"Wildness" Within Mobility in Shakespeare's *King Henry IV* and *Henry V**

ZHANG Han

Southwest University, Chongqing, China

In the past fifty years, scholars have examined fields of England's politics in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; however, the politics of mobility has not been extensively studied. This article addresses Prince Hal and King Henry V's wildness within mobility as an important role to the advancement of metaphorical wildness. King Henry V's "wildness" is an element that is often discussed in Shakespeare's *Henry IV* and *Henry V*. Locating in Prince Hal's wandering to uncertainty, unsettledness and changeability a potential to unveil the disguised aspects of the assumed politics, Shakespeare focuses on the interlocking aspect of wildness and mobility. He calls for exploring a recognition of ideal character and tactical figure into a transitional strategy of it. In reorganising civil culture, Shakespeare sees the possibility of re-configuring the approach from aimless roaming to communal mobility. It is the approach of these mobilities through ways of wildnes that permits us to explore between wildness as a strategy and as a metaphor, and to understand in the notion of early modern mobility that is as tactical in ambition as it is consequential in such contexts of Shakespeare.

Keywords: wildness, mobility, Shakespeare, Prince Hal, King Henry IV, King Henry V

Introduction

Many critics referred to the many qualities of King Henry V. According to A. W. Schlegel (1808-9) in *The New Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, King Henry the fifth is "as endowed with every chivalrous and kingly virtue; open, sincere, affable, yet still disposed to innocent raillery". William Hazlitt believes that King Henry V "was careless, dissolute, and ambitious;—idle, or doing mischief…he seemed to have no idea of any rule of right and wrong, but brute force, glossed over with a little religious hypocrisy and archiepiscopal advice…there is he a very amiable monster" (Hazlitt, 1818, p. 20). Although most critics from the old generations have noticed Hal's multi-faceted qualities, they took it as an adjective rather than discuss its formation under ocurring wildness in depth.

I aim to discuss the specific manifestation of his civility and the condition which promotes Hal's wildness into civility. Moreover, I will also explain that the interrelationship between his wildness and civility is related to his mobility. As I have stressed earlier that there are two kinds of mobility I would like to discuss in this article, the mobility of places and the mobility of ideas. What I intend to further illustrate is that Prince Hal's mobility is

transformed from aimless roaming into meaningful communal mobility, according to his transition between his wildness and civility. This article argues that Henry makes the transition from wildness to civility within mobility as a way of self-fashioning model. In the early modern period, the foreign trend of the state is gradually taking place from the exploration of individual or minority travellers to the people as a resolute community, which is a symbol of transition of the ever-changing early modern period.

Two parts, patterns of Prince Hal's wildness and mobility as a way of figuring wildness will be discussed in this paper. The first part is a brief introduction of the basic concepts about the Wild Man in different periods, as well as Hal's wildness shaping his courtsey. And then my own understanding of the wildness in *Henry IV* and *Henry V* will be put forward. The second part will analyze in detail about Henry V's wildness in mobility of places and in details about Henry V's wildness through mobility of ideas. I intend to interpret the significance of mobility in wildness in Shakespeare's these three historical plays. Wildness appears very frequently in *Henry IV* and *Henry V*. And the wildness is not deeply exploring in the description of the characters. Because these characters in the plays all agree that Henry's wildness has disappeared after Henry V's accession naturally. Through the discussion in this paper, the wildness is worth exploring and the disappearance of the wildness may not necessarily be a good thing. Unlike *The Tempest*, the ideal society portrayed by Shakespeare in *Henry IV* and *Henry V* is the possibility that the wild man can be in every man. The wildness coexists within mobility. King Henry V's metaphorical wildness may be a good way to study mobility in early modern England.

Patterns of Hal's Wildness

The disappearance of Prince Hal's wildness has been discussed continually in *Henry V*. Hal's wildness is not "barbarous" in the traditional sense. From the Oxford English Dictionary (OED), the word wildness means "uncivilized or uncultured state or character (of persons); savagery; barbarity; roughness of manners", "uncultivated state (of a plant)" as in "Our vineyards, Fallowes, Meades, and Hedges, Defectiue in their natures, grow to wildnesse", and also has comparably similarly meaning of "unstrained condition or quality", especially "want of, resistance to, or freedom from restraint or control (with various shades of meaning)".

