"I can no longer hold me patient!": Cursing and Female Memory in *Richard III*

Lauren Ottaviani
Independent Scholar

Responding to the murder of her two sons by Richard III, Elizabeth Woodville appeals in her grief to the disenfranchised Margaret of Anjou: "O thou well-skilled in curses, stay a while / And teach me how to curse mine enemies" (4.4.110-11). Tacitly acknowledging both her own losses and those of Margaret, Elizabeth's plea underlines the importance of cursing to Shakespeare's women throughout the play. This article will examine how women's curses—defined here as calls for another's misfortune—influence the historical narrative presented in *Richard III*. It will consider the extent to which cursing is presented as a female-coded language in the play and argue that women's curses follow a common structure emphasizing their relationships to the (male) heirs of social power. Each curse begins with a "catalogue of losses," then demands retribution for the causes of that loss. Taken together, the memories expressed in women's cursing offer an alternate narrative of the Wars of the Roses to the one presented by the Yorkists. By countering the male-dominated Yorkist narrative, they can also be read as working against women's erasure from the political narrative, as speeches remind the play's audiences of the very real loss brought about by Richard.

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 21, 94-107

ISSN: 1539-5758

In an analysis which reads the tetralogy as deeply misogynistic, Phyllis Rackin observes that the women of *Richard III* are rendered powerless except for their words.[1] Though she does acknowledge that the plays allow women a rhetorical space in which to present their own alternative narrative of the Wars of the Roses, she dedicates little space to this narrative, concluding that the play presents both female speech and female power as threatening. The threat of female influence at court is undeniable within the tetralogy; however, the importance of the alternative female narrative which emerges from the women in *Richard III* has been underestimated by critics. More recently, Kristin M. Smith has characterized the language of the women as "powerful, corrupt, and illegitimate," linking Margaret's curses to Joan of Arc's sorcery and citing them as a degenerative influence on an already corrupt court.[2] I read this association as unnecessarily reductive. While Joan's character bears an undeniable affiliation to witchcraft, actually calling on "ye familiar spirits, that are culled / Out of the powerful regions under the earth" (5.3.10), Margaret never speaks of witchcraft.[3] In fact, she even links her cursing to the divine: "Can curses pierce the clouds and enter heaven? / Why then, give way, dull clouds, to my quick curses" (1.3.192-93). Although Margaret does not suggest that curses emanate from heaven, her speech here works against any demonic associations. Instead, hoping for her words to be heard by "the heavens," she suggests that they carry the force of divine judgement. Though the subject of her curse, the young Edward, Prince of Wales, is innocent, his death would constitute a York loss equal to that which her son's death brought for the Lancastrians. This "eye for an eye" logic strengthens the biblical associations of her curse, emphasizing Margaret's dual status as both a bereaved mother and a leader of the conquered Lancastrian forces.

While all of the curses in *Richard III* come from women, the first tetralogy does contain a significant curse from a man in *3 Henry VI*. Because it helps to establish the gendered associations of cursing which stand throughout *Richard III*, I will study it briefly here. The curse comes from York after Margaret and Clifford have captured and humiliated him, and its timing is perhaps as crucial as its substance. By forcing York to surrender, Margaret enacts a drastic reversal of gender roles. Her capture of York puts him

in a position of powerlessness which mirrors her own in *Richard III*; this subjugated position prompts York to utilize the female-coded language of cursing. However, York's curse differs from the tetralogy's female curses in that it is preceded not by an account of his own experiences, but an extended slur of Margaret. Referring to her as "She-wolf of France," "Amazonian trull," and "tiger's heart wrapped in a woman's hide" (1.4.111,114,137-38), he finds fault with Margaret's cruelty as incompatible with her gender: "women are soft, mild, pitiful and flexible, / Thou stern, obdurate, flinty, rough, remorseless" (1.4.141-42). York's curse therefore responds more to Margaret's conduct than to his own loss, as he addresses her directly:

> Bids't thou me rage? Why, now thou hast thy wish:
> Wouldst have me weep? Why, now thou
> hast thy will: For raging wind blows up
> incessant showers, And when the rage
> allays, the rain begins.
> These tears are my sweet Rutland's
> obsequies: And every drop cries
> vengeance for his death,
> 'gainst thee, fell Clifford, and thee, false
> Frenchwoman. (1.4.143-49)

