"Masculine Margaret?": Margaret of Anjou's Gender Performance in Shakespeare's First

Charles Bell
University of Alabama

Although Margaret is not one of the most popular female characters in Shakespeare's canon, she is without a doubt one of the most interesting. In her 2015 book, *Women of Will: Following the Feminine in Shakespeare's Plays,* Tina Packer, an actor, director, and teacher of Shakespeare, relays the story of directing *The Third Part of King Henry VI* and telling the actress playing Margaret to castrate a male character on stage.[1] Indeed, Packer found Margaret's character so compelling that she "was the first woman in the canon [she] ever wanted to play."[2] Packer is not alone in realizing the appeal of Margaret. Scholar Charles Boyce describes her as "surely the greatest female part in Shakespeare."[3] Shakespeare's Margaret has earned this admiration due to her ferocious actions as she leads an army into battle and personally executes one of her political enemies. Despite these striking actions that many would call "masculine," Margaret manages to retain her femininity throughout the plays by performing both the masculine and feminine

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 17, 56-71
© Southern Utah University Press
ISSN: 1539-5758

genders depending on which would benefit her most at the time.

Scholarship concerning Margaret of Anjou today is not widely varied, as most scholars tend to concentrate on a perceived inversion of Margaret's gender roles. Of course, there is an older strain of criticism that seeks to determine Shakespeare's historical accuracy when portraying Henry VI's queen as demonstrated by the work of Patricia-Ann Lee.[4] At the same time, other scholars, like Roy E. Aycock, examine the character of Margaret in Richard III, asserting that she is the harbinger of doom.[5] These critics tend to compare her to figures like Nemesis from ancient literature. This older line of criticism still receives occasional attention as evidenced by M.L. Stapleton's article comparing Margaret with characters from Senecan tragedy;[6] however, most recent scholarship can be summed up in the words of Theresa Kemp: "Margaret is presented throughout the play as a vision of cursed and unnatural—even monstrous—masculinity."[7] Kemp's words echo the words of Angela Pitt, who argues that Margaret has developed from a feminine character in the earlier plays of the tetralogy into a monstrous, masculine character who defies all social conventions in *The Third Part of King Henry VI* and *Richard III*.[8] Phyllis Rackin, however, avoids using the word "masculinity," instead examining how Margaret oversteps the bounds of femininity.[9] Despite small differences in terminology, the vast amount of research recently published focuses on Margaret's lack of femininity and how that would have been perceived in Shakespeare's day. While Margaret's actions make her an excellent character to closely examine for gender criticism, the conclusion at which most scholars arrive paints far too simple a picture of Margaret and of the Early Modern conception of gender. A closer look at the text shows that although Margaret does perform masculine gender roles at times, she is not ultimately an overtly masculine character. Rather, Queen Margaret of Anjou is a vastly complex

character, who performs both the masculine and feminine genders in order to accomplish her goals.

Of course, scholars like Angela Pitt and Theresa Kemp are quite justified in their assertions that Margaret acts in a masculine manner. From the first scene of *The Third Part of King Henry VI,* Margaret acts in a distinctly unfeminine manner by openly berating and disobeying her husband. As Theresa Kemp demonstrates in her book *Women in the Age of Shakespeare,* Early Modern wives were expected to be silent and obedient to their husbands like a military lieutenant was to act towards his general.[10] However, Margaret acts in direct opposition to these social mandates the first time she enters the stage. After Henry promises to name York his heir, rather than his son Edward, Margaret speaks bold, rebellious words to her husband:

> Ah, wretched man! Would I had died a maid
> And never seen thee, never borne thee a son,
> Seeing thou hast proved so unnatural a father!
> (*3H6* 1.1.216-18)[11]

This acerbic exclamation does not portray Margaret as an obedient wife, who silently accepts her husband's word as law. Indeed, after hearing Henry's excuse that York and Warwick forced his hand, Margaret furthers her disobedience by giving Henry an ultimatum. Until Henry repeals the law that makes York heir to the throne, Margaret vows, "I here divorce myself / Both from thy table, Henry, and thy bed" (*3H6* 1.1.246-47). Both Margaret's acid tone and the ultimatum she gives to her husband place her in a position of rebellion. Rather than being the meek and mild wife, she takes command, usurping the place of the domestic general and dominating her weak husband in a manner unbecoming for a woman of the Early Modern era. Indeed, Margaret's mutiny against her husband and general even entices Henry's son to disobey him. When Henry asks Edward to stay with him, Edward replies, "When I return with victory from the field, / I'll see Your Grace. Till then, I'll follow her" (*3H6*

1.1.261-62). Margaret's disobedience and flagrant disregard for the gender hierarchy result in an entire inversion of the family dynamic where all members of the family are to obey the patriarch.