Most of these three historical plays talk about Prince Hal getting rid of his wildness, which I think is the opposite. Through the disguise of Prince Hal's wildness in different identities, Prince Hal uses his disguised wildness as a political strategy to cope with his new identity, the King. In the past, he was uninhibited, wandering in the wild. After becoming a King, he well concealed his wildness in dealing with both domestic and foreign issues. The reason for this may be that being a monarch requires reliable quality for the sake of stability and loyalty. Prince Hal has inherited this "wildness" from his aristocratic father. Henry IV's expedition to the holy land was motivated by his own atonement, and then he confessed to his son that this was just a way to distract from domestic contradictions. This can be a manifestation of variable wildness.

An anxious struggle between personal pursuit and royal expansionism lies at the heart of the motion of Hal. Though stressing the descriptive wildness that the patterns of wildness builds up, Leerssen basically differentiate wildness with patterns of motivation. Apart from this, Leerssen famously emphasized that wildness has a connotation of being "unruly, erratic, incomprehensible and surprising" (Leerssen, 1995, p. 31). Other than Prince Hal's unruly quality, his surprising sides are more worth exploring. However, texts, even if Hal appreciate royal status in one civic culture, do not simply proceed of his own wandering. His motion to cut across political

territories hinges on the region of court, politics and strategies and is thus related to a variety of potraits that are social, political and literary. Shakespeare stresses that power of politics generates considerable effect on patterns of Hal's so-called wildness and may stimulate or oppose its ambitions.

According to Hayden White, the Wild Man during the early modern period should be distinguished from "the Noble Savage". Wildness's latin form is "savagery". The notion of wildness mainly contains barbarity and roughness. In part, concepts like "savagery" and "wildness" expressed this longing for completed ordered self-centered way of life in those regions of the world for setting up civilized fantasies. Before fatasies could begin perfecting nature, they needed the wilderness—the jungle, forest, desert, and mountains. *The Myth of the Noble Savage* advised readers to understand the idea that there is a native wildness in every man that had been poorly destroyed but offered little advice on how to release them properly. This description exposed one of the main contradictions underlying both civilized and primitive huamanity. The man's pressure on the depressed labor and lands implied that his desires and anxieties should be treated as equal. At the same time, the generation of myth and the transition to fiction myth emerging from the characterization without any construction seemed to attribute the existence of wild things. Yet although historic humanization might have seemed like mad man, it was not actually. As an achieved with unified and imperfect humanity organized, without a single group even civilized man was wild. Without the human wild actions advocated by native wildness, historical emotions of manking could come into the chaoes itself. Nontheless, the unified and imperfect humanity was clear that although all wild man required a division of humanity, the forms of humanity should acquire moral norms if possible. As the early modern realistic concentration asserted, early modern English people needed differentness. Reassuring English people that Shakespeare's characters in plays resembled England reflected humanistic variations that human nature achieved it in the initial community.

To be specific, King Henry is not the uncivilized man who lives in caves in the mountains or forest. And He does speak human language. Then where does his wildness come from? People's references to Prince Hal's wildness is reflected in his character and casual way of life. In detail, Hal acts surprisingly for suppressing his personal desire as a king and later learn to build a community. To my way of thinking, in contrast to his wildness, his civility manifests itself in the correctness of his religious belief, his kindness and mercy towards his subordinates, his skills of speech, the change of his way of addressing somebody and his humour. As the Prince of Wales, he is away from the court and spends time with his unlettered, rude and shallow companions. After he became the King Henry, this way of self-centred life was replaced by his act of duty without any notice. As King Henry V, he is far away from his wildness and returns to his home as well as the court. His duty is well depicted through his civility and civilized manners. He turns into this calm, cautious, responsible, merciful, potent and tactical figure.

