STUDIA UBB PHILOLOGIA, LXVII, 2, 2022, p. 169 - 189
(RECOMMENDED CITATION)
DOI:10.24193/subbphilo.2022.2.10

LIONS AND SHE-WOLVES: KINGSHIP, QUEENSHIP AND THE LEGITIMACY OF POWER IN SHAKESPEARE'S HISTORICAL PLAYS

DANA PERCEC[1], ANDREEA ŞERBAN[2]

Article history: Received 14 February 2022; Revised 4 May 2022; Accepted 5 May 2022; Available online 30 June 2022; Available print 30 June 2022.

ABSTRACT. ***Lions and She-Wolves: Kingship, Queenship and the Legitimacy of Power in Shakespeare's Historical Plays*****.** A recent collection of studies about Shakespeare and animals (Raber and Dugan 2021) cogently points out that the playwright's bestiary is so charged symbolically and metaphorically that these nonhuman creatures rarely speak for themselves. However, the benefit of (Shakespeare's) animal studies lies in the intersectional framework, specifically, for the purposes of this paper, the discussion about the structures of power and subjugation with the combined tools of gender studies and animal studies, as theorized a few decades ago by Adams and Donovan (1995). Starting from the shared scope of these areas of research, the present paper discusses

[1] **Dana PERCEC** is Professor of English literature at the West University of Timişoara, Romania. She teaches early modern literature, Victorian literature, literary translation. Her areas of interest include cultural history and gender studies. She is a PhD supervisor in English literature, Comparative literature. She is a member of several professional and scientific societies, including the Romanian Writers' Union and The European Society for the Study of English. She has published books about Shakespeare's theatre and about British culture and civilization, as well as chapters in collective volumes and articles in Scopus, Erih+, Ebsco indexed international journals. She has edited a collection about middle-brow literary genres (historical fiction, romance, fantasy, children's literature, crime fiction). She is a member in the editorial board of several WoS indexed journals (*British and American Studies*, *Brukenthalia*). Email: dana.percec@e-uvt.ro.

[2] **Andreea ŞERBAN** is Associate Professor of English literature at the West University of Timişoara, Romania. She teaches British culture and civilisation, as well as gender discourse and its translation. Her research interests cover Anglophone literatures, modern transmediations of William Shakespeare's works (manga in particular), gender and cultural studies. In addition to several books on Margaret Atwood's novels, Shakespeare's theatre, the cultural history of England/Britain and the rewritings of Little Red Riding Hood, her publications include book chapters in various thematic volumes and a series of articles in WoS, Scopus and Erih+ indexed academic journals. She is also a member of the Interdisciplinary Centre for Gender Studies at the university where she currently teaches and co-editor of *Gender Studies Journal*. Email: andreea.serban@e-uvt.ro.

gender relations and the stratification of power described in Shakespeare's historical plays by means of a quantitative and qualitative analysis of specific animal imagery. While the lion is a recurrent symbolic animal evoked in these plays with reference to kingship, bearing positive connotations of legitimate power, he is often contrasted with the wolf, symbolizing usurpation, misrule, lack of legitimate authority. The she-wolf, although mentioned only once, is evoked in order to suggest an equally stark contrast, between male (and native) kingship and female (and foreign) queenship. Drawing on Elizabeth Norton's (2009) and Helen Castor's (2011) use of this animal phrase to address the relevance of female sovereignty in medieval and early modern England, our paper discusses how the choice of animals and the number of occurrences in Shakespeare's Henriad reflects the early modern perceptions about (monstrous) female rule.

Keywords*: animal imagery, gender relations, historical plays, kingship, legitimacy, queenship, power, Shakespeare*

REZUMAT. ***Lei şi lupoaice: regalitate masculină, suveranitate feminină şi puterea legiuită în piesele istorice ale lui Shakespeare***. Într-un volum recent dedicat studiilor shakespeariene şi animalelor (Raber şi Dugan 2021) se arată că bestiarul dramaturgului englez este atât de încărcat, metaforic şi simbolic, încât fiinţele non-umane arareori vorbesc în nume propriu. Dar ceea ce aduc studiile despre animale în opera lui Shakespeare este abordarea intersecţională, în special, cu relevanţă pentru studiul de faţă, discutarea structurilor de putere şi subjugare cu metodele specifice studiilor de gen şi studiilor despre animale, aşa cum au fost acestea dezvoltate în ultimii ani de Adams şi Donovan (1995), de pildă. Inspirându-se din discursul comun al acestor discipline, lucrarea abordează relaţiile de gen şi stratificarea puterii din piesele istorice shakespeariene prin analiza cantitativă şi calitativă a unor imagini specifice legate de animale. Leul este animalul cel mai frecvent evocat în legătură cu regalitatea, cu conotaţii pozitive, de putere legitimă, aşezat adesea în contrast cu lupul, care semnifică uzurparea, lipsa ordinii şi a autorităţii legiuite. Lupoaica, deşi menţionată o singură dată, are menirea de a face un contrast la fel de izbitor, între regalitatea masculină (şi pământeană) şi suveranitatea feminină (şi venetică). Pornind de la sensul dat lupoaicei în cărţile lui Elizabeth Norton (2009) şi Helen Castor (2011) în legătură cu regalitatea feminină în Anglia medievală şi a modernităţii timpurii, lucrarea de faţă demonstrează cum, prin alegerea animalelor şi frecvenţa evocării lor, Henriada lui Shakespeare reflectă percepţia epocii faţă de conducerea feminină, percepută adesea ca fiind monstruoasă.

Cuvinte-cheie: *animale, legitimitate, piese istorice, putere, relaţii de gen, regalitate, Shakespeare, suveranitate feminină*

Cultural discourses in the Anthropocene

Prefacing a book about trees in literature and the arts, philosopher Santiago Zabala writes: "while science seeks to rescue us *from* emergencies by improving and preserving knowledge, the arts rescue us *into* emergencies, calling for our intervention" (in Concilio and Fargione 2021, xiii, emphasis in the original). Silent emergencies, Zabala believes, are less successfully dealt with by science, which inexorably follows its path, while literatures and arts help us engage emotionally with these crises. Paradoxically, the humanities responsible for this soft intermediation have also been the promoters of the anthropocentric Weltanschauung now brought under scrutiny by posthumanist criticism.

Raber and Dugan (2021), in a book about animal studies in relation with Shakespeare's work, start from the observation that the status of the human and its centrality as well as superior position among the species is now regarded with concern and scepticism, while there is a growing preoccupation for understanding nonhuman life as autonomous and valuable. Moreover, they argue that traditional Western perceptions of the world in binary terms are the direct causes of "our current ecological crises because they have been the fodder for violent shifts of power, exploitation, and industry." (Raber and Dugan 2021, 6) Posthumanism encourages a transition from anthropocentrism towards a more "entangled" worldview, in which the distinctions between the "upper" and the "lower" are blurred, moving beyond the boundaries of the species, and therefore, beyond speciesism.

