Spring 1973

"Mercy seasons justice"

Robert Freeman Davidson

"MERCY SEASONS JUSTICE"

by

ROBERT FREEMAN DAVIDSON

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND
IN CANDIDACY
FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS IN ENGLISH

SPRING 1973

APPROVAL SHEET

Marguerite Roberts
Director of Thesis

Chairman, Department of English

Edward Piper
Dean of the Graduate School
and Second Reader of Thesis

Dedicated to

the memory of my beloved master

William Shakespeare

and

his earthly servant

without whom this would have been impossible

Professor John A. Dando

I, of course, wish to express thanks to everyone who aided in the production of this study since its beginnings six years ago. The people whom I should like to mention especially are the ladies who work in the Boatwright Memorial Library. Their aid was indispensible, and their sense of humor was delightful.

Preface

This is a study of the development of the mind of William Shakespeare as it relates to justice which tries to show how certain of Shakespeare's beliefs and theories, those shared by most of his contemporaries, were altered in the course of that development. The plays chosen for this treatment of the mind of Shakespeare -- the historically related cycle of Richard II, Henry IV (I and II), Henry V, Henry VI (I, II, and III), and Richard III -- show the ideas in question in greater abundance than any other of Shakespeare's plays. The historical grouping consists of Richard II through Richard III and acts as one unit which should not be broken for the purposes of the first part of this thesis. The rigid ideas seen in those works of medieval history become tempered and seasoned with Renaissance ideas of mercy, forgiveness, and rehabilitation. These first become evident in Richard II (considered apart from the historical cycle) which is used here in closer study to bridge the ideological gulf between the previously mentioned works of the young Shakespeare and the works more in the Renaissance tradition -- The Merchant of Venice, Measure for Measure, and The Tempest -- of the more mature playwright.

William Shakespeare

A Man of Great Knowledge and Wonder

Very little is known about the life and education of William Shakespeare. His baptism is a matter of record, however, in the register of Holy Trinity Church, Stratford, the date--April 26, 1564. Elizabethan custom places Shakespeare's birth date at April 23, 1564, since a child was usually christened within a few days of its birth. The child's parents, John Shakespeare and Mary Arden, were rather wealthy, John being a dealer in wool and farm produce, a leather dresser, and a glover and Mary being of a landed family, whose holdings included the Forest of Arden.

Many scholars believe that young William attended the Stratford Grammar School which, like most others, offered a strict training in Latin, for Latin was the basis of English education. In The Education of Shakespeare, George A. Plimpton lists some standard course offerings in the schools of Shakespeare's day. Along with arithmetic, geometry, the Bible (The Geneva Edition), and the Catecism were the best Latin authors. For prose study, the 1583 student at The Free Grammar School, St. Bees, Cumberland, for instance, would read Aesop's Fables, Cicero, Sallust, Justinus, and Caesar. The same student would probably peruse the verses of

Quintus Curtius, Cato, Terence, Virgil, Horace, and Ovid. The curriculum was much the same all over England except for the addition of perhaps Lyly, Plautus, or Juvenal. Perhaps the most significant mastery which the young Shakespeare gained during his schooling was that of English composition which was taught through the constant translation of Latin into English and the later imitation of the style of Latin poets and playwrights.

The contents of Shakespeare's many plays show his knowledge, both scholarly and common, to be quite extensive. Many perplexing questions arise concerning the extent of that knowledge, however, and varied, valid answers have been and can be presented. Was Shakespeare a man of truly extraordinary knowledge, or did he merely present the extent of learning of an average Elizabethan of his station? Was he a religious scholar as some of his works suggest, or was he just a simple Elizabethan Christian? Was the legal knowledge which Shakespeare displayed that of a mind trained and studied in the practice of law, or was it a knowledge common to all Elizabethans of property and enterprise?

My belief is that Shakespeare possessed a degree of knowledge not uncommon to any Elizabethan gentleman of wealth, station, or property. In consideration of the question of his religious knowledge, Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge by Richard Noble claims that Shakespeare made identifiable, direct quotations and

allusions to at least forty-two separate books of the Bible -- eighteen each from the Old and the New Testaments and six from the Apocrypha. This was fairly common among Elizabethan authors as the English audience was very familiar with the church, with religious terminology, and with the Scriptures.

The law also was well known to most Elizabethans, for all disputes and business dealings were eventually handled by some sort of court action. As George W. Keeton wrote in Shakespeare's Legal and Political Background:

> In Shakespeare's day and for nearly two centuries afterwards, some knowledge of the law was considered an essential part of the education of a young man of means, more especially as it would normally be necessary for him, on attaining mature years, to administer a portion of it at Quarter Sessions.[1]

Therefore, it is reasonable to believe that Shakespeare wrote to entertain his audience, which would include a large portion of upper class Elizabethans who were acquainted with the law, the church, and the varied aspects of knowledge afforded by a degree of education. This parallels the state of the theatre today -- the common man remaining at home before his television set allowing the

---

[1]George W. Keeton, Shakespeare's Legal and Political Background (London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons Limited, 1967), p. 95.

devotee and more affluent man to fill the theatre audiences. Were Shakespeare alive today, he probably would be linked with such popular dramatists as Neil Simon, David Storey, Anthony Shaffer, David Rabe, Jason Miller, Tom Stoppard, or any of the other promiment Broadway literary personalities.

The view expressed previously should make Shakespeare appear to be an inconsequential and a rather conventional poet and dramatist. Yet, he is neither of no consequence nor conventional. In style, subject matter, and dramatic technique, he surpassed his contemporaries -- Robert Green, George Peel, Thomas Nash, Christopher Marlowe, and Ben Jonson, to name a few. In the sequence of his plays, the mind of Shakespeare grew, developed, and altered with the progress of the English Renaissance. In fact, we might say that in the growth of his mind is the English Renaissance. In the plays, the author transcends the Medieval notions which had permeated all of society to find a new explanation of governance, of order, and of justice. He wondered at the paradox of good and evil, the juxtaposition of the near angelic and the near bestial in one person. Hamlet says:

> What a piece of work is a man
> how noble in reason! How infinite in faculties!

> in form and moving how express and admirable! in action how like an angel! In apprehension how like a God! The beauty of the world, the paragon of animals![2]

In contrast to that sublimity, Hamlet has a bestial side to his nature which lowers him to speak thus of his evil uncle:

> I should ha' fatted all the region kites
> With this slave's offal. Bloody, bawdy villian!
> Remorseless, treacherous, lecherous, kindless villain.[3]

Both Othello and Friar Lawrence (Romeo and Juliet) express the good and evil paradox, also. Frair Lawrence does this very poetically and symbolically in speaking of a flower:

> Within the infant rind of this weak flower
> Poison hath residence and medicine power.[4]

In the same speech he shows this relationship to man:

> Two such opposed kings encamp them still
> In man as well as herbs -- grace and rude will.[5]

Othello is not quite as direct as the good Friar but echoes the same sentiment in speaking to Iago:

---

[2]Hamlet, Act II, Scene 2, lines 311-315. The Complete Signet Classic Shakespeare, ed. by Sylvan Barnet (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., 1972). All quotations are from this edition.

[3]Hamlet, Act II, Scene 2, lines 585-587.

[4]Romeo and Juliet, Act II, Scene 3, lines 23-24.

[5]Romeo and Juliet, Act II, Scene 3, lines 27-28.

> And, for I know thou'rt full of love and
> honest
> And weigh'st they words before thou giv'st
> them breath,
> Therefore these stops of thine fright me
> the more;
> For such things in a false disloyal knave
> Are tricks of custom; but in a man that's
> just
> They're close dilations, working from the
> heart
> That passion cannot rule.[6]

In his wonder at the human condition, Shakespeare stands in awe of the two protagonists of Macbeth. Indeed, he even identifies the seed of modern psychiatry. When the Doctor says:

> Not so sick, my lord,
> As she is troubled with thick-coming fancies
> That keep her from her rest.[7]

Macbeth answers (and in effect requests modern psychoanalysis for his wife):

> Cure her of that.
> Canst thou not minister to a mind diseased,
> Pluck from the memory a rooted sorrow,
> Raze out the written troubles of the brain,
> And with some sweet oblivious antidote
> Cleanse the stuff'd bosom of that perilous
> stuff
> Which weighs upon the heart?[8]

The physician responds by advising that he cannot aid Lady Macbeth; only she can cure herself.

---

[6] Othello, Act III, Scene 3, lines 118-124.

[7] Macbeth, Act V, Scene 4, lines 37-39.

[8] Macbeth, Act V, Scene 4, lines 39-45.

Shakespeare seems to have wondered about many things. In fact, he was a man who never lost his sense of wonder. This is best displayed in his concern with the law. His idea of law is bound up in both order and the good and evil paradox. Shakespeare envisions, in his three great interrelated plays--The Merchant of Venice, Measure for Measure, and The Tempest--a new law, a new order, and a brave new world. He sees a new consideration of justice and the use of laws infused with humanism, Christianity, and legal-moral ethics. The new law, however, will not mean a destruction of the old law as seen in the history plays of the early Shakespeare canon; the relationship is much the same as that between the New Testament and the Old Testament, that which Christ represented when he stated: "I come not to abolish the law and the prophets, but to fulfill them."[9]

In the idea of seeking justice, in the idea of the purpose of the law, in the idea of defining legal ethics can be found some of the Renaissance views of Shakespeare. He transcends the Medieval ideas of order, of good and evil, and of the great chain of being, to fulfill them with a human view of Christian charity and the doctrines of a forgiving God. In this way, he has set before his centuries of readers, viewers, and players the basic tenets of modern law and modern justice--mercy, forgiveness, and rehabilitation.

---

[9]The New English Bible, Matthew 5:17.

Part I:

The Medieval Shakespeare

Chapter I:

The Shakespearean Concept of the Medieval Theories Concerning Justice

The Medieval period was characterized by a concern with order. That interest took many forms and permeated all activities. The orders of the cosmos, of the universe, and of the state were built on corresponding planes. Even the microcosm of a man's household and the innermost workings of his brain were so ordered and divided into hierarchies. The hierarchic correspondences have been extensively treated by E. M. W. Tillyard and Arthur O. Lovejoy and termed the great chain of being. That world view was still a major part of the age of Shakespeare, as Professor Tillyard wrote in his introduction to The Elizabethan World Picture:

> But though the general medieval picture of the world survived in outline into the Elizabethan age, its existence was by then precarious. There had been Machiavelli, to whom the idea of a universe divinely ordered throughout was repugnant, and in the seventeenth century men began to understand and heed and not merely to travesty and abuse him. Recent research has shown that the educated Elizabethan had plenty of text-books in the vernacular instructing him in the Copernican astronomy, yet he was loth to upset the old order by applying his knowledge. . . . The greatness of the Elizabethan age was that it contained so much of the new without bursting the noble form of the old order.[10]

---

[10]E. M. W. Tillyard, The Elizabethan World Picture, (New York: Vintage Books, 1961), p. 8.

Those same theories and hierarchic considerations inform such works as A Mirror for Magistrates which adopts the concept of the great chain of being (its ideas of order and quality of life) for use in understanding and defining a hierarchy and a degree of propriety for politics and law. God among the angels, the ruler among men, and justice among the virtues were the order of the day.

The early English Renaissance into which Shakespeare was born was still steeped in the traditions and beliefs of the Middle Ages. Those ideas of order, of kingship, and of justice mentioned previously were much a part of the late sixteenth century and the early seventeenth century thought which Shakespeare knew. Central to all of those Medieval beliefs stood the great chain of being. The great scholar and jurist of the fifteenth century, Sir John Fortescue, described the great chain of being in these terms:

> In this order hot things are in harmony with cold; dry with moist; great with little; high with low. In this order angel is set over angel, rank upon rank in the kingdom of Heaven; man is set over man, beast over beast, bird over bird, and fish over fish, on the earth, in the air, and in the sea; so that there is no worm that crawls upon the ground, no bird that flies on high, no fish that swims in the depths, which the chain of this order binds not in most harmonious concord. God created as many different kinds of things as he did creatures, so that there is no creature which does not differ in some respect from all other creatures, and by which it is in some respect superior or inferior to all the rest. So that from the highest angel down to the lowest of his kind there is absolutely not found an angel that has not a superior and an

> inferior; nor from any man down to the meanest worm is there any creature which is not in some respect superior to one creature and inferior to another. So that there is nothing which the bond of order does not embrace. And since God has thus regulated all creatures, it is impious to think that he left unregulated the human race, which he made the highest of all earthly creatures.[11]

From this canon rises the correspondence of the several existing chains of being. On the highest levels of existences the corresponding rulers of each plane become aligned in the following way: God, the sun, the lion, the king, the law, reason, and justice. King Richard II is referred to in Shakespeare's play bearing his name as both a lion and a rose, the rose being the most excellent of flowers. The highest orders of correspondence are laid down by Thomas Blundeville in a poem of the 1580's:

> For justice is of law the end,
> The law the prince's work, I say.
> The Prince God's likeness doth portend,
> Who over all must bear the sway.
>
> And like as God in heaven above
> The shining sun and moon doth place
> In goodliest wise as best behove
> To show His shape and lively grace.
>
> Such is that Prince within his land
> Which, fearing God, maintaineth right
> And reason's rule doth understand,
> Wherein consists his port and might.