The patterns of Hal's wildness employes to describe the figural motion in taverns and court differed, but the underlying emotions is not the same. There are two patterns concerning Hal's wildness. One can be concluded to as a circle of court, and the other is a solution from a self-centered way of life to a community-oriented responsibility. *The First Part of King Henry the Fourth, The Second Part of King Henry the Fourth* and The Life of *King Henry the Fifth*, those Shakespeare's history plays, explores the historically controversies between abundant internal and external changes in sixteenth and seventeenth century, an age which sees the initiating of mass-mobilizing to early modern England. Shakespeare for introducing Prince Hal combining the coming-of-age

story of Hal, lowlife humanises, to express his more complete view of surroundings, promoting his struggles to stay in control of the situation that revolves around Hal's personal interest. At the center of the story are Christian kings, self-doubtful soldiers, life-long companions, having full of doubts "I do not think a vraver gentleman, more active-valiant or more valiant-young, more daring or bold, is now alive to grace this latter age with noble deeds. For my part, I may speak it to my shame, I have a truant been to chivalry; and so I hear he doth account me too" (*King Henry IV Part 1*, 5.1: 89-95). Together with other, images of Henry, he struggles to cope with this "circle of court". At first, Prince Hal is away from his father's court as a discursively freeman in some way. And then he almost indulges himself in this wonderland of wildness with pretencious transformation. This can be viewed as a necessarily self-centered alteration. In such a context of Hal's idleness, distance and reassurance, Shakespeare's use of justifying fifures for both Henry's presence and heroic claims becomes an inventive means of shape of royal figure.

The patterns of Hal's wildness are the subject of this part is a process of unquestionable "journey of discovery". I may now be allowed to observe the second pattern of Hal's wildness, that is a reliable solution from a self-centered way of life to a community-oriented responsibility. In the first place, the returning of royal court and palace prior to the widespread acceptance are quite rare; and I believe the rivalries between Prince Hal and King Henry IV, between French and England in question is a specific situation of such attempt claiming to belong to the sixteenth century of Shakespeare's age. Hal's knowledge of kinship, we therefore see, was limited to two-faced civility. He states that "will awhile uphold the unyol'd humour of your idleness: yet herein will I imitate the sun, who doth permit the base contagious clouds to smother up his beauty from the world, that when he please again to be himself being wanted, he may be more wonder'd at, by breaking through the foul and ugly mists of vapours that did seem to strangle him" (*King Henry IV Part 1*, 2.2: 217-225). Perhaps this is the point where I should observe the more I have to say citing behaviour of nobles, mentioned suspiciously also, as I have already observed in the beginning. The civility and nobility of its having been observed in the circling mobility of Hal clung to the conversion. It is described by King Henry V in "my father is gone wild into his grave" as "mingle with the state of floods and flow henceforth in formal majesty". Readers of the play could naturally inquire about the monarch-based wildness. This wildness within wilderness has drastic advances of Hal's later action and motivation.

According to Hayden White, during the transitional period between medieval and the early modern ages, many viewers took a more ambivalent attitude, on both the desirability of both idealizing the Wild Man and also the possibility of escaping civilization. Speaking of Wild Man in Shakespeare's plays, the most commonly discussed play is *The Tempest*. However, the spatialization of the Wild Man does not work out in *Henry V* as it in *The Tempest*. First of all, King Henry the fifth is not the Wild Man in the traditional sense. And then Henry's wildness is more like self-fashioning within mobility rather than a distanced fantasy world. The whole play, *Henry V*, is filled with characters' constant discussions about Henry's vanishing disappearing wildness. This thesis argues that Henry's metaphorical wildness is under disguised by using different mobilities of places and of ideas as an innovative way of figuring early modern society. Mobility is no longer simply bad or good, but a more neutral attempt will be made to govern a kingdom.

Rollison believes that the centre of this universe leads to the "prince" and there is a "vast wall" which exudes power and authority surrounds his park. I agree with this spatial imagination to help to understand kingship

(Rollison, 1999, p. 6). However, the prince's road to the centre of the power isn't entirely roses all the way. For a long time, critics have long been studied King Henry V's image as ditchotomy: "Henry as ideal ruler and brutal conqueror"; or as "a politically strong monarch and weak human being"; or "Harry as model ruler saddled with a nation sadly deficient in moral virtue". The discussions of "wildness" runs through three plays. Here, Hal's wildness not only marks his uncivil ways of lifestyle but also states his marginal political status. As I shall argue, Hal's mobility is that of a carriage which, in early modern England, assisted him between his walls and his fields. In the discourse of politics, Hal's wildness works as carriage's wheels turning between the court and the wilderness. As Turner rightly suggests that many aspects of sociological theory are conceived by means of metaphor. "Metaphors enable images to be drawn, possibilities for understanding to be expanded and insights deepened" (Turner, 2010, p. 35).

