Emma Smith

Was Shylock Jewish?

Even to ask whether Shylock was Jewish may seem perverse. After all, *The Merchant of Venice* was first registered in the Stationers' Register in July 1598 as 'the Marchaunt of Venyce or otherwise called the Iewe of Venyce'[1] and the title page of its first printed edition of 1600 promised 'the extreame crueltie of *Shylocke* the Iewe towards the sayd Merchant, in cutting a just pound of his fleshe'.[2] The word 'Jew' and its cognates are heard more than seventy times in the play, and in print in both quarto and Folio, Shylock's given name is sometimes replaced with the identity 'Jew' in stage directions and speech prefixes.[3] For critics, readers, theatre practitioners and audiences, the issue of Shylock's Jewishness and its troubling relation to the genre of romantic comedy the play attempts to inhabit, has been utterly dominant. Shylock has been variously judged 'the greatest Jewish character since the Bible'; a 'renegade', 'apostate' and a 'bad Jew through and through'; 'The Jew of the *Galut* [the diaspora] in his dark, gloomy resentments'; 'a type of that great, grand race – not a mere Houndsditch usurer': different interpretations which modify but do not interrogate the idea of 'Jew'.[4] Almost every critic of *The Merchant of Venice* acknowledges as its most compelling figure Shylock, present in only five scenes and entirely absent from its final act. Elaborating

the significance of his Jewishness has been the key hermeneutic question for readings of the play.

Nevertheless, in this article I attempt to show that some repeated critical assumptions about the play's historical context do not stand up to close investigation. I revisit the evidence for Shylock's Jewishness – that he 'looked Jewish' on the Elizabethan stage, that he is implicated in a negative dramatic character type of the 'Jew', that he recalled anti-semitic prejudice crystallized by the Lopez affair, and that he is given linguistic and other cultural habits appropriate and realistic for a Jew. Reviewing this material suggests that, rather than being rooted in the attitudes of Elizabethan England as is often claimed, Shylock's strongly Jewish identity has actually served as posthoc supplement to Shakespeare's play. Like Jonathan Gil Harris, I find the figure of the Jew in the play 'a far less transparent category of identity' than is usually assumed.[5] While some of this reassessment has already been undertaken, revised understandings of the Elizabethan Shylock have been slow to enter mainstream critical discourse, and in particular, the influential introductions to the play in prominent scholarly and student editions. Reading a continuity between modern associations of Jewishness and those of the early modern period serves to calcify prejudicial assumptions around Shylock's original racial presentation, it is the aim of this article to draw out what is at stake in our iterative cultural and critical work of racial constitution.

That Shylock draws on an existing and negative literary and theatrical caricature of Jewishness has become a commonplace in criticism of the play, and particularly in introductions to standard student and scholarly editions. For the Norton Shakespeare, Katharine Eisaman Maus asserts that 'depictions of fiendish Jews were routine in medieval and Renaissance drama; the villainous protagonist of Christopher Marlowe's *Jew of Malta*, a popular success in the early 1590s, was only the latest precedent'.[6] M.M. Mahood's introduction to the Cambridge edition of the play invokes 'the wicked Jewish moneylender stereotype', a phrase echoed in Jay L. Halio's introduction to the Oxford edition: 'Shylock is another version of the villainous Jewish money-lender'.[7] In fact Jewish characters in drama before *The Merchant of Venice* are rare, and, additionally, they are sufficiently diverse to compromise any claim that they constitute an available stereotype.[8] In the miracle plays, for instance, while Herod and Judas are inevitably marked out for obloquy, the Jewishness of the other figures around them does not equal moral turpitude, and Tudor interludes on Old Testament subjects, such as *Jacob and Esau* (1554) and *Abraham's Sacrifice* (1575), make no generalized judgments about the religion of their protagonists. Paulina Kewes notes that Thomas Legge's manuscript play *Solymitana Clades* (1579-80) demonstrates 'an attitude of qualified empathy' with its Jewish protagonists.[9] Moneylenders, too, are rarities in the literature before *The Merchant of Venice*. Robert Greene and Thomas Lodge's biblical *A Looking Glass for London and England* (c.1593) includes a merciless Usurer who will not accept repayment of his debt because the clock has just struck the due hour: there is no mention of his religion. When Cleanthes

appears in the disguise of Leon the usurer in Chapman's *The Blind Beggar of Alexandria* (c.1596) the adjective attached to him is 'rich', never 'Jewish', and his religion is not an issue. Only three differentially Jewish characters predate Shylock in the public theatres: Gerontus in Robert Wilson's *The Three Ladies of London* (1584), Abraham in Robert Greene's *Selimus* (c.1590), and Barabas in Marlowe's *The Tragedy of the Rich Jew of Malta* (c.1589).

