November 2011

# Social Money: Literary Engagements with Economics in Early Modern English Drama

Myungjin Choi, *The University of Western Ontario*

Supervisor: Dr. Paul Werstine, *The University of Western Ontario*

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in English

SOCIAL MONEY: LITERARY ENGAGEMENTS WITH ECONOMICS
IN EARLY MODERN ENGLISH DRAMA

SOCIAL MONEY

(Thesis Format: Monograph)

by

MYUNGJIN CHOI

Graduate Program in English

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

The School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
The University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE AND POSTDOCTORAL STUDIES

**CERTIFICATE OF EXAMINATION**

Supervisor

______________________________
Dr. Paul Werstine

Supervisory Committee

______________________________
Dr. James Purkis

______________________________

Examiners

______________________________
Dr. Margaret Jane Kidnie

______________________________
Dr. Madeline Bassnett

______________________________
Dr. Paul Webb

______________________________
Dr. Randall Martin

The thesis by

**Myungjin Choi**

entitled:

**Social Money: Literary Engagements with Economics in Early Modern English Drama**

is accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Date______________________________

______________________________
Chair of the Thesis Examination Board

# ABSTRACT

This thesis investigates the impact of economic philosophy and history on sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English drama. It focuses primarily on the ways in which emergent mercantilist theories, new labour models, and changing class structures informed literary production. The significant influence exerted on the English public by financial developments during the early modern period suggests that economic concerns were of preeminent relevance to public discourse. As a result, playwrights cognizant of these worries produced plays that incorporated the distinctive language and character of economic thought and engaged their audiences through tableaus representative of select aspects of London's financial landscape. In my first chapter, I use historical studies of Jacobean England's engagement with slavery to read Shakespeare's *The Tempest* as a political debate over the delineations among slaves, servants, and subjects within English institutions of servitude. Chapter Two examines Walter Mountfort's *The Launching of the Mary* as a piece of early modern economic propaganda, with particular emphasis on its confluence of economic dialogue and the use of the female body as political imagery. Chapter Three is a rereading of Shakespeare's *1 Henry VI*; I argue that the play, which has chiefly been read as a dramatization of political history, is also an allegorical and moralized narrative of England's transition from feudalism to mercantilism. Chapter Four addresses the personifications of greed in the medieval morality plays *Everyman* and *The*

*Castle of Perseverance* and in Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta*, with specific attention paid to the models of ideological morality and institutional discipline promoted by these displays. The considerable perspectives offered by economic criticism produce meaningful engagements with these plays and their literary, historical, and philosophical frameworks.

Keywords

Early modern English drama, English literature – $16^{\text{th}}$ century, English literature – $17^{\text{th}}$ century, economic criticism, *The Tempest*, *The Launching of the Mary*, *1 Henry VI*, *Everyman*, *The Castle of Perseverance*, *The Jew of Malta*, mercantilism, economic history – $16^{\text{th}}$ century, economic history – $17^{\text{th}}$ century, William Shakespeare, Walter Mountfort, Christopher Marlowe.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I arrived in London, Ontario in 2005 carrying only the contents of a single backpack; I leave this city now with fond memories of countless friendships, the wisdom imparted by my teachers, and an intellectual maturity fostered by my studies that will continue to serve me for the rest of my life.

First and foremost, I would like to extend my deepest thanks to my esteemed supervisor, Paul Werstine, for his guidance and encouragement throughout all stages and aspects of this project. This dissertation could not have been written without him. He has been diligent in his attention, generous with his time, and patient with my mistakes. He has provided me with countless opportunities and has always been a source of unerring advice and judicious commentary. Paul has exemplified the ideals of his profession, his supervisory role, and academic scholarship, and I can only hope that my future teachers will prove to be half the mentors he has been to me.

I thank also James Purkis, my second reader, who has provided me with astute and attentive feedback at critical junctures in this project's development. James has been immensely helpful in guiding this dissertation in the right direction, and I consider myself lucky to have benefitted from his keen insights. Also, the Department of English at The University of Western Ontario has been a rich environment for my studies, and I would like to thank my professors and the administrative staff for providing for their students such a fine institution. I am indebted to the English department, the university, and the Implementing New Knowledge Environments SSHRC research group for the generous support that made my studies possible.

I owe a large debt of gratitude to my colleagues at Western for their friendship over the years. Thank you, members of my cohort, the first-rate thinkers and even better friends who have made this journey with me: Thomas Barnes, Christopher Bundock, David Drysdale, Keri Lamb, Joshua Lambier, and Sarah Pesce. Thank you, my friends, without whom London would have proven a far less appealing place to call home: Marie Comisso, Rebekah Lamb, Matthew Peebles, Philip Glennie, David Hickey, Stephanie Oliver, Patrick Casey, Jenna Hunnef, Elan Paulson, Shaun Ramdin, and Ross Bullen. Thank you, the best dog-walking friends I could ever ask for: Molly Luu, Stephen Hamilton, and Charlie the Goldendoodle. A special thank-you to Maria O'Brien for being a dear friend: everything happens exactly as it should, when it should.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for their bottomless love and unwavering trust in my decisions. They have taught me patience, diligence, responsibility, and humility. I owe my achievements to the support provided by my mother, Hyunsook, my father, Sungsub, my sister, Kyungjin, and, last but never least, my faithful and ever-present canine companion, Hera.

Myungjin Michael Choi

July 2011

*For my parents*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

# INTRODUCTION

# A BRIGHTER YESTERDAY

Narrative allows writers to display cultural anxieties within a controlled environment, whether it is on the page, the screen, or the stage. Money has proven to be an enduring and frequent theme for such processes: in participating in these moments of storytelling as exorcism, audiences can confront the vast economic forces that influence their lives through a series of personifications and localizations. Moral abstractions, such as greed and excess, are coalesced into representative characters, and systems of trade and exchange serve as backdrops as well as logical and rational explanatory origins for the characters that exist inside these stories. The consequences of a monetized and de-humanized worldview are illustrated in accordance with public morality.

Money-based narratives remain a staple of dramatic presentations in modern western cinema. Andrew Niccol's 2005 film *Lord of War* looks at the political complexities and the human costs of arms trafficking; Stephen Gaghan's *Syriana*, also 2005, explores similar themes within a specific Middle Eastern setting. Oliver Stone's *Wall Street* (1987) and Ben Younger's *Boiler Room* (2000) dramatize the public distrust of large financial institutions and address concerns over accountability, while films such as Gabriele Muccino's 2006 *The Pursuit of Happyness* and Ridley Scott's 2007 *American*

*Gangster* create narratives that explore, with vastly different results, the promise of achievement and advancement within American capitalist ideology.

Mary Harron's *American Psycho* (2000), much like Budd Schulberg's 1941 novel *What Makes Sammy Run?* and Anthony Minghella's 1999 film *The Talented Mr. Ripley*, dramatizes the effects of modern corporate culture and the acquisition of wealth on identity. Patrick Bateman's successful businessman veneer, defined by hollow signifiers such as suits and business cards, masks his perversions and killing sprees. The film also actively speaks against the moralization of economic narratives and refuses to conclude, unlike so many other films with similar topics, with cathartic justice enacted as punishment upon the excesses portrayed: as Bateman states in his last words of the film, "there is no catharsis," and "this confession has meant nothing." In the film's last scene, as a chilling emblem of public fear of the de-humanization entailed by corporatization, Bateman sits in a lounge, surrounded by his associates, and realizes that no one cares to investigate or even to know of his crimes as long as he continues to perform his function within the corporation's financial operations.[1]

These contemporary examples are part of a theatrical heritage centuries long. Medieval English morality plays and their combination of drama and pedagogy contain many of the same themes and social functions as these more modern works. The moral perils engendered by the pursuit of wealth are dramatized as a warning to play audiences in *Everyman*, and *The Castle of Perseverance*'s Greediness is the literal manifestation of his name. Both serve as allegorical figures in the pursuit of an educational agenda heavily inflected by morality. Although somewhat less didactic than the morality plays, early modern drama similarly allowed playwrights to stage representations of avarice in an effort to effect a cultural catharsis for the audience: by localizing large trends into individual human figures, dramatists could submit them to judgment, humiliation, and ultimately punishment. Drama thus serves as a tool for both understanding and managing economic phenomena and the fears they provoked; characters such as Shylock, Volpone, and Barabas functioned as part of a social ritual to explore the cultural anxieties occasioned and caused by money.

In this dissertation, I examine themes of money, greed, and commercial conduct in early modern English plays and elucidate the various economic trends that influenced English culture and the literature it produced through finely-tuned historical contextualization. To introduce this aspect of my dissertation, I will conduct a brief overview of some of the extant economic criticism of Shakespeare and show, through the readings of two plays, the general research methodology used in its studies. Reading the plays from a more localized perspective allows us to note the historical roots and incidences of economic phenomena that have continued to influence national and individual economies over the course of centuries and the stories these factors inspired. These interpretations also allow us, more centrally, to approximate the economic worlds of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as they were understood by their contemporary audiences.

There has been and continues to be an enormous amount of research dedicated to economic history, and even those works focused on my specific period of interest constitute a very impressive number. Modern economics is a field replete with tools, but many of these would prove anachronistic if applied to particular historical periods; my intent is to form a general understanding of the period and to track the impact of economics on early modern literature's social and political ideologies while suggesting new readings of plays that attend to contextual economic histories. The early modern period is marked by difficult transitions and substantial developments: new economic classes, sources of income, standards of living, political models, and conceptualizations of currency all emerged within a relatively short space of time and in rapid succession. Analysis thus deals not only with longer periods of growth, measured in decades, but must also be conducted with a strong awareness of individual years and events and the limits of individual perception: as Scott Cutler Shershow warns, early modern playwrights "must be seen neither as the sovereign source of the age's ideology, the fully agential expressor of its evolving values and habits of thought, nor as the mere passive reflection of changed economic circumstances." Instead, playwrights, like their audiences, were individual agents involved in "an endless interaction of material and symbolic practices that at once oppose, reflect, reciprocally produce, and thus 'overdetermine' one another" (16).

In pursing this line of research, the investigation must exercise caution due to the possibility of losing historical perspective in applying and in understanding economic theory in modern terms. For example, as part of an ongoing effort to join economic philosophy to developments in critical theory, critics have recently focused on the human individual's theoretical position as the point at which postmodern, postcolonial, feminist, or ethnic studies can inform and be worked into economic analysis. A significant portion of this discussion charges currently dominant neoclassical economics and its predecessor, late modernist economics, with an intentional effort to remove the human subject from theoretical discourse. Critics such as Arjo Klamer have argued that symptomatic of this process is a preference for abstraction over direct representation and an increasingly self-referential system of analysis that pays little attention to the individual circumstances of those that analyses seek to describe, understand, and predict.

This dehumanization-through-abstraction has been identified as stemming primarily from the Enlightenment, widely adopted and furthered in the twentieth century. Consequently, periods preceding the early 1800's have been theoretically construed and idealized by some as eras of lost potential tinged by a nostalgia for a past understanding of how the "full" human figure, characterized by desires, emotions, stresses, and idiosyncratic preferences, should occupy the heart of economic discourse. However, contrary to this generalization, plays such as *Arden of Faversham* and *The Merchant of Venice* show that dehumanization in economic theory extends back far earlier than Enlightenment positivism; the key ideological developments necessary for the promulgation of such a political and economic project can be observed as early as the sixteenth century.

Klamer locates the dehumanization imperative as a specifically and uniquely modern development due to a number of twentieth-century advancements that are, in his estimation, fundamental to the expression of reductive abstraction in current economic theory. He includes among these factors technological inventions such as the computer and its semantic deployment as "a dominant root metaphor" (81) that monopolizes "new classical models [...] largely about information processes and the 'noises' that regularly occur within these processes" (98); to these he adds theoretical movements such as a general turn away from Keynesian economics and a widespread adoption of mathematical strategy as the central analytical tool. The incorporation of mathematical language and the emergence of marginalism, beginning with William Stanley Jevons, Carl Menger, and Léon Walras[2] in the late-nineteenth century, are connected to the roughly concurrent focus on *homo economicus* as a theoretical assumption and specifically formulated as an analytical tool by Walras, Vilfredo Pareto, Lionel Robbins, and Francis Ysidro Edgeworth, among others.

The "loss of character" Klamer laments in his essay involves the disappearance of what he calls the "moral character" (98) and the growing centrality of an abstraction he names "Max U," the rational actor at the heart of neoclassical economics: "Max is a man without the qualities that would make a subject human; Max U has no history, is devoid of moral sentiments, does not know tradition, and is oblivious to the uncertainties and insecurities that plague anyone who has to make choices" (93). Klamer points to Smith's *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* and Aristotle's *Politics* and *Nicomachean Ethics* as examples of works that formulate economic analysis without losing sight of the human individual who should nominally occupy its centre. Modern neoclassical economics, to Klamer, has become "highly abstract, reductionistic and formalistic" and "devoid of references to historical situations or human subjects" (82). As a result, Klamer posits that economic discourse as it currently stands is an extremely axiomatic and logically procedural discipline that fails to capture the human dimension involved in decision-making processes, in large part due to an overdependence on a system that considers only utility, supply, and self-interest as motivations and assumes a restrictive definition of rationality.[3]

However, an examination of historical documents reveals a far less gentle vision of attitudes towards labour and human capital within economic systems than Klamer's narrative would suggest. Within the early modern context, writers – political, economic, and literary – appear to be divided across the same kind of ideological battlefronts that Klamer identifies as uniquely modern developments. Mercantilist writings promote some of these ideas: Thomas Mun's rudimentary formulations of economics as a large-scale system of networks and relations in his series of 1620's pamphlets prioritized over community the desire for the accumulation of wealth as the fundamental goal of exchange. William Ames's 1630 *Conscience with the Power and Cases Thereof* is deeply marked by attempts to understand the nature of service and dependency through distinctions between servant and child and to re-imagine the master-servant dichotomy in the post-feudal era by reducing the servant from an individual human figure, bound by notions of allegiance, duty, and familial tradition, to an abstracted type that responds to discipline and directions in a predictable and pre-determined manner without any possibility of resistance.

In *Arden of Faversham*, Arden's rejection of Dick Reede's pleas makes clear his decision's ideological basis. Reede approaches Arden, his landlord, to plead for leniency for missed tenant-payments; when his initial pleas fail, Reede resorts to belligerency. Arden states that "[i]t greatly matters not what he says" (XIII.56) in response to Reede's threats, simultaneously establishing his own defence while dismissing Reede's: the passage directly preceding Arden's claim contains both Reede's plea for his "wife and children [...] Needy and bare" (XIII.15-17) and his call for "some miracle / On thee or thine in plaguing [Arden] for this" (XIII.30-31). Arden's appropriation of land and its usage draws much from the discourse of "improvement,"

> a term much used in the agricultural writings of the early seventeenth century. In that context, improvement initially meant the turning of land to more profitable use and the consequent enhancement of its rental value. To the proponents of improvement, the assumed purpose of agriculture was not subsistence, but profit and rent. (Wrightson 203)

By distancing his own profit from Reede's need, Arden demonstrates a brutal utilitarianism. Arden's disregard for Reede's family's needs and refusal to acknowledge the specifics of his case are only heightened by Reede's insistence on making the dispute into a deeply personal conflict:

> Even in that fearful time would I fall down
> And ask of God, whate'er betide of me,
> Vengeance on Arden, or some misevent,
> To show the world what wrong the carl hath done.
> This charge I'll leave with my distressful wife;
> My children shall be taught such prayers as these.
> And thus I go, but leave my curse with thee. (XIII.47-53)

The defensive positions assumed by both parties in this dispute highlight their ideological differences. The strength of Arden's threat stems from his prioritization of their contract and his business motives over Reede's particular plight. Arden makes claim to rights of property and landownership according to monetary values and contract ("the rent of it was ever mine" [XIII.20]) supported by the threat of state power ("I'll lay thee up so close a twelve month's day" [XIII.24]), while Reede turns to an appeal to personal sympathy ("prayers and fair entreaties" [XIII.7]) and recourse to religious justice, characterized by a populist sentiment evidenced by his desire "to show the world what wrong the carl hath done" (XIII.50). The conflict over how to understand and to resolve economic and financial disputes is thus dramatized here as Arden's desire to see Reede as nothing more than the value of his land and services, overlooking the individual circumstances of Reede's situation: it is not so much that Arden has no sympathy for Reede's cause, but that Reede's particulars never even enter into Arden's reasoning.

The irreconcilability of these two positions is summed up neatly in Reede's semantically laden claim that Arden holds the land "wrongfully" (XIII.13):

> My coming to you was about the plot of ground
> Which wrongfully you detain from me.
> Although the rent of it be very small,
> Yet will it help my wife and children,
> Which here I leave in Faversham. (XIII.12-16)

Arden interprets "wrongfully" in its legal and contractual meaning without regard for the moral meaning that Reede attributes to it and sees as its sole function. The former's understanding of the term is made clear by his defence, "I assure you [Franklin] I ne'er did him wrong" (XIII.57). The ambiguity of the competing definitions seems to confuse even Franklin and jar him from his usual toadying stance; he replies only with a hesitant and unsure "I think so, Master Arden" (XIII.58) that is ambiguous and open to interpretation. The disparity is informed by the play's sense of historical tension and transition: Reede's linking of finance to character and traditions of generosity and hospitality is a throwback to medieval moralist thought that understood "economic behaviour [...] not as a phenomenon to be analysed in its own terms, but rather as a branch of personal and social morality" (Wrightson 149). Within those terms, Arden's moral position is reprehensible but also represents a discourse completely distinct from extant moralist philosophy: Reede's protest in part represents the deployment of "an alternative moral theology which placed less emphasis on positive law than on the primacy of the individual conscience guided by God, and on the virtue of voluntary adherence to high ethical standards in business affairs" (Wrightson 208).

Arden here should be construed as a character derived from a philosophy that was, if not fully formed at the time, then at least on its way towards such an ontological discipline, and not solely a reworking of the moralist villain-figure. Notions of economic selfishness and self-interestedness are recurrent and common themes, and marking them as morally unjust is a tradition that extends far back beyond the early modern period. What is particular to this historical period, however, is the social and cultural environment in which these vilified attitudes were becoming standardized and tacitly accepted conditions for business and trade. The intersection of commonwealth and "the natural harmony of interests" led the contemporary Edward Misselden to ask, "Is it not lawfull for merchants to seeke their *Privatum Commodum* in the exercise of their calling? Is not gaine the end of trade? Is not the publique involved in the private and the private in the publique?" (qtd. in Viner 439), marking a sharp break from moralist positions on commonwealth and money. Within modern criticism, Teresa Lanpher Nugent has already discussed how the practice of usury was perceived of as a necessary and acceptable, though ostensibly objectionable, measure as it was gradually disentangled from moralization throughout the early-seventeenth century, while Garrett Sullivan has examined how technological developments in cartography and surveying modified social conceptualization of terrain, land, and landownership. Natasha Korda's study of rising material consumption levels in early modern English society is also useful here in establishing the changing economic conditions in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries as distinct and unprecedented developments.

The deployment of ideological lines differs in *The Merchant of Venice*. Shylock's demanded price, a pound of flesh, presents a highly complex and fraught symbol; it is simultaneously a reductive gesture – isolating a part of the human body and reinscribing it within a seemingly arbitrary commercial value – and yet far more involved with the individual subject than any example of such ideology found in *Arden*. Wrapped in notions of revenge, Shylock's insistence on obtaining specifically "that same merchant's flesh" (4.1.296) enacts both a deeply personal attack on Antonio while also marking the flesh as a legal payment for "the law, / The penalty and forfeit of [his] bond" (4.1.203-204). The pound of flesh's location within a system of commerce and monetary value recalls the earlier casket scene in which the human body – in this case, Portia's – strongly resists and rejects any attachment to object value. In doing so, Portia's body fits thematically into her world, one that keeps the individual human subject distinct from any system of trade; this narrative in effect performs the same kind of distancing function that Arden's rejection of Reede does. By dismissing currency as a "pale and common drudge / 'Tween man and man" (3.2.103-104) and refusing to allocate any connection between monetary value and individual circumstances, Bassanio and, by extension, Portia's trial maintain a clean distinction between the two systems of economy. Despite attempts, as noted by Mark Netzloff,[4] to keep Portia's world entirely separate from Venice through an adherence to an abstract and limitless characterization of bounty, both are highly mercantilist systems of exchange and trade, with their primary differentiation stemming from how the two philosophies approach the common goal.

Although Portia's plea for mercy on Shylock's part appears to link her understanding of contract and justice to a religious perspective on business relationships, she herself seems aware that such an argument serves only to disrupt established codes of conduct for contractual obligations:

> The quality of mercy is not strained.
> It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven
> Upon the place beneath. It is twice blest:
> It blesseth him that gives, and him that takes,
> 'Tis the mightiest of the mightiest.
>         [...] I have spoke thus much
> To mitigate the justice of thy plea,
> Which if thou follow, this strict court of Venice
> Must needs give sentence 'gainst the merchant there.

At this point, Portia has already demonstrated the immovability of her own contract: her scenes with Morocco and Aragon make clear how they are all "enjoined by oath" (2.9.9) to the ritual's demands and that "[t]o offend and judge are distinct offices, / And of opposèd natures" (2.9.60-61) – a crucial ideological position that separates personal reaction from official contractual obligations. Even in the case of Bassanio, Portia is unwavering in her diligence:

> I would detain you here some month or two
> Before you venture for me. I could teach you

> How to choose right, but then I am forsworn.
>
> So will I never be; so may you miss me. (3.2.9-12).

Thus, Portia's call "to mitigate the justice" is never truly a sincere plea because it is "the language of equity, not the language of Christian mercy" (Schwartz 232); Portia herself is deeply aware that contract and personal circumstances should never be joined since such a connection undermines not only that individual bond but also the entire system of legal and commercial justice that informs both her and Shylock's worlds.

Shylock's failure is not purely a moral one; he ends the play with nothing because of his insistence on using an abstracted and formulaic legal system to pursue a deeply personal end, that of vengeance against Antonio. Antonio's plight itself – the terms of his bond with Shylock – originates also from a failure to respect the proper conditions of business: Marc Shell's examination of religion's impact on Antonio's choice makes clear that his decision to support Bassanio stems not from mercantilist values but rather notions of Christian brotherhood. The usage of systems that ignore the individual and respect only the letter of the contract is not the point of contention here as it is in *Arden*, since it is by those very measures that Bassanio wins Portia, Portia saves Antonio, and Antonio's investments come to fruition; rather, it is the contract's misappropriation and its entanglement with personal and human motivations that become the target of its criticism. Shylock is repeatedly given the option of taking a payment in exchange for dissolving the agreement, but his constant focus on having his bond, as voiced in 3.3's repetition of "I'll have my bond," makes clear that his apparent focus on contractual dues is actually informed by his drive for revenge. Because of his inability to perform the abstraction required of him by the system, that of distinguishing Antonio's personal insults from his monetary value, in order to extricate himself from the contract, he fails to negotiate the proper conduct of the exchange system.

Both plays present conditions under which human desires are excised from economic systems: *Merchant* makes a strong claim for the need for this impartiality by positioning all of its characters within the confines of economic doctrine, except for Shylock, who fails because he does not respect those conditions, and *Arden* dramatizes the tension between the incompatible languages of the discourses of religious generosity and contractual business. Klamer's criticism, while targeted specifically at economics as an academic discipline, operates under a sense of what Amariglio and Ruccio have called the "nostalgia for the true humanist beginnings of modern economics" (*Postmodern Moments in Economics* 109): this belief posits that the periods preceding the Enlightenment were given towards more humanized and unified understanding of economics despite evidence from the early modern era presenting the very kind of reductionism that Klamer identifies as a particularly modern convention. The displacement of the human body and desire in economics by abstracted ideology is not solely a modern phenomenon, and whether the question is framed in terms of religious morality, utility, rationality, or postmodern narratives, the fundamental conflict predates both modernity and the Enlightenment.

In a similar manner to the study I have conducted here, my dissertation seeks to explore concepts of servitude, greed, financial policy, and economic history engendered by early modern economic theory and the unique historical circumstances that provoked them. Comprised of four chapters, my work uses a combination of literary, historical, political, and linguistic histories to produce readings of various plays that seek to explore the ways in which early modern playwrights and their contemporary audiences understood how the economic factors of their world influenced the metaphorical and allegorical dimensions of the plays. Drama made possible the dissemination of ideological perspectives through theatrical propaganda: representative figures in narrative could be turned into advocates for political and economic agendas. Alternatively, as mentioned earlier, there is a uniquely cathartic dimension to plays about money because of the close epistemological connection between money as a theme and moralized cultural lessons on avarice. The embodiment of these anxieties in performed roles creates emblems and allows these allegorical figures to be subjected to discipline. Performance enacts Foucaultian ritualized and moralized punishments as a form of public spectacle that puts these representative characters on display within a controlled environment for the purposes of judgment; these parameters also allow audiences and playwrights alike to present abstract concepts to public opinion and pursue idealized forms of justice in which crimes are inalienable from their prosecutions and moral evils such as avarice are always punished.

My first chapter is a study of the history of slavery in early modern England and its connections to *The Tempest*. Although this combination of topics has been the subject of numerous studies, my intervention is aimed at the play's troubled and conflicted ideas regarding servitude, the tumultuous nature of service-related positions, and the beginnings of the re-introduction of slavery to English society at the turn of the seventeenth century. The nuances of this political debate are manifested primarily through the fraught relationships between Caliban and Ariel and their master Prospero. These characters engage in a linguistic battle over terminology and the cultural weight informing the distribution of names such as *slave* and *servant*; this dispute is correlative to the ambiguities surrounding the application of these names within systems of English labour at the time and is further informed by the social changes that rendered these labels unstable designations subject to political ideologies and power struggles. Caliban's and Ariel's speeches function as a performance of these instabilities and as attempts to assert, within the constantly shifting definitions of roles and their duties, some degree of political agency.

I then turn, in my second chapter, to a lesser-known play. Walter Mountfort's *The Launching of the Mary* is in many ways an anomalous work, both the product of an amateur playwright and a form of East India Company propaganda. The play's narrative consists of two plotlines operating in tandem to produce an endorsement of the English East India Company, then still a relatively new corporate entity, and the mercantilist philosophies that fuelled it. Drawing heavily from economic writers such as Thomas Mun and Gerard de Malynes, Mountfort strives to justify the EIC's policies and business practices, the company's growing dominance within English commerce, and public perceptions of royal favouritism; in doing so, Mountfort also displays a keen awareness of economic theory's semantic and conceptual associations with discourses of medicine and health. Using Jonathan Gil Harris's research on early modern economics and its pathological language as a critical framework, I examine how Mountfort constructs his narratives to embody physically, through representation on the stage, many of the metaphorical dimensions of economic discourse's terminology drawn from concepts of the body. Mountfort's work incorporates notions of health and activity into its political message, and I analyze how bodies on stage – particularly those of female characters – are made to serve the EIC's commercial agenda.

My third chapter shows how teleological narratives of economic history were understood by the early modern public through a study of Shakespeare's *1 Henry VI*. As a result of the substantial changes to London's financial culture and its institutions during the years between the Tudor period and the end of the Jacobean Era, much of the contemporary economic discourse was dedicated to theories attempting to explain the causes for the failure and collapse of the feudal manorial tradition. New developments, such as the promulgation of mercantilist ideas, large urban markets, and international trade, were scrutinized for their fit into England's economy, and shifts to balances of political power, demographics, work conditions, and types of employment forced further perceptual reassessments of domestic industries. Although ostensibly political histories, the *Henry VI* plays, and *1 Henry VI* in particular, also function as dramatizations of England's economic history and address, through the tactful relocation of setting to a past period, many of the concerns and anxieties exhibited by Shakespeare's audiences in response to an increasing awareness of political power's dependence on money. Characters such as Joan, Talbot, and Henry are all representative aspects of an economic history, heavily tinged by a pervasive pessimism about the effects of these changes on English society, and narrate the decline of feudal landownership and the rise of alternative models of exchange and currency.

The fourth and final chapter of my dissertation is a study of how personifications of avarice were used on the early modern stage and the role of staged punishments as an expression of communal authority and judgment in response to the cultural impact of economics. I examine the deployments of emblematic characters representing greed in several plays, including *Everyman*, *The Castle of Perseverance*, and *The Jew of Malta*, and trace the literary development of this dramatic convention from the medieval morality play to the early modern drama. While the medieval morality play stages these personifications as part of a didactic strategy aimed at imparting religious morality to the audience, early modern plays feature these types of characters as part of a theatrical spectacle that provides their audiences with subjects for collective condemnation with profound effect. The early modern theatre was a space in which the anxieties surrounding predatory usury, commerce, and trade that plagued early modern society could be gathered and be represented as embodied figures on the stage; drama provided audiences with the opportunity for catharsis, a chance to vent their frustrations and manage any anger or resentment they may have experienced in light of the harsh economic realities of their world. Early modern England, despite newfound wealth and power for many, was a site of substantial poverty, unemployment, and economic hardships. By giving physical forms to abstract concepts, the stage, much like our modern cinema, gave life to narratives in which the fears resulting from the vast political, economic, and social changes affecting England could be harnessed. These characters could be controlled and limited by boundaries imposed on them by the constraints of narrative, thereby reducing or eliminating their imaginative power and subjecting them to ritualized forms of punishment.

Early modern playwrights were extremely conscious of the socio-political circumstances under which their works were funded, produced, and presented to an audience, as well as the power they wielded over the public imagination as storytellers.

The narratives told on the stage were models through which their audiences could be brought to understand and to re-imagine the world around them, and economics formed an increasingly visible and relevant theme in playwrights' works. Mountfort's work uses this juncture between narrative and public as an occasion for propaganda, while Marlowe's Barabas gives his audiences a scapegoat onto which to heap their hatred and frustrations. Other plays use the stage's power as a space for self-reflection by creating, or sometimes re-creating, a vision of history superimposed with the attitudes and knowledge gleamed from their modernity, in effect forming a revisionist narrative that seeks to assess how England came to be the nation that it was in the late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries. Throughout this historical period, there are, with varying levels of subtlety, hints of a growing awareness of the pivotal role economics plays in forming the political and moral lives of the citizenry, and select early modern playwrights constituted a group keenly aware of this intersection. Motivated by the study of these confluences in these works, I have endeavoured here to produce readings that negotiate literature's often complex relationship to the world in which it was written through the study of that enduring motif, money.

# CHAPTER ONE

# SLAVES, SERVANTS, AND SUBJECTS: THE INSTABILITY OF SERVICE ROLES IN *THE TEMPEST*

## 1.1: The Early Modern Context

When Prospero calls Caliban "my slave," he uses a word that a modern audience associates with a long and difficult history that includes the cultures of ownership, brutal oppression, and monetized human bodies that characterized the Transatlantic slave trade. Modern understanding is coloured by this past, but while slavery's narrative has understandably been focused on the slave trade's heyday in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, it remains equally important to ask from where, and under what political and economic assumptions, such an enterprise originated. The sixteenth century, long before the beginnings of the abolition movement, already exhibited contested notions of how labour, whether it be enslaved, indentured, or contracted, was to be organized and its conditions enforced. These conflicts, in addition to overtly political actions such as riots, protests, and tracts, were manifested in the very language used to define the various forms of servitude extant during the early modern period. The usages of these terms in *The Tempest* indicate their instabilities and also how crucial these labels were as tools of control: affixing names to forms of service was a powerful political gesture that could both empower and limit individuals as a consequence of the rights, or lack thereof, accorded to each label. To be identified and be named a *servant* was to assume a position of strength, indicative of some degree of choice and agency in the designation; likewise, the unilateral application of *slave* to coerced labourers demonstrates the exertion of political power in assigning names. In gaining language, Caliban also learns of his subjection by being labelled as a "slave"; once he possesses this knowledge and enters into a full awareness of the term's power, his resistance by necessity must emerge as disobedience in both word and deed.

Attending to a society's engagement with slavery can entail also the danger of moralization and a metaphysical, rather than historical, perspective. In his collection *Munera Pulveris*, John Ruskin wrote that "slavery is not a political institution at all, but an inherent, natural, and eternal inheritance of a large portion of the human race" (142). Ruskin argues for the ubiquity of slavery as a human failing, repeated across cultures, eras, and civilizations, through a statement largely centered on the abstract concept of slavery as a philosophical and spiritual state. He eliminates in turn from his inquiry into slavery various forms of subjection, such as "imprisonment or compulsion of one person by another" (139), as in the case of the prisoner or the conscript soldier, or the "purchase, by money, of the right of compulsion" (141), as in the exercise of territorial rights over those that inhabit the land, to arrive at what he deems to be slavery's most essential condition and definition: "the purchase of the body and soul of the creature itself for money" (142). Such a sale, in Ruskin's estimation, transcends the political, social, and historical circumstances under which the transaction is performed; this exchange's combination of bodily and metaphysical conditions operates uniformly and permanently outside and independently of context. As a result of this distancing, Ruskin's moral objection and its application to slavery as a unified concept are dependent on a definition of a slave removed from its political and legal frameworks and its specific manifestations.

Written in the late-nineteenth century, Ruskin's essay was released in the wake of the British abolitionist movement in 1833. Abolition's general philosophy is again articulated in manner similar to Ruskin's by Sir Reginald Coupland in 1933:

> As with a beast of burden, the slave's health and happiness depend on chance – on the character of his master and on the nature of his work. He may be well cared for; he may even sometimes seem better off than if he had never been enslaved; or he may be cruelly treated, underfed, overworked, done to death. But Slavery stands condemned more on moral than on material grounds. It displays in their extreme form the evils which attend the subjection of the weak to the strong. The slave's soul is almost as much in bondage as his body. His choice of conduct is narrowly prescribed. He cannot lead his own life. He can do little to make or mar his fate: it lies in another man's hands. (7-8).

The confluence of these two writings indicates a distinctly moralized attitude towards their common subject due to their particular shared emphasis on the idea of the "soul." Slavery, as it has come to be recognized in its axiomatic opposition to the post-Enlightenment notion of freedom, represents something both more and less than its history and incorporates a number of philosophical conditions. Like Ruskin's pronouncement, slavery as a concept has been given a life of its own in an appeal to a universalized morality that operates both in tandem with, but also independent of, its history, its promulgation, and its later abolition in Western history.

This conceptual flattening of slavery across eras, an effect predicated in part upon historical revisionism, favours an understanding of slavery's moral dimensions with the consequence of glossing over the finer details of its various implementations. That is, hindsight grants us the ability to look back on former institutions and to identify the presence of slave-holding measures, laws, and cultures and to judge them on a moral basis informed by intervening developments such as the historical schism of abolition. This process, however, fails to attend sufficiently to the finer legal points and the political language of slavery in its specific historical contexts. This criticism is not to argue against the immorality of slavery or against its presence and effects, but rather, as a starting point for my literary analysis, to point out that to adopt such a perspective may potentially do disservice to the tensions exhibited in the contemporary literatures that sought to explore and understand slavery within their own frames of reference and knowledge.

My intervention examines one particular disturbance in the midst of many. Early modern dramatic language in Shakespeare's *The Tempest* exhibits nuances of the political debate over definitions of servitude. In this chapter, I will examine the ways in which slavery as an economic process operated in relation to other forms of servitude and how these interactions were dramatized on the early modern stage. I will begin with a brief overview of England's engagement with the slave trade during the early modern period with particular emphases on the English historical background that made slavery's later institutionalization possible; this background is necessary in order to situate the complexities of slavery's re-emergence during the early modern period. I look at how slavery, during this era, formed a unique non-presence in domestic English culture that differentiated the early modern concept of slaves from what came both before and after this historical period. Slavery was paradoxically both non-existent and crucial to England, a practice forbidden at home but increasingly prevalent abroad in the colonies.

I will then turn to Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. The tensions between slaves or servants and their masters are a foundational element of the play's political commentary; these clashes are exhibited in a linguistic struggle informed by the cultural connotations associated with such names and their applications. Caliban forms a crucial portion of my examination of the play, and my study utilizes research drawn from postcolonial and historical perspectives to read how his speeches and actions perform under the conditions of forced service imposed on him by Prospero, Miranda, and the culture that informs the play and its narrative. Both Ariel and Caliban are forced to work under the dominating influences and within the boundaries of the language forced upon them by Prospero, who even "[t]ook pains to make [them] speak" (1.2.356), but this language contains within itself a predisposition towards a slippage when defining and categorizing servitude. This ambiguity provides both characters with an opportunity to resist the political, although perhaps not the material or magical, power exerted over them by Prospero: Ariel refuses to accept the whitewashing semantics employed by his master and rightly calls himself a "slave," whereas Caliban approaches his subjection from the opposite angle and states that he is a "subject." I will conclude this interpretation with an analysis of the consequences of the ambiguity latent to service-related roles, specifically illustrated through Caliban's attempted rape of Miranda, and through the play's manipulation of narrative events to speak to the instability of labour roles in early modern England.

Slavery serves as a theoretical, political, moral and historical crux for my examination of the development of economic bondage in the early modern period. The conceptualization of the human body finds its most reductive yet absolute deployment in a commercial and political enterprise that seeks to reduce the individual to money and to work value and induct the body into systems of exchange. The issue of slavery was as much a historical question as it was a current political one to early modern England, tied both to social ranks and economic aspiration and pursuit. However, despite its epistemological value as a system of value for exchange, slavery was also a fraught issue without clear boundaries or definitions. As these roles were situated and, in the case of slavery, re-introduced into early modern England and its emergent language of economics, linguistic overlaps and unclear scopes in terminology illuminate the ways in which labels such as *slave*, *servant*, and *subject* served as ideological battlegrounds.

## 1.2: A Limited Engagement with Slavery

Although the British abolitionist movement would find its fullest expression and success in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries, traces of similar ideological positions can be found as far back as Anglo-Saxon legal codes. David Pelteret writes of Archbishop Wulfstan of York, who in the early eleventh century, in "his ecclesiastical tract, *Episcopus*, [...] interpreted this equality of all to mean that in the secular realm everyone should receive equal protection under the law" (90). Although Wulfstan's arguments maintained a strongly hierarchal perspective of society and stopped short of challenging the institution and rank of slavery itself, the expansion of rights to include all people, with further provisions and protection for Christian slaves, represented a sharp break from previous legal interpretations. The actual impact of these dissenting opinions remains debatable, but what is known is that the enterprise of slave-holding in England had a long and varied history leading into the medieval period, which was followed by a drastic decline entering the early modern. The figure of the slave was all but eliminated from England's domestic society by the late-sixteenth century, in large part due to a legal ruling: the 1102 decree by the Council of Westminster made slavery illegal within England and "any slave setting foot in England became a free man" (Reiss 6). The 1086 Domesday Book reports that approximately 10.5%[5] of the English population in all of its counties at the time of the census were *serui*, or slaves. J.S. Moore's work raises the figure to closer to 12% by "conjecturally filling in the gaps in the Domesday recording of slaves" (Faith 60), and David Pelteret raises similar questions about the figure, whether "the figures of *serui* either record the heads of slave households or else they represent all the members of slave families" (188). In either case, these debates only shift the numbers upwards, thereby setting 10.5% as a rough floor for the slave population in the eleventh century. Consequently, what the Domesday Book reports demonstrate, however inadvertently, is the decline in the slave population proper between the medieval period and the early modern in England.

This is not to suggest that the functions performed by slaves ceased to exist; rather, historians such as Ross Samson, David Eltis, and Madonna J. Hettinger draw attention to the legal ambiguities surrounding labour and its employment to argue that, although the slave class proper disappeared over the course of the fourteenth century, the economic and industrial roles performed by slaves were shifted onto serfs during the feudal period. Serfs occupied a legal grey zone in which "masters [had] large powers to enforce contracts. Those who would not enter such contracts, and who did not own sufficient land to support themselves, faced severe laws against vagrancy and idleness, the aim of which was the extraction of labor from those unwilling to volunteer it for wages" (Eltis 40). Under the official line of commonweal and traditional customs, manorial arrangements reorganized social titles and responsibilities while preserving, for the most part, the actual tasks performed by workers despite the fact that "slave masters found it ever more difficult to get slaves to work for them like slaves" (Samson 119).

