Locating Herself, Finding Her Voice:

Mapping the Queen's Story in Shakespeare's *Richard II*

Laura Higgins

Towards the end of *Richard II*, Richard commissions his Queen to tell his "lamentable tale" (5.1.44). Having exhorted him to remember his royal identity and tried to stand between her deposed husband and Bolingbroke's command that he be imprisoned in a north-eastern castle, the Queen accepts this task and she and Richard are forced to part: she towards France, and he towards Pomfret. It is "remarkably easy," as Barbara Hodgdon states, "to read *Richard II* selectively, through the King's part, and so to generate a sense of ending that tells this story and excludes all others."[1] However, the Queen has her own tale to tell: one which is also expressive of the personal and political tragedy at the heart of this history. Her words and silences punctuate the play, generating reflection on the action and dramatic argument and, ultimately, she disrupts the sense of ending suggested by Northumberland's recognition of Bolingbroke's "sacred state," the beheading of "traitors," and the presentation of Richard's coffin (5.6.6, 13-16, 30-33).[2] By taking on the role of disseminating the narrative that is her own story as well as Richard's, the Queen continues beyond the play as a figure representative of the legacies of the power shift and a spectral pointer to other possible versions of the apparently smooth regime change.

Interestingly, in a play which articulates characters' relations with place and in which name is deployed by various characters to confirm the relations between Christian name, title, status, and land—or their loss—the Queen is never referred to by name. This may be related to the fact that Richard II was first married to Anne of Bohemia and, after Anne's death, to Isabel of France, who was only six when she was betrothed to Richard and just nine years old when her husband was deposed. The absence of a given name for this female monarch, though, urges

a consideration of the Queen's, and our, perceptions of the status, identity, and responsibilities imposed by this title. Although she is often named Queen Isabel in production programs, I refer to her in this essay as the Queen.[3]

In reconsidering the Queen's story, I look particularly at the places she is associated with and her impact on these sites as the specific places in which she appears are not merely staging-posts in her story, but zones of symbolic significance where she actively participates in the mutable relations between place and identity. Shakespeare's history plays are also geography plays since the effects of negotiations around the crown and authority over land(s) have local, national, and international implications. The intertwining of histories and geographies is also implicit in individual character trajectories since all "narrated adventures," engender "geographies of actions" and figuring the Queen as actively mobile—emotionally, intellectually, and physically—challenges previous conceptions of her as passive or insignificant.[4] Moreover, as well as "tell[ing] stories and unfold[ing] histories," spaces "can be interrupted, appropriated, and transformed" and are therefore shaped by those who inhabit them while also acting as a shaping force.[5] My reassessment of the Queen, therefore, charts her journey from Gaunt's residence (2.1), through court (2.2) and garden (3.4), to street (5.1) and identifies significant junctures at which she interrupts, appropriates, and transforms the locations in which she appears. Her interactions with and within each of these sites result in new knowledge and an expansion of her rhetorical range which enable her to become not only witness to the maneuvers of monarchy but the judge of courtiers, commoners, and kings. Reflecting on these exchanges, opens up ambivalences in her character that invite both sympathy for her and judgment upon her words, actions, and motivations.

As Kavita Mudan Finn observes, "[i]t is something of a commonplace in criticism of [the histories] that they sideline women."[6] Based primarily on chronicle sources, the predominance of male characters is inevitable, as is the concomitant frequent figuring of "the

battlefield and the court," which "were typically regarded as the sites of masculine power and authority."[7] Jean E. Howard and Phyllis Rackin see in the shift from the first to the second tetralogy a movement away from the strong women who are "warriors, witches, or monstrous adulteresses"—such as Joan La Pucelle, Eleanor Cobham, and Margaret in the *Henry VI* plays—towards the "strategically peripheralized" women of the later history plays who "reside, literally, in the subplots of the narrative and in the borderlands of the plays' geographic economy."[8] Nina S. Levine offers a spatialized rationale for not focusing on the second-tetralogy women, stating that they "stand on the sidelines," while the women in the first tetralogy and *King John* "take center stage [. . .] refusing to play the 'woman's part' and, in the absence of a strong monarch, actively taking on the roles of men [. . . and] put[ting] up a fight, battling with wits and words if not with swords."[9]

Although *Richard II* stages no battles and, therefore, does not give any of its three women the opportunity to engage in military combat, they are marginalized through their connections with domestic spaces and their apparent prioritization of the personal over the political: perhaps because, although the Duchess of York penetrates the heart of government and successfully pleads for the life or her son, she returns home with her husband; and the Duchess of Gloucester, exhorted by Gaunt to complain "[t]o God, the widow's champion and defence" goes back to the "empty lodgings and unfurnished walls / Unpeopled offices, untrodden stones" of Pleshey (1.2.43, 68-69). Molly Smith has addressed these perceived deficiencies in relation to the Duchesses of York and Gloucester, arguing that "one mode of oppositional discourse is located unequivocally in the concerns of female characters in *Richard II*" and that to ignore the potency of their voices—which effect a "deterritorialization of the basic assumptions which informed court culture"—would be to "acquiesce in their marginalization and erasure."[10] Jeanie Grant Moore does reassert the Queen, constructing her as "a mirror of Richard" who becomes "a visual medium through which we gain a new view

of [. . . his] experience," and argues that Shakespeare "manages to valorize her point of view" so that "centricity is no longer privileged, but subversively usurped by the marginal," but "without actually demarginalizing" her.[11] Linda Bamber also sets the Queen on the margins, suggesting that she presides over "an alternative realm."[12]

Mapping the Queen's story brings her own experience into sharp perspective and shows that Shakespeare places her in a series of sites that her presence makes central to the play's exploration of the relations between monarch and kingdom. Her proactive listening to the dispute at Ely House nurtures her political awareness; at court, she passes judgement on the king's favourites by condemning their flattery; then on his subjects through her exchange with the Gardener, who, rather than "just standing for the common man [. . .] speaks as a chorus."[13] Finally, she judges both Richard and Bolingbroke in the street that links two of the play's most important geographies of power—Westminster Hall and the Tower of London—challenging her husband's fidelity to himself and his role and questioning Bolingbroke's legitimacy. Considering the role she plays in the identity of the places in which she appears, enriches the significances available through earlier historicist and symbolic analyses, and brings Richard's Queen rhetorically "into her own."[14]

From a sustained appraisal of her journey through the play, the Queen emerges as a dynamic figure of resistance to distractions, flattery, and broken vows, and sometimes to the truth of the circumstances that precipitate, and flow from, the crisis in the nation. The vibrancy of the character today is affirmed by attending not only to her words in Shakespeare's text, but to the views of actors who have given physical expression to her silences, utterances, and gestures, and whose insights—developed through the rehearsal process, performance, and post-production reflection—contribute to revealing the richness and complexity of the character.[15] I draw principally on four twenty-first-century productions: Michael Boyd, 2007, Royal Shakespeare Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon; Michael Grandage, Donmar Warehouse, London,

2011; Gregory Doran, 2013, Royal Shakespeare Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon; revived 2016; and Simon Godwin, Shakespeare's Globe Theatre, London, 2015.[16] None of these productions elected to evoke modern parallels through scenography but sought to express the ethos of the world of the medieval source narrative and the moment of composition and the respective tensions around sovereignty in both eras. The actors' voices, with the past- and present-mindedness required for their work on this historical-dramatic character, highlight the otherness of the world the Queen inhabits while also bringing a sense of the contemporary relatability of this royal woman facing the seismic shift that civil war brings.

