

7. “‘Outlandish Love’: Marriage and Immigration in City Comedies.” *Literature Compass* 6 (2009): 16-32.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-4113.2009.00663.x>

During my first year at Tulane, I worked on bringing this article to print. It is about two city comedies in which immigrants figure prominently. The central argument of the article is that while one may find elements of stereotyping in these plays, the stereotypes are often expressed as suspect ideas used to cover-up contentions of class and status.

Literature Compass is an online journal with multiple sections devoted to particular periods and specializations. The Renaissance and Shakespeare sections have published articles by senior scholars like Theodore Leinwand (U. of Maryland), Willy Maley (U. of Glasgow), Leah Marcus (Vanderbilt U.), Arthur F. Marotti (Wayne SU), Carla Mazzio (SUNY Buffalo), Jerome McGann (U. of Virginia), Gail Kern Paster (Director of the Folger Shakespeare Library), Richard Strier (U. of Chicago), and Mihoko Suzuki (U. of Miami).

As an online journal, *Literature Compass* tracks the number of times each article has been accessed. By August 17, 2010, my article had been accessed more than 1,200 times.

'Outlandish Love': Marriage and Immigration in City Comedies

Scott Oldenburg*
Tulane University

Abstract

This article questions the orthodox reading of early English city comedies that such plays exhibit intense national or proto-national fervor, especially articulated in terms of anti-alien sentiment. A close examination of *The Dutch Courtesan* and *Englishmen for My Money* shows that English playgoers were keen to see their cosmopolitan city staged. Moreover, these plays suggest that when it came to European immigrants to England, status and wealth were far more important to the English than considerations of birthplace and ethnicity.

The genre of play we retrospectively call *city comedy* dominated the first two decades of the 17th century. Brian Gibbons defines city comedy as plays with urban settings 'expressing consciously satiric criticism but also suggesting deeper sources of conflict and change' (4). Theodore Levinwand sees city comedy more generally as plays that look critically at the triangular 'relations among merchants, gentry, and women in their various roles' (7). Plays like Ben Jonson's *The Alchemist* and Thomas Middleton's *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside* with their London settings and biting social satire define the genre, but earlier plays like Thomas Dekker's *The Shoemaker's Holiday* sit uneasily at the margins of the genre: Dekker's play is set in London and deals with precisely the types of characters Levinwand says a city comedy ought to feature, but the play, argues Levinwand, 'suppresses the social tensions that characterize mature city comedies' (8). Still, James Knowles sees the play as exemplary of the genre, including it in the anthology *The Roaring Girl and Other City Comedies*.¹

The problem of defining city comedy, as I see it, is one of historical perspective. The term 'city comedy' is not one early modern audiences, actors, and writers would have used, and in coming up with a term retrospectively, we likely carve up what may have been experienced as a broad spectrum of comedies set in London. My interest here is not in suggesting a new or better way of accounting for what constitutes a city comedy. Instead, I want to explore two early city comedies, comedies written and performed as the genre was in formation, not yet dominated by the satirical voice of Jonson. Both comedies depict interactions among London's inhabitants: gentry, merchants, servants, and, significantly for this article, immigrants from Europe. The two city comedies differ, however, in their attitudes toward immigrants and therefore how much conflict and cohesion each depicts. By accounting for that difference I hope to suggest one of the sources for the diversity of approaches toward social tensions in the genre we now call city comedy.

Cosmopolitan London

In his *Church History of Britain*, Thomas Fuller writes,

'Happy the yeoman's house which one of these Dutchmen did enter, bringing industry and wealth along with them. Such who came in strangers within their doors soon after went out

2 Marriage and Immigration in City Comedies

bridegrooms, and returned sons-in-law, having married the daughters of their landlords who first entertained them. Yea, those yeomen in whose houses they harbored soon proceeded gentlemen, gaining great estates to themselves, arms, and worship to their estates' (419).

Fuller's account of English-immigrant relations (*strangers* was the early modern term for immigrants) runs counter to much 20th- and 21st-century scholarship. Ronald Pollitt discusses 'traditional hostility toward strangers' (D1004); Susan Brigden refers to 'traditionally xenophobic Londoners' and 'the traditionally xenophobic capital' (137, 509); Philip Schwyzer appeals to the 'xenophobic impulses to which Tudor subjects were so notoriously prone' (2), and A. J. Hoenselaars situates his examination of the representation of foreigners in early modern English drama within a context of 'time-honored prejudices' (19). While I do not wish to belittle the occasional anti-immigrant violence that did indeed occur in early modern England, statements like Fuller's indicate that the English had a significantly more complex attitude toward their immigrant neighbors.

Immigration was a major issue during the early modern period: guilds routinely submitted petitions expressing their concerns about the influx of new laborers from the continent while Norwich, Maidstone, Halstead, and Colchester invited strangers so that new industries could be started and old ones revived (Cotrett 55–7; Pollitt D1004; Yungblut 30, 52, 57). In Norwich the stranger population sometimes reached close to 30% of the total population (Cotrett 62); statutes describing and sometimes limiting the rights of strangers were periodically issued, and official stranger churches were built affording the Protestant refugees considerable freedom of religion. Most of the well-known portraits of the period, including the *First Folio* engraving of William Shakespeare, were made by Dutch and Flemish artists.² As many as 50,000 Protestant refugees are estimated to have passed through London in the latter half of the 16th century (Pettegree 299). Many returned to the continent in due course, but even so, by the early 1590s 7000 immigrants were counted living in London, and the number would soon rise as Dutch Protestants fled the Duke of Alba's persecutions (Pettegree 293).

While complaints regarding the impact of immigration to England arose throughout the early modern period – complaints about the effect immigrants had on the labor market and rent prices, about immigrants violating guild statutes or bringing with them Anabaptist doctrine – such complaints were mitigated by both the positive contributions of immigrants who brought new skills to England and English sympathies for the majority of immigrants, those who came to England to avoid persecution for their Protestant beliefs. Thus, in 1567 one recently arrived immigrant to Norwich wrote his wife still living on the continent, 'You would never believe how friendly the people are together, and the English are the same and quite loving to our nation.... Come at once and do not be anxious' (Tawney and Power 299). Such anecdotes do not diminish the seriousness of anti-alien riots, but they do provide a counterpoint to such thinking. Though not always practiced, an ethic of tolerance that went so far as to be characterized as 'loving' in the 1567 letter existed in England.