Serfdom did not persist, either, as "more and more villeins obtained their freedom and became copyholders" (Cannon) over the course of the fourteenth century. Changes to work-capable demographics further precipitated the decline of one-sided labour arrangements that favoured the landowner against the tenant and were specifically responsible for the decreasing ability of lords to extort labour and to set the conditions of employment. Wars and epidemics exerted a constant negative pressure on the able-bodied population, of which the severe population decline following the Black Death in the fourteenth century is a prime example. Ole Benedictow writes that

> on the eve of the Black Death, the social scene in the English countryside was characterized by strong population pressure. There was strong competition for land, the lords of the manors could demand high rents and fines and exact heavy labour services from their tenants. Cottars, day labourers, smallholders and other poor people who were dependent on work for wages in order to scrape together a livelihood had to compete for work opportunities and work hard for little pay. (362)

Survivors found themselves in positions possessed of far more bargaining power; with so few labourers available, lords were forced to make concessions in order to sustain their holdings. Like the French after the French Revolution, elements of the English population perceived the changes as an opportunity to escape previous structures of control and were deeply motivated by the historical memory of life under feudal bondage.

As a result, even serfdom, a political issue that catalyzed numerous peasant uprisings, was slowly whittled out of English landscape by the late-sixteenth century, "though it was a slow process, and as late as 1549, in Kett's rebellion, there were demands that bond-men should be made free" (Cannon), to be replaced by emergent contractual-labour relationships. By the early modern period, the decline of any widespread institution of slavery since the end of the medieval era had reduced the figure of the slave to a general abstraction in English domestic culture. Influenced by changes in economic, religious, and social factors, this reduction was also informed by developments in how labour was construed and utilized in the early modern English economy. Numerous peasant uprisings and the death of the manorial tradition made it abundantly clear that established labour models were no longer tenable by the late-sixteenth century.

While criticisms of slavery and the philosophical underpinnings of free labour were not as expansive as French writings or later English ones calling for abolitionism and recognition of fundamental human liberty, such as those by Jean Bodin, John Locke, Samuel Johnson, William Cowper, or Edmund Burke,[6] the recognition of bondage as a failed system – at least locally within England – was deeply ingrained in the early modern cultural landscape. Anxieties about servitude, power structures, and the value of a human body were key issues for the early modern English society collectively engaged in the process of reassessing how the human subject fit into its emergent economies in the wake of widespread changes to social orders and developing financial mobility. Although the middle to the late-seventeenth century saw the re-emergence of slave-taking, trade, and usage due to Cromwell's policies against Catholics and the "continuous and large-scale English involvement in the slave trade [which] began [...] in the 1640s" (Law xxxii), the Elizabethan and Jacobean eras of English history occupy a peculiar lull in domestic England's direct engagement with slaves. David Eltis elaborates on this odd period and geo-cultural distribution:

> There were certainly more slaves in southern Europe in 1492 than in 1772 – slaves made up ten percent of the population of Lisbon in the 1460s. However, north and northwest Europe had been free of chattel slavery since the Middle Ages. Indeed the incidence of chattel slavery everywhere in western Europe had declined irregularly since Roman times, but the pace of the decline had been greater in northern than in southern Europe. [...] From the Neolithic Revolution to the Middle Ages, every society had had some slaves. Suddenly there was a culture, and the larger part of a subcontinent, that did not. (25-26)

In contrast, the groundwork for England's overseas slave trade was simultaneously beginning to take shape. Eltis provides as evidence a table of figures that state roughly eight thousand Africans arrived in American colonies either directly under English control or by way of English ships between 1580 and 1640 – a noteworthy number but making up only a small percentage of total migration to the English New World, here given as one hundred and thirty thousand individuals. The political and economic deployment of slavery as a tenet of English colonialism stemmed largely from both historical and foreign lessons.

The Transatlantic slave trade would not emerge fully until the late-seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, but early modern England contained already a rough system of exchange values for the human body further informed by the necessities of colonial expansion: although exact numbers were variable according to circumstances, the general underpinning notion of a monetary value on human life and the body was a familiar concept manifested in internal systems of insurance, wage labour, and service. From these roots sprang such a large commercial and political enterprise that England, by the eighteenth century, held the unsettling distinction of being "the largest carrier of slaves across the Atlantic" (Morgan xi) and utilized slavery as a central component of its colonial strategy. Rapid colonization and development simultaneously profited from the capture and sale of slaves and their importation to colonies, leading Malachy Postlethwayt in 1745 to refer "to a 'magnificent Superstructure of American Commerce and Naval Power on an African Foundation' as the basis of French colonial expansion and as the objective of British imperial endeavour" (Morgan xii).

Beginning colonization later than some other European powers, the English crown and businesses had the benefit of hindsight and established examples from which to draw in constructing their own holdings. It was very clear to the English colonial movement from a very early point that slaves were an indispensable part of expansion, having witnessed the success of forced labour in rapidly developing colonial holdings in other European colonial developments. The specific historical precedent established by slaves and serfs within a primarily agricultural setting is particularly noteworthy given the colonial model largely favoured by English imperialists. The examples set by the Portuguese and the Spanish in their colonial projects made clear the usefulness of and necessity for slaves and indentured servants in quickly establishing a strong foothold in the New World. As a result of this use, some English merchants, starting from the mid-sixteenth century, made good business of transporting slaves. First among these was Sir John Hawkins, "a Devon shipowner and entrepreneur," who established a small Transatlantic trade in "cargoes of West African slaves." (16).[7] George Francis Dow remarks that Hawkins's initial voyage proved so successful that "[e]ven the queen became a shareholder and lent the expedition the *Jesus of Lubeck*" (Dow 21). However, Dew's descriptions of Hawkins's voyages also make clear that very little to none of the slave trade's human cargo was brought to England; instead, Hawkins focused on trade conducted on foreign shores with the Iberian powers, the sale of slaves to New World colonies, and their acquisition from African and Caribbean sources. The insular nature of the early English slave trade proved to be a key factor of its influence on domestic culture: social understandings of slavery and their implications were substantially different between London and the colonies until at least the later decades of the seventeenth century.

The close proximity of settlers to their slaves, once across the Atlantic, was a major difference between the colonial and the English experiences: Lawrence James argues that, unlike some other colonial projects and particularly those enacted in Central and South America, which were focused on a massive and expansive drive to extract natural resources and treasures from colonial territory and to ship them back to their home countries, the English model of colonial expansion was focused on creating permanent settlements for the purposes of building up a sustainable resource base and eventual trade partner with Europe. G.A.J. Hodgett and Andrew McRae similarly emphasize the agrarian nature of English colonialism. England largely drew from a history of agricultural settlements within its own borders and attempted to replicate proven models within the New World context. While this is a somewhat simplistic summary of imperialist philosophies, as Elinor G.K. Melville draws attention to the development of sheep grazing *haciendas* and O. Nigel Bolland the formation of cacao plantations in Central America under Spanish occupation, the English colonization of Barbados does seem to suggest a general adherence to more permanent solutions, as do later developments in continental North America. Kenneth R. Andrews writes that Spain's American colonies demonstrated the short-lived value of gold plundering for colonial expansion as opposed to plantations, a lesson taken to heart by empires that followed:

> [...] the first three decades of Spanish occupation had gutted not only [Espanola]'s accessible gold but the native population as well. The gentle Arawak people Columbus found there numbered at least a million; by 1520 they were almost extinct and from about that date the settlers look to slave-grown sugar for their livelihood. (Andrews 117)

For English migrants, although necessary systems of trade persisted between the colonies and their home nations, the emphasis on permanent settlement, encouraged by the high costs of transit and resettlement, ensured that the voyage was one-way for the vast majority of settlers.[8] The propagation of the plantation system in English colonies, most notable in the Thirteen Colonies and the Caribbean, is a highly visible example of the English colonization philosophy: James notes that in Barbados, the demand for labour for sugar plantations resulted in a gradual shift from "14,000 inhabitants, most of them white indentured labourers" in 1628 to approximately 42,000 African slaves by 1712 and close to two million in North America by 1810.[9] Kenneth Morgan supports this point by stating that

> [The slave trade] gave employment to merchants, suppliers of goods and thousands of seamen. It was linked to the people of the New World, with slaves delivered particularly to the plantations in the American southern mainland colonies and the Caribbean islands. The slave trade stimulated shipbuilding, the development of ports, attitudes towards capital accumulation and the growth of long-distance oceanic communications and trade. By the mid-eighteenth century, British colonial possessions were very much an empire of slavery [...] (Morgan xi-xii).

As if to underscore this disparity between domestic England and its colonial holdings, early modern London society benefited greatly from colonial expansion[10] while remaining relatively ignorant of the realities of colonial life. England's associations with slavery had relatively little effect on its domestic social realities until later in the seventeenth century. While border conflicts with Ireland and Scotland as well as pirates posed the threat of capture and enslavement,[11] thus suggesting some peripheral awareness of slavery, actual quotidian employment of slaves in London society was negligible. This discrepancy explains how England could pursue the rewards of the slave trade while also instilling a culture that led Richard Jobson, in his 1623 book *The Golden Trade*, to remark that the English people "did not deale in any such commodities, neither did wee buy or sell one another, or any that had our owne shapes" (Jobson).

Despite the first-hand experiences lived within overseas colonies and the Transatlantic slave trade, domestic lessons and the bits of information in the urban social and cultural spheres that informed the early modern London stage were coloured by what G.K. Hunter calls a "framework of assumptions." The cumulative effects of this interpretive distortion were politically and socially informed perspectives that affected and filtered all information entering England:

> [t]he foreigner could only 'mean' something important, and so be effective as a literary figure, when the qualities observed in him were seen to involve a simple and significant relationship to real life at home. Without this relationship, mere observation, however exact, could hardly make an impact on men caught up in their own problems and their own destiny. (44)

By these criteria, both the political conditions of burgeoning colonialism and the expanding intellectual horizon of English knowledge of the world served to influence England's literary production by turning it inward: the world "out there" became a lens through which society at home could be examined. Whatever knowledge entered England was immediately modified by two sets of perspectives: the first understood any information primarily within the context of extant English society, while the second reiterated and incorporated it as a part of this cultural fabric. A lack of any sense of immediacy to slavery, due to the distance afforded by overseas ventures as well as these cultural modifications, greatly influenced the manner in which slaves were gradually reintroduced into the ranks of English society.

The difference is exhibited in the contemporary language. For early modern English playwrights, words such as *slave* came to occupy a definition indicative of abjection and of low status; this meaning, for the most part, arose not from actual experience but rather from historical Roman and medieval legacy and observations of continental European powers and their colonial expansions. Concordantly, the *OED* notes that *slave* as a "term of contempt" or "in less serious use: Rascal; fellow" emerged in 1537 and 1592 respectively.[12] The diminished severity of the term and its transition into colloquial usage are particularly noteworthy given the historical circumstances under which the original referent of the word was largely a non-presence in London. Although it would be erroneous to claim that *slave* had only these definitions, the multiple usages of the word engendered by the contemporary social circumstances seem indicative of less rigid linguistic boundaries, leading to the possibility of a more liberal application of the word; Derek Cohen has even argued that *slave* is "overwhelmingly a term of abuse" that "in Shakespeare, [...] does not refer to a condition of virtual imprisonment and servitude" (49), thus removing it entirely from its literal register.

As a result of this semantic difference, early modern plays were written at a particularly uneasy point of intersection in history. The common language of *slave* as pejorative was being quickly brought into contact with the reality of economic and imperialist expansion. The actual human slave was returning to English public consciousness with a particularly fast and large presence, and the general ignorance of true slavery did not persist. As previously mentioned, Hawkins and others like him were rapidly expanding their trade, and the growth of colonial enterprises made clear the necessity for enslaved workers as well as indentured servants. This overlap between the semantic and the actual resulted in a distinct linguistic tension deeply informed by the political: it was simple enough to call someone a slave when the word was an abstracted insult and its roots divorced from everyday life, but colonial enterprises were rapidly recreating, if not an actual slave group in domestic English society, at least an awareness of the class.

## 1.3: Servitude in *The Tempest*

In *Shakespeare's Caliban: A Cultural History*, Vaughan and Vaughan write that

> to the eighteenth century, Caliban's enslavement was the logical result of his depravity, his rightful station in a natural hierarchy of reason over passion, virtue over vice, civility over savagery. Such complacency was bound to be disturbed in the early nineteenth century by the growing fervor of the abolitionist movement in England and the United States. *To many English and American observers slavery became a grim reality*; whether the commentator was for or against emancipation, Caliban was perceived in a new light. (Vaughan and Vaughan 105, italics mine)

They are right to point out the nuances of Caliban's depiction and the political inflections of the play's interpretation and audience in later periods, but slavery and its resonance in English society far predate their periodization. The language of *The Tempest* hints at a political and linguistic instability in a number of terms which were expanded by profound social changes wrought on English society as a direct result of colonial enterprises: the troubled political nature of the language employed by Caliban, Prospero, and Ariel indicates points of conflict over societal structures. [13] Transitional and emergent classes in

English society, centred on the servant and the slave, posed the question of what it meant to be a subject. These issues lie at the heart of a play focused on “a preoccupation with the ruler and the ruled” (Vaughan and Vaughan 50).[14]

In each of these cases and others concerning slaves, central to their characterizations are the possibilities of escape from or disobedience of their masters: anxieties about control and the exertion of power in this kind of skewed relationship appear to attend the vast majority of these characters. A careful distinction must be drawn in analyzing the depiction of slavery, however, since themes of gender and race, which have proven to be inseparable from the topic of slaves within this particular historical context, inform the portrayal of disobedience and how its repercussions are moralized. If Hunter is correct in his elevation of English interiority and self-interrogation as the primary influences on literary production in this period, then slavery as a concept must be examined and distinguished within the particular historical conditions of servitude and class as they existed for the majority of Londoners in the early modern period.

This distinction serves to identify how modern analyses have tended to favour a particular type of slave: the figure of the slave as racialized, colonial subject, enacting a response “prompted by the play itself, to humanize and domesticate Caliban, to rescue him from Prospero’s view of him – to succeed with him where Prospero has failed” (Orgel 26). In twentieth-century literary criticism, Caliban’s prominence has tended to overly steer discourse into particular directions and trends since works such as Aimé Césaire’s and Stephen Greenblatt’s in the late 1960s and 70s,[15] especially with regard to Postcolonial studies. This comment is not to dismiss the value of their works, and to a certain extent, this focus is aided and encouraged by the explicitness of Shakespeare’s characterization: Vaughan and Vaughan point out that “Caliban’s social condition is clear [...]. Prospero repeatedly calls him a slave – ‘Caliban, my slave,’ ‘What ho, slave!’ ‘poisonous slave,’ ‘most lying slave.’” (Vaughan and Vaughan 9). Additionally, Caliban’s acceptance of his condition further reinforces the centrality of his subject state as his defining feature: “Caliban himself admits and laments his bondage, complaining to Stephano and Trinculo that he is ‘subject to a tyrant’” (Vaughan and Vaughan 9). For a modern audience, sympathy for Caliban is a natural response.

However, I would add to these analyses that the very definitions of *slave* and *subject*, particularly within the larger context of servitude and its linguistic deployment, warrant further examination because the plays themselves wrestle with the fraught issue of what constitutes slavery and how servitude is defined. To state Caliban’s acceptance of his condition as a given is to overlook the complexity of his resistance. Language appears repeatedly in *The Tempest* as a source of power, and Caliban is cognizant of both its abilities and the potential it offers him. Bill Ashcroft identifies the political power inherent to discourse, language, and narrative, especially in the power and right exhibited in “Prospero’s capacity to teach Caliban how to ‘name the bigger light and how the less’.” This ability and education “[signify] the discursive range of Prospero’s power itself. The names he provides metonymise the power of imperial culture to determine the way the world is” (45). Language’s scope exceeds mere communication and encompasses also a strong political control over its user’s environment.

The vocabulary of Shakespeare’s plays presents several different usages of terms denoting servitude that can be made to pose some theoretical objections, as Cohen’s argument regarding *slave* as pejorative does, to Vaughan and Vaughan’s more direct readings. The disparaging use of *slave* regularly appears in the early modern dramatic language: in *All's Well That Ends Well*, Bertram calls Parolles "a past-saving slave" (4.3.138) and a "most perfidious slave" (5.3.205); Lear similarly insults Oswald when he asks, "Why came not the slave back to me when I call'd him?" (1.4.50); and Hamlet opens his Hecuba soliloquy at the end of Act 2 with the self-deprecating exclamation, "O, what a rogue and peasant slave am I!" (2.2.550). *Love's Labour's Lost*, *Othello*, *Henry V*, and numerous other plays make repeated use of the term. These usages are, of course, not speaking of slaves proper, but are rather using the terminology of servitude as a derogatory insult. The common usage of this term is especially pronounced given how little actual exposure the average Londoner had with true slavery: as discussed, the turn of the seventeenth century was a liminal period during which the last remnants of feudal bondage had been wiped away from English society and the later slave markets in colonial English cities during the eighteenth century had yet to develop.

Despite these philosophical and legal views and the gradual decline of institutionalized slavery in England over the course of centuries, there remained an uneasy tension between slave identities and the labour they performed; shifting definitions among serfs, slaves, and servants, pinned under a generalized category of *subjects*, compounded by indentured service and the rudimentary forms of wage slavery, resulted in both widespread discrepancies within these loosely defined groups and overlaps among them. Heather James articulates how Caliban's chronological progression throughout *The Tempest* represents different early modern subject-positions:

> Prospero invited Caliban into his home, Miranda nurtured and educated him as an underprivileged dependent, and Caliban reciprocated with love and

> obedience. Yet Caliban insists that his very education taught him villainous discontent. He learned his social identity as a laborer in whom any lapse in gratitude would undo him as a dissident; he learned about self-sovereignty when he lost it; he understood property when Prospero enclosed the land Caliban customarily enjoyed. At some point in Caliban's education as the grateful servant in a paternalistic Tudor household, he asked himself something like the angry question posed by a Somerset rioter in 1549: "Why should one man have all and another nothing?" (194)

Colonial subjects and slaves in the Caribbean and the Americas introduced a highly volatile element into the already troubled social hierarchy, precipitating further confusion and shuffling within these ranks: Caliban and, to a lesser extent, Ariel represents one aspects of the various extant forms of service as well as the difficulty of co-existence and delineation between these disparate social classes.

Instead of a universal dichotomy between two individuals predicated on the power of one over the other, there also existed a range of power relations that included the sometimes benign, sometimes malicious ties of masters and servants more familiar to early modern audiences such as the arrangements between Tranio and Lucentio in *The Taming of the Shrew* and both Dromios and Antipholuses in *The Comedy of Errors*. In such narratives, idealized master-and-servant relationships are characterized by a loyalty that extends beyond title and circumstance to create servants who "[worry] more about their master's fortunes than their own" (Weil 10-11). The emphasis on these kinds of relationships in drama is to be expected, given their predominance in English society. Hettinger remarks that "free but contractually attached servants [were] the preferred arrangement, in both agricultural and urban households, from the late-fourteenth century through the Tudor period" (208). However, extant models of servitude were destabilized by the appearance of a new type of subjection in overseas English colonies. The conceptualization of servitude and the exact circumstances of servants were tied to the definition of slavery as the slave class re-emerged. The roles and work conditions under which servants were expected to live were reorganized in light of the increasingly disparate meanings of the contemporary vocabulary.

*Servant* itself was a complex term. An analysis of early modern vocabulary points to oddities and discrepancies within the language of servitude which in turn reflect conceptual issues. Judith Weil points out, through reference to Edmund S. Morgan, that in the language of servitude the title of *servant* had become a gentle catch-all word that named "people who ran an iron foundry, apprentices, voluntarily indentured servants who sold their own labor, and involuntarily enslaved natives and blacks" (2). Hettinger agrees, noting that "[t]he language of service was broadly applied to armed retainers as well as to low-paid, low-prestige domestic or agricultural help" (Hettinger 208). Frances E. Dolan argues that *servant* was a multiple and confused label which referred to a "'transitional status between childhood and adulthood' [that] constituted about 60 per cent of the population aged fifteen to twenty-four" (324). This group was "woven into hierarchies that governed social order in early modern England and into households and families" and that, "neither distinguishable nor separable as a social group, servants, because of their intimate relationships with their employers, were confusing, even threatening, figures" (324). *Servant* emerges as a conflicted term not only by its lack of definite, singular meaning, since its variability allows it to be affixed to numerous kinds of occupations and peoples, but also by the servants' proximity to their masters.

The close associations and pseudo-familial ties between servants and masters engendered simultaneously a collapse of boundaries through the realities of servant life and a desire to use the word as a means of delineating and controlling power available to the servant. Servants constituted a "familiar, included member of the household" (Dolan 325) that potentially subverted power structures by "[seeing] the master/employer demystified and vulnerable" (Dolan 324). Parallels can be drawn between this discomfort and the tension Vaughan and Vaughan describe in Ben Jonson's commentary on *The Tempest*: "Jonson apparently saw [Caliban] as both fearful and comic" (Vaughan and Vaughan 90). Although neither Jonson nor Vaughan and Vaughan elaborate on the exact reasons behind this apprehensiveness, the complex nature of servitude and slavery and the lurking threats muttered by those figures placed into bondage seem a source of tension and fear within the play. Chief among these concerns is how effectively slaves can be made to obey: the semantic boundaries imposed by the name form, in part, an attempt to limit their political influence by inscribing them within a class designation possessed of clear boundaries.

Within *The Tempest*, there is a distinct terminological uneasiness that results in a series of ideologically informed tensions among Prospero, Ariel, and Caliban over the usage and application of names and titles. Assigning names is an act of political agency. Prospero, while browbeating Ariel for asking about his release, states that Ariel is his "slave, / As thou report'st thyself, [but] was then [Sycorax's] servant [...]" (1.1.271-272) and later calls him "my industrious servant, Ariel!" (4.1.33). The play's diction is telling and further suggests that language is a form of control on top of the already established theatrical conceit of magic practised through spoken spells. Prospero's demands are imperative and peppered with insults ("Thou liest, malignant thing" [1.2.258]), and backed by threats: "If thou more murmur'st, I will rend an oak / And peg thee in its knotty entrails till / Thou hast howl'd away twelve winters" (1.2.295-297). Ariel responds with deference, repeatedly calling Prospero his "master": "All hail, great master" (1.2.190), "[c]lose by, my master" (1.2.217), "I thank thee, master" (1.2.294), and "Pardon, master" (1.2.298) are just some examples. The distinction is made explicit here, delineating between "slave" and "servant"; Ariel considers himself Prospero's slave just as he was Sycorax's, but Prospero's statement suggests an attempt to dampen the severity of Ariel's self-identification by stating that it is only so because Ariel "report'st" it as such. Prospero prefers "servant" himself, and shifts the weight of and responsibility for the label "slave" onto Ariel.

Cohen makes a similar observation regarding Prospero's blame on Ariel, albeit with some key differences. He argues that Prospero, to some extent, fell into the predicament of mastery; by freeing Ariel from "a horrible bondage," Prospero became a *de facto* slave-master by virtue of Ariel's declaration upon release. Although

> Ariel has called Prospero 'master,' in our hearing he has not referred to himself as a slave, although he certainly doesn't demur when so described by Prospero. [...] By asserting that Ariel reported himself a slave in some pre-play moments, Prospero is tacitly acknowledging the moral ambiguity of his position as one who has enslaved another. [...] By making Ariel the namer of

> his own state, Prospero seems to be trying to absolve himself from a dilemma. (48)

Cohen reserves a touch of leniency for Prospero. Cohen points to Ariel's "occasional pride in his accomplishments" (48) as indicative of this interpretation: Prospero attempts to rename Ariel as "servant" over the character's self-imposed description in an effort to countermand Ariel's perspective, hinting that Ariel's assumption of bondage stems from his previous experience under Sycorax rather than his current situation with Prospero. Because Ariel was Sycorax's slave, he can respond only by assuming Prospero to be a different, newer incarnation of the same master-slave relationship. Prospero's re-identification is, in Cohen's estimation, thus a somewhat apprehensive, somewhat embarrassed gesture that is less of a political manoeuvre and more an attempt to wash his hands of a situation in which he is a reluctant participant.

This semantic misdirection can also be read as part of Prospero's character. His linguistic tactic is another facet of his manipulative nature demonstrated throughout the play and also informed by historical context. Despite his attempts at changing the terms of their relationship, Prospero's power over Ariel is an uneasy throwback to Ariel's subjection under Sycorax. Prospero uses the flexibility of the language of servitude to call on Ariel to "[f]ollow, and do me service" (4.1.264). Within and despite such an enlarged and variable terminology, Ariel's condition, although ostensibly defined as "service" by Prospero, does appear to be more akin to slavery than servitude or at least an indentured position.[16] Ariel's naming of his own position thus serves to divide the issue into a matter of perspective: what appears as servitude to Prospero, nominally informed by a cultural context built upon the mutually beneficial and emotionally linked master-servant relationships such as the ones exhibited in *Timon of Athens*, among others, is here cast as largely a matter of which side of the binary one occupies. This relationship is further distinguished by the exertion of political power to define the terms of labour. Prospero passes judgment on the matter and identifies their relationship as one of service, not slavery.

This tension is not an isolated case limited to Prospero and Ariel; Shakespeare continues to push at this schism through Caliban. Ariel thinks himself a slave despite Prospero's insistence that he is a servant, but Caliban fiercely resists the former label by refusing the name and its implications when he is identified as a "slave." Although "slave" is repeatedly applied to Caliban by Miranda and Prospero throughout Act 1, enacting simultaneously both pejorative and literal senses of the word, Caliban never once refers to himself as such, nor is there, as in Ariel's case, a point at which any such self-inscription is described.[17] Caliban instead labels his position as one of service: he calls himself "subject to a tyrant" (3.2.42) and "all the subjects that [Prospero] [has]" (1.2.343). He presents a similar response to Trinculo and Stephano, pledging that he'll "swear myself thy subject" (2.2.151). In line with Caliban's attempts to escape Prospero's control in the narrative, he uses the ambiguity found within the language of servitude to promote himself from abject slave to willing subject and frames his service to Prospero and later Trinculo and Stephano as choices on his part.

*Subject* is employed by Caliban and the other characters as a generalized, catch-all term, much like the ambiguous scope of *servant* as a designation as discussed by Weil and Hettinger. A brief analysis of its usage both in *The Tempest* and in other of Shakespeare's writings indicates that the early modern definition was a broad one that encompassed, essentially, anyone who fell under the dominion of a ruler. The following are just some examples: *Richard III*, “Sir Richard Ratcliff, let me tell thee this: / To-day shalt thou behold a subject die / For truth, for duty, and for loyalty...” (3.3.3-5); *The Winter’s Tale*, “the pretence whereof being by circumstances partly laid open, thou, Hermione, contrary to the faith and allegiance of a true subject, didst counsel and aid them, for their better safety, to fly away by night” (3.2.17-20); and *Henry V*, “Never was monarch better fear’d and lov’d / Than is your majesty: there’s not, I think, a subject / That sits in heart-grief and uneasiness / Under the sweet shade of your government” (2.2.28-31). Of particular note is the immense range covered by the term’s usage: *subject* applies as a title of respect (*Richard III*) to an expected class and behaviour (*The Winter’s Tale*) to a general name for the citizenry (*Henry V*). The term is used as a benign label that can be applied to everyone equally and under varying circumstances. In *The Tempest*, Caliban uses the ubiquity of the label as politico-linguistic leverage: by reclassifying himself as a “subject,” Caliban seeks both to voice his resistance to his enslavement and, as far as labels go, to place himself on equal footing with the vast majority of the play’s characters since, within the context of this play, *subject* refers to all characters under another’s command, such as Ariel, the shipwrecked nobles, and Miranda.

Reworking terminology is a component of Caliban’s attempt to be something more than the mere “wild man [common] on the Elizabethan stage” (Bloom 90). Caliban’s disobedience later in the play itself is noteworthy for this reading since it represents a conscious rejection of Prospero’s control. His pledge to “swear” service to other masters and his declaration, “I’ll not serve [Prospero]” (3.2.12), denote an element of will in his bondage: his service, even as a slave, is conditional upon choice. In defecting to Stephano, Caliban enacts the resistance latent in his earlier linguistic subversion and distinguishes himself from Ariel, who obeys Prospero under the belief of his complete enslavement and in hope of liberation. Stephano and Trinculo, despite their bumbling natures, seemingly respond to this change in identification as well: they call Caliban "servant-monster" repeatedly at the beginning of 3.2, and Stephano states that "the poor monster's my subject" (3.2.36-37). While certainly not a proud term, "subject" does suggest a shift within the language and the political spectrum used for Caliban; the plot's turn towards Caliban's attempts to escape Prospero's control mirror the semantic development by according him a greater degree of agency once his referent turns over from *slave* to *subject*.

Despite the narrative conditions, namely Prospero's magic, that define Caliban's subjection as just as absolute as Ariel's, his insistence on calling himself a "subject" demonstrates a keen awareness of the linguistic slippage. The lax and ambiguous terminology offers Caliban the possibility of resistance in self-identification instead of the "total powerlessness in relation to Prospero's domination over him" (Bloom 3); language is a means by which he rejects and protests Prospero's control by reworking the terms' ambiguities in his favour. Caliban, by manipulating *slave*, *servant*, and *subject* identifications, effectively sketches out a kind of linguistic Venn diagram and its exclusionary parameters: all slaves are subjects, but not all subjects are slaves. Aspiring to a freely chosen subject-position distances him from his slavery under Prospero and also consequently provides Caliban with a loose and ill-defined semantic space in which to hide due to the immensity of the terms and their ubiquitous applications.

## 1.4: Caliban and Miranda

The boundaries established by these names and the possible resistances to them are furthered distinguished by the narrative's conflicts. Language and action operate together in the play to illustrate the consequences of Caliban's intervention into the poorly-defined terminology. Caliban's crime against Miranda serves to demonstrate the results of ambiguous boundaries between social classes and the need for subjects to internalize and to accept their prescribed roles: Prospero's dialogue and actions are aimed at making Caliban know and understand that he is a slave and all of the restrictions the term implies. Prospero carries out this ideological position by contesting Caliban's attempts to redefine his own status, nature, and the conditions of his service to his master through the justification afforded by Caliban's attempted rape of Miranda. In the narrative as a whole, Caliban's character, despite his protests, is heavily inflected by the report of the crime preceding the play's depicted timeframe, and any attempt he puts forward to denounce Prospero's power must address its aftermath.

Critics have noted the narrative and emotional emphases ascribed to Caliban's crime. Paul Franssen describes Miranda's extreme reaction at the mention of the attempted rape:

> Of all the manifold crimes in the play, it is only Caliban's aggressive male sexuality that seems to rouse her to anger:
>
> > Abhorred slave,
> > Which any print of goodness wilt not take,
> > Being capable of all ill! (I.ii.350-52)

> This speech is so uncharacteristic of Miranda that early editors followed Dryden in transferring it to Prospero instead. (33)

Miranda is clearly distraught over the memory, and Prospero seems justified in controlling Caliban and his immorality, but to isolate and to diminish the attempted rape in this manner is to ignore the depth of Miranda's character, as protested by Slights's work and other critics. Such a reading is guilty of "[downplaying] the physical reality of characters on stage" (Lindley 42) and also misses the manner in which it operates according to both narrative and para-narrative values. As Lindley also writes, "[f]rom Miranda's perspective at least, [the] assertion that 'the rape only has significance insofar as it proves the savagery of the colonial subject' is scarcely adequate" (42-3).

There are many literary and theoretical readings of this crime: much attention has been paid to Caliban's attack on Miranda,[18] and most critics have followed one of two paths. These two types of readings interpret the act either as a metaphor for political agency or as a legal justification for Caliban's enslavement. Jessica Slights comments on the first approach by examining Kim F. Hall's and Jyotsna Singh's reductionist interpretations in which Miranda becomes abstracted to signify only "a counter in a power game dominated by the male characters in the play. It is this objectification of Miranda that, in turn, legitimates Caliban's attempted rape as the self-actualizing act of a 'desiring subject'" (Slights 374). This theoretical reading reduces the play's characters to abstract values within a political framework; the act itself is removed from its moral register and instead interpreted by and large according to its symbolic meaning.

The other dominant line of thought is to frame the crime as a narrative note that serves to justify Caliban's condition, as mentioned by Vaughan and Vaughan. The focus is on Caliban's betrayal of the trust bestowed upon him initially by Prospero and Miranda. Nineteenth-century criticism is particularly given to this approach; Daniel Wilson's 1873 book *Caliban: The Missing Link* dismisses the attempted rape because

> [Caliban] proved to be simply an animal, actuated by the ordinary unrestrained passions and desires which in the brute involved no moral evil, and but for the presence of Miranda would have attracted no special notice. Situated as he actually is, he is not to be judged of wholly from the invectives of his master. [...] There is in him still a dog-like aptitude for attachment, a craving even for a mastership of some higher nature, and an appreciation of kindness not unlike that of the domesticated dog [...]. (85)[19]

In this type of reading, Caliban is absolved of guilt because he lacks the faculties to understand truly the nature of his actions. Interpreting Caliban's character and motivations as being derived solely from "brute instincts" reduces his agency and classifies him as a "wild creature under harsh restraint" (Wilson 85). Caliban, as a beast, cannot reason properly, and Prospero is not to be faulted for imposing restraints on him. As a result, Prospero's relationship to Caliban is more akin to animal ownership rather than any human interaction. Jobson's objection, mentioned earlier, that the English did not enslave any with "our owne shapes," fails to apply to Caliban if he is characterized as a non-human entity.

Other readings similarly infused with a belief in justified discipline attribute a cold logic and touch of malice to the act. Ernest Renan's 1878 dramatic reimagining of Shakespeare's work, *Caliban: suite de La tempête, drame philosophique*, opens with a dialogue between Caliban and Ariel in which the two discuss the conditions of their bondage. Caliban rants and raves about the injustices of his subjection, while Ariel attempts to placate him by claiming that Prospero's rule is being unfairly characterized and, after all, is not that bad: Ariel is content, even happy, with it. Ariel proceeds to state that Caliban deserves his enslavement because he tried to rape Miranda, to which Caliban responds:

> Après tout, nous aurions peuplé l'île. Les hommes se valent. Son père me devait un salaire. Je fendais son bois, j'allumais son feu, je portais l'eau; sans moi, il n'aurait connu ni champs ni arbres.[20] (7)

These interpretations are noteworthy for their reductions of Caliban as a character. In Wilson's view, Caliban is reduced to nothing more than instincts, evident particularly in the thorough deployment of the animal analogy, and is fundamentally incapable of understanding the moral ramifications of his actions. Once removed from the moral and thus implicitly human register, Caliban, although capable of speech and thought, lacks some essential quality that distinguishes him from a beast. Renan pushes this type of rationalization into the territory of straightforward immorality by re-characterizing Caliban as possessing a mercenary economic attitude, wherein his justifications are laid out in terms of pure cost and compensation.

Their readings are based on a foregone conclusion regarding Caliban's status: his treatment prior to his enslavement is too generous and even misplaced because of an action he commits later; thus, Caliban deserved condemnation from the start. This retroactive application of power and punishment hints at the vague and poorly defined risks inherent to unstable boundaries: without clear demarcations between classes and the behaviours expected of them, liminal figures lacking respect and internalization of class norms like Caliban pose a threat to established power. The play also illustrates the difficulties involved in maintaining order over subjects unsure or unaware of where authoritative political power and sexual politics would emplace them. There is an underlying assumption that Caliban is aware, and always has been, of his slave status – that Caliban should be like Ariel, who immediately grasps gratitude for and subservience to his newfound master. Prospero's narrative justification imposes on Caliban previously established and inherited class distinctions and behaviours that raise questions of how slave identities are acquired and internalized or, oppositely, fail to take. The attempted rape is configured as a symbol of a reason why Caliban and the lower rungs of society he represents should not be afforded any freedoms since they are incapable of understanding and respecting their boundaries. Renan's Caliban dramatizes the extent of this risk: his character has overstepped the limits of the slave class, either intentionally or not, and believes his labour operates on a contractual basis and deserves compensation. His moral failure, as it stands in Renan's text, is not solely that he attaches monetary value to Miranda or that he tries to rape her, but that he believes that he can demand payment on equal terms from Prospero, in effect upsetting the established and accepted roles of master and servant.

Renan's approach is significant because it essentially accepts the reasoning laid out by Prospero in Shakespeare's play: Caliban refuses to or cannot behave when Prospero has "lodged [Caliban] / In mine own cell" (1.2.407) and is a figure in "which good natures / Could not abide to be with" (1.2.420-421), and as a result he must be controlled through exertion of power and ownership. Philip Mason[21] comments that this view accepts that Caliban "has to be shut up [...] for wanting to violate Miranda" (88).

However, neither view accounts for the complex changes to the existing relationships, from Caliban as guest to Caliban as slave, and both tacitly accept the causality described in the narrative. The attempted rape is thus configured as an absolute sign of Caliban's wickedness, compounded by the betrayal of Prospero and Miranda's trust; it "constitutes the event on which a power structure is ratified" (Linton 155). Caliban's retort, that he "had peopl'd else / This isle with Calibans" (1.2.411-412), does little to help his case, but Wilson and Renan are both myopic in their interpretations: they, like Prospero, hold Caliban's attempted rape as a self-evident and self-contained proof with little examination of how shifts in explicit power-relationships inform interpretation of this narrative moment as well as its significance. The idea that Caliban proves his savagery is crucial to understanding his de-humanization: proof presupposes a condition, here his bestial nature, which also classifies Caliban's status as a pre-established conclusion contingent on a burden of proof that he cannot possibly demonstrate.

Prospero's impossible demand is premised, in part, on Caliban's physical form. Caliban's body has been the subject of numerous debates and is relevant for its influence on how his character, as well as his crime and position of servitude, is read. Daniel Wilson's interpretation is one example of how Caliban's body can tacitly affect both interpretation and the severity of his transgression. This theatrical element has been examined by a number of critics. John W. Draper's "Monster Caliban" conducts a short but thorough survey of Caliban's "aggregation of odd parts, half man, half fish, with fins like arms with long, sharp fingernails for digging, perhaps with a receding forehead like a puppy [...]" (91) in relation to various mythological creatures and animals discovered in the course of European colonial enterprises into North America and the Caribbean.

Jacqueline E.M. Latham's "*The Tempest* and King James's *Daemonologie*" explores Caliban's emblematic body with an emphasis on the metaphysical and demonic side of Caliban's birth.[22] Both of these studies focus on more extreme interpretations of Caliban that have been staged and the cultural backgrounds that inform these representations.

Vaughan and Vaughan similarly devote a large portion of their book to examining Caliban's monstrous nature and its exact circumstances, but conclude ultimately that the character's ambiguous physicality "encourages artists, actors, and readers to see Caliban however they wish" (Vaughan and Vaughan 15). This interpretive freedom is largely based on the extensive animal metaphors in the play, drawing from early modern and medieval England's mythology of "wild men" and monsters. Their analysis rests on whether a given production interprets the language in a literal or a figurative sense; the numerous references to Caliban as "monster" and "moon-calf" are ambiguous enough to interpret as merely pejoratives and not actual fact and Trinculo and Stephano's "fish" dialogue as unreliable testimony, with the unspoken caveat that the play in performance also implicates its production as cultural reading and further serves to decide the audience's reaction. Thus, the character's body has been interpreted both as demeaned colonial, yet ultimately human, subject and literally "half a fish and half a monster" (3.2.29).[23]

By interpreting Caliban's being as animalistic both in form and character and using the attempted rape as proof of it, Prospero and Miranda functionally trap Caliban in an impossible situation: under such conditions, Caliban cannot prove that he is human, not just not-animal, and deserves equal treatment no matter the quantity of language, cultural behaviour, and law he internalizes and adopts. Under such judgment, Caliban has and will always be presumed animalistic, and is "*deservedly* confined into this rock" (1.2.359, italics mine). To borrow a legal metaphor, Caliban has been charged with the task of proving his innocence under conditions that will consider, and in fact presuppose, only his guilt: if he is animal, he can be controlled only under enforced bondage; if he is human, then the crime he has committed condemns him to similar, if not worse, treatment due to a conscious rejection of moral standards.