Stephen Brimson Lewis (Doran) sought to create a world "of real three-dimensional depth" where audiences could believe the characters lived; this was achieved through lighting and projection onto chain and supported by Paul Englishby's musical mirroring of three sopranos and three trumpets placed high on either side of the stage.[17] For Englishby, these sonic counterpoints reflected the "duality of [Medieval] monarchy," which combined a "divine feeling" with "military [. . .] and very human aspects."[18]

Richard Kent (Grandage) added an olfactory element to his evocation of the text's ritual elements. When the audience entered, the air was filled with incense and Richard (Eddie Redmayne) was already seated on a throne modelled on Edward I's coronation chair, wearing the crown and holding the orb and sceptre. Redmayne sat alone bathed in "the amber glow of candlelight" against a backdrop of "golden" Gothic arches and a staircase, which joined the stage to a gallery with a balustrade carved with quarterfoils.[19] This "preamble" indicated to spectators "both the intense self-absorption and the strain imposed by being the Lord's anointed."[20] As well as creating this royal pressure chamber, Kent's scenography evoked connections with Westminster Abbey, an important site of celebration and commemoration in the authorization of Richard's kingship and the royal role of both his Queens.[21]

Paul Wills (Godwin) echoed this burnished mode by making the Globe's *frons scaenae* and pillars gold and extending the stage into the yard with a cruciform buildout that emphasized the religious sanctity of kingship. Godwin's extra-textual prologue staged the coronation of the ten-year-old Richard and his vows to rule justly and, as "[t]housands of tiny glittering gold squares cascade[d] from the heavens" to celebrate this new era, the mature Richard (Charles Edwards) substituted his younger self (Thomas Ashdown / Frederick Neilson), crossing with him on the path formed by the axis of the cross that joined the stage to the exit at the back of the standee space.[22]

Boyd's production was part of *The Histories*, in which the Royal Shakespeare Company (RSC) staged all eight of Shakespeare's English history plays over two years (2006 – 2008) and was distinctive in the interpretive potentials afforded by its use of spectral figures both in *Richard II* and across the entire cycle. The creation of an ensemble for the duration of the project ensured that an actor played the same character in all the plays, and also allowed for the reappearance of actors as characters that echoed or foreshadowed their previous or later roles.[23] This casting strategy was underpinned by Boyd's belief that Shakespeare's early history plays present a view more akin to the medieval concept of a cyclic or concentric history than to our own linear idea of history: on stage, "the dead [. . . kept] on re-emerging either as the dead, or as new people."[24] A particularly significant intervention was Boyd's decision to cast Chuk Iwuji in the invented role of Dead Gloucester who, at times, haunted the action as the ghost of Richard's murdered uncle, unseen by the other characters, and, at others, played the messengers who bring bad news throughout the play. This sense of haunting was reinforced by Tom Piper's single set, which placed "the action [. . .] on a large thrust stage dominated by a curved three-storey tower against a similarly tall, rusted back wall," and facilitated the creation of hotspots within the performance area where parallel moments of violence or intense emotions across the cycle were staged.[25]

The productions, then, invited audiences to consider the, now alien, reality of divine right, treasons, and the contested crown, by immersing them in the rarefied world of what Keith Gregor regards as the "seemingly most arcane and intractable" of the English chronicle plays and Adjoa Andoh views as "the great play about England."[26] Leigh Quinn (Doran, 2016) recognized that the exclusive nature of the play-world was implicit in the singularity of *Richard II*'s language, which gave the text a sense of being "sacred" and engendered "a form of façade" for the court, where there was cohesion and consensus: where the shared idiolect of the verse produced a bounded space, creating a bonding within an exclusive world from which "no one, no matter how rebellious" should step out.[27] Thus, the shattering of this self-contained, yet fragile, world—which Quinn described as "a bubble; very much a protective thing"—is of equal consequence for King and country, and for the Queen.[28]

The space of listening and silent witness

The first reference to Richard's wife occurs when Mowbray explains that he had retained part of a sum of money given to him by Richard as repayment for expenses incurred when he "went to France to fetch his queen" (1.1.131). Although some directors have introduced the Queen into other scenes—with interesting effects—I will concentrate on her four textual presences, from her first, practically silent, appearance at Ely House (2.1), through the court (2.2), the garden (3.4), to the street (5.1). These scenes comprise a rich narrative arc as, in her journey from silence to speech, she articulates the implications of events for herself and the King, and ultimately challenges both Bolingbroke's 'usurpation' and Richard's 'abdication'.

In 2.1 the Queen accompanies her husband to visit the sick John of Gaunt and, following an enquiry about Gaunt's health, she is silent for the remainder of the scene. However, although "How fares our noble uncle Lancaster?" (2.1.71) is the Queen's only line, it is by no means perfunctory. Her first utterance echoes Richard's first words, "Old John of Gaunt, time-

honoured Lancaster" (1.1.1), as she acknowledges Gaunt's status, his kinship, his title, and his lands and thereby affirms her knowledge of the royal lineage and authority and her awareness of her place in the dynastic network. In the 152 lines subsequently spoken before the royal party exits, she is not addressed until Richard exhorts her "Come on, our Queen, tomorrow must we part. / Be merry for our time of stay is short" (2.1.222-23). Graham Holderness comments that the Queen's presence "could actually be made quite significant [. . . as] the female body is as elegant a theatrical sign as the presence secured through verbalisation," and, indeed, the eloquence of her silence can be borne out in performance where proxemics and her gestures may demonstrate her profound engagement with all that occurs.[29] Furthermore, although excluded from the discussions relating to the Irish war and the confiscation of Gaunt's riches, the Queen is witness to them and actively processes the information that surfaces; and actors maintain a personal interior narrative in the face of these negotiations. Genevieve O'Reilly (Nunn, 2005) viewed 2.1 as a space of intense listening where the Queen perceives the beginning of a "political firestorm" which "lights a fire within her" and fuels the foreboding she later expresses in 2.2.[30]

This state of being fully present to the dialogue of dissatisfaction regarding Richard's past behavior and the report of Gaunt's death and its consequences is also reflected in the thoughts and performances of other actors. Sian Thomas (Warner, 1995) found it extremely "unsettling" to observe the discussion of Richard's past deeds and the seizure of Gaunt's "plate, coin, revenues, and movables" (2.1.161) only seconds after the prayer for his soul.[31] Quinn (Doran, 2016) felt the need "to show some form of disagreement" with Richard's appropriation of Bolingbroke's inheritance; when Bushy crossed the stage with goods he was taking, she felt compelled to move to stop him but was left stranded when Richard (David Tennant) called him over.[32] Anneika Rose (Godwin, 2015) hovered uncomfortably, as if caught between the desire to assist the ailing Gaunt and yet respect his dignity; and Hannah Barrie (Boyd, 2007), was

clearly pained at the proceedings. All these actors showed the strain of being caught in the maelstrom of Richard and Gaunt's mutual anger and the revelations and actions of the scene.

That the Queen is actively struggling to respond to the competing demands of this unfolding scenario is thus evident in these modern stagings. Moreover, even if silent, her very presence generates questions. Thomas (Warner, 1995) affirms the need to actively register and interrogate her being there, stressing the importance of asking "in any given situation—with all these powerful forces happening—what's it doing to her? And how is she receiving it?"; even when the Queen is taciturn, she is "vitally hearing, digesting, growing, with all the information."[33] Indeed, the Queen's silence is expressive of the interpersonal complexities of the scene and her attendant fluctuating emotions are, sequentially or simultaneously, reflective of the states that Philip K. Bock posits can underpin a character's silence: obligation, love, assent, uncertainty, innocence, guilt, anger, and sorrow.[34] It is also a progressive wordlessness whereby the Queen is contemplating the ramifications of what she witnesses. Just as this scene is not static—racing in purely theatrical time from Richard and Gaunt's confrontation and the latter's death, through the seizure of Bolingbroke's patrimony, to Northumberland's revelation of Bolingbroke's return—neither is the Queen mentally or emotionally immobile.

It is not only that 2.1 gives ample opportunity for the Queen "to signify distress at rudeness, attempts at appeasement, wifely support, resentment of the uncles' reproaches, [and] dismay at the outcome of the sickbed visit" and, by not talking, to show "deference to powerful elders," but that, perceptibly silent and visibly other, her unspeaking figure disrupts the masculine space by staging a contemplative approach to the competing demands of queenship.[35] The images of tenderness, alarm, concern, and isolation that may materialize and dissolve in performance suggest a multidimensional female character whose experience of the tensions between love, duty, deference, and self-interest is no less significant than that of the male characters who are working out their own responses to these destabilizing events.[36]

Gaunt's house is, for the Queen, a liminal space where these conflicts and concerns are fomented before being released into speech in the following scene. Just as Gaunt's reluctance to support the Duchess of Gloucester in 1.2 and his criticisms of Richard in 2.1 "affirm[. . .] the public significance of the choice between loyal silence or vocal opposition," so the same dilemma can be read into the Queen's silence and gestures in 2.1.[37]

Seeing through façades

In 2.2 Richard has departed for Ireland and the Queen is at court, where Bushy, observing her sadness, reminds her that she promised the king "To lay aside life-harming heaviness" (2.2.3), but instead she expresses her profound fears that "Some unborn sorrow ripe in fortune's womb / Is coming towards me" (2.2.I0-11). Linda Bamber sees the Queen as "defined by something beyond history," viewing these words as a grieving for "something hidden, mysterious, [and] ineffable" and part of a conversation which, being "leisurely, philosophical, [and] dealing with the nature of emotion," is anomalous in a history play.[38] The Queen's language, though, suggests the sense of being caught between the transcendent and the grounded in response to her historical reality. As O'Reilly (Nunn, 2005) observed, the Queen's birth metaphor progresses from the vision of a "dark foreboding future" to the recognition that Bolingbroke's return fulfils this prophetic image—making her "a gasping new-delivered mother" (2.2.65). This shows her as both a "perceptive and intuitive" and a "rooted and visceral" woman.[39] Holding these perspectives in tension further nuances her speech as both an articulation of the fears of a vulnerable and childless Queen and an expression of the metaphorical and material agony of the birth of the rebellion which is Richard's, and her own, "dismal heir" (2.2.63). Performance demonstrates that this conversation can be infused with urgency as the Queen reflects on her personal disquiet, deals with Bushy's dismissal of her worries, and processes the news of Bolingbroke's uprising. In this state of instability, being "distraught," yet trying to conform to "queenly" expectations, the Queen moves from straining

against the confines of her role and struggling with these competing forces to openly combatting Bushy's false assurances and rejecting diversionary tactics, a shift aptly highlighted in Boyd and Doran through the use of dance and art.[40]