Erica Fudge (2004) observes yet another paradox in the human perception of animals. Even if animals were at the heart of medieval and early modern practices and beliefs, the very lives of the whole *bestiarum* were occulted by anthropocentric hierarchies. Although they show sound knowledge about the material realities of animal life, fables, for example, are mere allegories, where animals don't "speak" for themselves. They are always there to comment on human conditions and mores, but they are never on focus as themselves. If this pre-modern world was teeming with animals, the actual knowledge about them has been lost in the meantime, strengthening, in exchange, human biases about nonhuman species and creating both the economic and the cultural contexts that justify one category's alleged superiority and right to exploit the other. Narratives with and about animals have illustrated both our willingness to identify with (some of) them, and our capacity to reject (most of) them as dangerous, uncontrollable, or repulsive.

In recent decades, humanistic scholarship has turned not only towards the investigation of "other" human categories deemed marginal or inferior in

traditional western cultural discourses, with paradigm-changing disciplines like postcolonialism, disability studies, critical race theory, queer studies, etc., but also towards blending the human and the nonhuman, in ecofeminism or animal studies. What they share is an awareness and willingness to invest these categories with more than mere allegorical value, with agency.

Of wolves and women

The intersection between gender and animal studies has been highlighted since the 1990s. One of the first books on this subject, *Animals and Women* (Adams and Donovan 1995, 10) explains the connection in these terms: "Historically, the ideological justification for women's alleged inferiority has been made by appropriating them to animals: from Aristotle on, women's bodies have been seen to intrude upon their rationality […] Until the twentieth century this 'animality' precluded women's being granted the rights of public citizenship." Adams and Donovan identify four responses that have been given, within the timespan of half a century, to this cultural reality. The first one was to deny any connection, in an attempt to bring women closer to "masculinity" and farther away from "animality", that is, to demonstrate that women must be "unlike" animals in order to obtain full emancipation. The second position, equally pernicious, is to insist that feminism (rather than women in general) has no connection with animals and animal issues. To complain that feminist attention to animal issues is detrimental to feminist concerns means to deny the premises on which the violent exploitation of human categories has been carried for so long. A third response is the recognition that the human-animal dualism, like the man-woman dualism, or the nature-culture one, is the very reason why the oppression (of other humans) and the exploitation (of both humans and nonhumans) have been justified and excused. This is a broader form of feminism, which recognizes that the abuse and subjugation of women as well as of natural forms go hand in hand, that sexism is interconnected with speciesism. Fourthly, feminism emphasizes an ethical mission, intrinsic in women's traditions of care and respect, to be extended to the rights of nonhuman species.

Marti Kheel (in Adams and Donovan 1995, 85-124) makes a connection between the male exploitation of women's bodies and of wild animals' bodies in terms of how the hunting discourse, borrowed by traditional wildlife documentaries, for example, distorts our view of the natural world, shifting the focus from balance and symbiosis to sheer physical violence and predation. Such a discourse capitalizes on the ideology of male supremacy, emphasizes the nature-culture distinction, and further justifies human hunting practices, up to the extinction of many species. Taking her cue from here, Diane Antonio (in

Adams and Donovan 1995, 213-230) writes a plea for the rehabilitation and rescue from imminent extinction of *Canis lupus*, the wolf, one of the most abhorred animals according to western cultural and religious assumptions or economic practices.

Antonio points out there is a series of connections, to be observed with the specific tools of biology and ethnography, between women and wolves. She argues that there is no coincidence in the fact that the persecution of witches occurred at the same time and in the same places where the Church and secular authorities carried systematic campaigns to exterminate the wolves. As the wolf is the very archetype of the beast in western narrative and imagology, its persecution is not surprising. Moreover, the negative overtones attached to the she-wolf are also obvious. Never mind that a *lupa* nursed the male founders of the very centre of western civilization, Rome. *Lupa* was, in Latin, the name given to a prostitute. Female promiscuousness is evoked in many narratives, highbrow or from folklore, about she-wolves and women. Also, *lupus* and *lucis* are almost homophonous, thus the suggestion of the "fall" from grace, light, and control of the former, like that of Lucifer, is inevitable.

But Antonio shows that the positive similarities between women and wolves and the best practice examples wolves can provide women with are quite numerous. Firstly, observing the life of a pack of wolves offers insightful information about gender equality, because she-wolves are not only equal to male wolves, but, in the case of young females, their alpha status usually goes unchallenged. They are faster, better skilled hunters and have superior survival skills, which the whole pack needs and appreciates. For Antonio (1995, 216), the visceral human urge to destroy the wolf is in fact justified by the "causal relation between men's cultural and philosophical concepts about women as incarnations of evil and the violent treatment of wolves, which has pushed them even to the brink of extinction." This all goes down, Antonio concludes, to the "Disney Dilemma", which obscures a fact – the wolf's part played in preserving an ecological balance – in favour of a myth – "our cultural bias for the relative aesthetic value of the nonpredator species that wolves feed on" (Antonio 1995, 219).

For Clarissa Pinkola Estes (2006, 15), as the wild places on our planet disappear as our understanding for our own deep wild nature dwindles, profound femininity can be recovered only with the help of serious "psychoarchaeological work". She too observes that the wolves' history bears remarkable similarities with women's history in terms of courage and suffering. Healthy wolves, like healthy women, she continues, are alike: a playful spirit, very fine perception, and an extraordinary capacity for self-sacrifice. They are sociable by nature, curious and very resilient. They show great attachment to their pack and family, to their cubs and children. However, both "species" have been hunted down,

especially in Europe, but also in the Middle East, India, and North America, persecuted, considered inferior, labelled as rapacious, cunning, and vile. The aggressiveness with which both have been treated stems from the same refusal to understand, accept and tolerate. The wolf's "savagery", like the woman's, is not understood in its original sense, as natural, but pejoratively, as lacking control and reason. Literature and the folklore have not helped because, again, for women and wolves, successive cultural strata have dislodged the original centre of the tale. Estes gives the obvious example of the Grimm Brothers' fairy tales, which are "purified" of their original, often pre-Christian messages. This is why, Estes points out, the old healer turns into the bad witch and the benevolent beasts become demons, familiars, evil spirits.