Whether or not Caliban is depicted as an actual monstrous half-animal, the weight of the numerous pejoratives and bestial comparisons heaped upon him calls to mind a context that serves to instil an innate sense of perversion in the act. Ironically, much of the contextual monstrosity is evoked by Caliban himself: the "Calibans" that would have been produced according to Caliban's retort are couched in a cultural context that invokes both mythological and literary memories of tales of half-human breeding and the resulting monsters. Stories of creatures such as the minotaur, the centaur, the incubus, and the ogre are tacitly acknowledged through a monstrous Caliban and cast the act not only within a legal and moral judgment but also in the fear of slave sexuality as aberrant and unnatural. This context informs the postcolonial perspective in which fears of miscegenation, of "[s]exual intercourse between members of different groups [that were] the kind of crossover that generated the greatest anxiety" (Loomba 213), become a crucial way of understanding Caliban's crime. The characterization and full weight of the act extend beyond the reported action and even the play itself; although terrible in its own right, Caliban's attempted rape of Miranda draws upon numerous social and cultural contexts. Hall notes, drawing on Susan Griffin's work, that "the rape threat is the prime image formed by the racist imagination" and "a pornographic fantasy: the spectre of miscegenation" (142). Racialization consequently traps Caliban into an impossible definition: identifying as human constructs him as a symbol of the threat posed by "miscegenation," while accepting an animal designation invokes shades of bestial transgressions. Because of his actions, Caliban "seems to correspond exactly with the sickest fantasies of colonialist and racist ideology; [...] he is 'the first nonwhite rapist in white man's literature.' [Caliban is] reduced entirely to a racial being, to the impure, mestizoized body" (Halpern 282). The cultural understanding of monstrosity forms a powerful influence on the act and transforms it into an action that cannot be interpreted and analyzed without acknowledging contextual associations.

In addition to the grey areas represented by racialized or animalistic characterizations, the class boundaries surrounding slaves, servants, and other lower ranks are particularly potent modifiers to Caliban's monstrosity. The fear of couplings outside of acceptable social parameters is a recurrent theme on the early modern stage, appearing also in numerous other early modern plays. Caliban's attempted rape of Miranda represents a particularly fraught manifestation of this anxiety due to the notions not only of the savage, monstrous, and animal assaulting the virginal Miranda but also of a slave turning against its master – particularly one as kind and generous as Miranda, who deigned to "[endow] [Caliban's] purposes / With words that made them known" (1.2.6-7). Caliban's excesses have been read in light of fears of sexual monstrosity and depravity in the lower classes, a theme reiterated in a modified form in Trinculo and Stephano's murderous treachery. In this interpretation, the play is a metaphor for English identity in which "the adversarial masculinity of Caliban" "both enacts and disrupts the fiction of husbandry" (Linton 156) and attacks the family unit represented by Prospero and Miranda. The proximity afforded by Caliban's place as a servant in their household proved, in Prospero's reckoning, to be a liability and a weakness that jeopardized his mastery.

As a result, the cumulative effect of Caliban's attempted rape of Miranda stems both from the narrated imagery of this monstrous figure attacking a young woman and the connotations that Caliban is acting outside of his place as a slave: he has forgotten, or more accurately has never known, the prescribed limits of his social class and has overstepped his boundaries. This amalgamation of various readings is a symptom of "the character's long associations with both racial and class typifications" (Griffiths 169); in this light, Caliban is essentially a slave that has dared to turn against his master and also failed to recognize him as such. Consequently, Miranda's rebuke, that "thou didst not, savage, / Know thine own meaning" (1.2.357-358), operates multilaterally: it encompasses the explicit description of Caliban's failed education, but also includes his failure to understand his own place within the social and political hierarchies imposed on him by Prospero and Miranda. In accusing him of not understanding his "own meaning," Miranda predicts the confusion and challenge Caliban poses to established semantics through the muddled *slave* and *subject* definitions, and she undermines the semblance of agency language provides him.

# CHAPTER TWO

# UNBALANCED HUMOURS: NATION METAPHORS AND THE HUMAN BODY IN *THE LAUNCHING OF THE MARY*

## 2.1: The Curious Case of *The Launching of the Mary*

Walter Mountfort's *The Launching of the Mary* (1632) has a peculiar history: John Henry Walter, in editing the surviving holograph manuscript[24] for the Malone Society in 1933, wrote, "it seems [...] difficult to the point of impossibility to believe that any company would willingly have produced so remarkably unsuitable a play" (xi). The play features no substantial dramatic action and is instead largely devoted to numerous speeches that are thinly veiled encomia extolling mercantilist philosophy.[25] No record of its performance survives, and only the presence of the Master of the Revels Sir Henry Herbert's censorship and some production notes in an indeterminate number of hands give any indication of the manuscript's preparation for performance. Even Herbert seems to have been less than satisfied with the manuscript: although he signed off on it, John C. Meagher comments that the manuscript bears

> an admonitory note: 'I commande your Bookeeper to present mee with a faire Copy[26] hereafter' – which obviously implies that the theatrically definitive copy as issued by the company still bore too many corrections for his taste and patience. (424)

Walter concludes that, if it was performed at all, it was merely for "one or two subsidized performances instigated by, or offered to, the East India Company and their friends" (xi). The clumsiness of the text seems to support this characterization, and it seems reasonable to agree with Walter that the play had little public appeal and few performances, given its subject matter, construction, and amateur author.

Despite its limited scope, Mountfort's play is nevertheless historically significant and distinct from other early modern plays because of its intended audience and its textual condition. Walter notes that the play's author was "deeply interested in the East India Company, and was presumably in its service" (vi); the mercantilist philosophies that drive the play's narrative and characterize its rambling speeches indicate that the play is propaganda. The play's purpose, as it were, is focused on a singular objective: in the face of criticism from the general public and competitors, the play aims to defend and promote the ideology of its author's parent company. The play is a text produced largely for its propaganda value.

Little has been written about *The Launching of the Mary*. Matteo A. Pangallo's brief note remains, to date, one of the few looks at the play's literary sources and merits; though short, Pangallo's contribution points to numerous works, both literary and dramatic, from which Mountfort, apparently an avid playgoer and reader, drew in creating his own play. This list includes

> economic treatises and travel literature of the day, popular foreign novels, prominent stage plays, social conduct tracts, and a range of classical sources that could include Ovid (both in translation and in Latin) and Horace, as well

> as possibly various lesser Roman writers, English history and monarchical genealogy, medical publications, and medieval Italian poetry. (Pangallo 530)

Pangallo's list is expansive, but the emphasis placed on "economic treatises and travel literature of the day" is correct; they are almost certainly the primary focus of the play. As he points out, the play has been classified, rather reductively, as "no more than a versification of Thomas Mun's prose tract *A Discourse of Trade from England unto the East Indies* (1621), written as a defence of the East India Company" (529). Joseph Quincy Adams, Jr. is one critic who dismissed the play in this manner, writing in 1907 that *Launching* was essentially "a eulogy of the East India Company" (137), despite Mountfort's meagre attempts "to 'naturalize it' using theatrical gestures such as a banquet" (Christensen 121).

Ann Christensen's work largely follows in the dismissive interpretive tradition, although she supplements this analysis with additional interest in the play's subplot. The play is divided into a main plot, which Christensen has dubbed the "defence plot" and which is focused on the EIC's philosophy and practices, and a subplot (what she calls the "domestic plot") that engages with the effects of commercial trade, colonial expansion, and overseas ventures on domestic culture, society, and households, with particular emphasis on women who bear "the human costs of global trade" (118). Her work focuses on this "domestic plot" and studies the play's depiction of wives who, left at home while their husbands pursue foreign adventures, must fend off suitors and loneliness while maintaining the integrity of the home front and also contend with "accusations of illicit sex and bastardy" (127). Dorotea is one of these wives in this plot, left behind in England while her husband works on an EIC ship in an overseas assignment. Consequently, Dorotea's drama shares traits with other city comedies, particularly *The Shoemaker's Holiday*'s Rafe and Jane subplot: *Launching* and *Shoemaker's* both voice similar concerns over the collapse of households while men are called overseas by their duties.

Christensen's analysis places Dorotea's domestic plot in opposition to the Governor and Lord Admiral's and leads to her overall conclusion: Mountfort fails to harmonize the two plots and to resolve their conflicting messages. She writes that "the *drama* thus documents the hardships endured by the wife at home while the *discourse* attempts to exonerate the company of those hardships" (132, italics hers), thus arguing that the trials endured by Dorotea escape and surpass the rationalizations put forward by the EIC's defence and render their justifications hollow. Dorotea "compels audience interest and sympathy much more than the corporate monopoly" (129), drawing much more attention to the dramatized "reality" of the hardships the company imposes on people than to the "East India directors talking abstractly about trade and unpartnered wives living and working in port" (127). Ultimately, the conclusion of Dorotea's narrative, although ostensibly a gesture of generosity in which FitzJohn commends Dorotea's chastity and provides her with a living allowance in her husband's extended absence, further damns the insufficiencies of the defence plot: "that the captain must intervene (twice) with his own purse seems to point up the failure in Mun's version of EIC maintenance" (132) and confirms that the EIC "does not accommodate the social and economic realities of [its workers'] families" (132-33).

Additionally, Dorotea's need to work plays heavily into Christensen's analysis. Dorotea's work is necessary for survival in her husband's absence but also a source of risk and peril:

> Dorotea's honest labor at once ennobles and humiliates her; the captain who praises her modesty and diligence is also scandalized by her "hard hand-labor" and other (male) laborers accost her sexually because she works for pay. Meanwhile, the other port wives know enough about working life to fake it. (126)

Effectively, Christensen reads Dorotea as being forced into an impossible situation due to the demands of the EIC on her husband and, by consequence, on her. The EIC's meagre offerings are insufficient for her to live on, but her only hopes to supplement this income lie in either undertaking work, thereby opening herself up to risk, or following Sparke and Nutt into "sordid prostitution" (5.4.2911). This precarious situation is worsened by the uncertainty of her husband's return in good health: even the promise of future financial stability is at risk due to the dangers of her absent husband's work. Furthermore, the possibility of insurance coverage in the event of his death or injury – a point stressed by Committee 2[27] as one of the EIC's strongest acts of generosity[28] – does little to address the cultural and social implications of his absence, which "forbids her erotic life, limits her mobility, makes her poor, causes rumors, and invites mockery from other women and men" (Christensen 132).

Christensen's argument frames *Launching* as a play that got away from its author; despite Mountfort's intention to use the play as pro-EIC propaganda, the defence's arguments reveal numerous insufficiencies and a general flimsiness when confronted by both the domestic plot and the cultural and social realities that inform it. In her analysis, Mountfort's amateur skills as a playwright, and perhaps also his sympathies, create a "play [that] admits the voice of complaint against the EIC even as it tries to diminish the force of that voice" (133), with less than complete success in the latter effort. This generalized voice serves as a crucial element, with some alterations, for Christensen's understanding of Dorotea's difficulties as a widespread complaint about life under EIC rule. Ultimately, Dorotea's continued plight and unresolved difficulties at play's end, despite her appeal to "the spirit of perseverance" (5.4.2915), strongly support Christensen's conclusions.

However, acceptance of Christensen's interpretation is also contingent on numerous contradictory assumptions. Her reading of the EIC and its practices in Mountfort's play emphasizes a deeply troubled and conflicted relationship between the EIC and the general public. While this was certainly the case *historically*, as indicated by records documenting an often fraught relationship among the EIC, its workers, and the Crown,[29] whether or not that schism is faithfully admitted in Mountfort's play is debatable. While Christensen's analysis is convincing, its deconstructionist line of inquiry presupposes either a lack of skill and a historical blindness on Mountfort's part to control the direction and implications of his plots, or a latent subversive drive hidden in the play's subtext meant to undermine the overt propaganda of the defence plot.

While these possibilities are plausible, and subversion and sabotage of propaganda are long-standing and fairly widespread practices, Mountfort's specific involvement in such activities is unclear. His limited skills as an amateur playwright give particular weight to the first option, that of his inability to control the play's message, and the lack of knowledge regarding his life, employment, and person make the second choice – intentional sabotage – at least a potential scenario. However, there is another option than those arising from Christensen's analysis: it is possible to construct a third interpretation using a combination of pathological/economic metaphors of the kind analyzed by Jonathan Gil Harris, martyr-based allegories, and an analysis of Dorotea's gendered body-as-nation that preserves the play's value as propaganda while also taking into account Christensen's conclusions.

This reading also allows for what is known or assumed about the play's historical circumstances and composition – as pro-EIC propaganda written by an employee, intended for a small and specific audience – to be meshed with existing commentary without relying on tenuous assumptions regarding the playwright's skill or his political inclinations. This chapter will argue for an interpretation of the play's dual narratives and attempt to reconcile the political intentions underpinning them. Instead of seeing a secondary "domestic" plot that subverts the primary "defence" plot, I read both narratives as working in tandem in the presentation of a pro-EIC stance committed to enshrining the EIC's value to both its employees and England itself. I will begin with an analysis of the arguments put forward in the defence plot and proceed to conduct a similar study of the domestic plot, using early modern concepts of health and the body in both instances as my chief interpretive tools. Economic discourse's linguistic origins in bodily and medical terminology extend beyond borrowed words and metaphorical similarities and instead serve to shape fundamentally how economic phenomena were understood and received by early modern thinkers. Mountfort's drama functions as a physical representation of these associative connections, using the conventions of the stage and performance to illustrate not only his political views regarding the EIC but also a general framework of early modern concepts of economic forces and the emergent roles of corporations in that society.

I then proceed to an examination of Dorotea's role in Mountfort's ideological project. Mountfort draws heavily from martyr traditions to construct his chief female character, and he imbues her with a self-sacrificing imperative in order to support the propagandistic project already established by the defence plot. In this reading, the failure documented in Christensen's analysis regarding Dorotea's work and her husband's prolonged absence is acknowledged but not as a fault; rather, I argue that Dorotea's inability to sustain herself is an important element in constructing a pro-EIC message that accords and operates with the defence plot arguments. The suffering that Dorotea endures is not a plot that exceeds Mountfort's ideological hopes for his narrative; it is a carefully designed necessity in order to illustrate the EIC's role in supporting England's domestic culture and economy while it simultaneously extends its operations overseas. Mountfort adapts notions of female chastity to a symbol of national solidarity and calls for public support of the EIC. Whereas the defence plot likens the economy to the body through its discourse of health and activity, Dorotea's domestic plot functions by turning the female body into a metaphor for England's economy and uses the gendered martyred body to illustrate the nation's need for the EIC.

## 2.2: The Circulation of Bodies and the Discourse of Health

Christensen, although largely focused on the domestic drama, obliquely touches on the EIC's need to defend and reclassify its practices as *investment* in the defence plot. This defence mechanism posits that men, materials, and goods find worth only in usage and require deployment in order both to warrant their values and to increase them:

> The [...] objection [in lines 1377-1385] concerns shipbuilding, alleging that the EIC wastes raw materials such as timber and robs the state of ships, which are either gone at sea or "come home verie weake, and unserviceable" [...]. Mountfort's defenders [...] argue for the "commodious use" of materials: "Shall wee keepe our woods / & goodly trees onely to looke upon [?]" (1395, 1396, 1391-92). In a speech that elevates travel as it denigrates home, one officer asserts that, by definition, "all shipps / must goe & Come, they are not made to staye / at home, to rott in muddie Moorish dockes" (1438-40). (120)

"Woods" and "trees" must be turned into goods, and "shipps" must be put into service for them to hold any industrial value; otherwise, not only do they remain inert properties that produce nothing, but they also decay and become detrimental to a healthy economy. However, Mountfort must also address the human costs involved, since the original criticisms regarding waste and loss just as easily apply to the seamen and merchants who never return or who, like Rafe in *The Shoemaker's Holiday*, return from their ventures impoverished and injured. Luke Wilson's study of insurance and compensations gives some indication of the extent of this problem and some measures by which it was addressed.[30] Despite these risks to human lives, Mountfort asserts that the potential benefits to the nation, both in material and immaterial returns, far outweigh them; human lives are calculated as a quantity subject to the same conditions and actuarial measurements that govern ships and the transport of goods. The seamen's bodies thus serve as central examples and themes for the discussion of economic policies and their effects on the national economy, revealing economic language's inextricable entanglement with the human body and its pathologies in order to construct its epistemological framework and its subsequent defence.

As a result of this juxtaposition of human lives and economic production, Pangallo's mention of "medical publications" among Mountfort's sources is highly significant; although Pangallo himself does not focus on this source, other critics such as Harris have conducted extensive studies on the engagement of economic language with the pathological. The borrowing of terminology from medical discourse exemplifies a particular bent in economic language's deployment: mercantilist writers sought to understand and to explain the development of intangible systems and networks of trade through metaphor, allusion, and lateral comparison to the human body and its needs. This usage extends beyond the utility of a familiar and already constructed discipline; although the ubiquity and familiarity of the human body served well as a lexicon of readily available metaphors to describe emergent systems, there existed other more profound reasons for mercantilist interest in health and pathology for its rationales.

In *Sick Economies*, Harris establishes an interpretive and correlative link between monetary economies, conceptions of the human body, and national identity. Economics as voiced by the "four M's" (Thomas Mun, Edward Misselden, Thomas Milles, and Gerard de Malynes) utilizes the human body as its centerpiece and reveals a tangible intersection between medical knowledge and emergent analyses of trade and currency. Through study of a number of early modern plays, Harris argues that gendered and physiological metaphors were used by mercantilist writers and seventeenth- and eighteenth-century economic theorists to explain and to characterize the workings of their theories. The human body's centrality to political and economic discourses stems from numerous influences, ranging from the religious to the scientific to the linguistic. Mountfort's *Launching*, taking heavily from Mun in particular, dramatizes this theme through emblematic characters and manifests many of the same patterns as the essays and tracts. Specifically, Dorotea's character represents simultaneously a human body, Mountfort's gendering of that body as female, a confluence of domestic and international economies, and a metaphor for England as a nation. Medical language thus serves to give weight and context to intangible economic ideas through analogy, and Mountfort pushes this deployment to its literal embodiment on stage.

Critics have provided numerous conflicting explanations as to how and why economic terminology drew so heavily from medical language. Louise Hill Curth points to medieval and early modern conceptualizations of the human body's humors and their connection to the world around them, in effect positing a causative chain and shared attributes between human biology and natural sciences: "humans and animals were a microcosm composed of four primary elements of earth, air, fire and water, and four qualities of heat, cold, moistness and dryness which corresponded with those in the macrocosm (i.e. universe)" (14). Humorism posits a fundamental and direct connection between the human body and the rest of the world, thereby drawing many of the pathological and medical metaphors from a strong sense of concordance between body and environment.

In support of this interpretation, Peter Murray Jones argues that early modern thought directly linked the internal workings of the human body to both the natural and the political worlds through causation: a healthy body was the result of its environment, and in turn this body could produce a political institution that created and maintained the well-being of both its territory and its subjects. Diagnoses were formed and treatments decided through examination of a patient's body as well as its environment, astrological data, and physicians' calendars. Jones's work and Curth's theory is further supported by later works on political and cultural physiognomies that ascribed morphological traits and environmental factors to national identities. An example of such works is William Camden's *Britannia* (1586), which attributed the strength and health of the English people to England being "seated as well for aire as soile, in a right fruitful and most milde place" (qtd. in Wear 126).

In a different perspective, Harris favours an explanation focused on conceptual similarities, arguing that the intertwining of pathological and economic language originates from "the medieval discourse of luxury, which located the origins of sin in the pathological appetite" (167). Under such epistemological conditions, metaphorical connections (the human body's excesses are akin to the nation's wasteful behaviours) and more literal ones (the populace's greed results in the decay of the nation) both feed into popular discourse and center the human body as chief theme and causative agent in economic theory. This approach is particularly noticeable in Mun's constant use of bodily language to characterize England's economy, which was plagued by the "cankers" or "leprosie" of poor financial decisions and national policies. One of Harris's case studies, the etymological evolution of *consumption* through analysis of Thomas Dekker and Thomas Middleton's *The Roaring Girl*, argues that "'consumption' possessed in Thomas Middleton's England not simply a negative valence but, more specifically, a pathological one. [It] is associated less with an acquisition of goods than with a hepatic or tubercular wasting of wealth and health alike" (164). The body is the nation, blood is money, and its imbalance causes numerous illnesses in the body.

As Jerah Johnson notes,[31] blood remained a constant metaphorical vehicle in economics despite the changes to haematological knowledge over five centuries: Nicholas Oresme, writing in the mid-fourteenth century, stated that

> as the body is disordered when the Humours flow too freely into one member of it [...] and the body's due proportions are destroyed and its life shortened, so also is a commonwealth or kingdom when riches are unduly attracted by one part of it. (qtd. in Johnson 119)

The discoveries of the human circulatory system in 1628 and the lymphatic system in 1653 did little to dissolve the metaphor; instead, economic writers of the late-seventeenth century seized upon these discoveries simultaneously to create and to explain a model of currency flow that likened itself to the flow of blood through the human body. John Law, writing at the tail end of the seventeenth century, wrote that "Money is the blood of the state and must circulate. Credit is to business what the brain is to the human body" (qtd. in Valenze 66), bringing the long tradition of likening the nation to a body into contact with his contemporary knowledge. David Hume's 1752 essay "Of Money" attributed to monetary circulation an additional invigorative property: "In every kingdom, into which money begins to flow in greater abundance than formerly, every thing takes a new face: labour and industry gain life; the merchant becomes more enterprising; the manufacturer more diligent and skilful, and even the farmer ploughs his field with greater alacrity and attention" (293).

Consequently, economics in the early modern period constitutes as much of a macroscopic study of the movement of money and goods through international and national systems as an inward turn towards the human body. Harris points out the etymological progressions of terms such as *consumption* and *inflation* as the direct results of an effort to understand economic systems as a formalized body of knowledge through more localized and familiar bodily phenomena; this association extends beyond language to encompass perception and understanding in a discipline that is undergoing rapid growth both in its own theories and analyses and in the language it adopts from other fields.

A brief overview of early modern views of health as they relate to national economy and the body is a necessary prelude to an analysis of Mountfort's efforts to dramatize the figurative language of economic tracts. If economics is an extension of the knowledge of the human body, then the discourse of the human body's health is critical to understanding how economics was understood in the early modern period. The definition of what constitutes a healthy self is a historically fraught concept that has undergone numerous changes over time and differs significantly from modern concepts. Due to the emphasis on balance and caring for "the whole body of the trade, which will ever languish if the harmony of her health be distempered by the diseases" (*England's Treasure* 34), it is crucial to identify how health was demarcated within the early modern perspective because of its bearing on economic discourse: the parallels between economics and pathological language are maintained through a shared focus on an idealized, harmonious state. Despite the implausibility of ever achieving such an absolute ideal, proscriptive writings emphasized the need to aspire to it and hold it as a standard by which effects and actions could be judged.

Broadly put, health as it was understood in the early modern period was identified by humoral, geographical, religious, and bodily conditions. Andrew Wear writes that “[a] person’s constitution or humoral balance was influenced by the constitution of the country of [his/her] birth. There was, therefore, an intimate correspondence between the two” (126). The pathology of syphilis and its cultural conflation with a disease from abroad is but one example of this line of thought. Writers urged people to eat foods and take medicines derived from literally home-grown substances, and individuals and families alike were encouraged to remain at or near their hometowns. Additionally, “the countryside was the norm, from which urban living was an unnatural departure that incurred additional health risks” (Wear 131). To early modern medicine, humoral balance was established in accordance with environment at the time of a person’s birth; deviating from this constitution, either through foreign climates or unnatural ones such as cities, resulted in a disruption of this balance that exposed individuals to sickness.

Health was thus primarily construed as a combination of balance (humoral and environmental), familiarity, and nature (particularly evident in descriptions of the noble savage, who lived in tune with his environment outside of urbanization). Wear adds to these factors the belief in the discourse of activity as it relates to health: just as animals were to be judged by the vigour of their work and water’s cleanliness by its flow, so too were human bodies by their activity in work, free of confines imposed by urbanization and overcrowding. Elements of medieval religious doctrines that spoke against the sin of sloth and promoted the virtues of moderation in all appetites are visible in many of these early modern concepts; Curth points out the overarching opinion, drawn from previous eras, that “moral behaviour and health were seen to be linked” (136). Activity is thus framed as a metaphor for clean waters, as opposed to the stagnant decay of swamps, and a physical safeguard against the moral peril of sloth.

These emphases on balance and on remaining within one’s natural habitat served both to advance and to hinder mercantile philosophies as they entered the economic dialogue in the late sixteenth century. As Mark Netzloff points out, early mercantilism was not so much a fully formed and coherent economic doctrine as it was an effort by several thinkers to address many of the flaws in England’s economy as it stood in the sixteenth century.[32] Emerging from feudalism, mercantilist writers saw themselves not only as proponents of new thought but also as physicians, as it were, to amend and heal the flaws in previous systems. Malynes declares, on the opening pages of his *A Treatise of the Canker of England’s Common Wealth*, that he intends to address the nation’s shortcomings by “imitating the rule of good Phisitions.” Since “the vnknowne disease puteth out the Phisitions eye” (*Treatise* 12), identifying the “Canker [with which] the politike body of our weale publike is ouertaken” (*Treatise* 18) serves as a much needed diagnosis.

In the case of this particular Malynes treatise, the sickness in question is the imbalance of trade and currency exchanges: the bulk of the second part of his treatise addresses causes and solutions to England’s severe trade deficit. The use of *canker* as a metaphor is thus particularly apt; at the time of Malynes’s writing, cankers, an archaic synonym for cancer,[33] were believed to be caused by excesses of black bile and pathologized as unnatural and severe swelling.[34] Harris has already conducted considerable study of the usage of *canker* as a metaphor for usury as the illness was characterized by "twin connotations of complexional imbalance and external invasion" (92). His focus is on the parts of Malynes's writing concerned with the devaluation of English currency caused by coin clipping and foreign exchange rates; additionally, England's economy, as it were, suffered from an excess of imports that bloated the local economy and rendered English merchants unable to sell local goods or to sell to foreign markets at a fair price.

*Canker* thus emerges as a suitable metaphor because its many definitions and connotations reflect simultaneously the infectious decay of English currency and also the bloat afflicting its commodities.[35] Malynes's recommendations were characterized as prescriptions to ward off the diseases that were besetting the English economy by cutting off the source of excess (foreign trade) and limiting the quantity of goods and currency England bled out: imports were harmful to the economy and fed into concerns regarding the impact of foreign goods on bodily health. This vague understanding of sickness also gave rise to the canker-worm, which was primarily an agricultural and horticultural entity, but also a favoured piece of imagery for early modern playwrights.[36]

There was certainly a trend towards internationalism, if not yet globalism, as English thinkers shifted away from a focus on domestic markets and economies towards an understanding of how these smaller entities fit with each other and also belonged to the larger European economy. Malynes himself exhibits this shift over the course of his writings: his *Canker of England's Commonwealth* was written in 1601 and, like his other contemporaneous piece of writing, *St. George for England, Allegorically Described*, calls for the near abolition of foreign trade, citing the need for temperance and the sinful nature of foreign goods lest financial mismanagement destroy the commonwealth. England was threatened by foreign "commodities which please mens humours" and which foster "intemperance the daughter of excesse, which maketh men slaues to the mouth and belly, bringing them both wayes to destruction" (*St. George* 45-46). By 1622, however, his stance as stated in *The Maintenance of Free Trade*, has been heavily modified as he now calls for the preservation of free and open trade in order to allow money to flow without impediment wherever markets need. Trade restrictions and embargoes stifle and damage all economies, as evidenced by how "the trade of cloth is much diminished, both in number made and in the price thereof, which is a Canker to the Common-wealth" (*Maintenance* 46).

We can see in the case of Malynes how the indeterminate and generalized understanding of cancer allowed it to represent nearly any situation: it was an image for an invasive contagion seeping into the normally healthy English nation-body, but it was also a way of describing how trade restrictions or drastic undervaluations of currency or goods could stop up the healthful flow of blood/money from one part of the nation-body to the other. This reworking of the cancer metaphor served to incorporate foreign assets and trade into the nation-body and re-imagine them as being, if not totally as in the much later case of globalization, then at least to a limited extent, part of the metaphorical whole.

Mun enlarged the theoretical boundaries that delineated one economic entity from the next. Unlike the early Malynes, who imagined that the metaphorical body ended at the borders of a nation, Mun, the later Malynes, and by extension Mountfort argue for the historical and continued value of foreign trade flows by expanding the conceptualization of a nation's economic body to encompass both domestic and foreign trade as its circulatory network, as opposed to a closed, internal model treating domestic trade as a self-contained and isolated system. Although the flow should be kept under strict watch to prevent the kind of uncontrolled growth criticized by Malynes's canker metaphor, foreign expenditures must be taken into account as a natural and healthy part of national activity. In his *A Discourse of Trade*, Mun reasons that

> when the value of our commodyties exported doth overballance the worth of all those forraigne wares which are imported and consumed in this kingdome, then the remaynder of our stock which is sent forth, must of necesssitie returne to us in Treasure. (*Discourse* 27)

Mercantilist calls for maintaining both trade and currency balances between domestic and foreign markets were therefore made and received within a cultural context that imagined a nation-as-body that required moderation and evenness in its economies. Mun, more accepting of foreign trade than Malynes or other more extremist mercantilist writers, is careful to establish that foreign trade itself is not a cause of economic troubles; only the imbalance in trade is to be avoided. The chief goal of economic policy should be "to keep our money in the Kingdom" (*England's* 34) as much as possible, while adhering to the knowledge that "the Ballance of our Forraign Trade [is] the true rule of our Treasure" (*Discourse* 83). Trade could be beneficial to domestic growth, but only in limited amounts and controlled through regulations and tariffs in order to preserve balance in growth.

Mountfort addresses these concerns raised in mercantilist writings and debates, particularly those engaged with how the vision of a balanced English economy was to be reconciled with emergent foreign trade needs and with the dominant metaphor of health and body through two mutually supportive approaches: direct explication and Dorotea. The defence plot places a strong emphasis on justification premised on economic reasoning, while the domestic plot utilizes the image of the body as a central metaphor to explain the necessity of the EIC's policies. In the later parts of Act 1, the Lord Admiral raises an objection brought forward against the EIC:

> [...] some grumblinge rumour flys abroade,
> that you doe much impouerish the state.
> & that by seuerall meanes, & sundry wayes?
> & yf my memorie fayle not, these are they:
> first by an excesse transportation
> of siluer, Gold, & Coynes of Christendome,
> & more particularly of this our kingdome.
> next by the prodigall wast of tymber, plancke,
> & other needful vtenses for shippinge,
> Thirdly by death of men, and profuse wast
> of victualls, wch Causeth beggerie. (1.1.195-205)

The dramatized response comes from the EIC's governor, his "deputie," and two Committees. Of particular relevance are their responses to the charge of the waste of money, which is framed as a need for importation and circulation, and the waste of human lives, which draws heavily from the discourse of activity.

In the first instance, foreign lands offer "drugs, spices, rawsilke, Indico : / & Callicoes" (1.1.266-267) that supply "the vse / the needfull & the necessary vse / of all such wares wch vsually are brought / from orientall India into Europe" (1.1.262-265). Mountfort emphasizes the usefulness of "healthfull druggs" (1.1.283):

> they are most pertinent
> eyther for preseruation of health,
> or Cure of grosse impostumde maladies.
> [...] the moderate vse of all these wares
> haue euer suted wth the maiestie
> of this greate kingedome, & rich Comon wealth (1.1.286-288, 300-302)

Although all of the EIC group's arguments are ultimately brought to bear on their work's benefits for the English citizenry, Mountfort's prioritization of medicine in his defence, as this item comes first in his long list of responses, sets the tone for the rest of his arguments. Drugs and medicine serve as clear indications of the benefits of importation and, unlike commodities, are used "not thereby / to surfayte, or to please a lickorish taste" (1.1.285), but for the advancement of the public's health, a claim that gives credence to Jones's historical note on the perceived connection between healthy bodies and healthy political states.

Mountfort proceeds from this fundamental necessity to explain the benefits of a healthy populace. With its physical and medical needs met, the English people are free to pursue the trade of goods and produce a thriving industry, which in turn creates an environment in which "poore decayed tradesmen & theyre wiues / (wch otherwise might suffer Cold & hunger) / are euery daye imployde" (1.1.312-314). As a company dedicated to these aims, the EIC is Mountfort's chief example of an enterprise engaged in this service. Drawing from the discourse of activity, Mountfort argues that workers are able to pursue their vocations in the service of trade and that the risks involved should not deter such employment; Mountfort claims that "death's as frequent on the land as sea" (3.3.1600). Without such opportunities, seamen might be given to "desperate Courses" (3.3.1566) in which they might "dare ioyne wth Turkes & infidells / to rob & spoile all Christian nations" (3.3.1567-68). Foreign trade and adventures might even serve to reform individuals through activity, giving employment to those "wch before [...] weare most burthensome" (3.3.1581) and transforming them into "men well knowne for truth & honestie" (1.1.175). The benefits of industry extend beyond the financial to encompass the moral and religious.

The same argument applies to material goods. Given the abundance of natural resources in England and Ireland such as "tymber, plancke & other thinges" (3.3.1416) well-suited for construction, the natural and logical purpose for these resources, according to Mountfort, is shipbuilding. Even the resources themselves seem inclined to provide sufficiency and sustenance in a self-adjusting measure, because "yf one yeare exceede / a little sume, the next yeare falls as much" (3.3.1419-20). Mountfort thus argues that England is gifted with a natural quantity of resources that seem, if not reserved for, then especially conducive to, the enterprise of shipbuilding. Effectively, shipbuilding and its consumption of materials are rendered naturalized and intrinsic to the nation's environment. Under such conditions, it would be unnatural and a disservice to the resources and the products alike not to use them for their intended purpose: like their crews, "all shipps / must goe & Come, they are not made to staye / at home, to rott in muddie moorish dockes" (3.3.1438-40).

Perhaps Mountfort's most concise argument in favour of the employment of workers and resources in foreign trade is located in the passage he substituted in 3.3:

> Take a materiall from his proper vse
> and yt will serue to little or no purpose :
> leaue scarlett folded in a Cyprus Chest
> the mothes will eate yt : and what luster makes
> a diamond wthin a painted boxe?
> so ys yt wth a shippe yf still endockt
> [...] a shippe is but a pile of plancke & timber
> yf not imployde in trade: sett her to sea
> and sinke or swimme shee's in her Element. (3.3.1441-52)

Naturalizing industry serves Mountfort's purposes well: as described previously, it justifies expenditures by attributing the usage of resources to their natural state and conflating the resources themselves with their function. The emphasis placed on "proper vse" is a key element in his defensive retorts. Mountfort emphasizes the need for industry to match the nation's natural environment through the strategic and balanced employment of workers and resources in the pursuit of trade. According to this logic, materials such as "plancke & timber" are inevitably drawn to industrial usage and depend on being "imployde in trade" to give them purpose; emphasis should thus be placed not on these resources being used by the EIC, since this is a natural property of the resources themselves, but on the EIC's employment of them in the best manner possible. Although the flow should be kept under strict watch to prevent the kind of uncontrolled growth criticized by Malynes's canker metaphor, foreign expenditures must be taken into account as a natural and healthy part of national activity.

Additionally, a certain number of its population as well as a quantity of its resources are naturally inclined towards movement overseas, and restricting these currents, as offered by Mountfort's dramatization of ships and seamen, is just as unnatural as their oversaturation of the home country. By categorizing the human body as a material resource, Mountfort can define the EIC's use of workers as similarly natural – these individuals are best suited to employment by the EIC since they are allowed to pursue their natural inclinations and do not clutter the nation with their lack of productivity and "serue to little or no purpose." This reimagining serves to incorporate foreign assets and trade into the nation-body and re-categorize them as being part of the metaphorical whole. Mun and by extension Mountfort enlarge the theoretical boundaries that delineated one economic entity from the next. Unlike Malynes's theory of a metaphorical body that ended at the borders of a nation, Mountfort's arguments for the historical and continued value of foreign trade networks seek to expand the conceptualization of the body to encompass such networks as part of the circulatory system of a nation's economy.

## 2.3: Martyred Dorotea: The Female Body in Economic Discourse

The Lord Admiral's objections are concerned with both foreign expenditures and their impact on the domestic economy. Although Mountfort argues that the natural use of some of England's resources dictates the need for their foreign deployment, possible weaknesses and potential harm to England in its pursuit of overseas gains remain a constant concern. Mountfort's defence of foreign expenditures proceeds along two distinct lines. The first is explicit; as seen previously, the Governor responds to concerns raised by the Lord Admiral regarding the large deployment of assets and men in foreign adventures in a direct speech laced with arguments drawn from Mun and EIC policy. The second defence stems from Dorotea herself: her subplot, in which she defends her virtue and demonstrates her integrity in the face of would-be suitors and other seamen's adulterous wives, effectively operates as a reassurance that the home nation can remain strong even during times of large-scale overseas deployments. As a result, although her plot is simultaneously engaged with domestic and gender issues, which are elaborated by Christensen, Dorotea also performs an allegorical function in which her will and body, deemed chaste and impenetrable both morally and physically, stand in for England at large. Mountfort crafts their relationship and her character as a testament to England's strength, undiminished and even heightened by the toll taken by foreign adventures.

Dorotea's character is not one given a fully imagined life; instead, she is the site of numerous cultural and political ideas that Mountfort incorporates into a single body to be used as a component of his play's political agenda. These sources range from literary sources – Massinger and Dekker's *The Virgin Martyr* (1622), which dramatizes the story of the fourth-century saint Dorothea of Caesarea, may have provided Mountfort with the loose inspiration for his own Dorotea – to mercantilist economic philosophies, notions of the female body's place in industry and society, and religious thought, particularly with regard to martyrdom. Brought together, these influences serve as the foundation upon which Dorotea's character and the many functions it performs in Mountfort's play can be analyzed.

As the nation embodied metaphorically, Dorotea's body becomes the literal site of the economic distresses articulated as diseases and illnesses in mercantilist literature: the temptations and dangers Dorotea must overcome over the course of her plot can be read as allegorical representations of the pitfalls that, according to Mountfort's beliefs, England faced in its transition towards incorporation of foreign ventures and private companies. This allegory, however, requires careful manipulation: by casting Dorotea as a stand-in for England, Mountfort can proceed to establish England's moral strength, but he also must admit the nation's fragility in aligning England to the female body which is possessed of a particular cultural freight of weakness. Any such shortcomings are rectified by the characters strategically deployed by Mountfort as representative of the EIC, most notably Dorotea's husband, who, although absent, nevertheless carries a significant presence in the play, and Captain FitzJohn.

The usage of the female body as vulnerable to martyring is a recurrent theme throughout the era's literature and features heavily in numerous works, from *The Duchess of Malfi* to *Hamlet*. The martyr model calls for a paradoxical display of strength through weakness and adversity; Susannah Monta elaborates that the female martyr's body "may be exploited to show the amazing strength of God made visible through weakness and also the horrific cruelty of persecutors who attack women viciously. The suffering female body was extremely useful for propaganda" (211). Mountfort veers in this direction with Dorotea, who shares her name with two virgin martyrs, Dorothea of Alexandria and Dorothea of Caesarea. The latter Dorothea is of particular relevance since Mountfort was most likely aware of the Massinger and Dekker play[37] with which his domestic plot shares a general plot structure: the female martyr protagonist endures various trials and threats to her physical and moral purity as displays of devotion. Consideration of the influences of martyrs on Dorotea's character and how Mountfort deploys them is thus required for appreciating her allegorical role as a staged body representing England and the confluence of economic and bodily/pathological language. Although Mountfort's Dorotea remains inviolate and successfully repels her suitors, her protests and narrative events nevertheless reflect a definite martyr sensibility despite deviating from the archetype's usual narrative progression that culminates in death.