The passage from Fuller, however, goes further than tolerance. Fuller depicts a situation in which strangers were to be not only tolerated but married off to one's daughters. In fact, in the 1590s one member of the House of Commons complained that strangers comprised too insular a community, which they would 'not converse with us, *they will not marry with us*, they will not buy any thing of our country-men' (D'Ewes 506, emphasis added). As the final example of insularity here suggests, the impulse to marry strangers was at least in part economic, but it is interesting that money trumps the supposed xenophobia scholars have assumed to exist among the English. Examples from literary history

reinforce the economic underpinnings of such marriages: Richard Field, the Stratford-born printer of William Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece*, married the Huguenot Jacqueline Vautrollier, the widow of his sometime master, and John Marston of Coventry, father to the dramatist of the same name, married an Italian immigrant, the daughter of the well-to-do surgeon Andrew Guarsi (Geckle 145). The interest in marriages between English and strangers in the early modern period points to the inadequacy of self-other dynamics as an explanation of English identity, but further than that, the desire for exogamy indicates an early English populace intentionally treating its cultural and ethnic borders as permeable rather than distinctly chauvinist.

It may be that as fellow Protestants the Dutch and French in London were viewed more positively, but Thomas Fuller's account offers an economic rather than religious explanation for the interest in marrying immigrants. At least part of Fuller's narrative here can be attributed to his desire to place Protestant refugees in a positive light, but it would not work if it were not plausible to Fuller's early modern readers that a Dutch artisan might be so productive as to become an attractive match for one's daughter. Religion, economics, and status all coalesce in Fuller's view of marriage between English and strangers, and as we shall see, the three terms interacted during the early modern period, for they overlap with considerations of gender, immigration, and concepts of community and run counter to an emergent sense of nationhood in early modern England.

Linda Racioppi and Katherine O'Sullivan have shown that although not specifically addressed, gender and marriage politics underlie the dominant theories of nationhood – those of Benedict Anderson, Ernest Gellner, and Eric Hobsbawm, for example, which describe the nation as a distinctly modern formation, as well as those of Anthony Smith and John Armstrong, which see nations emerging much earlier. Women, according to Nira Yuval-Davis, 'reproduce nations biologically, culturally and symbolically' (2). The nation is reproduced symbolically through women in metaphors of the nation as a 'mother-land' and in propaganda that links national territory to the female body. The biological and cultural reproduction of the nation overlaps in women's roles as mothers. Mothers by definition reproduce biologically, and thereby produce a new generation for the nation, but as primary caregivers, they also play a central role in the cultural education of each new generation. Elsewhere, Yuval-Davis along with Floya Anthias emphasizes that for nations invested in a particular racial make-up, mothers logically act as 'reproducers of the boundaries of ethnic/national groups' (Anthias and Yuval-Davis 7). It is indeed surprising that these key elements in the construction of nations are rarely emphasized in the dominant theories of nationhood.

Yuval-Davis' work is aimed at contemporary society, but even though gender roles have changed significantly since the 1600s, the particular relation between women and community holds true. For example, although Lawrence Stone emphasizes the relative remoteness of early modern parents to their children and an evolution in child-rearing practices culminating in the modern day, he nonetheless states that 'it would be a mistake to think that there was no affective bonding between parent and child' (116).³ Linda Pollock amplifies Stone's qualifying remark, claiming that there is no evidence of a 'significant change in the quality of parental care given to, or the amount of affection felt for infants for the period 1500–1900' (235). Whether one agrees more with Stone or Pollock, it should be noted that even Stone emphasizes that parents across all classes played major roles in their children's lives, choosing spouses and careers for them, for example. Thus, early modern women may be said to have had an importance to early modern community not unlike the importance Yuval-Davis attaches to the relationship between women and the modern nation.

Although Yuval-Davis posits a variety of relations – biological, cultural, and symbolic – it is clear that women’s role as mothers is especially important to the relationship between women and the nation. What is crucial to note is that marriage is the means by which that role is legitimated, especially in the early modern period. Nancy Cott has explained that mothering is intimately connected to marriage rites and that this explains much of the pressure nations place on the legal institution of marriage, what counts and does not count as a valid union: ‘No modern nation-state’, explains Cott, ‘can ignore marriage forms, because of their direct impact on reproducing and composing the population. The laws of marriage must play a large part in forming “the people.” They sculpt the body politic’ (5). It is with an eye to the intimate connections among motherhood, marriage, and the nation that I wish to approach immigration in early modern England through a reading of *Englishmen for My Money* and *The Dutch Courtesan*. Given the relationship between women and the nation one would expect a high degree of endogamy among the English, assuming, that is, that the English had some form of pervasive national consciousness to protect from the influence of outsiders. I would contend, however, that nationhood, if at all felt, was less important to early English subjects than economics, social status, religion, and solidarity among crafts, and, as I have tried to sketch in the beginning of this article, immigrant spouses were not shunned but actively sought by many. Both plays feature courtships between the English and immigrants, and in both class and status of the immigrant characters and the English audience are determining factors of whether strangers and the children of strangers are accepted or rejected as potential spouses.

The Courtesan at the Inns of Court

The Dutch Courtesan, performed between 1603 and 1605, is the first English play known to use an immigrant character for its title. Philip J. Finkelpearl explains that the play ‘shows the corrupting effect of an alien force, a Dutch prostitute, on the life of a young Englishman living in London’ (197). It should be said, however, that Francischina, the Dutch courtesan of the title, is not purely Dutch. Said to be a ‘Dutch Tanakin’ (1.1.143–45) and a member of the Family of Love which had its start in the Low Countries, Francischina’s name suggests a more Italianate origin; similarly, Martin L. Wine has described her speech as ‘a helter-skelter of Germanic, French, Italian, as well as pure English pronunciation’ (xix, note 15) and Hoenselaars has claimed that in addition to her name, her jealousy and capacity for revenge are traces of an Italian stereotype (117); perhaps Marston, whose mother was Italian, was particularly sensitive to the stereotype and therefore sought to deflect it on to a Dutch character. Following Wine, Jean Howard describes Francischina as ‘cosmopolitanism rendered monstrous’ (112). According to Muriel C. Bradbrook, Francischina is ‘a savage, murderous, treacherous beauty, whose sweetness of appearance, and whose dancing and songs are shown making their full effect upon a man who despises her but cannot free – himself from her enchantment’ (152). Monstrous, murderous, treacherous, corrupting ... such descriptions of one of the few stage representations of a female stranger should make us wonder why exactly Englishmen would clamor about their desire to marry strangers. Stage characters should not, of course, be mistaken for real potential brides, but an examination of *The Dutch Courtesan* when compared to *Englishmen for My Money* does reveal some of the underlying concerns of class, status, and religion in the acceptance or rejection of immigrants in early modern England.