In Boyd, while Bagot (Forbes Masson) played the piano, the Queen (Hannah Barrie) was led on by Bushy (Nicholas Asbury) and Green (Anthony Shuster) in a pavane. This mirrored the extra-textual prologue, in which the Queen and Richard's entourage had progressed downstage in a choreographed gesture of honour to Richard (Jonathan Slinger), who entered from the central aisle in the auditorium and passed through the courtiers to ascend the throne, his cloak sweeping over the body of Dead Gloucester, which was revealed lying onstage as the courtiers parted.[41] Green and Bushy continued their steps and bowed when the Queen temporarily left the measure, but Barrie was drawn back into dancing with Green as Bushy waxed lyrical about ways of seeing and the distorted vision produced by tears. Barrie's response to Bushy's inference that she may be seeing with "false sorrow's eye" (2.2.26) was a sarcastic "It may be so" (2.2.28), and her "Howe're it be I cannot but be sad" (2.2.29-30) was spoken firmly and loudly, terminating their attempts to dissuade her from her woeful conviction through entertainment.

Doran also emphasized finding entertaining strategies for the Queen (Emma Hamilton 2013; Leigh Quinn 2016). She entered alone and was glimpsed in solitude before Bushy and Bagot entered laughing, carrying painted boards and an anamorphoscope. The Queen made to exit but was arrested by Bushy's comments on her mood. In arguing that "sorrow's eye, glazèd with blinding tears, / Divides one thing entire to many objects" (2.2.16-17), Bushy deployed the magic mirror to reinforce his idea that "perspectives, which rightly gazed upon, / Show nothing but confusion—eyed awry, / Distinguish form" (2.2.18-20), giving her a demonstration of the optical wonders of this Renaissance device. For Quinn, this stage business crystalized the production's construction of the Queen as an elevated and untouchable figure who could

not have “opinions and concerns” and was treated as if status, wealth, and entertainment cancelled the cares of monarchy: as if the possession of her “jewels,” “[fine] dress.” and “throne” were shields against distress.[42] The prop amplified Bushy’s rhetorical strategy for silencing the Queen, giving him a material object to help block the external expression of her fearful interior vision; although, later in the scene, she finds incisive language to dismantle this obstruction.

The disruption created in 2.2 by news of Bolingbroke’s return was magnified in Boyd, as this intelligence was communicated by a letter handed to Green by a servant, who—in line with Boyd’s through-line and spectral casting strategy—was played by Chuk Iwuji (Dead Gloucester). This allowed for a frisson of potential recognition on Barrie’s part, adding another unnerving element to the Queen’s premonitions: a consciousness of Richard’s guilt. When, in response to Barrie’s outstretched hand, Green crossed to give her the letter, she grasped his wrist and held him in her gaze for “So Green, thou art the midwife to my woe” (2.2.62), emphasizing her moment of vindication. In Barrie’s hands, this letter became a weapon of reproach as she gestured with it towards Bushy to reinforce the words, spoken directly to him, “Now hath my soul brought forth her prodigy” (2.2.64); and when Bushy urged her not to despair, she shouted her objections back at him. Barrie’s forceful and emotionally raw delivery of the truth to Richard’s favorites elevated her to the level of the absent King as they bowed in a gesture of fear and respect, mirroring their response to Richard’s outbursts. Turning to Green on “He is a flatterer,” she approached him with the words “A parasite, a keeper-back of death. / Who gently would dissolve the bands of life, / Which false hope lingers in extremity” (2.2.69-72). In her realization of their flattery of her as well as of Richard, Barrie made these words a reproof.

Although Quinn (Doran, 2016) imbued her forebodings with sweetness and her admission that her “inward soul / With nothing trembles” (2.2.11-12) with reasonableness, her

pronouncement on the fatal consequences of flattery and "cozening hope" (2.2.69) was, like Barrie's, delivered as a fiery reprimand to the favourites. Similarly, Rose (Godwin, 2015) poured out her revelations about flattery with a fierce anger and when Bushy (Greg Haiste) knelt and desperately urged her not to despair, she supported the firmness of "I will despair and be at enmity / With cozening hope" (2.2.68-69) by striking him across the head. As Rose had been glimpsed praying at the scene's opening, this violent gesture offered a sharp contrast to her initial portrayal, underlining a capacity to flout decorum and disrupt courtly space. Holderness argues that 2.2 reflects the Queen's "self-abnegation," that her speech is characterized by a "vague melancholy," and that the birth of the "prodigy" of "Bolingbroke's usurpation" confirms her own literal barrenness and lack of power to fulfil her role as a royal woman.[43] However, performance offers alternative views as the range of emotions and gestures played work with the language to present the Queen as cutting and combative with the strength of will to resist deceptive platitudes.

In production, it also strikes home that in 2.2 the Queen is proactively listening as arguments about Richard's actions and their consequences are rehearsed in front of her or directly to her. The expansion of her voice through criticism of her husband's allies emerges from both the justification of her private misgivings and the same acute attentiveness that characterizes her protracted silence in 2.1. Gaunt stresses Richard's susceptibility to flattery and its grave consequences, and Quinn (Doran, 2016) was particularly conscious of carrying these resonances with her into the following scene.[44] Gaunt's final words to Richard—"Live in thy shame, but die not shame with thee— / These words hereafter thy tormentors be" (2.1.135-136)—fuel the Queen's initial fears and her subsequent rejection of flattery. Indeed, as Sanchez points out, although the Queen does not witness "the final pact between Northumberland, Ross, and Willoughby [at the end of 2.1]," her presence for the preceding dialogue affords her "the same information about the frustration of noble subjects like Gaunt

and York that the play's male characters have," and consequently her dialogue with Bushy in 2.2 "cannot be simply understood as a debate between female passion and imagination, on the one hand, and male rationality and realism, on the other." Sanchez regards the Queen, rather, as "calculating the potential cost of Richard's irresponsible behavior"—a pattern of thought that makes her trenchant sense of approaching sorrow "a far more rational response to the events of 2.1 than Bushy's blithe assurances that there is nothing to worry about."[45]

It is not merely that the Queen is right to reject diversion and that her sensations of extreme grief are justified by Green's report of Bolingbroke's return and military campaign, but that she offers an astute commentary on the implications of these developments. Her words about flattery and false hope expose the dangers of both, cutting though courtly riddling, dismantling attempts to appease her, and further intensifying the disturbance created at court by the unwelcome news. The Queen's refusal, then, to succumb to Bushy's game of words and his exhortation "Despair not" (2.2.67) destabilizes the court as an authoritative and protective site. Her penetration of the flattering façades of the King's favorites gives her a place in the sequence of the play's truth tellers as her words echo one of the dying Gaunt's most stinging statements—"A thousand flatterers sit within thy crown" (1.1.100)—and anticipate York's later assertion "Now shall he try his friends that flattered him" (2.2.85). The ferocity, urgency, and acute attention that the actors cited here brought to the interpretation of the character's silent and verbal presence in 2.1 and 2.2 point to a figure not just right in her perceptions but affectively and politically engaged in what has become a civil conflict.

The troubled garden

At the end of 2.2, York directs the Queen away with the words "Come, cousin, / I'll dispose of you" (116-117); the *OED* glosses 'dispose' as "to place (things) at proper distances apart and in proper positions with regard to each other, to place suitably." From Bolingbroke's comment "Uncle, you say the Queen is at your house" (3.1.36), we learn that York judges the

proper position for the Queen to be his own home but, crucially, her next appearance is not in a domestic interior but in a garden. Although initially this appears to be a safe haven and a place apart or on the margins, the dialogue and action undercut this sense of security and, in fact, Shakespeare takes the Queen right to the structural and symbolic center of the play: a place characterized by ambiguities. For the Elizabethans, gardens were sites of visual, aural, and haptic pleasure, and loci of converging imaginative geographies, textured with a range of mythological references that embraced classical Roman, Greek, and Egyptian, and Biblical narratives.[46] The dialogue at the opening of 3.4 initially constructs the garden as such a pleasurable place, but it takes on emblematic force as a microcosm of the kingdom, and holds significance through its theological resonances and the historical materialist ideals that disrupt these spiritual notions. Moreover, gardens are particularly unstable spaces since "there can be no final form [. . .] because the gardener is fighting a constant battle for control."[47] As a dramatic setting, the garden articulates this battle for control of cultivated land and the nation, and reflects the instability of England at this point in the play, exemplifying the contention that "places are never complete, finished or bounded but are always becoming—in process."[48] Throughout 3.4, the Queen is actively involved in the dynamic relations between places as shaping forces and as shaped by those who inhabit them; and she comes to exercise her voice in a way that nuances the nature of her political and affective involvement with the king, the land, and its subjects, while raising questions about the motivations for her speech and actions.