York's reference to both his tears and his "sweet Rutland" contribute to the pathetic appeal of the speech. However, even as he appropriates the female language of cursing, York uses nature imagery to distance himself from the emotion which drives his speech. Shakespeare's cursing women are not ashamed to cry. Lady Elizabeth actually uses tears as a measure of wrongs committed against her by Richard when she states that "I myself have many tears to wash / Hereafter-time for time past wronged by thee" (4.4.301-10), and Margaret's aforementioned "tears as salt as sea" (3.2.96) similarly seek to underline wrongs done to her by her husband. York instead makes his tears metaphorical, turning them into a storm before directing their force toward Margaret. King Lear also appeals to nature imagery when cursing:

> I am ashamed
> That thou hast power to shake my manhood thus,
> That these hot tears, that break from me perforce
> And should make thee—worst blasts and fogs upon thee!

> Untented woundings of a father's curse
> Pierce every sense about thee! (1.4.286-90)

Both the imagery and the context of York and Lear's speeches are remarkably similar. The men curse in response to being subordinated by women. In likening their tears to rain, they attempt to avoid the gendered associations of crying by associating it with elemental forces. Lear's speech connects his tears with feelings of emasculation; though York's speech is not so direct, his verbal efforts to transform his tears to rain reflect his fundamental discomfort with the pathetic appeals necessary for cursing. Paula S. Berggren notes: "In a society where men are ashamed to weep, to appear womanly can only be a humiliation, but in avoiding any semblance of the opposite sex, Shakespeare's men cut themselves off from an understanding of the fullest range of human experience."[4] Male appropriation of curse language thus demonstrates the extent to which it is viewed as a female form; men curse only when gender roles have been reversed and focus their rhetoric not on memorialization, but on the defamation of women in power.

When spoken by women, curses in Shakespeare follow a relatively consistent pattern. Aleida Assmann states that women "are the personification of obstinate memories of suffering and the desire for revenge." I wish to build on this concept and break down how women come to "personify" these memories through curse.[5] Women typically begin their curses by emphasizing their loss and emotional distress, then use this evidence to justify the wish for harm to their subject. For the purposes of this paper, I will refer to the verbal structure comprising both the relation of losses and the subsequent ill-wishing as the curse narrative, treating the curse as a rhetorical style rather than a single statement. Early in *Richard III*, Lady Anne delivers a curse which follows this basic pattern; her response to Henry VI's death strongly reflects the rhetoric Margaret uses in response to Edward's death in and makes the first contribution to the alternative historical narrative which emerges through women's speech. Phyllis Rackin observes the power of female speech in Shakespeare's history plays, stating of the female characters that "Shakespeare does give them a voice—a voice that challenges the logocentric, masculine historical world."[6] Anne's curse narrative does just this:

> Poor key-cold figure of a holy king,
> Pale ashes of the house of Lancaster,
> Thou bloodless remnant of that royal blood,
> Be it lawful that I invocate thy ghost
> To hear the lamentations of poor Anne,
> Wife to thy Edward, to thy slaughtered son
> Stabbed by the selfsame hands that made these holes. (1.2.5-11)

Consistent with the aforementioned structure, she begins her curse by enumerating her losses. Furthermore, she actually invokes an audience by calling forth Henry's ghost to listen to her curse, and she does so with the particular aim of making her memories heard. While no characters in the play are present to hear her narrative, her speech performs a critical memorializing function nonetheless; it reminds the play's audience of the Lancastrian narrative told in the three plays preceding *Richard III* and introduces the re-telling of that story as a distinctly feminine act. Anne also portrays herself as a central figure within that curse narrative. By emphasizing her relationship to Henry and Edward, she creates and legitimates a persona which is itself memorialized through its reflection on the dead Lancastrian king and prince. This persona first emerges when Anne refers to herself in the third person as "poor Anne." Unlike Bedford, who characterizes only Henry V in his speech opening *1 Henry VI*, Anne establishes her credibility as mourner by referring to herself as "wife to thy Edward." By asserting her place within the past of the Lancastrian house, Anne also shows herself in the line of cultural memory, demonstrating the power of cursing to form an alternate Lancastrian narrative and asserting her own place within it.