As the play opens, Freevill, a young gentleman, decides to break off his relations with Francischina as he is soon to be married to Beatrice, the respectable daughter of

Sir Hubert Subboys. When Freevill goes to Francischina, he introduces her to his rigidly moralistic friend Malheureux who, despite his insistence on abstinence and rational thought over base desires, instantly falls madly in love with Francischina. Infuriated by Freevill's decision to leave her for Beatrice, Francischina, noting Malheureux's devotion to her, promises to be his if he kills Freevill and gives her Freevill's ring, a token he had received from Beatrice. Malheureux agrees, but upon consideration tells Freevill of the plot, and they conspire to stage Freevill's death so that Malheureux can satiate his desire for Francischina. Malheureux returns to Francischina with the ring only to be arrested; Francischina had contacted the authorities and coaxed a confession from Malheureux. Rather than free his friend immediately, however, Freevill intends to continue feigning his death to teach Malheureux a lesson about controlling his desires, an ironic motive since the first scene of the play features Malheureux instructing Freevill on exactly this point. As Malheureux mounts the scaffold, Freevill reveals all and Francischina is imprisoned.

The play's subplot involves a citizen-jester by the name of Cocledemoy, who repeatedly plays tricks on Mulligrub, a London vintner. Mulligrub and his wife are highly acquisitive and many of Cocledemoy's antics are aimed at punishing them for their profiteering impulses. In the final scene Mulligrub, like Malheureux, faces death, confesses all his ways of swindling customers, and is, at the last minute, saved. Like Francischina, the Mulligrubs are members of the Family of Love, and this detail not only links the two plots but helps signal that the Mulligrubs, like Francischina, are to be mistrusted. Although Jean Dietz Moss notes the diversity of actual practices among the Family of Love, the sect was generally associated not only with an early modern communism, but also with free love and a form of moral exceptionalism which stated that once a member had experienced revelation, he or she need not fear God's final judgment (189). The Family of Love's open approval of 'simulation' (appearing to be members of the dominant religion), while wise politically, led to accusations of hypocrisy. The acceptance of adultery within the sect, moreover, led to the association of the Family of Love with licentiousness.⁴ Coming on the heels of James' own denunciation of the Family of Love as 'that vile sect' in the 1603 edition of *Basilicon Doron* (Craigie 21), the negative ideas about the Family of Love are emphasized in the play to discredit Francischina, Mary Faugh (Francischina's bawd), and the Mulligrubs. By placing the acquisitive Mulligrubs and the vengeful prostitute Francischina in the Family of Love, *The Dutch Courtesan* further emphasizes a negative influence of immigration – English citizens may be corrupted by not only individual immigrants like Francischina but also the culture and religion immigrants bring with them.

Howard, however, has argued that the play tempers this paranoid view of London cosmopolitanism by showing Cocledemoy to be a master of difference. Cocledemoy impersonates and has decent relations with London's diverse population. He is, for Howard, a city comedy version of Prince Hal, able to 'observe and master otherness without being destroyed by it' (115).⁵ Cocledemoy is, in that sense, not unlike Lacy in Thomas Dekker's *Shoemaker's Holiday*, but the latter play does not lay considerable emphasis on anxieties over immigration, anxieties that Cocledemoy's playfulness fail to allay entirely in *The Dutch Courtesan*. Though Cocledemoy may embrace London's cosmopolitanism, the one figure representing that cosmopolitan aspect of London, Francischina, is treated as the source of all social ills: she is the character most closely associated with a corrupting religious outlook; she entices men to murder, fails to keep her word, and in the end retreats to a Iago-like silence on all matters: 'Ick vil not speake, torture, torture you fill/ For me am worse than hang'd, me ha lost my will' (5.3.56–57).

Whether the play is critical or approving of immigration, however, there remains Francischina's unusual attraction; characters are enchanted by her beauty. Early in the play, even though Freevill is prepared to break off relations with Francischina, he nonetheless describes her as 'a pretty nimble eyd Dutch Tanakin; An honest soft-hearted impropriation, a softe plump, round cheekt froe, that has beauty inough, for her vertue, vertue enough for a woman, and woman enough for any reasonable man' (1.2.144–48). Although at the prospect of meeting Francischina Malheureux exclaims, 'Fye on't I shall hate the whole sex to see her: the most odious spectacle the earth can present, is an immodest vulger woman' (1.2.150–52), he becomes obsessed with her almost immediately, and by his second meeting with her resolves to murder his friend at her request. She sings, plays the lute, and can discourse on a variety of topics. In short, the text indicates that we are to view her as attractive, yet it is also clear that we are to see Freevill and Malheureux's ultimate rejection of Francischina as the right choice, confirmed by Francischina's outrageous behavior once Freevill has broken off relations with her. While Fuller's Dutch artisan seemed a highly sought-after mate, Francischina is an unacceptable match for these English gentlemen.

Freevill explains his choice and this seems to bear on himself and any English gentleman:

O heaven: what difference is in women, and their life?
 What man, but worthie name of Man,
 Would leave the modest pleasures of a lawfull bed,
 The holie union of two equal harts
 Mutuallie holding either deere as health,
 The undoubted yssues, joyes of chast sheetes,
 The unfained imbrace of sober Ignorance:
 To twine the unhealthful loynes of common Loves,
 The prostituted impudence of things.
 Senceless like those by Cataracks of Nyle,
 Their use so vile, takes awaie sence, how vile
 To love a creature, made of bloud and hell,
 Whose use makes weake, whose companie doth shame,
 Whose bed doth begger: yssue doth defame. (5.1.70–83)

Freevill here poses a rather simple choice: the 'lawfull bed' of marriage to Beatrice who he is sure would never cuckold him and therefore put in doubt any of their offspring's paternity, or the beggar's bed of Francischina who by profession would cuckold Freevill; indeed, if we are to take their relationship as seriously as Francischina evidently does, she has already cuckolded him. It should be remembered, however, that Freevill was among Francischina's best customers and spent a good portion of the opening scene of the play jovially defending prostitution from Malheureux's moralizing: 'Alas good creatures, what would you have them doe?' asks Freevill, 'Would you have them get their living by the curse of man, the sweat of their browes? So they doe, everie man must follow his trade, and everie woman her occupation ... They sell their bodies: doe not better persons sell their soules?' (1.1.99–124).

His transformation owes something to the discovery that Francischina is prepared to have him murdered for leaving her, but his rhetoric suggests other motives for rejecting Francischina. The first line he uses to imagine a life with Francischina is telling: 'To twine the unhealthful loynes of common Loves'. 'Common Loves' works on several levels. A prostitute holds her love in common (it is shared by customers), but the idea of commoning love suggests yet another connection to the Family of Love, signaling a

rejection of Francischina on religious grounds. According to Alastair Hamilton, adultery within the Family of Love was 'sanctioned enthusiastically' (117); Janet E. Halley has shown that this was merely one interpretation of the Family of Love's texts, but it was a reading that, for the Family of Love's opponents, conveniently maligned the sect.