The Queen's exchanges with her Ladies concerning the agreeable "sport[s]" that might "drive away the heavy thought of care" (3.4.1-2): playing at bowls, dancing, telling tales, and singing (3.4.3-19), define the garden as a place of courtly recreation and constructs the women themselves as embodiments of the well-taught female courtier who was "able to entertain in an innocent manner with dancing, music, games, laughter, [and] witticisms."[49] However, as in 2.2, the Queen eschews distracting entertainments and invites her companions to "step into the

shadow of these trees" (3.4.25) so they can clandestinely overhear the gardeners, who "[will] talk of state, for everyone doth so / Against a change" (3.4.27-28). In Doran, the Ladies entered walking behind the Queen and paced and stopped in imitation of her movements, evoking the game grandmother's footsteps, thus giving a sense of serious playfulness underpinned by surveillance. By subsequently concealing herself to spy on the workers—becoming the surveillant rather than the surveilled—the Queen indicates that her concern about the changes in the state supersedes her desire for diversion.[50]

Bamber's conception of "Isabel's garden" as a world "private, slow, full of sorrow that cannot be released into action" is unsettled in performance and by the shifts in language which reveal how the Queen and England's subjects are processing the impending regime change.[51] Sorrow is, in fact, released into indignation in the Queen's response to the Gardener's news, and into action by the end of the scene as she resolves to go to London. Thomas (Warner, 1995) felt that the report the Queen hears turned the "beautiful garden," which was keeping the "war" at a distance, into a "threatening and frightening place" infused with "fear and terror" about the future.[52]

By contrast with these treatments of the garden's transformations in 3.4, the garden as a site of disturbance for the Queen was underscored in Boyd from the scene's opening. The Queen and her Ladies entered with movements that echoed the dance of the extra-textual prologue and that of 2.2, but their dialogue was punctuated by halts in the choreography as they stepped and stopped, the disruptions in the dance emphasizing the disruptions in the state and in the Queen's own life. Moreover, this garden was haunted by victims of Richard's rule, as the actors playing the Duchess of Gloucester (Katy Stephens), Gaunt (Roger Watkins), and Dead Gloucester (Chuk Iwuji) resurfaced in 3.4 as an uncanny partnership of Second Lady and Gardeners. Stephens wore the same black dress she had worn in 1.2, so could be identified with the Duchess of Gloucester the audience had seen soliciting revenge for her murdered husband,

giving poignancy to her only line—"I could weep, madam, would it do you good" (3.4.21)—and momentarily linking the Queen's grief with that of Gloucester's widow.

As with Stephens, there was no costume change for Watkins as the Gardener; he wore the nightshirt and dressing gown in which he had left the stage as the dying Gaunt. Although doubling the Gardener with Gaunt is not unusual, the absence of any signifier to indicate that the actor has taken on another role is; therefore, when Watkins waxed lyrical about the garden as kingdom, the echoes of Gaunt's earlier elegy for England were both intensified and alienated. Spoken by Watkins/Gaunt and Iwuji/Dead Gloucester, the state-of-the-nation dialogue, in which two workmen interrogate the nature of governance, was simultaneously a "conversation between two dead brothers:" one murdered at the king's command and one who had died bereft of his banished son.[53]

As a site within the haunted space of Boyd's *Richard II*, this garden of ghosts materialized the Queen's own psychological landscape and created a space in which she could have paused to reassess her own knowledge of, and attitude towards, Richard's actions.[54] Furthermore, Boyd's reimagining of the garden as a place where, through their spectral presences, the sufferings of the Duke and Duchess of Gloucester, and Gaunt could be remembered, added new levels of pathos to the Gardener's intention to plant rue in remembrance of the "weeping Queen." Since Barrie gave no sign of recognizing these disturbingly familiar yet disquietingly strange figures, the rue planted in this garden commemorated both the Queen's sorrow at Richard's fate and the sadness of her missed opportunity to reckon with these ghosts.

Although initially constructed as a site of leisure, with the entrance of the Gardener and his Servants, the garden becomes a site of labor, and through their allegorizing it acts as a reflection of an ordered, though perhaps not wholly benign, state. When the Queen steps forward and disrupts their discourse concerning the importance of "Keep[ing] law and form

and due proportion" both "in the compass of a pale" and within "our sea-wallèd garden, the whole land" (3.4.40-43), it is with the words "O, I am pressed to death for want of speaking!" (3.4.72). This utterance not only expresses a pent-up desperation for verbal expression but evokes the legal punishment of *peine forte et dure* meted out to those accused of serious crimes who refused to plead. By indicting Richard for poor governance, the workers are also, indirectly, casting her as guilty and her verbal explosion constitutes a turning point as she becomes an active defender of the realm's ruler. The Queen makes the garden a court of judgment where she subverts relations between the accusers and accused, censuring the Gardener's condemnation of "the wasteful king" by questioning the authority of his "harsh rude tongue". Addressing the Gardener as "old Adam's likeness" and asking "What Eve, what serpent, hath suggested thee / To make a second fall of cursèd man?" (3.4.73,75-76), she asserts the resonances of Eden and points to the proper order in the post-lapsarian, redeemed nation. If God was betrayed through the first fall, then He is betrayed again through the deposition of "God's substitute, / His deputy anointed in His sight" (1.2.37-38).

Karl F. Thompson nuances the Queen's response, arguing that "The gardener in *Richard II* guides our judgement of the king, justly pictured as a slovenly caretaker of the fair garden entrusted to him by God," and that his words would remain "a graceful phrasing and political cliché—save that the Queen overhears." Thompson maintains that "[h]er reaction [is] all the more passionate because she knows the reproach is sound" and she therefore "depicts for us a woman troubled alike by pity for Richard and by awareness of his failings;" and so, in turn, the audience must also "pity Richard, yet condemn him."[55] The Queen, then, can be seen, in Conal Condren's formulation, as "the voice of compassion and the voice of judgement," and can herself elicit compassion and judgment.[56] Abandoned by her husband, "dispose[d] of" and isolated from news in a time of national and personal crisis, and in a state where "joy [is] altogether wanting" (3.4.13), we may pity her. However, Condren notes that "[i]f the Gardener

offers an example of constant care and good counsel, she neither recognizes his authority within his realm, nor appreciates his wisdom" and argues that although "[d]istress is fitting, and the Gardener understands her grief [. . .] it is her 'harsh rude tongue' that spits venom at the messenger: and for 'these news of woe, / Pray God the plants thou graft'st may never grow!'" (3.4.100-101).[57] Indeed, the acerbity of her speech contrasts sharply with that of the Gardener who, as James R. Siemon observes, responds "[w]ith a tongue neither 'harsh' nor 'rude,' but by no means apologetic, [. . . and] initially appears to ignore the powerful invocations of biblical sinfulness in the queen's attacks upon his knowledge, his judgment, and his impudence in giving them utterance."[58]

Similarly, Rebecca Laroche and Jennifer Munroe, acknowledge the Queen's rude voice since, evoking the "earth" in her denigration of the Gardener, she "discredits the importance of a connection to the dirt he digs in, and hurls a curse at him that aims straight at the heart of his material practice;" however, they recognize her potential as a curative force.[59] By "focus[ing] on material practice and thus the gendered implications of the garden [. . .] and the plants in it," Laroche and Munro suggest that the play "revalues women's garden work with herbs and flowers and establishes it as equally important as men's," and argue that "those best positioned to heal the kingdom are not just men, foremost the King, but also women."[60] They posit that the references to '''Noisome weeds' and 'wholesome flowers,' evoke not the husband's orchard, but the housewife's garden," enabling the scene to "offer [. . .] both gardens coexisting in the same space—metaphorically and materially;" and, thus, we may view the Queen as "aligned with that which has a substantial power to heal, the dietary and medicinal concoctions that women employed to balance the body and as a prophylactic against further harm."[61] Laroche and Munroe's foregrounding of gender with concomitant gender-related skills and knowledge in the specific setting of the garden, permits a view of the Queen, at this juncture,

as not merely resisting Richard's fall but as resisting the feminine work that could contribute to salving both the nation and her own sense of unease.