Margaret's outburst in this first scene could be attributed to a momentary feminine outburst of passion if she had not proceeded to take up the role of the military general as well. As Mary Beth Rose acknowledges in the prologue to her book *Gender and Heroism in Early Modern English Literature,* activities like adventure, rescue, conquest, and war were viewed as forms of masculine heroism.[12] She goes on to argue that heroism in the Early Modern era can also encompass a patient, enduring woman;[13] however, Margaret places herself in a category much closer to the male warrior than the dutiful wife. Just before Margaret leaves her husband's side, she formulates a plan, exclaiming, "The northern lords that have forsworn thy colors / Will follow mine, if once they see them spread" (*3H6* 1.1.251-52). Margaret makes good on her word, leading soldiers onto the field of battle. The reactions of York and his sons are telling as to their view of a woman's competency as a soldier. They laugh and mock Margaret's army even though they are outnumbered, as Richard (later Richard III) derisively states, "A woman's general. What should we fear?" (*3H6* 1.2.68) They all agree that victory shall be theirs, but Margaret is not acting like a normal woman. Rather, as one of the conquering male generals that littered Renaissance literature, she oversees the utter destruction of York's army, making her seem masculine.

Not content with merely winning the battle, Margaret feels the need to take revenge on those persons responsible for disinheriting her son, and the cruelty she displays in doing so highlights an absolute breach of female conduct. When York is captured, Margaret brutally murders him in a way that is "jarring" and "completely repulsive."[14] As York stands bound before her, Margaret begins to taunt him by explicitly pointing out that his son Rutland has already died.

She gives York a piece of cloth stained with Rutland's blood and exclaims,

> Look, York, I stained this napkin with the blood
> That valiant Clifford, with his rapier's point,
> Made issue from the bosom of the boy;
> And if thine eyes can water for his death,
> I give thee this to dry thy cheeks withal. (*3H6* 1.4.79-83)

The fact that Margaret, who has a son of her own, can stand before this man and bid him wipe his tears with a cloth soaked in the blood of his young, defenseless son is grotesque, and this grotesqueness can be explained by women's roles in the Early Modern era. As Kemp points out, in Shakespeare's time, "it was assumed that marriage would be the path taken by all women,"[15] and one of the primary purposes of marriage was legal procreation.[16] In fact, one of the primary genres of writing by women of the Early Modern era was books for their children, in which mothers provided "educational and life advice."[17] Therefore, since motherhood was such an important aspect of femininity in this period, one would expect Margaret to show some pity for the fallen child of York. However, she revels in Rutland's death, bringing to mind the same type of macabre image of violence against innocents that Henry V paints when he threatens to have the "naked infants spitted upon pikes" (*H5* 3.3.38) if the governor of Harfleur does not surrender. Margaret seems to be emulating the masculine warrior-king, not a soft, nurturing, mother.

While Margaret's husband, Henry, is not able to see that her behavior is unnatural, other men in the play are eager to point out Margaret's unnatural behavior. After Margaret taunts York with the bloody napkin, he lists her faults saying that she is without beauty, without virtue, and without self-control, all of which he claims women should have. Towards the end of his invective, York culminates his argument against her femininity:

> Oh, tiger's heart wrapped in a woman's hide!
> How couldst thou drain the lifeblood of the child,

> To bid the father wipe his eyes withal,
> And yet be seen to bear a woman's face?
> Women are soft, mild, pitiful, and flexible;
> Thou stern, obdurate, flinty, rough, remorseless.
> (*3H6* 1.4.137-42)

York attacks Margaret's femininity by questioning her maternal instinct—which has been traditionally viewed as a necessity for women in the Early Modern era.[18] Thus, when York tells her that she lacks the essential qualities mothers must possess, he is attempting to take away her very womanhood, turning her into a masculinized monster; moreover, York is not the only one to realize Margaret's cruel, vindictive streak. After seeing the Queen's cruel taunts, Northumberland, Margaret's own ally in this scene, says, "Had he been slaughterman to all my kin, / I should not for my life but weep with him" (*3H6* 1.4.169-70). Northumberland's response gives Margaret's actions a darker edge. While she stabs York, soaking her hands in her enemy's blood, Northumberland weeps for York's plight, which inverts the genders of the characters in the scene. The man weeps, while the woman soaks herself in the blood of her enemies, making Margaret appear more masculine and less maternal than the men with whom she fights.