Mountfort is far from alone in casting the female body in such terms. Shakespeare's usage of this imagery in *The Rape of Lucrece*, as Leonard Tennenhouse points out through reference to the Ditchley portrait (Marcus Gheeraerts's painting of Elizabeth standing on and illuminating a map of England and Wales), demonstrates the extent to which the metaphor can be drawn:

> Shakespeare takes this occasion to render the female in emblematic terms which resemble the Ditchley portrait in its bonding of the cartographic image to the sexual body of the monarch. [...]
>
> > And bubbling from her breast, it doth divide
> > In two slow rivers, that the crimson blood
> > Circles her body in on every side,
> > Who like a late-sack'd island vastly stood
> > Bare and unpeopled in this fearful flood. (1735-41)
>
> [...] By describing the mutilated woman in such apparently self-contradictory terms, he not only equates the health of the aristocratic body with that of the

> state, or island, he also specifies the nature of the threat to the nation's well-being. (Tennenhouse 109)

Gabriel Rieger pushes this concept beyond its usage as a dramatic tool to encompass also its cultural significance in the early modern period:

> This gendering of power which Elizabeth represented had far-reaching implications. It was inextricably bound to the nation's conception of itself as a sovereign political entity. By the time of Renaissance, there was already a lengthy tradition of using the gendered body as a political theme, which most often took the form of an association of the body of the monarch with the body of the state, the physical body with the political body, a body which was almost exclusively depicted as female. (30)

Within this context, the female body's metaphorical dimensions operated within a vivid cultural imagination that saw the nation as a personified being that possessed its own vitality and life. The nation's body was at once a site of fertility, providing for its people and its enterprises, and also a means of establishing exclusivity, attaching a corporeal significance to its borders clearly to demarcate the limits of its interiority and of the world outside of itself. Helen Hackett also discusses the usage of this model in John Lyly's "Euphues' Glass for Europe" in which "Elizabeth's intact virginal body [was] an emblem of the unity and impregnability of the nation" (83).

Mountfort's usage of the same idea, although similar in type to Shakespeare's imagery, is far more restrained due to the political necessity of convincing the public that preserving Dorotea/England's body despite overseas expenditures and traffic through its borders was possible. Dorotea is vulnerable, but Mountfort imbues her with an intellectual and moral impenetrability and compensates for any perceived physical weakness through her ability to stymie male suitors in the absence of her husband. While Mountfort cannot make proper and explicit use of the cultural power and weight of virginity in characterizing Dorotea, since she is a married character, he elides some of its characteristics – primarily its morality – with her married state and the concept of chastity to retain many of virginity's social implications and associations. Effectively, his characterization of Dorotea, due to its service as a metaphor for England, and specifically for English commercial industry, must project the possibility of weakness in order to secure a martyr sensibility, but also remain untouched and unblemished to deny any harm or wrongdoing on the part of the EIC and to promote its continued ability to defend the nation during the course of its own pursuits. He must, like the martyrologists, "[highlight] the spiritual strength contained within the weak vessel of the female body and at least potentially [rehabilitate] the female body as a site of passive resistance (Monta 211). Mountfort treads this thin line carefully, employing many of the same techniques he utilizes in his defence plot, to show the dangers of unguarded bodies and economies while simultaneously projecting the possibility of strength and successful defence.

Dorotea's plot answers the objections raised in the defence plot through her narrative of a wife and absent husband with an additional interpretive layer of nation metaphor. Her plot dramatizes the rationale laid out in the defence plot's arguments: her dialogue with Captain FitzJohn in 2.1 sets the stage for the EIC's response to the charge concerning its loss of men and ships; the underlying theme of work throughout the play and Locuples's attempt to buy Dorotea's honour in 3.1 are a parable of how England can survive and maintain its economic and political integrity in the face of exports, foreign pressures, and economic competition, thereby answering the first charge brought against the EIC; and the last charge, of the loss of materials in the pursuit of EIC interests, becomes a dramatic material reality through Dorotea's poverty and distress and the threat posed by the loss of her husband. Throughout these scenes, Dorotea's characterization primarily stems from oppositional displays: her character embodies the values Mountfort promotes for the EIC through her antagonistic relationship with her suitors and with Nutt and Sparke.

Perhaps the clearest and best-formed parallel scene is Dorotea's first. Her entry into the play is her 2.1 dialogue with Captain FitzJohn, who re-enters from the play's first act, where he functions as part of the "defence plot," and establishes continuity between the multiple narratives. While he is not cast primarily as a suitor, unlike Locuples or the various other captains whose primary functions are to attempt to sway Dorotea, FitzJohn is nevertheless situated in opposition to Dorotea by his expounding of the value and benefits of the EIC to society at large while she protests that her suffering, on a smaller, more personal level, outweighs whatever meagre gains she receives.

Dorotea's entrance is marked by her plaint:

> would I had neuer knowne a maryed state
> or else would India had beene neuer knowne.
> how solitary doe I spend my days
> encarcared like a forlone wretch. (2.1.681-4)

The key element of Dorotea's speech is its intensely personal level: the juxtaposition of her "maryed state" and the alternative of "India [...] neuer knowne" puts into play the sharp contrast between her personal situation and the nation's interests that define her narrative as a whole. FitzJohn's response, quoted here in full, highlights this disparity:

> Why doe you thus exclayme gaynst India:
> You rather should exclaime gaynst want of meanes.
> India hath made you husbandles a while,
> What then? Is India therefore blameable?
> Did not your husband by petition
> Implore implyoyment? Did the marchante want
> Your husband more, then did your husband them?
> The fayre imployment that's Conferrd on him
> Had been supplyde by better abler men
> Had not his importunitie beene such
> As would take no denyall? Theyr imployment
> Ys not so easily purchast as you thinke.
> Good friends indeed struck Close vnto your husband
> Else had he Come farre short of what he got.
> Tis impudence euen in an-ill-tongd trull
> (much more in you fayre mistres) to reuile
> Gaynst that wch giues you yearely maintenance :
> For shame, for shame forbeare: all ills amonge
> There is none worser then a lavish tongue. (2.1.711-29)

FitzJohn responds only to her second exclamation, her wish that "India had beene neuer knowne." This exchange is essentially a parallel version of the defence-plot argument regarding the loss of men in the course of trade expeditions mentioned in 1.1 and elaborated in 3.3; here it is cast in terms of the absence of one particular man. Consequently, FitzJohn's reply to Dorotea operates on both levels, speaking to her individual case as well as to the cases of all absent husbands who are sent overseas by the EIC. FitzJohn responds by changing the terms of the plaint raised by Dorotea. His rebuttal is focused on the EIC's purported role in taking away her husband by shifting responsibility onto the individual. According to FitzJohn, the EIC provides only "fayre imployment," and her husband holds the responsibility for his choice. Furthermore, FitzJohn implies that the EIC receives more applications than it has positions, particularly from "better abler men"; she should therefore be grateful that her husband was even able to secure the opportunity through "good friends"' support, "else had he come farre short of what he got." Dorotea in turn must endure what FitzJohn stresses is a temporary and unavoidable sacrifice ("husbandles a while"), and her husband's absence is the necessary condition for his financial success, therefore rendering any objection on Dorotea's part a moot point and of no economic consequence. In return for this patience, she stands to gain from the many benefits the EIC bestows upon its employees and their families.

While the play does seem to indicate that FitzJohn and Dorotea already know each other upon her entry into the play ("but tell me Dorotea, / what make you heare so early" [2.1.574-675]), and his response is predicated on at least some knowledge of her husband's circumstances, the true aims of his speech here are twofold: to discredit her opposition to the EIC's India mission at large and to shift the trajectory of the dialogue towards emphasizing Dorotea's own role in both creating and managing the issue of an absent husband. Her speech here also serves to establish the groundwork for concerns later voiced in the defence plot regarding the toll of international trade on the nation's resources and supplies.

Although FitzJohn's reply seems to be similar to the more straightforward discursive style exhibited in the defence plot, his argument, despite its references to general employment conditions, functions in the same emotional register as Dorotea's plaint while displaying the same type of bland generalizations deployed in the defence plot. His series of accusatory questions, punctuated by liberal usage of "you" and "your," appears to localize his response to Dorotea's particular concerns, but a closer inspection of the passage and its placement in the text reveals that it functions primarily to draw the domestic plot into the same political space as the defence plot by dramatizing the formal arguments heard by the Governor and Committees. Mountfort deliberately anticipates the more formal argument later in the play, between the Lord Admiral and the Governor concerning the loss of lives under EIC voyages, with a smaller version of the same point between Dorotea and FitzJohn. FitzJohn's series of questions serves to form the foundation for the later rebuttal of the same argument in the defence plot. Dorotea's overdramatic speech, despite its absurdity, is taken as grounds for a full reply by FitzJohn and incorporated by Mountfort as something of a straw-man argument aimed at deflating criticism of the EIC's responsibility and agency in deploying men overseas before the abstract and almost banal response to the same issue presented by Governor in 3.3:

> So precious is the lyfe of euery man,
> that yt ought not on euery idle terme,
> & triuiall Cause to be exposde to dangers.
> and yet wee knowe that the whole Course of lyfe

is nothinge but a passage vnto death. (3.3.1546-50)

Arguments regarding Mountfort's ineptitude notwithstanding, the disjointed nature of the exchange between Dorotea and FitzJohn does serve a valuable political purpose within Mountfort's larger pro-EIC effort. Dorotea's plot as a whole functions as a representation of the human side of the arguments heard by the Lord Admiral and Governor; when these officials speak of England's resources, both human and natural, as being cast abroad and possibly wasted, Dorotea operates in parallel by bemoaning the conditions she endures in her husband's absence. The absence itself is not the primary reason for her distress – she protests, "Thinke you my husbands absence is my griefe?" (2.1.748) – but, instead, Mountfort's play works to position her as incomplete and forced into a fundamentally unnatural societal role. It should also be noted that Dorotea's clarification serves to undo a possible misinterpretation: although her husband's absence is not the cause of her "griefe," his return *will* undo her turmoil by removing the circumstances that his absence engendered. FitzJohn's reply, by focusing on issues of agency and responsibility of choice, emphasizes Dorotea's, and by extension England's, "encarcared" state. Although his response is off the mark in terms of addressing Dorotea's voiced concerns, it effectively undermines her curses against both India and her "maryed state."

Rhetorically, FitzJohn emphasizes the irrationality of Dorotea's position by misrepresenting her complaint and turning it into an attack on a personified India. FitzJohn takes an exaggerated, hyperbolic outburst and uses it as a springboard for addressing anti-EIC sentiment. Although his is far from an appropriate response, it serves Mountfort's purposes admirably: FitzJohn's reply conflates Dorotea's valid criticism (that of the troubles she endures without her husband) with her emotional outbursts and dismisses the former on the basis of the latter and finishes off his opening retort with a moralized attack on her character. The incongruity of his response is hardly addressed: Dorotea initially reproaches him for being “too lavish in your tongue” (2.1.730), but instead focuses her reply on her general right to complain – “Cannot an honest woman say she want / the sweet embracements of a lovinge husband / without a scandall to her honestie?” (2.1.851-3) – and on having to fend off would-be suitors. No response is provided for FitzJohn’s commentary on the value and benefits provided by EIC employment.

While FitzJohn seemingly ignores her complaint against her “maryed state,” this status forms a tacit part of Mountfort’s rhetorical approach. By making Dorotea and her husband wholly accountable for his employment by the EIC, FitzJohn effectively highlights Dorotea’s plight: with her husband away because of the couple's need of his employment, Dorotea is forced into a functionally non-productive social space in which her highest achievement is to remain stationary and untouched. The discourse of work, as examined by Christensen, is for Dorotea’s character a fundamentally different type of work than her husband’s or men’s in general, and subjects her to numerous risks through her exposure to the outside world while doing little more than allowing her to tread water.

A critical distinction between her and her husband is that Dorotea’s work has little to do with socio-economic advancement or the growth of wealth; it is instead purely a survival measure and entirely concerned with combating poverty. As Nutt points out, Dorotea “is euer / workinge, & yet she doth but liue” (2.1.939-40); this insult is mirrored later by Dorotea’s own complaint, “worke, worke poore Dorotea: worke to liue / & liue to worke" (4.4.2396-7). In Mountfort's narrative, work is always a peril, as either physical danger in the case of the husband's employment or moral and social in the case of Dorotea's, but they are differentiated by potential. The husband's, and by extension the EIC's, ventures are maintained through the promise of investment and returns, in effect producing more wealth. On the other hand, women work in desperation for sustenance or in practice of immoral hedonism. Dorotea's productive value within the workplace, at best, allows her to break even. Furthermore, she is forced into the outside world by necessity; without her husband, she has insufficient financial and social standing to remain within the private sphere. Although her plot is the "domestic" one, her husband's absence precludes her from arguably one of the most significant defining traits of domesticity in the early modern period, that of child-bearing and -rearing.

Within a play deeply concerned with human lives in one plot and sexuality in the other, the absence of any substantial discussion of reproduction is a notable one. Children are hardly mentioned: there are passing references to "widowes and widowes Children vnreleeud" (3.3.1484), and children are used metaphorically to illustrate the loyalty "twixt parents & theyr Children" (4.3.2325) and the subject and the state, but the only speech concerning children occurs roughly midway through 3.3. In responding to allegations of EIC negligence towards widows and orphans left by seamen killed on voyages, the Second Committee argues that

> Besides theyr large munificence & doales
> of beefe porke, biskett, & of some readie monies,
> are not there diuerse Children sett a worke
> to doe some labour, such as maye befitt

> theyr tender age, & weake Capacitie? (3.3.1734-8)

Despite Mountfort's intention to include this opportunity as a positive note, children and childbearing exist in his play only according to their purely monetary and industrial values. These elements function as economic actions instead of any normative judgment of private or human worth.

These values are either productive, as in the above case in which the children can work to compensate for the income lost through the deaths of their fathers, or reductive, in which the EIC accounts for them in terms of money owed to widows and their children. Sexuality is never defined in reproductive terms, instead emerging primarily as an exchange tinged by military metaphors between Dorotea and her suitors or as a good to be sold in "sordid prostitution" (5.4.2911). The play is absolute in its application of this philosophy: everything, including human lives, is configured around a central focus on its economic value or cost. As a result, there is no boundary between the privileged private and the public commercial from the EIC's perspective. Everything can be measured in terms of economic power and agency, including quantities traditionally inscribed within the domestic sphere.

What little attention the play does give to human reproduction is similarly incorporated into Mountfort's economic philosophy. Pregnancy contributed to a community's health and was a resource that was nominally subjected to "proper" management, as explained by Laura Gowing:

> In the case of illegitimate mothers, what they carried was a threat to the community's economic survival and moral stability. Women's part in regulating sex and pregnancy might well be seen as testimony not to the

> privacy of women's bodies, but to their place in the public world of the neighbourhood, where women had a stake in moral order and economic stability. ("Ordering" 50)

Mountfort's amalgamation of the public and the private is a key element in the construction of the play's political narrative. Dorotea's fidelity extends beyond any personal responsibility or dedication because of its potential impact on communal concerns; her act of self-regulation in resisting her suitors is both an act of private devotion and a commitment to the health of the community she inhabits as a character and as a political metaphor. Further supplementing this responsibility is what Maurizio Calbi calls "the economy of reproductive discourses" in which reproduction is the site of "specific anxieties about the 'work' respectively carried out by the male and female reproductive fluids in the generation of offspring" (Calbi 57). Dorotea must do her rightful part in her industrial role: to fail this duty is to risk severe collateral damage, since "when marriages broke down, a whole edifice of economic transactions, sexual relations, and social roles came unstuck" (Gowing, *Domestic* 180).

The destabilization of community and resources is also accompanied by a more direct risk to the EIC's manpower: without the reasonable assurance of wives' fidelity, men may prove less willing to sign up for overseas service. FitzJohn laments women who "wth wanton eyes, & flattering words / make prostitutes of your betrothed selues / bringing dishonour to your husbands beds" (2.1.895-7) and extols the value of wives like Dorotea: "who would thinke any thinge / too hott, or Cold for such a Constant spouse?" (2.1.903-4). Although Mountfort strives to paint EIC service as both well-funded and necessary and to downplay the dangers involved, both to the domestic sphere and in the course of service, the centrality of adultery to Dorotea's plot is a reminder of its powerful capacity to "transform[] both the spatial and economic organization of the household" (Gowing, *Domestic* 197). The effects of redistribution of resources – "money, provisions, and sexual attention" (Gowing, *Domestic* 197) – that adultery entails are amplified by the husband's absence. The risk of his displacement is a strong strike against the rewards offered by the EIC, thus forcing men to consider their marriages within the same system of checks and balances and risks and rewards that the EIC tacitly promotes in its policies.

Although this type of dehumanization and reductionism was hardly a groundbreaking idea even in the early modern period, the consequences it carries for Dorotea's character and allegorical role are significant. By establishing her lack of agency in her husband's choice of employment and binding Dorotea to the expectations of marital fidelity, Mountfort, while he may be sympathetic to actual wives trapped in similar circumstances, effectively exposes Dorotea's productivity as dependent on the presence of her husband to re-establish a domestic space, to allow her to exhibit a sanctioned sexuality, and to turn her into a productive actor within an economic system through reproduction.

Between the moral imperatives stemming from her married status and the dangers of work, Dorotea, without her husband, is effectively a fixed value that can produce neither economically nor biologically. Such a social position was not unheard of, although its application to women such as Dorotea was a new phenomenon: the non-space Dorotea occupies is also the realm of aberrant women, fodder for "table talke, nay tavern-talke to all" (2.1.863):

> Protestant/capitalist marriage reinforced women's use-value as wives, and their position as chattels defined all unmarried women – whether spinsters or widows – as "use-less" and relegated them to a pariah-like existence on the fringes of society. Thus, any woman who was not married (or living with her father) was liable to various forms of social censure as an anomalous creature. (Jankowski 131-2)

The paradox is, of course, that Dorotea is neither of these and yet suffers and shares in their circumstances: her husband's overseas deployment engenders a new social condition under which women, although married, existed as non-entities and social outcasts subject to "scoffs, reproches, taunts, & Checkes" (4.4.2602). In a system in which "women's bodies [...] were 'used' in the same way capital was for men's economic advancement" (Jankowski 131), to be "use-less" is to be valueless and subject to opposing forces that would re-inscribe Dorotea within their own economic domains.

This is the crux of Dorotea's plot: Mountfort's characterization operates according to a binary system in which Dorotea's body can only be productively neutral, in which case she awaits her husband, or a potential site of disease, both moral and physical, as a result of engaging in the temptations offered her. Dorotea *sans* husband can be possessed only of one of two states, forced to choose between "Chast Camilla & adulterate Thais" (2.1.697): a pure and idealized sterility in which she remains untouched and unblemished by the conditions she endures, evoking the twin discourses of fidelity and obedience, or, the condition of Sparke and Nutt, the "Corosiue creatures" defined by immorality and "Corrupt flesh" (3.3.1836, 1838). Her carefully maintained stability is also an ideologically fraught state: as elaborated previously, the discourse of motion and activity so crucial to Mountfort's arguments in the defence plot regarding the usage of men and materials is violated here by his paradoxically arguing that, in the absence of the husband, the wife's ideal state is to remain unchanged.

In casting Dorotea's body as productively neutral without her husband, Mountfort casts the nation in a similar light: England needs the EIC to make use of its materials and resources lest they go to waste or be plundered by foreign powers. This is essentially the argument put forward by the Governor in reply to the Lord Admiral's second and third criticisms, "the prodigall wast of tymber, plancke, / & other needful vtenses for shipping" (1.1.202-3), only utilizing human reproduction as its central resource instead of lumber and shipbuilding materials. The EIC's importance to the nation consequently extends far beyond its monetary value, which is nevertheless crucial, into performing what basically constitutes a social imperative fundamental to the nation. The resources it trades and the luxuries it acquires from abroad are but a small fraction of its significance; Mountfort instead hints that the EIC's greatest achievement is its role in putting the nation's resources to proper use and, although always subject to certain degrees of risk, keeping them from being plundered by foreign powers or given to unsavoury relationships like the aforementioned sailors who would "dare joyne wth Turkes & infidels / to rob & spoile all Christian nations" (3.1.1567-8).

Furthermore, overseas trade as a whole can thus be removed from the realm of the morality of all citizens and of the nation itself – the body politic made real. Mountfort's narrative structures are aimed at solidifying the EIC's power base by moralizing its relationship to local industry and resources (through Dorotea's need to keep herself for her husband) and by linking the nation's well-being and productivity to the EIC's industry, both for the nation itself and its "land men [...] / wch might haue begged, or starud, or else beene hangd, / had that implopment faylde" (1.1.26-8).

As evidenced by the children example, the economics of EIC policy are conducted according to a philosophy that distils everything into monetary or industrial value, even going so far as to appropriate bodily discourse for its own metaphors beyond the ones already established by economic language, that then allows the EIC, as an emergent economic powerhouse and a financial agency firmly invested in business above all other considerations, to claim dominion over numerous resources and institutions formerly under control of the government. The odd note towards the end of the play, in which the London Mint is mentioned but left undiscussed, is a prime example of this development: the Governor speaks of how "the mints implopment hath beene wondrous small / and oft tymes none" (4.3.2283-4) since the EIC emerged in London economics. Although he is rebuked by the Lord Admiral, since "what's the mint to you, or you to yt" (4.3.2286), the implication is clear: the EIC has superseded the Mint's, and therefore the government's, control and influence over currency.

This totalizing philosophy extends beyond internal economies to incorporate also larger international trade. Mountfort takes his cues from Mun in creating a Dorotea who, while morally self-sustaining, is financially dependent on her husband's success abroad; the metaphorical nation's health and well-being hinge on foreign factors. While Dorotea must endure the allegorical and moralized assaults from the sea captain and the land captain, who along with Locuples (meaning "rich" in Latin) represent the threats of military conquest and economic domination respectively, she ultimately accepts her need for the income generated by her husband's foreign adventures. The militaristic suitors drew also from the cultural legacy stemming from Elizabeth, who "when Phillip II sent his armada [...] persuaded her subjects that the defense of the English borders was the defense of her own body; that their honor rested upon preserving her virginity from Phillip's intended rape" (Camino 125). Regardless of the actual efficacy of that political metaphor, it provides Mountfort with an established theme upon which to draw in constructing his allegory.

Mountfort remaps traditional domestic economies, which the pro-EIC commentators insinuate as being insufficient in the contemporary world, in favour of an international perspective "wch giues [...] yearely maintenance" (2.1.727) to the nation. Doing so furnishes England with a productive outlet for its people and its natural resources in an expanded, international perspective. While the overarching goal of the home nation and its economies was to remain balanced in trade and currency flows in accordance to mercantilist thought, Mountfort was keen to adopt Mun's view on how this was to be accomplished. This balance was not to be achieved by an exclusively inward focus on the movement of money within the nation's border, but rather through careful management of its international trade relations while ensuring that domestic economies remained protected from foreign corruption. Dorotea's defence is thus possessed of both its moral value and its symbolism, connoting an economic fidelity that sustains and is sustained by the EIC, further supplemented by the rewards FitzJohn, and by extension the

EIC, give to those that remain loyal to its cause. To deviate from this bond is, according to Mountfort's perspective, analogous to adultery, to a woman cuckolding her husband while he works overseas for her.

## 2.4: Conflicts Abroad and at Home

Mountfort's intention of legitimizing the EIC in popular thought and metaphor was a goal that meshed neatly with the EIC's corporate objectives, given the EIC's still precarious situation in the 1630's. At the time of the play's composition, the EIC faced stiff competition from the Dutch and Portuguese, who had the advantage of decades of experience and established networks, and domestic dissent over the Royal Charter and its subsequent monopoly on international trade granted to the EIC by Elizabeth in 1600 and monarchical privileging that continued under James I. The naturalization motif in *Launching* serves to address both of these concerns by connecting the EIC to England through a parallel relationship using marriage and the military metaphor of the captains. Although the EIC was making strong headway into India by this decade, the threat of foreign navies was very much still a source of concern, as evidenced through the shipyard workers' story of the Amboyna Massacre of 1623,[38] in which "the dutchmen [...] Causde our men to be so / Cruelly torturd, & most inhumanely murthered" (2.1.1078-9).[39] Additionally, tensions with the Portuguese resulted in clashes such as the Battle of Swally in 1612, and historical records are littered with mentions of skirmishes between the EIC and their French, Dutch, and Spanish counterparts.

The other source of conflict, perhaps most easily aligned with Locuples in the play, was resentment and competition from other English companies, possibly the "ill-affected [that] will gaynsaye / the truth alledgd" (Epil.2962-3) dismissed by Mountfort in the epilogue. The charters granted by Elizabeth and reaffirmed by James effectively granted the EIC monopolies over trading with the entire Indian region; although it would take nearly a century, competitors eventually had Parliament strike down this privilege in 1694. Furthermore, the EIC was under constant pressure to meet revenue expectations in order to maintain its advantage: the Charter passed by James in 1609 contained the following clause:

> Provided also, that if it shall hereafter appear to Us, Our Heirs, or Successors, that this Grant, or the Continuance thereof, in the whole, or in any Part thereof, shall not be profitable to Us, Our Heirs and Successors, or to this Our Realm, that then, and from thenceforth, upon and after Three Years Warning, to be given to the said Company, by Us, Our Heirs or Successors, under Our or their Privy Seal, or Sign Manual, this present Grant shall cease, be void and determined, to all Intents, Constructions and Purposes. ("Charter" 31)

Due to these conditions, Mountfort's eagerness in promoting the natural fit between the EIC and the English people and nation is more than simple propaganda: it is also a plea for recognition of the EIC's strengths and for trust in its judgment in the face of its competitors' dissent and criticisms, which carried the risk of serious financial repercussions for the EIC. In return for such devotion, his idealized EIC promises to act as "a greate man good, a rich man liberall" (4.4.2635) and offers praise and gestures of "small beneuolence" (4.4.2628) as depicted in the reward scene between FitzJohn and Dorotea towards the end of the play. Dorotea's gratitude, delivered as lavish and heavy-handed praise, functions to relate Mountfort's idealized notion of correct response to the EIC's magnanimous generosity:

> I yeild you humble thankes: your large munifence
> (farre beyond meritt) hath tyde me by the bond
> Of loue & dutie to your sacred lore
> And shall for euer tye me. (4.4.2639-42)

The play's politically driven goals, as presented here, encompass promises of financial success in the defence plot and also what is effectively a hearts-and-minds objective; it sells not only the EIC's economic power but also its social awareness. Mountfort heavily emphasizes Dorotea's need for her EIC husband in the play's narrative, but this is accompanied by the husband's tacit need for her loyalty as well. Mountfort strives to cast Dorotea and her husband's relationship as not only mutually beneficial but also mutually necessary.

To return to the earlier example of the exchange between Dorotea and FitzJohn in Act 2: the trajectory of their dialogue establishes precedent for the narrative's operation as a whole, and the theoretical and abstract values held by FitzJohn, drawn from EIC policy and Mun, are brought into contact and friction with Mountfort's dramatization of the lives of those who bear the consequences of those policies. This much is as discussed by Christensen; however, the further superimposition of the nation metaphor allows for Dorotea's suffering and acknowledgement of negative repercussions caused by economic actions while maintaining the overall pro-mercantilist, pro-EIC propagandist stance of the play as a whole. Although Dorotea suffers in her husband's absence, the play emphasizes that she should be appreciative of the EIC since it attempts to provide for her to the best of its ability, tacitly suggesting that the EIC's success will expand this capacity. The EIC employs her husband and many others who would otherwise find no other employment and, as an extension of his engagement with the company, her support for the company obliquely supports her husband through association.

Mountfort reconciles the domestic plot with the defence plot by using the figure of the body-as-nation as a recurrent theme throughout both narratives. In the case of the defence plot, likening the nation to a physical body in need of the proper management tended by the EIC serves to highlight the fit between its resources and the EIC's goals through an intellectualized and measured relationship. In parallel, casting Dorotea as an emblematic representation of England tied to the EIC through marriage provides Mountfort with grounds for an approach aimed at making a moral, naturalized argument: the English nation and people should show both gratitude and loyalty to the EIC, which suffers and works abroad for England's benefit. In both cases, the human body serves as the common ground on which to elaborate his economic and cultural views: in the defence plot, the nation is like the body. In Dorotea, the body exemplifies the relationships that the nation should cultivate, cherish, and defend. The effectiveness of Mountfort's subtexts are inconsequential, as is his skill in carrying out his intentions; what is clear is that there is little need to pit the two narratives against one another in order to make sense of them, especially given that such a contradictory and antagonistic interpretation requires a presumption of self-sabotage on Mountfort's part. The body functions as a powerful metaphor in both early modern economic philosophy and literature. Mountfort brings the two strains of semiotics and their hermeneutics of the human body together in his play in an attempt to fashion a political platform that utilizes the physical presence of the stage to push for both the continued value of the EIC to England and the human dimensions of compromise and sacrifice required for economic expansion.

# CHAPTER THREE

# THE ECONOMICS OF PESSIMISM IN SHAKESPEARE'S *HENRY VI* PLAYS

## 3.1: *1 Henry VI*'s Economic History

If, as Lars Engle argues, *Troilus and Cressida* is Shakespeare's scathing critique of free-market transactions and the devastation they visit upon social and interpersonal ties, then the play is the culmination of a theme already thoroughly explored in his earlier works. For Engle, *Troilus* presents a brutal world in which all people, acts, and relationships are measured by "a rabid allegiance to market forces and an unrelieved economism with almost no residue of inherited absolutist conviction to work upon" (148). The deeply mercantilist transactions that perform many of the play's exchanges – prisoner trades, vows of love, and the mathematics of combat between Achilles and Hector – serve both to underscore the play's thematic criticism of contemporary economic culture and simultaneously to raise "the unavoidable suspicion that [the audience] are implicated in its trade" through their participation and presence in "a commercial transaction" (Baker 88) – paying for entertainment.

A tone of disillusionment with mercantilist ideology and its pernicious effects on society, such as the subversion of even core cultural values such as love, is rampant throughout *Troilus*. This alone is hardly startling, since many of the same grumblings appear in other of Shakespeare's works (*Timon of Athens*) and those of other playwrights of the time (Heywood's *A Woman Killed with Kindness*). The rejection of such economic policy, however, is a theme operating on the groundwork laid in Shakespeare's earlier works: Shakespeare's history plays, and the *Henry VI* works in particular, are filled with apocalyptic scenarios of insufficiency and death wrought by the inability of the feudal system to provide for the country and its citizens.

In this chapter, I will examine *1 Henry VI* with reference to the other plays comprising the tetralogy, and suggest an alternative reading to the play focused on its narrative of economic history. While most critical studies of the plays have examined its sources, such as the Holinshed Chronicles and questions of its authorship, or its political themes of medieval nostalgia and the depiction of the French, the plays also allegorize England's economic history leading up the Wars of the Roses. By structuring the play's central narrative around England's progression from the collapse of feudal enterprises to the emergence of mercantilist market economies, Shakespeare allegorizes the narrative of not only political but also economic history as it was understood in his time. Early modern notions of why the previous systems of exchange had been subsumed by then-dominant mercantilist ideologies can be identified and traced in the play. I will firstly examine Talbot's place within this narrative and its relation to feudal manorialism; particular emphasis will be placed on early modern conceptualizations of trust and how this model was connected to economic exchanges as well as a social value.

Secondly, I will read the play's depiction of the economic system that emerged to replace feudalism: mercantilism was denigrated by many early modern critics for its perceived selfishness and lack of moral character, and Shakespeare's integration of these attitudes into the play's narrative explains many of its themes and characters. Thirdly, I set out to examine how concurrent and intertwined debates regarding mercantilism's relation to currency, counterfeiting, and the cultural impact of credit inform the play's ideas of moral character and just behaviour. At its heart, *1 Henry VI* is a play intensely concerned with the effects economics and financial debates have on the moral character of the nation's citizenry. Money, by virtue of its cultural power, serves as a powerful and meaningful image through which the morality of economic behaviours can be demonstrated in narrative.

Finally, I will examine Margaret's and Suffolk's characters in *2 Henry VI* and the strategies each deploys to estimate the values to be ascribed to an individual person, each according to a different system of reckoning. My study of Margaret draws from recent research into the emergence of a consumerist society in the early modern period in England propagated by a rise in international commerce and England's integration into the larger European economy.[40] Her connection to commodity culture is particularly important to her characterization since she herself, at her introduction in *1 Henry VI*, is a foreign commodity to be imported into England. As Natasha Korda demonstrates in *Shakespeare's Domestic Economies*, the conceptual links among women, commodities, and value underscore a particularly pragmatic approach to the growing market-based nature of political organization predicated heavily on social visibility. This strategy is counterbalanced by Suffolk's depiction in *2 Henry VI*, in which he attempts to naturalize power in his own physical body and effectively serves as a counterpoint to the methodology manifested in Margaret's character. In adapting England's history to the play's narrative oppositions, Shakespeare illustrates several different tactics used in an attempt to stabilize the often tumultuous and fractured social structures resulting from emergent economic trends.

The *Henry VI* plays chronicle the periods before and during the Wars of the Roses, and much criticism has focused on the political history laid out within them. There is, however, also a subtle narrative of economic history woven through the plays as well. If we "follow the money" (404) as Nina Levine puts it, then we can see how patterns of trade and credit inform and influence the rise and fall of political dynasties in the histories. Characters and factions are used to represent different modes of value, industry, and exchange and are put into opposition with one another to dramatize the conflicts and shifts between economic philosophies as England undergoes both political upheaval and substantial changes to financial institutions and the economic lives of its inhabitants. Nationalization of industry, Charter companies, international trade, and more complex systems of market, credit, and currency were quickly supplanting traditional arrangements. The critiques of feudal, market-based domestic economies appear to be predicated on the inability of these systems to provide properly for the material and also cultural needs of those they involve because they undermine social and interpersonal bonds through their monetization.

## 3.2: Talbot, Dead Man Walking

Contemporary economic history has strongly argued for a reimagining of mercantilist philosophy as a series of patchwork solutions emerging to combat and to correct fiscal policy amidst the breakdown of the feudal system in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries, rather than as a distinct and fully realized system implemented from a top-down, macroeconomic perspective. Within the murky and uneven progression from feudalism to English bullionism[41] in the sixteenth century to the dominance of mercantilist trade-balance ideology by the mid-seventeenth, there were a multitude of theories and chronological anomalies:

> In England this transition [from bullionism to mercantilism] began around 1620 and was almost completed by 1663 when the age-old prohibition of the export of bullion and of foreign coin was removed. But of course not all writers [...] kept to this neat logical divide, for some quite advanced mercantilist views appeared before 1620, while many apparently crude and narrow-minded bullionist views appeared long after 1663. (Davies 225)

Writings by Mun and Malynes are examples of these outliers and are examined elsewhere in my work. However opposed the two writers may have been on various subjects, they share a common emphasis that makes it abundantly clear that mercantilist theories were equal parts philosophies to be implemented in order to provoke growth and to provide correctives for a deficient, extant system plagued by broken policies Malynes termed the "canker of England's commonwealth." Mun's work in "England's Treasure by Foreign Trade," though critical of Malynes' approach to monetary policy, is equally concerned with offering solutions to exchange-market abuses prevalent in their time.

If possible solutions to and criticisms of existing practices form the two trends in economic discourse in mercantilist writers, Shakespeare's *Henry VI* plays fall squarely in the latter camp: here, and nowhere more directly, Shakespeare dramatizes the insufficiencies present in the feudal regime and the interfactional bickering it promotes. Although scholars have traditionally noted *1 Henry VI* for its focus on memory, specifically in the character of Talbot, who "is a figure for the nostalgia" (Hattaway 30) for a nobility lost to the English by the time of the Wars of the Roses, therein also lies a tacit acceptance of his passing and the order he represents. The moral character of Talbot's age is to be mourned, but the play casts his character as a man no longer current to his circumstances: his model of the world is no longer able to meet sufficiently the pressing demands of his present world. Talbot is nominally defeated "because he has been let down by factional rivalries among the English" (Bevington, "1 Henry VI" 316) at the moment of his death, in a "scene where he calls for troops who do not appear [in] yet another demonstration of the destructiveness of aristocratic factionalism" (Hattaway 30), but Shakespeare appears hesitant to give Talbot a free pass on the events leading up to and including his death.

Talbot's problems begin long before the play's action opens. Talbot's army is already beleaguered in France: money, men, and supplies are short for the overextended English, who are trying to hold more territory than their resources can manage, while the French mount a fresh offensive headed by Joan. Food and hunger are themes repeated throughout *1 Henry VI*; the play's usage of them hinges on its connection to a larger issue – resource management – and also serves as a measure by which the health of the nation can be judged. In the play's opening scene, the loss of several French towns previously held by the English, news of which is brought by a series of messengers, is pinned squarely on a constant theme of insufficiency. The first Messenger tells of a defeat brought upon by "No treachery, but want of men and money" (1.1.69), which stems from disputes amongst the nobles on how to conduct the war:

> Amongst the soldiers this is muttered:

That here you maintain several factions,
And whilst a field should be dispatched and fought,
You are disputing of your generals:
One would have ling’ring wars, with little cost;
Another would fly swift, but wanteth wings;
A third thinks, without expense at all,
By guileful fair words peace may be obtained.
Awake, awake, English nobility!
Let not sloth dim your horrors new-begot:
Cropp'd are the flower-de-luces in your arms;
Of England's coat one half is cut away. (1.1.70-81)

This messenger is quickly followed by another, who tells of the siege of Orleans:

[...] Fore Orleans, besieged,
The English army is grown weak and faint.
The Earl of Salisbury craveth supply,
And hardly keeps his men from mutiny,
Since they, so few, watch such a multitude. (1.1.157-61)

The dramatic shortcomings of the English army are also the subject of French discussion in the following act, this time framed as a series of insults by the French against the weakened soldiers who besiege them. Charles speaks of “the famished English, like pale ghosts, / Faintly besiege us one hour in a month” (1.2.7-8) with a hint of condescending pity for the soldiers who would “rather with their teeth / The walls [...] tear down” (1.2.18-9), and Rene notes that Salisbury, the English commander, “Nor men nor money hath [...] to make war" (1.2.17). Before proceeding to an attack, Alençon scoffs at the English, who face odds of "One to ten? / Lean raw-boned rascals, who would e'er suppose / They had such courage and audacity?" (1.3.13-5), and Joan is quick to quip about Talbot's "hungry-starved men" (1.7.16).

While the English struggle against their lack of supplies, the French suffer from an overabundance and abuse of them: the French quickly lose their hold on Orleans after "having all day caroused and banqueted" (2.1.12) following Charles's hasty and mistimed command to "banquet royally / After this golden day of victory" (1.8.30-1). Overindulgence and gluttony operate conceptually as themes of imbalance, both bodily and cultural, and were familiar topics to an early modern audience. Joan Fitzpatrick writes of how such excesses "were denounced for their negative effects upon physical health [...] but the moral effects of the practice upon the Christian soul were also emphasized" (18). In *1 Henry VI*, resource management, embodied in the action as troop strength, their supply trains, and the ways in which each side deals with these realities, serves to differentiate the nations from one another: the English persevere in the face of hunger and reduced armies, while the French are fast to overindulge their appetites and are prone to complacence.

Despite the heroic underdog narrative enabled by the dearth of resources, the food and soldier shortages are also a criticism of England's fraught political situation at the time. Talbot's lack of funds and troops, ultimately resulting in his death, thematically performs as an ideological analogy: unable to adapt to modernity, Talbot cannot survive and is thus killed. That he dies before Joan is crucial to the play's thematic structure, although the historical Joan "in reality he outlived by twenty-two years" (Hoenselaars

94), since Joan and the values she represents supplant him entirely. Joan's sneak attack, completely disrupting Talbot's expectations and his understanding of warfare, proves as much within the play's action. That his son, John, who is "born only to die" (Leggatt 14) in the drama, is also killed nearly simultaneously is no accident. The play fully intends to drive home the point that Talbot's way of life is finished, not only through his own death but through that of his son, who represents "our household's name, / My death's revenge, thy youth, and England's fame" (4.5.38-9).

Fred Tromly points out that the close relationship between the two Talbots, further isolated by Shakespeare's revisions to "[delete] young John's siblings (including an illegitimate brother) and thus [make] him an only son" (43-4), develops further as each approaches death: "each figure partakes of the qualities of the figure whom he saves" (46) until the elder Talbot, dying, asks "Where is my other life? Mine own is gone" (4.7.1). Talbot's calling attention to the death of "our household's name" in his final lines is a calculated reference. Mourning its loss reiterates Talbot's particular view of his world, premised on notions of family, heritage, and community. With both Talbots dead, the ideals and lineage of chivalric nobility and the era to which they belong are interred once and for all.