The Queen's attitude towards work and knowledge complicates the compassion she is capable of eliciting as, in her treatment of the Gardener—who also ranks amongst the play's truth-tellers—she undermines his integrity as a laboring subject in the macro-realm of the nation and micro-realm of the garden. Siemon argues that the very languages of the Queen and the Gardener and the ideologies attached to their speech are in opposition and that "[t]hough a garden site could support the Queen's sinful Adam in Eden, the Gardener's vocabulary of labor and cultivation is clearly that of humanist counselors."[62] Further, Siemon notes the Queen's misapprehension, and her rejection of the "common Knowledge" that she herself has previously claimed and stresses the Gardener's evidence-based approach to his intelligence: "though denounced by the Queen as a 'little better thing than earth' for his treason, the Gardener patiently explains to her the knowledge that grounds his conjecture: authority depends on political weight and 'In your Lord's scale is nothing but himself / And some few vanities' while 'in the balance of great Bolingbroke, / Besides himself, are all the English peers, / And with that odds he weighs King Richard down' (3.4.85-89)."[63] Condren also undercuts the Queen's impromptu prosecution of the workman whose testimony is so unwelcome, stating that "[t]he gardener was a long-standing image of divinely sanctioned office" and that "by creating Eden, God was the first gardener, Adam his deputy."[64] From this perspective, it is the Queen who is being subversive and resisting not just Richard's displacement, but an officer appointed by God in the form of the Gardener. Shakespeare, then, is able to use her character to show the clash in theological, materialist, and humanist ideologies and to pit against each other two divinely sanctioned figures.

There is, though, another potential subtext underpinning her voice of protest against the Gardener's remarks on equity and good governance in, notably, what he refers to not as the

kingdom but the "commonwealth" (3.4.35). The Queen, like Gaunt, is one of the play's truthtellers, but just as Gaunt's anger about the diminished status of England may be rooted in a sense of privilege, so the rage the Queen displays at the Gardener's report may reflect her own sense of entitlement: not just her affective protection of Richard, but a political exclusionism.

At the opening of the play, Richard addresses Gaunt as "time-honoured Lancaster" (1.1.1), evoking from the outset important relations between land and title. John of Gaunt was the greatest English magnate and the "castles, forests, manors and other estates" in England and Wales—which he had acquired through inheritance, his three marriages, and royal mandate— "were so extensive, and their associated powers and privileges so complex, that it was necessary to administer them via a quasi-royal chancellor and council and to appoint separate chief stewards for the north and south parts."[65] Gaunt's "this England" speech, usually regarded as an aria or panegyric, combines images which draw on the natural qualities of England as a bounded space, its resistance to exterior forces, and the spread of its fame across the world, with images from Biblical narratives. He locates England in the mythological and physical landscapes of the early modern world, although he ultimately acknowledges radical change in the poetic geography he constructs.

The material geographies and histories that Gaunt's name and title contain, and his awareness of his place-based identity would make him "no disinterested commentator on the glories of England."[66] Donald M. Friedman unsettles ideas of Gaunt as "the sound patriotic voice of the play," and argues that what "offends" Gaunt "is not simply that England's reputation for deeds of arms and for crusading valor has been diminished" but that "the kingdom—'this earth, this realm'—has been sold, leased, given to those who, presumably, have no title to it."[67] He attributes to Gaunt a "fierce determination" to preserve "his fortress island [. . .] inviolate."[68] In her outbursts in the garden and later in the street, the Queen exhibits

a similar fiery resolve to save the monarchy and the monarch himself, whom she sees as the material and mythological heart of England. “The inmost core of Gaunt's outrage,” Friedman suggests, “appears to be not the dulling of national fame, but the fact that possession of the land has passed from the hands of its traditional owners.”[69] Again, the Queen’s concerns may be seen to parallel Gaunt’s worries about entitlement, and her later appeal in the street is also shot through with an anxiety about the crown and all that it represents falling into inappropriate hands: she laments that with Bolingbroke’s accession “triumph is become an alehouse guest” (5.1.15).

In this polyvalent garden space, the Queen builds on her frank denunciation of the treachery of flattery in 2.2. Her rage at the Gardener’s intelligence may, as Dorothea Kehler suggests, be underpinned by her awareness that he has penetrated the mystification of political murder by encoding in figurative language that “the price of power is unremitting violence.” [70] It may be born of exasperation at being the “last that knows” of her husband’s fall (3.4.94), or fuelled by the prospect of “[her] sad look grac[ing] the triumph of great Bolingbroke” (3.4.98-99). Whatever its motivation, she speaks (to borrow Friedman’s phrase), a “rhetoric of frustration” and mobilizes herself to step out of the *hortus conclusus* with a curse. Having decided to seek out Richard in London, she levels her malediction on the Gardener and his labors: “for telling me these news of woe, / Pray God the plants thou graf’tst may never grow” (3.4.100-101). Rose’s Queen (Godwin 2015) anointed a plant with a tear: an ambiguous gesture that gave a note of pathos to her departure and signalled her vulnerability, yet which also worked symbolically to reinforce her anger by leaving a trace of lachrymose salt.

The street of stories remembered and not yet told

Places possess, to use Marc Augé’s term, an “evocative force,” which, as Edward Said suggests, varies according to context and has a “power and resonance [. . .] over and above a particularly specifiable moment in history or a geographical locale.”[71] Furthermore, since

"cumulative meanings accrue in a single location as a result of the history of events that have taken place there," the street of the Queen's encounter with Richard is profoundly resonant of English monarchical histories.[72] She meets him on his way to "Julius Caesar's ill-erected tower" (5.1.2), a place of particular evocative force for the historical Richard II and his ancestors. It was a symbol of conflict between Londoners and the crown, and an emblem of English nationhood, as well as a concentrated site of Richard's personal memories of power and vulnerability.[73] During the Peasants' Revolt rebels gained access to the Tower, "plundered and pillaged," assailed the king's mother, and dragged two of Richard's allies, Archbishop Sudbury and Sir Robert Hales, to Tower Hill to execute them.[74] But the Tower was also the place from which Richard rode to Westminster in festive procession on the eve of his coronation.[75] By locating this scene on the very route between the Tower and his glorious coronation, Shakespeare has the Queen intercept Richard on this reversed procession, now not towards the ceremonious confirmation of his title, power, and identity, but towards ignominy and abjection. In the interstice between the tearing apart of her own union with Richard and the implementation of a new regime, she holds on to and defends order and love and judges both Richard and Bolingbroke in respect of their kingly, and un-kingly, attitudes and attributes.

It is possible to read the Queen's intervention as imaging what Howard and Rackin describe as a "loving affective union" that offers "a retrospective ratification of Richard's patriarchal authority," or—since she interrupts the process of popular justice that Bolingbroke's usurpation represents—as endorsing a man whose "pursuit of personal, political and factional advantage" Peter Lake sees as "the quintessence of tyranny."[76] Her resistance here is not unproblematic, and further nuances the play's interrogation of the operations of power, since tyrants become more complicated and challenging if they are seen not merely as ruthless leaders, but as multi-dimensional human beings, capable of giving and receiving affection and eliciting faithfulness. Although fidelity is one characteristic she exhibits, the

range of conflicting emotions and motivations that may be played in 5.1 show that the Queen does not fit neatly into the singular mould of sweet and submissive spouse. O'Reilly (Nunn, 2005) saw the Queen as someone suffering "unrequited love" but who, in the face of Richard's unpopularity, "risks life and limb, everything, to meet him, *on a road*," and whose public display of affection could be considered "a treasonous act."[77]

Quinn (Doran, 2016) was also conscious of the Queen's personal and political risk, and felt the Gardener's words revealed that the court had "broken down," making her "her own free woman" who "chooses to run towards Richard and trouble."[78] Inspired by Stephen Brimson Lewis's scenography, which captured the grandeur of Westminster Hall, Quinn perceived the Queen as "the last pillar standing [. . .] still trying to hold up [. . . the] court" in a place where everything "had crumbled around her."[79] Doran highlighted this sense of danger and disintegration as Hamilton / Quinn entered running in semi-darkness, and threatening figures making mocking noises raced across the stage colliding with her, suggesting her dislocation and vulnerability. [Figure 1] Tennant staggered in accompanied by guards and a "mob" and the staging of these prying eyes heightened his humiliation while also affirming the Queen's bravery and emphasizing how exposed she is at this moment.[80]

Figure 1. Emma Hamilton as the Queen and David Tenant as Richard. Dir. Gregory Doran, 2013. Photo by Kwame Lestrade © RSC.

Strength of purpose and tenacity, then, may be counted amongst the qualities that drive the Queen to the London street, which acquires a centrality as the site where Richard's fall, and

her own, are displayed. Through this encounter, which she precipitates, the Queen configures the street as a site of reaffirmation of her own responsibilities and generates a microsite of reflection on past, present, and future for herself and Richard. She thereby creates a space in which to make an argument for resistance to the disruption of rightful order and also for reviewing the affective bonds of their marriage.