A she-wolf worse than many wolves

The figure of the she-wolf in connection with medieval and early modern English queens has been revived in recent years by two historical accounts of the lives and actions of Matilda, Isabella of France, Margaret of Anjou, and others. Elizabeth Norton (2009, 8) gathers several Anglo-Saxon and medieval English queens under the label of she-wolves, remarking that chroniclers presented the monarchs' consorts in simplistic oppositions: saintly vs. notorious. But, from what we know, at least some of those accused of greed, adultery, treason, or murder might have been innocent. The uncertainty about the verdict stems from the fact that such early chronicles were less concerned with truth and more with "the subject of female power" in a time when these terms were mutually exclusive. Some of the women, instead of being wicked, were simply "unsuitable" (like Catherine Howard) or "sorely tried" (like Isabella of France). Looking at consorts from the eighth to the fifteenth century, Norton distinguishes between traditional "good" queenship, suitable to the Anglo-Saxon, pre-conquest period and the early modern times, on the one hand, and the post-conquest medieval regencies. This distinction is justified, in her view, by the geopolitical status of England and the role played by the king in a country with or without overseas territories. While Anglo-Saxon monarchs and early modern monarchs had an exclusively local mission, the medieval English kings, with vast territories across the Channel, needed replacements and lieutenants. In short, the more domestic English kingship was, the more passive the role of English queenship was expected to be. Therefore, Anglo-Saxon and early modern kingship requested consorts whose mission was linked only to fertility and intercession. Post-conquest, medieval geopolitical circumstances allowed more agency in the queens, who were expected to rule in the king's interests during his absence, but without ambitions of their own.

Helen Castor (2011) resumes the label of she-wolves for the queens who were not supposed to rule in their own right, as this right belonged to their fathers, husbands, or sons. She reminds us that medieval and early modern patriarchy was wary of women who exercised power. In the historian's opinion, while these women were vilified by contemporaries and followers, they also paved the way for those who would exercise power in the next centuries. Like Norton, Castor admits that contemporary chroniclers could and would not be concerned with women's experiences, so, in the case of the first notorious queen, Matilda: "We know little about [her], but a lot about how she acted and reacted amid the dramatic events of a turbulent life, how she was seen by others, whether from the perspective of a battlefield or that of a monastic scriptorium." (2011, xiv) Therefore, we cannot reconstruct her portrait, only what emerges from "the collision between personal relations and public roles that made up the dynastic government of a hereditary monarchy." (2011, xv)

What Helen Castor writes about Matilda is equally true for later queens, who were remembered as wicked by posterity, with the significant contribution of chroniclers, playwrights, and poets. Isabella of France was held responsible, by Holinshed, for her husband's atrocious death, but it was Christopher Marlowe who called her an "unnatural" queen in his *Edward II* (1594, published posthumously), an image that was later amplified by Thomas Gray's poem *The Bard* (1757). The 18th-century poet evoked the French queen's image thus: "She-wolf of France, with unrelenting fangs,/That tear'st the bowels of thy mangled mate", referring literally to the gruesome circumstances, though not proven historically, of her husband's death by impaling, but also allegorically hinting at "unnatural" or, rather, un-woman-like cruelty.

The first attempts to rehabilitate Isabella date back to the 1930s, when historian Hilda Johnstone summarized the queen's afterlife under the sign of the she-wolf by observing that the reputation stuck as a result of a brief moment of revolt, even if it came after twenty years of being a good daughter, wife, and mother and before thirty years of being a devout Christian. "Surely we need not fix our whole and sole attention upon the grisly spectacle of the wolf tearing its prey." (1936, 208) Johnstone also noticed that, if Shakespeare was the first to use the image of the she-wolf in connection with a queen (Margaret of Anjou), the more obscure Thomas Gray was "luckier" because his she-wolf, Isabella, won posthumous popularity. Indeed, Bertolt Brecht used the phrase about the queen in *The Life of Edward II of England* (1924) and the French writer Maurice Druon (1818-2009) titled the fifth volume of his *The Accursed Kings*, saga of the Capetian dynasty, *The She-Wolf of France* (1959).

In Shakespeare's chronicle plays, the singular female "wolf" is opposed by the pack, those courtiers, usurpers, native and foreign enemies who undermine

the authority of the king. Both the solitary she-wolf and the numerous male wolves symbolize the deception and wickedness that, in turn, is opposed by the legitimate power they plot to destroy. Nicole Mennell (in Raber and Dugan 2021, 231-240) locates this authority in the figure of the first English heraldic animal, the lion. The king of the animals was regarded, during the Renaissance, as the creature which best harmonized contradictory features: force and majesty, determination and clemency, power and protectiveness. Lions could be brutal as well as gentle, when circumstances required. The most leonine of English lion kings, Henry V in Shakespeare's eponymous play, invites his army to be like the "tiger", a more aggressive and merciless feline, but only because the most drastic measures were expected from a leader on the battlefield. In contrast, Richard II is urged to imitate the king of beasts and "roar" rather than accept his defeat "mildly" (5.1.2365-66). His inability to adopt leonine behaviour, even if justified by the very fact that he is called to rule over beast-like men rather than humans ("A king of beasts, indeed – if aught but beasts/ I had been still a happy king of men", 5.1.2369-70), eventually costs him the throne. Only legitimate kings have the right to act like lions (and several legitimate kings fail to do so). When Julius Caesar, former supporter of the republic, wants to be crowned king of Rome, his leonine behaviour is not welcome: "He were no lion, were not Romans hinds." (1.3.534) In other words, it is easy to imagine oneself a legitimate ruler when the common people accept to be subjected by a tyrant.

Lions versus wolves

That in the Henriad Shakespeare explores not only the horrors of civil war but also what makes a good king has long been debated. It has also been made abundantly clear that, together with *Richard II* and *Richard III*, the Henriad provides antithetical royal types and leonine heroes in order to outline the profile of the perfect English king in the matter of Elizabeth I's succession. What is crucial for the purpose of our present study is that it is in the six Henry plays where the lion is especially contrasted with the wolf and where the highest number of occurrences is recorded: "lion" and its various plural or genitive forms are used 32 times, whereas "wolf/wolves" are mentioned 19 times[3]. Significantly, as already mentioned earlier, Shakespeare associates legitimate sovereignty with leonine attributes, while (unnatural) ambitions for power receive wolfish connotations.

Already in the 1940s, Tillyard remarked particularly in relation to *2 Henry VI* that King Henry VI, Humphrey of Gloucester and Richard of York are compared against an ideal of kingship that, relying on the Machiavellian

[3]All Shakespeare quotes are taken from the Shakespeare Concordance, available online: https://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/views/plays/plays.php (accessed February 10, 2022).

metaphors of the lion and the fox, blends the nobility of the lion, the cunning of the fox, as well as the unselfishness of the pelican. The Duke of York shows kingly qualities, being "an excellent diplomat", combining "the qualities of lion and fox", but he lacks "disinterestedness, the attribute of the pelican" (Tillyard 1944, 196). By contrast – Tillyard goes on to explain – Gloucester lacks the qualities of the fox even if he has those of the lion and the pelican, whereas Henry VI has only the characteristics of the pelican. What emerges from this comparison is that the three men's personalities combined would have made a perfect king. Following up on Tillyard's analysis, it is also important to note that in *3 Henry VI*, Edward IV is endowed with the fox's artful craftiness, as it emerges from his brother Richard's aside on their bloodless occupation of the city of York: "But when the fox hath once got in his nose,/ He'll soon find means to make the body follow." (4.7.2449-50) Considering this in addition to his proven military prowess, Edward IV – much like Duke Humphrey – blends the qualities of the fox and the lion, becoming the best available solution to the civil war at the end of the Henry plays.