The juxtaposition of Anne's speech with Richard's opening monologue lends a great deal of insight into the way that male and female speech differs throughout the play; this builds on French's observation that the play examines gender by alternating between "masculine" and "feminine" scenes.[7] Aside from the obvious moral distance between the characters, two major characteristics distinguish Anne's female speech from Richard's more masculine one. The first is the way that the two figures reference time. Richard's speech is firmly grounded in the present and future. In fact, Richard speaks the first word of the play, and that word is *now*: his famous "Now is the winter of our discontent / Made glorious summer

by this sun of York" (1.1.1-2) opens with a trochee to emphasize the importance of the current moment. Even as Richard becomes more introspective, he maintains the present tense, referring to himself as "I that am curtailed of this fair proportion, / Cheated of feature by dissembling nature" (1.1.18-19). Richard does not hold that nature cheated him in the past; instead, he *is* cheated, and he characterizes his disfigurement not as a past action but as a present and constant state. The forward-looking speech finishes on the conditional, as Richard muses over the possible outcomes of his plots: "…And if King Edward be as true and just / As I am subtle, false, and treacherous / This day should Clarence closely be mewed up…" (1.2.10-11). Richard begins firmly rooted in the present, and the end of his speech speculates on the possible outcomes of his current plots.

Lady Anne's speech approaches time differently. She rarely refers to the present, instead employing a curse to link past action directly to future outcome. Her early lines emphasize what once was, as she recalls how her own husband was "stabbed by the selfsame hands that made these holes" (1.2.11) and, looking on the body of her father-in-law, imagines "those windows that let forth thy life" (1.2.12). Anne's imagery is intensely physical. By focusing the early part of her speech on the markers of death on Henry's body, Anne makes a rhetorical return to the time of the king's murder, associating his wounds with the absent corpse of her own husband. This past moment acts as the source of Anne's cursing within the second part of the speech. Once again drawing attention to stab wounds, she calls:

> Cursed be the hand that made these fatal holes,
> Cursed be the heart that had the heart to do it.
> …
> If ever he have child, abortive be it,
> Prodigious, and untimely brought to light,
> Whose ugly and unnatural aspect
> May fright the hopeful mother at the view.
> If ever he have wife, let her be made
> As miserable by the death of him
> As I am made by my poor lord and thee. (1.2.14-26)

Looking to the future from the moment of Henry's demise, Anne derives the force of her curse from verbally reconstructing both

Henry's and Edward's murders. Her repeated use of "be" constitutes a central tenet of curse language as utilized by the women of *Richard III*. Like Richard, Anne speculates on future events; however, where Richard schemes and manipulates to achieve his own ends, Anne here uses the force of her own grief to fuel her cursing. Maintaining her use of body imagery, she moves from the physical to the emotional, linking the "hand" to the "heart" which chose to undertake the murder. Kate E. Brown and Howard I. Kushner note that "Dividing hand from heart and heart from blood, Anne's curse enacts a verbal form of the dismemberment she seeks to return upon Richard."[8] By creating an image which links the intangible motive for murder with the physical act of it, these two lines perform on a miniature scale what Anne's speech does in the context of the play. They render the invisible visible, just as Anne's cursing makes her memory of the Lancastrian defeat available to the audience as an alternate narrative to the one presented by the Yorkists. By foregrounding her own pain, Anne's speech acts a powerful counter to Richard's charismatic but villainous rhetoric, which otherwise dominates the play.

Perhaps the most significant link between curse narrative and memorialization is when cursed characters recall the words spoken against them. The potential for this kind of representation is limited in Anne's case as she curses while alone; however, Anne actually memorializes her narrative by referring to her own curse later on in the play. This reflection comes after a significant change in Anne's status from Lancastrian to (albeit hesitant) Yorkist: Madonne M. Miner notes that the women of the play are "caught in a society that conceives of women strictly in relational terms (that is, as wives to husbands, mothers to children, queens to kings), and we see Anne struggle to reconcile her past status as a Lancastrian widow with her current one as a Yorkist queen."[9] This tension is visible as Anne defines herself in relation to the York princes in the Tower: "Their aunt I am in law, in love their mother" (4.1.19). However, she still recalls her Lancastrian past:

> When he that is my husband now
> Came to me as I followed Henry's corpse
> When scarce the blood was well wash'd from his hands
> Which issued from my other angel-husband
> And that dead saint which then I, weeping, followed,

> O, when, I say, I looked on Richard's face,
> This was my wish: "Be thou," quoth I, "accursed,
> For making me, so young, so old a widow!
> And, when thou wed'st, let sorrow haunt thy bed;
> And be thy wife—if any be so mad—
> As miserable by the life of thee
> As thou hast made me by my dear lord's death." (4.1.61-72)