For Thomas (Warner, 1995), the ambivalent relations with the favorites and Bolingbroke produced by Fiona Shaw's Richard emptied their marriage of its sexual dimension, which fitted with the "chasteness" Thomas saw as pertaining to the Queen. Nevertheless, Thomas saw it as incumbent upon this foreign "little, pale Queen"—as she was often referred to in company discussions—to devote herself to her royal husband and to fulfil the responsibility her marriage placed upon her as the compact of peace between France and England.[81] The absence of sex did not preclude love as an element in the relationship, and Thomas saw their farewell as characterized by "true tenderness" and a poignant realization of what might have been: that "in another life you might have got an awful lot more, but it's too late."[82]

This space of lost potential and contemplation was vividly materialized in Boyd, as Richard (Jonathan Slinger) walked from the end of 4.1 into a shower of sand into which Barrie had to reach. Barrie saw her husband visibly "[t]ransformed and weakened" (5.1.27) as he stood penitent-like below the flowing sand, which offered a paradoxical image of cleansing and soiling, and suggested time running out. Initially, Barrie appealed urgently to Slinger from outside the zone defined by the sand, making visible the isolation from which they had both suffered. Slinger was conscious of the sand as a visual reference to the "dust" thrown on "Richard's head" by "rude misgoverned hands" (5.2.5-6) and of the space of separation it created.[83] The company sought to express a "sense of [Richard] being abandoned by everyone and [. . .] to show the Queen as somebody who he had abandoned completely," and yet who

was prepared to "be in that horrific moment with him."[84] [Figure 2] Their view of the relationship was that although the couple had once been close and very much in love, over the years Richard had "forgotten all about her," but that her act of loyalty was a point of rediscovery and of realizing his neglect of her and his squandering of time.[85] The Queen, therefore, is not just a loving face that endorses Richard's flawed rule, but a figure that confronts him with a reality he has not seen and which he later articulates as "I wasted time, and now doth time waste me" (5.5.49).

Figure 2. Hannah Barrieas the Queen and
JonathanSlinger as Richard. Dir. Michael Boyd, 2007.
Photo by Elly Kurttz © RSC.

From the beginning of 5.1, the Queen speaks against the subsumption of their lives and roles within the corrosive forces of wasted time and resignation. Although Richard has already declared that without the crown he has "no name, no title— / No, not that name was given me at the font" (4.1.255-256) and lost his sense of self, on coming into the street, the Queen asserts both their identities: "Here let us rest, if this rebellious earth / Have any resting for her true King's Queen" (5.1.5-6). She appeals to Richard to change the story that is unfolding because, as Thomas (Warner, 1995) notes, her "survival depends on Richard not dying" and also because her breeding from girlhood would have made her aware that Richard's acquiescent words were not royal behavior, as "Kings don't talk like that."[86] Moreover, in asking Richard "Hath Bolingbroke / Deposed thine intellect, hath he been in thy heart?" (5.1.27-28) the Queen urges

a recognition of the holistic nature of kingship as not just a matter of external pomp, but a state supported by reason and emotion, and she criticizes his refusal to fight, since even "The lion dying thrusteth forth his paw / And wounds the earth if nothing else, with rage / To be o'erpowered" (5.1.29-31). Quinn's (Doran, 2016) race to London was motivated by the desire to "fight" for them both—even though Richard had "given up and accepted his story"—and was underpinned by an awareness that "whatever he does is very much going to be her story;" she felt driven to "stand[. . .] up for herself" and confront Richard since he had "broken his contract."[87]

The idea of contract was a crucial motivation for Bennett-Warner (Grandage, 2011) and fundamental to the Queen's unwavering loyalty to Richard was that "[s]he's said vows."[88] The Queen stages in the street a public show of her resolve to keep her conjugal vows and the pronouncement that she is the "true King's Queen" (5.1.6) constitutes a rejection of Bolingbroke's rule and an affirmation of her own and Richard's monarchical roles. Oaths "were the glue that joined society together, the divine sinews that bound the body politic" and "were not to be undermined" on account of their "great theological and social significance."[89] In 5.1 the Queen resists the subversion of personal, sacred, and political promises.

By keeping her own vows and exhorting Richard to keep his, she becomes his critic and challenger. In his invented ceremony of un-kinging, Richard renounces his regal vows and endorses Bolingbroke's usurpation by proclaiming "God pardon all oaths that are broke to me, / God keep all vows unbroke are made to thee" (4.1.214-215). In the wake of the Queen's intervention, however, he reaffirms the importance of vows in both marriage and kingship by accusing Northumberland of violating "A two-fold marriage—'twixt my crown and me, / And then betwixt me and my married wife" (5.1.72-73). Opposition to both of these violations was embodied in the mix of rough and gentle gestures with which Quinn (Doran, 2016) appealed to Richard not to surrender, and in Rose's (Godwin, 2015) physical intervention as she pulled

fiercely at Richard's chain in an effort to prevent his being dragged away. [Figure 3] These interpretations uncovered in the text a determination on the part of the Queen to defy patriarchal authority and thwart—as she would see them—Bolingbroke's quasi-regal orders, and revealed her imperative to Northumberland—"Banish us both, and send the King with me" (5.1.83)—as her standing between Richard and "the mind of Bolingbroke" (5.1.51).[90]

Figure 3. Anneika Rose as the Queen and Charles Edwards as Richard. Dir. Simon Godwin, 2015. © Johan Persson / ArenaPAL.

Love, honor, duty, integrity, pragmatism, desperation, and selfless or selfish ambition may variously play a role in bringing the Queen to this final site in her trajectory and her speech is similarly richly nuanced. She addresses Richard in terms shot through with mundane and mythological geographies, and the paradoxes of places and identities. Her vision of the man she desires to "wash [. . .] fresh again with true-love tears" (5.1.10) is expressed in place-related imagery that reflects the knowledge of duplicity she has gained: "Ah thou, the model where old Troy did stand, / Thou map of honour, thou King Richard's tomb, / And not King Richard" (5.1.11-13). In referencing Troy, the Queen evokes what Abigail Wheatley describes as "London's most important legendary association in the Middle Ages" and, by identifying

Richard with Troy, she connects him with the foundation of the city as historical event, and with its foundations as geographical site: a proclamation ostensibly infused with glory.[91]

However, the suggested correlation between king, Troy, and London is problematic since, in Troy, as in all exemplary cities, aspects of the real and the ideal coexisted.[92] If Troy was emblematic of "heroic success" and of "failure through treachery," then Troy can be figured as the epitome of duality.[93] As Troy suggests narratives of power and betrayal while casting the city of London as a legendary site, by harnessing this paradoxical imaginary geography, the Queen faces Richard with an image of himself as both the exemplary city and the embodiment of duplicity. By expressing the simultaneity of these conditions in the monarch, the Queen's metaphor encodes a resistance to the flattery she has come to despise.

The Queen continues to deploy place-related figures to reassert Richard's identity, proclaiming him as a "beauteous inn" inhabited by "hard-favoured grief" and Bolingbroke as the "alehouse" where "triumph" is now, inappropriately, a "guest" (5.1.13-15). Further, she sees what Richard does not when beholding his face in the mirror of 4.1: his transformation in "shape and mind" (5.1.26-27). She rebukes his willingness to "pupil-like / Take thy correction, mildly kiss the rod, / And fawn on rage with base humility" and declares him "a lion and the king of beasts" (5.1.31-34). Although ultimately defeated in her fight against Richard's surrender and denied her modified appeal to be exiled together, she does more than "stand by the roadside and observe the 'woeful pageant' of the King's disgrace" as she offers not bland, comforting words but insightful and urgent exhortation.[94]

The Queen mobilizes herself to prevent the disintegration of the three-fold marriage which unites her and Richard and England and, while she may not achieve this, she is successful in her quest to "restore the spiritual life of her king" since "Richard spends his final hours 'studying' the value of his life."[95] This outcome of the Queen's resistance manifests after her departure; and her memorialization of their history, moreover, goes beyond the play as she

assures a place for the "lamentable tale" (5.1.44) in the collective memory of her homeland. Although Dorothea Kehler argues that "[s]elf-pity leads him to almost forget his wife, except as his mournful biographer," Richard's story and the Queen's story are inextricably bound up with each other and with the fate of the nation.[96] While the Queen's pithy exhortations fail to change the unfolding story, her last act of resistance is to take hold of their narrative and the opportunity to disseminate her version of it.