Robert Wilson's Gerontus in *The Three Ladies of London* offers a promising Shylock prototype: Gerontus is a Jewish moneylender owed money by a Christian merchant – the familiar sum of three thousand ducats for three months - and he goes to court to recover his debt. The similarities with *The Merchant of Venice*, however, end there, for Gerontus, a moneylender in Turkey, is marked by his generous care for his unscrupulous debtor Mercadore. The play is the didactic tale of the power of Lady Lucre in drawing all men to her:

> For Lucar men come from Italy, Barbary, Turky,
>
> From Jury: nay the Pagan himselfe
>
> Indaungers his bodie to gape for her pelfe.
>
> They forsake mother, Prince, Country, Religion, kiffe and kinne,
>
> And men care not what they forsake, so Lady Lucar they winne
>
> (sig.A2v)[10]

Mercadore, an Italian merchant, is one of her conquests, and Lady Lucre engages him to export on her behalf 'wheate, Pease, Barly, Oates and Fitches and all kinde of graine', and 'Leather, Tallow, Beefe, Bacon, Belmettell and every thing'. In return, 'for these good commodities. trifles to Englande thou must bring/ As Bugles to make bables, coloured bones, glasse, beades, to make bracelettes withall' (sig.B2v). Mercadore borrows the money to fund this trade from Gerontus, who, having repeatedly asked for its repayment, seeks legal recourse. Mercadore resolves to convert to Islam and thus expunge his debt: 'Me will be a Turke'.

Gerontus tries to make him reconsider: 'I cannot think you will forsake your faith so lightly' (sig.E3). As the Judge begins to hear Mercadore's conversion, Gerontus intervenes: 'Stay there most puissant Judge. Senior Mercadorus, consider what you doo,/ Pay me the principal, as for the interest I forgive it you' (sig.F).When Mercadore rejects this offer, Gerontus persists: 'Then pay me the one halfe, if you will not pay me all' (sig.F). Again Mercadore will not be dissuaded. Gerontus relents:

> I would be loth to heare the people say, it was long of me
>
> Thou forsakest thy faith, wherefore I forgive thee franke and free:
>
> Protesting before the Judge and all the world, never to demaund peny
>
> nor halfepeny. (sig.F).

The Judge points out that plaintiff and prosecutor have exchanged their religious and moral affiliations: 'One may judge and speak truth, as appeares by this,/Jewes seeke to excel in Christianitie, and Christians in Jewishnes' (sig.F).

That the only Jewish moneylender on the Elizabethan stage before Shylock is a man of conscience who respects the Christian religion of his debtor more than he desires the legal return of his loan, has been strangely problematic for many scholars. Peter Holland, introducing the Penguin edition, claims that 'there was no shortage of Jewish villains to offset this apparently lone example of Jewish goodness', although he gives only Marlowe's Barabas in support.[11] M.J. Landa can only grudgingly allow that Gerontus 'is by no means a bad fellow' in his study of *The Jew in Drama*, since his thesis is that 'open the book of dramatic representation at whatever page you choose, you will find on it the figure of the Jew, sinister in his evil-doing, uncouth in his appearance, at best a caricature of a man'.[12] Citing Wilson's play, Jay Halio immediately discounts it in favor of other non-dramatic antecedents, most notably Thomas Nashe's prose fiction *The Unfortunate Traveller* (1594) and its depiction of 'the scoundrels Zadoch and Zachary' who are 'much more like what *we might expect*' (italics mine).[13] The expectation of wicked Jewishness seems here to be a modern, rather than an early modern, phenomenon, a back-projection which overlays an attestable dramatic history with an imagined (or expected) anti-semitic one.