That the Talbots and their deaths represent the closing of an age is abundantly clear both from the scholarly criticism and the play itself. What is somewhat murkier is the implication raised by Lawrence V. Ryan in his edition of the *Henry VI* plays that, on some level, Talbot deserves his fate because of his failure to accept that the rules of the world have changed. Talbot's problems extend beyond a simple misplacement of trust, instead encompassing a much larger ideological failure on his part. His inability to assess or even to understand his military opponent's strategy precipitates his defeat at Orleans:

> My thoughts are whirled like a potter's wheel.
> I know not where I am nor what I do.
> A witch by fear, not force, like Hannibal
> Drives back our troops and conquers as she lists.
> So bees with smoke and doves with noisome stench
> Are from their hives and houses driven away. (1.7.19-24)[42]

This failure is later compounded by his reliance on reinforcements from York and Somerset, who are occupied with factional power plays, costing him and his son their lives. The tragedy is two-fold: the Talbot deaths and York and Somerset's roles in them are tragic, but equally so is Talbot's unyielding and brutally misplaced faith in his countrymen. The outbreak of factionalism, even before Talbot's entry into the play, in the Tower scene between Gloucester and Winchester immediately demonstrates the widespread dissent already shown in the play's opening act. Talbot enters the play in the next scene, freshly released by the French in a hostage exchange and thus having missed the bickering at Henry V's funeral in 1.1, and then proceeds conveniently to miss every factional clash in the following acts.

Nowhere is this ignorance more apparent than Talbot's untimely exit in 4.1, where he leaves the stage right before Vernon and Basset enter wearing their respective roses and the assembled party dissolves into political bickering. Despite being witness to Gloucester's commentary on the degradation of the king's power in the same act, Talbot appears almost intentionally to turn a blind eye to the political squabbles surrounding him, instead holding blindly to the principles of the "Knights of the Garter [...] this most honourable order" (4.1.34, 41). Shakespeare thus intimates that although the lion's share of the blame is to be placed on factionalism, Talbot is not entirely innocent in his own death – after already being betrayed once by Falstof and witnessing the king's weakened grasp on his subjects, Talbot still clings to a trust that is thenceforth tinged by ignorance. Although the presence of such widespread English infighting is regrettable, transcending it entirely is not a feasible solution either.

This blindness forms an integral part of Shakespeare's commentary on England's political and economic history due to Talbot's – and by association the feudal past's – inability to see the writing on the wall, as it were. Talbot's system of belief is rooted in an economic model predicated on close interpersonal relationships originating from traditional agrarian modes of organization. Keith Wrightson writes that England's countryside manorial arrangements depended on

> a need for the co-operative organisation of husbandry. They entailed a good deal of collective activity – ploughing, sowing, harvesting, haymaking, the folding of sheep on the stubble after harvest, and the supervision of herds on the common – and all this required decision-making about timing and good tenant practice. In England and in manorialised Wales this usually involved decisions of the manor courts which all tenants were obliged to attend. (76)

He further suggests the possibility that this way of life was, at the end of the sixteenth century, fast being superseded by a far different cultural perspective on how to conduct business:

> Whether the period was indeed witnessing a novel outpouring of ruthless economic individualism is hardly a matter that can be determined with certainty. Self-interested economic behaviour was scarcely an innovation of the sixteenth century, and its less scrupulous manifestations had been the object of moralistic condemnation since time immemorial. The commonwealthsmen were certainly mistaken when they imagined an earlier age of harmony and social responsibility unblemished by such practices. Yet, despite their rhetorical excess, they were perhaps right to detect a shift of standards in economic life and an erosion of constraints on the manner of its conduct. Neither established economic relationships nor the values informing them were simply swept away by a tidal wave of greed. But there is evidence enough of how the pressures and the opportunities of the times could combine to bring about a rearticulation of both. (150)

The "pressures" Wrightson mentions include changes to credit arrangements and the rise of urban markets as the primary driving force behind a national-scale economy that unified many of the smaller domestic economies that had previously dominated England's trade networks and drew power away from the aforementioned collaborative efforts. Furthermore, Craig Muldrew's research paints a picture of an England that, by the late-sixteenth century, had become almost entirely dependent on credit relations to function economically as well as socially: premised on complex interpersonal networks built on trust and social standing to gauge credit-worthiness, credit not only formed the currency of daily life but also "could be extended for often very long periods as a means of forming social bonds to secure repeated custom" (124). Muldrew uses "trust" as the key element in these networks, first as a measure of financial responsibility and, second, to connote the social nature of these exchanges. This connection formed an active and recognized part of the developing economy, leading "early modern texts frequently [to comment] on what they perceived as the pervasive infiltration of the rules of economic exchange into the realm of social relations" (Netzloff 23), often attributing also a moral inflection to these interpersonal assessments. Credit was the monetization of communal bonds, but also a means by which they could be solidified in representation and extended into social links.[43]

Reliable means of exchange were further threatened by the emergence of widespread counterfeiting and a dearth of currency. Much critical work has already been done on the troubles surrounding coinage, coin clipping, and their representation in literature.[44] While this line of research has proven to be a fruitful one, comparatively little work has been done on a concurrent issue, the chronic shortage of actual specie in parts of the country and the consequent rise in credit dependence that this lack produced in England's growing national economy. As Wrightson discusses in his historical survey, the policies of debasement and practices such as coin clipping in the mid-to-late-sixteenth century stemmed from "The Third Great Bullion Famine" in the fifteenth century and the nation's dependence on commodity money, under which "the ideal of Tudor and Stuart currency was a correspondence between face value and intrinsic value" (Cohen 76). In an economic system dependent on a currency made from and tied to a particular material value, here gold and silver, the finite supply of money within the system as a whole limits the potential growth of its economy, further constrained by its reliance on a steady influx of raw materials with which to materialize its increase. Without these raw materials, the economy is effectively incapable of growth, and, as urban centres increasingly became the primary sites of economic exchange in England, "pooling" of specie may occur in certain parts of the country, or currency may be exported from certain regions without similar rates of import, so that the lack of wealth of these regions decreases their ability to conduct business.

This situation was more or less the one England faced during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries as a result of several different factors: a shortage of raw materials for coinage in the first half of the fifteenth century, due to its steady outflow to foreign markets in exchange for commodities; the slow but pernicious disappearance of gold coins as the purest ones were melted down or hoarded; and the collapse of "the [silver] mines of Serbia and Bosnia [in the 1450s], which had provided the mainstay of European supplies for three-quarters of a century" (Blanchard 1071). Consequently, English supplies of coin within the country were at dangerously low levels. It was not until the import of raw gold and silver from the Americas that this problem was largely rectified, but this development was also accompanied by its own problems such as inflation. The quantity of precious metals proved to be an issue: such large inflows devalued existing supplies in the English economy, and, although never quite reaching the levels experienced by Spain, inflation occurred and thus placed constraints not only on the national economy but also on everyday life. The creation of trade routes to India and China, fuelled by European consumerist desires for goods such as spices, cloths, and porcelains, contributed to a steady outflow of coins to the East without significant reciprocal purchases to counterbalance this decline.[45]

The shortage of metals, although briefly alleviated by the opening of silver mines in Langley in 1451,[46] was only fully overcome by two developments. The first was material, consisting of "the influx of precious metals which had the most direct and obvious effects on monetary developments in Europe, first in Spain and Portugal, but subsequently spreading in turn through Italy, France, the Low Countries and the rest of Europe, including Britain, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries" (Davies 176). Furnished with raw materials and victorious at the end of the Wars of the Roses, Henry VII made his first order of business re-establishing unified control over the fractured country and rebuilding the people's trust in and usage of government coins: "to Henry sound money was essential to sound government, and 'no previous English King had ever realised so fully that money was power'" (Davies 190). This understanding found its most complete expression under Elizabeth I, under whom "economic and spiritual strength had become twin pillars of the Tudor nation state" and "reformed not just religion but the coinage – an achievement which, according to admirers, indebted the English people to her for all time" (Gaskill 125).

Henry VII's reforms, as well as Henry VIII's undoing of his predecessor's work, can roughly be classed as the end of English bullionism; it is easy to see, given the focus on and necessity of precious metals to the system, why mercantilist writers were so concerned with their movements. If Henry VII was the first to understand truly power's relationship to money, Henry VIII's disastrous mismanagement of national funds proved power's dependence on it as well. His well-known ostentatious lifestyle, immense forced loans drawn from the public and the government to pay for foreign wars, and private expenses were a notorious chapter in English history; compounding these relatively recent events during Shakespeare's time was further royal enmeshment with joint-stock companies, as the Crown purchased shares in ventures it itself had approved through Royal Charters. The mercantilist motto "the balance of trade" largely stemmed from an examination of a history that had been plagued by the country's inability to keep its wealth within its borders and distributed optimally, and also promoted macroeconomic control of the nation's wealth through its political organization. Debasement, coin clipping, and currency outflow are all issues tied to this central bullionist perspective.

Equally important to consider as the overall historical narrative, however, is how the English coped *during* this period by developing an unprecedented reliance on credit and social networks. Muldrew summarizes the problem:

> The amount of actual gold and silver currency in circulation was small, and the inflation of the period 1500-1640 meant that its value shrank over time, even though more gold and silver were continually coming into the country. As a result, full and direct payment in cash was usually impossible except in certain cases. [...] What this system meant in practice was that the supply of actual money [...] was always much smaller than the demand for it in exchanges so that its value was maintained. (98-9)

Without sufficient coins to conduct everyday business, alternative systems by which to measure exchange were sought; consequently, complex system of credit, interpersonal debt and obligations, and barter-based trade value supplemented or occasionally entirely supplanted direct money exchange. Under these systems, the lack of formal and abstracted currency thus depended on the communally defined trustworthiness of an individual to make good on promises and return an equivalent value in a different form, whether it be eventual repayment denoted by credit arrangements or a material exchange using values established by local community and between the involved parties. To return to Muldrew's earlier point on trust: the centrality of social relationships in the late medieval English economy – the timeframe for the *Henry VI* plays – is manifested as a direct effect on financial transactions and the economy as a whole and is also contingent on a number of cultural, social, and political factors.

Morality also factored heavily into the ideal economic agent. Greed and its associations with selfish behaviours in business were familiar topics for the early modern audience: greed's role as one of the deadly sins made it a popular topic for both sermons and the stage, and personifications of the sin surfaced in morality plays such as *The Castle of Perseverance*'s Sir Greediness. Interest in the topic was particularly strong during Shakespeare's life due to the general emergence of new trade practices and public debates on usury: moneylenders were an increasingly visible fixture of England's financial scene, leading Thomas Lodge in 1584 to denounce "ungracious pettie Brokers," by whom "the prisons are replenished with young Gentlemen" (2). Similar sentiments are expressed in the anonymous 1625 *Usurie araigned and condemned. Or a discoverie of the infinite injuries this kingdome endureth by the unlawfull trade of usurie* and Roger Fenton's 1612 *A Treatise of Usurie*, in which he demonized the usurer's ability to "so cunningly twist good and evil together, that the appearance of usurie shall be presented without shew of unjustice" (3). For some segments of population, greedy behaviour was, however reprehensible, entirely expected. With such behaviour already current (or so believed to be) in the population, then, the depiction of Talbot's betrayal by York and Somerset, especially given the fiercely calculated nature of their exchange, is received and understood not only for its political angle but also for its allegory of a transactional game and a distrust increasingly prevalent in financial life. In bringing "sixteenth century commerce into play with fifteenth-century history" (Levine 405), the plays render particularly stark the immorality of such behaviours by placing them in characters and classes that should be above such pettiness.

Somerset's and York's responses to Lucy's pleas for help are carefully constructed, on both sides of the exchange, to demonstrate the different cultures informing each. Prior to his last battle, Talbot besieges Bordeaux but is quickly surrounded by French forces. Lucy attempts to summon York's forces to aid Talbot, but is denied reinforcements when York states that he will not send his men into battle while Somerset holds his troops back. Lucy proceeds to Somerset with another request for help, but Somerset rejects Lucy's accusation that he, rather than York, is responsible for the lack of support. Somerset, although he eventually dispatches his horsemen, is engaged in a power struggle with York, and both men attempt to deny responsibility while holding their respective armies back in order to retain strength against each other. While Lucy appeals to values couched in "England's honour" (4.3.23) and "fame" (4.3.46), thereby invoking "the aristocratic ideals of chivalric warfare and noble lineage" (Rackin 263), Somerset and York's mercenary replies use a far more calculating vocabulary. The principal point of dispute is the dispatch "of horsemen that were levied for this siege" (4.3.11); the twin connotations of "levied," its financial meaning related to debt, leverage, and obligation and its military reference to conscription, are impossible to miss. The usage of the term by both York and Lucy further illustrates the rift between them: to York they are a "promised supply" (4.3.10) to be used as part of his political game against

Somerset, directed primarily by expediency. Lucy's call for the "levied horse / Collected for this expedition" (4.4.31-2), with the emphasis falling squarely on "this expedition," highlights his expectation that they be used as part of the military campaign. "Levied" thus becomes a source of linguistic ambiguity that York exploits to justify his withholding: these soldiers and the leverage they provide against Somerset are owed to him and to be collected as his debt, whereas Lucy perceives their obligation to fall under a general English purpose.

The shift from a collaborative resource management and allocation and its replacement by self-interested parties and companies was a gradual trend extending back from the end of the medieval era and continuing well into and past Shakespeare's own time. This development was a significant change from extant models in which lords, while still engaged in competition with one another, were believed to adhere to higher moral principles and dependent on favourable ties. Although competition between feudal lords had long been a characteristic of the English economy, as well as Europe's as a whole, the elites were still based in a system dependent on mutual cooperation, "grounded ultimately in its control of resources, with land and agrarian labor being the preeminent sources of wealth" (Lachmann 173) and limited to smaller, inter-county markets: economic tools for the feudal and city-state models of political organization consisted primarily of tools such "a variety of public storage systems, price controls and subsidies to the price of bread, [which were] a form of welfare support that aimed to keep prices stable" (Epstein 157). The transition to international trade – following the crowning of major urban centres as the primary sites of trade and business to an unprecedented degree – and the subsequent rise of royally supported companies thus proved to be a marked shift from previous arrangements.

York and Somerset's self-promoting behaviours function to illustrate the newfound scope economic power entailed in the late-medieval and early modern periods and the co-opting of traditional trust-based credit arrangements by predatory creditors: although their competitive attitudes are still loosely informed by the same mentalities and power plays that feudal lords were engaged in for centuries, the centralization of power into a few specific regions, the growing awareness of how closely political and economic lives were intertwined, and the comparatively large stakes now under dispute as a consequence of these various factors meant that interfactional bickering was no longer a county- or region-level issue: the competition among various political powers and growing private companies now had the clout to jeopardize all levels of English governance and industry. Talbot serves both as a representation of England's lost nobility and also as a warning of its present state: as a parallel to both past and present time, Talbot's example calls for the English to be wary of such heavy dependencies in the midst of unprecedented consolidation of power and money into private hands. The dearth of resources that both contextualize and precipitate his death renders particularly acute the need for such defensive measures; factionalism and self-interested behaviours grow and become even larger threats to the general good of the public as resources dwindle and are consolidated into the hands of those private individuals who claim ostensibly to have the nation's best interests in mind.

## 3.3: Henry, Joan, and the Problem of Knowing

The play's closing scene and its depiction of Henry further drive home the need for all levels of English society, including its government, to remain vigilant in defending its money in the face of the "dangerous threat to moral order" presented by "credit's ability to traverse social boundaries" (Levine 408) – including its formalization of even the king's dependence on money. In the play's last scene, Henry, taken with Suffolk's stories of Margaret, hastily commits his political support and financial resources in order to secure her hand in marriage. In doing so, he neglects his existing promise to marry the Earl of Armagnac's daughter. Henry is guilty of numerous infractions and offenses here: he breaks an existing contract with the Earl, a poor choice both politically and financially; he quickly hands off a significant amount of money, "a tenth" (5.5.93) drawn impulsively from the people, to Suffolk to arrange Margaret's voyage; and he commits a Talbot-esque mistake in trusting advisors in whom he is unable to see politicking and deceit, too concerned with his own emotions and the "sudden execution of his will" (5.5.99). Henry, in one short scene, commits all of the errors committed by numerous other characters over the course of the play – he fails to honour existing arrangements (thereby ruining his own credit), is in turn careless with his trust, and oversubscribes his scant resources in the pursuit of ideals with little hope of a positive return.

The second failure – misplacement of trust – proves to be an increasingly problematic one due to its political implications and its connection to the validity of credit. Henry, while theoretically occupying a privileged position of power as creditor and Suffolk as debtor, miscalculates Suffolk's motives. While such an inappropriate allocation is historically accurate in terms of the political histories informing

Shakespeare's depiction of Henry as weak-willed and a poor judge of character, it also underscores the growing difficulty facing credit arrangements; traditional parameters used to designated a person's trustworthiness, as judged by "not only [...] lenders but brokers, friends, associates, kin, and courts" (Leinwand 43), were becoming increasingly insufficient and unreliable. Here, then, we have a return to the same problems that plagued Talbot; nominal values such as class and social ties used to assess credit accounts, criteria that had long been, if not wholly accurate, then at least operational, were incapable of serving their intended purposes and yet remained incredibly important in establishing credit-worthiness in the absence of alternative tools and the country's growing reliance on credit for both large-scale investments and everyday commerce.

Aaron Kitch notes that "legal cases of default for debt also increased sharply between 1590 and 1630, transforming the 'natural' sociability of Aristotelian economics into what Kant would call the 'unsocial sociability' of self-preservation in a market" (130). Dependence on credit for almost all functions meant that all English were, to some degree, engaged in credit relations, and yet growing geographical mobility (and its consequent disconnection of social ties), a shortage of coin, and perceived changes in social values fostered a general and mutual distrust between creditors and debtors. Hand in hand with this shift came growing legal actions against defaults and debt restructuring. Brooks and Lobban note that early modern courts were growing increasingly involved in such cases: for early modern lawyers and courts, "the reality was that the vast majority of [legal] actions concerned some form of the debtor-creditor relationship" (87), and cases involving debt-related incarcerations were becoming more prominent both as a legal issue and as a social problem.

The trustworthiness that Henry wrongly attributes to Suffolk thus serves as a testimony to the flaws of both medieval and early modern credit systems. As a character, Suffolk is possessed of the traits that were ostensibly the marks of reliability and safe credit trust: he is well-connected and well-known and of a distinguished social rank, and he fulfills, at least for Henry, the conditions of his debt by bringing Margaret from France. The inability of these traditional characteristics to account for intent – Suffolk's political ambitions – and a creditor's dependence on knowing the individual thoroughly to assess trust, since it is implied that Henry is unaware of what exactly transpired at Rouen, disrupt established social conventions regarding morality and its association with class. Levine notes a similar criticism in *2 Henry IV*: the "betrayals and bad faith" in that play "warn of the dangers, especially when credit is extended solely on the basis of a gentleman's, or a prince's, word" (Levine 420). By usurping this associative tradition, the play circumvents lines of political duty and recasts them and consequently all parties involved, regardless of social rank, within a system of financial obligation that replaces any other form of allegiance or trust while also speaking to the insufficiency of medieval systems to capture properly the necessary checks in the early modern world.

Henry mistakenly assumes that his royalty affords him power and a position outside of the political and economic systems that circulate among all of the other characters. As Levine argues in her article on the *Henry IV* plays, part of what makes Hal such a successful political figure is his awareness of how networks of debt and obligation figure into his public life and his adeptness in negotiating their various demands and properties:

> Hal’s use of contract is also crucial to ensuring a stable succession: it allows him to renegotiate his responsibilities as Henry IV’s inheritor, to pay his father’s moral debts without accepting them as his own and, at the same time, to translate passive inheritance into active consent – “to be himself” in majesty. (417)

Henry VI’s disengagement from court politics costs him dearly, as it did Talbot – the play is clear that no one, regardless of whatever he may believe, exists outside of the influence of obligation; refusing to play the game does not absolve a character of his or her place in it. His weak pleas for peace in 3.1 are all predicated on appeals to ideals such as “commonwealth” (3.1.77) and “allegiance to ourself” (3.1.91). Even when confronted with outright fighting, he calls for combatants only “to join your hearts in love and amity” (3.1.72), and his entire faith in his advisors rests on the naive belief that “friendly counsel cuts off many foes” (3.1.194). These poor decisions illustrate Henry’s obliviousness to the changing reality of his circumstances: his court, like early modern London, is an increasingly hostile and cutthroat environment characterized by hidden motives, greedy behaviours, and confrontational and exploitative relationships among its members.

Joan is the other character who most prominently tries to operate outside of established lines of economic power. Joan’s character emulates all of the negative consequences of defective economic systems: she is guilty of establishing illegitimate credit through false claims, consequently threatening the tacit system of social agreement underlying the play’s economy, and also performs as a physical embodiment of forgery – specifically, counterfeit currency. Her multiple attempts at obscuring her identity "[comprise] the nightmare vision of unknowability that was the most recognizable epistemological symptom of the new market's effect on the English imaginary" (Rich 207). Her defences at her trial are all configured as attempts to redefine lines of influence to her favour, whether they be her lineage or biological productivity, while the Englishmen's response is to impose upon her the strength of communal identity and ascribe to her a particular value that fails to meet any of the criteria by which credit is established.

Such a battle over the right to assign value invokes a return to a theme Jennifer Rich notes in Joan's introduction. The very mutability that Joan uses to rise to power proves to be her downfall at play's end:

> Like the narrative governing currency and the speculative market, Joan's narrative demands a discounting of the physical form as inherently unreliable and insists on an apprehension of her as inherently divorced from the physical – in other words, as sublime ("Whereas I was black and swart before / With those clear rays which she infus'd on me / That beauty I am blest with which you may see"). (Rich 214)

Whatever social credit Joan enjoyed amongst the French is invalid within the English court: while Joan claims to be "issued from the progeny of kings" (5.4.39), the English produce a lowly shepherd who states that Joan is not only his daughter but also "the first fruit of my bach'lorship" (5.4.13), thereby invalidating any potential value bestowed by social rank as well as whatever limited rights parentage confers by marking her as an illegitimate child. The instability of currency and its connection to a speculative value are thus examined within the context of human social status and the power it wields. As a "counterfeit" person, Joan's power depends entirely on its perceived rather than actual value: she freely admits to the French lords that she is "by birth a shepherd's daughter" (1.2.72), but the multiple interpretations of this lineage (as a sign of pastoral purity and divinity by the French, and as a mark of lowborn baseness by the English) reveal the fragility of this position.

York's parting curse to Joan – "Break thou in pieces" (5.4.93) – is a particularly apt one when reading Joan as a representation of counterfeit currency. York's curse comes as Joan, found guilty, is being led off stage after much of the scene has already been spent by the English doing exactly that on an allegorical level. By reducing Joan's character to its constituent parts – lineage, religion, and female biology – the gathered English enact a ritualistic process in which the false components contained in the counterfeit currency are identified and exposed for display, thus removing any power they may have wielded. Joan's vacillating claims between purity and various pregnancies recall the constant battle government mints and courts fought against counterfeiters and clippers over the content of minted coins and also concerns over foreign coins devaluing native English ones:

> [...] not only did the presence of foreign coins within England, often having names like those of their English counterparts, complicate financial transactions, but other threats to the system, such as counterfeiting and melting coins into place or vice versa, were perceived as typically committed by foreigners in England or performed abroad [...]. (Cohen 76)

As Gaskill notes, part of the challenge faced by English authorities was the usurpation of government control over money by counterfeiters and clippers who failed to respect the differentiation between official and homemade coins: such practices were

> seen [by the general public] as a 'social crime' akin to poaching, wrecking, smuggling, and rioting – activities which, although technically illegal, were sanctioned by popular notions of legality. [...] This was not a 'real' crime in the eyes of the people. [...] All this was extremely frustrating for the authorities. In the 1690s one London man who made counterfeits (but drew the line at burglary), apparently needed convincing that 'any way of getting money contrary to Law was altogether as bad as Robbery,' and that the only difference was that 'the Law was not so hard in some cases as others.' (132-3)

The ideological battle between the English and the French, coalescing in Joan's body, thus also incorporates struggles over the right to produce currency and create industrial power. Nugent notes a similar theme at work in *Measure for Measure*: there is a recurrent "metaphor of children born out of wedlock as illegitimate, counterfeit coins" and of their mothers as "the illegal mold [...] in which counterfeit currency is 'coin[ed]' with a forbidden stamp" (210). Additionally, currency is a direct representation of the government that distributes it, and Joan's challenge to that right recalls monetary policies under Elizabeth. Elizabeth's coinage emphasized the usage of her image on all coins under strict stipulations; emblazoning her image on all coins was "a very subtle form of propaganda" through which "Elizabeth the Queen slowly was transformed into Gloriana, the national icon" (Potter 70, 73). Joan's body presents a similar threat to English sovereignty here; not only does her pregnancy pose a possibility of political disruption by her listing as fathers of her child various French lords, who are the enemies the English have confronted over the course of the play, but she also manifests the dangers of illegitimate creation and the challenge it raises towards monarchical power and the right to production.

Joan must be found guilty of counterfeiting and proven to be a false value in order for the play to reinstate the power of inherent and absolute worth, lest any ambiguity in Joan's final scenes suggest that *all* systems of currency are established by subjective and speculative valuations. To allow such a troublesome idea this opportunity would be to disseminate Joan's challenge to all levels of social power. For now, the play deploys an ultimately conservative strategy in order to end the narrative with a reaffirmation of not only English supremacy but an economic doctrine that hinges entirely on a basic, fundamental principle that "money had an intrinsic value, equal to the weight of the gold or silver contained in it" (Backhouse 116). Joan's self-assertion raises the nagging question, taken up as the primary theme in the subsequent *Henry VI* plays, of political power's instability and the ultimately tenuous notion of self-apparent and natural legitimacy.

## 3.4: Legitimizing Power in *2* and *3 Henry VI*

According to arguments first put forward by E.K. Chambers in 1923, the *Henry VI* plays were written out of sequential order, with *Part 2* and *Part 3* being written before *Part 1*; nevertheless, Shakespeare appears to work many of the same themes across the plays' chronological progression in his effort to chronicle the history of the period. In doing so, he makes visible many of the themes present in *1 Henry VI*, although in sometimes more muted forms, in *Part 2* and *Part 3*. Effectively, *Part 1* serves as a space in which Shakespeare could foreground and provide a foundation for much of the economic history already written into the later *Henry VI* plays, thus elaborating these plays' themes of money, exchange, and ideological changes through more developed presences in the "prequel" play. *1 Henry VI* draws attention to the presence of these themes in the subsequent plays by placing such an emphasis on the social, political, and monetary exchanges in its narrative.

This note on composition order is of relevance in analyzing themes that span several of the tetralogy plays. The ideological alignment of money to a particular social capital is a recurrent theme throughout the *Henry VI* plays. In elevating the themes present but less fully explored in *Parts 2* and *3* to a level of importance equal to the political history driving the plays' action, the plays cast attention on a narrative that serves to explain not just "what" transpired doing the Wars of the Roses but also "why," with particular emphasis on the shifts in England's fiscal policies and economic conditions during the period and the effects these developments had on political stability. Analysis of this narrative construction yields a number of insights into how *1 Henry VI* acts as a retroactive introduction to the Tudor understanding of economic history depicted in *2* and *3 Henry VI* and an overarching theme of transaction that permeates all four plays in the tetralogy.[47]

Within the plays' complex systems of human exchange, demonstrated perhaps most transparently in *3 Henry VI*'s parliament scene, in which Henry fails to navigate successfully the various costs and values of the lords' political support, Shakespeare presents his audience with a catalogue of numerous attempts at negotiating power within a free-flowing market-based political economy. Henry's gradual downfall over the course of the plays is a serious blow to the concept of innate value and inherent legitimacy: having lost its once-unquestionable privilege, political power is configured as an empty symbol lacking any substantial definition and subject to ideological pressures. The various characters and parties of the tetralogy manifest different attempts to capitalize on its ambiguity and to redefine the parameters of power in their favour. Margaret recognizes power in its material manifestations, while Suffolk appeals to traditional notions of inherent nobility. Henry fails to hold the throne due to his single-minded pleas of religious and royal idealism, and Richard, as demonstrated in *Richard III*, understands power as only a matter of political expediency and strength.

In terms of the overall narrative, many of the plot elements fleshed out in *Part 1* retroactively find their origins in *Part 2*. In the latter play's opening scenes, mentions are made of England's dire economic crises and their connections to the political instability threatening the country. Petitioners and various lords argue and bicker over the poor state of England's economy and their numerous troubles. Due to the extensive time required for the political and military battles that make up the latter portions of the play, 1.3 quickly sketches out the economic climate of the play's setting: a petitioner seeks compensation "[a]gainst the Duke of Suffolk for enclosing the commons of Melford" (1.3.22); Somerset accuses Gloucester of misappropriation of funds that "have cost a mass of public treasury" (1.3.134); the various political parties have overdrawn all of their resources, leaving even "the clergy's bags / [...] lank and lean with [...] extortions" (1.3.131-2); and former English military victories have been surrendered through "the sale of offices and towns in France" (1.3.138). In speaking of the throne, the second petitioner confuses "usurer" and "usurper" (1.3.32, 35); this pun and its resulting conceptual entanglement of extorted money and illegitimate power reinforce the conjoined nature of corrupt politics and fiscal irresponsibility. In one short scene, Shakespeare lays out the financial troubles and corruption affecting the common people, all levels of the government, and England's religious institutions.

Some of these themes are "old," in the sense that they are taken up in *Part 1*'s groundwork, while some are left to stand self-evidently. For example, enclosure debates, a well-known and contentious issue during Shakespeare's time, are mentioned here but do not appear in the preceding play, although they function to flesh out the general malaise afflicting the English economy since the issue was "the flashpoint of mid-Tudor Crises, sparked in part by [a later] Somerset's decrees ordering the restoration of enclosed commons, which earned him the wrath of Northumberland and the disapproval of Holinshed" (Holstun 200). Some of the other themes do appear in *Part 1*; commentaries on the sale of captured French territories back into French hands and the treasury's depletion are key elements to *1 Henry VI*'s themes of insufficiency and general political unrest.

In addition to mentioning the elements foundational to *1 Henry VI*, 1.3 also serves as the introductory scene for a theme central to *Part 2* as a whole: the assessment of an individual's worth, in both financial and moral senses. Queen Margaret, in complaining about the state of the royal court to Suffolk, states that

> Not all these lords do vex me half so much
> As that proud dame, the Lord Protector's wife.

She sweeps it through the court with troops of ladies
More like an empress than Duke Humphrey's wife.
Strangers in court do take her for the queen.
She bears a duke's revenues on her back,
And in her heart she scorns our poverty.
Shall I not live to be avenged on her?
Contemptuous base-born callet as she is,
She vaunted 'mongst her minions t'other day
The very train of her worst-wearing gown
Was better worth than all my father's lands,
Till Suffolk gave two dukedoms for his daughter. (1.3.78-90)

In making this criticism, Margaret raises an issue that will prove central to the play's later scenes, namely that of how a person's status can be expressed and from where it derives its merits. Margaret's primary objection is, in her opinion, the Duchess' conflict between her "base-born" lineage and her visible richness, which is "like [that of] an empress," while Margaret, tied to Henry, endures a "poverty" in comparison. Consequently, the Duchess is more possessed of the traditional markers of royal power: entourage, material wealth, and a proud demeanour.

Although it is certainly possible to read Margaret's outburst as an instance of the political jealousy and ambition that defines her character, or merely a transgression of culturally established notions of appropriate dress,[48] her claim that "strangers in court do take [the Duchess] for the queen" hints at the instability of class-and-wealth based definitions of power and prestige in moments of political upheaval. Furthermore, Margaret's material obsession foreshadows the root cause of her eventual downfall in *Part 3*: her reduction of ideologies of royal power to their visible trappings leaves her vulnerable to their removal, thereby tacitly threatening the preeminent sources of validity to her claims to power. Ironically, she herself plays out the weakness of this approach in *3 Henry VI*'s 1.4, where she mocks York before his death with a paper crown, placing it and then removing it from his head as a sign of his failed bid for the throne:

> A crown for York, and, lords, bow low to him.
> Hold you his hands whilst I do set it on.
> *She puts a paper crown on York's head.*
> Ay, marry, sir, now looks he like a king,
> Ay, this is he that took King Henry's chair,
> And this is he was his adopted heir. (1.4.95-9)

Margaret's criticism of the Duchess also offers a subtle commentary on consumer culture. While the main function of this passage is to characterize Margaret's views on prestige, politics, and royalty, particularly when placed in contrast with Henry's saintly, ascetic demeanour, the premise of her complaint indicates some degree of awareness on the play's part of the social disruption inherent to material accumulation and the politicization of fashion. The proliferation and associated accessibility of urban markets, the formation of the rudimentary elements of a consumer culture, and newfound wealth in "lesser" social circles entailed the dispersal of cultural capital from its previously enshrined emplacement within a select group. As Robert Bucholz and Newton Key note,

> luxury imports and re-exports to Europe were coming to replace wool exports as the motor of English trade [by 1603]. These new trades led to the beginnings of a thriving consumer culture and the revival of ports other than London, such as Bristol, Exeter, Hull, Newcastle, or Southampton. (202)

This "thriving consumer culture" not only served as an economic boom to England's domestic and international economies but also brought about a certain degree of social anxiety through its ability to "[offer] ways of asserting identity" (Tancke 114). Compounding such anxieties were the conjoined natures of identity and status as manifested through material goods: to possess a good was to inherit its cultural weight and to re-inscribe it within one's own person through "the power of things not only to communicate status but to *confer* status on their owners" (Friedman 232). This theory is supported by early modern accounts, such as

> an anecdote [...] of a traveller who established his personal identity as well as his social status by referring to his possession of a Holland shirt, a "neat" night cap, silver buttons and buckles, and a wife who drank tea twice a day. No one listening could have failed to appreciate the significance of possessing these items, even though there is no hint of monetary values. Even the tea-drinking wife is seen as a status possession, but hardly one that could be bought or sold. (Cox and Dannehl 163)

Margaret's criticism is thus supported by some degree of real threat: the Duchess, in wearing "a duke's revenues on her back," poses a legitimate challenge towards the established pecking order, touching as well on the play's larger themes of social upheaval and the insufficiency of established hierarchies.

The orientation of power according to male lineage and relationship is likewise an assertion of financial power. Note the repeated alignment of economic clout with male figures in the cited passage: the Duchess is “the lord protector’s wife” and “Duke Humphrey’s wife”; Margaret’s wealth – or lack of it – is defined as that of “all my father’s lands / Till Suffolk gave two dukedoms for his daughter”; and her criticism is directed as much towards Henry as it is towards the Duchess. The constant expression of female dependence on male wealth – rendered particularly acute due to Margaret’s status as a foreigner and her political aspirations – belies an anxiety stemming from “the threat to identity posed by the vagaries of the marketplace [which] positions women in a double unstable fashion, because it jeopardised both the material conditions and the immaterial underpinnings of their identities” (Tancke 114). Instead of mere pride or jealous pettiness, Margaret’s motivations stem from actual necessity: the fragility of her political position requires her to prop up her status with all conceivable tools, including fashion.

Margaret’s outburst addresses the difficulty of assessing a person’s worth without an outward expression of financial power, and this theme reappears later in the play during Suffolk’s last scene. In 4.1, Suffolk barters for his life alongside two other gentlemen held for ransom by Whitmore and his crew: while the two men plead for their lives at the price of “a thousand crowns” (4.1.16) set by Whitmore’s master, Suffolk first offers Whitmore that he “rate [Suffolk] at what [Whitmore] wilt” under guarantee as “a gentleman” (4.1.30-1) and then “a prince” (4.1.45). Upon revealing his identity, Suffolk is initially met by disbelief (“The Duke of Suffolk muffled up in rags?” [4.1.47]), thereby reiterating the difficulty of ascertaining status without material signs, and is reduced to raving protests about his status compared to his “obscure and lousy” (4.1.51) captors.

Whether or not Whitmore and the Captain truly believe Suffolk's claims regarding his identity is largely irrelevant; if they do believe him, then their belief serves only to make the execution a more troubling scene than it already is. As a way of playing into themes of identity crises and social upheaval, the Captain subjects Suffolk to an impromptu and summary trial before ordering his beheading. Suffolk is killed both as a prisoner and as a traitor who "[smiled] at good Duke Humphrey's death" (4.1.76). The Captain justifies Suffolk's execution with further accusations of culpability for the sale of English-held French territories and "for swallowing the treasure of the realm" (4.1.74). Far from a *carnivale*-esque role reversal, the Captain's self-appointed moral and legal authority over Suffolk is further supplemented by the play's tacit agreement (and presumably the audience's) with his sentence: "in Suffolk's death scene, Shakespeare [...] brings out popular resentment of Suffolk's malign political influence, as 'the most swallower up and consumer of the kynges treasure' and enemy of 'all good and verteous counsailors'" (Chernaik 34). Such a judgement tacitly undoes the pretence of nobility's inherent right, to the extent that murderous pirates command far more moral respect than Suffolk.

For Shakespeare's audience, the historical memory of disastrous fiscal policies under Mary I, including heavy taxation (which continued under Elizabeth I), failed currency reforms, and poor regulation of import/export duties and tariffs, made understanding Henry's poor choices easy to relate to their own recent history. *1 Henry VI* as a whole performs as an allegory for late medieval economics and its dissolution under the rise of urban merchants and creditors and the birth of large-scale companies; while Shakespeare underscores the values lost in the transition through the character of Talbot,

Talbot's shortcomings hint also at the insufficiency of such models in the development of England as an international power fuelled by new economic models of trade and fiscal policy. What replaces this failed system, however, is far from ideal: Suffolk's self-interested plays for power and the casual waste of the people's money hint at a grim future – a fitting end to a play enacting the collapse of the feudal way of life – and what emerges as its replacement, as depicted in *Part 2* and *3*, indicate the turbulence produced by the lack of mutually-agreed upon designations for fundamental social and cultural values in an increasingly market-based world.

# CHAPTER FOUR

# EDUCATION THROUGH ENTERTAINMENT: PERSONIFICATIONS OF GREED AND PUBLIC MORALITY IN *EVERYMAN*, *THE CASTLE OF PERSEVERANCE*, AND *THE JEW OF MALTA*

## 4.1: The Personification of Evil

The personification of metaphysical concepts in literature and performance was already an established tradition by the time it arrived on the early modern stage. Informed by a literary heritage that included religious exegeses, Classical texts, and medieval drama, early modern playwrights staged plays featuring new representations of cardinal virtues and sins that were equal parts spectacle, entertainment, and what we might call catharsis. Christopher Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta* represents one instance of a work that operates within this framework: Barabas, as that play's complex reimagining of the allegorical personification of greed, serves to draw out and enflame the audience's emotions and offers his own destruction as a powerful symbol of communal validation. As discussed in my previous chapter, when *1 Henry VI*'s Joan, an emblem of economic values in her own right, is burned at the stake, the ramifications of her execution resound through both the play's onstage audience of assembled English characters and the theatre's patrons as well. The deaths of these characters on the stage serve as manifestations of power that ultimately reinforce the ideological correctness of the values they opposed: Barabas teaches his audience about the perils of greedy Machiavellian behaviour, while Joan's death restores, however fleetingly, sovereign power over currency and authenticity.

The representation of sin, either as an internal quality located within each individual or as an external foe to battle, carries different interpretive weights depending on its characterization in a given work. Medieval morality plays are predominantly of the former dramatic methodology, which features personifications denotative of one of an individual's moral aspects. Cumulatively, these allegorical figures represent the various dimensions of a single human being; this dramatic structure locates sin as an internal quality left to the responsibility of the individual to combat and overcome. The latter approach externalizes sin by emphasizing conflict between representative characters and by pursuing the punishment of external agents. This dramatic format utilizes the possibilities and physicality of stage performance to demonstrate visually the communal response to and culturally inscribed aggression towards individuals who would seek to manifest sinful attitudes and to use these notions to oppose the collective. The deployments of these narrative methods indicate different perspectives on the role of drama in society: one instructs while the other provides a scapegoat.

