'So much English by the Mother': gender, foreigners and the mother tongue in William Haughton's *Englishmen for My Money* (1598)

Emma Smith, Hertford College, Oxford

For those dramatists representing a theatricalized version of contemporary London in the civic comedies of the early seventeenth century, there was a cast of stock characters waiting for employment. Alongside the prodigals and merchants and usurers and whores who populate these plays and whose roles have been extensively discussed[1], however, another conventional character needs to be examined: the amorous foreigner. This character, usually male, has received relatively little critical attention, despite appearing in more than a score of plays from the period 1580-1620[2]. In what follows, I want to suggest that some of the dramatic interest of this figure derives from contemporary anxieties about inter-national sexual liaisons. The sexual interface was, I argue, metonymic of other boundaries and categories of inclusion and exclusion as the city sought, through its dramatic self-fashioning, to define itself and its populace. Through representing foreign characters in a London setting, and specifically through the representation of their accented English speech, the plays construct legible and recognizable fictions of both Englishness and non-Englishness, in order to produce an idea of national identity. Numerous comedies of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries explore the crucial and problematic role of women in the national polity. As the 'reproducers of [the nation's] boundaries'[3], women's chastity, repeatedly assailed by foreign suitors, is critical in its capacity to guarantee or to hazard a secure national identity. These issues are given a complex articulation in William Haughton's play *Englishmen for My Money* (1598), which, in the context of other plays of the period, can be seen to problematize an easy idea of civic and national identity.

Foreigners formed a significant part of the early modern London populace. During the 1560s and early 1570s, immigration from mainland Europe, particularly of Protestant Huguenots from France and the Low Countries, reached a peak. Relations between these newcomers and the native Londoners were fraught: in 1567 libels were published showing 'galowys and as it were hangying of strangers', and in 1572 foreigners were warned not to venture into the streets. In April 1586 the city aldermen noted 'some dislike […] amongest divers her highness subjectes of the meaner sorte in respects of the dearthe and scarcytie increased in some places of this Realm aswell by the number of strangers'.[4] Economic grievances continued to be laid at the door of the alien communities in libels, petitions and ballads – and in plays. The Dutch Church Libel of 1593, for example, makes allusions to several plays and resulted in the arrest of the dramatist Christopher Marlowe for suspected involvement in stirring up anti-alien rioting.[5] The authorities' response was to commission, in short succession during 1593, two separate censuses of 'the Strangers of the *French, Dutch* and Italian churches', which put the total at around 7000. Recent estimates of the total population of the city and the liberties in 1600 at 200,000 makes the foreign population about 3.5%.[6] Significantly, however, although second-generation immigrants were counted as English nationals by law, many people born in England to foreign-born parents are included on the censuses. Anti-alien feeling was at a pitch during the early 1590s, a generation after the most significant influx of foreign immigrants into England, suggesting that stranger communities remained a focus for discontent. The theater's role in the relations between the communities is most clearly seen in the fragmentary manuscript of *The Booke of Sir Thomas More* (c.1593). *The Booke of Sir Thomas More*

concerns the Ill Mayday riots of 1517 during which apprentices targeted foreigners resident in London. That a repetition of this was feared by the Elizabethan authorities is made clear by a report in 1586 by William Fletewode, Recorder of the City of London, about the interrogation of a number of suspects 'for conspiring an insurrection in this cittie against the French and Dutche […] all things as lyke unto Yll MayDaye, as could be devised'.[7]

The Booke of Sir Thomas More establishes the dramatic paradigm for sexual encounters between native and foreign. This unfinished and apparently unperformed play opens with Doll, a Londoner, struggling against her would-be seducer, a Lombard called De Bard. In the manuscript's opening stage direction, he is found 'haling her by the arme' and claiming 'thou art my prize and I pleade purchase of thee'[8]. This is the last straw after a string of foreign insolencies, and the redoubtable Doll incites the menfolk of the city to riot in defense of her marital chastity. She leads them 'in a shirt of Maile, a head piece, sword and Buckler', and orders an attack on the strangers' houses to inscribe Mayday on the calendar 'in flaming letters'.[9] Along with the other miscreants, she is arrested. On the scaffold, she kisses her husband, makes arrangements for the care of her children, and delivers her final, rousing, justificatory speech:

> Now let me tell the women of this towne,
> No straunger yet brought doll to lying downe.
> So long as I an Englishman can see,
> Nor ffrenche nor dutche shall get a kisse of me.
> And when that I am dead, for me yet say,
> I dyed in scorne to be a straungers preye.[10]

This (apparent) valediction refigures the riot as the defense of her threatened chastity, the proper patriotic response of men and women to the sexual presumption of a foreigner. Her behavior is, indeed, implicitly endorsed, as it is immediately followed by the arrival of a pardon for all the rioters from the king.