Like Elizabeth of Gloucester, Anne cannot "forget herself," but she retains autonomy over her own memories. By giving up her status as a Lancastrian widow, she also surrenders her ability to present her past as narrative through cursing. However, she becomes a mirror for her own language, actually quoting herself within her speech: "And be thy wife—if any be so mad— / As miserable by the *life* of thee / As thou hast made me by my dear lord's death" (4.1.70-72, italics mine). Yet these are not the exact words Anne spoke previously. Her original curse ran as follows: "If ever he have wife, let her be made / As miserable by the *death* of him / As I am made by my poor lord and thee!" (1.2.24-26, italics mine). She even adapts the context under which she cursed; though she claims that she "looked on Richard's face," she actually addressed her words to Henry VI's corpse before Richard entered the scene. We here see Anne manipulating her own memories to better suit her current situation. Though the scene she describes bears no major differences to the one which played out on stage several acts earlier, her slight derivations are telling; by emphasizing punishment in life as opposed to death, Anne makes her curse pertain to her tortured union with Richard. Anne no longer curses, but by recalling her curse itself, she both alters and memorializes the narrative which she herself put forth. By re-presenting her own curse, Anne maintains some control over her place within the collective memory. She is both the curser and the cursed; by casting herself as the living embodiment of her own words, she fulfills her own predictions and brings them to the attention of the other characters in the scene.

While Anne does bring a crucial Lancastrian perspective to the play, Margaret ultimately becomes its foremost cursing woman. Margaret's very presence in *Richard III* marks a significant departure from Shakespeare's sources which John Jowett calls "both ahistorical and ghostly."[10] Historically, Margaret was exiled

after the Yorkist victory and died in France before Richard took power.[11] While Shakespeare does often depart from his sources, his choice to include her fundamentally alters the historical narrative presented in the play. Unlike Anne, who invokes an audience of the deceased whom she mourns, Margaret demands that her enemies become her audience. Though her presence at court is certainly ahistorical, it is her life, not her death, which haunts the court. Desperate to be heard, she speaks six asides before interacting with any of the Yorkists. These asides provide a Lancastrian commentary on a Yorkist version of events; for, just as Margaret enters the scene, Richard attempts to discredit Elizabeth, referencing his deeds against the Lancastrians as proof of his loyalty to the crown. Though the two characters do not interact, their dialogue coincides. Margaret states that "Thou slewest my husband Henry in the Tower, / And Edward, my poor son, at Tewkesbury" (1.3.119-20). In the next line, Richard presents his version of events: "I was a pack-horse in his great affairs, / A weeder-out of his proud adversaries… To royalize his blood, I spilt mine own" (1.3.122-23,125). Without Margaret's lines, Richard's would be the only voice relating these past events; her presence injects the scene with a real sense of pain and loss and shakes Richard's hold on the historical narrative.

Referring to himself as a "weeder-out," Richard in turn characterizes the Yorkist adversaries as weeds, a dehumanizing image countered by Margaret's characterization of Henry as "my husband" and Edward as "my poor son." While it is true that, on one level, Margaret's references to Henry and Edward as her husband and son are effective pathetic appeals, they also ensure that Margaret is at the center of the Lancastrian narrative she creates. Anne used a similar form of self-definition in her speech when she introduced herself to her imagined audience as "wife to thy Edward, to thy slaughtered son" (1.2.10). Both Margaret and Anne use cursing to voice their own memories, and the stories they tell are, crucially, from the female perspective.

Unlike Anne, however, Margaret does not content herself with an imagined audience to whom she can address her curses. While Anne's curses do memorialize both Henry and Edward for the play's audience, they serve a largely private, epitaph-like purpose; they allow her both to invoke her own memories of Henry and

Edward and to transfer the force of her grief toward the Yorkists who killed them (and their relations). Margaret's curse is a public one. In addition to bringing another Lancastrian perspective to the play, her speech functions as an act of self-memorialization numerous York characters refer to her words throughout the play in her absence. Assmann likens Margaret to a Greek chorus, stating that "She is an allegory of the accumulated burden of guilt, and her presence in the first and fourth acts shows clearly that the overwhelming force of these virulent memories can no longer be contained."[12] While Margaret certainly does memorialize the Lancastrian narrative, Assmann underplays Margaret's agency by characterizing her as an allegory. Margaret is successful in making the Yorkists remember her speech in large part because she insists on being heard ("I can no longer hold me patient"), calling for them to "hear me, you wrangling pirates, that fall out / In sharing that which you have pilled from me" (1.3.157-59). She even singles out particular members of the court to ensure their attention, addressing Richard with "O gentle villain, do not turn away" (1.3.163). Although they come to represent the larger Lancastrian experience across the four plays, Margaret's memories are distinctly her own, and she lays claim to them within her subsequent speech.