This chapter is devoted to an examination of the fear arising from early modern economic thought and its intersection with the theatre. As demonstrated throughout my work, the early modern period was a time of great changes to England's economic and political landscape. These changes produced a troubled public that sought answers, comfort, community, and, most importantly, a chance to rid themselves of some of their anxieties. The theatre provided one such opportunity: early modern plays spoke to a disillusioned English public that perceived, whether accurately or not, traditional and familiar social institutions and systems falling apart during this period. This intersection between public and performance forms the basis of my work here: it is a study of money's connection to concepts of morality in early modern English culture through examinations of characterizations and personifications of avarice in relation to the virtual punishment enacted on the stage. The personifications of greed in the period's literature hint at the instabilities of and the debates over money and financial knowledge, and I argue that the growing predominance of economics as social and ideological processes appropriates extant discourses of religious and communal morality in order to produce a new system of meaning, one fully versed in the character and language of a deeply commercial world.

One such change to England involved national economic philosophy. The emergence of mercantilist policies produced an awareness within English society that economic models were fluid and ultimately human systems that could be influenced by numerous factors. As discussed in my previous chapters, the beginnings of colonialism, the failure of the feudal model, changes to labour demographics, and writings by mercantilist writers entailed a reassessment of money's role both in everyday life as well as in larger political systems; consequently, the study of money and a strategic perspective of the economy gradually ceased to be a cunning relegated to moral evil and instead became a source of empowerment and a necessary element of defence against predatory characters. Although these characterizations are, of course, generalized descriptions of the extremes in the range of attitudes present in the era and there were countless middle positions between them, there is nevertheless a fundamental realignment of money's relationship to morality in the early modern period. The usage of this intersection by the period's dramatists is an ideologically motivated decision that reflects differing perspectives on how economic knowledge was to be integrated into the early modern model of proper citizenship.

I will begin by looking at dramatic models that preceded the early modern stage in order to ascertain how preceding models influenced the late-sixteenth century. Medieval morality plays produced a specific framework, influenced by feudal-era thought and religious teachings, which emphasized notions of Christian charity tailored to rural English audiences. *Everyman* and *The Castle of Perseverance* both contain personifications of greed that differ in some key respects that denote different cultural functions performed by such representations than those present in early modern plays. I argue chiefly that the didacticism exhibited in these two medieval plays operates to turn the audience's attention towards themselves and to have them perform individual reflections on their own moral lives. For the medieval audience, the offender was the individual self, which was dramatized through the presentation of audience-surrogate characters and, by virtue of narratives of death and repentance, encouraged a correction of one's own sins.

I then turn to a drama produced in the early modern period, Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta*, to demonstrate how these medieval models were adopted for the early modern sensibility. I explore in this play and throughout the chapter the ritualized punishments enabled by actors' and characters' bodies on the stage. In *Discipline and Punish*, Michel Foucault notes that public torture served to make "men [...] remember public exhibition, the pillory, torture, and pain duly observed" (34); these spectacles of punishment were "a political ritual [...] by which power is manifested" (47). The stage, both medieval and early modern, serves as a space in which greed as a concept could be scrutinized and subsequently punished, thereby enacting justice upon an abstraction and fulfilling a communal desire to see such behaviour penalized. Within the plays, the consequences of sin take many forms: they range from social exclusion and banishment, which effectively mark the end of commerce and communal engagement for that individual; to physical harm or illness, demonstrating the interiority of sin manifested externally; to legal punishment, as the ultimate execution of collective power on a person.

By turning abstract and frequently ambiguous notions of greed within English culture into specific visible characters, early modern drama permitted audiences to witness the execution of moral and legal justice on those that sought to undermine nominal ideas of proper conduct and community within the marketplace as well as the larger social world. These spectacles were further sustained by a culture that retained some elements of the medieval period's imaginative connections between economics and morality. The ideological externalization of discipline was a significant change from the inwardly oriented trials of the medieval morality play; the early modern period presented a significant reworking of the model of education through punishment by removing it from the individual self and displacing it onto external agents. To strengthen the concept of irresistible authority, the nature of controlled narrative creates a necessary "climate of irrefutable certainty" (Foucault 97): the perspectives offered by dramatic fiction into characters and their motivations, facilitated by stage conventions such as asides and soliloquies, erase any uncertainty as to whether or not the enforced punishments are proper and appropriate to the circumstances. I examine *The Jew of Malta* to illustrate how this play displays subtly modified forms of public morality centered on a personification of greed, a potent figure in a time of substantial economic instability and unrest. This character type allows the drama to retain the overall pedagogical bent of its predecessors and to incorporate contemporary realities through a relationship between play and audience based on conflict and opposition.

### 4.2: The Responsibility for Sin in *Everyman* and *The Castle of Perseverance*

The medieval morality play contains many of the fundamental principles that would prove instrumental to the illustration of personifications in later periods. The first issue regarding these plays is a broad one concerning classifications and traits: Robert A. Potter's landmark study divides medieval English drama into two broad categories, the Corpus Christi plays and the morality plays. Although different enough to warrant distinction and differentiation, as the former strives to present narratives "in which all human history could be comprehended" while the latter focuses on "the life of the individual human being" (6), Potter recognizes that both types of plays effectively pursue a common goal of religious education while he formally rejects the tripartite structural distinction among "mystery," "miracle," and "morality" play. As "two manifestations of the same dramatic purpose," Potter indicates that the Corpus Christi plays re-enact Biblical stories while morality plays incorporate "these truths [...] [into] the sequence of every individual life" (8). In doing so, these plays invoke "ritual and ritual drama" in order to convey "information to the largely illiterate rural populace of Christendom" (18), thereby emphasizing the communal function performed by these plays within English society and perhaps reflective of a structural overlap with school plays.

This pedagogical intent translated into a series of largely straightforward renderings of greed according to Christian belief and produced generalized and ultimately non-controversial definitions of greed, even leading James Keller to assert that morality plays survived the Restoration relatively unscathed because they were "not explicitly scriptural" (160).[49] This generality extended into its ideas of audience: William Davenport remarks that "the writers needed to express Christian teaching and the impression of holy sanctity and authority, and for these purposes sought elevated diction and rhetorical patterns" (10). This language often contrasted with the plays' simple themes and characters, which were constructed to address "everyday conduct" (11) and to depict "the life of an ordinary human being making free moral choices" (Russell 246) as well as the associated impetus to make the plays as accessible as possible for a wide and variable audience. The sin of covetousness is configured with little complication and requires no substantial explanation in order to function as a plot device, thereby encouraging a flexible interpretation through its non-specific depiction. Medieval morality plays appear to have drawn heavily from theological models that did not delineate between healthy acquisition and the sin of greed: Richard Newhauser writes that "Avarice, in Ambrose's reflection of the Golden Age mythology, is not a perversion of the desire to increase one's possessions; it is the desire itself" (71).

For example, *Everyman*'s God sends Death on his task to punish humankind because "in worldly riches is all [humanity's] mind" (27), and although God lists further reasons for his anger ("They use the seven deadly sins damnable; / [...] Now in the world be made commendable" [36, 38]), Death seizes upon God's original statement and vows, "he that loveth riches I will strike with my dart" (76). This commitment resurfaces when

Death confronts Everyman, who offers Death a bribe of "a thousand pound" to "defer this matter till another day" (122-3); Death responds that he is "set not by gold, silver, nor riches" (125). When Everyman begs Goods to travel with him after death, the play offers only vague platitudes on the impermanence and insignificance of Goods in God's reckoning. Among other pithy remarks, Goods denies Everyman's hope "[t]hat money maketh all right that is wrong" (413) and states that his "love is contrary to the love everlasting" (430). Everyman and Goods part ways with Everyman's declaration that Goods is a "traitor to God, that hast deceived [him]" (452), thus dramatizing clearly Goods's true nature and Everyman's rejection of it.

While critics have interpreted these generalizations as simplifications for the benefit of a largely uneducated populace, the loosely defined examples of evil and sin in morality plays also ensure their inoffensiveness. As Lawrence M. Clopper points out, play production was carried out by a number of different bodies, including "the trade guilds, civic and town governments, and in a few cases, religious guilds" (269); he also identifies this widespread dissemination of plays and the production of "vernacular religious and moral drama" as the reason "that it took the state and the church so long to make the move to suppress them" (269). However, a further consequence of the decentralized production of performances was the latent need for plays to be usable under diverse circumstances: given the numerous situations in which these plays were performed as well as the variability of audiences and performers, medieval plays were by necessity ambiguous enough in terms of content to be appropriate for a variety of settings. This adaptability was both dependent upon and manifested in logistics – modularity to the props, staging, and the number of actors required – and also themes: the non-specificity of sin in morality plays produces an elasticity of interpretation that directs the work's pedagogical imperatives simultaneously at everyone and no one in the audience.

Given the extremely polarized political and economic climates in medieval England between landowners and tenants and the vast power the former wielded over the latter, this degree of caution can be read as a warranted measure. Clopper's examples of play production groups – trade guilds, local governments, and religious groups – were all subject to the centralised power exercised by feudal landowners, a condition further compounded by the players' needs for the protection offered by "a patron, usually a wealthy lord, secular or spiritual, at whose manor, palace, castle, or abbey they remained on call at major festival seasons" (Wertz 89). Tom Saunders notes that in medieval England the Church functioned in tandem with landowners, and its edifices were powerful symbols of feudal tradition:

> Churches became symbols of feudal power situated, as they usually were, upon prominent ground within enclosures, adjacent to manorial halls. They were the first stone buildings to be erected in early medieval England, and gave a sense of permanence and stability to the new feudal landscape. Their physical presence signified the dominance of lordship, and the integration of economic and ideological legitimization. (224)

If these plays were indeed performed by groups aligned with the dominant political force in medieval England, it is unsurprising that they were not critical of the very institutions that produced them. *Everyman*'s criticism of "he that loveth riches" is so universal and generic that any audience – even powerful landowners – could believe themselves exempt from the play's moral judgments and, if so desired, instead apply such comments to other parties. Dorothy Wertz argues that *Everyman*'s Mankind, unlike earlier renderings of the archetypal figure, "lost his generalized characteristics after about 1530 and became a historical personage or a personification of only one social class" (83).[50] The latitude afforded by the play's lax and vague characterizations seems more indicative of an attempt to appeal to a more widespread and diverse audience. In effect, the morality play contains enough ambiguity and generalizations within its structure to allow for plausible deniability: its moral reminders are apolitical and contain no specific referents in order to render the plays uncontroversial and also to allow for a wide range of interpretations.

Should any of these interpretations turn political, the loosely defined nature of these narratives and their themes also allowed them to be reassigned into any number of different political agendas. By allegorizing malicious economic activity through personified sins and describing such predatory behaviour only in moral terms without specific reference to any particular persons, groups, or practices, these plays, with some qualified exceptions, present greed as a concept operating as a freely determinable condition that can be ascribed by an audience to any group it wants to marginalize. The plays' allegories not only function as a part of their educational goals but can also be an adaptable tool for political criticism: without specific referents, avarice can be interpreted with several meanings simultaneously and validly applied to numerous circumstances. The extreme depictions of greed represented by such personifications remove their criticisms from the more muddled practices employed by economic agents outside of dramatic fantasy and instead locate them as non-specific parables. Morality plays could thus be performed in front of almost any audience and in any number of settings without directing political satire at any particular group and thus avoiding becoming a liability to the performers.

Despite the nebulousness of their criticisms, in both *Everyman* and *The Castle of Perseverance* there is a definite focus on finding fault in the individual. An analysis of the two personifications, Goods and Sir Greediness, in their respective plays reveals significant differences but also a common underlying ideological principle towards guiding the audience to question their own conducts and beliefs. *Everyman*'s Goods invokes the miser figure through his self-description of "[lying] here in corners, trussed and piled so high / And in chest [...] locked so fast" (394-5). The most salient feature of Goods's characterization is his passivity: fitting with his immobile nature, Goods does not commit here any act of evil, nor is his temptation a performed gesture. Instead, the fault lies entirely with Everyman who has placed undeserved importance on Goods and, unlike other figures such as Kindred or Fellowship, Goods forsakes him through his inability to follow Everyman into the next life rather than an active disavowal and abandonment. The moral character of this episode thus frames sin as in large part the fault of the individual rather than external forces. Goods does not misrepresent himself nor does he attempt to instil false beliefs in Everyman. Goods is clear that his power encompasses only "the world" and its "sorrow or adversity" (401), and any notion that he could aid Everyman and his "reckoning help to clean and purify" (411) stems solely from Everyman's misguided understanding of both the nature of Goods and of God's judgment. The play's cautionary morality is thus solely oriented toward miser-like hoarding practices and any notion that riches carry any weight in religious appraisal.

*The Castle of Perseverance* differs in its depiction of greed through the additional pitfall of temptation and lacks the complete commitment to inoffensiveness found in the later play. As one of the Vices, Sir Greediness, also named as Avaricia and Coveytyse at different points in the play, tempts Mankind and lures him from his castle: he "ever covets Mankind's fall" (66)[51] and offers him "wealth enough [he] shall make boast" (681). The battle against Covetousness is also depicted as a lifelong struggle: as Fiona Dunlop notes, *Castle* differs from other plays such as *Nature* or *The Worlde and the Chylde* insofar as Covetousness appears throughout Mankind's lifetime and "at the age of sixty, [Mankind] is enticed from his place of safety, not by his former companions, but by the sin Coveytyse (covetousness). Humanum Genus was also covetous in his youth" (26-7). By distributing greed as a moral pitfall over the entire course of an individual's life, *Castle* suggests that greed possesses some degree of primacy over the other sins, perhaps drawing from a long-standing theological perspective in which avarice was "the beginning, middle, and end of all evils. The egotism lying behind the vice is the cause of wars, robbery, and the strife which divides humans from each other in hatred" (Newhauser 41).

In addition to a few general platitudes such as "Greediness against Generosity fights overlong" (65), which are reminiscent of *Everyman*, the play stages an active criticism of predatory merchants. Greediness offers Mankind his distorted and dishonest wisdom in the form of suggestions on the conduct of business and the accumulation of wealth:

> Thou must give thyself to simony
>
> Extortion and false assize;

Help no man but thou knowest why;
Pay not thy servants their service;
Thy neighbours look that thou destroy;
Tithe not in any wise;
Hear no beggar, thou he cry --
And then thou shalt full soon rise.
And when you handle merchandise,
Look that thou be subtle of sleights,
And also swear all by deceits,
Buy and sell by false weights --
For that is natural greediness. (685-97)

While *Everyman* finds fault with the individual's private assessment of the spiritual value of material wealth, Greediness here calls for the destruction of communal bonds. The play depicts greed's anti-social nature as the active undermining of established conventions through devices such as "false weights" and the withholding of due payments. Notions of charity are similarly dismissed by his edicts to "hear no beggar cry, though he cry" and "thy neighbours look that thou destroy." This characterization of greed and its tacit criticism of such behaviours represent a significant difference from *Everyman*'s focus on the individual soul: greed's consequences for others are highlighted as a malignant influence that, instead of simply hoarding wealth and placing it into seclusion and thereby removing it from a community's economy, takes wealth from others through deception and by "the entailing away of his property from his heirs" (Smith 124). Due to the importance of trust and familial connections in business relations, as discussed in my previous chapter, such actions were not only self-destructive but harmful to the harmonious transaction of business within a community: the absence of this human underpinning threatens commerce as a whole.

Although both are morality plays, *Castle* is of a substantially different character than *Everyman* due to its prescriptive commentary on the conduct of business. *Castle*, while still retaining enough ambiguity in its criticisms to be interpretable as largely allegorical, identifies greed not only as an abstract and extreme principle – miserly hoarding – but also as a series of commercial practices that are symptomatic of the sin. In this reckoning, greed not only damages one's soul but also places undue hardships on others; it is tied directly to the abuse of the interpersonal trust. Establishing this additional connection, between the greedy individual and the transformation of that interior quality into an attack on others, allows the play to qualify the effects of greed and negotiate the ultimate culpability for this moral flaw.

Both of these characters are linked conceptually to the same common underlying cause, but the dramatic and narrative roles enacted by each carry different connotations. In *Everyman*'s case, Goods displays no active influence on him, and the fault lies with Everyman's poor understanding of the nature of the soul. The play demonstrates no real desire or need to demonize Goods beyond the elucidation of his transience: it is Everyman who has committed the error and must take full responsibility for his poor decisions, and one form of punishment is a foregone conclusion since "Death is the agent by which Everyman is forced to examine his soul" (Daniell 67). While the consequences of his sins are represented in the other characters, the sins themselves are not present in any physical role and are understood instead as qualities internal to Everyman.

*Everyman*'s Goods is the result, rather than the cause, of Mankind's faulty judgment: he represents the material culmination of Mankind's greed at the end of his life. In *Castle*, despite Sir Greediness's more active role, responsibility remains with Mankind. Greediness exists as an external quantity that serves to influence the individual who must then materialize the abstract sin in outward expression. This secondary step, in which Mankind must enact Greediness's advice in order to commit harm against others, is a crucial ideological and dramatic element because it emphasizes the act of volition in Mankind's sinfulness. The uncontested adoption of Greediness's suggestions attributes to Mankind a specific responsibility for his selfishness and underscores that his central motivation, greed, is a freely chosen one.

This interiority of willing choice represented externally is necessary to the morality play: all of the characters on the stage must be understood as aspects of a singular individual in order to avoid the interpretive backdoor afforded by traditional demon-figures and the occult. Hilaire Kallendorf, writing on the theme of demons and exorcisms in early modern drama, argues that "[d]emonic possession was an effective way for early modern victims to attempt to rationalize tragedy, to find a scapegoat to take the blame for all the sadness and outrage they felt" (140). This insight into early modern drama is equally applicable to medieval plays due to the similarities of function afforded by possession as a literary device. Kallendorf writes of *A Yorkshire Tragedy* that "the only way the anonymous playwright can explain what has happened is through recourse to the scenario of demonic possession" (141) when the play confronts its audience with scenes of wanton murder and destruction by a man of his family and community. Demonic possession interposes a causative player into the sequence of events that explains and, to some degree, mitigates the horror invoked by these events. Morality plays must actively deny and prevent this type of reading in order to reinforce the role of the individual's responsibility. Demons are not to blame, although sins are represented allegorically, and all judgement falls squarely on the individual human. The struggle against greed is depicted as an internal, spiritual battle in which agency lies solely with the individual. *Castle*, despite the numerous personifications of evils present on the stage, constructs a scenario similar to *Everyman* for its human protagonist.

*Castle*'s punishment and repentance scenes further elaborate that although there are personifications of sins present on the stage, they are not to be blamed for Mankind's actions. Punishment is enacted allegorically and theatrically upon the individual rather than the sins. When Penance enters the stage in *Castle* to save Mankind, who is at that point seated alongside all seven of the sins, her words and actions are directed at him rather than the other actors:

> With point of spear I will thee pierce:
> God's laws so dear instruct.
> With my dagger of sorrow sweet,
> I reach to thine heart's root.
> Thy shame shall show thee what is right –
> Mankind! Go shrive thee quick! (1241-6)

Penance then proceeds to stab Mankind with her lance, ignoring those around him. The moral lesson is clearly represented here through this sequence of actions: although detestable, the sins themselves are not the subject or target of God's punishment, nor are they capable of independent function. They exist and attempt to sway Mankind to sinfulness throughout the play through various means, but the ultimate failure rests with Mankind who has taken to them and allowed them into his soul. Penance targets Mankind specifically: declarations of "I will thee pierce" and "thine heart's root" clarify where responsibility ultimately falls. Judgment too stems from God – "God's laws" – instead of the community or other characters, and Mankind's battle and subsequent redemption are purely internal qualities.

Internalized conflict is a facet of the morality play's structure and strategy. In forcing Mankind to face his death, the play provokes its audience to undertake similar introspection and question the presence of sin and evil in their own lives. Doing so ultimately reaffirms the validity of the religious doctrine and community informing the play's moral message; the audience "identifies with the comforting social stasis represented by the 'good' characters" (Jerz 77) while rejecting, both in the theatre and in spirit, the Vice characters parading about the crowd. Punishment, while ostensibly suffered by the audience through this shared identity and mutual experience, is characterized as an opportunity to demonstrate spiritual resolve and reaffirm individual commitment to religious principles. Simultaneously, the representations of evil and moral failure are vague enough to transpose such negative characteristics away from the individual and onto other potential targets. Morality plays provide through dramatization a firm sense of correct behaviour and morality that serves as the basis for the audience's own conduct.

The salvations of Mankind and Everyman at the end of their respective plays endorse a bi-directional corrective measure. The plays redeem their protagonists and tacitly call for the audience to undergo similar transformations and adhere to religious principles. Morality plays were pedagogical entertainment, "a didactic ritual drama about the forgiveness of sin" (Potter 57). These plays aimed to teach lessons to an audience through a combination of comedy and allegory ultimately designed to lead their viewers to turn inward and fashion their own lives and behaviours after the models presented on the stage. The audience is the true target of the morality play: performance invited audiences to become active participants in their presentation of communal morality through the interpretive proximity created and sustained by the single human character at the heart of each play.

### 4.3: The Theatre of Punishment in the *Jew of Malta*

Early modern playwrights possessed a powerful tool in the stage. The theatre facilitated the elucidation of abstract ideologies through the physicality of the stage; this immediacy gave playwrights a powerful added dimension to their writings. Actors on the stage carried a weight that was "considerably less abstract when conditioned by the realities of stage performance" (Dessen 65), thus giving a physical presence and body to allegorical personifications that could be manipulated, judged, and killed. The traditions associated with personifications established by the medieval play were carried forward and altered by playwrights in the early modern period, and the early modern stage "played a part in forging the ceremonial practices of early modern punishments" (Covington 94). Both personifications of greed and the individuals who battle them shift from being allegorical and fundamentally internalized characters denotative of the aspects of a single individual's engagement with sin and religion to representations of socially engaged figures performing actions within a world drawn from contemporary culture. Instead of

Sir Greediness and Goods, the early modern stage favours Barabas, Shylock, and Volpone; the cultural background informing notions of greed as they are manifested in individuals is retained, but the narrative battles are reorganized to represent external conflicts between individuals or groups. A thorough delineation between good and bad commerce is established through these oppositions, and, most crucially, emphasis shifts from the salvation of characters representative of the audience to the punishment of their enemies. The audience, by participating in the punishment of these fictional characters, endorses a corrective public morality and internalizes self-discipline.

Whereas the medieval drama operates around a central figure that undergoes the entire trial of sin, punishment, and correction, early modern drama exhibits a shift in which sin and punishment continue to be performed on the stage, but correction is internalized by the audience, thus producing an experience that progresses from sin to punishment to confirmation. The audience simultaneously participates in the spectacle of punishment and tacitly endorses "self-discipline" against aberrant behaviour through the appreciation of its consequences in "hidden, private, interiorized zones" (Sponsler 52). While religion continued to operate as the dominant organizing principle behind moral justice, early modern plays recognized the role of cultural ideology in distributing punishments upon its villains. This practice was further supplemented by the state's growing understanding of "public display" as part of its political apparatus, as "early modern rulers relied heavily on display to control the population" (Whelan 145), and increasing appeals in plays to what Sarah Covington has termed "a communitarian dynamic" of socio-political judgment. In early modern drama, punishment's corrective aims cease to be applied to audience-surrogate characters and are instead replaced by the audience's conviction that the characters put on trial in the play have been properly punished for their actions, feeding on "Tudor fascinations with display, surveillance, and spectacular judicial punishment that took medieval practices and transformed them into the unique apparatus of the Henrican state" (Lerer 53).

Figures representative of greed and immoral commercial behaviour were popular targets due to England's highly unstable financial climate towards the end of the sixteenth century. "Depopulation, unemployment, abject poverty, and social unrest" (Herman) were significant social issues, and Johanna Rickman offers a further conjecture regarding the popular need to see these representations humiliated. She theorizes that "Elizabethans commonly linked economic failures and crises to the moral ills of greed, overspending, and social climbing, primarily because they did not fully grasp the workings of inflation on the economy" (21). Representations connected to morality proved easily translatable into contemporary figures for playwrights writing about commerce as a result of a generally poor understanding of economics within the English public. Specific economic criticisms were more readily adapted for the stage when these criticisms were enmeshed with personifications derived from an extant tradition of religious moralities. In writing for an English public plagued by the constant fear "of the worst consequences of economic and social change" (Braddick 52) brought on by harsh realities such as "an oversupply of labour and declining real wages" (Braddick 49) in the workforce, the destruction of stage villains denotative of economic exploitation served as a powerful theatrical device.

The audience's collective disavowal of these representations mimicked the social banishment of criminals in early modern England, in which legal punishments were "often more 'interactive' affairs, with onlookers able to contribute to the punishment themselves by hurling rotten fruit, rocks, or even dead cats at the pilloried offenders, sometimes to fatal effect" (Covington 95). Although the plays' villains are, within drama, ostensibly punished for their actions, the true recipient of the play's correctional invective is the audience who, upon witnessing the consequences of unacceptable practices, are presented with a reaffirmation of communal beliefs through the presence of a body to serve as the unequivocal subject of their scorn and object of punishment through transference. This model of theatrical entertainment fed on a heritage of "shaming rituals [which were] based on certain rules of action and the use of symbols, on audience participation and spectacle, which makes them intrinsically theatrical" (Habermann 67). Punishing the theatrical criminal subject reasserts the value and terms of proper behaviour both in the play and in the audience.

Marlowe's Barabas is a reimagining of the medieval morality play villain for an early modern audience; like the morality play's battles, "conflict in *The Jew of Malta* is calculated to intensify the collective bile and suffering of the audience and divest it of its pain" (Bowers 24). The play, however, does not use the didactic and overt disciplinary measures enacted upon the medieval subject, who experiences the drama through surrogate characters as reminders of individual moral failures and the need to adhere to religious authority. Marlowe's play instead achieves this goal of catharsis and discipline through the creation of a violent but ultimately positive emotional reaction to Barabas's downfall. The chief ideological shift exhibited in this change in approach is the indoctrination of the audience and the inculcation into it of disciplinary power. The medieval subject is the target of the morality promoted by contemporary plays and is taught obedience through the fear of punishment, while the early modern play seizes upon the idea of turning the audience into its own disciplinarian. The audience willingly participates in and agrees with the punishment of the stage villains, therefore becoming both juries and soldiers of the play's ideology.

While numerous critics have examined Barabas's performance from the perspective of audience response, my intervention focuses on key differences in social purposes between medieval and early modern plays and emphasizes the moralization of the merchant-figure in the early modern period that gave Barabas's villainy a particularly economic character. Emergent factors in the early modern period such as changes to usury laws and humanism's impact on the English public's role in punishment and conceptualization of salvation exerted substantial pressures on the period's plays. I have conducted an examination of the medieval morality play in order to foreground the dramatic model present in those works and to provide a basis of reference for the modifications early modern plays applied to those discursive systems. The literary roles performed by redemption, salvation, punishment, and the individual continue to be present in writings of the later period while also undergoing substantial revisions indicative of shifts in public receptions of morality's connection to economics.

The dramatization of salvation, for example, is one case of an extant model's transformation motivated by the growth of new ideological and economic perspectives in English culture during the sixteenth century. The philosophical views promoted by humanism's secular perspectives informed a renegotiation of money's cultural role by attempting to distance finance from its traditional close association with morality, although these connections, as mentioned, persisted to some degree. Plays ceased to invoke a moral authority oriented towards individual redemption and increasingly offered spectacles featuring the punishment of externalized characters that demonstrated unacceptable behaviours; rather than moral remonstrations that chided the audience for being greedy, playwrights staged personifications of greed for the purposes of subjecting these figures to communal punishment. Salvation shifted from being a personal and religious experience to participation in a communal demonstration of power.

Dorothy Brown reads the fundamental differences in interpretations of salvation between medieval and early modern audiences as a product of English humanism:

> Whereas medieval man might have felt he should be obedient and not question God's will, the man of Renaissance England felt that an attempt at understanding was not necessarily disobedience but rather the acceptance of a role God intended for man when He gave him the power to reason. [...] [T]he humanists deemed the universe to be an ordered entity, working according to divine laws devised in accordance with feeling and reason, reaching highest earthly perfection in God's creation, man. (29)

Religion remained an important and inalienable function in drama, but the means by which salvation could be achieved were expanded to include secular education and reasoning. No longer confined to the singular perspectives engendered by the medieval morality plays, early modern drama served as a vehicle of expression in which concepts of good and evil, while remaining crucial devices, could be complicated and the means by which they were achieved made more numerous. The growing emphasis on education had a significant impact on how punishment and salvation were conceptualized and dramatized. Kent Cartwright reads John Redford's *The Play of Wit and Science* as a transitional work that actively sought to connect medieval religion to early modern secular humanism by "[refashioning] the allegory of Everyman's salvation into the metaphor of transformation through academic study, with secular knowledge replacing divine grace as the goal" (50). While final judgment continued to be the sole realm of God, the means by which representations of religious ideals could be achieved or enacted upon individuals were expanded to incorporate a larger role for the community. As a result, despite a divergence from the religious, educational intentions underlying earlier plays, drama continued to find the already established conceptual and literary frameworks provided by such cultural background to be useful in constructing its own conventions.

The introductions of secular forms of moral defence and salvation were accompanied by significant changes to the cultural connotations associated with money and commerce. Usury was one such practice that underwent significant revisions over the course of the sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries. Teresa Lanpher Nugent highlights the tension between traditional moral and theological opposition to usury with, by 1604, a growing understanding of moneylending as a crucial tool for economic development. This tension is formalized in *The Three Ladies of London* through the moral alignments of Usury and Gerontus and their conduct in moneylending, with the chief distinction placed on motivation: Usury extorts repayment through greed, while Gerontus's lending is predicated on love and conscience. While officially illegal, usury became understood as an acceptable and necessary measure near the turn of the seventeenth century, and a ten percent return was accepted as the norm. This change to usury in practice was a massive departure from previous theoretical positions that deemed all forms of usury to be morally indefensible and economically unprincipled. This shift is evident in a semantic change in terminology: *usury* becomes a derogatory comment reserved for extreme demands and "only gains above the rate," while the more modest *interest* enters the language to identify acceptable returns that fall "within the statutory rate" (Kerridge 38).

English humanism remapped not only salvation as within the domain of secular learning and community, but also the trials and punishments that preceded it. Characters and their narratives shifted from purely allegorical religious figures to more culturally relevant types that, while inheriting many of the archetypal characteristics drawn from the medieval morality-play models, incorporated complex traits drawn from everyday society. I have already discussed in my introduction Arden from *Arden of Faversham*, who represents a significantly complex figure that incorporates emergent discourses of law and finance. Merchants were an increasingly popular subject for stories: the growing prominence of merchants in urban culture and the wealth and political power they accumulated significantly altered public perceptions of those who made their livings in finance. Simultaneously, the increasing dependence of all levels of English society on credit and debt systems, as studied in my third chapter, was an uneasy one and a constant source of anxiety and peril. These conditions were conducive to a popular demand for plays about money. Andrew Gurr notes that plays, much like their medieval counterparts, carried forward the need for flexible appeal since

> [t]hroughout the Shakespearean era companies retained the capacity at the end of an afternoon's playing to take their plays off to a nobleman's house or to Court and play again there with no more aids to performance than the arena itself and what they could carry to it. (115)

Increased usage of merchants and characters ensnared by financial difficulties thus speaks to a widespread appeal and understanding of these figures. As Peter F. Grav states, the heavy usage of merchant characters by Shakespeare and his peers was “an apt choice given the rising profile of the mercantile class in late sixteenth-century England” (28), and city comedies employed references to commerce, law, and civil society in their plots.

Despite this growing complexity in narratives and their characters, the fundamental character types used by plays continued to incorporate and utilize notions drawn from medieval moralities. Ostensible usage of a more diverse range of figures did not unilaterally indicate the incorporation of substantial new knowledge: Jacob Selwood writes of *The Jew of Malta* that “references to the actual content of Jewish belief or practice are absent from this litany, largely because accursedness and avarice are imputed to form the core of what it means to be Jewish” (138). This reworking of literary precedents is also noted by David Bevington, who in his edition of the play argues that Barabas’s characterization stems primarily from “the unresolved way in which he is compounded of historically plausible elements and more timelessly metaphysical aspects derived from the morality play” (“Introduction” 9). Bernard Spivack’s *Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil* and Bevington’s *From Mankind to Marlowe* take up this idea in depth, casting Barabas, among other villainous characters such as Iago and Richard III, as following in the tradition established by Vice figures in medieval morality drama.

While Barabas does indeed draw much of his literary and dramatic character from the Vice tradition, Marlowe infuses his villain with a particularly economic bent tailored to his early modern audience. Placing Barabas into this literary lineage entails two sets of consequences. Firstly, it locates Marlowe’s ostensibly Jewish character as, to some extent, allegorical and not derived from contemporary examples. Indeed, a characterization informed by proper observation would have proven difficult for Marlowe and his contemporary audiences in light of the expulsion of all Jewish people from England following the Edict of Expulsion in 1290. The political decree was informed by numerous factors, including the widespread presence of negative stereotypes that would carry forward for centuries after the forced deportation: Robin Mundill emphasizes, in writing about medieval concepts of the Jew, that "a stereotype existed and was easily detectable in the invective of church sermons as in various decrees ordering the expulsion of usurers" (262), and Bevington reminds us that Barabas invoked "virulently anti-Semitic stories of the supposed kidnapping and crucifying of children by the Jews, of poisoning wells, and the like" ("Introduction" 2) rather than any substantial information familiar to Londoners.

Although small Jewish communities are recorded as surviving into the sixteenth century, these numbered only a few dozen individuals at any given time and escaped persecution largely by virtue of hiding their religious affiliation.[52] Jewish foreigners continued to enter England in limited numbers, but the conflation of national, racial, cultural, and religious identities as a part of a larger exoticism of the foreign speaks to the general distrust of other nationalities rather than a specific informed campaign against Jewish individuals; characters such as Gerontus in *Three Ladies* indicate a concept of Jewish individuals in England that was fluid and not uniformly negative. Mundill similarly notes "some well-attested amicable relationships between Jew and Christians in late thirteenth-century England" (262). The overall tone, however, seems to have be a negative one, marked by the attribution of religion as grounds for shaming and persecution.[53] Marlowe's Jewish Barabas provides him with a figure in which to condense fears of predatory merchants and usurers supported by existing cultural perceptions.

Secondly, the interpretation of Barabas as heir to the Vice figure tradition indicates a significant realignment of English drama's understanding of cathartic punishment as part of its engagement with its audience. Despite changes in attitudes toward moneylending as analyzed by Nugent, Jewish characters on the stage continued to be categorized as usurers: Barabas boasts, among his previous professions, of having been "an usurer, / And with extorting, cozening, forfeiting, / And tricks belonging unto brokery, / I filled the jails with bankrupts in a year" (2.3.193-6). With the establishment of a distinction between interest and usury, the latter became a characterization solely denotative of a moralized process: self-identification as a "usurer" is thus indicative of Barabas's acceptance of and willing participation in his own evil and a particularly loaded claim in light of the vast debts that plagued many early modern Londoners. His joyful commitment to his own villainy is crucial as a theatrical device for the purposes of inciting the audience, a pre-eminent trait in the tradition of Vice figures, and implementing early modern models of public punishment through the moralization of an economic practice.

Alfred Harbage calls this practice "devil-baiting":

> We shall get nearer the truth about the play if we ourselves [...] think a little less in terms of moral philosophy and a little more in terms of native sports. There was bear-baiting, bull-baiting, and, their theatrical equivalent, devil-baiting. Behind the latter lies a long tradition, with the "Vice" figures of the

> interludes bustling aggressively and triumphantly among men until their final pre-ordained discomfiture. (53)

In Harbage's reading, Marlowe "supplied the best devil-figure thus far conceived – in his agile-minded, arrogant, ruthless, lethal Barabas" (54) – by feeding off extant forms of public entertainment. The character is memorable and effective as a literary figure because of the direct engagement afforded by "baiting"; Barabas not only operates within the play's world but also provokes the audience through the deliberate deployment of inflammatory remarks and actions. In the play's first scene, Barabas mocks those "pitied in a Christian poverty" (1.1.114) and boasts that humility and modesty breed only "malice, falsehood, and excessive pride" (1.1.116). Barabas speaks on behalf of all Jews in his estimation, those blessed by "old Abram's happiness" (1.1.105), and claims that "we have scrambled up / More wealth by far than those that brag of faith" (1.1.122). In making these claims, Barabas picks at not only the relative poverty of the audience, claiming that all Jews are "wealthier far than any Christian" (1.1.127), but also at any religious justification that the audience may forward in its defence. Additionally, Machiavel primes the audience in the prologue, setting a tone of direct engagement and conflict between the play and the audience. Barabas enters the stage under the umbrella of Machiavel's endorsement and as his economic champion, a character whose "money was not got without my means" (Prol.32). As a result of this framework, which is oriented towards the audience and the narrative simultaneously, Barabas functions within the drama with a singular purpose: to cause havoc within the play until he is destroyed as part of an ideological reconfirmation and reestablishment of social authority over money and people.

Indeed, few characters are destroyed as thoroughly as Barabas: his daughter disowns him, converts to a different religion, and subsequently dies (by his own hand, reinforcing the character's self-destructiveness), thereby cutting off his biological and religious lineage; his obsessive pursuit of riches is undermined by the appropriation of all of his material possessions not once but twice by Ferneze, at both the start and the end of the play; his political machinations to kill Calymath and his soldiers are taken over and used by Ferneze for his own ends; and even his physical body is burned away in the cauldron, leaving no bodily trace of his existence. This destruction plays into the audience's desire to see such representations completely obliterated by the play's internal conduct of justice. Marlowe removes all ambiguity from Barabas by having his character wholly accept his role in the narrative as well as the play's social agenda. In speaking to Ithamore, Barabas proclaims "Make account of me / As thy fellow; we are villains both; / Both circumcisèd, we hate Christians both" (2.3.216-8); his declaration, "*Ego mihimet sum simper proximus*" (1.1.188),[54] is an explicit rejection of any sense of community. Barabas and Ithamore are villains not only for the play's characters but also for the audience, who, by virtue of these characterizations, are allowed to side against Barabas without reservation or sympathy. Defining Barabas with little human characterization and as one who is completely immersed in the villain role makes clear the audience's own position: the audience is present to participate in the play's morality through the collective hatred and punishment of Barabas.

Matthew Steggle's research has already explored the complexities of audience engagement in reading the theatre as "a function akin to that of a sounding-board [...] between onstage performance of laughter and weeping, and audience response" (10); my intervention posits the possibility of a far more visceral connection between performers and their audience in jointly delivering punishment upon the stage villain. As Annalisa Castaldo points out, Foucault's description of crowds' participation in ritualized public punishments through actions such as "yelling, throwing refuse, engaging in arguments with the principal actors [...] also exactly describes the English theater of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries" (50). Barabas plays the role of unabashed villain who can, without remorse or reservation, be sentenced for his crimes because his entire character has been devised to elicit a response from the audience through blatant villainy and by embodying the audience's fears surrounding the marketplace and commerce's effects on individual behaviour: Barabas cheats, steals, lies, hoards, and is willing to commit any crime for his own gain. His character summarizes, even glorifies, all of the negative valences associated with the developing commercialization of culture and the proliferation of the marketplace metaphor as a dominant model for social interactions.

Audience response is a complex system crucial to Marlowe's play. Stephen Greenblatt theorizes that the relationship between audience and Barabas is akin to "the silence of the passive accomplice, winked at by this fellow criminal" (*Self-Fashioning* 216) due to the audience's impossible situation: the audience cannot, due to the passive nature of witnessed performance, prevent any of the heinous crimes committed by Barabas despite being fully aware of his intentions and schemes. The audience can only watch as Barabas murders his way through the play and schemes against all of the other characters. Consequently, the audience is forced into the role of a bystander made complicit through silence and inaction, and the audience must assume collectively some degree of guilt for the actions performed on the stage.

While this argument is an interesting theoretical note on the nature of audience response in the world of theatre, it also supports Felsenstein's notion that

> Marlowe is both eliciting the stereotypical response in his audience to a conventional Jew-figure who glories in his inordinate brutality, and implying that such cold-blooded and ruthless behavior is hardly different in the rest of humanity (162).