Doll's unique dramatic presentation has no precedent in Raphael Holinshed's narrative of the events of 1517, an account which the play follows closely in all other particulars. Its symbolic charge is clear. Her vulnerable female body stands in for the body politic, the civic populace whose livelihood, according to the play, is threatened by the economic activities of foreign immigrants. The sexual threat posed by the amorous Lombard functions as the perceived threat to the city itself. Doll's debased scaffold heroics admit her into the gallery of female personifications of the city of London common to contemporary civic pageant literature. George Peele's pageant for the Lord Mayor's investiture in 1585 *The Device of the Pageant Borne Before Wolstan Dixi*, for example, describes London as 'This lovely Lady rich and beautifull'; Robert Wilson's play *The Three Lords and Three Ladies of London* (1589) opens with a tableau of the gendered metropolis: 'Enter the Preface, a Lady very richly attyred, representing London'; Thomas Dekker 's pageant for James' arrival in London *The Magnificent Entertainment* (1604) uses the extended image of marriage with the new king as 'Bridegrome' and the city as wife; and Thomas Middleton's civic entertainment *The Triumphs of Truth* (1613) describes how 'a grave feminine shape presents itself from behind a silk curtain, representing London'.[11] As Gail Kern Paster has written in her

study *The Idea of the City in the Age of Shakespeare*, the walled city lent itself to female personification in classical and Christian iconography, and 'as a fortified place subject to siege and assault, this personified city becomes associated with sexual possession'[12]. De Bard's assault on Doll is thus an assault on the feminized city of London, as female sexuality serves as a trope for writing out other anxieties about the presence of foreign communities in the capital.

Such sexual assaults are, however, always successfully repelled. Robert Wilson's *The Three Lords and Three Ladies of London* (1589) dramatizes the defeated Spanish Armada as the triumph of native suitors over Spanish ones for the hands of three eponymous London ladies. The play ends with these three marriages based on compatible nationalities. Other plays are less obviously symbolic than Wilson's - whose Spanish Lords are called Pride, Ambition and Tyranny, and whose English marriages couple Policy with Love, Pomp with Lucre and Pleasure with Conscience - but the allegorical purpose of the encounter between native and foreign is the same. The conventional impossibility of sexual relations between English wives and presumptuous strangers is a plot device in a number of early modern dramatic representations of the city. French doctors in *The Wisdom of Dr Dodypoll* (1600) and *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (c.1600), for example, are characterized as unsuccessful wooers, and in John Marston's *Jack Drums Entertainment* (1601) there appears a 'Gotish French-man, *Mounsieur John fo de King*'[13] whose congenial drunkenness with Jack Drum and Timothy Tweedle ends over a disagreement about the favors of a woman:

> *Mounsieur*. Hee my Vinifride, by gor you are come, in te very nick to pleasure mee, pree you kisse mee, clip mee, love mee, or by gor mee ang die certaine.
> *Drum*. Out you French Dogge, touch my Love, and Ile -
> *Mounsieur*. Touch her, by gor mee touch her, and touch her, and touch her. [14]

In the play, the Frenchman's stereotypical virility is used to gull him, as Brabant Senior tricks him into an encounter with his chaste wife, Mistress Brabant:

> I wil strait frame the strongest eternall Jest
> That e're was builded by Invention:
> My wife lies verie private in the Towne,
> I'le bring the French man to her presently,
> As to a loose lascivious Curtezan:
> Nor he, nor you, nor she shall know the rest
> But it shall be immortal for a Jest.[15]

The foreigner's suit is here so unlikely to succeed that it can be provoked and staged with no danger to Brabant himself. There is even a certain frisson at this dalliance with forbidden, and controlled, sexual expression. Without exception, English women in Elizabethan comedies follow Doll's advice in *The Booke of Sir Thomas More*, and repeatedly snub and rebuff alien advances. Dramatic mixed marriages or dalliances are presented as a comic taboo, frequently evoked only to be made risible in the reiterated spectacle of foreign inferiority.