The purpose of the metaphor of the wildness builds on what was uncovered in Hal's military intentions. Speaking of Hal's later politeness and civility, there are still some ambivalence which combines pleasant behaviour with an intention to hide unpleasant intentions. As Peltonen says "civil courtesy and conversation made up a pleasing sociability whose purpose was to gain other people's approval and respect" (Peltonen, 2003, p. 22). Henry's ambitions are hidden there. At first he is the prince Hal, and then he becomes the King Henry, Hal's social mobility is not vertical but horizonal in nature. His social wildness seems tamed by his errand of civility and by means of social mobility converts what is wild into what exemplifies the status: its capacity to mobilize.

Mobility as a Way of Figuring Wildness

Henry's wildness varies according to his different roles in *King Henry IV* and *King Henry V*. To be specific, Henry's wildness is evident yet invisible when he was the Prince of Wales and later King Henry the fifth, respectively. As the Prince of Wales, Henry was young, passionate, free, tameless and evidently wild. As the King Henry the fifth, Henry was clearly far away from his wilder days and became this calm, cautious, responsible and tactical figure. Henry indeed inherited his "wildness" from his father. It was his father Henry IV who succeeded in ascending the throne through his own "wildness". When it comes to wildness, it is completely different when you are a king. Henry's wildness in this new figure can be invisible to my way of thinking. His wildness is maintained within mobility. Thus, Mobility as a way of figuring wildness enriches the characteristics of Henry as a king in the early modern period.

One meaning of the word mobility is the ability to move between different levels in society. Although Hal's social status had not changed much, his political status is drastically inconsistent. He went from powerless to powerful. In this way, he is capable of controlling desires in political contexts. I intend to discuss how Hal's wildness runs through as a metaphorical mobility. And I plan to explore Henry V from a new perspective to explain why this is a very favourite monarch with the English nation.

There are two kinds of mobilities to be discussed in my thesis—mobility of places and mobility of ideas. The reason why I divide mobility into these two kinds is because of the meaning of the word "wildness". Basically, wildness is the quality in feelings of being strong and hard to control. But "wildness" also contains the meaning of a place. As the Prince of Wales, Henry spent most of his time at public roads, camps, fields and mostly at Boar's Head Tavern rather than palace. As the King Henry the fifth, Henry spent most of his time at English

camps and the fields of battle rather than palace as well. Henry's wildness and ambition, whether as a prince or king, is performanced through places outside the palace. And then the second mobility of ideas as a way of figuring wildness. Henry, the Prince of Wales, is mingled with the crowd in *Henry IV* and become determined and thoughtful later as the King Henry the fifth. The evidence for Henry's disguised wildness is that he keeps on asking his ministers questions about all these affairs about his kingdom. This may be due to the disguise that he is learning to be a proper monarch. Through the analysis of Henry's ideas at different times, it is of great help to understand the mobility in his wildness.

Hal's wildness in *Henry IV* and *Henry V* is more metaphorical and political. I am going to discuss the "wildness" through political discourse. The so-called uncultivated, unhabited, inhospitable region and undesirable status have specific innate qualities especially when discussing it in political context. Obviously, from the text, when Henry V was the prince, he was full of wildness with "his companies unletter'd, rude, and shallow" and "his hours fill'd up with riots, banquets, sports", "and never noted in him any study, any retirement, any sequestration from open haunts and popularity" (*Henry V*, 1.1: 56-59). According to Hotspur, Prince Hal was the nimble-footed madcap Prince of Wales in Act 4 of *Henry IV Part 1*. In addition, Henry IV believed Prince Hal had "such inordiant and low desires, such poor, such bare, such lewd, such mean attempts, such barren pleasures, rude society" *(Henry IV Part 1*, 3.2: 12-14). On the one hand, these words, such as rude, poor, bare and barren, are closely related to the natural wildness. On the other hand, it implies Prince Hal's marginal political status. In addition to these words mentioned above, many other words used in *King Henry IV* and *King Henry V* were related to natural wildness. At this time, Prince Hal was margianlized and was excluded from the political centre and power centre. Prince Hal was not recognized by the monarch and the aristocracy. Like the civilized man and the barbarian, the chosen man of god and the lost lamb, Prince Hal was something between because of his contradictory identity. He was raised as a prince but defined as a savage who deviated from the course of his life.