Thus, with such damning evidence, it is quite easy to see why Theresa Kemp would say that Margaret is "a vision of cursed and unnatural—even monstrous—masculinity."[19] In only the first act of T*he Third Part of King Henry the Sixth,* Margaret takes on the role of a man, leading an army to victory and brutally taunting and executing her enemy. However, before coming to the conclusion that Shakespeare was depicting the dangers of a woman acting outside the constraints of her gender roles, one must consider the time in which this play was written. At the latest, Shakespeare wrote *The Third Part of Henry the Sixth* in 1592, during the height of Elizabeth's reign and a scant four years after the Spanish Armada crisis.[20] It is difficult to believe that a

neophyte playwright would risk offending his reigning monarch by portraying a powerful Queen of England in a negative light. Therefore, categorizing Margaret merely as a masculine character perhaps paints far too simple a picture of Margaret's character. As M.L. Stapleton says, "Hers [Margaret's] may well be the most multifaceted female role in Shakespeare."[21] Margaret's role is multifaceted because she is forced to negotiate her gender performance in order to act as she finds necessary.

Margaret begins to step out of the conventions of femininity by openly rebelling against her husband; however, Margaret's rebellion is staged to protect her feminine, familial relationships. She defies her husband due to the insecure position in which Henry places their entire family. Patricia-Ann Lee speculates of the historical person of Margaret: "With a husband who was strong and dominating, or at least one who was capable of effective rule, she might well have become a conventional wife and popular queen consort."[22] The same conjecture applies to Shakespeare's depiction of Margaret. She recognizes that when Henry proclaims York his adopted heir, her entire family is in mortal peril, and she acts accordingly. During her invective against her husband, Margaret emphasizes the fact that Henry has doomed his family:

> Thou hast undone thyself, thy son, and me,
> And given unto the house of York such head
> As thou shalt reign but by their sufferance.
> To entail him and his heirs unto the crown,
> What is it but to make thy sepulcher
> And creep into it far before thy time?
> (*3H6* 1.1.232-37)

While Henry's primary regret in naming York his heir is that he "unnaturally shall disinherit" (*3H6* 1.1.193) his son Edward, Margaret is able to see a much larger danger. She knows that York will not be satisfied to wait for Henry's natural death. Rather, York would gladly help Henry to an

early grave. She also knows that York's claim to the throne will be exponentially weakened if Edward were allowed to live. Therefore, her natural feminine response is to protect her family from that perceived danger, even if it means that she must disobey her husband.

Margaret's duty to protect her entire family, however, is dwarfed by her duty to protect her son, and her maternal tendencies prompt her to take up arms like a man in order to defend her son and his inheritance at all costs. Indeed, her maternal feelings are epitomized when she tells Henry how unnatural disinheriting his son is by using explicit language about her pregnancy and Edward's birth. She tells him that if he had "felt that pain which I did for him once, / Or nourished him as I did with my blood" (*3H6* 1.1.221-22), Henry would not disinherit his son. This explicitly gendered language, which gives the audience the mental picture of Edward's birth, displays the maternal sacrifice Margaret already made for Edward before the events of the play, and, as a loving mother, she is quite willing to make more. As Phyllis Rackin explains, motherhood in the Early Modern Era was sometimes equated to a "special vocation" due to its necessity and thankless nature.[23] Margaret of Anjou holds her "special vocation" so dear that she is willing to sacrifice her good name and outward, perceived femininity in order to protect her son Edward.

Although Margaret's detractors claim that she does not possess the softness and pity required of a woman, her reaction to the death of her son makes a convincing argument to the contrary. The scene of Edward's death, described by Stapleton as a type of *"pietá"* requires the actor playing Margaret to invoke a vast amount of pathos if the scene is to be at all believable.[24] As Margaret cradles the bloody, lifeless body of her son, she cries out her grief telling Edward, Gloucester, and Clarence that they are worse men by far than those who murdered Caesar because "He was a man; this, in respect, a child, / And men ne'er spend their fury on a child" (*3H6*

5.5.56-57). After decrying the men as villains, she then begs for them to kill her as well as she weeps over her son's lifeless corpse: "Dispatch me here! / Here sheath thy sword. I'll pardon thee my death" (*3H6* 5.5.69-70). Her invocation of pathos and weeping place her firmly on the feminine side of gender performance. In this scene, she performs as a woman affected by the ravages of war. Bereft of both her husband and her son, Margaret cannot function in the world without these familial relationships that define females of the Early Modern era.