The Queen, then, enacts resistance at each stage of her journey; her resistance may not be entirely effective or sympathetic, but her protests are gestured and voiced. Her speech expands from the silence of 2.1, where she is a conflicted figure of otherness, through her expression of the monstrous birth of rebellion and exposure of the dangers of flattery in 2.2, to her scathing attack on the bearer of unpalatable news in the garden. Finally, in the street, she intercepts Richard on the very route between two historical sites of richly ambiguous cultural meanings which are key places in the play's geographies of power and displacement. She places herself at the center of decisive action, and momentarily creates a site of bidirectional memory that functions to recollect their personal relationship and Richard's kingship, while also reviewing events to advocate for a different future.

The Queen journeys from silent, active listener to vociferous supporter and critic of Richard. Through her silences, words, and actions she becomes a dynamic figure of resistance to compromise and expectations who penetrates the facades of hypocrisy and flattery, articulates myths of power and place, and speaks out against Richard's contravention of both his regal and marital vows. Within the public space of the street, the Queen claims, if only fleetingly, a place of pause where she attempts to avert the tragic ending towards which she sees Richard's story and her own hurtling.

By accepting the part of chronicler through whom that story will be continued, she disrupts the sense of closure that the play ostensibly offers, and her final intervention lingers

in *Henry The Fourth, Part One* as her allusion to Richard as her "fair rose" (5.1.8) is echoed in Hotspur's lament for the "put[ting] down of "Richard, that sweet lovely rose" (1.3.173).[97] Her intuitive and prophetic foresight in 2.2 reaches through to her exhortations in 5.1 and is expressed by Richard in the insight her presence brings him; he addresses Northumberland as the "ladder wherewithal / The mounting Bolingbroke ascends my throne," and predicts the poor reward that he and other supporters of the new King Henry will receive as "The love of wicked men converts to fear, / That fear to hate and hate turns one or both / To worthy danger and deservèd death" (5.1.55-56, 65-68). Escorted, then abandoned, then placed, the Queen ultimately locates herself and finds her voice. Though banished from the map of England at the end of 5.1, she exits with a new role: that of Richard's and her own historiographer meaning that their story—an imagined dramatic future history that remains to be written—will be told in the tone and tenor of the Queen's own voice.[98]

---

[1] Barbara Hodgdon, *The End Crowns All: Closure and Contradiction in Shakespeare's History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 130.

[2] All references to the play are from *Richard II*, ed. Anthony B. Dawson and Paul Edward Yachnin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

[3] Mowbray refers to "fetch[ing] [Richard's] queen from France" (1,1.31) and Richard laments in 5.1, that his wife is going to France "from whence set forth in pomp / She came adornèd hither like sweet May / Sent back like Hallowmas or short'st of day" (5.1.78-80), suggesting that she is Richard's second child-wife, Isabel of Valois. Throughout the play's production history, an adult actor has generally been cast in the role, but Helen Ostovich ("'Here in this garden': The Iconography of the Virgin Queen in Shakespeare's *Richard II*," in *Marian Moments in Early Modern British Drama*, ed. Regina Buccola and Lisa Hopkins (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 21-34) and Deanne Williams (*Shakespeare and the Performance of Girlhood* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014) argue that the figure is Richard's second wife, the girl-bride. The actors I interviewed were conscious that Richard had married twice and variously drew on aspects of the lives of both wives in developing their interpretations of the Queen.

[4] Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans Steven Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 116. Michael Billington echoed much previous theater criticism when, commenting on the "exceptional fire and spirit" that Leila Farzad (dir. Adjoa Andoh and Lynette Linton, Sam Wanamaker Playhouse, 2019) brought to the role, he referred to the character as "Richard's normally anonymous queen" ("*Richard II* review – women of colour's blazing show reflects our current chaos," *Guardian* 7 March 2019).

[5] bell hooks, *Yearning, Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics* (London: Turnaround, 1991), 152.

[6] Kavita Mudan Finn, "'Nothing Hath Begot My Something Grief': Invisible Queenship in Shakespeare's Second Tetralogy," in *The Palgrave Handbook of Shakespeare's Queens*, ed. Kavita Mudan Finn and Valerie Schutte (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), 229.

[7] Jean E. Howard, and Phyllis Rackin, *Engendering A Nation: A Feminist Account of Shakespeare's English Histories* (London: Routledge, 1997), 20.

[8] Ibid., 30.

[9] Nina S. Levine, *Women's Matters: Politics, Gender, and Nation in Shakespeare's Early History Plays* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1998), 15.

[10] Molly Smith, "Mutant Scenes and 'Minor' Conflicts in *Richard II*," in *A Feminist Companion to Shakespeare*, ed. Dympna Callaghan (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), 272-273.

[11] Jeanie Grant Moore, "Queen of Sorrow, King of Grief: Reflections and Perspectives in *Richard II*," in *In Another Country: Feminist Perspectives on Renaissance Drama*, ed. Dorothea Kehler and Susan Baker (London: Scarecrow Press, 1991), 19, 28.

[12] Linda Bamber, *Comic Women, Tragic Men* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1982), 135.

[13] Conal Condren, "Skepticism and Political Constancy: *Richard II* and the Garden Scene as a 'Model of State,"' *The Review of Politics* 78.4 (2016), 635-636.

[14] I am drawing here on Cheryl Glenn, "Remapping Rhetorical Territory," *Rhetoric Review* 13. 2 (1995), 296.

[15] I am indebted to Genevieve O'Reilly (Trevor Nunn, 2005), Pippa Bennett-Warner (Michael Grandage, 2011), Leigh Quinn (Gregory Doran, 2016), and Sian Thomas (Deborah Warner, 1995), who generously gave their time to discuss their work on the role of Richard's Queen.

[16] My analysis is informed by seeing these productions and by video recordings and other relevant archival materials. While I focus mainly on these four productions, I refer to Deborah Warner's production (Cottesloe Theatre, 1995), designed by Hildegard Bechtler, which also deployed an aesthetic that evoked both the historical

worlds of the narrative and the play's original context. The traverse staging, which Benedict Nightingale saw as "a long golden corridor flanked by an audience in pews" (Review of *Richard II*, dir. Deborah Warner. *Times* 5 June 1995) reflected Warner's view of *Richard II* as "a corridor play, between well defined spaces:" the 'corridor' being "an incredible late twentieth century state [. . .] where most of us are" (Barbara Norden, "The King and I," *Everywoman* (August 1995)).

[17] Production Diary 10, *Richard II*, Royal Shakespeare Company <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RQ2DrEu69I8>. Footage from Production Diary 7 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wa0-_arRG64>) shows that the surface for projection was made up of fine vertically-hanging chains, which Brimson Lewis found, as well as adding depth, allowed for "actors to appear to be in the projection as well as standing in front of it" (Production Diary 10). <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RQ2DrEu69I8>). Production Diary 8, *Richard II*, Royal Shakespeare Company < https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aln--xk8tes>.

[18] Production Diary 8.

[19] Paul Taylor, Review of *Richard II*. *Independent* 7 December 2011. The words 'golden' and 'gilded' occur frequently in reviews of Grandage's production.

[20] Ibid.

[21] See Julie Capenter*, Review of Richard II*. *Express* 7 December 2011.

[22] Stephen Collins, Review of *Richard II*, *BritishTheatre.Com* 22 July 2015.

[23] For a discussion of Boyd's casting across the cycle and his use of symbolic doubling see Coen Heijes, "'Thus play I in one person many people': The Art and Craft of Doubling in the Boyd History Cycle," *Shakespeare* 6.1 (2010), 52-73.

[24] Kevin Wright, ed. *The Histories*. RSC Enterprises, 2007, 4; Donnacadh O'Briain, Assistant Director, *The Histories*, personal interview. 27 May 2008.

[25] David Benedict, "Blazing Bard Binge," *Variety* 16 May 2008.

[26] Keith Gregor, "The Spanish Premiere of *Richard II*," in *Shakespeare's History Plays: Performance, Translation and Adaptation in Britain and Abroad*, ed. Ton Hoenselaars (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 213; Adjoa Ando, "I wanted it to be the People at the Bottom of the Empire Telling the Story," Production Program for *Richard II*, co-directed by Adjoa Andoh and Lynette Linton, Sam Wanamaker Playhouse, London, 2019.

[27] Leigh Quinn, Queen in *Richard II,* dir. Gregory Doran, 2016, personal interview, 10 August 2017.

[28] Ibid.

[29] Graham Holderness, "'A Woman's War': A Feminist Reading of *Richard II*," in *Shakespeare Left and Right*, ed. Ivo Kamps (London: Routledge, 1991), 171-172,

[30] Genevieve O'Reilly, Queen in *Richard II*, dir. Trevor Nunn 2005, personal interview, 27 November 2008.

[31] Sian Thomas, Queen in *Richard II,* dir. Deborah Warner, 1995, personal interview, 29 July 2017.

[32] Quinn, personal interview. In Doran's original 2013 production the roles of Bushy, Bagot, and Green were played by Sam Marks, Jake Mann and Marcus Griffiths respectively and in the 2016 revival by Martin Bassendale, Nicholas Gerard-Martin, and Robert Gilbert.