Moreover, 'common Loves', with its appositive phrase 'The prostituted impudence of things', hints at Freevill's vision of marriage as a form of ownership, by definition not to be held in common. Here, Francischina is reduced to the status of a 'thing' whose will (the last word she utters in the play) is therefore unnatural or 'impudent'. This idea of marriage as a husband's ownership of a wife, while reflected in early modern England's theory of gender relations, seems to have been out of step with the actual practice of marriage: Amy L. Erickson has shown that from initial courtship and marriage settlements all the way to the crafting of wills, women were much more active than the theory has suggested. In fact, Erickson shows that the place of women in the marriage process is to some degree based on class. She notes that 'strict settlements to preserve property in the male line were used only by the wealthy' and that more equitable arrangements were often instigated by 'ordinary women' (150). Freevill's rejection of Francischina, of 'common Loves' as impudent 'things', may have more to do with status than anything else. No matter how sophisticated her discourse, no matter how skillful her musicianship, Francischina is still well below the status of artisan, and Freevill still needs to maintain his status as a gentleman. That Francischina's profession, status, and religion factor into Freevill's choice may seem rather unsurprising, but what is surprising is what his speech leaves out. Although the play emphasizes Francischina's 'Dutch' accent, her birthplace seems less important to Freevill; in fact, he only mentions that she is Dutch when he is describing her positively in the beginning of the play.

Still, there is little doubt that Francischina's connection to Dutch culture includes her religion and, in the play's representation of that religion, her illicit profession, but then far more English characters in the play profess to be members of the Family of Love. There is, for this reader, a degree of sympathy for Francischina: Dutch prostitutes were not uncommon in early modern England because labor restrictions and life in the suburbs sometimes left destitute immigrants with few other vocations, and Francischina's relentless and irrational devotion to Freevill makes her seem tragic, not unlike Angelica Bianca in Aphra Behn's *The Rover*. Michael Scott notes that this possibility troubles the plot so that fairly vocal characters like Crispinella, Beatrice's vociferous sister, are awkwardly absent during the play's resolution. According to Scott,

if Marston had put words into her mouth her character would have demanded the right to criticize the whole unstable fabric of the plot's mixed conventions and dubious philosophy. She would have had to take up the cause of the wronged Franceschina (47).

Anne Haselkorn likewise finds the play to reinscribe male fantasies of domination over women by treating Francischina 'as if she were nothing more than an object' (58) and contrasting her with the docile Beatrice and the ultimately subdued Crispinella (62–5).

I doubt, however, that an early modern audience would have felt much sympathy for the homicidal prostitute. Indeed, the notion of an appeal to 'popular' xenophobia in the play would almost work here were it not for the fact that Marston wrote the play for the elite Inns of Court audience rather than an audience of artisans and apprentices. Harry Keyishan has asserted that Marston wrote *The Dutch Courtesan* as a tacit attack on Dekker and his more sensitive and sentimental treatment of prostitutes in *The Honest Whore*. Perhaps the choice of a Dutch prostitute was part of this attack, an allusion to Dekker's heritage and/or previous Dutch-centered *Shoemaker's Holiday*.⁶

It is worth noting that the aforementioned complaint about the difficulty of marrying into the immigrant community was lodged in the House of Commons, not the House of Lords; that is, rather than xenophobia, those supposedly representing the commons expressed a desire to integrate further with the immigrant community. Rather than a popular dislike of immigrants, *The Dutch Courtesan* suggests that any aversion to marriage to immigrants was rooted in a fear of compromising one's status. If there was a xenophobic motive behind such a rejection, that xenophobia was primarily held by the elite rather than the common Englishmen and women of the early modern period; the play, after all, represents London's citizens – the Mulligrubs and Cocledemoy – as embracing immigrant culture (albeit perhaps to a foolish extent). To get a sense of the allure of the immigrant woman without the intervening factors of religion and prostitution, we will need to turn to the three trophy brides of *Englishmen for My Money*.

Englishmen for whose Money?

Unlike *The Dutch Courtesan*, William Haughton's *Englishmen for My Money* was written for Henslowe's theater, the Rose, which catered to popular Elizabethan tastes (Gurr 156). Little is known about Haughton. He wrote for the Admiral's Men, was a frequent collaborator with Dekker and Henry Chettle, and has two plays to his credit, *Englishmen for My Money* and *Grim the Collier*. Both plays are early forerunners of city comedy, but unlike city comedy, tend to avoid the satirical bite of Marston or Jonson.

The play takes place in London and tells the story of three English gentlemen, Harvey, Ferdinand Heigham, and Ned Walgrave, all of whom owe a substantial amount of money and all their land to a Portuguese immigrant named Pisaro who has settled in London and become a usurer. By his now deceased English wife, Pisaro has three daughters, Laurentia, Marina, and Mathea, who through encouragement of their English tutor, Anthony, have fallen in love with Harvey, Ferdinand Heigham, and Ned, respectively. When Pisaro discovers that his three greatest debtors have designs on his daughters, he objects, dismisses Anthony, and sends his servant Frisco to find a French tutor for his daughters. Anthony, privy to this plot, disguises himself as Monsieur Mouse, and is promptly hired as the new French tutor and continues advocating on the Englishmen's behalf. In the meantime, Pisaro has arranged to match his daughters with three merchant-strangers, Delion, a Frenchman, Alvaro, an Italian, and Vandalle, a Dutchman. The complicated plot revolves around a number of jests and counter-jests ending with the successful matches of Pisaro's daughters to the English gentlemen who in turn secure the land they owed to Pisaro. Pisaro ultimately gives his blessing to the match and invites all to a wedding feast.

Because the English suitors triumph over their stranger adversaries, the play has been taken as 'patriotic' (Hoenselaars 58; Howard 106), 'jingoistic' (Leinwand 7), and 'nationalist' (Pincombe). A more nuanced series of readings have been put forth by recent scholars interested in immigration in the period, but even these ultimately conclude that the play appealed to a feeling of embattled national pride. McCluskey, for example, examines the play's strategies for 'making anti-immigrant satire acceptable to the authorities' ('The Stranger's Case' 281) and decides that 'the play ends, with the primacy of the English language having been reaffirmed and the purity of the English race preserved' (316). Such readings, however, require that the audience not only take nation and race as givens but also forget that the English suitors are, after all, marrying the daughters of a stranger and an English woman.

Edmund Campos, in his exploration of Pisaro as a 'crypto-Jew', explains away the daughters' status as strangers by pointing to places in the text that emphasize 'maternal inheritance' (613). Unlike most stage-strangers, Pisaro's daughters, like Pisaro himself, speak perfect English, thus indicating a high degree of assimilation and perhaps the strong influence of Pisaro's deceased English wife. This 'positive portrayal of the three daughters', argues Campos, 'encourages a carefully constructed notion of miscegenation – one that allows access to the trade advantages of the Crypto-Jew, but one that will not compromise English national identity' (613–14). The play, however, does not really go out of its way to emphasize the absent mother's influence over the present father's influence; she is, after all, absent. If anything, the play is about the three daughters' *paternal* inheritance. Pisaro is their only living relative in the play; he arranges for them to learn languages; he supervises them; and he supplies the material inheritance, the dowries which seem to be part of the young women's attraction to their English suitors. Walgrave renders this aspect of their beauty transparent:

Weele worke our landes out of Pizaros Daughters:
And cansell all our bondes in their great Bellies,
When the slaue knowes it, how the Roge will curse. (1864–6)

It is never quite clear in the play whether the courtship of the three daughters is motivated primarily by romance or finance. In fact, the two motives seem inextricably linked, as in the case of Bassanio's attraction to Portia in *The Merchant of Venice*: the first thing Bassanio says of her, before even mentioning her name, is that she 'is a lady richly left' (1.1.161).