Thus, the triumphant, competent Queen, having lost a husband and a son, also loses her vivacious nature and spends the rest of her days speaking words rather than performing against her gender in such a lively way as she once did. In *Richard III,* Margaret is no longer leading armies or killing those audacious enough to wish harm to her son. Rather, she is, as Kemp describes her, "a ghost haunting the castle as she curses Richard."[25] With the death of her son, Margaret loses both her security and her drive. Instead she focuses all of her wrath on Richard in the form of curses because he has slain her son. As she brings up her son's death she begs God to give her justice, exclaiming, "O God, that see'st it, do not suffer it! / As it is won with blood, lost be it so!" (*R3* 1.3.271-72). In *The Third Part of Henry VI,* one would expect Margaret to attempt to achieve justice by actively seeking Richard's life; however, Margaret is through performing as a man. Instead she begs for favors from God because she has lost one of the most defining features of her femininity—her motherhood. In fact, in the two scenes in which Margaret appears in *Richard III,* she explicitly refers to her son's murder thirteen times. Her obsession with her son's murder is evident in the fact that she speaks incessantly of it, and this fixation on the fruit of her womb dramatically changes her from the vivacious, active Queen to a common, cursing hag.

Interestingly enough, although Kemp and others point to Margaret's actions in *The Third Part of King Henry III*

when they attempt to point out her masculinity, Margaret performs a much more masculine role in *The First Part of King Henry VI* and *The Second Part of King Henry VI.* Indeed, her actions in the earlier plays may have troubled Early Modern audiences much more than her actions in the subsequent plays. Of course, in the earlier plays, her performance is much more subtle than personally executing York; however, the implications of her actions are more masculine than her most bloody moment.

As Theresa Kemp notes, Margaret's part in *The First Part of King Henry VI* is only to capture the imagination and heart of Suffolk so that he will woo her for King Henry.[26] However, Margaret already begins to show an unhealthy affection for the married Suffolk when she believes herself to be set-aside for Henry. Indeed, Suffolk is largely to blame as he continues asking her if she will send a "loving token to His Majesty" (*1H6* 5.3.181). Margaret's reply is at first modest and honorable, one becoming to an Early Modern maiden: "Yes, my good lord: a pure unspotted heart, / Never yet taint with love, I send the King" (*1H6* 5.3.182-83). At these words Suffolk kisses her, saying that he will also send that to the king. However, Margaret refuses, saying, "That for thyself. I will not presume / To send such peevish tokens to a king" (*1H6* 5.3.185-86). By giving the kiss to Suffolk rather than to Henry she is hovering close to the line of adultery, even though she is not fully in a position of power in this scene.

Margaret crosses that line fully in *The Second Part of King Henry VI.* There are many indications that Margaret and Suffolk are having an affair towards the beginning of the play. For example, when some petitioners mistake Suffolk for the Lord Protector, one complains about his neighbor taking his house, lands, and wife. Suffolk, alone in the company of Margaret, immediately responds, "Thy wife too? That's some wrong, indeed" (*2H6* 1.3.21). Small hints such as these lead up to the definitive scene in which the audience is certain

that Suffolk and Margaret are lovers. When Gloucester is murdered, Henry decides to take action:

> For, sure, my thoughts do hourly prophesy
> Mischance unto my state by Suffolk's means.
> And therefore, by His majesty I swear,
> Whose far unworthy deputy I am,
> He shall not breathe infection in this air
> But three days longer, on the pain of death.
> (*2H6* 3.2.283-88)

After Henry's bold proclamation of Suffolk's exile, the audience realizes that Henry's action has come too late. Suffolk and Margaret are left alone on the stage, and what unfolds is a love scene that could have come out of Romeo and Juliet. As they are forced to part, Margaret and Suffolk begin to speak freely. Suffolk boldly says to his king's wife,

> For where thou art, there is the world itself,
> With every several pleasure in the world,
> And where thou art not, desolation" (*2H6* 3.2.362-64).

After many impassioned speeches from the two of them, Suffolk finally departs, and Margaret tells him, "Take my heart with thee" (*2H6* 3.2.409). Margaret and her lover are parted, never to meet more.