---

[11] Sir John Fortescue, The Works of Sir John Fortescue, ed. by Lord Clermont (London, 1869) Vol. I, p. 322.

But Plato said God dwells above
And there fast fix in holy saws
From truth He never doth remove
Nor swarves from nature's steadfast laws:

And as in heaven like to a glass
The sun His shape doth represent,
In earth the light of Justice was
By Him ordain'd for like intent.[12]

In this poem on the hierarchic correspondences exists an ideal portrayal of the Medieval English legal system, as Shakespeare was to treat it. Justice is the natural end of laws, and the law and its disposition are the natural work of the temporal prince. Also, the thought that justice is the ultimate will of God, although indirectly administered, has been echoed by Blundeville. On a political level, the Medieval ideal of governance made the supreme earthly ruler answerable only to God. Anyone who struck down a prince would incur the wrath of the deity if not upon his own head, on that of one or many forthcoming generations.

The frame encasing the great chain of being and the Medieval concept of justice is that of a universal, natural order. To the pre-Elizabethan and the Elizabethan mind, order was a most treasured state of existence. St. Thomas Aquinas saw that great intengible body of "the state" as a natural order ordained by and ruled by God.

---

[12]Thomas Blundeville, "The Learned Prince," Three Moral Treatises (London, 1850). The poem is also an interesting plea for princes to be ruled by reason.

The state must justify its existence by, or have as its goal to, offer to its citizens the satisfactory material considerations of life. Those factors having been attained, men could spend much more time for intellectual and moral education. Nature provides certain tasks for certain men and certain men for certain tasks; it is the privilege and the duty of authority to put the proper man in his proper place. In such seemingly unrelated poems as John Donne's "Love's Dietie," for example, correspondence, duty, and place are treated:

> His office was indulgently to fit
> Actives to passives. Correspondencie
> Only his subject was . . .[13]

Also, in the Summa Theologica, St. Thomas Aquinas wrote that legal justice stands foremost among the moral virtues, for it deals with the common good of all people and is used to render to each person that which is rightfully his.[14] Justice, then, is the greatest necessity for the maintenance of established Medieval order.

E. M. W. Tillyard, in his study of the idea of order in the Elizabethan age, The Elizabethan World Picture, states that the varied parts of God's universe are in an

---

[13]John Doone, "Loves Deitie," John Donne Poetry and Prose, ed. by Frank J. Warnke (New York: The Modern Library, 1967), p. 45.

[14]St. Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologica, II-II, Question 58, Article 12 "Whether Justice is Foremost Among All Moral Virtues."

order represented by an harmonious cosmic dance. The idea of representing order by universal harmony was quite strong in the Middle Ages, but it retained its popularity well into the seventeenth and even the eighteenth centuries in such varied literary forms as the poetry of John Dryden and in Essay on Man by Alexander Pope. While crime, in the sense of this idea of order, can be defined as the production of civil discord, excessive actions which were in violation of a man's given place or degree could not be tolerated.

Shakespeare makes his best interpretation of the Medieval concept of order and degree in Troilus and Cressida (1601-2). Ulysses may be considered as speaking for the playwright:

> The heavens themselves, the planets, and
> this center
> Observe degree, priority, and place,
> Insisture, course, proportion, season, form,
> Office, and custom, in all line of order.
> And therefore is the glorious planet Sol
> In noble eminence enthroned and sphered
> Amidst the other; whose med'cinable eye
> Corrects the influence of evil planets,
> And posts, like the commandment of a king,
> Sans check, to good and bad. But when the planets
> In evil mixture to disorder wander,
> What plagues, and what portents, what mutiny,
> What raging of the sea, shaking of earth,
> Commotion in the winds, frights, changes,
> horrors,
> Divert and crack, rend and deracinate
> The unity and married calm of states
> Quite from their fixture? O, when degree is
> shaked,
> Which is the ladder to all high designs,
> Then enterprise is sick. How could communities,
> Degrees in schools, and brotherhoods in cities,
> Peaceful commerce from dividable shores,

> The primogenity and due of birth,
> Prerogative of age, crowns, sceptres, laurels,
> But by degree, stand in authentic place?
> Take but degree away, untune that string,
> And hark what discord follows. Each thing meets
> In mere oppugnancy. The bounded waters
> Should life their bosoms higher than the shores
> And make a sop of all this solid globe;
> Strength should be lord of imbecility,
> And the rude son should strike his father dead;
> Force should be right, or rather right and wrong --
> Between whose endless jaw-justice resides--
> Should lose their names, and so should justice too.
> Then everything include itself in power,
> Power into will, will into appetite,
> And appetite, an universal wolf,
> So doubly seconded with will and power,
> Must make perforce an universal prey,
> And last eat up himself. Great Agamemnon,
> This chaos, when degree is suffocate,
> Follows the choking.[15]

Chronologically, Troilus and Cressida was written after The Merchant of Venice, the first of the new law plays. As both plays deal with radically different materials, instances, and periods, it should not seem incongruous that two different world views are being espoused. This merely displays, in its own way, Shakespeare's great versatility as a playwright. Of course, although Ulysses' speech is a serious statement of Medieval notions, the author's primary purpose in Troilus and Cressida could very well be satirical.

---

[15] Troilus and Cressida, Act I, Scene 3, lines 85-126.

Shakespeare interprets the Medieval philosophies learned in his early life as meaning that when one level of order is shaken by a disregard for degree, then all levels of order beneath it will be shaken also. Only justice, seen here as the mean between the two extremes of right and wrong between proper conduct and improper conduct, in the Aristotelian sense, can maintain an established order. Only justice can restore the order, the harmony, the degree which had been shaken and placed in disarray. It is this concept of justice, a balancing force of evil by good for the restoration and preservation of degree, harmony, and order, that Shakespeare presents in his early plays.

Chapter II

The Blossoming of Disorder

A Study of the Historical Cycle from *Richard II* To *Henry VI*

The credo of Tudor times, that image which has been termed the Tudor Myth, is stated by Shakespeare in Troilus and Cressida as:

> Take but degree away, untune that string,
> And hark what discord follows: Each thing meets
> In mere oppugnancy.[16]

Historians and chroniclers of that era served a definite purpose apart from the mere recording of events and facts. That second function was stated by the early sixteenth century chronicle writer John Hardyng in a preface to his Chronicle of 1543:

> Wherefore Goddes woorde and holy scripture
> Which abandoneth all maner vanitee
> Yet of Chronicles admitteth the lecture
> As a thing of great fruite and utilitie
> And as a lanterne, to the posteriteee
> For example, what they ought to Knowe
> What waies to refuse, and what to followe.[17]

The point that this author and many others of the Tudor period made was that the Tudor use of history was a chiefly political one, to establish and solidify the validity of the Tudor line.

---

[16] Troilus and Cressida, Act I, Scene 3, lines 109-111.

[17] C. L. Kingsford, "The First Version of Hardyng's Chronicle," English Historical Review, 27 (1912), pp. 462 - 482.

The sixteenth century was characterized by turmoil. England was constantly on the verge of civil strife and open rebellion. Consequently, the engagement of writers of tracts and chronicles to remind the general populace of its place within the hierarchy of human beings and of its civic duty became commonplace. The Book of Homilies, issued in 1547 and distributed to every parish in the kingdom to be read as sermond, discussed the great importance of order and of obedience:

> Let us all therefore fear the most detestable vice of rebellion, ever knowing and remembering that he that resisteth common authority, resisteth God and his ordinance, as it may be proved by many other mo[re] places of holy scripture. And here let us take heed that we understand not these or such any like places, which so straitly command obedience to superiors and so straitly punish rebellion, and disobedience to the same, to be meant in any condition of the pretended power of the Bishop of Rome. For truly the scripture of God alloweth no such usurped power, full of enormities, abusions, and blasphemies. But the true meaning of these and such places be to extol and set forth God's true ordinance and the authority of God's anointed kings and of their officers appointed under them.[18]

These same ideas were shared by those writers of the sixteenth century who were deemed acceptable by the ruling monarch, two chief examples being Sir Walter Raleigh in the preface of his History of the World and William Cecil,

---

[18]"An Exhortation Concerning Good Order and Obedience to Rulers and Magistrates," The Book of Homilies as found in The Norton Anthology of English Literature, ed. by M. H. Adams, et al., (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1968) vol I, p. 423.

who wrote in The Execution of Justice in England: "But God's goodness, by Whom kings do rule and by Whose blast traitors are commonly wasted and confounded, hath otherwise given to Her Majesty, as to His handmaid and dear servant ruling under him, the spirit of wisdom and power."[19]

Into this tradition Shakespeare was born, both physically and literarily. His series of historical plays shows the working out of the problems of order, obedience, respect, degree, status, calling, and justice in Medieval terms. To Shakespeare, in the historical cycle of Richard II, Henry IV Parts I and II, Henry V, Henry VI Parts I, II, and III, and Richard III, justice is imposed on a cosmic scale with God as the principal actor in the preservation of order.

The idea central to Shakespeare's history plays is that the universe is ordered, arranged in a fixed system of hierarchies but modified by man's sin - and by his hope of redemption through the love of a God who sacrificed his only Son. The effect of this belief informs the series of plays from Richard II to Richard III, in which rebellion against the king is shown to be the most terrible of all crimes. The king reigns supreme on

---

[19]William Cecil, The Execution of Justice in England in The Execution of Justice in England by William Cecil and A True, Sincere, and Modest Defense of English Catholics by William Allen, ed. by Robert Kingdon (Ithaca: The Cornell University Press, 1965), p. 7.

earth; he is part of an ordered universe, and just as he owes allegience to God alone, above him, so do all of those persons below owe allegience to him. It remains easy to see in this context the justification of the divine right of kings which was a substantial part of the Tudor Myth. Even a weak actor-king such as Richard II can reign with the optimistic hope that he is inviolate:

> Not all the water in the rough rude sea
> Can wash the balm off from an anointed king;
> The breath of worldly men cannot depose
> The deputy elected by the Lord.
> For every man that Bolingbroke hath pressed
> To life shrewd steel against our golden crown,
> God for his Richard hath in heavenly pay
> A glorious angel; then, if angels fight,
> Weak men must fall, for heaven still
> guards the right.[20]

In principle, to the Medieval mind, King Richard spoke the truth.

Richard was the anointed king, the rightful heir, the person properly entitled to reign -- despite the fact that his crown was hollow, his reign marred by weakness and failure. On the purely factual level, Richard II retains the honor of being the last king to rule England by a direct and undisputed hereditary right from William the Conqueror. By taking Richard's crown

---

[20] Richard II, Act III, Scene 1, lines 54-62.

and ultimately his life, Henry Bolingbroke committed the most despicable crime which the Tudor could imagine -- open rebellion against the established order and usurpation.

The baffling King Henry IV was both a rebel and an usurper. He had upset the order of the realm; he had taken "degree away"/[21] and "untune[d] that string"/[22] which had been playing harmoniously. As the result of that act by Bolingbroke and his coronation as King Henry IV, God began His lengthy process of exacting judgment and bringing those responsible to His ultimate justice. A Medieval sooth-sayer would prophesy an unquiet reign for anyone in the circumstances of Henry IV. Plagued publically by civil wars and privately by the adventures of his eldest son with the reprobate, Sir John Falstaff, not to mention the insomnia that he suffered much like the insomnia which so greatly disturbed another of Shakespeare's regicides, King Henry was not a comfortable man, nor was his reign orderly, peaceful, or blessed with propriety. As the Tudor Myth taught, he lived out his days haunted by guilt and under the siege of persistent memory, as the King explained to Prince Hal:

---

[21] Troilus and Cressida, Act I, Scene 3, line 109.

[22] Troilus and Cressida, Act I, Scene 3, line 109.