It is clear, however, that the three daughters are aware of their bi-cultural upbringing. When Mathea thinks that Walgrave is really Delion impersonating Walgrave, she rails,

No, no, it is the Frenchman in his stead,
That Mounsieur motlicoate that can dissemble:
Heare you Frenchman, packe to your Whores in Fraunce;
Though I am Portingale by the Fathers side,
And therefore should be lustfull, wanton, light;
Yet goodman Goosecap, I will let you know,
That I haue so much English by the Mother,
That no bace slauering French shall make me stoope:
And so, sir Dan-delion fare you well. (1782–90)

Emma Smith takes the line 'so much English by my mother' to indicate the dominance of the daughters' Englishness. The father's side is here couched in a subordinate clause, and Mathea's point is to emphasize that in terms of stereotypes, her English chastity wins out over her Portuguese licentiousness.

Still, the case of mistaken identity compounded with Mathea's description of her own mixed heritage prompts Walgrave to declare angrily,

You Dan-de-lion, you that talke so well:
Harke you a word or two good Mistris Matt,
Did you appoynt your Friends to meete you heere,
And being come, tell vs of Whores in Fraunce,
A Spanish jennet, and an English Mare,
A Mongrill, halfe a Dogge and halfe a Bitch;
With Tran-dido, Dil-dido, and I know not what?
Heare you, if you'le run away with Ned,
And be content to take me as you find me,

Why so law, I am yours: if otherwise,
 Youle change your Ned, to be a Frenchmans Trull? (1794–1804)

In the midst of a misunderstanding between himself and Mathea, Walgrave amplifies (and vilifies) Mathea's mixed parentage, calling her 'A Mongrill' (1799). This does not sound much like an exclusive emphasis on 'maternal inheritance'. Even if early modern England operated on the principle that one's birthplace defined one's identity, at the level of character development in the play it would seem that Haughton wanted to show that this mixed heritage was important to Walgrave – the word and an accompanying series of bestial images is at hand the moment he has a falling-out with Mathea and she mentions her maternal and paternal inheritance. He complains that she 'talke[s] so well', the very characteristic that potentially masks her immigrant heritage, as if the illusion that she might be fully English were suddenly shattered by the mere mention that she is 'Portingale by the Fathers side'. Even if the audience excuses Walgrave this xenophobic moment, it is difficult to forget that the women are part Portuguese: their father's presence is so overbearing to the very end.

Thus there is a real paradox in the readings of the play: critics see the play as patriotic, even nationalist, but the English triumph by marrying women who are not wholly English, and their offspring will naturally be at least part Portuguese. According to McCluskey,

The lands impawned to Pisaro thus metaphorically represent an England dominated by foreigners, and the success of the English suitors in gaining control over the girls' fertility will ensure the survival of the English race and the preservation of English property (312).

Without a doubt, property is central to the play, but it is difficult to understand how marrying what Walgrave momentarily thinks of as 'mongrels' will 'ensure the survival of the English race'. What seems like a bid for independence from immigrants, wresting debts from Pisaro, turns out to be a greater reliance on immigrants: Walgrave, Harvey, and Ferdinand's children will, like their wives, be 'mongrels', part English and part Portuguese.

This paradox has been addressed to some degree by Kermode and Smith. Kermode suggests that there are multiple motives for the English suitors' romantic quest: love, property, and 'Anglicizing the half-foreign women' (259). Other than the Englishmen encouraging Pisaro's daughters to reject their immigrant-suitors, however, there is nothing in the play that could suggest anglicizing these women: they speak English from the start of the play. Such readings treat Pisaro's daughters as if they were passive objects awaiting the influence of Englishmen. If Francischina and Pisaro's daughters share any qualities, however, it is their willfulness, their agency in attempting to create a match between themselves and their would-be mates. Pisaro's daughters thwart their stranger-suitors, and the final jest of the play is a cooperative effort between Pisaro's daughters and their English suitors.

The emphasis on male will over female agency is perhaps an effect of later revision: today the play is known as *Englishmen for My Money, or a Woman Will Have Her Will*, but this main title appears to have been an addition prepared for publication. The more female-centric subtitle appears as the main title in the Stationer's Register. The title provides a frame through which the play is now read; today critics focus on Englishmen and their role in defining Englishness, but the play is just as much about the half-English women and their will, their machinations to get the objects of their desires. Moreover, we need not assume that marriage leads to female subjugation. Erickson observes that

'wives at all social levels ... managed finances on their own behalf and jointly with their husbands' (225). We cannot know how Pisaro's daughters fared in their marriages, but it is not unreasonable to suppose that an early modern audience would have projected that these fictional brides, like many women of the era, would participate in a kind of partnership with their husbands, an arrangement in marked contrast to Freevill's vision of marriage as ownership. There is, at any rate, little reason to suppose that marriage would make the daughters less Portuguese.

Smith, like other critics, sees the play participating in the construction of a national identity, but she also recognizes the complexity of the pairing of Englishmen with half-Portuguese brides. Smith explains,

In their rejection of foreigners, the women represent the *hortus conclusus* of the pure English nation; but what is so fascinating about Haughton's play is that these bearers of Englishness are themselves half-foreign: the feminized symbol of the city is always and inescapably hybridized, as London simultaneously asserts an idea of the native while registering the complex diversity of its populace (178).

Although among the most nuanced readings of the play, Smith's nonetheless takes as her point of departure the idea that the play is about nationhood. There is no indication in the play that the daughters are symbols of a 'pure English nation'. It is this assumption, the same assumption that informs Kermode and McCluskey's work, which has led critics astray in their explorations of the play.

Englishmen for My Money is not actually a play about nationhood at all. The play is not, like Shakespeare's histories, invested in presenting the entire realm; it is, on the contrary, fixated on specific London locales. Frisco, for example, mentions a number of very specific landmarks and local allusions as he mischievously misleads the stranger-suitors through the dark streets of London: 'the Blew Bore in the Spittle', 'mother Walles Pasties' on Abchurch Lane and so forth (1600–14). This scene indicates that the audience was to have an intimate knowledge of the city; otherwise the local color would have little resonance and the jest would carry only a very cryptic humor. The characters, though broad stereotypes – the wealthy usurer, the spendthrift English gentlemen, the befuddled Dutchman – are part of a specifically London landscape. Although some of the audience may have come from outside of London, they too would have knowledge of London that those from, for example, the countryside would not. The play was written, then, not for a national audience, but a local one familiar with the London landmarks and inhabitants presented in the play. London (and Norwich) were uniquely cosmopolitan areas that did not stand in for the realm as a whole.

