michael Hattaway comments on this point:

> Talbot is a figure for the nostalgia that suffuses the play, a dream of simple chivalric *virtus* like that enacted every year at Elizabeth's Accession Day tilts, a dream of true empire.[22]

One of the focal points of the play is the rivalry between Talbot and Pucelle. They represent their respective forces and seem appropriate opponets, but England and France in this play are very different in thier characters. This difference is clearly presented by the differences between Talbot and Pucelle. Rackin says:

> Shakespeare repeatedly calls attention to the fact that the French champion is a woman, defining the conflict between England and France as a conflict between masculine and feminine values: chivalric virtue versus pragmatic craft, historical fame versus physical reality, patriarchal age versus subversive

> youth, high social rank versus low, self versus other.[23]

These differnces are prominent in the scenes of single combats between Talbot and Pucelle. Their first encounter occurs when the French are assaulting Orleans. Talbot challenges Pucelle, saying:

> Here, here she comes. 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.
> (I.v.4-7)

Pucelle responds to him and they fight, but their fight does not come to a conclusion. Pucelle suddenly leaves Talbot saying: "Talbot, farewell, thy hour is not yet come./ I must go victual Orleance forthwith"(13-14). Left alone, Talbot says: "My thoughts are whirled like a potter's wheel,/ I know not where I am, nor what I do"(19-20). Apparently Pucelle uses magic to leave her opponent. What is still more interesting about this scene is, that while Talbot is engaged in single combat, the city falls into the French hands. Pucelle fights with Talbot only to keep him away from the defence of the city. Thus, from a strategic point of view, Talbot's inclination to single combat is harmful to the English side. Talbot, however, does not learn his lesson. When Rouen is taken, he challenges Pucelle again, and with the same words he used at Orleans. He says: "Damsel, I'll have a bout with you again"(III.ii.56). This time Pucelle laughs at him and says that now that she has taken the city there is no reason for her to fight with him.

Pucelle's attitude towards single combat reveals the lack of chivalric sentiment on her side. Rackin emphasises the fact that she is a woman and establishes the conflicts between the English and the French on the basis of a couflict between masculine and feminine values. But the contrast is presented not only by Talbot and Pucelle: in front of Orleans Salisbury, who is called "mirror of all martial men" (I.iv.74), is shot to death by a boy who is not even given a name. The English try to fight according to the chivaric code, but the French are not on the same rule.

On the other hand, the battle of Shrewsbury at the end of *Henry IV, Part I* presents a very different mode of fighting. The issue of the battle is decided by a single combat between Hotspur and Prince Hal. Hotspur is an almost legendary warrior whose prowess is acknowl-edged by everyone. He is arrogant and stubborn, but sensitive to honour. He is the champion of honour, and Hal is the challenger. Their combat is a formal one: before the battle Hal sends a challenge to Hotspur, and when they meet in the field, they exchange these words:

> *Prince.* I am the Prince of Wales, and think not, Percy,
> To share with me in glory any more.
> Two stars keep not their motion in one sphere,
> Nor can one England brook a double reign
> Of Harry Percy and the Prince of Wales.
> *Hot.* [Nor] shall it, Harry, for the hour is come
> To end the one of us, and would to God
> Thy name in arms were now as great as mine!
> *Prince.* I'll make it greater ere I part from thee,
> And all the budding honours on thy crest
> I'll crop to make a garland for my head.
> (V.iv.63-73)

They have a same purpose: they fight to decide which is to enjoy the name of *the* greatest man of war.

Stephen Greenblatt discusses the relationship between heroic fighting and honour in heros' encounters with rebellious peasants in Renaissance literature and says:

> A heroic encounter is a struggle for honour and must conform to the code which requires that the combatants be of roughly equal station.[24]

In terms of both honour and the combatants' station, the combat between Hotspur and Hal seems ideal. However, the world around this combat is not honourable or chivalric. The king is a Machiavellian politician and lacks the sense of honour. He brings his

counterfeits to the battle, and when Douglas meets the king, he says:

> Another king? they grow like Hydra's heads.
> I am the Douglas, fatal to all those
> That wear those colors on them. What art thou
> That counterfeit'st the person of a king. (25-28)[25]

They fight, but their combat is interrupted by Hal when the king is in danger. Even though, however, the king brings men dressed like him to the battlefield, it does not directly blemish his honour. In *Richard III,* Richmond employs the same stratagem. Richard says:

> I think there be six Richmond in the field;
> Five have I slain to-day in stead of him.
> A horse, a horse! my kingdom for a horse!
> (V.iv.11-13)

Then he fights with Richmond and is slain by him.[26] Richmond is the embodiment of divine justice, and yet he brings his counterfeits to the battlefield.