> Come hither, Harry, sit thou by my bed,
> And hear, I think, the very latest counsel
> That ever I shall breathe. God knows, my son,
> By what by-paths and indirect crooked ways
> I met this crown, and I myself know well
> How troublesome it sat upon my head.
> To thee it shall descend with better quiet,
> Better opinion, better confirmation;
> For all the soil of the achievement goes
> With me into the earth. . . .
> How I came by the crown, O God forgive,
> And grant it may with thee in true peace live![23]

King Henry IV's hope that all of the blame for the usurpation will be buried with him can be naught but vain according to Medieval tradition.

Henry V succeeded in establishing a temporary and very superficial order within his realm, but its foundations were the tenuous uncertainties of usurpation. The Tudor Myth maintained that quiet could never be insured until the rightful lineage was restored to the throne. Even though Henry V contains the best of Shakespeare's political poetry and the King is presented as a good man, a hero, and a capable ruler, the character of Henry V retains a large measure of ambiguity. Henry V never could forget that his crown was tainted with the blood of Richard II, through the crimes of his father Henry IV, and that he was doing penance because of that through the medium of the French wars:

---

[23] Henry IV, Part II, Act IV, Scene 5, lines 181-190 and 218-219.

> Not today, O Lord,
> O, not today, think not upon the fault
> My father made in compassing the crown!
> I Richard's body have interred new,
> And on it have bestowed more contrite tears
> Than from it issued forced drops of blood.
> Five hundred poor I have in yearly pay,
> Who twice a day their withered hands hold up
> Toward heaven, to pardon blood;
> And I have built two chantries,
> Where the sad and solemn priests still sing
> For Richard's Soul. More will I do:
> Though all that I can do is nothing worth;
> Since that my penitence comes after all,
> Imploring pardon.[24]

Yet, the God of that age does not offer pardon, cannot be merciful. Ultimately justice must triumph, and until then all will suffer. Although Henry wins his French wars and a French Queen, he possesses a duality of character which is quite perplexing. Despite his heroic image, King Henry V indeed inherited the plague incurred by the rebellion of his father. Henry's speech before Harfleur although not uncommon in horror for a warrior is unbecoming and not in perfect harmony with the king's good image. The catalogue of horrors rivals the bloody and violent monologues of Timon of Athens and Titus Andronicus:

> If I begin the batt'ry once again,
> I will not leave the half-achieved Harfleur
> Till in ashes she lie buried.
> The gates of mercy shall be all shut up,
> And the fleshed soldier, rough and hard of heart,
> In liberty of bloody hand shall range
> With conscience wide as hell, mowing like grass
> Your fresh fair virgins and your flow'ring
> infants.
> What is it then to me if impious war,
> Arrayed in flames like to the prince of fiends,

---

[24] Henry V, Act IV, Scene 1, lines 292-306.

> Do with his smirched complexion all fell feats
> Enlinked to waste and desolation?
> What is't to me, when you yourselves are cause,
> If your pure maidens fall into the hand
> Of hot and forcing violation?
> What rein can hold licentious wickedness
> When down the hill he holds his fierce career?
> We may as bootless spend our vain command
> Upon th' enraged soldiers in their spoil
> As send precepts to the Leviathan
> To come ashore. Therefore, you men of Harfleur,
> Take pity of your town and of your people
> Whiles yet my soldiers are in my command,
> Whiles yet the cool and temperate wind of grace
> O'erblows the filthy and contagious clouds
> Of heady murder, spoil, and villainy.
> If not -- why, in a moment look to see
> The blind and bloody soldier with foul hand
> Defile the locks of your shrill shrieking
> daughters;
> Your fathers taken by their silver beards,
> And their most reverend heads dashed to the walls;
> Your naked infants spitted upon pikes,
> Whiles the mad mothers with their howls confused
> Do break the clouds, as did the wives of Jewry
> At Herod's bloody-hunting slaughtermen.
> What say you? Will you yield, and this avoid?
> Or, guilty in defense, be thus destroyed?[25]

These lines seem to insinuate that Henry V is more than just a warrior issuing a rather grotesque threat. The King has the ambition and obsessions of his father:

> Shall not thou and I, between
> Saint Denis and Saint George, compound a boy,
> half French, half English, that shall go
> to Constantiople, and take the Turk by
> the beard? Shall we not? What say'st
> Thou, my fair flower-de-luce?[26]

The price of Henry IV's rebellion has not been paid. Although Henry V, in the preceding passages, does not make the same forceful statement that he made in Henry V,

---

[25] Henry V, Act III, Scene 3, lines 7-43.

[26] Henry V, Act V, Scene 2, lines 208-212.

Act IV, Scene 1, he shows his character to be imperfect, and tainted. There is a permissible presumption that Henry at Harfleur and Henry in wooing Katherine displays an obsession for conquest and destruction which has grown to excessive proportions.

The glories of Henry V were shortlived as Shakespeare wrote in the Epilogue of Henry V:

> Small time: but in that small, most greatly lived
> This star of England. Fortune made his sword;
> By which, the world's best garden he achieved;
> And of it left his son imperial lord.
> Henry the Sixth, in infant bands crowned king
> Of France and England, did this king succeed;
> Whose state so many had the managing,
> That they lost France, and made his England bleed.[27]

And England did bleed. God's vengeful justice was imposed without mercy or cessation throughout the long reign of King Henry VI, as Young Clifford stated:

> Shame and confusion! All is on the rout;
> Fear frames disorder, and disorder wounds
> Where it should guard. O war, thou son of hell,
> Whom angry heavens do make their minister,
> Throw in the frozen bosoms of our part
> Hot coals of vengeance![28]

Disorder is truly the frame of the three parts of Henry VI and the roots of that disquiet are restated and enumerated constantly. Mortimer, near death, explains to his nephew:

---

[27] Henry V, Epilogue.

[28] Henry VI, Part II, Act V, Scene 2, lines 31-36.

> I will, if that my fading breath permit
> And death approach not ere my tale be done.
> Henry the Fourth, grandfather to this king,
> Deposed his nephew Richard, Edward's son,
> The first-begotten and the lawful heir
> Of Edward king, the third of that descent:
> During whose reign the Percies of the north,
> Finding his usurpation most unjust,
> Endeavored my advancement to the throne.[29]

The Duke of York explained his titles to Salisbury and Warwick in this way:

> Then thus:
> Edward the Third, my lords, had seven sons:
> The first, Edward the Black Prince, Prince
> of Wales;
> The second, William of Hatfield; and the third,
> Lionel Duke of Clarence; next to whom
> Was John of Gaunt, the Duke of Lancaster:
> The sixth was Thomas of Woodstock, Duke of
> Gloucester:
> William of Windsor was the seventh and last.
> Edward the Black Prince died before his father,
> And left behind him Richard, his only son,
> Who after Edward the Third's death reigned as
> king;
> Till Henry Bolingbroke, Duke of Lancaster,
> The eldest son and heir of John of Gaunt,
> Crowned by the name of Henry the Fourth,
> Seized on the realm, deposed the rightful king,
> Sent his poor queen to France, from whence
> she came,
> And him to Pomphret; where, as all you know,
> Harmless Richard was murdered traitorously.[30]

Shakespeare leaves no doubt about his belief that God's system of vengeful justice is being slowly worked out to its proper end - the reinstitution of the proper monarch. That task is left up to Richard III: evil, brutal, tyrrannical, working as God's vice-gerent but in doing so, bringing about his own doom.

---

[29] Henry VI, Part I, Act II, Scene 5, lines 61-69.

[30] Henry VI, Part II, Act II, Scene 2, lines 9-27.

Chapter III

The Tragedy of King Richard the Third Containing, his treacherous plots against his brother Clarence: the pittieful murther of his innocent nephews: his tyrannicall usurpations; with the whole course of his detested life, and most deserved death:[31]

[A Shakespearean Exemplum on
the Theme of Medieval Justice]

---

[31] *Richard III* was published in the quarto of 1597 with this title.

Richard III, written in 1592-93, holds the key to Shakespeare's understanding of and use of the medieval philosophies which inform his historical progression of plays from Richard II to Richard III, rather than the chronological order of their composition. Richard, Duke of Gloucester, was not exactly an honorable man. In the first act of Richard III, he describes himself as being created to be a villain because of his deformed body and ugly countenance. King Richard enjoys the worst position in which a medieval Shakespearean character could be placed. He cannot win; he may never prosper. However, Richard is in the service of God as vice-gerent to rid long-suffering England of Henry VI and purge the kingdom of the cancer which blossomed at the deposition and death of Richard II. These acts are good, but to carry out God's design, the King must be a bloody tyrant and breach all bounds of Medieval decorum. Richard III must be the scourge which permits the succession of the rightful heir to the throne, the true ruler--Henry VII.

Richard III embodies all that is evil in the world. Having murdered ten people, including his brothers and his nephews; having driven his wife to an early death (although of natural cause); having cheated, lied, and misrepresented his way to a kingship and a second political marriage; having violated the lawful sanctuary of the church; having refused to honor the contracts and agreements made with his associates, Richard has gained the stature of a true Machiavellian villain. Symbolically, Shakespeare represents the Duke of Gloucester, the minister of chaos, as various forms of beast, the bestial being that part of man's nature which is at an opposite pole from the angelic. People refer to Richard variously as a boar, a bottled spider, a foul bunch-backed toad, and a bloody dog. Queen Margaret, the widow of Henry VI, would have everyone believe that Richard was the devil incarnate.

In the Medieval sense, Richard, although the God-ordained scourge, violently had upset order, degree, priority, and place. His excess of villainy and hatred, jealousy and greed had caused him to plot the downfall of all who hindered his advancement, and he followed through with all of his murderous plans. By the tenets of the English legal system, justice would be dispensed and penalty exacted from the rebellious Duke by the king and his agents; but Richard had done away with most of them.

While in the service of God, Richard managed through his traitorous, villainous, and inhuman actions to incur divine wrath.[32] According to the political doctrines of St. Thomas Aquinas, rebellion against even a tyrant or an usurper was not permissible. Such problems were left to the solution of the deity.

Indeed, Richard's constant abuse of the name of God, of the authority of God, and of all holiness would be enough in itself to incur divine wrath. After abusing the name of St. Paul, Richard makes advances to Lady Anne Neville begging her pardon for his treachery. She is moved to reply: "Villain, thou know'st no law of God nor man; no beast so fierce but knows some touch of pity."[33] Richard III says of himself:

> I do the wrong, and first begin to brawl.
> The secret mischiefs that I set abroach
> I lay unto the grievous charge of others.

---

[32]King Edward IV succeeded King Henry VI to the throne of England by bloody usurpation in 1461. Shakespeare has Richard III admit responsibility for the murders of King Henry VI and Edward, the Prince of Wales. This he states in the scene in which Richard wooes Lady Anne Neville, Edward's widow. The insertions on Shakespeare's part concerning the murders and the wooings are completely fictitious. Also, King Edward IV, Richard's brother, died of a stroke in 1483 while Richard was in Yorkshire. Soon after, Richard usurped the throne and reigned until 1485, when he fell in battle on Bosworth field at the hand of Henry Tudor, thereafter Henry VII. In his rearrangements of history and in his fictional additions, Shakespeare enhanced the diabolical and guilty nature of Richard, Duke of Gloucester.

[33]<u>Richard III</u>, Act I, Scene 2, lines 70-71.

> Clarence, who I, indeed, have cast in darkness,
> I do beweep to many simple gulls -
> Namely to Derby, Hastings, Buckingham -
> And tell them 'tis the Queen and her allies
> That stir the King against the Duke my brother.
> Now they believe it, and withal whet me
> To be revenged on Rivers, Dorset, Grey.
> But then I sigh, and, with a piece of scripture,
> Tell them that God bids us do good for evil:
> And thus I clothe my naked villainy
> With odd old ends stol'n forth of Holy Writ,
> And seem a saint, when most I play the devil.[34]

The character of Richard III is here made apparent.

Richard III also represents Shakespeare's ultimate statement of the utter and complete chaos and personal suffering which a vengeful God could have created and had wrought. The level of depravity and disregard for the medieval concept of justice, order, degree, and the universal system of hierarchies appears in two specific legal problems. The first and more complex of the two concerns the right of sanctuary, the second is the contractual dispute over the Earldom of Hereford.

The privilege of lawful sanctuary dates from Anglo-Saxon times, the seventh century, and remained as a valid means of protection until its abolition because of abuse in 1623. The many and varied qualifications for sanctuary changed frequently and drastically. By right, sanctuary existed to protect innocent persons whose lives were endangered by private feuding and vengeance. The

---

[34] Richard III, Act I, Scene 3, lines 323-337.

church also afforded a forty-day protection for traitors and felons as an intermediate step before abjuration and formal outlawry. Two important contingencies were these: first, a criminal, if he had not abjured the realm after forty days, could be starved out of sanctuary but could not be removed therefrom by any other means of physical force. Second, any man seeking sanctuary had to do so in person, not by proxy.