Of course, it is conceivable that he has to choose where he belongs to avoid a crisis of kingship. The death of Henry IV is the turning point. After the death of King Henry IV, Henry V says "that I have turn'd away my former self, so will I those that kept me company" (*Henry IV Part 2*, 5.5: 63-64), what followed was a credible monarch. However, everything happened naturally. What about those recurring doubts about King Henry V's wildness? Here I don't think that Prince Hal is always wild just as King Henry V is always civil. Hal's "wildness" is disguised and fucnctional. Prince Hal made it clear that he uses his wild behaviours as a means to prove himeself later. As you can see that he says "I'll so offend to make offense a skill; redeeming time when men think least I will" (*Henry IV Part 1*, 1.2: 238-239). Here he is either willful or tactical. He cannot be defined one-sidedly. Whether as the Prince Hal or King Henry V, he still keeps in the habit of enjoying a moment alone, he also lacks displine or restraint as he enjoys to disguise himself as a common man. He is regarded as "a most princely hypocrite" (*Henry IV Part*, 2 2.2: 61). Prince Hal made a promise to King Henry IV, "I shall hereafter, my thrice gracious lord, be more myself" (*Henry IV Part 1*, 3.2: 92-93). This "myself" is anything but defined by others. King Henry IV once drew an analogy between Hal and Richard II, Henry IV and Henry Percy, "for all the world, as thou art to this hour was Richard then when I from France set foot at Ravenspurgh and even as I was then is Percy now" (*Henry IV Part 1*, 3.2: 94-96). However, this "myself" differs from Prince Harry, differs from Richard II, differs from the old King Henry IV. This "myself" a new King's self. King Henry V's identity is multiple, contradictory yet harmonious. His wildness is disguised and metaphorical.

Various contexts work meanwhile have supported the above discussions. King Henry the fifth questions "May I with right and conscience make this claim?" (*Henry V*, 1.2: 96). Though his subjects answer their new king's doubts with persuasive assumptions and evidences. King Henry V seems to be assured but still keeps doubting inside his subconscious. He keeps mentions words as "barbarous" "wilder" from "and we understand him well, how he comes o'er us with our wilder days, not measuring what use we made of them. We never valued this poor seat of England; and therefore, living licence, did give ourself to barbarous licence; as 'tis ever common that men are merriest when they are from home" (*Henry V*, 1.2: 266-272). A similar statement concerning "give furtherance to our expedition" finds a place in "therefore let every man now task his thought, that this fair action may on foot be brought (*King V*, 1.2: 309-310)". This notice is clearly the testimony of figuring wildness.

Upon making inquiries at mobilities, I found the boundaries between wildness and civility had been melted from Henry's insights. Hostess of the Board'd Head Tavern has marked that "The king has killed his heart (*Henry V*, 2.1: 92)". There is some other aspect in connection with Henry's politics of place which has been offered previously. Henry, as a King, is fierce but sophiscated in many obvious talks, to have been discussed by all kinds of characters; and his house of monarchy is still indicated in his detour of motion, which stands for the constant determinations on his quest both to restrain his wildness and to his pursuit of own historical achievement. It is thus a not spontaneous growing-up among his companions off the court. Being an expected and appropriate ruler, it is probable that the past might have been placed under his subconscious in the grevious and dangerous environment. That King Henry himself acts as a wholesome male to his people, is of course a resolute policy; in fact, it would appear, his obscure mobility as a model. From the above we learn that "The king is a good king; but it must be as it may; he passes some humours and careers (*Henry V*, 2.2: 133)". It can be marked that Henry as a King needed the support from identically himeself as a growing monarch, which we have heard were metaphors of the military situations at battlefield. There is also a claim of difficulties in his mobility. Under a disguised and sophiscated of the barbarous habits he rebels more than one time would be appointed to link this previous state, and approves the attemptations are the fileds for his motivation.