By making an association between her own memories of loss and her call for equivalent loss on the York side, Margaret ensures that the Yorkists will remember the narrative which precedes her curse. Her speech effectively binds the Lancastrian past with the York future:

> If not by war, by surfeit die your king
> As ours by murder to make him a king.
> Edward thy son, which now is Prince of
> Wales,
> For Edward my son, which was Prince of
> Wales,
> Die in his youth by untimely violence. (1.3.194-206)

Referring to Henry as "ours," Margaret embraces her role as spokesperson for the Lancastrian side. Her speech draws a direct comparison between her lost family members and the members of the York royal family, which is reinforced by the repetition of "king" and "Wales" at the ends of her lines. Brown and Kushner characterize the power of her words: "Erupting from the position

of the displaced, Margaret's maledictions are at once lamentational and prophetic, comprising a litany of past losses for which her words can 'make' future 'repetition'—can return on her usurpers—but cannot undo."[13] Margaret's own experiences are central to the rhetorical power of her curse. Establishing her loss as equal to the loss for which she calls, Margaret (like Anne) maintains her own presence in the Lancastrian history constructed within her speech. By identifying Edward as "my son," Margaret defines Edward through his relationship to her; her subsequent call for Edward's death comes to avenge not just Prince Edward, but, crucially, Margaret's son.

The power of Margaret's curses to memorialize the Lancastrian narrative is perhaps most evident when she is not on stage. Margaret's curses are initially met with dismissive comments from the Yorkists. Richard tells her to "Have done thy charm, thou hateful, withered hag" (1.3.212), and Hastings calls for her to "have done thy frantic curse, / Lest to thy harm thou move our patience" (1.3.247-48). However, almost every character she mentions in her Act I curse later makes direct reference to her words. John Jowett reflects on Margaret's predictive capacity: "Because she preserves the past and makes it actively meaningful during the course of the play, she in effect preserves the future."[14] Grey is the first character to recognize this capacity. Just before his execution, he states: "Now Margaret's curse is fall'n upon our heads, / For standing by when Richard stabbed her son" (3.3.13-14). Many other characters follow in Grey's footsteps. Hastings, Queen Elizabeth, and Buckingham all remark that Margaret's curses against them have been fulfilled. The play provides no concrete evidence on the retributive efficacy of Margaret's curses; however, Rivers's speech shows how they have been remembered by her York audience:

> Then cursed she Hastings, then cursed she Buckingham,
> Then cursed she Richard. O, remember, God,
> To hear her prayers for them as now for us;
> And for my sister and her princely sons,
> Be satisfied, dear God, with our true bloods
> Which, as thou knowest, unjustly must be spilt. (3.3.15-20)

Neither Grey nor Rivers tie Margaret's cursing to magic; instead, Rivers furthers Margaret's previous association between cursing and heaven. Furthermore, he actually likens Margaret's curse to a

prayer and calls directly for God to "hear her prayers for them as now for us" (3.4.17). This line is particularly telling, for it frames Margaret's speech as an appeal for justice to a higher power. The lords in the scene show that they have remembered both Margaret's account of her own loss and her wish for theirs, but Rivers hints at yet another layer of memorialization. Calling specifically for God to "remember" to act upon all of Margaret's curses, Rivers legitimizes Margaret's curse narrative by suggesting that her words have found divine favor. At least in Rivers's view, Margaret's memories become a driving force of the action; by speaking the memories of her loss, Margaret prompts the divine retribution which leads to her enemies' death. Ultimately, the play's support or rejection of divine support for Margaret's words is less significant than the lords' belief in that support. Remembering her words immediately before their executions, they attest to the effectiveness of Margaret's cursing in prompting her enemies to register her alternate narrative of both personal and Lancastrian loss.