This complicated presentation of "ruthless behavior" is the lynchpin of the play's ideological fostering of communal self-monitoring and a way of compromising the audience's initial moral response to Barabas. If greed is indeed a universal trait shared by the audience, then the audience cannot speak out against Barabas's greediness. By rendering the audience complicit in Barabas's sins, either through Greenblatt's concept of passivity or through Felsenstein's reading of the sin's universality, the play locates its audience as simultaneously endorsing punishment on the provided scapegoat and internalizing the moral imperative to object to Marlowe's caricature of greed and the values this figure represents. After all, Barabas's greed is not a quality introduced from outside of the systems of trade and mercantilism that permeate the play's world: as one of Ferneze's knights makes clear, Barabas and the other Jewish merchants were given "leave with us to get their wealth" (1.2.60). Barabas is the extension, rather than an abnormality, of the marketplace attitude shared by the theatre and its contemporary world. As a result, the tacit hypocrisy of this arrangement – punishing someone for characteristics that one may carry within oneself – promotes internalized and private discipline as a safeguard against having the community turn on the individual in a similar manner to the collective abuse of Barabas.

Barabas's villainy is constructed in such a way as to ensure this indoctrination. His opening soliloquy, although more akin to a harmless daydream as he awaits the arrival of his ships, outlines a fantasy in which money supersedes all political structures, because it can "ransom great kings from captivity" (1.1.32), and seeks growth only for its own sake. Marlowe invokes the figure of the miser, long associated with personifications of greed as in *Everyman*, by having Barabas dream of "steel-barred coffers [...] crammed full" (1.1.14) and "infinite riches in a little room" (1.1.37). Money is removed from its active role in communal exchange and repurposed by Barabas as a glorification of his own cunning, a characterization supplemented by his later retrieval of hidden gold and gems. By having Barabas amass a fortune only for his own private interests, the drama plays into the public fear of selfish economic behaviour that bears little concern for the health of the community.[55] Such greediness was a direct attack on the collective need for cooperation and "behaviours that enabled early modern villagers to deal collectively with hardship, maintain their individual 'credit,' and get along" (Bucholz and Key 183). This fear is catalyzed during the later appropriation of the Jewish merchants' wealth in order to secure Malta's tribute to the Turks: Ferneze specifically refers to the need for individual sacrifice and the value of "a common good" over the desires of "a private man" (1.2.99-100), thereby establishing a strict dichotomy in order to justify his demands. Trapped between selfless sacrifice and outright greed, Barabas's hesitation "requires only the slightest interpretive squint to take on the appearance of ill-gotten gain" (Murakami 122). No matter how reasonable Barabas's objections may be, any protest is characterized as strictly contrary to communal well-being and is therefore deemed as bad-natured – an interpretation particularly easy to suggest in light of Barabas's opening speech.

*The Jew of Malta*'s vision of the marketplace is further complicated by undermining audience introspection and resistance to its villains through the play's dramatic conventions. The play engenders a sense of complicity and interpretive proximity between the audience and Barabas as a result of forcing both into a mutual belief in commerce as a political strategy. Machiavel's opening diatribe hints at the possibility of his followers being amongst the audience, calling out that while "to some perhaps my name is odious, / But such as love me guard me from their tongues" (Prol.5-6). From the play's very prologue, suspicion is directed at Barabas and also at the audience, who must scrutinize themselves and each other for the presence of such a belief. Even those in the audience who would denounce Machiavel openly are not above suspicion, since he claims to be "admired [...] of those that hate me most" (Prol.9). He then proceeds to list some of the conditions of his philosophy, including the belief that "religion [is] but a childish toy" (Prol.14) and that "murders past" (Prol.16) are forgettable offenses. Both admiration and hatred of Machiavel and his beliefs are tinged by envy according to this declaration, in effect placing the entire audience within his influence and providing no interpretive opportunity for the audience to refute his claims or Machiavel's power over them. The audience's aggression towards Machiavel and Barabas is immediately subverted and remodelled as aggression against themselves.

Barabas's numerous asides to the audience also implicate the audience as sharing in the guilt. As in Greenblatt's reading, the audience is forced into complicity by Barabas when he speaks in asides in 2.3 and vows Lodowick's death; similarly, his panicked asides when confronted by Bernadine and Jacomo in 4.1 are ostensibly directed at Ithamore but grasp tenuously at the audience as well. When he complains that "we are both undone" (4.2.50) upon the friars learning of the murder of the nuns, he is speaking to Ithamore, but the audience, by virtue of its metatheatrical engagement with Barabas, is tangentially pulled into the villains' guilt. The dramatic aside, by this point in the play, has already been mapped as a space of exchange between Barabas and the audience. This space is crucial for the audience's proper understanding of the character and his motivation since it provides unfettered access to Barabas's thoughts, but this essential channel into the play's world is appropriated by Barabas in order to draw the audience into complicity. After the audience is connected by Machiavel to Barabas by an inescapable shared belief in his philosophy, the narrative's structural dependence on asides guarantees that this overlap is transformed into passivity that tacitly condones Barabas's actions.

The audience is confronted with a dilemma: they must object either to the performance directly, mimicking the culture of public humiliation and punishment that Castaldo saw as paralleled within the theatre; or the audience must remain quiet and allow the performance to continue unimpeded and thus be implicated in Barabas's crimes. Neither choice is attractive, since Machiavel's declaration regarding those who would "hate [him] most" already complicates and subverts any possible overt resistance to the play's content, while silence serves only to support Greenblatt's assertion of complicity through abstention. The ideal methodology through which the play's audiences could repudiate Barabas – reject Barabas, a follower of Machiavel, to reject

Machiavel – has already been undermined by Machiavel's assertions in the prologue. The play circumvents resistance throughout its plot structure, and the audience, who is already situated within the play's influence by Barabas's provocations, is not given a clear path through which to vent frustration; instead, they must wait for one to be opened for them.

The play does eventually provide the audience with an exit strategy and a chance for cathartic emotional release through Ferneze's victory over Barabas. Until Ferneze turns the tables on him at play's end, Barabas has enjoyed the upper hand on all of the other characters, and also the audience by means of the narrative impasse. Ferneze breaks this deadlock and, despite the "religious and political hypocrisy of the Governor of Malta" (Kitch 118), the audience accepts his resolution due to the necessity of seeing Barabas punished. In this manner, Castaldo's concern that the play is "inherently conservative – reinscribing the state's claim of sole authority over violence" (51) – is confirmed: whatever the draconian measures Ferneze employs, the action rules in his favour. His restoration to power is seen as grounds for concluding the play, thus reaffirming the correctness of power systems extant at the start of the play, and Ferneze's conspiratorial aside shortly before Barabas's death, a metatheatrical device so crucial to Barabas's strategy of implicating the audience in his own schemes, recovers the audience from the villain's influence and places the audience squarely in Ferneze's territory. Despite his troubling character, Ferneze guarantees that wealth is controlled by authority and is properly redistributed.

Near the end of the play, Ferneze has conspired with his knights to betray Barabas to Calymath by using the very trap Barabas has already set up for the Turks. As Calymath enters the hall, Barabas greets him; Ferneze then speaks in an aside, voicing his disgust:

"*How the slave jeers at him!*" (5.5.55). This realignment is a small but immensely significant development: prior to this moment, the audience has been privy only to Barabas's and Ithamore's asides and consequently been a part of their group through collusive association; here Ferneze seizes control of the dramatic perspective and invites the audience to participate in his scheme. The early modern community was already accustomed to a legal environment in which it was tacitly "itself invited, by its sovereign, to participate in the punishment of the offender" (Ward 198). Like the monarch calling subjects to watch public executions, Ferneze draws in the audience and invites them both to witness and to engage in Barabas's death. In destroying this personification of greed collectively, Ferneze and the audience reaffirm their commitment to authority and the moral judgment exercised by institutional power. Although Bevington points to the worrying notion that Ferneze is essentially "the only true devotee of Machiavelli's writings" ("Introduction" 9), his battle against Barabas, sanctioned by political might, gives the audience the means by which to wrest control from Barabas and to see the character punished. Essentially, the audience is taught to hate Barabas because Barabas represents the evil of greed; this singular definition and the animosity it engenders, further supported by Ferneze's earlier invocation of the "common good" (1.2.99) and its imperative, preclude the possibility of its presence in other characters.

Marlowe's version of greed personified thus deftly schemes against both other characters and the audience: Barabas plays with the audience's emotions, drawing out negative reactions from them while simultaneously placing them in league with him through the conventions of theatrical narrative. The audience's negativity is complicated by this complicity, rendering particularly profound and acute the moment when they are finally allowed to divest themselves of Barabas and his greed. The play thus operates according to a complex relationship with its viewership in which morality is imparted to and affirmed by the audience through their own desire to enact revenge and punishment on Barabas for breaking these standards, even if those very standards exist only within the play's world. Greed is not solely a trait to be interrogated internally; it is also a negative attribute that is solved through communal prosecution. Like the early modern public execution, the play's structure recognizes the political power manifested in having its audience participate in its judgment: the play promotes its own ideological framework through the public execution of its personifications by means of turning the audience into its adherents and having them desire the vengeance carried out in the play.

## 4.4: A Sanctioned Response

Like the Two Minutes' Hate in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the early modern stage was an established area, demarcated by and controlled through the boundaries of narrative and physical theatre space, in which the spectacle of the public's enemies could be performed and put on public display. Marlowe's play builds on and develops further the morality play villain seen in medieval drama. Early modern playwrights drew from these literary and dramatic traditions and also incorporated concepts of public display and communal punishment into the works; plays functioned as spectacles for a public that could, through the collective disapproval of characters trotted out as targets, assert a definition of general morality. Morality is encoded into the speeches and actions of these plays, and "drama reinforces the values which a society believes are fundamental to its survival" (Wertz 88). The audience's responses to dramatized fiction were carried out within a culture already conditioned to public humiliation as a form of punishment. In the same manner as Julia lashing out physically at the screen in Orwell's novel, these audiences were enticed to respond to these provocations by the displays put on in front of them and were encouraged by the play to divest themselves of their anger, anxieties, and frustrations upon specific characters who were offered up as villains and scapegoats.

Unlike their medieval counterparts, early modern plays were used to impart religious lessons and the definitions of acceptable public morality on their audiences through a strong but favourable emotional response instead of the former's didacticism. At the heart of this response, economics and the anxieties it produced occupied a crucial role in the discourse of morality. Early modern England was a nation characterized simultaneously by the rising riches of select, predominantly urban, groups, the destabilization of the landed gentry's traditional political structures, and "widespread hardship, dispossession, and the creation of [...] an unprecedented number of beggars and vagabonds" (Carroll 21). Rampant poverty, constant inflation, increasing debts, and political unrest served to foment populist anger towards those individuals or groups who were believed, rightly or not, to steal or to appropriate what meagre resources the citizenry did possess. Theatres provided an opportunity for frustrated Londoners to participate and indulge temporarily in fantasies in which clear-cut villains that sought to cheat others were always caught and punished for their immoral actions. This illusion of control gave audiences a chance to confront actively and directly the nebulous economic factors influencing their lives by means of personifications to which a range of atrocious characteristics had been attached. Whereas the medieval play taught its audiences that they should beware unacceptable behaviours such as greediness lest they be punished for these excesses, the early modern play engaged its audiences by making them participants in the act of punishing those that exhibited greedy conduct. The audience, once they assume a role in the execution of justice, internalizes the moral authority that the play exercises over its villains and – by extension – the audience itself. Community is thus established through negation: the boisterous villain character, a construct loaded with the energy of negative valences drawn from contemporary culture, serves as an opportunity for a collective, shared experience in which the play and audience alike unite to destroy their common enemy and thus engage in a cathartic symbolic destruction of their anxieties, hatreds, and insecurities instigated by economic change.

# CONCLUSION

## SOCIAL THEATRE, SOCIAL MONEY

Money as an imaginative force affects everything it comes into contact with and economic narrative operates according to a relentless drive to reconfigure events into elements of its own discourse. Modern mass media unceasingly demonstrate this proclivity; financial perspectives consume events time and time again. News of the earthquake that devastated swaths of northern Japan in March of 2011 was immediately followed by articles that estimated the impact of the natural disaster on Japan's, and by extension the world's, economy, right down to the consequences for the domestic American car retail market due to the cuts to car paint pigment production resulting from the closures of plants in Japan.[56] Similarly, the gestures of goodwill and solidarity extended to the Japanese people by individuals and organizations around the world are summed up neatly as donations and contributions.[57] Price tags, once attached, perform as clean and generalized proofs that quantify the magnitude of events. Media are awash with stories documenting the rise of oil and gas prices whenever political tensions grow in the Middle East, and even the death of Osama Bin Laden on 2 May 2011 was followed immediately by notices of gains made in stock markets around the world and uncertainty about the cost of oil in the wake of such news.[58]

The influences exerted by economics and its assimilatory processes are similarly noticeable in the narratives generated by early modern England. Meaning within drama is created by virtue of its correlation to the economic world outside of the theatre. This dependency is in large part due to the impingement of playwrights' circumstances on play composition and performance. The professionalization of the theatre in the late-sixteenth century entailed a thorough reassessment of the relationship between play and audience, informed additionally by the popular success of London theatres, "the undoubted economic benefits the public theatre brought" (Zaller 387), and the growing commercialization of theatre companies themselves. As one of the first adopters of a rudimentary limited liability model and as "one of the few trades not regulated by a guild or fixed prices and wages" (Sharpe 419), theatre companies represented an emergent arrangement in London's financial landscape and playwrights were deeply immersed in the commercial aspects of their trade both as a business enterprise and as a source of themes for their works.

The significance of economic thought's impact on drama is also in part a product of the role of public performance in the production of the very cultural values and norms that contextualize dramatic narratives. Theatre was "the site of public discourse and hence the primary focus for concerns about the use, moral value, and social consequences of marketplace-situated discourses" (Halasz 182). I began this thesis with some thoughts on the usage of public performance as a communal space for social catharsis of the fears and anxieties incited by money, economic ideology, and financial institutions; to conclude this dissertation, I want to revisit the idea, raised briefly in my fourth chapter, of drama as a platform for social beliefs as a way of connecting some of the implications of my analyses. Dorothy Wertz argues that "drama reinforces the values which a society believes are fundamental to its survival" (88): by virtue of manageable devices such as characters, locations, and scenarios that respond in predictable and controllable ways, early modern plays engaged their contemporary world through idealized fictions that encapsulated social and cultural beliefs. My specific focus has been on the "values" most closely associated with economics. The range of drama I have examined studies how money as an emblem of cultural beliefs has been used on the stage, but there are numerous different models, approaches, assumptions, and ideological goals operating behind these varied deployments. By way of closing my work, I will briefly look at how these plays exemplify a range of different tactics in bringing public performance into contact with its commercial world and the social morality of its audiences.

As demonstrated throughout this thesis, these presentations manipulate cultural values and relationships with audiences in a variety of ways. Shakespeare's *The Tempest* provides its audience with a condensed examination of a key social institution, servitude, undergoing significant changes during his time, while *1 Henry VI* dramatizes one version of events that led England to the then-present widespread adoption of mercantilist ideologies. These plays, rather than promoting a strict formalization of extant beliefs, challenged their audiences to resolve firmly contemporary conflicts: what should *slave*, *servant*, or *subject* mean in the emergent systems of servitude? How were these titles to be amended in light of recent developments such as slavery? By what criteria were political powers to be judged, what suppositions informed these demonstrations of power, and how did past models influence newly developing ones?

Although *The Tempest* and *1 Henry VI* both conclude their respective plots with ostensible re-establishments of organized and legitimized political authorities, these questions – among others – go largely unanswered. Caliban's barely reformed submission and Ariel's freedom, granted only as a condition of his good service, do little to resolve the core conceptual disorganization inherent to the unstable service-roles and their nebulous definitions that resulted in the characters' initial conflicts with Prospero. In this regard, any interpretation that reads the play as "choreographed to assure moral reconciliation" (Murphy 33) between its characters is deeply ignorant of the larger institutions of power and "the emotional costs of mastery and subjection" (Kearney 222) investigated by the play. Ariel may be free at play's end, but this development does not attend to the dysfunctional system of indentured servitude that has, up to that point, defined his character. His freedom is only an isolated resolution of an epidemic problem. Caliban, seemingly subdued, still lurks and slavery remains a contested concept.

Similarly, Joan's execution, while a seemingly triumphant moment near the end of *1 Henry VI*, fails to resolve the underlying political turmoil visible in the increasingly fractured English court and does not offer any solutions to the fundamental problem posed by the disappearance of Talbot's feudal era. Retributive justice is a pointless endeavour, and killing Joan neither revives the feudal age nor provides direction or impetus for a structured, coherent model for the future. To compound this failure, Joan's death is also the scene in which Margaret enters the play and "assumes Joan's role as the French woman who jeopardizes England's war effort" (Levin and Watkins 69). The play subverts any expectation of clear resolution with the immediate introduction of further complications. As a result, the instabilities latent to the play's political history and its economic allegory persist beyond the drama's boundaries; the manner in which the economic, social, and political questions posed by these two plays exceed the limits of their dramas and refuse to proffer solutions thus serves to shift the responsibility for producing formal declarations of social values onto the audience. *The Tempest* and *1 Henry VI*, rather than codifying belief, attempt to stimulate thought and reflection through the presentation of analogies referential of the world external and contemporary to their performances.

Mountfort's play uses a strategy that differs strongly from these interrogative models. Instead of calling for audiences to seek out answers to questions with vast societal implications, *The Launching of the Mary* operates prescriptively by providing its audience with an ideologically motivated set of answers to the troubles raised by current events. As a form of propaganda, *Launching* simultaneously raises a number of issues afflicting early modern commerce – the precepts of mercantilism, Charter exclusivity and monopolies, the growing political power wielded by financial institutions and corporations, and the risks associated with international expansion – and furnishes its drama with plots that operate cooperatively to suggest Mountfort's own answers to these conflicts. Rather than enshrining and reinforcing existing beliefs, Mountfort's work attempts to instil in its audience values, informed by EIC policies, that the drama itself believes should be widely adopted. This turn is a keen exploitation of dramatic theory and one that fully understands the substantial societal impact discussed in Wertz's argument. The play reworks the connections between narrative and its presentation of cultural values and public morality as enacted through performance to further its own political and economic ideologies. Mountfort exploits this pre-existing relationship and, through its appropriation, legitimizes the views that the drama puts forward; *Launching* attempts to naturalize the specific conditions of its economic discourse through its internal content and the opportunity provided by the play format's cultural power.

There is also a third approach, perhaps most closely adhering to Wertz's original argument, yet still complicated by the developments furnished by early modern playwrights. My studies of *The Jew of Malta*, *Everyman*, and *The Castle of Perseverance* provide strong support for Wertz's assertion and demonstrate the importance of religious models to medieval and early modern playwrights, who used performance as corrective space in which to reassert communal beliefs. The latter two plays offer exemplary case studies of dramatic representations of societal and religious behaviours as culture-and-community-building exercises. In *Everyman* and *Castle*, drama offers its audience a unified experience that clearly establishes what kinds of economic behaviours and attitudes are deemed acceptable; in this regard, these plays operate as extensions of religious morality in a collaborative condemnation of greed and selfish, predatory finances. This connection is hardly surprising, given the circumstances of these plays' compositions and the cultural context ("in the Middle Ages, only religious values held enough universal validity to unite people of all social degrees and to provide a common basis for drama" [Wertz 88]), but the developments of new discourses and philosophical models such as humanism in the early modern period create alternative approaches to widespread appeal.

Marlowe's Barabas is a character indicative of the emergence in the early modern period of economics as a new "common basis" for drama's public meaning. Rather than a complete debasement of religious values that "makes evident the inadequacy, even the absurdity, of Christian ethics in the dog-eat-dog world that the characters inhabit" (McAdam 150), Marlowe's work, I would argue, is a far more subtle endeavour that brings residual traditional and religious morality into contact with his early modern vision of cutthroat economics. The medieval morality play's overall dramatic trajectory is retained, in that desirable values are established through the negation of their opposites: killing a personification of greed is a reminder to the audience of the behaviour's perils and a call to remain on the proper side of judgment. However, while Marlowe's play uses the established connection between communal morality and performance as its foundational framework, Marlowe also infuses his characters with contextual associations drawn from his increasingly commercial world. Doing so, especially in light of the play's deployment of a model of public punishment as part of its theatrical experience, produces the marginalized figure of Barabas as an embodiment of new notions of morality's intersection with business. This arrangement is further complicated by the metanarrative association drawn between Barabas and the audience. Destroying Barabas is a gesture of political effacement that attempts to reaffirm collective cultural values by means of a disavowal of the values he represents, but participation in this ideological reconfirmation is also an act of self-monitoring due to the universal reach of Barabas's monetized world. Marlowe's play recognizes, through characters such as Ferneze, the impossibility of not engaging with the increasingly commercial world, and offers as a solution to this dubious moral stance the punishment of its most egregious offenders.

Early modern English playwrights wrote for a nation plagued by economic turmoil. A predominantly urban merchant class, fuelled by increasing governmental acceptance of mercantilist policies, was quickly gaining prominence in England's economy at the expense of traditional financial structures and arrangements, and a growing middle class and the weakened gentry both suffered under the twin pressures of constant severe inflation and vast debts. Amidst widespread poverty and homelessness, corporations were beginning their first forays into systems of wage labour and Transatlantic slavery. Most crucially, the English people were more aware than ever before of the circumstances of the world around them: the emergence of "pamphlets of varying reliability" and "manuscript newsletters," as well as the commentary provided by "merchants and those close to the pulse of the court and political life" (Raymond 99) inundated the English with a wealth of information about the world with an unprecedented speed. Within this growth, there was also "an explosion of business newspapers" (McCusker 145) that tracked the daily developments of finance and commerce in London. Drama provided, among its other functions, an opportunity to condense and to reflect on some of the contents of this massive volume.

The institutions of trade, labour, and slavery would later emerge as fundamental to the English colonial empire, but they would also provoke a thorough interrogation of how economic theories were to be reconciled with philosophical, legal, and political debates over the individual being's role and place within these vast systems. In the midst of these debates, playwrights seized elements of these various discourses and produced public performances that found meanings not only within their fictions but as vehicles to explicate, denounce, promote, or rationalize the vast economic changes sweeping through their nation. An examination of the early modern period's contemporary drama, cognizant of the contextualization provided by fine-grained historical analyses, reveals the numerous ways in which theatrical performance, a commercial enterprise so deeply enmeshed with more ephemeral social and cultural values, played a key role in turning abstract and impersonal economic philosophies into a series of more manageable forms for consumption by the English public. From this perspective, early modern drama is a rejection of money's imperative imaginative power: drama undermines the dominating discourse of economics by incorporating money into its fictions and forcing money's emblematic representations to listen, to obey, and to perform.

# NOTES

[1] This last scene can be seen in its entirety at the following address: <http://youtu.be/KnmzcHSCn0c>.

[2] See E.K. Hunt and Mark Lautzenheiser's *History of Economic Thought*, especially Chapter 10, for an overview of Jevons, Menger, and Walras and their works on utility theory.

[3] Responses to Klamer's Lyotardian criticism have been varied. Jack Amariglio and David F. Ruccio have approached Klamer's argument with a deconstructionist methodology, positing in short that the human subject never existed in a fully realized form in economic theory: "the corporeal, sensate body elevated to the privileged status of a first principle" (*Postmodernism, Economics, and Knowledge* 143) is a historical fallacy and has instead been represented through a variety of "orders" that, through the bias of focus, have come to represent different aspects of the human subject throughout periods: there has been "a change in the conception of the human body" [...] as it is thought or represented in economic discourse" ("Modern Economics" 85). George DeMartino argues for the necessity of professional ethics in economics both in theory and as a regulatory body, thereby tacitly agreeing with Klamer that a human dimension to economics is at least partially absent. S. Charusheela questions the viability of Klamer's ideal human subject on the grounds that such figures always exist in some form of

abstraction and remove from reality. The variability necessary for the subject's construction in discourse is always informed and modified by individual circumstance, resulting in Charusheela's challenge to find a means of representing the human without stumbling into the pitfalls of ethnocentrism or "a cultural relativism that reinforces patriarchy" (197). Ulla Grapard and Julie Nelson have similarly raised concerns regarding the need to include alternative discourses and perspectives in any such project that seeks to redefine the human subject in more individualized terms.

[4] See Mark Netzloff's "The Lead Casket: Capital, Mercantilism, and *The Merchant of Venice*" in Linda Woodbridge's collection *Money and the Age of Shakespeare*.

[5] See Pelteret 193.

[6] See Brown; Carey; and Headley, particularly Chapter 2, "The Universalizing Principle and the Idea of a Common Humanity" for further details.

[7] See Kelsey for an exhaustive study of Hawkins's life.

[8] James gives the estimated costs:

> The transatlantic fare was about £5 a person, to which had to be added the price of food during the voyage, and freightage was £4 a ton. An English yeoman farmer with his family and their farming implements and domestic utensils would expect to pay at least £100 for transit to North America. Given that such a man's annual income might be between £40 and £60, if he wished to emigrate, he would be forced to sell his land. In other words, his decision to leave would have to be final (L. James 39).

[9] See Simmons.

[10] See Harris and Korda's *Staged Properties* for a study of how commodities drawn from colonial holdings influenced London's domestic spheres.

[11] Numerous period plays feature plots or references to the threat of pirates: part of Othello's speech to the council justifying his love for Desdemona recounts "Of being taken by the insolent foe / And sold to slavery, of my redemption thence" (1.3.155-6); similarly, Massinger's *The Renegado* and Heywood's *The Captives* are built around characters taken as slaves by pirates.

[12] See definitions 1.b. and 1.c. of "slave" in the *OED*.

[13] See also Skura's article, "Discourse and the Individual: The Case of Colonialism in *The Tempest*," for another analysis of political readings of the play.

[14] This is not to perform a kind of historical revision on Shakespeare's work and to claim its intention of serving as a proto-postcolonial text, nor do I intend to perform the kind of interpretive de-racialization Kim F. Hall has criticized in her book *Things of Darkness: Economies of Race and Gender in Early Modern England*. Such a distinction, however, allows for an analysis of England's fraught history with slavery prior to and during its embedment within colonialism and opens up an interpretive approach applicable to instances of slaves other than as racialized bodies, such as classed and historically located ones.

[15] See Césaire's *Une Tempête: A tempest: based on Shakespeare's The Tempest: adaptation pour un théâtre nègre* and Greenblatt's "Learning to Curse: Aspects of Linguistic Colonialism in the Sixteenth Century" in *Learning to Curse: Essays in Early Modern Culture*.

[16] The temporary condition of Ariel's service seems to suggest a more contractual understanding of his employment. Prospero states that the terms of Ariel's service are dependent on time: Prospero asks if Ariel should be released "[b]efore the time be out?" (1.2.247). Ariel similarly responds by stating that his obligation was for a fixed period: "Thou did promise / To bate me a full year" (1.2.249-50).

[17] Interestingly, Caliban seems to wrestle also with the paratextual voice: the play's *dramatis personae* presents Caliban with the oft-quoted description, "a salvage and deformed slave." The nuances and implications of this title are particularly pronounced, given the way Caliban enacts part of his resistance through language. While it would be too extreme to call this a case of an unreliable narrator or a trans-and-meta-narrative battle, the discrepancy between the paratextual elements and the development of the named character poses numerous questions: is the audience supposed to side with Prospero in labelling Caliban a slave? Does the audience's acceptance of the *dramatis personae* title thus place them in an analogue to the narrative conflict, playing the part of Prospero and Miranda, who relentlessly attempt to inscribe Caliban as "slave" and are resisted by his linguistic manoeuvres?

[18] See Williams; Bennett; and Lindley's introduction to the New Cambridge Shakespeare edition of *The Tempest*.

[19] See Frank for a similar interpretation.

[20] My translation:

> After all, we would have to populate the island. People are worth something. Her father owed me a salary. I chopped his wood, I lit his fire, I carried the water; without me, he would have known neither fields nor trees.

[21] See Mason's *Prospero's Magic: Some Thoughts on Class and Race*.

[22] See also Goldberg, especially Chapter Two, "Caliban's Woman."

[23]A variation of this phrase, "half a fish and half a monster," appears in *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*. In Scene 5, one of the three Fishermen remarks that the "porpoise" is said to be "half fish, half flesh" (5.66), furthering culturally-contextual imagery that may not be entirely coincidental. In Chapman, Jonson, and Marston's *Eastward Ho*, Drawer speaks these lines:

> Sir Petronel, here's one of your watermen come to tell you it will be flood these three hours; and that 't will be dangerous going against the tide – for the sky is overcast, and there was a porpoise even now seen at London Bridge, which is always the messenger of tempests, he says. (3.3.153-8)

Robert Chester's 1611 *The annuals of great Brittaine* contains a similar mention:

> Here swimmes the Ray, the Sea-calfe and the Porpoise·
> That doth betoken raine or stormes of weather [...] (100)

The portentous porpoise reappears in Charles Croke's 1667 *Fortune's uncertainty, or, Youth's unconstancy* (published posthumously):

> no Sun appeared in many weeks to direct the Seaman's observation; nothing but showers and blustring storms; the Porpoises skipping and swarming about the Ships, plainly told them of their present dangers; and the hourly spectacles of most sad and lamentable Shipwracks portended their own destructions, without an Almighty Providence [...] (55-6)

The associative link between the "half flesh" porpoise and tempests and ill omens may serve to explain further the provenance of Trinculo's comment in addition to expanding the impact of its narrative context, and may also indicate the pervasiveness of the animal analogies in *The Tempest* and how they operated within larger cultural thought and trends.

[24] Part of MS Egerton 1994 at the British Library.

[25] See Chapter X.i of F.S. Boas' *Shakespeare & The Universities* for a detailed account of the play's plot.

[26] "faire Copy" is unclear and has been disputed: "Scholars divide over whether Herbert writes 'fairer Copy' or 'faire Copy' in the third last line" (Werstine). See Adams 35 (1917), Walter 125 (1933), and Ioppolo 78 (2006), who read 'faire'; Boas 184 (1923), Greg 1:301 (1931), and Bawcutt 180 (1996) read 'fairer.'

[27] Mountfort's usage of *Committee* is a now-obsolete meaning of the word. The *OED* entry for *Committee*, under entry 1.c, explains that it was "The title of each of the 24 directors elected annually by the East India Company to manage its affairs." The play's Committees (1 and 2) thus refer to individuals.

[28] See 3.3.1685-1745 for the full passage in which the EIC defence addresses compensation and insurance policies.

[29] Parliamentary records from the early seventeenth century, available online at www.nationalarchives.gov.uk, show numerous instances of grievances filed against the EIC over several decades. For example, a petition heard on August 24th, 1623 is recorded as follows:

> Petition of Rose Fuller, a poor widow. Petitioner's late husband, Robert Fuller, was employed as a chirurgeon by the East India Company and died about four years since, having made his will, leaving petitioner sole executrix.

> Prays that the Company may be ordered to pay her the residue of the sum due from them to her late husband.

Numerous similar cases can be found in the database, with a noticeably large number of them concerning unpaid dues or complaints lodged by rival merchants regarding EIC practices.

[30] Luke Wilson examines Daniel Defoe's *Essay Upon Projects* (1697) and its classification of the human body into constituent parts that, once insured, are attributed a particular value. These partitions are, as Wilson specifically points out, "primarily interested in the monetary value not of a human life but of parts of the body" (20). Additionally, Wilson draws attention to the existence of similar tables of value in Anglo-Saxon legal documents, such as the Laws of Ethelbert and the *Leges Henrici Primi*, and identifies them as "conceptually and legally distinct" (20) legal tools from *wergild*. As a result, these rationalizations and valuations of the human body are defined by the isolation of "nonfatal bodily injuries as a distinct conceptual category" (21). Wilson's case study, *The Merchant of Venice*, neatly demonstrates how early modern systems of monetary valuation engaged with human subjects, with particular emphasis on how the correlation between insurance and cost can entail a bidirectional system. Antonio and Shylock's arrangement dramatizes such a problem: Shylock uses a system of value nominally concerned with the body that "acquires value only in its loss or waste" (30) but arranges it to focus on his gain – the pound of flesh he demands as payment, despite the flesh's lack of practical utility. In other words, Shylock manipulates a judicial system arranged on the negative relationship – insurance for the loss of body parts in a commercial enterprise – to demand compensation for his financial losses. If employees

can demand money in exchange for losing body parts, then the employer, in Shylock's reductive estimation, can similarly demand body parts for monetary losses incurred by their debtors.

[31] See Johnson's "The Money=Blood Metaphor, 1300-1800."

[32] See Netzloff's *England's Internal Colonies*.

[33] There are some discrepancies in the etymological history. In addition to being a synonym for *cancer*, *canker*, as Slack notes, in many instances has the more modern meaning of *canker* in early modern and medieval texts ("canker in mouth" [Slack 263]) alongside more general usage as a term for ulcerous sores. Additionally, *cancer* itself is mentioned in parish records (Forbes 130). The *OED* suggests that *canker* may have also referred to gangrene, and Slack posits another possible overlap with thrush. The term's ambiguity is most likely a result in poor understanding of the various illnesses themselves, but Malynes's usage of *canker* as a metaphor intended to indicate the type, range, and severity of England's problems seems to favour cancer (i.e., malignant growth) as the probable meaning of *canker*.

[34] See *OED* entry for *cancer*, definition 3.a., quotation 1601: "1601 P. HOLLAND tr. Pliny *Hist. World II*. Gloss., Cancer is a swelling or sore comming of melancholy bloud, about which the veins appeare of a blacke or swert colour, spread in manner of a Creifish clees."

[35] See Korda's *Shakespeare's Domestic Economies* for an in-depth study of commodities in the English economy.

[36] It should be noted here that the cankers afflicting humans and those afflicting other organisms were of two distinct registers: without the much later discovery of cytology to

unite human, animal, and plant, the shared application of *canker* stemmed more from metaphorical and observational similarity rather than scientific basis. Further compounding the term's freight was a metaphorical meaning much like our contemporary usage of *cancer*, in which *canker* referred to any generalized malignant or destructive influences.

[37] Thomas Dekker and Philip Massinger's 1622 play *The Virgin Martyr*.

[38] John Dryden's 1673 play *Amboyna, or the Cruelties of the Dutch to the English Merchants* is a highly fictionalized retelling of this event, reworked to include cues contemporary to the Third Anglo-Dutch War, which was in progress at the time, in order to present a topical piece.

[39] The torture inflicted on the English captives is described by Mountfort as "fire & water two merciles elements inflicted in such / abundant measure, as heretofore hath beene vnheard of" (2.1.1095-6). According to the account given in *Littell's Living Age* Vol. 147, issue 1894 (1880), the "fire" consisted of

> [burning] the bottoms of his feet with lighted candles until the fat dropped from them; they also burned the palms of his hands and under his armpits until his inwards might evidently be seen[,]

and

> Occasionally these torments were varied by incisions being made in the breasts of the unhappy captives, which were filled with [gun]powder and then ignited.

Furthermore, *Littell* also makes clear that "water" refers to waterboarding:

> A cloth was then bound round the lower part of the face of the victim, tight at the throat and loose at the nose, water was now poured gently upon the head, until the cloth was full to the mouth and nostrils, so that the prisoner could not draw breath without sucking in the water, "which, being continually poured in, came out of his nose, ears, and eyes, causing the greatest agony, till he became insensible." This result attained, the tortured man was taken down quickly and made to vomit the water. ("Records" 592)

The severity of this torture proved to be a source of national outrage once the news reached England: "When the news of the Amboyna massacre reached England, the greatest excitement prevailed. The nation cried out loudly for revenge, and our ambassador at the Hague was instructed to demand reparation from the Dutch" ("Records" 593). Given that this episode was already a part of general public knowledge and the antagonism between the English and the Dutch no secret, it is unclear why the passage is stricken from Mountfort's manuscript. Political sensitivity, as opposed to outright secrecy, appears more likely.

[40] See Jardine and Mukerji for some general studies on the rise of European consumerism.

[41] English bullionism was a popular model of economic thought preceding the mercantile era. Bullionist theory held that the nation's wealth was defined by the amount of precious metals (gold and silver) that it controlled, and that strict measures to regulate the influx and export of these metals was the key to the nation's economic health. In addition, bullionists "embraced the price-specie flow model [...] to explain how a country's money supply would fluctuate automatically under the gold standard to correct external

imbalances and reestablish international equilibrium" (Helleiner 82). Mercantilism retained this emphasis on trade regulation, but expanded its definition of wealth to include also non-monetary items such as raw materials and produced trade goods.

[42] A comment should be made here regarding Joan's attack on Orleans and Talbot's claim of witchcraft and the problematic nature of the play itself. Until 5.3's appearance of the demons, the play's author(s) leaves ambiguous the source of Joan's power. The English forces' weakness is certainly a factor, as is Talbot's inability to anticipate or deal with guerrilla tactics, but it is conceivable to read Joan's character, at least until Act 5, as a superior warrior in her own right and potentially possessed of the favour of "Heaven and Our Lady gracious" (1.2.75). Talbot's accusations of witchcraft, then, can possibly be read as the desperate insults of a befuddled man unable to find his footing in the modern world; however, the introduction of the fiends later in the play retroactively removes such blame from Talbot by formalizing Joan's connection to the demonic. Such a heavy-handed scene thus absolves Talbot and the English of some of their failures and also cements the reassurance that God, after all, was not on the side of the French. Removing the ambiguity is crucial to the play's propagandist value, and yet the clumsiness and abruptness of 5.3 undoes much of the work accomplished by the play's previous acts. The possible validity of arguments for a multi-authored text is outside the purview of my work here, but the schisms between Joan's various characterizations and their bearing on the other parts of the play warrant a mention.

[43] For further reading on the subject, please see Schofield, Mathias, Kerridge, Briggs, and Leinwand.

[44] See Nugent's "Usury and Counterfeiting in Wilson's *The Three Ladies of London* and *The Three Lords and Three Ladies of London*, and in Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure*" in *Money and the Age of Shakespeare*; Shapiro's *Shakespeare and the Jews*; and Dubrow's "'I would I were at home': Representations of Dwelling Places and Havens in *Cymbeline*" in *Shakespeare and Historical Formalism.*

[45] Glyn Davies speaks to the quasi-barter nature of the English economy during this period and the poor ability for goods to step in for coins as an exchange currency:

> In particular, spices could not long command high scarcity prices, except initially in Europe; and even here the natural scarcities, intensified by artificial "corners," were in due course interspersed by long unprofitable periods of "glut." In other words there was a *limited* market in spices compared with an almost unlimited market for the precious metals. A few bags of pepper unloaded in Amsterdam or London could quickly depress its price far more than many tons of silver could depress the price of silver. (Davies 184)

[46] Blanchard 1070.

[47] For a detailed survey of the debate surrounding the *Henry VI* plays' chronology, see Chapter 1 of Nicholas Grene's *Shakespeare's Serial History Plays*. Most pertinent to my work here is the notion that "whereas *1 Henry VI* shows a detailed awareness of the later two parts, *2* and *3 Henry VI* do not seem to require knowledge of the first part" (14).

[48] Many scholars have discussed the social complexities involved in clothing; see Susan Vincent's *Dressing the Elite* and Valerie Wayne's "Assuming Gentility" for just some examples.

[49] John Wasson's research suggests an alternative explanation for this survival. In his chapter in *The Drama of the Middle Ages*, Wasson argues that morality plays received little critical or political pressure because they were simply unimportant: Corpus Christi plays were frequently staged in numerous settings, but he interprets the lack of references to morality-play performances in contemporary records to indicate that morality plays had little influence or presence in the public sphere. See Wasson for further details; see also Lawrence Clopper's *Drama, Play, and Game* on the emergence of antitheatrical movements in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

[50] In her article, Wertz theorizes that the universal character of Mankind-type figures in earlier morality plays such as *Castle* was the result of two primary factors. The first factor is the diversity of the audiences for whom dramas of this era were performed. The general public, "newly rich merchants," and "the old feudal landowners" (89) all attended these plays and the "marginal situation of the wandering actors" (86) required plays to speak to a generalized, inoffensive appeal. The second factor is the cultural shock experienced by the English following the Black Death of 1348-49: the annihilation of huge swaths of the population by "Death the Leveller [who] struck all classes equally" (86) served to produce, to some extent, the idea of "Mankind's classlessness" (86). This situation changed in the sixteenth century: following the Reformation's termination of the Mystery Cycles and the removal of "the amateur burghers from competition" (89), playwrights came into possession of the opportunity necessary for the production of more finely-tuned and classed characters.