[33] Thomas, personal interview.

[34] Philip K. Bock, "'I Think but Dare Not Speak:' Silence in Elizabethan Culture," *Journal of Anthropological Research* 32.3 (1976), 287.

[35] Helen Ostovich, "'Here in this garden': The Iconography of the Virgin Queen in Shakespeare's *Richard II*," in *Marian Moments in Early Modern British Drama,* ed. Regina Buccola and Lisa Hopkins (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 26.

[36] It is natural in performance for spectators' ocular attention to follow the speakers. I hope, though, by highlighting these actors' performances of the Queen's silent movements and gestures, to encourage a conscious looking at her within the stage picture as a whole, with a view to seeing how interpretations of the role are established, nuanced, and/or challenged.

[37] Melissa E. Sanchez. "Bodies that Matter in *Richard II*," in *Richard II New Critical Essays*, ed. Jeremy Lopez (London: Routledge, 2012),102.

[38] Bamber, 139.

[39] O'Reilly, personal interview.

[40] Pippa Bennett-Warner, Queen in *Richard II,* dir. Michael Grandage, 2011, personal interview, 14 July 2017.

[41] As outlined above, Boyd introduced the ghostly figure of Dead Gloucester, and his 'unseen' presence in the opening scene was intended to highlight the murder that predates the play and to key the audience into the reason underpinning Bolingbroke's accusations.

[42] Quinn, personal interview.

[43] Holderness, 176-177.

[44] Quinn personal interview. Various forms of 'flatter' occur seven times in 2.1, five in the Queen's presence.

[45] Sanchez, 106.

[46] Elisabeth Woodhouse, "The Spirit of the Elizabethan Garden," *Garden History* 31.1 (2003), 1-28.

[47] Stephanie Ross, "Gardens' Powers," *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 33.3 (1999), 7.

[48] Tim Cresswell, "Introduction: Theorizing Place," in *Mobilizing Place: Placing Mobility: The Politics of Representation in a Globalized World*, ed. Ginette Verstraete and Tim Cresswell (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2002), 20.

[49] Baldesar Castiglione, *The Book of the Courtier*, trans. George Bull (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967), 217.

[50] In Doran's original 2013 production the Ladies in Waiting were played by Gracy Goldman and Miranda Nolan and in the 2016 revival by Emma Wing and Evelyn Miller.

[51] Bamber, 135.

[52] Thomas, personal interview.

[53] O'Briain, personal interview.

[54] I am drawing here on Michael Mayerfeld Bell's theory that "[t]he ghosts of place are [. . .] fabrications, products of imagination, [and] social constructions" and "[t]he ghosts we find in places are [. . .] ghosts of our own imaginations." "The Ghosts of Place," *Theory and Society* 26.6 (1997), 816.

[55] Karl F. Thompson, *Modesty and Cunning: Shakespeare's Use of Literary Tradition* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1971), 82-83.

[56] Condren, 367 n. 52.

[57] Ibid. 637.

[58] James R. Siemon, *Word Against Word: Shakespearean Utterance* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002), 181.

[59] Rebecca Laroche and Jennifer Munroe "On a Bank of Rue; or Material Ecofeminist Inquiry and the Garden of *Richard II*," *Shakespeare Studies* 42 (2014), 46.

[60] Ibid. 45.

[61] Ibid. 44-45; 46.

[62] James Siemon, "Dead Men Talking: Elegiac Utterance, Monarchical Republicanism and *Richard II*," in *New Critical Essays*, ed. Jeremy Lopez (London: Routledge, 2011), 54-55.

[63] Ibid. 55.

[64] Condren, 630.

[65] Peter Saccio, *Shakespeare's English Kings: History, Chronicle and Drama* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), 20; Richard Dutton, "Shakespeare and Lancaster," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 49.1 (1998), 3.

[66] Donald M. Friedman, "John of Gaunt and the Rhetoric of Frustration," *ELH* 43.3 (1976), 291.

[67] Ibid. 291-292.

[68] Ibid. 288.

[69] Ibid. 292.

[70] Dorothea Kehler, "What the Gardener Knew: Pruning and Power in *The Troublesome Reign of King John* and *Richard II*," *Journal of the Rocky Mountain Medieval and Renaissance Association* 9 (1988), 127.

[71] Marc Augé, *Non-places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*, trans. John Howe (London: Verso, 1995), 95; Edward W. Said, "Invention, Memory, and Place," *Critical Inquiry* 26.2 (2000), 180.

[72] D. J. Hopkins and Shelley Orr, "Memory/Memorial/Performance: Lower Manhattan, 1776-200," in *Performance and the City,* ed. D. J. Hopkins, Shelley Orr, and Kim Solga (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 36.

[73] Kristen Dieter, *The Tower of London in English Renaissance Drama: Icon of Opposition* (London: Routledge, 2008), 37.

[74] Nigel Saul, *Richard II* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 69.

[75] Saul, 24; Dieter, 38.

[76] Howard and Rackin, 157; Peter Lake, *How Shakespeare Put Politics on the Stage: Power and Succession in the History Plays* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016), 239.

[77] O'Reilly, personal interview, original emphasis.

[78] Quinn, personal interview.

[79] Ibid.

[80] Prompt Book, *Richard II*, dir. Gregory Doran, 2013, revived 2016.

[81] Thomas, personal interview. Thomas was drawing here on her knowledge that Richard's second wife was the child bride Isabel of France.

[82] Ibid.

[83] Jonathan Slinger, personal interview, 14 August 2008.

[84] Ibid.

[85] Ibid.

[86] Thomas, personal interview.

[87] Quinn, personal interview.

[88] Bennett-Warner, personal interview.

[89] Jonathan Michael Gray, "Vows, Oaths, and the Propagation of a Subversive Discourse," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 41.3 (2010), 731.

[90] The change in "the mind of Bolingbroke" sends Richard not to the Tower but to Pomfret Castle, a decision that Elizabethans may have interpreted as a conscious employment of geographical location for the consolidation of his hold on power. The Tower was "immemorially associated with the crown," while Pomfret was "the strongest of [. . . Bolingbroke's] duchy castles, where a loyal Lancastrian garrison would make rescue unlikely and politic murder all too possible" (Dutton, 14). Furthermore, this castle already had resonance as the "bloody Pomfret," "fatal and ominous to noble peers" (*Richard III* 3.3.10). But Bolingbroke's removal of Richard from the centralized hub of national governance to this fortress in west Yorkshire also has more macabre historical undertones. In 1322 Richard's great grandfather, Edward II, had executed his "troublesome cousin" Earl Thomas of Lancaster and declared his inheritance forfeit to the Crown "a few hundred yards north" of Pomfret Castle (C. Given-Wilson, "Richard II, Edward II, and the Lancastrian Inheritance," *English Historical Review* 109.432 (1994), 553-571, 553). Edward's judgment was reversed by parliament in 1327 and the Lancastrian estates restored to Thomas's brother Henry. But if history was repeating itself in the contest between Richard and Bolingbroke, Richard's death at Pomfret constitutes a kind of subverted geographical repetition. Bolingbroke's order to "exile" his own "troublesome cousin" to the castle that would evoke memories of Edward II's failure to hold onto duchy lands gives this fatal site a resonance that goes beyond the pragmatism that may have underpinned the move.

[91] Abigail Wheatley, *The Idea of the Castle in Medieval England*. (York: York Medieval Press, 2004), 53.

[92] Ibid., 52-53.

[93] Ibid., 45.

[94] Holderness, 177.

[95] Ostovich, 31.

[96] Kehler, 15.

[97] William Shakespeare, *Henry the Fourth, Part One*, ed. Burton Raffel (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006).

[98] I am thinking here of the possibilities of creative responses to the Queen's story, such as those inspired by Margaret of Anjou in the *Henry VI* plays and *Richard III*: notably *Margaret of Anjou* by Elizabeth Schafer and Philippa Kelly, premiered with new material by Wendy Haines and Alexander Woodward, By Jove Theatre Company the Gallery on the Corner, Battersea, London, 2016; and *Queen Margaret* by Jeanie O'Hare, Royal Exchange Theatre, Manchester, 2018. Nereids Theatre Company (Dudley, UK), whose play *Ophelia* won the Best Adaptation award in the Birmingham (UK) Festival in 2022, are working on a piece inspired by the Queen

in *Richard II*. The company (Jessica Mabel, Lucy Spicer, and Ashleigh Burr) told me that they are drawn to "hidden narratives," and so found the potential for both of Richard's wives to have been amalgamated in the Queen to make her a "mysterious and intriguing" figure. Their aim is "to untangle these mixed-matched identities and reimagine what their story could be" (Personal correspondence, 4 January 2024).