There is, to be sure, a kind of triumph for the English suitors, but it is also a triumph for Pisaro's daughters. They may not have made the financially savvy decision their father had hoped for – marrying merchant-strangers and thereby consolidating wealth for the merchant class – but from the first scene of the play they declare their interest in the English suitors. That is, marriage is a victory for both the Englishmen and Pisaro's daughters. Marina tells the tutor Anthony as he urges their interest in the Englishmen by threatening to teach them philosophy,

Haue done, haue done; what need'st thou more procure,
When long ere this I stoop'd to that faire lure:
Thy ever louing Haruie I delight it:
Marina ever louing shall requite it young.
Teach us Philosophy? Ile be no Nunne;

Age scorns Delight, I loue it being:
 There's not a word of this, not a words part,
 But shall be stamp'd, seal'd, printed on my heart;
 On this Ile read, on this my senses ply:
 All Arts being vaine, but this Philosophy. (99–108)

Whether prompted by Anthony or not, the attraction between Harvey and Marina seems mutual, and the aforementioned female will is apparent in the speech: no philosophy, no nunnery, only Harvey.

Similarly Laurentia states,

Why was I made a Mayde, but for a Man?
 And why Laurentia, but for Ferdinand?
 The chastest Soule these Angels could intice?
 Much more himselfe, an Angell of more price:
 were't thy selfe present, as my heart could wish,
 Such vsage thou shouldst haue, as I giue this. (109–14)

Interestingly, like her suitors, Laurentia combines romantic and financial interests: the English suitors are 'angels' enticing souls, but these angels are also coins, 'Angels of more price'.

Mathea then echoes the play's original title, *A Woman Will Have Her Will*, in her declaration of love for Ned, stating 'Mathea is resolu'd to haue her will', a statement that combines a phallic pun on *will* that doubles for her own phallic potency in getting what she wants, a direct contrast to Francischina's 'me ha lost my will' and her loss of both freedom and Freevill. Although Pisaro's daughters entertain the merchant-strangers, they do so under duress, but when the English suitors arrive, they are keen to meet with them. In the end, the suitors as well as Pisaro's daughters get what they want: the women have their will and the English cancel their debts. Rather than fixating on the triumph of the male English suitors, the original title emphasized the triumph of the women of the play, while even the later title prepared for publication balanced the importance of the would-be grooms and their potential brides, and their mutual interest in marriage.

In a comparison of *Englishmen for My Money* with *The Shoemaker's Holiday*, Andrew Fleck writes,

Foreign figures in English city comedies function in many ways, but typically they come to the stage to be used, mocked, gulled, and ultimately expelled, often to the advantage of good, native Englishmen. In this way, city comedies participate in the process of developing an early modern national identity, as the values and interests of the English – signaled by linguistic, mercantile, and/or marital success – come out ahead of their foreign competitors (17).

Nationalist readings of *Englishmen for My Money* emphasize the mockery of Delion, Alvaro, and Vandalle, but it is important to note that only male strangers are treated so. Rather than pariahs, Pisaro's daughters appear as highly sought-after prizes, and they view their English suitors as desirable as well. Pisaro's daughters are not gulled into marriage, and so there appears to be something other than the development of national identity at stake here. It is important, too, to note that unlike Marston, Haughton was writing for an audience with popular tastes, made up often of artisans and apprentices. As we saw in the beginning of this article, the English complained not of losing potential brides or grooms to strangers but of the difficulty had in securing marriages to strangers. No doubt, the stranger community itself was the greatest obstacle to successful courtship of strangers; the Dutch and French churches of London seemed to fear that such marriages would

compromise the religious uniformity of the stranger community. Andrew Spicer in his study of assimilation in the period writes, 'Marriages outside the [stranger] community were indeed exceptional' (193), but there are several records of such marriages in Joannes Hessels' collection of documents from the Dutch church in London, and many such marriages took place in the English rather than the Dutch or French churches (3.888, 932, 980; 1199). Rather than consolidating some abstract sense of national identity, *Englishmen for My Money* plays out the fantasy of overcoming the obstacles of marrying into the stranger communities: family, rival suitors from the immigrant communities themselves, and the ability to afford a marriage in the first place. Given the ways in which Yuval-Davis describes women reproducing the nation, however, such a fantasy also suggests that the community being reproduced was fundamentally multicultural and less invested in an exclusionary idea of Englishness than is usually believed.

Such an interpretation, however, raises the question: Why would the English clamor for access to immigrant wives? The answer, I believe, lies in a comparison of Francischina with Pisaro's daughters. Francischina, as already mentioned, is an unsuitable bride for Freevill in part because of her immigrant status but this seems closely tied to the social status which would compromise Freevill's own fairly high status as a gentleman. Francischina brings neither status nor an acceptable form of income to a marriage, and adheres to a set of suspect religious beliefs. Francischina fails, in other words, in terms of economics, status, and religion, the three considerations in play in Fuller's account of the desirable Dutch artisan.

Pisaro's daughters, on the other hand, stand to inherit not only the lands their suitors pawned to Pisaro but also the wealth he has accumulated from others first as a merchant and then as a usurer. As the daughters of a merchant-stranger/usurer, however, Laurentia, Marina, and Mathea lack a secure status in London, but they have the capital. Although Campos makes much of the possibility that Pisaro might be a 'crypto-Jew,' his family's Judaism appears to be so cryptic that it is never mentioned as a complicating factor; this is in marked contrast to Francischina who is overtly associated with the Family of Love. By marrying three English gentlemen, Pisaro's daughters enter into an exchange of wealth for status to the mutual benefit of brides and grooms. This precisely fits a pattern Stone found evident in marriages in the early modern period. Stone explains, 'Since men were acutely conscious of the value of status, this was a quality which might be traded for money, for example by the marriage of the son and heir of an impoverished nobleman to the heiress of a rich merchant' (60–1). That the brides are half-Portuguese (and perhaps Jewish) is merely incidental to the exchange; what is crucial is that each pair of brides and grooms augments one another: the impoverished gentlemen regain their land, and the immigrant brides elevate their status. Although they may have gained wealth, had Pisaro's daughters married the merchant-strangers favored by their father they would not have improved their status, just as Freevill would not have entered into a mutual exchange in marrying Francischina. These marriages, then, appear to be based at least in part on economic interdependence between status-seeking strangers and money-seeking gentry, a form of solidarity that, as it crosses cultural and ethnic borders, denies the importance of a national community founded on English identity.