Fearing for her life and for the lives of the members of her family, Queen Elizabeth sought sanctuary at Westminster:

> Ay me! I see the ruin of my house.
> The tiger now hath seized the gentle hind;
> Insulting tyranny begins to jut
> Upon the innocent and aweless throne.
> Welcome destruction, blood, and massacre!
> I see, as in a map, the end of all.[35]

The Archbishop of York could scarcely refuse, and the Queen, the young Duke of York,[36] and their entourage were granted God's protection. Richard, however, would have the young Duke in the company of his brother, the future Edward V, who was under Richard III's protection:

---

[35] Richard III, Act II, Scene 4, lines 49-54.

[36] Hollinshed's Chronicle advances the supposition, as does Shakespeare, that the Duke of York did not speak up in his own behalf but did willingly accept the benefits of sanctuary.

Hastings: On what occasion God he knows, not I,
The queen your mother and your brother York
Have taken sanctuary. The tender prince
Would fain have come with me to meet your grace
But by his mother was perforce withheld.

Buckingham: Fie, what an indirect and peevish
course
Is this of hers! Lord Cardinal, will your grace
Persuade the queen to send the Duke of York
Unto his princely brother presently?
If she deny, Lord Hastings, go with him
And from her jealous arms pluck him perforce.

Cardinal: My Lord of Buckingham, if my weak
oratory
Can from his mother win the Duke of York,
Anon expect him here; but if she be obdurate
To mild entreaties, God in heaven forbid
We should infringe the holy privilege
Of blessed sanctuary! Not for all this land
Would I be guilty of so deep a sin.

Buckingham: You are too senseless-obstinate,
my lord,
Too ceremonious and traditional.
Weigh it but with the grossness of this age,
You break not sanctuary in seizing him.
The benefit thereof is always granted
To those whose dealings have deserved the place
And those who have the wit to claim the place.
The prince hath neither claimed it nor deserved
it.
And therefore, in mine opinion, cannot have it.
Then, taking him from hence that is not there,
You break no privilege nor charter there.
Oft have I heard of sanctuary men,
But sanctuary children ne'er till now.

Cardinal: My Lord, you shall o'errule my mind
for once.
Come on, Lord Hastings, will you go with me?[37]

That which Buckingham accomplished in the name of Richard III was a breach of English moral, canon, and civil laws.[38]

---

[37]Richard III, Act III, Scene 1, lines 26-58.

[38]The laws governing the use and the privilege of sanctuary can be found in the following works:

The little scene points out the degenerate state of English and the utter chaos which had come upon the land presumably as a result of the original act of Bolingbroke. All semblance of earthly law has disappeared, and men like the Cardinal can be easily swayed in their uncertainty.

The second specific legal problem brings to light Richard's total amorality. He had promised Buckingham, one of his chief partners in evil enterprise, "th' earledom of Hereford and all the movables"[39] which King Edward IV had withheld from the Duke's family. When seeking fulfillment of their contract, Buckingham is told by the newly crowned King that he is not in a "giving vein."[40] Richard repays Buckingham for all his loyal service by having him executed; at the time of which event the Duke summarizes the acts of Richard III as being wrought "by underhand corrupted foul injustice."[41]

George W. Keeton, Shakespeare's Legal and Political Background (London: Pitman, 1967), pp. 204-210.
W. S. Holdsworth, A History of English Law (London: Methuen, 1935) vol. III, pp. 303-307.
Edward Jenks, A Short History of English Law (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1912), pp. 158-160.
Sir William Blackstone, Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England (Dublin: Jones and Rice, 1794), pp. 332-333.

[39] Richard III, Act IV, Scene 2, line 89.

[40] Richard III, Act IV, Scene 2, line 115.

[41] Richard III, Act V, Scene 1, line 6.

The theme of justice exacted by a vengeful God is seen throughout the play as criminals are executed and as Godly men speak. The criminals, although brought to untimely, unlawful deaths by King Richard, see their fates as being a repayment by a vengeful God for their previous offenses. Clarence says:

> O God! if my deep pray'rs cannot appease thee,
> But thou wilt be avenged on my misdeeds,
> Yet execute they wrath in me along.
> O, spare my guiltless wife and my poor children![42]

Edward IV says, after the murder of Clarence (an act for which he blames himself):

> O God, I fear thy justice will take hold
> On me and you, and mine and yours, for this![43]

The Duchess of York, Richard's mother, in her ramblings discloses a very wise statement of the Medieval idea of order triumphing over chaos and being reinstated in a more just age:

> Dead life, blind sight, poor mortal living
> ghost,
> Woe's scene, world's shame, grave's due by
> life usurped,
> Brief abstract and record of tedious days,
> Rest they unrest on England's lawful earth
> Unlawfully made drunk with innocent blood![44]

---

[42] Richard III, Act I, Scene 4, lines 69-72.

[43] Richard III, Act II, Scene 1, lines 133-134.

[44] Richard III, Act IV, Scene 4, lines 26-30.

The prayer uttered by the Earl of Richmond, Henry Tudor and the future King Henry VII, in his tent on Bosworth field, shows that he considers himself the minister who has been chosen by God to restore order and harmony to England by bringing Richard of Gloucester to justice and the subsequent reinstitution of the proper ruling house:

> O Thou whose captain I account myself,
> Look on my forces with a gracious eye!
> Put in their hands they bruising irons of wrath,
> That they may crush down with heavy fall
> The usurping helmets of our adversaries!
> Make us they ministers of chastisement,
> That we may praise Thee in the victory!
> To Thee I do commend my watchful soul
> Ere I let fall the windows of mine eyes.
> Sleeping and waking, O defend me still![45]

In his oration to his soldiers before the decisive battle, Richmond continues and reaffirms the ideas that he is an instrument of God's wrath and vengeance:

> Yet remember this:
> God and our good cause fight upon our side;
> The prayers of holy saints and wonged souls,
> Like high-reared bulwarks, stand before our
> faces. . . .
> God will in justice ward you as his soldiers;
> Then in the name of God and all these rights,
> Advance your standards, draw your willing
> swords. . . .
> Sound drums and trumpets boldly and cheerfully;
> God and Saint George! Richmond and victory![46]

---

[45] Richard III, Act V, Scene 3, lines 109-118.

[46] Richard III, Act V, Scene 3, lines 240-243, 255, 264-265, 271.

Thus, Richmond, the instrument of God's justice slays King Richard III. With the victory of Henry of Richmond, order is restored along with the proper line of kings; justice triumphs; the requirements of the Medieval ideal are fulfilled as well as the necessities of the "Tudor Myth."

In the fulfillment of that ideal arises a paradox of good and evil. Both the evil Richard and the good Richmond were in the service of God. As Lily Bess Campbell shows in Shakespeare's "Histories:" Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy, Richard is a scourge of God, a vice-gerent who in his evil and tyrannical way purges England of political criminals and Lancastrian usurpers.[47] He prepares the stage, unknowingly, for the reign of King Henry VII, who, as a good agent of God's justice, purges England of the scourge of Richard III. The paradox of Richard III is that God uses both good agents and evil agents to attain his ultimate goal - justice and the preservation of world order.

---

[47]Lily Bess Campbell, Shakespeare's "Histories:" Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy (San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1968), pp. 313-318, and to R. W. Battenhouse, Marlowe's Tamberlaine (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1941) for a lengthy discussion of the vice-gerent theory.

Part II:

A Transitional View

Chapter I

Richard II

A Closer View Showing Shakespeare's Incorporation of Renaissance Concepts with Medieval Traditions

Written one year after Richard III, in 1593-94, Richard II has proven to be through time one of the most confused and confusing of the plays of Shakespeare. Previously in this study, Richard II was briefly treated, because of its historical content, as the beginning of the historical cycle culminating with Richard III. Albeit not a chronological treatment, as far as authorship is concerned, the plays (of that series) are all interrelated through the historical basis of their contents. Here, divorcing Richard II from its place at the beginning of the history plays, that play can be considered as a separate entity in the light of its chronological composition. In some respects the play marks a great departure in history from one age of Shakespearean literature to another. At the bare historically factural level noted before, Richard II was the last king to rule England by a direct and undisputed hereditary right from William the Conqueror. He received, as he was entitled, the complete sanctity of Medieval kingship. For much more than a century after Richard, the Kings of England were a band of successful usurpers who were allowed to reign by the grace of Parliament if they agreed

to meet certain conditions. The succeeding kings would not and could not have the same claim to closeness to God that Richard II had.

Thus we see in Richard II a true king who brings himself to tragedy by his very nature and life style. Shakespeare portrays Richard as a very shallow individual, a man of formality and ceremony. He plays at being king. He looks like that which a king should look like and has a perfect command of the trappings of royalty. In short, he appears authentic. He would be a perfect king, as the Duke of York says outside Flint Castle:

> Yet looks he like a king: behold, his eye,
> As bright as is the eagle's, lightens forth
> Controlling majesty. Alack, alack for woe,
> That any harm should stain so fair a show.[48]

Richard is a show; he is only an effective regent in physical appearance and bearing. Yet he remains the King and no harm should come to him.

Shakespeare seems to mock this ineffectual flamboyant King who rules England even though the playwright does at times take great pity on him. Through the course of the play, however, Shakespeare rejects the Medieval idea of kingship. The ideas of cosmic order, divine will, and the great chain of being are all meaningless in the context of the man, Richard. He is a dual

---

[48] Richard II, Act III, Scene 3, lines 67-70.

personality but lacks the harmony necessary to reconcile his duality. The appearance and the reality of Richard do not meet harmoniously within the man. Through the weakness of the character of the King and his inability to fulfill the expectations of his office, Shakespeare mocks the Medieval ideas of kingship. Richard's speech in Pomfret Castle elaborates on that Shakespearean mockery of Medieval hierarchies as Richard parades them about in a grand display:[49]

> I have been studying how I may compare
> This prison where I live unto the world:
> And for because the world is populous,
> And here is not a creature but myself,
> I cannot do it. Yet I'll hammer it out:
> My brain I'll prove the female to my soul,
> My soul the father, and these two beget
> A generation of still-breeding thoughts;
> And their same thoughts people this little world,
> In humours like the people of this world,
> For no thought is contented. The better sort,
> As thoughts of things divine are intermixed
> With scruples, and do set the world itself
> Against the word; as thus: "Come, little ones."
> And then again,
> "It is as hard to come as for a camel
> To thread the postern of a small needle's eye."
> Thoughts tending to ambition, they do plot
> Unlikely wonders: how these vain weak nails
> May tear a passage through the flinty ribs
> Of this hard world, my ragged prison walls;
> And, for they cannot, die in their own pride.
> Thoughts tending to content flatter themselves
> That they are not the first of fortune's slaves,
> Nor shall not be the last; like seely beggars
> Who sitting in the stocks refuge their shame,
> That many have, and others must, sit there;
> And in this thought they find a kind of ease,
> Bearing their own misfortunes on the back

---

[49]Until now Shakespeare's references to the medieval and Elizabethan ideas of orders and hierarchies had been subtle and implicit and reverently presented.

Of such as have before endured the like.
Thus play I in one person many people,
And none contented; sometimes as I king,
Then treasons make me wish myself a beggar,
And so I am. Then crushing penury
Persuades me I was better than a king.
Then am I kinged again and, by and by,
Think that I am unkinged by Bolingbroke,
And straight am nothing. But whate'er I be,
Nor I, nor any man that but man is,
With nothing shall be pleased, till he be eased
With being nothing.

Music do I hear.
Ha-ha! Keep time! How sour sweet music is
When time is broke, and no proportion kept!
So is it in the music of men's lives:
And here have I the daintiness of ear
To check time broke in a disordered string,
But for the concord of my state and time,
Had not an ear to hear my true time broke.
I wasted time, and now doth Time waste me:
For now hath Time made me his numb'ring clock;
My thoughts are minutes, and with sighs they jar
Their watches on unto mine eyes, the outward watch
Whereto my finger, like a dial's point,
Is pointing still, in cleansing them from tears.
Now, sir, the sound that tells what hour it is
Are clamorous groans which strike upon my heart,
Which is the bell. So sighs, and tears, and groans,
Show minutes, times, and hours; but my time
Runs posting on in Bolingbroke's proud joy,
While I stand fooling here, his jack-of-the-clock.
This music made me: let it sound no more.
For though it have help madmen to their wits,
In me it seems it will make wise men mad.
Yet blessing on his heart that gives it me,
For 'tis a sign of love; and love to Richard
Is a strange brooch in this all-hating world.[50]

Richard begins by making a grand correspondence between the microcosm of his thoughts and prison room and the macrocosm of people and the world. He fantasizes his own griefs as

---

[50]Richard II, Act V, Scene 5, lines 1-66.

being in the pattern of the workings of a clock. The clock, of course, is a standard symbol of order. The speech ends in chaos - the chaos of the world and the discord of the spheres are seen in the madness, the untuned string of the deposed king's mind. In Richard rests the cause of his own tragedy.