Heraldic lions

A standard image of kingship, the lion receives other, even opposite, connotations in Shakespeare's Henriad, as we will show in the following sections. Throughout the six plays, several characters are associated with the lion's characteristics of strength, valour, fortitude and clemency, but somewhat surprisingly various other characters allude to the heraldic usage of the animal and, therefore, we will start our analysis with this aspect.

The lion is not only a standard symbol of kingship and absolute power, but it appears three times on the English royal arms, a heraldic animal going back to the reign of Henry II, who added his lion to William the Conqueror two-lion badge (cf. Mennell 2021, 232-233). Furthermore, in Machiavelli's (2008, 281) view of the Renaissance prince, leonine characteristics such as strength, bravery and the fear/respect the lion inspires in others, together with the cunning diplomacy of the fox, are essential characteristics for a successful ruler.

In *1 Henry IV*, Hotspur talks about the rebellion against the ruling king in hunting terms, focusing on the adrenalin rush and the (empty) honour it will bring him: "the blood more stirs/ To rouse a lion than to start a hare" (1.3.528-29). Later, in Act III, when he describes Glendower, Hotspur comments on the incomprehensible fables the Welsh warrior tells, from which the heraldic references – "a couching lion, or a ramping cat" (3.1.1698) – stand out. Representing a burlesque of the heraldic leonine positions couchant (lying), as opposed to rampant (rearing), these contrasting heraldic lion positions allude to the times of

peace and war respectively, although the danger posed by the rampant/warring lion is ridiculed by its transformation into a domesticated "ramping cat", which hints at Henry Bolingbroke's usurpation of Richard II.

In *1 Henry VI*, leonine Lord Talbot, one of England's finest military leaders in France, an older substitute for the lion king Henry V, encourages the English soldiers to fight for the preservation of the French territories by challenging their cowardice on the battlefield: "Hark, countrymen! either renew the fight,/ or tear the lions out of England's coat;/ Renounce your soil, give sheep in lions' stead" (1.5.612-14) What emerges from Lord Talbot's lines is that leonine bravery is an innate quality of Englishness; as a result, the cowardly gregarious behaviour of the deserting soldiers reflects badly on the entire England, who can therefore replace its heraldic animals with mindless sheep.

Royalty as lions

Given that the lion is a well-established early modern symbol of royal authority, all kings and princes are endowed with various leonine qualities. In *1 Henry IV*, King Henry refers to himself as a lion when commenting on Hotspur's hot-headedness, who "[t]urns head against the lion's armed jaws" (3.2.1926); the line suggests not only that the leonine, enthroned king is more than prepared to fight the rebellion but also that the rebel's action is unreasonable and brash.

In the same play, Falstaff makes four references to the lion, two of which appear in his extended comparison of the lion not harming the true prince (2.4.1256-60), a story which, in addition to touching on Prince Hal's dubious right to the throne, means to show Falstaff himself as a falsely courageous knight. Further on, in a discussion about courage and fear, Falstaff designates Hal as "the lion's whelp" (3.3.2156), whose only authority derives from being the offspring of the lion king, thus mocking the prince's authority as unconvincing. By contrast, real, de facto authority is embodied in the king: "The king is to be feared as the lion" (3.3.2158). Nonetheless, Hal's qualification as "the lion's whelp" also contains an allusion to the prince's (however weak) leonine lineage, which will be insisted upon in *Henry V*, as well as the promise of the mature, leonine roar of kingly sovereignty, which will eventually result in Henry's transformation not only into a good king but an ideal one, and in his ultimate public rejection of the knight.

In *2 Henry IV*, Falstaff – albeit mockingly – talks about Prince Hal as "the young lion [who] repents" (1.2.524) for having physically abused the Lord Chief Justice, a mistake the reformed King Henry V will later acknowledge as lawfully and rightfully punished. The phrase again emphasizes Hal's royal/leonine descent and his capacity to mature and learn from his mistakes, a skill that will serve him well when he becomes king.

In the same play, rebel leader Lord Hastings comments on King Henry IV's inability to repress the rebellion due to a lack of means to exercise punishment: "his power, like a fangless lion,/ May offer, but not hold." (4.1.2425-26) Although still a ruling king, Henry IV may seem threatening but is actually "fangless", i.e. he would not be able to carry through the military defeat of the rebels. In fact, the rebellion will be suppressed by a ruse of young Prince John of Lancaster, who artfully deceives the rebel leaders to dismiss their troops only to have them arrested immediately afterwards.

Royal associations with lions continue in *Henry V*, when Archbishop of Canterbury justifies Henry's claim to the French throne, recalling Edward the Black Prince and his victories in France, "[w]hiles his most mighty father on a hill/ Stood smiling to behold his lion's whelp/ Forage in blood of French nobility." (1.2.253-55) The lion's strength is highlighted here in terms of the leonine offspring's prowess and military achievements, which are proudly observed and sanctioned with an approving smile by the mighty King Edward III. In the same scene, the Duke of Exeter further supports Henry V's claim on France, arguing that his European peers expect him to continue in the same vein as his leonine ancestors: "Your brother kings and monarchs of the earth/ Do all expect that you should rouse yourself,/ As did the former lions of your blood." (1.2.267-69) Exeter's lines strengthen Henry's legitimacy to rule (which was subverted in *1 Henry IV* by Falstaff's story of the lion and the true prince). Moreover, according to Nicole Mennell (2021, 237), the verb "rouse" suggests that Henry need not rule "constantly in a leonine manner", but only bring "forth the beast within" when he has enemies to defeat.

Starting with the Henry VI plays, the kingly lion loses its connotations of strength and becomes "gentle", gradually turning into a lamb. As Mennell (2021, 236) aptly observes, "[i]n *2* and *3 Henry VI*, lion imagery highlights the king's limitations rather than his strengths." In this respect, it is noteworthy that in *3 Henry VI*, King Henry is the only one who sees himself as a lion, with a strong focus on the leonine king's attribute of clemency, while the other characters perceive him as a weak lamb in need of protection from surrounding power-hungry wolfish nobles. For example, when observing a son who has killed his father in battle, Henry VI deplores the situation of his subjects and the horrors of the civil war: "O piteous spectacle! O bloody times!/ Whiles lions war and battle for their dens,/ Poor harmless lambs abide their enmity." (2.5.1177-79) Although the imagery is meant to suggest that lion kings lead their forces in the protection of their dens/territories, what we actually infer is that, while Queen Margaret leads his fight for the throne, he is a "harmless lamb", joining his subjects in suffering. In a later scene, the king compares his reign to Edward IV's, and emphasizes various aspects (mildness, mercy, sympathy and low taxes) which he

thinks made him a good king whom his subjects love: "these graces challenge grace:/ And when the lion fawns upon the lamb,/ The lamb will never cease to follow him." (4.8.2570-72) Further playing on the lion-lamb imagery, these lines indicate that the king who focuses too much on pleasing others loses his leonine strength and respect, becoming an ineffectual ruler.