This taboo is enforced by the association of stage prostitutes with foreigners. If the city could be personified as a maiden, it could also attract the corresponding negative associations of female allegory, as Dekker demonstrates in the ironic paeon to London in his pamphlet *The Seven Deadly Sinnes of London* (1606):

> O London, […] Thou hast all things in thee to make thee fairest, and all things in thee to make thee foulest: for thou art attir'de like a Bride, drawing all that looke upon thee to be in love with thee, but there is much harlot in thine eyes.[16]

Laurence Manley's observation that 'the history of [civic] personification is also a history of sexual ambivalence, as the Book of Revelation's contrast between Jerusalem, the Bride of Christ, and Rome, the Whore of Babylon, attests' mobilizes the traditional dichotomy of virgin/whore for the feminized city.[17] If chaste women maintain the boundary between native and foreign by rejecting foreign suitors, unchaste ones confound that boundary in their indiscriminate sexuality. The bifurcated feminization of the city, as virtuous and as immoral, shapes the frequently-staged comic encounter between English women and foreign men. Behind the comedy, however, is a taboo: no play outside the historical chronicles shows a sexual relationship between people of different nations until the early years of the seventeenth century.

Thus, the stage prostitute's traffic with foreign men is often emphasized. In Robert Wilson's *The Three Ladies of London* (1581), Lady Lucre is indicted at the end of the play on the charge of adultery with the Italian merchant Mercadore. In her personification, the avaricious and unscrupulous financial operations of the city are sexualized as female promiscuity: trade is imaged as intercourse with foreigners and thus as a kind of prostitution. In Dekker and Webster's *Northward Ho* (1604), another Doll, in contrast to her namesake in *The Booke of Sir Thomas More*, comments appreciatively on the generosity of her Dutch clients, and is heard conversing in stage-Dutch with Hans van Belch, and later in Welsh to the Welsh captain. A young apprentice who is accused of being a bawd denies that he '[e]ver sold one Maiden-head

ten severall times, first to an Englishman, then to a Welshman, than to a Dutchman, then to a pockie Frenchman'.[18] Mary Faugh, the bawd in Marston's *The Dutch Courtezan* (1605) addresses the eponymous courtesan, Franceschina, in similar terms:

> I ha made as much a your maydenhead, and you had been mine owne daughter, I could not ha sold your Mayden head oftner than I ha done. I ha sworn for you, God forgive me, I have made you acquainted with the Spaniard, *Don Skirtoll,* with the Italian M. *Beieroane,* with the Irish Lord, S. *Patrick*; with the Dutch Marchant, *Haunce Helkin Glukin Skellam Flappdragon*; and specially with the greatest French, and now lastly with this English[19].

Here this conventional trope is unmodified in the light of Franceschina's own foreignness, although Marston's title may play on the titillating associations of foreign sex[20]. Middleton's *A Fair Quarrel* (1617) uses a similar catalogue in the mouth of Meg the Bawd, culminating in the association of 'French' with venereal disease:

> Whate'er we get by strangers
> The Scotch, the Dutch, or Irish,
> Or to come nearer home.
> By masters of the parish,
> It is concluded thus,
> By all and every wench,
> To take of all their coins,
> And pay 'em back in French.[21]

Another whore, this time in Heywood's *If You Know Not Me, You Know No Bodie* (1606) exclaims to her English love:

> O how I dote on thee! I have tride ere now
> The sweaty Spaniard and the carousing Dane,
> The foggy Dutchman, and the fiery French,
> The briske Italian, and indeed what not;
> And yet of all and all, the Englishman

The English object of this adulation, John, replies with the proverbial phrase, 'why then the Englishman for thy money'.[22]

The play which most insistently plays on this theme takes it for a title. William Haughton's *Englishmen for My Money* (1598) concerns the matrimonial ambitions of the daughters of Pisaro, a wealthy merchant. At the opening of the play, his background is explained:

> ...every Soyle to mee is naturall:
> Indeed by birth, I am a *Portingale*,
> Who driven by Westerne winds on *English* shore,
> Heere liking of the soyle, I maried,
> And have Three Daughters.[23]

He describes his fortune as deriving from 'the sweete lovde trade of Usurie'[24]. (Elsewhere there is a suggestion that he is intended to be interpreted as Jewish.[25]) Three unfortunate English gentlemen, Harvie, Ferdinand, and Ned, have contracted debts to him, and thus their claims to marry his daughters, though welcomed by the young ladies themselves, are not supported by Pisaro. He has other plans:

> There are three wealthy Marchants in the Towne,
> All strangers, and my very speciall friendes,
> The one of them is an Italian:
> A french-man, and a Dutchman be the other.[26]

The stage is quickly set: the three foreign rivals for the daughters' hands are tricked and ridiculed, and through the agency of the women and the help of the clownlike

Friso and the girls' amiable tutor Anthony, the triple marriages to the Englishmen are presented as a *fait accompli* to Pisaro. Three