King Richard II is a remarkable departure from the Medieval norm of kingship. By right and heredity a true king, he abuses his kingship by foolishness and pretentions. He farmed out his realm to keep his court of flatterers and to subsidize his Irish wars. For the latter purpose, he seized the lands of the dead John of Gaunt. While Bolingbroke threatened the throne, Richard wasted time. He wasted time; he wasted kingship; he wasted his realm; he wasted himself and his microcosmic order which was the standard for England. But Richard is not an evil man. Shakespeare portrays him as a good man but weak and troubled, playing a role, trusting in the divine right of kings while at the same time dooming himself by abusing that God given state.

The Medieval ideal is best presented in these words, which were quoted previously:

> Not all the water in the rough rude sea
> Can wash the balm off from an anointed king.
> The breath of worldly men cannot depose
> The deputy elected by the lord.[51]

---

[51] Richard II, Act III, Scene 2, lines 54-57.

The vain hope echoed above does not work for Richard, for Shakespeare would now imply that God helps those who help themselves. Bolingbroke does not have to steal the crown, for the anointed Richard is more than willing to give it away.

The scene between the gardener and the servants in the Duke of York's garden is a microcosm of the action of the entire play. Presented as it must be, in full, it reads:

> Gardener: Go, bind thou up young dangling apricocks,
> Which like unruly children make their sire
> Stoop with oppression of their prodigal weight;
> Give some supportance to the bending twigs.
> Go thou, and like an executioner
> Cut off the heads of too fast growing sprays
> That look too lofty in our commonwealth:
> All must be even in our government.
> You thus employed, I will go root away
> The noisesome weeds which without profit suck
> The soil's fertility from wholesome flowers.
>
> Man: Why should we, in the compass of a pale,
> keep law and form and due proportion,
> Shawing, as in a model, our firm estate,
> When our sea-walled garden, the whole land,
> Is full of weeds, her fairest flowers choked up,
> Her fruit trees all unpruned, her hedges ruined,
> Her knots disordered, and her wholesome herbs
> Swarming with caterpillars?
>
> Gardener: Hold thy peace.
> He that hath suffered this disordered spring
> Hath now himself met with the fall of leaf:
> The weeds which his broad spreading leaves did shelter,
> That seemed in eating him to hold him up,
> Are plucked up root and all by Bolingbroke -
> I mean the Earl of Wiltshire, Bushy, Green.
>
> Man: What, are they dead?
>
> Gardener: They are; and Bolingbroke
> Hath seized the wasteful king. O, what pity is it

That he had not so trimmed and dressed his land
As we this garden! We at this time of year
Do wound the bark, the skin of our fruit trees,
Lest being overproud in sap and blood
With too much riches it confound itself;
Had he done so to great and growing men,
They might have lived to bear, and he to taste
Their fruits of duty. Superflous branches
We lop away, that bearing boughs may live:
Had he done so, himself had borne the crown,
Which waste of idle hours hath quite thrown down.

Man: What, think you the king shall be deposed?

Gardener: Depressed he is already, and deposed
'Tis doubt he will be. Letters came last night
To a dear friend of the good Duke of York's,
That tell black tidings.[52]

In speaking through the gardeners, Shakespeare voices his own opinion that Richard had sown the seeds of his own destruction by being a poor ruler. He made errors of judgment and made bad choices for friends and advisors. He did not keep his kingdom well weeded and thus the flowers of productivity and good life and peace were choked and suffocated. The impassioned words of the dying John of Gaunt echo the state of England under Richard:

This royal throne of kings, this scept'red isle,
This earth of majesty, this seat of Mars,
This other Eden, demi-paradise,
This fortress built by Nature for herself
Against infection and the hand of war,
This happy breed of men, this little world,
This precious stone set in the silver sea
Which serves it in the office of a wall,
Or as a moat defensive to a house,
Against the envy of less happier lands,
This blessed plot, this earth, this realm,
this England,
This nurse, this teeming womb of royal kings,
Feared by their breed and famous by their birth,

---

[52]Richard II, Act III, Scene 4, lines 29-71.

> Renouned for their deeds as far from home,
> For Christian service and true chivalry,
> As is the sepulchre in stubborn Jewry
> Of the world's ransom, blessed Mary's son,
> This land of such dear souls, this dear,
> dear land -
> Dear for her reputation through the world -
> Is now leas'd out - I die pronouncing it -
> Like to a tenement or pelting farm.[53]

Still, Richard II is not evil.

Neither is Henry Bolingbroke evil. At first, he defends Richard. He accuses the Duke of Norfolk of treason in what Bolingbroke believes to be the defense of his king. It is not until the seizure of his father's lands that the Duke of Hereford seeks to confront his king. He wanted only a return of that property which was rightfully his own. Bolingbroke's mistake is in taking the crown that Richard II was so willing to give away. The wrath of a vengeful God does not appear except apprehensively in the new king's mind. The usurpation here does not entail forcible theft and murder as in Richard III. But God will still avenge his Richard in time.

The conflict in Richard II then is between two fundamentally good men, one of whom is more suited than the other to dispense justice and remove evil. It is Bolingbroke who shows mercy and pardons Aumerle for his treachery while extracting earthly justice from the far

---

[53]Richard II, Act II, Scene 1, lines 40-60.

far more guilty conspirators. The Duchess of York pleads for her son's life with words familiar to the later plays of Shakespeare:

> Pleads he [the Duke of York] in earnest? Look upon his face.
> His eyes do drop no tears, his prayers are in jest;
> His words come from his mouth, ours from our breast;
> He prays but faintly, and would be denied;
> We pray with heart and soul, and all beside;
> His weary joints would gladly rise, I know;
> Our knees still kneel till to the ground they grow;
> His prayers are full of false hypocrisy,
> Ours of true zeal and deep integrity;
> Our prayers do outpay his - then let them have
> That mercy which true prayer ought to have.[54]

The Duke of York seeks his son Aumerle's death so that his name shall be vindicated and his prestige restored - this is the old law and the old justice. The Duchess of York seeks mercy for her son - this is the new law and the new justice. The granting of that mercy by Bolingbroke, King Henry IV, marks a new departure from medieval theory for Shakespeare.

As we have seen, Richard II marked the turning point in Shakespeare's works concerning law and justice. It tested the theory of the infallibility of kings and the concept of revenge in the name of and in the cause of justice. The new king, Henry IV, at the end of Richard II

---

[54]Richard II, Act V, Scene 3, lines 99-109.

pardons Aumerle at a time when others would have had him executed to vindicate the blot marring the good name of his father, the Duke of York. This showing of mercy marks the true turning point in Shakespeare's definition of justice. Divine vengeance and retribution for a true king deposed and strict justice for all sinners, justice fitted to the crime and not the man, have left the Shakespearean scene. These ideas and this alteration of attitude paved the way for some of the greatest plays of the Shakespeare canon: The Merchant of Venice, Measure for Measure, and The Tempest.

Part III

The Renaissance Shakespeare

Chapter I

"Mercy Seasons Justice"[55]

---

[55]The further development of Shakespeare's thought with a new accent on Renaissance ideas culminating in a theory of a brave new world founded on principles of mercy as seen in The Merchant of Venice, Measure for Measure, and The Tempest.

The Merchant of Venice is the earliest of the new law plays. In the case of Shylock versus Antonio, Shakespeare condenses the conflict between the old law and the new law, justice and mercy. In the play, the author shows the need of a compromise between the two legal theories - justice yielding a little to mercy and mercy yielding a little to justice. He asserts the correctness of both principles individually, however, but considers each one in itself inadequate.

Neither Shylock nor Antonio can be called an evil man. Both are law abiding men, but they subscribe to vastly different legal authorities. In the character of Shylock dwells the old law; he is righteous and truthful. "What judgment shall I dread, doing no wrong?"[56] summarizes his theory. He made Antonio a loan of many ducats, and the two made a firm bond. Shylock wishes only that which is rightfully due him by the terms of that bond. In his attitude toward the bond, he represents the letter of the old law; in his attitude of vengeance towards Antonio, he represents the spirit of the old law.

---

[56] The Merchant of Venice, Act IV, Scene 1, line 89.

Portia symbolizes the new law. She has a great distaste for cruel and heartless justice. She says:

> The quality of mercy is not strained;
> It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven
> Upon the place beneath. It is twice blest;
> It blesseth him that gives and him that takes.
> 'Tis mightiest in the mightiest; it becomes
> The throned monarch better than his crown.
> His sceptre shows the force of temporal power,
> The attribute to awe and majesty,
> Wherein doth sit the dread and fear of kings;
> But mercy is above this acept'red sway
> It is enthroned in the hearts of kings,
> It is an attribute to God Himself,
> And earthly power doth then show likest God's
> When mercy seasons justice. Therefore, Jew,
> Though justice be thy plea, consider this:
> That, in the course of justice, none of us
> Should see salvation. We do pray for mercy,
> And that same prayer doth teach us all to render
> The deeds of mercy. I have spoke thus much
> To mitigate the justice of thy plea;
> Which if thou follow, this strict court of Venice
> Must needs give sentence 'gainst this
> merchant there.[57]

She embodies the spirit of the new law which is mercy and Christ-like forgiveness. Porta applies this new spirit to the old views as presented by Shylock and arrives at a view of law characterized by justice tempered with mercy, a human system rather than the coldly legalistic view of the Old Testament.

This mercy, however well expressed by Portia and well exemplified in Portia, does not triumph in The

---

[57] The Merchant of Venice, Act IV, Scene 1, lines 183-204.

Merchant of Venice by virtue of its own merits and inherent good sense. Shylock does not turn from his beliefs at all:

> My deeds upon my head! I crave the law,
> The penalty and forfeit of my bond.[58]

Shylock hopes for the same measure of justice to be meted out on Antonio that he would expect for himself if he were in the position of forfeiture.

In this, the masterful work of Shakespeare as an artist appears. Making the old law appear in Shylock, a Jew, the playwright shows the close ties that law and religion enjoy. The Jew honors the laws of the Old Testament. Because he does not believe in original sin, Shylock can guiltlessly plead for divine justice for himself as he pleads for earthly justice for Antonio. The new law represented as Christianity in Portia alludes to the law of the New Testament. Justice still must be served, but only with mercy, forgiveness, and kindness can it best be served. The relationship of old law and new law is also seen in the Judeo-Christian relationship. The New Testament fulfills, not destroys the Old Testament; the new law does likewise. Mercy does not win; Portia, the woman, however, does win the trial. She uses legal

---

[58]The Merchant of Venice, Act IV, Scene 1, lines 205-206.

technicalities within the letter of the bond to ensnare Shylock and secure Antonio's safety. By pointing out to Shylock that he may claim his due but by the letter of his bond may not draw one drop of Antonio's blood, Portia has made the contract an impossible one to perform.

Shakespeare, although just beginning to express his new legal theory, hints at its eventual fulfillment. The Jew is forced to convert to Christianity, but his daughter converts willingly. Jessica, the child of Israel and daughter of Shylock, leaves her father's house with Lorenzo to go to Belmont; she says: "I shall be saved by my husband. He hath made me a Christian."[59] In like manner, the old concept of strict justice will be won over and tempered by mercy. Shakespeare equates mercy with Christianity and the New Testament while strict justice is seen as Judaism and the Old Testament. The relationship of those two Biblical elements points out the relationship of mercy to justice. Mercy is the logical fulfillment of justice and its logical, humanistic end. Mercy fulfills justice but does not replace it.

The theme of a Christian, human law is carried into Measure for Measure, whose title originates in Matthew 7:1-2:

---

[59] The Merchant of Venice, Act III, Scene 5, lines 19-20.

> Pass no judgment, and you will not be judged. For as you judge others, so you will yourselves be judged, and whatever measure you deal out to others will be dealt back to you.[60]

The sermon from which the play takes its title is the same fundamental, Christian belief which Portia states in The Merchant of Venice. That is, if men were to rely solely upon justice for salvation, they would only be damned because of original sin. Since men can be saved only by divine mercy, men must reflect that mercy in their dealings with other men.