The only other character who compares Henry VI to a lion – albeit for the specific attribute of (over)clemency again – is the vindictive young Lord Clifford, who tries to show the king that too much leniency is damaging to his successful rule; instead, the king should show courage and aggression in the face of those who challenge his sovereignty: "My gracious liege, this too much lenity/ And harmful pity must be laid aside./ To whom do lions cast their gentle looks?/ Not to the beast that would usurp their den." (2.2.851-54)

At the end of the play, Edward IV refers to the deaths of Lancaster supporters Warwick and Montague as "two brave bears, …/ That in their chains fetter'd the kingly lion/ And made the forest tremble when they roar'd." (5.7.3105-107) Interestingly enough, the Yorkist monarch's lines highlight the bravery – however desperate it may be – and the physical strength of the bears but simultaneously render their limitations in the reference to chains; symbolic of the men's allegiances, the chains parallel the two warriors to baiting bears vulnerable to the attack of enemy dogs.[4] It is also significant that Edward mentions their chains as "fetter[ing] the kingly lion", hinting that their own limitations were reflected on the Lancaster King Henry VI as well.

Challengers and other lions

Challengers of the leonine, de facto king are also endowed with leonine qualities by the supporters of the rebellions. For instance, even before King

[4] In addition to such other animal fights as bull-baiting, monkey-baiting, or cockfighting, bear-baiting was a popular form of entertainment, consisting in a bear being chained to a post by its neck or a hind leg and several dogs attacking it. Scholars have noted the overlapping use of the early theatres as both playhouses and bear-baiting arenas (cf. Elspeth Graham in Raber and Dugan 2021, 186) and, as the Globe was situated very close to the bear garden in Southwark, it is no surprise that bear-baiting contributed the most to the plays in terms of imagery, particularly through the bear's defensive position on its hind legs, which reminded the audience of "human bipedalism", while also making "'humans' bestial in their blood-lust" (Raber 2018, 102). In this respect, Erica Fudge (qtd. in Raber 2018, 102-103) persuasively argues that, although such violence against bears was meant to show human superiority, it in fact blurred the boundaries between species, between civilization and wilderness. The comparison of a warrior to a chained bear thus endows the man with animalistic strength and aggression necessary for survival in dire circumstances. Furthermore, as bears were extinct in England, the ones used in the Southwark arenas were imported from the continent via the North Sea ports and featured in spectacles in towns and fairs on their way to London (cf. Ian MacInnes in Raber and Dugan 2021, 81), becoming an easy point of reference for the audience.

Henry IV associates himself with the lion in *1 Henry IV*, Mortimer praises Glendower's qualities as both man and statesman, among which he includes "valiant as a lion" (3.1.1712), emphasizing Glendower's courage in combat and his potential ability to rule.

In *2 Henry VI*, aiming to show that King Henry is a weak and ineffectual monarch, Queen Margaret confers leonine qualities to Humphrey of Gloucester, the Lord Protector: "But great men tremble when the lion roars;/ And Humphrey is no little man in England." (3.1.1296-97) The leonine characteristics are however undermined by the negative description of Duke Humphrey as "no little man", meant to challenge his royal lineage and power (as descendant of Edward III), which, in Queen Margaret's eyes, are a threat to Henry VI's own sovereignty. In her attempt to control her ineffectual kingly husband and the kingdom, the queen presents to the king, with Suffolk's help, an image of the Lord Protector as both "a fox" (Suffolk, 3.1.1332, 1537, 1541) and "a ravenous wolf" (Queen Margaret, 3.1.1356) that craves personal advancement and power. Suffolk's association of the Duke with the cunning fox is yet another nod to Machiavelli's metaphor of the fox not only with respect to the intended addressee but also in terms of the accusers' personalities, as Suffolk and the Queen themselves are revealed to be cunning foxes that plot to usurp legitimate kingship.

Interestingly enough, the first occurrence of a lion in *1 Henry IV* is found in Prince Hal's reply to Falstaff's comment that he feels "as melancholy as a gib cat, or a lugged bear" (1.2.180). Hal's line – "Or an old lion, or a lover's lute" (1.2.181) – continues the focus on the loss of energy and lack of danger that such animals may pose when in their prime, connecting the lion with the process of ageing and its negative consequences, including the (ridiculously) emotional songs of a lover. Old lions were on exhibit at the royal Tower menagerie in Shakespeare's times, so Falstaff's parallel with the forlorn expression of an ageing lion, dependent on others for bare necessities, must have been pathetically striking to Elizabethans (and even to us today), even if only a privileged few may have actually visited the menagerie (cf. Mennell 2021, 233, 234). Later in the play, Prince Hal continues to subtly ridicule Falstaff's declared instinctual leonine courage by turning it on its head, when he compares his Eastcheap friends to lions: "you are lions too, you/ ran away upon instinct" (2.4.1285-86).

In *Henry V*, the king's sentencing speech of the three traitors reaches a climax with the apostrophizing of Lord Scroop. Deeply betrayed by the nobleman whom he considered his friend (obvious in the use of the more intimate, second person singular pronouns "thee" and "thou"), Henry V describes the betrayal in terms of Scroop's much too easy yielding to the seduction of the demon of self-aggrandizement that walks the earth with "his lion gait" (2.2.758), tempting

men with promises of royal power. Also in *Henry V*, the French Duke of Orleans (who, among other things, serves as replacement for Hotspur's hot-headedness in *1 Henry IV*) compares the English and French monarchs to a flea and a lion respectively: "that's a/ valiant flea that dare eat his breakfast on the lip of a lion." (3.7.1773-74) Although the Duke's words do credit the English "flea" with valour for trying to steal – albeit insignificantly – from the lion's breakfast, they are meant to indicate the inferiority of the English king, to minimize the numbers of the English army and the effectiveness of the English attack against the grand, noble and blatantly leonine French army.