Alexander Leggatt claimed *Englishmen for My Money* as the first city comedy, but Theodore Leinwand gives as his reason for not including it in his study 'the jingoism that motivates the tedious plot'.[27] This criticism seems to take the play's own titular chauvinism too much for granted. As an exercise in a simplistic assertion of national superiority, *Englishmen for My Money* undermines fixed ideas of national identity at every turn. From the uncertain status of the three sisters born to a Portuguese father, Pisaro, and an English mother, to the multiple disguises as the foreigners try to pass for English and vice versa, the play offers a curiously dense index to the problematic of national recognition and certainty. William Haughton's own relative invisibility in the records of the early modern theatre has not helped the critical reputation of this play, his only extant sole-authored work. Haughton first appears in Henslowe's diary in 1597 and over the next five years is associated with some twenty-two other plays, in combination with other jobbing Admiral's Men writers such as John Day, Thomas Dekker, Wentworth Smith (a witness to Haughton's will in 1605) and Henry Chettle. Henslowe also reveals that Haughton was imprisoned in the Clink in March 1600, probably for debt. He died in 1605. *Englishmen for My Money* was entered on the Stationers' Register in 1601, and first published in 1616. Two further editions appeared in 1626, advertised as 'As it hath been divers times Acted with great applause', and in 1631.

By 1598, certain dramatic tropes for representing foreigners were well established. First among these was accented speech. Stage foreigners, since their first appearance in Tudor interludes such as *An Enterlude of Welth and Helth* (1554) or Ulpian Fulwell's *Like Will To Like* (1568), had developed a singular idiolect, comprising an abominable mixture of exclamations and phrases from their native language coupled with a distorted form of English that seems to have varied in intelligibility. Often it was unwittingly rude, with the joke firmly on the foreigner. No dramatic foreigner, it seems, could ever speak English without this insistent marker of foreignness. In his account of 'The Excellencies of the English Tongue', first published in 1614, Richard Carew praises English as a shibboleth which enables non-natives to be forever recognized: 'a stranger, tho never so long conversant amongst us, carrieth ever more a Watch-word on his tongue, to descrie him by'[28]. Such aural self-description was crucial to the representation of foreigners on the stage, and early modern printed playtexts appear to attempt to represent this speech phonetically. Spoken language is the most insistent marker of nationality in stage comedies, in a representational strategy which pushes linguistic competence into the forefront of stage nationality. Language thus becomes the key site for the comic theatrical differentiation of native and foreign.

Englishmen for My Money follows this comic convention in many respects. The butt of much of the humor is the heavy accents of the immigrant merchants, who frequently speak in succession to heighten the comic effect:

> *Vandalle*. Gods sekerlin, dats un-fra meskin, Monsieur *Delion* dare de Grote freister, dare wode ic zene, tis un-fra Daughter, dar heb ic so long loude, dare Heb my desire so long gewest.
> *Alvaro*. Ah *Venice, Roma, Italiam, Frauncia, Anglitera*, nor all dis orbe can shew so much *belliza, veremante de secunda, Madona de granda bewtie*.
> *Delio*. Certes me dincke de mine depeteta de little Angloise, de me Mastresse *Pisaro* is un nette, un becues, un fra, at un tendra Damosella[29].

In fact, the daughters' implacable opposition to their father's preferred suitors is repeatedly figured in terms of linguistic incompatibility. As Laurentia tells Vandalle, the Dutchman:

> Maister Vandalle, as much as I say for you;
> If needes you marry with an English lasse,
> Woe her in English, or sheele call you Asse[30].

It is language which marks the daughters' self-identified nationality. Marina says she can speak no other language but English, interrupting her Italian beau's sweet nothings with 'Pray sir, what is all this in English?', and her sister Mathea rejects her own suitor by declaring 'I have so much English by the Mother/That no bace slavering French shall make me stoope'[31]. Friso, their servant describes the French teacher as 'a clipper of the Kings English: and to conclude an eternall enemie to all good Language'[32]. Even the unspeakable possibility of inter-national marriage and its mongrel offspring is transferred to the resultant linguistic progeny. Friso begs: 'doe not suffer a litter of Languages to spring up amongst us'[33]. While the foreign suitors cannot escape their watchword accents, however, Pisaro's own language is unmarked, despite being himself an immigrant to London. Accented language as a marker of foreignness is further complicated by Anthony, the girls' tutor. At the beginning of the play, Pisaro

sacks Anthony, intending to get a new French master for his daughters. Many immigrants to London did work as language tutors, as John Eliot mocks in his Ortho-epia Gallica of 1593 in a sideswipe at 'the learned professors of the Frenche tongue in the famous citie of London' who, against a background of 'still warres' at home, are 'in good health, have many schollers, get good store of Crowns, and drinke good wine'[34]. Anthony's response to this trend towards foreign teachers is admirable: undeterred by his ignorance of French he disguises himself as a Frenchman and reapplies for his old job. All he needs is a suitably outlandish accent to pass for a foreigner.