The perfect character of King Henry the fifth have put up a fight to try to ward ogg his inner beast. He claims: "Now, fie upon my false French! ……yet my blood begins to flatter me that thou dost, notwithstanding the poor and untempering effect of my visage! He was thinking of civil wars when he got me: Therefore was I created with a stubborn outside, with an aspect of iron, that, when I come to woo ladies I fright them" (*Henry V*, 5.2: 235-239). If this analysis of wildness and civility by the means of language usage is credible, there will find more textuals to support the idea. According to William Fulwood (1568), "polite conversations and discourse had come to be regarded as a key social activity, loaded with implications for the prestige of participants" (p. 13). He distinguishes between superlative terms of respect required in addressing superioes, the "familiar reverence" to be emplyed with equals, and the plainness reserved for inferiors. In *King Henry IV* Act 1, Falstaff uses the plainness for Prince Hal, such as "now, Hal, what time of day is it, lad?". He considers Hal as equals at least. If this fits Hal's wildness at that time, the situation does not become better when Hal becomes the King. In early modern period, "the most obvious element in verbal deference was the use of formal titles in salytation and discourse." People should greet a superior or stranger with his proper title, and also to repeat the title at intervals during the exchang. However, in *King Henry V*, nobleman like the Archbishop of Canterbury only addresses King Henry V as decent as "full of grace and fair regard (*Henry V*, 1.1)" only few times. The second time he

addresses in the same scence King as "this King". From the following conversations, it is clearly to find out that the Canterbury directly address King Henry V as pronouns, such as "his hours", "his youth", "he seems". In sixteenth and seventeenth century, "Clamorousness, the swallowing of words, stammering, and uncertainty in delivery were all considered to show a vulgar subjection to impulse and personal eccentricity inconsistent with the self-mastery of the 'civil' gentleman." Most of the characters at beginning in *King Henry V* shows uncertainty toward the disappearance of King Henry V's wildness. I suppose this is the mirroring of King Henry V's social wildness. Prince Hal is swaying from side to side.

In detail, Hal acts surprisingly for suppressing his personal desire as a king and later learn to build a community. To my way of thinking, in contrast to his wildness, his civility manifests itself in the correctness of his religious belief, his kindness and mercy towards his subordinates, his skills of speech, the change of his way of addressing somebody and his humour. It is uplifting to come into ambition, as it were, with his great potentials, whose whole existence was intensifying. His mobility invests with improvement everything with which he has been reframed.

Conclusion

As proverb in early modern period, the wild man is lurking within every man. Prince Hal and King Henry's wildness is a dimensional object in Shakespeare's these three history plays and is used in a mobile way to emphasize the dubious monarch. The two patterns types King shortly as an imprudent and ambitious king. Both patterns explain largely consistent actions by his main identities which characterize, or, reframe them, and through struggles with his wildness in the wilderness of settlements. In any case great entanglement is maintained between every line of the play. And it is especially in this shifting mobility between, on the one hand, Hal's wildness, on the other, King Henry's mobility as way of figuring wildness, that the deliberate, ordered, rational powers of a Wild Man in early modern stage are uncovered. As there is a native wildness in every man, and there is a social model in every society.

References

Bryson, A. (1998). *From courtesy to civility: Changing codes of conduct in early modern England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Dudley, E., & Maximillian, E. (Eds.). (1972). *The wild man within: An image in western thought from the renaissance to romanticism*. London: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Fulwood, W. (1568). *The enimie of idlenesse: Teaching the manner and stile how to endite, compose and write all sorts of epistles and letters*. London: Leonard Maylard.

Hazlitt, W. (1818). *Characters of Shakespeare's plays* (2nd, ed.). London: Taylor and Hessey.

Jucker, A. H. (2020). *Politeness in the history of English: From the middle ages to the present day*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leerssen, J. (1995). wildness, wilderness, and Ireland: Medieval and early-modern patterns in the demarcation of civility. *Journal of the History of Ideas, 56*(1), 25-39.

Peltonen, M. (2003). *The duel in early modern England: Civility, politeness and honour*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. (2003). *Early modern civil discourse*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Rollison, D. (1999). Exploding England: The dialectics of mobility and settlement in early modern England. *Social History, 24*(1), 1-16.

Shakespeare, W. (1943). *The complete works of William Shakespeare*. W. J. Craig (Ed.). London: Oxford University Press.

Taylor, G., & Jowett, J. (Eds.). (2016). *The New Oxford Shakespeare: The complete works modern critical edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thomas, K. (2018). *In pursuit of civility: Manners and civilization in early modern England*. London: Yale University Press.

Turner, C. (2010). *Investigating sociological theory*. London: Sage.

"wildness, n." OED Online, Oxford University Press, September 2020, Retrevided from www.oed.com/viewdictionaryentry/Entry/229017.