In addition to lions, other similarly ferocious beasts receive kingly attributes. It is crucial to note here that it is Henry V, the ideal monarch, "the epitome of the lion king" (Mennell 2021, 237), who urges the English soldiers at Harfleur to "imitate the action of the tiger" (3.1.1097), namely to move beyond leonine strength and courage and to adopt the aggression, violence and cruelty of the tiger. Nicole Mennell (237) concludes that, in order to win, "in combat the king must go beyond the nature of the noble lion and take on the cruelty of its vicious cousin the tiger." Although the emulation of the tiger's destructive force unleashes chaos initially, it also secures victory for the English. That Henry V is a good king-diplomat, who can balance the tiger's brute force with skilful diplomacy, emerges again in Act IV, when he allegorically answers the French envoy regarding his capture by alluding to a popular fable: "[t]he man that once did sell the lion's skin/ While the beast lived, was killed with hunting him." (4.3.2331-32) By replacing the fable's original bear with the lion, Henry elegantly alludes not only to his own royal status, but also to a general ruler's flexibility and attention to spoken promises which may cause his downfall.

In *1 Henry VI*, the English noblemen fight courageously like lions, even if Reignier's account of the event focuses on the animal's appetite and despair rather than on military prowess: "The other lords, like lions wanting food,/ Do rush upon us as their hungry prey." (1.2.220-21) Later on, before the siege of Rouen, Lord Talbot vows to conquer the city where "Great Coeur-de-lion's heart was buried" (3.2.1538). The reference to Richard the Lionheart nods back to the heraldic usage of the leonine beast and underlines once more the nobility and courage of both English warriors. In addition to Talbot, other English warriors are endowed with leonine attributes of courage and nobility in battle. For example, in Act IV of *1 Henry VI*, Talbot describes his young son's bravery in battle: "His bloody sword he brandish'd over me,/ And, like a hungry lion, did commence/ Rough deeds of rage and stern impatience" (4.7.2257-59). The lion's hunger is meant to suggest here not only the fighter's motivation but also his increased strength and prowess in combat. In *2 Henry VI*, Richard Plantagenet describes old Salisbury as "That winter lion, who in rage forgets/

Aged contusions and all brush of time" (5.3.3320-21). Similarly to hunger, leonine rage overcomes any impediment posed by age and turns its host into a powerful enemy. Moreover, in *3 Henry VI*, Richard III, Duke of Gloucester, refers to his father chasing old Clifford on the battlefield: "Methought he bore him in the thickest troop/ As doth a lion in a herd of neat." (2.1.639-40) The comparison between the old duke and the lion's strategy of attack is meant to indicate the warrior's prowess and valour in battle, as well as his determination to defeat his sworn enemy. At the end of the play, before his own imminent death, Warwick the Kingmaker sees himself as a tall proud cedar sheltering a lion that could represent either Edward IV or Henry VI since his allegiance shifted from the former to the latter: "Thus yields the cedar […]/ Under whose shade the ramping lion slept" (5.2.2733, 2735). What the imagery does is to actually construct Warwick visually superior to the rampant/ warring lion king who sleeps under his watch, thus making Warwick the most important person in the realm.

Like tigers or wolves, lions can also be vicious and destructive, causing chaos when they go on a rampage. In *3 Henry VI*, Edmond, Earl of Rutland, is overwhelmed by young Lord Clifford, whom he describes: "So looks the pent-up lion o'er the wretch/ That trembles under his devouring paws;/ An so he walks, insulting o'er his prey,/ And so he comes, to rend his limbs asunder." (1.3.389-92) Clifford's leonine characteristics are far from the nobility of the lion king and closer to the viciousness of the tiger; they emphasize here Clifford's obsession of avenging his father by murdering all his enemy's male children.

Wolves as dangerous, treacherous and rapacious enemies

By contrast to the lion as a symbol of legitimate sovereignty and bravery, the wolf stands for usurpation, misrule and chaos. Surprisingly enough, although *1 Henry IV* has the most mentions of "lion", it has no mentions of "wolf/wolves", most likely because any mention of the latter predator would have contributed to the challenging of King Henry IV's already debatable claim to the English throne. Contrastingly, the play that has the largest number of "wolves" is *3 Henry VI*, where the word appears seven times either in singular or plural form and always connoting threat to kingship and kingdom.

The first mentions of wolves as dangerous occur in *2 Henry IV* in the conversation between Lord Chief Justice and Falstaff, where the proverbial animals (dog and rat) are replaced with wild, more dangerous ones, i.e. wolf and fox. At the same time, the lines represent another nod to Machiavelli's metaphor of the fox as a crafty diplomat, a talent necessary to fight off lurking wolfish enemies:

> Lord Chief Justice: But since all is well, keep it so: wake not a sleeping wolf.
> Falstaff: To wake a wolf is as bad as smell a fox." (1.2.471-73)

In Falstaff's line both the wolf and the fox connote danger but of different kinds. Whereas the wolf poses a more evident physical threat, the fox suggests a subtler trap, harder to identify, but which can be equally hazardous.

In *2 Henry VI*, the overall atmosphere of rebellion and treachery is suggested by the very vivid imagery created by the Captain: "now loud-howling wolves arouse the jades/ That drag the tragic melancholy night" (4.1.2154-55). The noise intensity of the "loud-howling wolves" suggests that the enemies to the king and welfare of the country are not only nearby and closing in but they seek to frighten "the jades", bringing about chaos and tragedy for the entire country. The jades can be read here both literally and metaphorically: they are the knackered horses crazed by the danger of the battle and the precarious situation of their masters, as well as the monarch's noble but old worn-out supporters who, nevertheless, stand for English determination and pragmatism in the face of adversity.

The danger that wolfish enemies pose has also been briefly touched upon by Caroline Spurgeon in her work on Shakespearean imagery. Spurgeon was perhaps the first to note that Henry VI's "enemies or claimants to the crown" are likened to "wild beasts, ravening wolves, beating away the shepherd (Duke Humphrey) from the lamb so that they may devour it" (Spurgeon 2005, 229). To further illustrate her claim, for instance, in *2 Henry VI*, upon his arrest at Queen Margaret's orders, Duke Humphrey already prophesizes that the king will become the main bone of contention, as the nobles and the queen herself fight for authority: "Ah! thus King Henry throws away his crutch/ Before his legs be firm to bear his body./ Thus is the shepherd beaten by thy side,/ And wolves are gnarling who shall gnaw thee first." (3.1.1470-73)

In *3 Henry VI*, an angry Queen Margaret publicly scolds her husband for conceding the crown to Richard of York upon his death and for accepting the Duke of Exeter as protector: "The duke is made protector of the realm;/ And yet shalt thou be safe? such safety finds/ The trembling lamb environed with wolves." (1.1.257-59) By comparing the king to a "trembling lamb", Queen Margaret turns the meaning of safety on its head, casting the king as a weak – almost sacrificial – sovereign that can be easily manipulated by others. Later in the same play, upon his return to England and capture by the English, Henry VI casts himself as a shepherd who has abandoned his flock to the wolfish enemy, giving up the country's resources and his own life: "So flies the reckless shepherd from the wolf;/ So first the harmless sheep doth yield his fleece/ And next his throat unto the butcher's knife." (5.6.3002-04)