The three daughters are adamant that they will not marry the foreign merchants. The play has two titles: 'Englishmen for My Money', which is implicitly voiced by the women, and 'A Woman will have her will' - implicitly about them. At least two stock storylines, then, one concerning the comic implausibility of foreign suitors, and the other concerning New Comedy's foiled parental attempts to control the marriage choices of their children, are being played out. Ultimately, Laurentia, Mathea and Marina hold out against their father's choices and marry their English suitors. Clearly, though, their own mother clearly had no such qualms about marrying a foreigner. This rather unnecessary convolution to the plot – a patriotic message would have been clearer had the three women been unequivocally English - brings up a number of questions about the status of the daughters.

As the English-born daughters of a foreigner, the women's own national status is ambivalent, but their claim to Englishness rests entirely with the absent mother. Her

very existence is evaded in Pisaro's elliptical description:

> I maried,
> And have Three Daughters: But impartiall Death
> Long since, deprivde mee of her dearest life:
> Since whose discease, in London I have dwelt[35].

We never see her, nor hear her name. It would have been impossible to show this match on stage, and although such a marriage does not seem to have been unthinkable in contemporary London, the available evidence does not suggest that exogamy was common. It does seem, however, that it was more common for stranger men to marry English women than the other way around: in his research into the records of the French Church in Threadneedle Street, Charles Littleton finds only a handful of mixed marriages among the 336 households, and that 'all but one of the twenty exogamous marriages [...] concern stranger husbands and their English wives'[36]. On the other hand, however, the historian of London's immigrant Protestant communities Andrew Pettegree has described a 'marriageable daughter' as a passport for more prosperous members of these communities to integrate themselves into the host community.[37] The status of the heirs to these pairs of English and foreign grandparents is uncertain. Marital assimilation, however, remained relatively insignificant in relations between the different communities.[38] What is significant is the reiterated dramatic trope of trans-national desire, as the theater refashions and renegotiates the models of assimilation and distinction for the heterogeneous London population.

During the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, there was an ongoing legal debate about whether national identity was primarily inherited or bestowed through the place of birth. There were several attempts in Parliament to make the English-born children of foreigners, who were by law English citizens, subject to additional taxes and other restrictions placed on immigrants. On the other hand, the pragmatism of an expanding nation meant that inheritance needed to be taken into account, otherwise none of the nascent colonies could perpetuate themselves as English settlements. Francis Bacon, commenting on the Calvin case in 1609, argued that 'either place or parents' should suffice: 'If he be born in England it is no matter though his parents be Spaniards, or what you will: on the other side, if he be born of English parents, it skilleth not though he be born in Spain or in any other place of the world'[39]. This double standard, however, was not widely accepted. The ontological question of whether national identity was the contextual, cultural, circumstantial and ultimately arbitrary property of the place of birth, or the biological, inherent and inherited property of the blood was unresolved.[40] In practice, no-one knew. Mixed marriages complicated this still further. What was the status of children born to English/foreign matches? Was there a difference between those with an English father and those whose mother was the English parent? Many children of mixed marriages paid taxes at the non-native rate or paid to become denizens to alleviate certain disadvantageous fiscal pressures on aliens. The French church court discussed at intervals through this period whether the children born to a mixed marriage were French enough to benefit from the community's system of poor relief, never, it seems, coming to a clear conclusion. Neither the host not immigrant communities knew how to categorize children born of

one stranger and one native parent, despite the apparent certainty of *Englishmen for My Money* on this point.

If Mistress Pisaro is a notable absence from Haughton's play, it is not until *Westward Ho,* Dekker and Webster's play of 1604, that non-historical drama shows a marriage between a foreigner and an English woman. Here, though, the play begins with the separation of the Italian merchant Justiniano and his English wife, although they are reconciled at the conclusion. They have also apparently had the delicacy not to have children. In *Englishmen for My Money*, however, the play's insistence on the inviolable Englishness of its female characters relies on inheritance through the mother, however, and the consequent marginalization of paternity. When Mathea claims 'so much English by the Mother', the implicit question is 'how much'? The play cannot allow for intermarriage onstage, although some of its contradictions about the status of foreignness are predicated on the 'mongrill' parentage of the distinctly unEnglish sounding trio Laurentia, Mathea and Marina. Their assertion of Englishness is primarily linguistic: it is, quite literally, the mother tongue.