Of course, scholars have noted the inappropriateness of Margaret and Suffolk's relationship. Phyllis Rackin describes Margaret as a "bloodthirsty adulteress,"[27] but she claims that her infidelity is not her primary transgression.[28] Rackin is referring to Margaret's disobedience and violence as the greater of her faults, but, to the Early Modern audience, that might not have been the case. As Katherine Henderson and Barbara McManus make extremely clear in their book *Half Humankind,* one of the most popular stereotypes of Early Modern Women was that of the seductress, "the image of woman as enticing, sexually insatiable, and deceitful in the service of her lust."[29] Indeed, Angela Pitt argues that Margaret is fulfilling that stereotype from the moment that she gives

her kiss to Suffolk rather than to Henry.[30] She seems to be hazarding her most precious chastity, the feminine ideal for women in the Early Modern Era,[31] in order to opportunistically gain power and prestige. Of course, this stereotype may apply extremely well in that one scene; however, there is a slight complication to the stereotype in the subsequent play. In *The Second Part of King Henry the VI,* Margaret comes from the position of power that the man usually held in these adulterous relationships, as she is Suffolk's Queen. Therefore, the power dynamic in the relationship is reversed. Margaret acts like a king with a consort, while Suffolk takes a more submissive role.

Indeed, the submissive role that Suffolk takes is rather shocking when rereading the scene in which they must part. Immediately after Henry declares Suffolk's exile, Margaret begins heaping curses upon her husband and Warwick. Suffolk tells her to stop and let him take his punishment in peace. Margaret perceives this as weakness and reprimands him saying, "Fie, coward woman and softhearted wretch! / Hast thou not spirit to curse thine enemies?" (*2H6* 3.2.307-8). Suffolk does not bristle at being called a woman by Margaret. On the contrary, he immediately obeys her and begins hurling bitter curses to his malefactors. In fact, he curses for twenty-nine lines until Margaret commands him to stop, which he does in the middle of his sentence. Indeed, Suffolk does not leave until Margaret commands him to do so, and when he does, he cries out in a manner that invokes *pathos* rather than displaying the strength, courage, and unmovable nature required of men:

> If I depart from thee, I cannot live,
> And in thy sight to die, what were it else
> But like a pleasant slumber in thy lap?
>
> * * *
>
> To die by thee were but to die in jest;
> From thee to die were torture more than death.

> Oh, let me stay, befall what may befall!
> (*2H6* 3.2.388-90, 400-2)

Suffolk's weakness and dependence upon Margaret may have been acceptable in an Early Modern woman, but certainly not in a man. Indeed, Margaret's response lacks the melodramatic tone of Suffolk's exclamation. She again commands him with strength and courage, "Away! Though parting be a fretful corrosive, / It is applièd to a deathful wound" (*2H6* 3.2.403-4). Margaret has taken the man's part, issuing commands and remaining pragmatic even in the face of a serious crisis. Suffolk, meanwhile lets his emotions control his actions and only acts in obedience to Margaret's imperatives—an obedience that was expected of Early Modern wives.[32]

Margaret's masculine performance does not end after she must part with Suffolk. On the contrary, her masculine behavior becomes even more pronounced after she becomes aware that Suffolk has died. After Suffolk was beheaded, an unnamed gentleman brings Suffolk's body and unattached head to Henry and Margaret. When the scene begins, Margaret is carrying Suffolk's head, grieving over him. However, Margaret once again displays a pragmatism that one would expect from a man. She tells herself,

> Oft have I heard that grief softens the mind
> And makes it fearful and degenerate.
> Think therefore on revenge and cease to weep.
> (2H6 4.4.1-3)

Rather than being ruled by her emotions, Margaret hardens her heart and begins to think about revenge. She actively pushes away the feminine action of crying and resolves herself into a bone-chilling plan for revenge. However, Margaret's masculine performance is intensified by the visual spectacle she presents while bearing Suffolk's head. Usually, in Shakespeare's plays when a head unattached to the trunk of the body appears on stage, it is a trophy of war. For example, after Macduff kills Macbeth, the stage directions

read *"Enter Macduff, with Macbeth's head"* (*Mac.* 5.8.53). Later in the very same play in which Margaret enters carrying Suffolk's head, Iden enters the scene bearing the head of Cade to Henry as a war trophy. Rather than grieving over Suffolk's lifeless body like Juliet grieves over Romeo's, Margaret holds his gory, trunkless head in her hands like a man displaying his war trophy and tells herself not to weep. She detests any type of weakness in herself, which would have struck the Early Modern audience as rather strange and masculine. Margaret is not performing the part of a grieving woman as she does over the body of her son, but the part of a vengeful man.