It is not only the king who presents unchivalric surroundings to the combat between Hotspur and Hal. It is noteworthy that soon after Hal's challenge to Hotspur, Falstaff delivers the famous catechism about honour:

> ... What is honour? A word. What is in that word honour? What is that honour? Air. A trim reckoning! Who hath it? He that died a'Wednesday. Doth he feel it? No. 'Tis insensible then? Yea, to the dead. But will['t] not live with the living? No. Why? Detraction will not suffer it. Therefore I'll none of it, honor is a mere scutcheon. And so ends my catechism. (V.i.133-41)

and that their combat proceeds side by side with that between Douglas and Falstaff in which Falstaff pretends to be dead. The irony in the contrast is presented, and it compromises the honour of the combat. Still more problematic is the characterisation of Hal. At first sight, he seems an ideal participant in a chivalric combat; his challenge to Hotspur and his victory seem to guarantee his honour. But Hal's estimation of Hotspur earlier in the play throws doubt onto his sense of honour. He says to the king:

> Percy is but my factor, good my lord,
> To engross up glorious deeds on my behalf;
> And I will call him to so strict account
> That he shall render every glory up,
> Yea, even the slightest worship of his time,
> Or I will tear the reckoning from his heart.
> (III.ii.146-52)

The commercial images in this speech have been pointed out by critics. Leggatt says: "The thinking is that of a chivalric hero, but the words belong to the counting-house."[27] By overcoming Hotspur, Hal succeeds in inheriting the name of the champion of honour, but the inheritance is deeply tinted by the imagery of commercialism. It is as if Hal had obtained honour by some commercial transaction.

Thus seen, Hotspur looks the only character in the play who purely holds honour as of absolute value. However, even his honour is not without problems: it is the very honour of Hotspur which makes him a rebel. Rackin says:

> Personified in Hotspur, the old knightly honour is doubly compromised, not only by the slightly comical enthusiasm with which he embraces it but also by the fact that it inspires him to rebel against the king.[28]

If honour drives Hotspur to rebel against the king, which is presumably the most reprehensible action in the code of knighthood, his honour must be regarded as compromised as well as those of the king and Hal. Thus through the single combat between Hal and Hotspur, which at first seems very chivalric, the collapse of the notion of chivalric honour is perceived.

Next combat we should see in this light must be that between Jack Cade and Iden in *Henry VI, Part II.* Their combat is neither one fought by noblemen nor a combat for honour. As Greenblatt points out, Iden is a small property owner, and their combat is essentially

around property.[29] Iden refuses to fight with Cade on the ground that he is poor and famished:

> Nay, it shall ne'er be said, while England stands,
> That Alexander Iden, an esquire of Kent,
> Took odds to combat a poor famish'd man.
> (IV.x.42-44)

and he finally fights even without knowing his opponent's identity. This combat around property, however, is transformed into a traditional chivalric one as soon as Iden learns the identity of his opponent:

> Is't Cade that I have slain, that monstrous traitor?
> Sword, I will hallow thee for this thy deed,
> And hang thee o'er my tomb when I am dead.
> Ne'er shall this blood be wiped from thy point,
> But thou shalt wear it as a herald's coat,
> To emblaze the honour that thy master got.
> (66-71)

As Rackin observes: "Iden mystifies his victory as an acquisition of chivalric honor."[30] Furthermore, the king actually knights him. The mystification seems complete. But the king awards Iden not only with knighthood, he says:

> Rise up a knight.
> We give thee for reward a thousand marks.
> And will that thou henceforth attend on us.
> (V.i.78-79)

Iden who fought to defend his property gets money as well as a knighthood and a place in the king's household.

Thus in all three cases we have seen, the notion of chivalric ideal which was originally the essence of single combat is undermined by modern notions. In the combat between Talbot and Pucelle in *Henry VI, Part I,* Pucelle embodies the pragmatism in war, which finally leads the French to the victory. In that between Hotspur and Hal, Hal is proved to be a character who sees honour in terms of commercial activities, and Hotspur's honour drives him to rebellion. Moreover, the notion of honour is undermined by the king's Machiavellianism and Falstaff's catechism. In *Henry IV, Part I,* no honour without problem is presented. Then in the combat between Cade and Iden, we see the notion of the defence of private property replaces that of honour. We also see the mystification of Iden's victory to make it accordant with the chivalric honour, but this episode ends with the reward of money. We may conclude that single combats in Shakespeare's history plays threaten the chivalric ideal of honour rather than endorse it, and shows the appearance of modern ideas such as pragmatism, commercialism, and private property.[31]

IV

The combats we have seen are more or less anachronistic. In all the cases, the chivalric ideal is undermined in some way or other, even though some characters stick to the lost ideal. At the beginning of this essay we have seen that the barriers were performed as a part of courtly entertainment. In *Hamlet,* Shakespeare presents a fencing match between Hamlet and Laertes as courtly entertainment. Now, I would like to look at this combat in comparison with the combats we have seen, and think what will happen to the ideals when a combat is performed at a corrupted court.

The fencing-match between Hamlet and Laertes are first initiated by Claudius as a trap to kill Hamlet. Claudius begins by talking of Lamord, who had a mastery in horse-riding, and then tells Laertes that this Lamord praised his skill of fencing which made Hamlet envious. Then, Claudius suggests a revenge on Hamlet with an unfoiled rapier. After this, Laertes proposes the use of poison to secure the assassination. That Laertes suggests using poison is notable, since poisoning is one of the characteristic of a "Machiavellian" villain,[32] and Claudius poisoned his brother, too. Thus, this fencing is coloured with treachery from the beginning.