The trope of the mother tongue is frequently evoked in the contemporary debate about the status of the English language, and particularly about word-borrowing from other languages. Much of this debate follows Richard Mulcaster's *Elementarie* (1582) in using terms referring to categories of citizenship, particularly denization and naturalization, as principles of lexical organization. Thus the language is divided into 'homeborn' and 'stranger', with the second category

'*enfranchised*, become bond to the rules of our writing […] as the stranger denisons be to the laws of our cuntrie'.[41] The mother tongue, though, is an image which shifts unsettlingly between the symbolic and the material. It is both a property of the country, the symbolic mother, and of the immediate, material parent. To give one example, the first synonym dictionary in English, Robert Cawdrey's *A Table Alphabeticall* (1604) reproduces verbatim from Thomas Wilson's *Arte of Rhetoric* (1553) to criticize some men who 'seek so far for outlandish English that they forget altogether their mother's language' - where mother's language seems simply to mean the native language of English. The passage goes on to literalize this 'so that if some of their mothers were alive, they were not able to tell or understand what they say, and yet these fine English clerks will say they speak in their mother tongue'[42]. This literalization is rather more startling in a reference to the 'mother tongue' in Camden's *Remains Concerning Britain* (1605). Camden is praising English noblemen who have not allowed their language to be corrupted though living in Ireland. He likens these linguistic standard-bearers to a historic colonial enterprise:

> So that our Ancesters seemed in part as jealous of their native language, as those Britons which passed hence into France, and marrying strange women there, did cut out their tongues, lest their children should corrupt their language with their mothers tongues.[43]

Here it seems that Englishness can be maintained despite intermarriage, so long as the pollutant mother tongue, here an alien mother tongue, is forcibly amputated.

In his play, Haughton has killed off the mother, but not her tongue: Pisaro's wife has given her language, and with it her national status, to her daughters. This

unlikely double bequest disregards both contemporary rules on inheritance of property and titles, and widespread Galenic assumptions about reproduction which credited the male with providing the matter of the child, and the female with an empty space in which it could grow. We can see from some of the historical records that the idea of the mother's national identity automatically conveying itself to her children is by no means self-evident. In the records of those who applied for Acts of Naturalization and Letters of Denization, something of the ambivalence of the mother's role in transmitting national identity to her child can be seen. Both John Bartholomewe, born abroad to a London couple 'both mere Inglishe', and Bartilmew Beeston and his siblings born in Antwerp to an English merchant father and Dutch mother, are granted naturalization in 1580-1[44]. Here, birthplace is a more urgent consideration than the national configurations of parentage, and there is no discernible difference between the treatment of children with two English parents and those with a non-English mother. There are no cases of naturalization concerning children born abroad to an English mother and non-English father, perhaps partly because English women did not have the same opportunities or reasons for travel outside England. In the early years of James' reign, the immigration of Scots provides other examples of the difference between the national statuses of men and women. In cases involving a marriage between an English man and a Scottish woman, such as that of Charles, Earl of Nottingham and his wife Margarett, naturalization for the woman with provision for their children is sought. The Act of Naturalization concerning Margarett, Duchess of Nottingham, extends the privilege for 'all and evene her children lawfullie begotten, and to be begotten, wheresoever she was or they shalbe borne'[45], which, in its final

clause, conflates the possible disability of her foreign birth, apparently not automatically offset by her naturalization, with another possible disability: that her children might be born outside England. Where both partners are Scottish, however, the Naturalization is applied to the husband with the wife as an extension of the benefit. Children are accounted the child of their father, so that George and Elizabeth Howme, children of Sir George Howme and Elizabeth Gordon, both of Scotland, are naturalized along with their parents, with the proviso that includes 'all and evene other the children of the said S^{r} George Howme by him lawfullie to be begotten, and w^{ch} heereafter shalbe borne wthin the Kingdomes of England and Scotland, or any other y^{or} hignes domynions'[46], suggesting that it is paternity which is important in bestowing the privileges of nationality on the child.