Unlike lions, whose appetite carries attributes of prowess and valour in battle, the hunger of wolves is connected to manipulative power and influence for self-aggrandizement. Thus, in *3 Henry VI*, Richard Plantagenet, Duke of

Gloucester, comments on Queen Margaret's victory in terms of his army running away like lambs from starving wolves: "And all my followers to the eager foe/ Turn back and fly, like ships before the wind/ Or lambs pursued by hunger-starved wolves." (1.4.438-40) Later on, similarly to Henry V's speech at Harfleur, Queen Margaret encourages the French soldiers to fight for the legitimate king and a right cause against the wolfish usurper Edward IV: "Henry, your sovereign,/ Is prisoner to the foe; his state usurp'd […]/ And yonder is the wolf that makes this spoil./ You fight in justice: then, in God's name, lords,/ Be valiant and give signal to the fight." (5.4.2883-84, 2887-89) It is somewhat cruelly ironic that the queen who was dubbed the "she-wolf of France" at the beginning of the play and whose authority is a mere substitute for the legitimate king's now calls Edward IV a wolf that contests her own claim to the English throne although allegedly on behalf of her husband.

It is particularly noteworthy that while the wolves are usually associated with internal enemies, i.e. English supporters of what each faction believes to be the rightful king, foreign enemies like the French, and especially the French Queen Margaret receive tiger-like attributes of violence, viciousness and destruction. Thus, the rapaciousness of wolves is even further developed with Richard Plantagenet's description of Queen Margaret as "She-wolf of France, but worse than wolves of France,/ Whose tongue more poisons than the adder's tooth!" (1.4.551-52) What makes the Queen stand out as an archenemy is not only her femaleness ("she-wolf") but also her foreign lineage and negative superiority as absolute evil force ("worse than wolves of France"). To strengthen this almost otherworldly evilness and show the subversion of the legitimate leonine authority and sovereignty, the duke's speech further confers negative, vicious, tiger-like characteristics to Queen Margaret: "O tiger's heart wrapt in a woman's hide!/ […] you are more inhuman, more inexorable,/ O, ten times more, than tigers of Hyrcania." (1.4.577, 595-96) Whereas in *Henry V*, the tiger was used by the king to connote a 'positive' application of the animal's viciousness in battle to secure victory, Gloucester's lines cast the Queen in a much worse light even than Lady Macbeth's invocation of the spirits of the night to endow her with masculine qualities. At the same time, at least to Shakespeare's contemporaries, the French Margaret's "tiger heart" must have struck a shockingly vivid opposition to the reigning Elizabeth I's famously strengthening her own legitimacy to the English throne by claiming to have the heart and stomach of not just any ordinary monarch but fit for a *king* of England.[5]

[5] Although scholars have debated the authenticity of Elizabeth I's speech at Tilbury (cf. Frye 1992, Green 1997), given that it only emerged in the early 17th century, Green (1997) clearly explains why it may be considered a genuine Elizabeth I oration. That the general population was aware of it is indicated by Thomas Deloney's ballad, *The Queenes visiting of the campe at Tilsburie with her*

By contrast to Lady Macbeth and Elizabeth I, Gloucester's lines completely dehumanize Queen Margaret, the "false Frenchwoman" (1.4.589-90), singled out not only through her foreign background but also because of her "unnatural" meddling in state politics. Unlike a leonine male monarch, the Queen is incapable of showing any sympathy – let alone clemency – in the treatment of her defeated enemies, gloating in the torture of Gloucester with a handkerchief soaked in his dead son's blood. Furthermore, Queen Margaret's loss of human(e) attributes cannot help but recall the dehumanization of another French noble woman, Princess Catherine of Valois, who at the end of *Henry V*, is metaphorically described through the dowry she brings to the eponymous English king: "you see them perspectively, the cities/ turn'd into a maid; for they all are girdled with/ maiden walls that war has never enter'd." (5.2.3303-05) The parallel between the courting/conquering of Princess Kate and the entering of walled-in cities creates an uncomfortable sexual imagery, turning the English military victory over France into a sexual one, where the male victor metaphorically forces himself on the effeminate loser. This imagery gives us an insight into the darker side of leonine Henry V, who is now associated with a rapacious – albeit restrained – appetite.

The insatiable appetite of enemy wolves is emphasized even earlier, when in *Henry V*, the Constable of France describes the English warriors in terms of ravenous hunger which then transforms into devilish, superhuman strength: "they will/ eat like wolves and fight like devils." (3.7.1778-79) Also, in *1 Henry VI*, Joan La Pucelle's father renounces what he judges to be an ungrateful daughter, saying: "I wish some ravenous wolf had eaten thee!" (5.4.2701)

Following up on the danger they traditionally connote, wolves can easily disguise their intentions and turn into traitors. For instance, in *2 Henry IV*, the king moralizes Prince Hal, drawing his attention particularly to the negative consequences for the entire country if young Harry does not reform and assume his royal responsibilities: "What wilt thou do when riot is thy care?/ O, thou wilt be a wilderness again./ Peopled with wolves, thy old inhabitants!" (4.5.3031-33) In this alternative scenario, the country turns into another Eastcheap, where the prince wastes his time, and which is peopled with selfish, unruly inhabitants.

In *1 Henry VI*, commenting on the English soldiers' momentary cowardice at the siege of Rouen, Lord Talbot continues his heraldic imagery of tearing the lions out of England's badge and casts the cowardly soldiers as worse than

entertainment there (1588), which includes the lines "my loving friends and countriemen" and "But if our enimies doe assaile you, / never let your stomackes faile you" (Norrie 2019, 184, n. 8). Moreover, Tudor propaganda made every effort to construct for the queen a convincing image as a politically legitimate, 'masculine' monarch, "descendent of the leonine King Henry VIII" (Mennell 2021, 233), and consequently capable of ruling England.

gregarious sheep escaping the attack of wolves: "Sheep run not half so treacherous from the wolf" (1.5.615). In *3 Henry VI*, Richard III chases Lord Clifford to avenge his brother's death: "I myself will hunt this wolf to death." (2.4.1100) The wolf here receives connotations not only of treason but also of lack of chivalric honour that would have compelled the winner to spare and negotiate the ransom of his noble prisoner.

Last but not least, disguised wolves are symbolic of undercover power-thirsty enemies, just as in *1 Henry VI*, the Duke of Gloucester identifies Winchester to be: "Thee I'll chase hence, thou wolf in sheep's array." (1.3.410) Disguise facilitates the schemer's proximity to the monarch and, subsequently, the manipulation and usurpation of the king's authority. Ironically enough, in the following play, *2 Henry VI*, Queen Margaret makes a very similar comment about Gloucester himself, presenting him as a fraud and potential usurper to the much too trusting king: "Is he a lamb? his skin is surely lent him,/ For he's inclined as is the ravenous wolf/ Who cannot steal a shape that means conceit?" (3.1.1355-57)

Conclusions

In this study we have tried to show that throughout the Henriad Shakespeare uses lions to designate especially good monarchs that successfully blend the leonine qualities of force and clemency. Such leonine characteristics as valour and prowess are also lent to other warriors who prove their worth in battle. On the other hand, wolf imagery is usually associated with danger and treachery that lurk among the English nobility and appear more obvious when the French are concerned. Among these foreign enemies, the French Queen Margaret of Anjou stands out as a female wolf, embodying cruelty and destruction, and subverting the legitimate sovereignty of her kingly husband.