Such a view of marriage may sound cold and calculating, altogether unromantic to modern ears. Stone historicizes marriage thus: 'Until romanticism temporarily triumphed in the late eighteenth century, there was thus a clear conflict of values between the idealization of love by some poets, playwrights and authors or romances on the one hand, and its rejection as a form of imprudent folly and even madness by all theologians, moralists, authors of manuals of conduct, and parents and adults in general' (181). *Englishmen for My Money* qualifies what I take to be an overstatement on Stone's part. After all, the fact that

poets could write of love in a recognizably romantic mode suggests that something more than a fantasy and a practical reality were at work in the early modern period. Indeed, in early modern England economics and standards of beauty were clearly interconnected: the prized fair skin of so many sonnets was thought beautiful precisely because it indicated a life of indoor leisure as opposed to browner skin, indicating a peasant's life of toil in the sun. However, one takes the early modern conflation of beauty and wealth (as if such a conflation did not also exist today) it is nonetheless true that the lovers in *Englishmen for My Money* talk about love in terms of wealth as though the two interests were not mutually exclusive. The title sums up the mutual arrangement: Englishmen and money in the main title, and women and their will in the subtitle.

In this sense, the marriages of the three English gentlemen to the three daughters of the immigrant Pisaro are not unlike the one Fuller describes in his *Church History*, in which English landlords and masters happily married their daughters off to Dutch artisans: the unique and profitable skills brought by many Protestant refugees made them attractive to some Londoners, and as Fuller suggests, the Dutch artisan's productivity might be great enough to augment his status to that of gentleman. Attraction in these relationships is at least in part underwritten by economic interest; birthplace, one's status as a stranger, seems to count for little.

The marriages discussed here fit a larger pattern in the early modern period. The English and their immigrant neighbors often formed solidarities based on mutual interest, whether that interest was religious or economic. Just as with those bonds between English and immigrant, the marriages reveal friendlier relations between the English and their immigrant neighbors than most historians and literary scholars have attributed to early modern England. In all of these relations, xenophobic rhetoric rarely came into play. Even in *The Dutch Courtesan* xenophobia seems tied in with illicit labor and suspect religion rather than Dutchness in and of itself. When xenophobic rhetoric is espoused, it often represents, like Walgrave's vitriolic 'Mongrill', a moment at which mutual interest disintegrates; that is, it is usually used to express discontent with a breakdown in social relations, as in weavers complaining about guild ordinance violations, rather than as an expression of inherent dislike of immigrants because of where they come from or what language they speak. The complaints about the insularity of the immigrant communities cited in the beginning of this article are a case in point. While they express dissatisfaction with the Dutch and French living in England, they are aimed ultimately at closer, more interdependent relations with immigrants rather than at the deportation of strangers.

Finally, such complaints and the solidarities represented in the literature of the period suggest something disruptive to the critical consensus on early modern English nationhood. For Anthony Smith, a leading scholar of nationhood, national identity is supposed to transcend all 'other loyalties in scope and power' (229). True, Smith argues that nationhood is part of a long process culminating in the modern era, but his point bears on early modern studies. To declare England a nation in the modern sense of the word is to claim that national identity was pervasive throughout England. On that reckoning we would surely see a good deal of xenophobia and very little cross-cultural identification from these new nationals. The study of the cultural dynamics of immigration in early modern England, however, suggests that in fact the English often saw themselves in their immigrant neighbors, which they actively sought to create lasting bonds with strangers. The traces of these bonds are ubiquitous in literary and cultural documents of the period, but their most telling and lasting records are the English-immigrant marriages that resulted in offspring who were undoubtedly English not only because they were born in England but because they were the outcome of the multicultural character of that realm.

Short Biography

Scott Oldenburg's primary research interest is early modern English literature from a global perspective. He is particularly interested in cross-cultural encounters which show early modern subjects actively connecting with one another despite cultural and ethnic differences. His articles have appeared (or soon will appear) in *The Journal of the Wooden O*, *JEMCS*, and *ELH* as well as in a collection of essays entitled *The Mysterious and the Foreign in Early Modern England*. He is currently assistant professor of English at Tulane University.

Notes

*Correspondence: Department of English, Norman Mayer 122, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA 70118, USA. Email: soldenbu@tulane.edu

¹ For a discussion of the genre as it relates to plays like *The Shoemaker's Holiday*, see John A. Twyning's 'City Comedy'.

² See E. A. J. Honigmann's 'Shakespeare and London's Immigrant Community circa 1600' for a brief discussion of the portrait. For an overview of Dutch influence on early modern English arts and letters, see Ben Parsons' 'Dutch Influences on English Literary Culture in the Early Renaissance, 1470–1650'.

³ Indeed, recent scholarship suggests significant bonds between parents and children even among the upper classes that Stone thinks of as remote. See, for example, the conference papers by Patricia Phillippy and Sara Mendelson. See also Catherine Frances' 'Making Marriages in Early Modern England'.

⁴ See Hamilton 117 and Moss. Janet E. Halley further argues that the diversity of opinion regarding the Family of Love is in part attributable to the difficulty of the texts, especially those of Henrik Niclaes.

⁵ As much as I agree with this particular aspect of Howard's reading, I do question her basic premise that early modern England is a 'nation-state'.

⁶ Thomas Dekker was more than likely the son or grandson of immigrants to England. The name Decker seems common enough in England, but Thomas Dekker consistently spelled his surname with a double-k characteristic of the Dutch, and Dekker appears to have had an intimate knowledge of Dutch language and literature, exemplified by the stage-Dutch he deployed in plays like *Northward Ho!* and *The Shoemaker's Holiday*, and in his use of untranslated Dutch and German sources (Jones-Davies i:29–30; Hunt 32–4). Arthur Kinney, noting that 'dekker' means 'thatcher' in Dutch, suggests that Dekker 'was descended from a line of craftsmen' and that 'he had traded in work of the hands for work of the mind, the life of a craftsman for that of a merchant' (248–9).

Works Cited

- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities, Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised Edition. London and New York: Verso, 1991.
- Anthias, Floya and Nira Yuval-Davis. 'Introduction.' *Woman – Nation – State*. Eds. Nira Yuval-Davis and Floya Anthias. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989. 1–16.
- Armstrong, John. *Nations before Nationalism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982.
- Bradbrook, Muriel C. *Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Brigden, Susan. *London and the Reformation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- Campos, Edmund Valentine. 'Jews, Spaniards, and Portingales: Ambiguous Identities of Portuguese *Marranos* in Elizabethan England.' *ELH* 69.3 (2002): 599–616.
- Cott, Nancy F. *Public Vows: A History of Marriage and the Nation*. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Cottret, Bernard. *The Huguenots in England, Immigration and Settlement c. 1550–1700*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Craigie, James, ed. *The Basilicon Doron of King James VI*. Edinburgh-London: Scottish Text Society, 1944–50, II.
- D'Ewes, Simonds. *A Complete Journal of the Votes, Speeches, and Debates, Both of the House of Lords and House of Commons Throughout the Whole Reign of Queen Elizabeth, 1693*. Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources Inc., 1974.
- Erickson, Amy L. *Women and Property in Early Modern England*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Finkelppearl, Philip J. *John Marston of the Middle Temple*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969.