All of the characters in Measure for Measure can be divided into two groups: upholders of the law and offenders against the law. The upholders are Angelo, Escalus, the Provost, the Justice, and Isabella. The offenders are obvious. None of these people can be considered as a Medieval example of an evil being; all have some virtues and commendable qualities. The conflict in Measure for Measure, then, is a conflict of absolutes which alone cannot hope to arrive at a true and fair concept of human justice. The question to be resolved is one of legal ethics.

Isabella and Angelo represent two ideal and absolute extremes. Angelo stands for the law and the execution of justice by the letter of that law. Isabella stands for the absolute of Christian forgiveness, mercy,

---

[60] The New English Bible, Matthew 7:1-2.

and chastity. Their absolutism in polarity cannot be mitigated by themselves as this exchange shows:

> Angelo: Your brother is a forfeit of the law,
> And you but waste your words.
>
> Isabella: Alas, alas!
> Why, all the souls that were were forfeit once;
> And He that might the vantage best have took
> Found out the remedy. How would you be,
> If He, which is the top of judgment, should
> But judge you as you are? O, think on that,
> And mercy then will breathe within your lips,
> Like man new made.
>
> Angelo: Be you content, fair maid;
> It is the law, not I, condemn your brother.
> Were he my kinsman, brother, or my son,
> It should be thus with him; he must die
> tomorrow.
>
> Isabella: Tomorrow! O, that's sudden!
> Spare him, spare him!
> He's not prepared for death. Even for our
> kitchens
> We kill the fowl of season: shall we serve
> heaven
> With less respect than we do minister
> To our gross selves? Good, good my lord,
> bethink you:
> Who is it that hath died for this offense?
> There's many have committed it. . . .
> Yet show some pity.
>
> Angelo: I show it most of all when
> I show justice,
> For then I pity those I do not know,
> Which a dismissed offense would after gall;
> And do him right that, answeing one foul wrong,
> Lives not to act another. Be satisfied;
> Your brother dies tomorrow; be content.[61]

There is a seemingly unresolvable incompatability between these two extremes. One mediating device, Escalus, fails as he advances the idea of law as a corrective process

---

[61] Measure for Measure, Act II, Scene 2, lines 73-90, 100-106.

rather than as a punitive process; his is an unheeded voice of reason. Old, wise Escalus pardons both Froth and Pompey in Act II, Scene 1 of Measure for Measure. In Froth's case the use of mercy was successful as the foolish gentleman repented and was never heard from again. Pompey, being incorrigible, did not use his second chance wisely, as he himself states.[62] Escalus states his views on rehabilitation in the following lines:

> Escalus: Ay, but yet
> Let us be keen, and rather cut a little,
> Than fall, and bruise to death. Alas, this gentleman
> Whom I would save had a most noble father.
> Let but your honor know,
> Whom I believe to be most strait in virtue,
> That, in the working out of your own affections,
> Had time cohered with place or place with wishing,
> Or that the resolute acting of your blood
> Could have attained th' effect of your own purpose,
> Whether you had not sometime in your life
> Erred in this point which now you censure him,
> And pulled the law upon you.
>
> Angelo: 'Tis one thing to be tempted, Escalus,
> Another thing to fall.[63]

Escalus pleads for Angelo to be human in his judgment of Claudio, but Angelo abjures his humanity. In his lust for Isabella, however, Angelo does find that he cannot escape being human. When tempted, he does fall. But, even

---

[62]See Measure for Measure, Act II, Scene 1, lines 226-237.

[63]Measure for Measure, Act II, Scene 1, lines 4-18.

his own fall does not cause him to deviate from his absolutely strict legality. To satisfy justice and the laws of Vienna, Claudio must die.

The only person capable of uniting Angelo and Isabella, justice and mercy, is the Duke. He states his position as being that of an Aristotelian mean between the two extremes of virtue when he says:

> He who the sword of heaven will bear
> Should be as holy as severe;
> Pattern in himself to know,
> Grace to stand, and virtue go;
> More nor less to others paying
> Than by self-offenses weighing.
> Shame to him whose cruel striking
> Kills for faults of his own liking.
> Twice treble shame on Angelo,
> To weed my vice and let his grow.
> O, what may man within him hide,
> Though angel on the outward side!
> How may likeness made in crimes,
> Making practice on the times,
> To draw with idle spiders' strings
> Most ponderous and substantial things?
> Craft against vice I must apply:
> With Angelo tonight shall lie
> His old betrothed but despised;
> So disguise shall, by th' disguised,
> Pay with falsehood false exacting,
> And perform an old contracting.[64]

In effect, the Duke states that the man as well as the crime must be considered before a realistic form of justice can be found. He questions Angelo's ethics in trying to seduce Isabella after having condemned her brother Claudio for lying with his betrothed. The judge himself is not above the law. The Duke has the correct idea,

---

[64] Measure for Measure, Act III, Scene 2, lines 262-283.

but the last six lines of his speech proposing that idea cause a great questioning of his professional ethics. Can the good ends which he wishes to attain justify the chicanery and falsehood of the means which he intends to employ? Shakespeare, apparently would think so, for the Duke triumphs and represents an entirely new order of ethics. He is a philosopher, a governor, and a teacher; to show Angelo his own treachery, the Duke himself must be treacherous also.

Act V of Measure for Measure brings the final resolution of the justice and mercy conflict. Angelo realizes his humanity and guilt to be equal to Claudio's when the deception of Mariana and Isabella is disclosed:

> O my dread lord,
> I should be guiltier than my guiltiness,
> To think I can be undiscernible,
> When I perceive your grace, like pow'r divine,
> Hath looked upon my passes. Then, good prince,
> No longer session hold upon my shame,
> But let my trial be mine own confession.
> Immediate sentence then, and sequent death,
> Is all the grace I beg.[65]

Angelo asks for the same measure of justice which he ordered for Claudio. He remains firm in that belief because he refuses to believe and to accept the tempering of passion as a proof of his humanity. He thus blocks the restoration of well-balanced reasoning to his judgment, as he says:

---

[65] Measure for Measure, Act V, Scene 1, lines 368-376.

> I am sorry that such sorrow I procure,
> And so deep sticks it in my penitent heart,
> That I crave death more willingly than mercy;
> 'Tis my deserving, and I do entreat it.[66]

Isabella, however, has been much more successful than Angelo in tempering her forgiving fervor with reason. She speaks in behalf of Angelo, the villain who she believed had taken her brother's life for an offense of which he himself had just been guilty, in response to the entreaties of Mariana:

> Most bounteous sir,
> Look, if it please you, on this man condemned,
> As if my brother lived. I partly think
> A due sincerity governed his deeds,
> Till he did look on me. Since it is so,
> Let him not die. My brother had but justice,
> In that he did the thing for which he died.
> For Angelo,
> His act did not o'ertake his bad intent,
> And must be buried but as an intent
> That perished by the way. Thoughts are no subject,
> Intents but merely thoughts.[67]

Isabella has captured the meaning of the Duke's speech on justice and mercy, and she is of one mind with him.

The Duke makes his final judgments: Claudio is freed to marry his betrothed, Juliet; Angelo is compelled to marry his betrothed, Mariana, and thus uphold his part of their five-year-old contract; Isabella will marry the Duke. The judgment of the Duke in showing

---

[66] Measure for Measure, Act V, Scene 1, lines 476-479.

[67] Measure for Measure, Act V, Scene 1, lines 445-456.

mercy to Claudio is the only acceptable verdict which could have been found. Angelo's sterness would have been correct had it not been for the state of Viennese law and society. As George W. Keeton says in Shakespeare's Legal and Political Background, the sense of justice is offended when Claudio is condemned to die because the laws of Vienna regarding prostitution had been unenforced for many years. In a society in which prostitution was widely practiced and tolerated, a first offense fornicator hardly deserved the death penalty. Angelo as the reigning sovereign was obligated to be merciful in the case of Claudio.[68]

The Tempest is Shakespeare's culmination of the theme of a new society based on the reasonable joining of justice and mercy. An important aspect of this, Shakespeare's last play, is the new ideal community which Prospero builds on the island and carries off to Italy at the conclusion. The island is uninhabited except for Caliban, half-man -- half-beast, a symbol of the lowest form of natural humanity -- uneducated, uncivilized, neither guilty nor evil because of ignorance. He is ruled by passion only. With Caliban is a good spirit named Ariel.

---

[68]See George W. Keeton, Shakespeare's Legal and Political Background (London: Pitman, 1967), pp. 371-393.

The persons who come to populate the island, exiles and victims of shipwrecks, represent the entire range of types of humanity. Prospero, deposed by his brother from the dukedom of Milan, cared more for knowledge and learning than for governing. His daughter, Miranda, is the uncorrupted pure child of nature -- chaste and innocent. In his twelve years on the island before the play begins, Prospero has learned that knowledge itself is useless. Through Caliban, Ariel, Miranda, and the island kingdom, he has learned the practical application to life of learning and virtue; the value of knowledge rests in its good and successful applications. Prospero's exile has also taught him self-discipline and has transformed him into the ideal model of a Renaissance prince, always in control of himself and thus able to aid his subjects through his own learning, virtue, and practical ability.

Also to the island come Antonio, the usurper; Sebastian; Gonzalo; Alonzo, the King of Naples; and Ferdinand, the King's son. Ferdinand is good, learned, and civilized, but he is marred by being a product of the sinful city and the son of Prospero's worst enemy. Gonzalo is a good and wise man. Antonio and Sebastian are corrupted, civilized men who have ignored their moral senses and who by numerous sinful actions have fallen to depths lower than that of the beasts.

The characters are all placed together in a new kind of social order which transcends the rigidity of the great chain of being. Beasts and kings, nature and civilization, men and spirits exist in the same plane as equals in the sight of the laws of that new society. The ruler, Prospero, still has a separate distinction as being the ruler, but the mystical powers of his office he finally abjures:

> Ye elves of hills, standing lakes, and groves,
> And ye that on the sands with printless foot
> Do chwse the ebbing Neptune, and do fly him
> When he comes back; you demi-puppets that
> By moonshine do the green sour ringlets make,
> Whereof the ewe not bites; and you whose pastime
> Is to make midnight mushrumps, that rejoice
> To hear the solemn curfew; by whose aid
> (Weak masters though ye be) I have bedimmed
> The noontide sun, called forth the mutinous
> winds,
> And 'twixt the green sea and the azured vault
> Set roaring war; to the dread rattling thunder
> Have I given fire and rifted Jove's stout oak
> With his own bolt; the strong-based promontory
> Have I made shake and by the spurs plucked up
> The pine and cedar; graves at my command
> Have waked their sleepers, oped, and let 'em
> forth
> By my so potent art. But this rough magic
> I here abjure; and when I have required
> Some heavenly music (which even now I do)
> To work mine end upon their senses that
> This airy charm is for, I'll break my staff,
> Bury it certain fathoms in the earth,
> And deeper than did ever plummet sound
> I'll drown my book.[69]

In The Tempest justice and mercy do not enter in the usual sense of their relation to crimes and criminals. The conflicting elements of this play are the broad

---

[69] The Tempest, Act V, Scene 1, lines 33-57.

ideas of a natural order versus an unnatural disorder; those headings can encompass many ideas including crime as being unnatural. In A Natural Perspective, Northrup Frye wrote:

> The island, then, is a place of confused identify in which a world of nothingness, symbolized by the tempest and the sea, separates from a world of regained identity in which Ferdinand receives a "second life" from Prospero, and the Court Party, as Gonzalo says, find their true selves again. Stephano and Trinculo fall into a "filthy-mantled pool" and Caliban is persistently associated with fish: they hardly emerge from a submarine world. The Court Party wander through a "maze" of hallucinations, and for them the conceptions of reality and illusion are reversed. In the cognitio Antonio and Sebastian understand that their realistic efforts to gain power by assassination are what is unnatural, and so unreal, and that the marvels and wonders of the magical island are a part of a purgatorial cleansing of both their reason and their senses:
>
> > And as the morning steals upon the night,
> > Melting the darkness, so their rising senses
> > Begin to chase the ignorant fumes that mantle
> > Their clearer reason.[70]

Prospero, then, is the wise judge who must, and does, bring the misguided, unnatural persons on the island to that clearer reason. He does this by means of a purgative, de-habilatative type of merciful justice. One of Prospero's triumphs rests in the marriage of Ferdinand and Miranda.

---

[70]Northrup Frye, A Natural Perspective (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967), p. 151.