While we see curse language function as an effective method for women to memorialize their experiences, a scene at the end of *Richard III* also lends us insight into the results of cursing for the women who speak those curses. The scene opens with Margaret, Queen Elizabeth, and the Duchess of York competing to prove who has felt the greatest sorrows, but it ends with a remarkable moment of unity between the Yorkist and Lancastrian queens. Observing that the women attain a "tragic dignity," Miner holds that "Margaret, Elizabeth, and the Duchess evidence a new humanity, a humanity apparent nowhere else in the play."[15] The three women unite through their suffering under Richard III: Margaret calls "Cancel his bond of life, dear God, I plead, / That I may live to say, 'The dog is dead'" (4.4.72-73), and Queen Elizabeth concurs with her wish, reflecting that "thou didst prophesy the time would come / That I should wish for thee to help me curse / That bottled spider, that foul bunch-backed toad" (4.4.74-76). Like the men who mention Margaret's curses, Elizabeth here emphasizes the truthfulness of Margaret's words. However, in voicing her desire to curse alongside Margaret, Elizabeth allies herself with the Lancastrian queen in a manner that would be impossible for the men she previously cursed. Responding to Elizabeth's request that she "teach me how to curse mine enemies" (4.4.111), Margaret

explains that her cursing comes through her fixation on her son's death: "Think that thy babes were fairer than they were, / And he that slew them fouler than he is. / Bett'ring thy loss makes the bad causer worse" (4.4.114-16). By tying her curse language to her emotional reaction to her son's death, Margaret characterizes cursing as a distinctly motherly act. The statement is perhaps Margaret's most introspective in the tetralogy. It is fitting that her final speech should reflect on the curse language which she developed alongside her entrance into the English court. Margaret makes her exit from England by teaching her knowledge of cursing to the women around her, solidifying the status of curse language not only as her own legacy but as a female mode of self-expression and memorialization.

Brought together by their joint suffering under Richard, these fallen queens are able to reclaim at least some level of agency by telling their stories of loss and willing them to be remembered through curses. Representing both the York and Lancastrian sides, their physical presence together onstage at the end of the play can be seen to prefigure the House of Tudor and the longstanding domestic unity which accompanied it. But it is their speech which works most powerfully as a counter to the erasure of women's suffering from the cultural memory. Their shared vow to curse is also a vow to remember, a counter to Aleida Assmann's caution that "as long as entry into the cultural memory is conditioned by heroism or canonization, women systematically disappear into cultural oblivion."[16] Though Richard's reign was the stuff of well-established lore in the English Renaissance, Margaret, Elizabeth, and the Duchess work against their own erasure in that history both through their individual curses and by their ultimate union onstage.

Notes

1. Phyllis Rackin, "Patriarchal History and Female Subversion," in *Stages of History*, ed. Phyllis Rackin (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), 148.

2. Kristin M. Smith, "Martial Maids and Murdering Mothers: Women, Witchcraft, and Motherly Transgression in *Henry VI* and *Richard III*," Shakespeare 3, no. 2 (2007): 153.

3. All quotations from this and other Shakespeare plays are from the following editions: *1 Henry VI*, ed. Michael Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003; *3 Henry VI*, ed. Randall Martin (Oxford: Oxford University Press,

2001); *Richard III*, ed. John Jowett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); *Titus Andronicus*, ed. Jonathan Bate (London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 1995).

4. Paula S. Berggren, "Female Sexuality as Power in Shakespeare's Plays," in *The Woman's Part*, ed. by Carolyn Ruth Swift Lenz et al. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1980), 21.

5. Aleida Assmann, "The Battle of Memories in Shakespeare's Histories," in *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization*, ed. Aleida Assmann (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 53-78, 59.

6. Rackin, "Patriarchal History," 148.

7. Marilyn French, "Power: The First Tetralogy," in *Shakespeare's Division of Experience*, ed. Marilyn French (Bury St. Edmunds: St. Edmundsbury Press, 1981), 68.

8. Kate E. Brown and Howard I. Kushner, "Eruptive Voices: Coprolalia, Malediction, and the Poetics of Cursing," *New Literary History*, 32.3 (Summer, 2001): 548.

9. Madonne M. Miner, "'Neither mother, wife, nor England's queen': The Roles of Women in Richard III," in *The Woman's Part*, ed. Carolyn Ruth Swift Lenz et al. (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1980), 41.

10. John Jowett, "Introduction," in *Richard III* by William Shakespeare, ed. John Jowett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 45.

11. Carole Levin, "Queen Margaret in Shakespeare and Chronicles: She-Wolf or Heroic Spirit," in *Scholars and Poets Talk about Queens*, ed. Carole Levin and Christine Stewart Nuñez (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 117.

12. Aleida Assmann, "The Battle of Memory in Shakespeare's Histories," in *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization*, ed. Aleida Assmann (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 60.

13. Brown and Kushner, "Eruptive Voices," 547.

14. Jowett, "Introduction," 45.

15. Miner, "'Neither mother, wife, nor England's queen,'" 47, 45.

16. Aleida Assmann, "The Secularization of Memory," in *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization*, ed. Aleida Assmann (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 52.