The legal complexities of maternal inheritance, along with the symbolic complexities of the trope of the mother tongue, combine to make *Englishmen for My Money* a rather more nuanced response to contemporary anxieties than Leinwand's epithet 'jingoistic' suggests. G.K. Hunter's reading of the play as one in which 'foreignness is no part of the moral structure, but is only an intriguing local colour'[47] comes, perhaps unwittingly, closer to its confusions between apparently oppositional national categories in his elision of 'foreignness' and 'local'. The fascination of the possible attraction between English and foreign attests to the compulsion of English projections of national identity, and these dramatic courtships stage a culture which is imaginatively engaged in defining and fixing the otherness of the foreigner, and in testing and affirming its own self-identity. Women in these plays are presented both as

the custodians and the destroyers of a sustainable national identity. In her character as maid or chaste bride she is its guarantor, while as whore she is its greatest threat. Just as women's place in the maintenance and inheritance of national identity is problematic and disruptive, so women in the plays are ciphers for the national polity, and the strained legibility of the categories of Englishness and foreignness. Peter Stallybrass has written of the ways in which, in Renaissance thought:

> the normative 'woman' could become the emblem of the perfect and impermeable container, and hence a map of the integrity of the state. The state, like the virgin, was a hortus conclusus, an enclosed garden walled off from enemies[48].

Plays such as *Englishmen for My Money* cast the foreign threat to this sexual and national integrity in comic terms, in their presentation of the hapless and unlikely alien suitors of English women. 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.

NOTES

[1]Both Brian Gibbons, *Jacobean City Comedy* (London: 1980) and Theodore Leinwand , *The City Staged: Jacobean Comedy, 1603-1613* (Wisconsin: 1986) discuss these stock characters. Neither is concerned with the figure of the foreigner.

[2]Wilson O. Clough's 'The Broken English of Foreign Characters of the Elizabethan Stage' in *Philological Quarterly* 12 (1933), pp255-68, includes a list of plays featuring such characters.

[3]Nira Yuval-Davis and Flora Anthias (eds), *Women - Nation - State* (London: 1989), p.7.

[4] Ian W. Archer, *The Pursuit of Stability: Social Relations in Elizabethan London* (Cambridge: 1991), p.7.

[5] The text of the Dutch Church Libel is printed in Arthur Freeman, 'Marlowe, Kyd, and the Dutch Church Libel', *English Literary Renaissance* 3 (1973), 50-1.

[6] John Strype, *Brief Annals of the Church and State Under the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (London: 1731), p.167. The population estimate comes from Roger Finlay and Beatrice Shearer, 'Population growth and suburban expansion', in A.L Beier and Roger Finlay (eds), *London 1500-1700: the Making of the Metropolis* (London: 1986), p.45.

[7] Quoted by Alfred Pollard in *Shakespeare's Hand in 'The Play of Sir Thomas More': Papers by Alfred W. Pollard, W.W Greg, E. Maunde Thompson, J. Dover Wilson & R. W Chambers* (Cambridge: 1923), p.37.

[8]Anon., *The Booke of Sir Thomas More* (Malone Society Reprints, Oxford: 1911), p.1.

[9]*Booke*, p.15.

[10]*Booke*, p.24.

[11]George Peele, *The Device of the Pageant Borne Before Wolstan Dixi* in *The Life and Works of George Peele* vol. I, ed. Charles Tyler Prouty (Yale: 1952), 45-7; Robert Wilson, *The Three Lords and Three Ladies of London* (Tudor Facsimile Texts, n.p.: 1912), sig. A2v°; Thomas Dekker, *The Magnificent Entertainment Given to King James* in *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker* vol. II ed. Fredson Bowers (Cambridge: 1955), 1545-50; Thomas Middleton, *The Triumphs of Truth* in *The Works of Thomas Middleton* vol. VII ed. A.H. Bullen (London: 1886), p.236.

[12]Gail Kern Paster, *The Idea of the City in the Age of Shakespeare* (Athens, Georgia: 1985), p.4.

[13]John Marston, *Jack Drums Entertainment* (Tudor Facsimile Texts, n.p.: 1913), sig.B4.

[14]*Jack Drums*, sig.E.

[15]*Jack Drums*, sig.G.

[16]Thomas Dekker, *The Seven Deadly Sinnes* (1606) *The Non-Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker* II ed. Alexander B. Grosart (New York:1963), p.10.

[17]Laurence Manley, *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London* (Cambridge:1995), p.355.

[18]Thomas Dekker and John Webster, *Northward Ho* in *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker* II ed. Fredson Bowers (Cambridge: 1955), I.iii.11-14

[19]John Marston, *The Dutch Courtezan* (London: 1605), sig.C2v°.

[20]Ruth Mazo Karras discusses the number of Dutch prostitutes in late medieval London, but also suggests that some prostitutes may have assumed foreignness because of its exotic cachet. See her *Common Women: Prostitution and Sexuality in Medieval England* (Oxford: 1996), esp. p.51. Anne Haselkorn suggests that the term 'Dutch widow' was current slang for a prostitute, in her *Prostitution in Elizabethan and Jacobean Comedy* (New York: 1983), p.12.