[51] For ease of reference, I have used Alexandra F. Johnston's modernization of the text (available online) for my quotations and the line references here. I have checked these lines against Mark Eccles's edition of the play, on which Johnston's work is based.

[52] See James Shapiro's *Shakespeare and the Jews*; Chapter 2 of his book undertakes a study of the history of Jewish populations in England.

[53] The public execution of Roderigo Lopez in 1594, which has been hypothesized to have influenced Shakespeare's writing of *The Merchant of Venice*, is one such historical example of the foreigner's assumed guilt and the xenophobic and anti-Semitic attitudes that informed such judgments. See Frank Felsenstein's *Anti-Semitic Stereotypes*, especially Chapter 7, for an overview of this theory.

[54] "I am always nearest to myself."

[55] Many of elements found in Barabas's soliloquy are contrary to the idealized notions of a nation's financial health and proper merchant responsibility extolled by Mountfort's *The Launching of the Mary*. For example, rendering money inert is a rejection of an economic doctrine that holds activity and movement as the ideal conditions for economic prosperity. See Chapter Two for further information.

[56] In early April of 2011, Toyota, Ford, and Nissan announced temporary plant closures in factories across North America over the course of the following months due to a shortage of critical parts as a result of production disruptions in Japan (Schreiner).

[57] As of 10 June 2011, the American Red Cross has donated \$210 million USD for relief efforts and aid to Japan ("American Red Cross").

[58] See "Oil Prices Rise Again."

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Jr., Joseph Quincy. "The Authorship of Two Seventeenth Century Plays." *Modern Language Notes* 22.5 (May 1907): 135-37. Print.

---. *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels, 1623-1673*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1917. Print.

Agnew, Jean-Christope. *Worlds Apart: The Market and the Theater in Anglo-American Thought, 1550-1750*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1986. Print.

Amariglio, Jack and David F. Ruccio. "From Unity to Dispersion: The Body in Modern Economic Discourse." *Postmodernism, Economics and Knowledge*. Eds. Stephen Cullenberg, Jack Amariglio, and David F. Ruccio. New York: Routledge, 2001. 143-65. Print.

---. "Modern economics: the case of the disappearing body?" *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 26 (2002): 81-103. Print.

---. *Postmodern Moments in Modern Economics*. New Jersey: Princeton UP, 2003. Print.

"American Psycho end Scene." *Youtube.com*. 21 Feb. 2008. Web. 15 June 2011.

"American Red Cross Investments in Japan Disaster Response Reach Nearly $210 Million." American Red Cross. 10 June 2011. Web. 14 June 2011.

Andrews, Kenneth R. *Trade, Plunder and Settlement: Maritime Enterprise and the Genesis of the British Empire, 1480-1630*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1984. Print.

*Arden of Faversham*. Ed. Martin White. London: A & C Black, 2007. Print.

Ashcroft, Bill. *Caliban's Voice: The Transformation of English in Post-Colonial Literatures*. New York: Routledge, 2009. Print.

Backhouse, Roger. *Economists and the Economy: The Evolution of Economic Ideas.* 2nd ed. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, 1994. Print.

Bawcutt, N. W. *The Control and Censorship of Caroline Drama: The Records of Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels 1623-73.* Oxford: Clarendon P, 1996. Print.

Benedictow, Ole Jorgen. *The Black Death, 1346-1353: The Complete History*. Rochester, NY: Boydell & Brewer P, 2006. Print.

Bennett, Susan. *Performing Nostalgia: Shifting Shakespeare and the Contemporary Past*. New York: Routledge, 1996. Print.

Bevington, David. "1 Henry VI." *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works: The Histories*. Eds. Richard Dutton and Jean Elizabeth Howard. New Jersey: Blackwell Publishing, 2003. 308-24. Print.

---. *From Mankind to Marlowe: Growth of Structure in the Popular Drama of Tudor England*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1962. Print.

---. "Introduction." *The Jew of Malta*. Ed. David Bevington. New York: Manchester UP, 1997. Print.

Blanchard, Ian. *Mining, Metallurgy, and Minting in the Middle Ages: Continuing Afro-European Supremacy, 1250-1450*. Wiesbaden, Germany: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2005. Print.

Bloom, Harold. "Introduction." *Caliban*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1992. 1-4. Print.

Boas, Frederick S. *Shakespeare and the Universities*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1923. Print.

Bolland, O. Nigel. "Colonization and Slavery in Central America." *Unfree Labour in the Development of the New World*. Eds. Paul E. Lovejoy and Nicholas Rogers. London: Frank Cass & Co., 1994. Print.

Bowers, Rick. *Radical Comedy in Early Modern England: Contexts, Cultures, Performances*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2008. Print.

Braddick, Michael J. *State Formation in Early Modern England, c. 1550-1700*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2000. Print.

Briggs, Chris. "Creditors and debtors and their relationships at Oakington, Cottenham and Dry Dayton (Cambridgeshire), 1291-1350." *Credit and Debt in Medieval England, c. 1180-c.1350*. Eds. P.R. Schofield and N.J. Mayhew. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2002. 127-48. Print.

Brooks, C.W. and Michael Lobban. *Lawyers, Litigation, and English Society since 1450*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, 1997. Print.

Brown, Christopher Leslie. *Moral Capital: Foundations of British Abolitionism*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2006. Print.

Brown, Dorothy H. *Christian Humanism in the Late English Morality Plays*. Florida: UP of Florida, 1999. Print.

Bucholz, Robert and Newton Key. *Early Modern England 1485-1714: A Narrative History*. 2nd ed. New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons, 2009. Print.

Calbi, Maurizio. *Approximate Bodies: Gender and Power in Early Modern Drama and Anatomy*. New York: Routledge, 2005. Print.

Callaghan, Dympna. *Shakespeare Without Women*. New York: Routledge, 2000. Print.

Camino, Mercedes Maroto. "'That Map Which Deep Impression Bears': The Politics of Conquest in Shakespeare's *Lucrece*." *Shakespeare: World Views*. Eds. Heather Kerr, Robin Eaden, and Madge Mitton. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1996. 124-45. Print.

Cannon, J.A. "serfdom." *The Oxford Companion to British History*. Ed John Cannon. *Oxford Reference Online*. 2009. Web. 21 April 2011.

Carey, Brycchan. *British Abolitionism and the Rhetoric of Sensibility: Writing, Sentiment, and Slavery, 1760-1807*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. Print.

Carroll, William C. *Fat King, Lean Beggar: Representations of Poverty in the Age of Shakespeare*. New York: Cornell UP, 1996. Print.

Cartwright, Kent. *Theatre and Humanism: English Drama in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1999. Print.

Castaldo, Annalisa. "'These were spectacles to please my soul': Inventive Violence in the Renaissance Revenge Tragedy." *Staging Pain, 1580-1800: Violence and Trauma in British Theater*. Eds. James Robert Allard and Mathew R. Martin. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2009. 49-56. Print.

Césaire, Aimé. *A Tempest: Based on Shakespeare's* The Tempest*: Adaptation for a Black Theatre*. Trans. Philip Crispin. London: Oberon Books, 2000. Print.

"Charter Granted by James I and Dating 31st May 1609, Confirming and Extending the Charter of Elizabeth." *Charters Relating to the East India Company From 1600 to 1761: Reprinted from a former collection with some additions and a preface*. Ed. John Shaw. Madras: The Government P, 1887. 16-31. Print.

Charusheela, S. “Women’s Choices and the Ethnocentrism/Relativism Dilemma.” *Postmodernism, Economics and Knowledge*. Eds. Stephen Cullenberg, Jack Amariglio and David F. Ruccio. New York: Routledge, 2001. 197-220. Print.

Chester, Robert. *The anuals of great Brittaine. Or, A most excellent monument wherein may be seene all the antiquities of this kingdome, to the satisfac ion both of the vniuersities, or any other place stirred with emulation of long continuance. Excellently figured out in a worthy poem*. London, 1611. *Early English Books Online*. Web. 25 April 2011.

Chernaik, Warren L. *The Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare’s History Plays*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2007. Print.

Christensen, Ann. “‘Absent, Weak, or Unserviceable’: The East India Company and the Domestic Economy in *The Launching of the Mary, or The Seaman’s Honest Wife*.” *Global Traffic: Discourses and Practices of Trade in English Literature and Culture from 1550 to 1700*. Eds. Barbara Sebek and Stephen Deng. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008. 117-36. Print.

Clopper, Lawrence M. *Drama, Play, and Game: English Festive Culture in the Medieval and Early Modern Period*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2001. Print.

Cohen, Derek. *Searching Shakespeare: Studies in Culture and Authority*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2003. Print.

Cohen, Stephen. *Shakespeare and Historical Formalism*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2007. Print.

Coupland, Sir Reginald. *The British Anti-Slavery Movement*. London: Frank Cass & Co., 1964. Print.

Covington, Sarah. “Cutting, Branding, Whipping, Burning: The Performance of Judicial Wounding in Early Modern England.” *Staging Pain, 1500-1800: Violence and Trauma in British Theatre*. Eds. James Robert Allard and Mathew R. Martin. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2009. 93-110. Print.

Cox, Nancy C. and Karin Dannehl. *Perceptions of Retailing in Early Modern England*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2007. Print.

Croke, Charles. *Fortune's uncertainty, or, Youth's unconstancy wherein is contained a true and impartial account of what hapned in the space of a few years to the author, whom you will know in this ensuing discourse by the name of Rodolphvs.* London, 1667. *Early English Books Online*. Web. 25 April 2011.

Curth, Louise Hill. *English Almanacs, Astrology & Popular Medicine*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2007. Print.

Daniell, Christopher. *Death and Burial in Medieval England, 1066-1550*. New York: Routledge, 1998. Print.

Davenport, William Anthony. *Fifteenth-Century English Drama: The Early Moral Plays and their Literary Relations*. Suffolk: Boydell & Brewer, 1984. Print.

Davies, Glyn. *A History of Money: From Ancient Times to the Present Day*. Cardiff: U of Wales P, 1994. Print.

DeMartino, George. “A Hippocratic Oath for Economists? On the Need for and Content of a Professional Economic Ethics.” *Future Directions for Heterodox Economics*. Eds. John T. Harvey and Robert F. Garnett, Jr.. Michigan: The U of Michigan P, 2008. 116-24. Print.

Dessen, Alan C. "*Edward II* and Residual Allegory." *Christopher Marlowe the Craftsman: Lives, Stage, and Page*. Eds. Sarah K. Scott and M.L. Stapleton. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2010. 63-78. Print.

Dolan, Frances E. "The Subordinate('s) Plot: Petty Treason and the Forms of Domestic Rebellion." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 43.3 (Autumn 1992): 317-40. Print.

Dow, George Francis. *Slave Ships and Slaving*. New York: Courier Dover Publications, 2002. Print.

Draper, John W. "Monster Caliban." *Caliban*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1992. 89-94. Print.

Dubrow, Heather. "'I would I were at home': Representations of Dwelling Places and Havens in *Cymbeline*." *Shakespeare and Historical Formalism*. Ed. Stephen Cohen. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2007. 69-94. Print.

Dunlop, Fiona S. *The Late Medieval Interlude: The Drama of Youth and Aristocratic Masculinity*. Rochester, N.Y.: Boydell & Brewer P, 2007. Print.

Eltis, David. "Slavery and Freedom in the Early Modern World." *Terms of Labor: Slavery, Serfdom, and Free Labor*. Ed. Stanley L. Engerman. Palo Alto: Stanford UP, 1999. 25-49. Print.

Engle, Lars. *Shakespearean Pragmatism: Market of His Time*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1993. Print.

*Everyman and Medieval Miracle Plays*. Ed. A.C. Cawley. London: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1967. Print.

Felsenstein, Frank. *Anti-Semitic Stereotypes: A Paradigm of Otherness in English Popular Culture, 1660-1830*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins UP, 1999. Print.

Fenton, Roger. *A Treatise of Usurie*. London. 1612. Print.

Fitzpatrick, Joan. *Food in Shakespeare: Early Modern Dietaries and the Plays*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2007. Print.

Forbes, Thomas R. "By what disease or casualty: the changing face of death in London." *Health, Medicine, and Mortality in the Sixteenth Century*. Ed. Charles Webster. New York: Cambridge UP, 1979. 117-40. Print.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. Toronto: Random House of Canada, 1995. Print.

---. *The History of Sexuality. Vol 1, An Introduction*. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage Books, 1980. Print.

Frank, Mike. "Shakespeare's Existential Comedy." *Major Literary Characters: Caliban*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1992. 109-23. Print.

Franssen, Paul. "A Muddy Mirror." *Constellation Caliban: Figurations of a Character*. Eds. Nadia Lie and Theo d'Haen. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1997. 23-42. Print.

Friedman, Alice T. "Inside Out: Women, Domesticity, and the Pleasures of the City." *Material London, ca. 1600*. Ed. Lena Cowen Orlin. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2000. 232-50. Print.

Friedman, Yvonne. *Encounter Between Enemies: Captivity and Ransom in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem*. Boston: Brill, 2002. Print.

Gaskill, Malcolm. *Crime and Mentalities in Early Modern England*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2003. Print.

Goldberg, Jonathan. *Tempest in the Caribbean*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2003. Print.

Gowing, Laura. *Domestic Dangers: Women, Words, and Sex in Early Modern London*. New York: Oxford UP, 1998. Print.

---. "Ordering the body: illegitimacy and female authority in seventeenth-century England." *Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Britain and Ireland*. Eds. Michael J. Braddick and John Walter. New York: Cambridge UP, 2001. 43-62. Print.

Grapard, Ulla. "The Trouble with Women and Economics: A Postmodern perspective on Charlotte Perkins Gilman." *Postmodernism, Economics and Knowledge*. Eds. Stephen Cullenberg, Jack Amariglio and David F. Ruccio. New York: Routledge, 2001. 261-85. Print.

Grav, Peter F. *Shakespeare and the Economic Imperative: "What's Aught But as 'tis Valued?"* New York: Routledge, 2008. Print.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Learning to Curse: Essays in Early Modern Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1990. 16-39. Print.

---. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: from More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2005. Print.

Greg, W. W. *Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses: Stage Plots, Actors' Parts, Prompt Books*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1931. Print.

Grene, Nicholas. *Shakespeare's Serial History Plays*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2002. Print.

Griffiths, Trevor R. "'This Island's mine': Caliban and Colonialism." *The Yearbook of English Studies* 13 (1983): 159-80. Print.

Gurr, Andrew. *The Shakespearean Stage 1574-1642*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1992. Print.

Habermann, Ina. *Staging Slander and Gender in Early Modern England*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2003. Print.

Hackett, Helen. *Women and Romance Fiction in the English Renaissance*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2000. Print.

Halasz, Alexandra. *The Marketplace of Print: Pamphlets and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1997. Print.

Hall, Kim F. *Things of Darkness: Economies of Race and Gender in Early Modern England*. New York: Cornell UP, 1995. Print.

Halpern, Richard. "'The picture of Nobody': White Cannibalism in *The Tempest*." *The Production of English Renaissance Culture*. Eds. David Lee Miller, Sharon O'Dair, Harold Weber. New York: Cornell UP, 1994. 262-92. Print.

Harbage, Albert. "Innocent Barabas." *The Tulane Drama Review* 8, 4 (Summer 1964): 47-58. Print.

Harris, Jonathan Gil. *Sick Economies: Drama, Mercantilism, and Disease in Shakespeare's England*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2004. Print.

Harris, Jonathan Gil and Natasha Korda. *Staged Properties in Early Modern English Drama*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2006. Print.

Hattaway, Michael. "Introduction." *The First Part of King Henry VI by William Shakespeare*. Ed. Michael Hattaway. New York: Cambridge UP, 1990. 1-56. Print.

Headley, John M. *The Europeanization of the World: On the Origins of Human Rights and Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2008. Print.

Helleiner, Eric. *The Making of National Money: Territorial Currencies in Historical Perspective*. New York: Cornell UP, 2003. Print.

Herman, Peter C. *A Short History of Early Modern England: British Literature in Context*. New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011. *Google Books*. Web. 4 July 2011.

Hess, Andrew C.. "The Mediterranean and Shakespeare's Geopolitical Imagination." The Tempest *and its Travels*. Eds. Peter Hulme and William Howard Sherman. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2000. 121-30. Print.

Hettinger, Madonna J. "Defining the Servant: Legal and Extra-Legal Terms of Employment in Fifteenth-Century England." *The Work of Work: Servitude, Slavery, and Labor in Medieval England*. Eds. Allen J. Frantzen and Douglas Moffat. Glasglow: Cruithne P, 1994. 206-28. Print.

Hodgett, G.A.J. *Agrarian England in the Later Middle Ages*. London: Historical Association, 1966. Print.

Hoenselaars, A.J. *Images of Englishmen and Foreigners in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries: A Study of Stage Characters and National Identity in English Renaissance Drama, 1558-1642*. New Jersey: Associated UP, 1992. Print.

Holbrook, S. E. "Covetousness, Contrition, and the Town in the Castle of Perseverance." *Fifteenth-Century Studies* 13 (1988): 275–89. Print.

Holstun, James. "Damned Commotion: Riot and Rebellion in Shakespeare's Histories." *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works: The Histories*. Vol. 2. Eds. Richard Dutton and Jean Elizabeth Howard. New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell, 2003. 194-219. Print.

Hunt, E.K. and Mark Lautzenheiser. *History of Economic Thought: A Critical Perspective*. 3rd ed. New York: M.E. Sharpe, 2011. Print.

Hunter, G.K. *Dramatic Identities and Cultural Tradition: Studies in Shakespeare and his Contemporaries: Critical Essays*. Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 1978. Print.

Ioppolo, Grace. *Dramatists and their Manuscripts in the Age of Shakespeare, Jonson, Middleton, and Heywood*. London: Routledge, 2006. Print.

James, Heather. *Shakespeare's Troy: Drama, Politics, and the Translation of Empire*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1997. Print.

James, Lawrence. *The Rise and Fall of the British Empire*. New York: Macmillan St. Martin's Griffin, 1995. Print.

Jankowski, Theodora A. "'The scorne of Savage people': Virginity as 'Forbidden Sexuality' in John Lyly's Love's Metamorphosis." *Renaissance Drama* NS 24. Ed. Mary Beth Rose. Illinois: Northwestern UP, 1995. 123-54. Print.

Jardine, Lisa. *Worldly Goods: A New History of the Renaissance.* New York: Nan A. Talese, 1996. Print.

Jerz, Dennis G. *Technology in American Drama, 1920-1950: Soul and Society in the Age of the Machine*. Connecticut: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2003. Print.

Jobson, Richard. "The Golden Trade, Part VI." *The Golden Trade*. Ed. James Eason. Web. 2 Nov, 2009.

Johnson, Jerah. "The Money=Blood Metaphor, 1300-1800." *The Journal of Finance*, 21.1 (March 1966): 119-22. Print.

Johnston, Alexandra F. "*The Castle of Perseverance*." 1999. Web. 4 July 2011.

Jones, Peter Murray. "Image, Word, and Medicine in the Middle Ages." *Visualizing Medieval Medicine and Natural History, 1200-1550*. Eds. Jean A. Givens, Karen M. Reeds, Alain Touwaide. Cornwall: MPG Books, 2006. 1-24. Print.

Kallendorf, Hilaire. *Exorcism and its Texts: Subjectivity in Early Modern Literature of England and Spain*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2003. Print.

Kearney, James Joseph. *The Incarnate Text: Imagining the Book in Reformation England*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2009. Print.

Keller, James. "Drama, Medieval." *Encyclopedia of Medieval Literature*. Eds. Robert T. Lambdin and Laura C. Lambdin. Connecticut: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2000. 152-61. Print.

Kelsey, Harry. *Sir John Hawkins: Queen Elizabeth's Slave Trader*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2003. Print.

Kerridge, Eric. *Trade and Banking in Early Modern England*. New York: St. Martin's P, 1988. Print.

Kitch, Aaron. *Political Economy and the States of Literature in Early Modern England*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2009. Print.

Klamer, Arjo. "Late Modernism and the Loss of Character." *Postmodernism, Economics and Knowledge*. Eds. Stephen Cullenberg, Jack Amariglio and David F. Ruccio. New York: Routledge, 2001. 77-101. Print.

Korda, Natasha. *Shakespeare's Domestic Economies: Gender and Property in Early Modern England*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2002. Print.

Kusunoki, Akiko. "'Their Testament at their Apron Strings': The Representation of Puritan Women in Early-Seventeenth-Century-England." *Gloriana's Face: Women, Public and Private in the English Renaissance*. Eds. S. P. Cerasano and Marion Wynne-Davies. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1992. 185-204. Print.

Lachmann, Richard. *Capitalists in Spite of Themselves: Elite Conflict and Economic Transitions in Early Modern Europe*. New York: Oxford UP, 2000. Print.

Latham, Jacqueline E.M. "*The Tempest* and King James's *Daemonologie*." *Major Literary Characters: Caliban*, Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1992. 151-58. Print.

Leggatt, Alexander. "The Death of John Talbot." *Shakespeare's English Histories: A Quest for Form and Genre*. Ed. John W. Velz. Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997. 11-30. Print.

Leinwand, Theodore B. *Theatre, Finance and Society in Early Modern England*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1999. Print.

Lerer, Seth. "'Representd now in yower sight': The Culture of Spectactorship in Late-Fifteenth-Century England." *Bodies and Disciplines: Intersections of Literature and History in Fifteenth-Century England*. Eds. Barbara Hanawalt and David Wallace. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1996. 29-62. Print.

Levin, Carole and John Watkins. *Shakespeare's Foreign Worlds: National and Transnational Identities in the Elizabethan Age*. New York: Cornell UP, 2009. Print.

Levine, Nina. "Extending Credit in the *Henry IV* Plays." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 51, 4 (2000): 403-31. Print.

Lindley, David. "Introduction." *The Tempest*. Ed. David Lindley. New York: Cambridge UP, 2003. Print.

Linton, Joan Pong. *The Romance of the New World: Gender and Literary Formations of English Colonialism*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1998. Print.

Liang, Lloyd and Jennifer Liang. *Anglo-Saxon England*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979. Print.

Lodge, Thomas. *Alarum against Usurers*. London: T. Este, for Sampson Clarke. 1584. *Google Books*. Web. 27 March 2011.

Loomba, Ania. "'Delicious traffick': racial and religious difference on early modern stages." *Shakespeare and Race.* Eds. Catherine M.S. Alexander and Stanley Wells. New York: Cambridge UP, 2000. 203-24. Print.

MacCormack, Geoffrey. "Inheritance and *Wergild* in Early Germanic Law: I." *Irish Jurist*, NS 8 (1973): 143-63. Print.

*The Macro Plays: The Castle of Perseverance, Wisdom, Mankind*. Ed. Mark Eccles. New York: Oxford UP, 1969. Print.

De Malynes, Gerard. *A Treatise of the Canker of Englands Common Wealth*. Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1977. Print.

---. *The Maintenance of Free Trade*. London, 1622. *Early English Books Online*. British Library. Web. July 5th, 2010.

---. *Saint George for England, allegorically described*. London, 1601. *Early English Books Online*. British Library. Web. July 5th, 2010.

Marlowe, Christopher. *The Jew of Malta*. Ed. David Bevington. New York: Manchester UP, 1997. Print.

Mason, Philip. *Prospero's Magic: Some Thoughts on Class and Race*. London: Oxford UP, 1962. Print.

Mathias, Peter. "Risk, credit and kinship in early modern enterprise." *The Early Modern Atlantic Economy*. Eds. John J. McCusker and Kenneth Morgan. New York: Cambridge UP, 2000. 15-35. Print.

McAdam, Ian. *The Irony of Identity: Self and Imagination in the Drama of Christopher Marlowe*. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1999. Print.

McCusker, John J. *Essays in the Economic History of the Atlantic World*. New York: Routledge, 1997. Print.

McCutchan, J. Wilson. "Covetousness in The Castle of Perseverance." *University of Virginia Studies* 4 (1951): 175-91. Print.

McRae, Andrew. *God Speed the Plough: The Representation of Agrarian England, 1500-1660*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1996. Print.

Meagher, John C. *Pursuing Shakespeare's Dramaturgy: Some Contexts, Resources, and Strategies in His Playmaking*. New Jersey: Rosemont Publishing & Printing Corp., 2003. Print.

Melville, Elinor G.K. "Land-Labour Relations in Sixteenth Century Mexico: The Formation of Grazing Haciendas." *Unfree Labour in the Development of the New World*. Eds. Paul E. Lovejoy and Nicholas Rogers. London: Frank Cass & Co., 1994. 26-35. Print.

Monta, Susannah Brietz. *Martyrdom and Literature in Early Modern England*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2005. Print.

Morgan, Kenneth. "Introduction." *The British Transatlantic Slave Trade* Vol. 1. Ed. Kenneth Morgan. Burlington, VT: Pickering and Chatto, 2003. xxxi-lii. Print.

Mountfort, Walter. *The Launching of the Mary or the Seaman's Honest Wife*. 1623. Ed. J.H. Walter. Oxford: Malone Society Reprints, 1933. Print.

Mukerji, Chandra. *From Graven Images: Patterns of Modern Materialism*. New York: Columbia UP, 1983. Print.

Muldrew, Craig. *The Economy of Obligation: The Culture of Credit and Social Relations in Early Modern England*. New York: St. Martin's P, 1998. Print.

Mun, Thomas. *A Discourse of Trade from England unto the East-Indies*, 1621. New York: Facsimile Text Society, 1930. Print.

---. *England's Treasure by Forraign Trade*. Ed. Basil Blackwell. London: Lowe and Brydone, 1928. Print.

Mundill, Robin R. *England's Jewish Solution: Experiment and Expulsion, 1262-1290*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2002. Print.

Murakami, Ineke. *Moral Play and Counterpublic*. New York: Routledge, 2011. Print.

Murphy, Patrick M. "Interpreting the Tempest: A History of its Readings." *The Tempest: Critical Essays*. Ed. Patrick M. Murphy. New York: Routledge, 2001. 3-74. Print.

Nelson, Julie A. "Feminist Economics: Objective, Activist, *And* Postmodern?" *Postmodernism, Economics and Knowledge*. Eds. Stephen Cullenberg, Jack Amariglio, and David F. Ruccio. New York: Routledge, 2001. 286-304. Print.

Netzloff, Mark. *England's Internal Colonies: Class, Capital, and the Literature of Early Modern English Colonialism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. Print.

---. "The Lead Casket: Capital, Mercantilism, and *The Merchant of Venice*." *Money and the Age of Shakespeare: Essays in New Economic Criticism*. Ed. Linda Woodbridge. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. 159-76. Print.

Newhauser, Richard. *The Early History of Greed: The Sin of Avarice in Early Medieval Thought and Literature*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2000. Print.

Nugent, Teresa Lanpher. "Usury and Counterfeiting in Wilson's *The Three Ladies of London* and *The Three Lords and Three Ladies of London*, and in Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure*." *Money and the Age of Shakespeare: Essays in New Economic Criticism*. Ed. Linda Woodbridge. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. 201-18. Print.

"Oil Prices Rise Again as Dollar Weakens." Bloomberg Businessweek. 2 May 2011. Web. 14 June 2011.

Orgel, Stephen. "Introduction." *The Tempest*. Ed. Stephen Orgel. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1987. Print.

Pangallo, Matteo A. "A New Source for a Speech in *The Launching of the Mary*." *Notes and Queries* 53.4 (2006): 528-31. Print.

Pelteret, David A.E. *Slavery in Early Mediaeval England: From the Reign of Alfred until the Twelfth Century*. Rochester, NY: Boydell & Brewer P, 1995. Print.

Potter Jr., Clifton W. "Images of Majesty: Money as Propaganda in Elizabethan England." *Money: Lure, Lore, and Literature*. Ed. John Louis DiGaetani. Conneticut: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1994. 69-76. Print.

Potter, Robert A. *The English Morality Play: Origins, History, and Influence of a Dramatic Tradition*. Boston: Routledge, 1975. Print.

Rackin, Phyllis. "*Henry VI, Part 1*: A Modern Perspective." *Henry VI, Part 1*. Eds. Barbara A. Mowat and Paul Werstine. New York: Washington Square P, 2008. 257-68. Print.

Raymond, Joad. *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2006. Print.

"Records of Early English Adventure." *Littell's Living Age* 147.1894 (October 1880): 579-94. 1880. Web. 12 May 2010.

Reiss, Oscar. *Blacks in Colonial America*. North Carolina: McFarland P, 2006. Print.

Renan, Ernest. *Caliban: suite de La tempête, drame philosphique*. France: Calmann-Lévy, 1878. Print.

Rich, Jennifer A. "Gender and the Market in *Henry VI, I*." *Images of Matter: Essays on British Literature of the Middles Ages and Renaissance. Proceedings of the Eighth Citadel Conference on Literature*, Charleston, South Carolina, 2002. Ed. Yvonne Bruce. Newark: U of Delaware P, 2005. 206-27. Print.

Rickman, Johanna. *Love, Lust, and License in Early Modern England: Illicit Sex and the Nobility*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2008. Print.

Rieger, Gabriel A. *Sex and Satiric Tragedy in Early Modern England: Penetrating Wit*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2009. Print.

Rivers, Theodore John "Adultery in Early Anglo-Saxon Society: Æthelberht 31 in Comparison with Continental Germanic Law." *Anglo-Saxon England* 20 (1991): 19-25. Print.

Ruskin, John. *The Works of John Ruskin: Munera Pulveris. Six Essays on the Elements of Political Economy*. Kent: George Allen, 1880. *Google Books*. Web. 20 April, 2011.

Russell, Jeffrey Burton. *Lucifer, the Devil in the Middle Ages*. New York: Cornell UP, 1984. Print.

Ryan, Lawrence V. "Introduction." *Henry VI, Part One*. Ed. Lawrence V. Ryan. New York: Signet Classics, 1967. Print.

Samson, Ross. "The End of Early Medieval Slavery." *The Work of Work: Servitude, Slavery, and Labor in Medieval England*. Eds. Allen J. Frantzen and Douglas Moffat. Glasglow: Cruithne P, 1994. 95-124. Print.

Saunders, Tom. "Class Space and Feudal Identities in Early Medieval England." *Social Identity in Early Medieval Britain*. Eds. William O. Frazer and Andrew Tyrrell. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2000. 209-32. Print.

Schofield, Phillip. "Access to credit in the early fourteenth-century English countryside." *Credit and Debt in Medieval England, c. 1180-c.1350*. Eds. P.R. Schofield and N.J. Mayhew. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2002. 106-26. Print.

Schreiner, Bruce. "Parts Shortage from Quake Could Idle Toyota Plants in North America." *The Star*. 4 Apr. 2011. Web. 14 June 2011.

Schwartz, Regina M. "The Price of Justice and Love in The Merchant of Venice." *Triquaterly* 124 (2006): 225-43. Print.

Selwood, Jacob. *Diversity and Difference in Early Modern London*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2010. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *1 Henry VI*. *The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works*. 2nd ed. Eds. Stanley W. Wells, Gary Taylor, John Jowett and William Montgomery. Oxford: Clarendon P, 2005. Print.

---. *2 Henry VI*. *The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works*. 2nd ed. Eds. Stanley W. Wells, Gary Taylor, John Jowett and William Montgomery. Oxford: Clarendon P, 2005. Print.

---. *The Merchant of Venice*. *The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works*. Eds. Stanley W. Wells, Gary Taylor, John Jowett and William Montgomery. Oxford: Clarendon P, 2005. Print.

---. *The Tempest*. Ed. Frank Kermode. London: Methuen, 1954. Print.

Shapiro, James. *Shakespeare and the Jews*. New York: Columbia UP, 1997. Print.

Sharpe, Kevin M. *Remapping Early Modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics*. 3rd ed. New York: Cambridge UP, 2000. Print.

Shell, Marc. *Money, Language, and Thought: Literary and Philosophical Economies from the Medieval to the Modern Era*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1982. Print.

Shershow, Scott Cutler. "Idols of the Marketplace: Rethinking the Economic Determination of Renaissance Drama." *Explorations in Renaissance Drama. Volume 26 of Renaissance Drama*. Ed. Mary Beth Rose. Illinois: Northwestern UP, 1995. 1-28. Print.

Simmel, George. *The Philosophy of Money*. Ed. David Frisby. Trans. Tom Bottomore and David Frisby. New York: Routledge, 1990. Print.

Simmons, Richard C. "slave trade" *The Oxford Companion to British History*. Ed John Cannon. Oxford UP, 2009. *Oxford Reference Online*. Oxford UP. Web. 16 July 2009.

Skura, Meredith Anne. "Discourse and the Individual: The Case of Colonialism in *The Tempest*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40 (1989): 42-69. Print.

Slack, Paul. "Mirrors of health and treasures of poor men: the uses of the vernacular medical literature of Tudor England." *Health, Medicine, and Mortality in the*

*Sixteenth Century*. Ed. Charles Webster. New York: Cambridge UP, 1979. 9-60. Print.

"slave, n.1 (and a.)" *The Oxford English Dictionary. 2nd ed. 1989. OED Online*. Oxford UP. Web. 15 July 2009.

Slights, Jessica. “Rape and the Romanticization of Shakespeare’s Miranda.” *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*. 41.2 (2001): 357-79. Print.

Smith, Kathryn Ann. *Art, Identity and Devotion in Fourteenth-Century England: Three Women and their Books of Hours*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2003. Print.

Spivack, Bernard. *Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil: The History of a Metaphor in Relation to his Major Villains*. New York: Columbia UP, 1968. Print.

Sponsler, Claire. *Drama and Resistance: Bodies, Goods, and Theatricality in Late Medieval England*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1997. Print.

Steggle, Matthew. *Laughing and Weeping in Early Modern Theatres*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2007. Print.

Strauss, Gary. “Higher Gas Prices Pinch Consumers.” USA Today. 20 May 2011. Web. 14 June 2011.

Sullivan, Garrett A., Jr. “‘Arden Lay Murdered in That Plot of Ground’: Surveying, Land, and *Arden of Faversham*.” *ELH* 61.2 (July 1994): 231-52. Print.

Tancke, Ulrike. *“Bethinke thy self” in Early Modern England: Writing Women’s Identities*. Netherlands: Rodopi, 2010. Print.

Tennenhouse, Leonard. *Power on Display*. New York: Routledge, 2005. Print.

Tromly, Frederic B. *Fathers and Sons in Shakespeare: The Debt Never Promised*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2010. Print.

Valenze, Deborah M. *The Social Life of Money in the English Past*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2006. Print.

Vaughan, Alden T. and Virginia Mason Vaughan. *Shakespeare's Caliban: A Cultural History*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1991. Print.

Vincent, Susan. *Dressing the Elite: Clothes in Early Modern England*. London: Berg Publishers, 2003.

Viner, Jacob. "English Theories of Foreign Trade Before Adam Smith", parts I and II. *Journal of Political Economy* 38 (June 1930): 249-301; and 38 (August 1930): 404-57. Print.

Walters, J. H. *The Launching of the Mary by Walter Mountfort*. Oxford: Malone Society Reprints, 1933. Print.

Ward, Ian. *Shakespeare and the Legal Imagination*. Markham, ON: Butterworths, 1999. Print.

Wasson, John. "The Morality Play: Ancestor of Elizabethan Drama?" *The Drama of the Middle Ages: Comparative and Critical Essays*. Eds. Clifford Davidson, C.J. Gianakaris, and John Stroupe. New York: AMS, 1982. 316-27. Print.

Wayne, Valerie. "Assuming Gentility: Thomas Middleton, Mary Carleton and Aphra Behn." *Women and Politics in Early Modern England, 1450-1700*. Ed. James Daybell. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2004. 243-56. Print.

Wear, Andrew. *Health and Healing in Early Modern England: Studies in Social and Intellectual History*. Great Britain: Galliard Printers, 1998. Print.

Weil, Judith. *Service and Dependency in Shakespeare's Plays*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2005. Print.

Werstine, Paul. "Walter Mountfort's *The Launching of the Mart, or the Seamans Honest Wyfe* (*Launching*)." Letter. 2010. MS.

Wertz, Dorothy. “Mankind as a Type-Figure on the Popular Religious Stage: An Analysis of Fifteenth-Century English Morality Plays.” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 12 (January 1970): 83-91. Print.

Whelan, Ruth. “From the other side of silence: Hugenot life-writing, a dialogic art of narrating the self.” *Narrating the Self in Early Modern Europe.* Eds. Bruno Tribout and Ruth Whelan. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2007. 139-60. Print.

Williams, Carloyn D. “‘Silence, like a Lucrece knife’: Shakespeare and the Meanings of Rape.” *The Yearbook of English Studies* 23 (1993): 93-110. Print.

Wilson, Sir Daniel. *Caliban: The Missing Link*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1873. Print.

Wilson, Luke. “Monetary Compensation for Injuries to the Body, A.D. 602-1697.” *Money and the Age of Shakespeare*. Ed. Linda Woodbridge. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. 19-38. Print.

Wrightson, Keith. *Earthly Necessities: Economic Lives in Early Modern Britain*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2000. Print.

Zaller, Robert. *The Discourse of Legitimacy in Early Modern England*. Palo Alto: Stanford UP, 2007. Print.

Curriculum Vitae

Myungjin Choi
Department of English
The University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario N6A 3K7

## Education

2011-present: Juris Doctor
University of Victoria

2006-2011: Doctor of Philosophy (English)
The University of Western Ontario

Supervisor: Dr. Paul Werstine
Thesis: Social Money: Literary Engagements with Economics in Early Modern English Drama

Qualifying Examinations: Drama to the Restoration (Primary, with distinction) and Textual Studies (Secondary, with distinction)

2005-2006: Master of Arts (English)
The University of Western Ontario

2001-2005: Bachelor of Arts, with Honours (English)
University of British Columbia

## Conferences

**Refereed Papers:**

8 January 2011: "Bringing Architectures of the Book into the Digital Age." Implementing New Knowledge Environments (INKE) and the Scholarly Edition. *MLA Convention 2011*. Los Angeles, California.

11 April 2009. "Vanishing Acts: The Human Subject in *Arden of Faversham* and *The Merchant of Venice*." Ethics and Economics in Shakespeare. *Shakespeare Association of America 37th Annual Meeting*. Renaissance Hotel, Washington D.C.

2 June 2008. "The Margins of an Infinite Page: Paratext Display in Digital Online Editions." Database and Textual Editions. *SDH/SEMI 2008*. University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC.

**Seminars and Presentations:**

9 June 2010: "Notes and Annotations: XML'ing the Folger *Troilus and Cressida*." Digital Humanities Summer Institute 2010. University of Victoria, Victoria, BC.

12 May 2010: "Cankers, Coins, and Commonwealth." McIntosh Prize Competition. The University of Western Ontario, London, ON.

7 March 2009. Panel Chair: "Too Manny: Males and their Excesses." *Annual Comparative Literature Graduate Conference 2009*. The University of Western Ontario, London, ON.

**Workshops:**

6-10 June 2010. Attended "Transcribing and Describing Primary Sources." Digital Humanities Summer Institute 2010. University of Victoria, Victoria, BC.

8-12 June 2009. Attended "Expressing Physical Materiality in Digital Projects." Digital Humanities Summer Institute 2009. University of Victoria, Victoria, BC.

## Academic Awards

| | |
|---|---|
| 2005-2010: | Western Graduate Research Scholarship |
| 2009: | DHSI SSHRC Tuition Scholarship |
| 2008: | SDH/SEMI Graduate Student Travel Fund |
| 2004: | Korean Translation Award, Department of Asian Studies at UBC |

## Teaching

2005-2006. Teaching Assistant: Film 020e, "Introduction to Film." Dr. Heather Snell.
2006-2007. Teaching Assistant: English 117, "Reading Popular Culture." Dr. Thy Phu.
2007-2008. Teaching Assistant: English 224e, "Renaissance Literature." Dr. Peggy Roffey.
2008-2009. Teaching Assistant: English 2420e, "Topics in Medieval and Renaissance Drama." Dr. M.J. Kidnie and Dr. James Purkis.

## Other Academic Employment

2009-2011: Graduate Research Assistant for the SSHRC MCRI program *Implementing New Knowledge Environments* (INKE) (Textual Studies team)