- Fleck, Andrew. 'Marking Difference and National Identity in Dekker's *The Shoemaker's Holiday*.' *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 46.2 (2006): 349–70.
- Frances, Catherine. 'Making Marriages in Early Modern England: Rethinking the Role of Family and Friends.' *The Marital Economy in Scandinavia and Britain, 1400–1900*. Eds. Maria Agren and Amy Louise Erickson. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2005. 39–56.
- Fuller, Thomas. *The Church History of Britain*. London: Thomas Tegg & Son, 1837.
- Geckle, George L. 'John Marston.' *Dictionary of Literary Biography, Volume 58: Jacobean and Caroline Dramatists*. Ed. Fredson Bowers. Madison, VA: The Gale Group, 1987. 139–68.
- Gibbons, Brian. *Jacobean City Comedy*. London: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Gurr, Andrew. *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Halley, Janet E. 'Heresy, Orthodoxy, and the Politics of Religious Discourse: The Case of the English Family of Love.' *Representations* 15 (1986): 98–120.
- Hamilton, Alastair. *The Family of Love*. Cambridge, UK: James Clarke and Co., 1981.
- Haselkorn, Anne M. *Prostitution in Elizabethan and Jacobean Comedy*. Troy, NY: Whitson Press, 1983.
- Haughton, William. *Englishmen for My Money: Or a Pleasant Comedy, Called, A Woman Will Have Her Will*. London: W. White, 1616.
- Hessels, Joannes Henricus. *Ecclesiae Londino-Batavae Archivum*. 3 vols. Cambridge: Typis Academiae, 1887–1897.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Hoenselaars, A. J. *Images of Englishmen and Foreigners in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*. London and Toronto: Associated University Press, 1992.
- Honigmann, E. A. J. 'Shakespeare and London's Immigrant Community circa 1600.' *Elizabethan and Modern Studies, Presented to Professor Willem Schrickx on the Occasion of his Retirement*. Ed. J. P. Vander Motten. Gent: Seminarie voor Engelse en Amerikaanse Literatuur, R. U. G., 1985. 143–53.
- Howard, Jean. 'Mastering Difference in *The Dutch Courtesan*.' *Shakespeare Studies* 24 (1996): 105–17.
- Hunt, Mary Leland. *Thomas Dekker, a Study*. New York: Russell and Russell, 1964.
- Jones-Davies, Marie-Therese. *Un Peintre de la Vie Londonienne: Thomas Dekker*. 2 vols. Paris: Collection des Études Anglaises, 1958.
- Kermode, Lloyd Edward. 'Alien Stages: Immigration, Reformation, and Representations of Englishness in Elizabethan Moral and Comic Drama.' Dissertation. Rice University, 1998.
- Keyshian, Harry. 'Dekker's *Whore* and Marston's *Courtesan*.' *English Language Notes* 4 (1967): 261–6.
- Kinney, Arthur, ed. *Renaissance Drama, an Anthology of Plays and Entertainments*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999.
- Leinwand, Theodore B. *The City Staged: Jacobean Comedy, 1603–1613*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1986.
- Marston, John. *The Dutch Courtesan*. Ed. Martin L. Wine. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1968.
- McCluskey, Peter M. 'The Strangers' Case': Representations of Flemish Immigrants in Renaissance English Drama, 1515–1635.' Dissertation. University of Arkansas, 1998.
- Mendelson, Sara. 'Seventeenth-Century Childrearing in Theory and Practice: Mary Clarke and John Locke.' The Fifty-Second Annual Meeting of the Renaissance Society of America, 23–25 March, San Francisco, CA.
- Moss, Jean Dietz. 'Variations on a Theme: The Family of Love in Renaissance England.' *Renaissance Quarterly* 31.2 (1978): 186–95.
- Parsons, Ben. 'Dutch Influences on English Literary Culture in the Early Renaissance, 1470–1650.' *Literature Compass* 4 (2007): 1577–96. 4 May 2009. <<http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/117994500/abstract>>.
- Pettegree, Andrew. *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Phillippy, Patricia. "'The Marble of My Childe': Funeral Monuments and Early Modern Childhood.' The Fifty-Second Annual Meeting of the Renaissance Society of America, 23–25 March, San Francisco, CA.
- Pincombe, Mike. 'Review of Janette Dillon, *Language and Stage in Medieval and Renaissance England*.' *Renaissance Forum* 3.2 (1998). July 2006. <<http://www.hull.ac.uk/renforum/v3no2/pincombe.htm>>.
- Pollitt, Ronald. "'Refuge of the Distressed Nations,'" Perceptions of Aliens in Elizabethan England.' *The Journal of Modern History* 52.1 (on demand supplement, 1980): D1001–19.
- Pollock, Linda. *Forgotten Children: Parent-Child Relations from 1500–1900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Racioppi, Linda and Katherine O'Sullivan. 'Engendering Nation and National Identity.' *Women, States, and Nationalism: At Home in the Nation?* Eds. Sita Ranchod-Nilsson and Mary Ann Tétreault. London and New York: Routledge, 2000. 18–34.
- Schwyzler, Philip. *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Scott, Michael. *John Marston's Plays*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1978.
- Smith, Anthony D. *Myths and Memories of the Nation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Smith, Emma. "'So Much English by the Mother': Gender, Foreigners, and the Mother Tongue in William Haughton's *Englishmen for My Money*.' *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 13 (2000): 165–81.

- Spicer, Andrew. 'A Process of Gradual Assimilation: The Exile Community in Southampton, 1567–1635.' *The Strangers' Progress: Integration and Disintegration of the Huguenot and Walloon Refugee Community, 1567–1889. Essays in Memory of Irene Scouloudi. Proceedings of the Huguenot Society* 26.2. London: Huguenot Society of Great Britain and Ireland, 1995. 186–98.
- Stone, Lawrence. *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500–1800*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1977.
- Tawney, Richard Henry and Eileen Power. *Tudor Economic Documents*. Vol. 1. London: Lowe and Brydone Printers, 1963.
- Twynning, John A. 'City Comedy.' *A Companion to Renaissance Drama*. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2002. 353–66.
- Wine, Martin L. 'Introduction.' *The Dutch Courtesan*. Ed. Martin L. Wine. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1968. i–xxviii.
- Yungblut, Laura Hunt. '*Strangers Settled Here among Us*': *Policies, Perceptions and the Presence of Aliens in Elizabethan England*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira. *Gender and Nation*. London: Sage Publication, 1997.