Another thing which is interesting about this match is that it is a part of courtly entertainment, and as such, it is an object of wagering. Osric very pompously tells Hamlet what Claudius wagered:

> The King, sir, hath wager'd with him six Barbary

> horses, against the which he has impawn'd, as I take it, six French rapiers and poniards, with their assigns, as girdle, [hangers], and so. Three of the carriages, in faith, are very dear to fancy, very responsive to the hilts, most delicate carriages, and of very liberal conceit. (V.ii.146-53)

What is at stake in this kind of match is primarily these wagered things, and the result does not matter very much. Hamlet says: "I will win for him and I can; if not, I will gain nothing but my shame and the odd hits"(176-78).

Thus, the match is a site of villainy and wager, rather than that of honour, and there is no room for any divine justice to intervene. This is not a place that right makes might. The issue of the battle clearly shows it: Gertrude drinks poisoned cup and dies, both Hamlet and Laertes die wounded by the poisoned rapier, and Hamlet stubs Claudius with the poisoned rapier and forces him to drink the poison, too. The gamely fencing match turns to be a place of massacre. There, both the right and the villainous die by the same poison. We have seen that fencing match as entertainment originates in the chivalric exercise of barrier, but in the corrupted court of *Hamlet*, it is presented as a location of "Machiavellian" villainy, wagering, and deaths of both good and evil. We can perceive no sense of chivalric honour or divine justice to bestow victory to the right.

We have seen various single combats in Shakespeare's plays, but, although single combat is originally a chivalric contest which is based on the notions like honour and divine justice, none of the combats in the plays confirmed these notions. The combats as trial in *Richard II* proved to deny the divine authority through the interruption by the king, and it finally works to deny the king's authority as well. The combat between Peter and his master Horner in *Henry VI, Part II* ends in the victory of Peter and the confession of treason by Horner. It might confirm the presence of divine justice, but the fact that Peter's victory largely depends on his master's drunkenness throws doubt onto this. These combats seem to present the absence of providence.

The combats on battlefields, on the other hand, show the invalidity of chivalric honour in front of the newer ideas. In *Henry VI, Part I,* Pucelle uses an encounter with Talbot starategically, in order to keep him away from Orleans, and does not hesitate to use magic to leave him behind when the city is taken. The combat between Hotspur and Hal in *Henry IV, Part I* at the first sight seems an ideally chivalric one. But it is surrounded by the Machiavellian king and cowardly pragmatic Falstaff. Furthermore, Hal proves to be a character of not a chivalric, but a commercial mind thinking of his battle with Hotspur in commercial terms. Finally, in the combat between Cade and Iden in *Henry VI, Part II,* the chivalric combat is reduced to a battle between a starving thief and a modest landowner who wants to defend his property. Surrounded by modern notions, none of these combats is a fight for honour, and those who sticks to honour is to be defeated like Talbot. Then finally, the fencing match at the end of *Hamlet* is presented as an occasion where "Machiavellian" villainy is performed as well as it is a game for wagering. In this match, revenge is completed, but it is done by means of poisoned rapier and drinks.

Single combat which started as high knightly exercise had become a commercial activity by the Elizabethan age. Even if the ideals of the Arthurian legend were still pursued at the court, such ideals were mere anachronism. Hence, it is natural for Enobarbus to say ironically in an aside when he learns that Antony has challenged Caesar:

> Yes, like enough! high-battled Caesar will
> Unstate his happiness, and be stag'd to th' show
> Against a sworder! (III.xiii.29-31)

Indeed, there was no clear distinction between a noble contestant and a "sworder" on stage. As the fencers on popular stage cannot claim chivalric honour by their performances, Shakespeare's noble characters fight in the world where single combat does not confirm any justice or honour.

Hattaway, Machael. Introduction. *The First Part of King Henry VI.* By William Shakespeare. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990. 1 - 57

Kastan, David Scott. "Proud Majesty Made a Subject: Shakespeare and the Spectacle of Rule." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 37 (1986): 459- 75.

Leggatt, Alexander. *Shakespeare's Political Drama: The History Plays and the Roman Plays.* London : Routledge, 1990.

Praz, Mario. "The Politic Brain: Machiavelli and the Elizabethans." *The Flaming Heart.* Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1958.

Rackin, Phyllis. *Stages of History: Shakespeare's English Chronicles.* Ithaca, New York: Cornell UP, 1990.

Turner, Craig and Tony Soper. *Methods and Practice of Elizabethan Sword Play.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1990.

Wickham, Glynne. *Early English Stages 1300 to 1660. Volume One 1300- 1576.* 1959. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Limited; New York: Columbia UP., 1966.

---. *Early English Stages 1300 to 1660. Volume Two 1576 to 1660, Part I.* 1963. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Limited; New York: Coumbia UP, 1971.

Wilson, Jean. *Entertainments for Elizabeth I.* Woodbridge: D.S.Brewer; Totowa, N.J.: Rowan & Littlefield, 1980.

Yates, Frances A. Astraea: *The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975.