Ferdinand's "punishment" for his slight unnaturalness is doing Caliban's log carrying. This form of justice, like that proposed by Escalus in Measure for Measure, serves an educative purpose, for Ferdinand comes to appreciate fully and to admire completely the natural virtues of Miranda. The others are treated in similar fashion as Prospero states:

> A solemn air, and the best comforter
> To an unsettled fancy, cure thy brains,
> Now useless, boiled within thy skull!
> there stand,
> For you are spell-stopped.
> Holy Gonzalo, honorable man,
> Mine eyes, ev'n sociable to the show of thine,
> Fall fellowly drops. The charm dissolves
> space;
> And as the morning steals upon the night,
> Melting the darkness, so their rising senses
> Begin to chase the ignorant fumes that mantle
> Their clearer reason. O good Gonzalo,
> My true preserver, and a loyal sir
> To him thou follow'st, I will pay thy graces
> Home both in word and deed. Most cruelly
> Didst thou, Alonso, use me and my daughter.
> Thy brother was a furtherer in the act.
> Thou art pinched for't now, Sebastian.
> Flesh and blood,
> You, brother mine, that entertained amibition,
> Expelled remorse and nature; whom, with
> Sebastian
> (Whose inward pinches therefore are most strong),
> Would here have killed your king, I do forgive
> thee,
> Unnatural though thou art. Their understanding
> Begins to swell, and the approaching tide
> Will shortly fill the reasonable shore,
> That now lies foul and muddy. Not one of them
> That yet looks on me or would know me. Ariel,
> Fetch me the hat and rapier in my cell.
> I will discase me, and myself present
> As I was sometime Milan. Quickly, spirit!
> Thou shalt ere long be free.[71]

---

[71] The Tempest, Act V, Scene 1, lines 58-87.

The preceeding explanation of Prospero's actions follows closely on the heels of his merciful treatment of Ferdinand and the latter's marriage to Miranda. That union insures the continuation of the new society's ideal of justice tempered with mercy and humanity, for that marriage was one of natural virtue and purity (Miranda) to civilized reason and education (Ferdinand). Prospero fulfills the ideals of Escalus in Measure for Measure as he frees the members of the community from the bondage of their misdeeds:

> Though with their high wrongs I am struck
> to th' quick,
> Yet with my nobler reason 'gainst my fury
> Do I take part. The rarer action is
> In virtue than in vengeance. They being
> penitent,
> The sole drift of my purpose doth extend
> Not a frown further. Go, release them, Ariel.
> My charms I'll break, their senses I'll restore,
> And they shall be themselves.[72]

By far the most important statement of the entire play comes in the Epilogue, which is spoken by Prospero, now the ideal of Renaissance princes and judges:

> Now my charms are all o'erthrown,
> And what strength I have's mine own,
> Which is most faint. Now 'tis true
> I must be here confined by you,

---

[72] The Tempest, Act V, Scene 1, lines 25-32. Also, the word themselves in the final lines of the quoted passage means new selves. They are better people because of the workings of merciful judgment and human, Christian justice.

> Or sent to Naples. Let me not,
> Since I have my dukedom got
> And pardoned the deceiver, dwell
> In this bare island by your spell;
> But release me from my bands
> With the help of your good hands.
> Gentle breath of yours my sails
> Must fill, or else my project fails,
> Which was to please. Now I want
> Spirits to enforce, art to enchant;
> And my ending is despair
> Unless I be relieved by prayer,
> Which pierces so that it assaults
> Mercy itself and frees all faults.
> As you from crimes would pardoned be,
> Let your indulgence set me free.[73]

Lines six and seven show the complete change in the attitude of the playwright from the Medieval thoughts which he expressed in the history plays. Then an usurper would be subject to the vengeance of an angry God. But, now, in The Tempest, with its new hierarchies and social structures, God does not appear to avenge his anointed ruler. The humanity of the Renaissance emerges as the Duke regains his office by the exercise of merciful justice. The usurper is pardoned. Shakespeare has created a work which stands at an opposite pole from his early efforts and his history plays. He has also created numerous play which in theory, characterize the development of the age in which he lived and worked; three of those are The Merchant of Venice, Measure for Measure, and The Tempest.

---

[73] The Tempest, The Epilogue.

Chapter II:

The Shakespearean Concept of the Renaissance Theories Concerning Mercy

What is a man? What should he be? What is his nature? What should it be? What is his place in the world? Where should he be? What is man's ideal and how should he measure up to it? These were the wonderings of Shakespeare. His own concepts of the meaning of the human experience and of the definition of the purposes and the natures of man grew from the conflicts within the age during which he lived and wrote. The Elizabethan era (1558-1603) was characterized by a conflict between the Medieval and the Renaissance views of man. That tension fostered the evolution of Shakespeare's views of humanity and evoked responses in his works which reflect the true character of his age.

The Elizabethan age was very much one of a transitional nature. The Medieval ideals, thoughts, theories, and practices which appear in the early Shakespearean plays were giving way to those of the Renaissance. Men of new learning and information were tempering the old ideas with new concepts of order, degree, priority, religion, justice, mercy, and humanity. Chapter two of this study defines some of the Medieval notions important to this treatment of the works of Shakespeare.

The new Shakespearean ideas of such concepts as justice, order, God, and man can be described by the word human. The Merchant of Venice, the first humane treatment of a Jew in several centuries, Measure for Measure, and The Tempest are all dominated by an emphasis on humanity, repeating Hamlet's words again:

> What a piece of work is a man, how noble in reason, how infinite in faculties, in form and moving how express and admirable, in action how like an angel, in apprehension how like a god: the beauty of the world, the paragon of animals.[74]

It is noble and good to be a human being. Humanity is seen in the New Testament sense of man being the paragon of God's animal creations; Christ was a human being. Man is also a paradoxical being. He is capable of both good and evil; the two coexist in the mind. Friar Lawrence in Romeo and Juliet speaks of the good and evil paradox in man in this way:

> Two such opposed kings encamp them still
> In man as well as herbs - grace and rude will;
> And where the worser is predominant,
> Full soon the canker death eats up that plant.[75]

An excess of rude will is what creates persons like Richard III, yet, an excess of goodness can be equally destructive. Angelo in Measure for Measure is so consumed by his own virtue that his human vision is impaired if

---

[74] Hamlet, Act II, Scene 2, lines 311-315.

[75] Romeo and Juliet, Act II, Scene 3, lines 27-30.

not totally destroyed. Therefore, he acts as an unwise judge. The true Renaissance man, however, can control himself and keep the two opposed kings in balance and teach others to do the same. The Duke in Measure for Measure succeeds in doing so by the end of that play, as do Prospero and Ferdinand in The Tempest.

The Renaissance higher view of man affects the standards of religion, order, and justice. Regarding those ideas, The Tempest shares the same relationship with the early Shakespearean plays that the New Testament has with the Old Testament. The Tempest defines a society in which justice is tempered by mercy, as Miranda says:

> O, wonder!
> How many goodly creatures are there here!
> How beautious mankind is! O brave new world
> That has such people in't![76]

In the new society, the great chain of being approach to an ordered universe does not appear in its Medieval sense. Men are not merely fixed, immobile links in a chain placed somewhere between beats and angels. They are placed, rather, in a setting in which they enjoy a more expanded role in the cosmos. The airy sprites, elves, and Ariel originate higher up in the chain than man, but they interact with him freely in his new cosmic stance, as does Caliban who represents the lower, sub-human level of the chain. That idea is in the best

---

[76] The Tempest, Act V, Scene 1, lines 181-184.

tradition of Renaissance Neo-Platonism.[77] Prospero is the ruler of the island in The Tempest because of his superior intellect and powers of reasoning, not because of a God-ordained appointment.

The theory that all men are imperfect and, although made in God's image, fall short of that ideal, characterizes many actions in The Tempest and makes up a major part of the new Shakespearean idea. The new concept of justice is a very religiously oriented one. It emphasizes the goodness rather than the evil of men. It considers the persons involved in crimes as well as the crimes themselves. It is merciful and forgiving, based on the assumption that nearly all men can be taught and rehabilitated. Therefore, Shakespeare populated his little island in The Tempest with representatives of all levels of society, the natural hierarchy of mankind.

Caliban is the lowest inhabitant being half-man and half-beast and being nearly devoid of all reasoning powers. He cannot control his actions because they are totally rooted in passions and emotions. He

---

[77]See W. C. Curry, Shakespeare's Philosophical Patterns (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1937).

can never be a complete man and must remain forever on the island when everyone else leaves it. Stephano and Trinculo are lesser men but above Caliban. They deny their powers of reason their proper right to function. Their form of justice must be physical suffering for they are incorrigible and not yet prepared for a simple purgatorial form of penalty.

The types of men more noble in reason benefit most from a short confinement in a purgatorial state. Alonzo, Sebastian, and Ferdinand lose their humanity and human faculties for a short time but regain them after awakening and repenting. Of those men Prospero says:

> Their understanding
> Begins to swell, and the approaching tide
> Will shortly fill the reasonable shore,
> That now lies foul and muddy.[78]

The wisest men, such as Prospero, learn without committing crimes or doing evil and without the aid of educative justice.

This is the essence of the Renaissance concept of justice which Shakespeare developed throughout the course of his writing. Men must be educated, so that their ability to control the good and evil forces inside of them will be increased. The ideal Renaissance man is

---

[78] The Tempest, Act V, Scene 1, lines 79-82.

the model of a controlled existence. In this sense, justice must serve a rehabilitative purpose rather than a vengeful and destructive one. God once judged Satan as being the absolute of evil and banished him forever from heaven. Men cannot judge other men using such absolutes of virtue and vice, as Shakespeare points out in the actions of Angelo in Measure for Measure. All men are in some way imperfect, flawed. Any justice which one man may render to another man must be decided upon on the basis of and in the light of the imperfections of both the judged and the judge. Shakespeare's new God is forgiving; Shakespeare's new man is tolerant, kind, and knowing; Shakespeare's new justice is merciful.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARTICLES

Barber, Charles. "Prince Hal, Henry V, and the Tudor Monarchy." The Morality of Act., Ed. by W. D. Jefferson. London: Routledge and K. Paul, 1968.

Barish, Jonas A. "The turning away of Prince Hal." Shakespeare Studies, I (1965), 9-17.

Berger, Harry, Jr. "Miraculous Harp: A Reading of Shakespeare's Tempest." Shakespeare Studies, V (1969), 253-283.

Berman, Ronald. "Shakespeare and the Law." Shakespeare Quarterly, Spring (1967), 141-150.

Berman, Ronald. "The Nature of Guilt in the Henry IV Plays," Shakespeare Studies, I (1965), 18-28.

Birjie-Patil, J. "Marriage Contracts in Measure for Measure." Shakespeare Studies, V (1969), 106-111.

Bronstein, Herbert. "Shakespeare, the Jews, and The Merchant of Venice." Shakespeare Quarterly, 20, 3-10.

Cogbill, Neville. "Comic form in Measure for Measure." Shakespeare Survey, VII (1955), 19-27.

Coursen, Herbert R., Jr. "Prospero and the Drama of the Soul." Shakespeare Studies, IV (1968), 316-333.

Dando, John A. "The Mind of Shakespeare." The Trinity College Library Gazette, III (1966), 17-22.

Dickenson, J. W. "Renaissance Equity in Measure for Measure." Shakespeare Quarterly, Summer (1962), 278-298.

Dunkel, Wilbur. "Law and Equity in Measure for Measure." Shakespeare Quarterly, Summer (1962), 275-286.

Elmer, Dean. "The Tempest: Rebellion and the Ideal State." Shakespeare Quarterly, Spring (1965), 161-174.

Elton, W. R. "Shakespeare's Ulysses and the Problem of Value." Shakespeare Studies, II (1966), 95-111.

Felheim, Marvin. "The Merchant of Venice." Shakespeare Studies, IV (1968), 94-108.

Fraser, John. "The Tempest Revisited." The Critical Review, 11 (1968), 60-78.

French, A. L. "Henry VI and the Ghost of Richard II." English Studies, xxxvii - xLiii.

French, A. L. "The World of Richard III." Shakespeare Studies, IV (1968), 25-39.

Godshalk, W. L. "Measure for Measure: Freedom and Restraint. Shakespeare Studies, VI (1970), 137-150.

Graham, Cary B. "Standards of Value in the Merchant of Venice." Shakespeare Quarterly, April (1953), 142-152.

Hassel, R. Chris, Jr. "Antonio and the Ironic Festivity of the Merchant of Venice." Shakespeare Studies, VI (1970), 67-74.