The Margaret of Anjou that Shakespeare presents is an astounding woman, and there is little doubt as to why scholars like Charles Boyce and Tina Packer treat her with such reverence. She is one of the only women in Shakespeare's canon able to actively shape the plot of a play without fooling those around her into thinking she is a man. Throughout the four plays in which she appears, she does not don a disguise. She rather uses her own person and vitality to achieve her goals. Despite her lack of disguise, however, she still performs masculine actions with reasonable success. Therefore, we are not left with the impression of a masculine Margaret. We have instead a wonderfully vivacious, intricate character who continually has to negotiate her gender due to her circumstances. This new reading of Margaret of Anjou's gender performance opens up the entire canon of Shakespeare to new interpretation. Rather than simply labeling characters "masculine" or "feminine," scholars can now revisit not only the scholarship surrounding female characters like Margaret of Anjou, Lady Macbeth, and Juliet, but also masculine characters like Romeo, Henry V, Hamlet, and Macbeth. Rather than generalizing these characters into masculine and feminine categories, one can now more comprehensively explore the complex gender performances these characters put forth in the plays.

Notes

1. Tina Packer, *Women of Will: Following the Feminine in Shakespeare's Plays* (New York: Knopf, 2015), 30.

2. Ibid., 23.

3. Charles Boyce, *Shakespeare A to Z: The Essential Reference to His Plays, His Poems, His Life and Times, and More* (Warwick: Roundtable Press, 1990), 399.

4. Patricia-Ann Lee, "Reflections of Power: Margaret of Anjou and the Dark Side of Queenship," *Renaissance Quarterly* 39, no. 2 (1986):183-217.

5. Roy E Aycock, "Dual Progression in *Richard III,*" S*outh Atlantic Bulletin* 38, no. 4 (1973): 70-78.

6. M. L. Stapleton, "'I of Old Contemptes Complayne': Margaret of Anjou and English Seneca," *Comparative Literature Studies* 43, no. 1 (2006): 100-33.

7. Theresa D. Kemp, *Women in the Age of Shakespeare* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2010), 101.

8. Angela Pitt, *Shakespeare's Women* (New York: Barnes & Noble Books, 1981), 150-52.

9. Phyllis Rackin, *Oxford Shakespeare Topics: Shakespeare and Women,* ed. Peter Holland and Stanley Wells (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 12, 49.

10. Kemp, *Women in the Age of Shakespeare,* 29, 42.

11. All references to Shakespeare's plays come from *The Complete Works of Shakespeare,* ed. David Bevington, 7th ed. (London, Pearson, 2014).

12. Mary Beth Rose, *Gender and Heroism in Early Modern English Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), xi.

13. Ibid., xii.

14. Stapleton, "'I of Old Contemptes Complayne,'" 113.

15. Kemp, *Women in the Age of Shakespeare*, 33.

16. Ibid., 40.

17. Ibid., 55.

18. Barbara Lewalski, "Writing Women and Reading the Renaissance," *Renaissance Quarterly* 44, no. 4 (1991): 792-821; Rackin, *Oxford Shakespeare Topics,* 8-10; Kemp, *Women in the Age of Shakespeare,* 37-40.

19. Kemp, *Women in the Age of Shakespeare,* 101.

20. David Bevington, "Canon, Dates, and Early Texts," in *The Complete Works of Shakespeare,* A-7.

21. Stapleton, "'I of Old Contemptes Complayne,'" 105.

22. Lee, "Reflections of Power," 187.
23. Rackin, *Oxford Shakespeare Topics,* 129.
24. Stapleton, "'I of Old Contemptes Complayne,'" 125.
25. Kemp, *Women in the Age of Shakespeare,* 102.
26. Ibid., 100.
27. Rackin, *Oxford Shakespeare Topics,* 49.
28. Ibid., 23.
29. Katherine Henderson and Barbara McManus, *Half Humankind: Contexts and Texts of the Controversy about Women in England, 1540-1640* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1985), 47.
30. Pitt, *Shakespeare's Women,* 153.
31. Henderson and McManus make the argument that chastity is the ideal for women in their book *Half Humankind,* 19.
32. Kemp, *Women in the Age of Shakespeare,* 55.