[21]Thomas Middleton, *A Fair Quarrel* in *The Works of Thomas Middleton* IV ed. A.H. Bullen (London: 1895), IV.iv.141-8.

[22]Thomas Middleton, *If You Know Not Me You Know Not Anybody Part II* (Malone Society Reprints, Oxford: 1934 (1935)), sig. Gv°.

[23]William Haughton, *Englishmen for My Money* ll 12-16.

[24]*Englishmen*, l 19.

[25] See Lloyd Edward Kermode, 'After Shylock: the 'Judaiser' in England', *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Reformation* 20 (1996), 5-26.
[26]*Englishmen*, ll 218-21.

[27]Alexander Leggatt, *Citizen Comedy in the Age of Shakespeare* (Toronto: 1973); Theodore B. Leinwand, *The City Staged* p.7. Criticism on the play has been unwilling to accord it much detailed attention, although A.J. Hoenselaars includes it in his important *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* (London and Toronto: 1992). Andrew Gurr argues interestingly for the play's influence on Shakespeare's *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, including its representation of foreign suitors, in 'Intertextuality at Windsor', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 38 (1987), 189-200.

[28]Richard Carew, *An Epistle of Richard Carew Esq* in *The Survey of Cornwall. And An Epistle Concerning the Excellencies of the English Tongue* (London: 1723), pp7-8.
[29]*Englishmen*, ll 762-771.
[30]*Englishmen*, ll 1124-6.
[31]*Englishmen*, ll 1843-4.

[32]*Englishmen*, ll 319-21.

[33]*Englishmen*, ll 347.
[34]John Eliot, *Ortho-Epia Gallica. Eliots Fruits for the French* (London: 1593), sig. A3
[35]*Englishmen*, ll 12-15.

[36]Charles Littleton, 'Social interactions of aliens in late Elizabethan London: evidence from the 1593 Return and the French Church consistory "actes"', in Randolph Vigne and Graham C.Gibbs (eds), *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 of Great Britain and Ireland XXVI (London:1995), p.153.

[37]Andrew Pettegree, '"Thirty Years On": progress towards integration amongst the immigrant population of Elizabethan London' in John Chartres and David Hey (eds), *English Rural Society 1500-1800* (Cambridge:1990), p.308.

[38] See Lien Bich Luu, 'Assimilation or Segregation: colonies of alien craftsmen in Elizabethan London' in Randolph Vigne and Graham C. Gibbs (eds), *The Strangers' Progress: Integration and Disintegration of the Huguenot and Walloon Refugee Community 1567-1889* (London: 1995).
[39]Francis Bacon, *The Works of Francis Bacon* VII eds James Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis and Douglas Denon Heath, (London: 1859) p. 664. For further details on the Calvin Case see Richard Marienstras, *New Perspectives on the Shakespearean World* trans. Janet Lloyd (Cambridge: 1985), and Emma Smith, ' "Sifting Strangers": Some Aspects of the Representation of the European Foreigner in the English Drama 1580-1617', unpublished D.Phil thesis, University of Oxford (1997).
[40] See Kim Keechang, 'Alien Status in the Medieval Common Law: An Aspect of the Birth of the Modern State', unpublished Ph.D thesis, University of Cambridge (1993).
[41]Richard Mulcaster, *The First Part of the Elementarie* (Scolar Press Facsimile, Menston: 1970), pp152-5.
[42]Robert Cawdrey, *A Table Alphabeticall* (London: 1604), sig.A3.
[43]William Camden, *Remains Concerning Britain* ed. R.D. Dunn (Toronto: 1984), p.32.
[44]William Page, *Denizations and Naturalizations of Aliens in England*, Publications of the

Huguenot Society of London VIII (Lymington: 1893), p.15; p.19.

[45]William A. Shaw, *Letters of Denization and Acts of Naturalization for Aliens in England and Ireland 1603-1700*, Publications of the Huguenot Society of London 18 (Lymington: 1911), p.2.

[46]Shaw, p.3.

[47]G.K. Hunter, *Dramatic Identities and Cultural Tradition: Studies in Shakespeare and his Contemporaries* (Liverpool: 1978), p.16.

[48]Peter Stallybrass, 'Patriarchal Territories: the Body Enclosed' in Margaret W. Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan and Nancy J. Vickers (eds), *Rewriting the Renaissance: the Discourses of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe* (Chicago: 1986), p.129.