Holaday, Allan. "Antonio and the Allegory of Salvation." Shakespeare Studies, 4, 109-118.

Jenkins, Harold. "Shakespeare's History Plays" 1900-1951." Shakespeare Survey, VI (1953), 1-15.

Jenkins, Harold. "The Tragedy of Revenge in Shakespeare and Webster." Shakespeare Survey, XIV (1961), 45-55.

Kernan, Alvin. "The Henriad: Shakespeare's Major History Plays." Yale Review, 59, 3-32.

Knowles, Richard. "Unquiet and the Double Plot of 2 Henry IV." Shakespeare Studies, II (1966), 133-140.

LaBranche, Anthony. "If thou Wert Sensible of Courtesy: Private and Public virtue in Henry IV, Part One." Shakespeare Quarterly, Autumn (1966), 371-382.

Leech, Clifford. "The Meaning of Measure for Measure." Shakespeare Survey, III (1950), 66-73.

Leech, Clifford. "The Unity of 2 Henry IV." Shakespeare Survey, VI (1953), 16-24.

Lyons, Charles R. "Use in Measure for Measure." Eilogia Moderna (Madrid), 35-36, 173-184.

MacKay, Maxine. "The Merchant of Venice: A Reflection of the Early Conflict between Courts of Law and Courts of Equity." Shakespeare Quarterly, Autumn (1964), 371-376.

Mincoff, Marco. "Measure for Measure: A Question of Approach.: Shakespeare Studies, II (1966), 141-152.

Mowat, Barbara S. "Shakespeare's Last Plays: A Study of Late Shakespearean Dramaturgy.: Dissertation Abstract, 29, 4014S-4015A.

Newman, Franklin B. "The Rejection of Falstaff and the Rigorous Charity of the King." Shakespeare Studies, II (1966), 153-161.

Nuttall, A.D. "Measure for Measure: Quid Pro Qur." Shakespeare Studies, IV (1968), 231-251.

Ostergaard, V. "Kobnanden i Venezia." Kommenta, 1969, 107-123.

Petit, J.P. "This Wooden O': Theatre et Signedans des Cheurs de Henry V." Etudes Analyaises, 21 (1968), 286-292.

Phialis, P.G. "The Medieval in Richard II." Shakespeare Quarterly, Summer (1961), 305-310.

Phillips, J. E. "The Tempest and the Renaissance Idea of Man." Shakespeare Quarter, Spring (1964), 147-160.

Pope, Elizabeth M. "The Renaissance Background of Measure for Measure." Shakespeare Survey, VII (1949),

Schafer, Jurgen. "Falstaff's Voice." Notes and Queries, 16, 135-136.

Schanzer, Ernest. "The Marriage Contract of Measure for Measure." Shakespeare Survey, XIII (1960), 81-89.

Sisk, John P. "Bondage and Release in the Merchant of Venice." Shakespeare Quarterly, 20, 218-223.

Skulsky, Howard. "King Lear and the Meaning of Chaos." Shakespeare Survey, Winter (1966), 3-18.

Sjoberg, Elsa. "From Madcap Prince to King: the Evolution of Prince Hal." Shakespeare Quarterly, 20, 11-16.

Stadler, Verena. "Zwr uttopie des Gonzalo in Shakespeares Tempest." Shakespeare-Jahrbuck (Heidelberg), II (1968), 169-178.

Textand, Jean-Paul. "Catharsis Comique et Reconaissance Dramatique Dans La Tempete." Etudes Anglaises, 21 (1968), 113-124.

Tillyard, E.M.W. "Shakespeare's Historical Cycle: Organism or Compilation?" Studies in Phidogy, 51 (1954), 34-41.

Turner, Robert K., Jr. The New Aider Henry VI, Parts I, II, and III." Shakespeare Studies, III (1967), 167-172).

Williams, George W. "Some Notes on Shakespeare's Henry IV." Renaissance Papers, 1968, 49-53.

Zimbardo, R. A. "Form and Disorder in The Tempest." Shakespeare Quarterly, Winter (1963), 49-56.

BOOKS

Alden, Raymond Macdonald. Shakespeare. New York: Duffield, 1922.

Allen, William. A True, Sincere, and Modest Defense of English Catholics. Ed. by Robert M. Kingdom. New York: Cornell University Press, 1965.

Allman, June Stemer. Shakespeare's treatment of Kingship in the Lancastrian tetraology. Richmond: Privately published, 1968.

Barnet, Sylvan (ed.). The Complete Signet Classic Shakespeare. New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1972.

Barnet, Sylvan (ed.). The Merchant of Venice, A Collection of Critical Essays. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Bellesort, Andre. Le Plaisu du Theatre. Paris: Librairie Academique Perris, 1938.

Berman, Ronald. (ed.) Henry V, A Collection of Critical Essays.

Bigongiari, Dino (ed.). The Political Ideas of St. Thomas Aquinas. New York: Hafner Publishing Co., 1966.

Blackstone, Sir William. Commentaries on the Laws of England. Dublin: L. White, William Jones, and John Rice, 1794.

Boas, Frederick S. Shakespeare and his Predecessors. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905.

Bradbrook, Murial Clara. Elizabethan Stage Conditions. London: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Bradley, A. C. Shakespearean Tragedy. Greenwich: Fawcett Publications, Inc., 1968.

Brink, Bernhard Seigidius Konrad ten. Five Lectures on Shakespeare. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1895.

Brooke, Charles Frederick Tucker. Essays on Shakespeare and Other Elizabethans. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948.

Bryant, J. A., Jr. Hippolyta's View, Some Christian Aspects of Shakespeare's Plays. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1961.

Burckhardt, Sigiord. Shakespearean Meanings. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.

Burgess, Anthony. Shakespeare. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970.

Bush, Geoffrey. Shakespeare and the Natural Condition. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.

Campbell, Lily Bess. Shakespeare's Histories: Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy. San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1968.

Cecil, William. The Execution of Justice in England. Ed. by Robert M. Kingdom. New York: Cornell University Press, 1965.

Chute, Marchette. Shakespeare of London. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, Inc., 1949.

Craig, Hardin. An Interpretation of Shakespeare. New York: Dryden Press, 1948.

Craig, Hardin. Freedom and Renaissance. Port Washington: Kennikat Press, 1969.

Craig, Hardin. The Enchanted Glass; The Elizabethan Mind in Literature. Oxford: B. Basil, 1966.

Curry, Walter Clyde. Shakespeare's Philosophical Patterns. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1937.

Dean, Leonard F. (ed.). Shakespeare, Modern Essays in Criticism. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Dorius, Raymond Joel. (ed.) Henry IV, part One: A Collection of Critical Essays. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Eastman, A. M. and Harrison, G. B. (eds.). Shakespeare's Critics from Johnson to Auden. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1964.

Frye, Northrup. A Natural Perspective. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.

Frye, Northrup. Fools of Time. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.

Frye, Roland Mushat. Shakespeare and Christian Doctrine. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Grebanier, Bernard. The Truth About Shylock. New York: Random House, 1962.

Giotius, Hugo. A Prolegomena to the Law of War and Peace. Ed. by Oskar Piest. Indianpolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1957.

Halliday, F. E. A Shakespeare Companion, 1564-1964. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1964.

Harbage, Alfred. Shakespeare's Audience. New York: Columbia University Press, 1964.

Heilman, Robert B. (ed.). An Anthology of British Drama Before Shakespeare. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1952.

Holdsworth, W. S. A History of English Law. London: Methuen and Company, Ltd., 1935.

James, D. G. The Dream of Prospero. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1967.

Jameson, Thomas. The Hidden Shakespeare. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1967.

Jenks, Edward. A Short History of English Law. Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1912.

Keeton, G. W. Shakespeare's Legal and Political Background. London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, 1967.

Knight, G. Wilson. Shakespeare and Religion. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967.

Knight, G. Wilson. The Crown of Life. London: Methuen, 1965.

Knights, Lionel Charles. The Histories of William Shakespeare. London: Longmans, Green, Ltd., 1962.

Kott, Jan. Shakespeare Our Contemporary. Garden City: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1966.

Lawrence, William Witherle. Shakespeare's Problem Comedies. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931.

Lucas, F. L. Tragedy. New York: Collier Books, 1965.

Machiavelli, Viccolo. The Prince. Trans. by A. Robert Caponigri. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1965.

Markels, Julian. The Pillar of the World. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1968.

Muir, Kenneth. Last Periods of Shakespeare. Racine, Ibsen, Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1961.

Neilson, Francis. Shakespeare's Tempest. Rindge: Richard R. Smith Publisher, Inc., 1956.

Newdigate, Bernard H. Michael Draton and His Circle. London: Compton Printing Works, 1961.

Nicoll, Allardyce and Josephine. (eds.). Hollinshed's Chronicle As Used in Shakespeare's Plays. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1860.

Noble, Richmond. Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1935.

Palmer, John. Political Characters of Shakespeare. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1948.

Phillips, O. Hood. First Book of English Law. London: Sweet and Co., Ltd., 1972.

Plimpton, George A. The Education of Shakespeare. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.

Quinn, Michael. (ed.). Shakespeare, Henry V, A Casebook. London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1969.

Rabkin, Norman. (ed.). Approaches to Shakespeare. New York: McGraw-Hill Brook Company, 1964.

Reed, Henry. Lectures on English History and Tragic Poetry, as Illustrated by Shakespeare. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Company, 1860.

Reese, M. M. The Cease of Majesty. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1961.

Ribner, Irving. (ed.). The Complete Plays of Christopher Marlowe. New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc., 1963.

Schucking, Levin L. Character Problems in Shakespeare's Plays. London: George G. Harrap and Co., Ltd., 1922.

Sewell, Arthur. Character and Society in Shakespeare. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951.

Sen Gupta, Subodh Chandra. Shakespeare's Historical Plays. London: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Smith, Hallett. (ed.). The Tempest, A Collection of Critical Essays. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1969.

Smith, Lacey Baldwin. The Horizon Book of the Elizabethan World. New York: American Heritage Publishing Company, Inc., 1969.

Spencer, Hazleton. (ed.). Elizabethan Plays. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1933.

Spivak, Bernard. Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958.

Spurgeon, Carolina. Shakespeare's Imagery. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Stoll, Elmer Edgar. Shakespeare Studies. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1960.

Thalev, Alwin. Shakespeare and Drama. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1941

The New English Bible, with the Apocrypha. London: Oxford University Press, 1970.

Thornbury, George Walter. Shakespeare's England. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1856.

Thorndike, Ashley Horace. The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakespeare. New York: A.M.S. Press, 1966.

Tillyard, E.M.W. The Elizabethan World Picture. New York: Random House, 1961.

Tillyard, E.M.W.The English Renaissance, Fact or Fiction? Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1952.

Tillyard, E. M.W. Shakespeare's History Plays. London: Chatto and Windus, 1964.

Tillyard, E.M.W. Shakespeare's Problem Plays. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1949.

Toole, William B. Shakespeare's Problem Plays. The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1966.

Tooney, J. Thomas. Shakespeare Identified. London: Cecil Palmer, 1920.

Traversi, Derek. An Approach to Shakespeare. Garden City: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1969.

Traversi, Derek. Shakespeare, from Richard II to Henry V. Los Angeles: Stanford University Press, 1957.

Van Doren, Mark. Shakespeare. Garden City: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1953.

Waithe, Eugene M. (ed.). Shakespeare, the Histories: A Collection of Critical Essays. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

Ward, Henry Snowdon. Shakespeare's town and Times. London: Dawbarn and Ward, Ltd., 1896.

Warner, Beverley E. English History in Shakespeare's Plays. New York: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1903.

Watson, Curtis Brown. Shakespeare and the Renaissance Concept of Honor. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960.

White, Howard B. Copp'd Hills Toward Heaven. The Hague: Martinus Nyhoff, 1970.

Wilson, H.S. On the Design of Shakespearean Tragedy. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968.

Wilson, John Dover. Life in Shakespeare's England. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1951.

Wilson, John Dover. The Fortunes of Falstaff. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1944.

Wine, M. L. (ed.). Drama of the English Renaissance. New York: Modern Library, 1969.

Young, David P. Henry IV, part two: A Collection of Critical Essays. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Vita

Robert Freeman Davidson was born in Hartford, Connecticut, in 1950 and attended private schools in the New England area. Having graduated from Trinity College in Hartford in 1971, he entered the University of Richmond.

A poet, photographer, and independent film producer, Mr. Davidson permanently resides at "Tulloch Vale," the estate of his parents Mr. and Mrs. Harley Davidson. He plans a career in teaching and film making.