Interestingly enough, tigers – as the physically bigger and crueller cousins of the lion – lie in-between, while their attributes are crucially influenced by the gender element. The tiger receives somewhat positive connotations when associated with the English soldiers' fortitude and military prowess on the French battlefields, making victory more graspable for the English. Nonetheless, the tiger is given negative connotations, especially when associated with foreign French enemies who challenge English male sovereignty. Here too, Queen Margaret stands out from among these foreign enemies by having a "tiger's heart", lacking humaneness. An important addition to these three symbolic animals is the fox, since – in Machiavellian vein – it is its craftiness and dissimulation that contribute to a ruler's success.

Perhaps the most obvious conclusion emerging from our analysis above is that these predatory animals testify yet again to Shakespeare's creativity while

also being mutable symbols of bravery, diplomacy and sovereignty, or of danger and treachery. Last but not least, as the posthumanist angle prompts us to see, our interest in Shakespeare's use of ample wild animal imagery for the benefit of his contemporaries lies not only in the metaphor, but also in the retrieval of a cultural and historical understanding of co-habitation. In this sense, given that in our contemporary world wolves are almost extinct in many countries and there are more statues of lions than actual lions, our wild animal inventory hopes to offer not only a symbolic interpretation, but also a moral compensation.

WORKS CITED

Adams, Carol J., and Josephine Donovan (eds.). 1995. *Animals and Women. Feminist Theoretical Explorations*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Brecht, Bertolt. (1924) 1966. *Edward II. A Chronicle Play*. Translated by Eric Bentley. New York: Grove Press.

Castor, Helen. 2011. *She-Wolves: The Women Who Ruled England Before Elizabeth*. New York, London: Harper Perennial.

Concilio, Carmen, and Daniela Fargione (eds.). 2021. *Trees in Literatures and the Arts. Humanarboreal Perspectives in the Anthropocene*. Lanham, Boulder, New York, London: Lexington Books.

Druon, Maurice. (1959) 2014. *The She-Wolf of France*. Translated by Humphrey Hare. New York: Harper Collins.

Frye, Susan. 1992. "The Myth of Elizabeth at Tilbury". *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 23, no. 1 (Spring): 95-114. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2542066.

Fudge, Erica (ed.) 2004. *Renaissance Beasts. Of Animals, Humans, and Other Wonderful Creatures*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Gray, Thomas. (1757) 2018. *The Bard*. Hard Press. Kindle e-book.

Green, Janet M. 1997. "'I My Self': Queen Elizabeth I's Oration at Tilbury Camp". *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 28, no. 2 (Summer): 421-445. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2543451.

Johnstone, Hilda. 1936. "Isabella, The She-Wolf of France." *History* 21, issue 83 (December): 208-218. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-229X.1936.tb00695.x.

Machiavelli, Niccolò. 2008. *The Prince*. Translation, Introduction and Notes by James B. Atkinson. Indianapolis/ Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Co.

Marlowe, Christopher, and Richard Rowland, ed. (1954) 1995. *The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe*, vol. III *Edward II*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Mennell, Nicole. 2021. "The Lion King: Shakespeare's Beastly Sovereigns." In *The Routledge Handbook of Shakespeare and Animals,* edited by Karen Raber and Holly Dugan, 231-241. London and New York: Routledge.

Norrie, Aidan. 2019. "King's Stomachs and Concrete Elephants: Gendering Elizabeth I through the Tilbury Speech", *Royal Studies Journal* 6, no. 2: 183-203. http://doi.org/10.21039/rsj.192.

Norton, Elizabeth. 2009. *She Wolves: The Notorious Queens of Medieval England*. Stroud: The History Press.

Pinkola Estes, Clarissa. 1996. *Women Who Run with the Wolves: Myths and Stories of the Wild Woman Archetype*. Ballantine Books.

Raber, Karen. 2018. *Shakespeare and Posthumanist Theory*. The Arden Shakespeare. London and New York: Bloomsbury.

Raber, Karen, and Holly Dugan (eds.). 2021. *The Routledge Handbook of Shakespeare and Animals*. London and New York: Routledge.

Shakespeare, William. (1590) 2022. *Henry VI, Part II*. OpenSourceShakespeare.org. https://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/views/plays/play_view.php?WorkID=henry6p2&Scope=entire&pleasewait=1&msg=pl (accessed February 10, 2022).

Shakespeare, William. (1590) 2022. *Henry VI, Part III*. OpenSourceShakespeare.org, accessed February 10, 2022, https://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/views/plays/play_view.php?WorkID=henry6p3&Scope=entire&pleasewait=1&msg=pl.

Shakespeare, William. (1591) 2022. *Henry VI, Part I*. OpenSourceShakespeare.org, accessed February 10, 2022, https://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/views/plays/play_view.php?WorkID=henry6p1&Scope=entire&pleasewait=1&msg=pl.

Shakespeare, William. (1595) 2022. *Richard II*. OpenSourceShakespeare.org, accessed February 10, 2022, https://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/views/plays/play_view.php?WorkID=richard2&Scope=entire&pleasewait=1&msg=pl.

Shakespeare, William. (1597) 2022. *Henry IV, Part I*. OpenSourceShakespeare.org, accessed February 10, 2022, https://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/views/plays/play_view.php?WorkID=henry4p1&Scope=entire&pleasewait=1&msg=pl.

Shakespeare, William. (1597) 2022. *Henry IV, Part II*. OpenSourceShakespeare.org, accessed February 10, 2022, https://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/views/plays/play_view.php?WorkID=henry4p2&Scope=entire&pleasewait=1&msg=pl.

Shakespeare, William. (1598) 2022. *Henry V*. OpenSourceShakespeare.org, accessed February 10, 2022, https://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/views/plays/play_view.php?WorkID=henry5&Scope=entire&pleasewait=1&msg=pl.

Shakespeare, William. (1599) 2022. *Julius Caesar*. OpenSourceShakespeare.org, accessed February 10, 2022, https://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/views/plays/play_view.php?WorkID=juliuscaesar&Scope=entire&pleasewait=1&msg=pl.

Spurgeon, Caroline. (1935) 2005. *Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tillyard, E.M.W. (1944) 1974. *Shakespeare's History Plays*. London: Chatto and Windus.