Janet Adelman discusses *The Three Ladies of London* at more length in a wonderfully subtle and illuminating account of *The Merchant of Venice* informed by the historical presence of converso Jews in early modern London and explicitly and humanely framed by her own 'perspective as a Jew'.[14] But Adelman's reaction to the image of Gerontus is striking. Apparently so as to neutralize the problematic charge of his positive presentation, she identifies another character in the play, Usury, as also Jewish. Thus the two Jewish moneylenders in the play are counterbalanced: 'the Jewish usurer in England is (again reassuringly) the embodiment of foreign evil'.[15] Usury is certainly presented in *The Three Ladies of London* as a bloodsucking moneylender. He murders Hospitality, has previously lived in Venice, and serves Lady Lucre in her unscrupulous dealings with merchants and tenants, and is one 'that hath undone many an honest man,/ And daily seeks to destroy, deface, and bring to ruin if he can' (C3). But it must be noted that there is no hint whatsoever in this play that Usury is Jewish – unless *we* make the assumption that to be a ruthless moneylender must be to be Jewish. As Lady Conscience bewails, 'Usurie is made tollerable amongst Christians as a necessary thing' (D4v): Usury is of the city, rather than alien from it. *The Three Ladies of London* is not subtle in its characterization: characters are emphatically introduced, with a visual appearance consonant with their characterization (Simplicity the miller enters 'all mealy' (A3)), and are typically named and described by other characters and themselves at their entrance ('my good freend Fraude'; 'I knowe thee, thou art Dissimulation' (A3V); 'heere comes […] a Lawyer'; 'I am an Attorney of the Law' B3v)). Adelman's suggestion that the play 'does not

explicitly identify this transplanted Venetian Usury as a Jew, but the play's audience would have had no trouble making the connection' is out of step with the play's own overtly declarative representational mode. Instead her argument works overtime to discount the evidence of the play and instead to reconstruct as 'reassuring' that 'wicked Jewish moneylender' stereotype.[16]

The message of *The Three Ladies of London* is that Lady Lucre's power threatens to corrupt the entire city. A sequel in 1590 – significantly, post-dating both the Spanish Armada and the stage success of Marlowe's Barabas – is more obviously xenophobic in its attempt to identify this pervasive moral threat with foreigners. In *The Three Lords and Ladies of London*, Usury is given Jewish parentage, in a speech identifying all the play's villains as outsiders. Accused of treachery to his country, Simony crows: 'Tis not our native countrie, thou knowest, I Simony am a Roman. Dissimulation a Mongrel, half an Italian, halfe a Dutchman, Fraud so too, halfe French, and halfe Scottish: and thy parentes were both Iewes, though thou wert borne in London'.[17] Adelman suggests that this belated identification of Usury as Jewish 'would have come as no surprise to the audience', but what is important is that Usury's deferred Jewishness postdates his appearance in *The Three Ladies of London* where that identity has been already preempted by the named Jew Gerontus. The narrative importance of Gerontus' charity in *Three Ladies* also substantially outweighs this single reference in the sequel play. Lloyd Kermode's argument that 'the *Three Ladies*' connection with Venice would already suggest London Usury's "Jewishness" before *Three Lords*' confirmation of that identity' is

likewise proleptic, and risks a circular argument: it is Shakespeare's later play that has established for us as inevitable the relation between Venice and Jewish moneylenders, and there is no reason to suppose that this association predates *The Merchant of Venice*.[18] What is conspicuous here is the strenuous critical attempt to explain away Gerontus' generosity and to minimize its importance for the understanding of audience expectations of Shylock.

Greene's play *Selimus* has been similarly distorted to provide evidence for the wicked Jewish stereotype. The play is based on the early sixteenth century history of the Ottoman empire, and the violent overthrow of Bajazet by his son Selimus. It is true that Abraham the Jew is commissioned by Selimus to poison his father and that Abraham takes up the task even though he feels neither loyalty to Selimus nor animus to Bajazet. But Abraham makes only two appearances, is on stage for a matter of minutes, speaks only twenty lines, and finally decides to share the poisoned cup with his victim because he too is old 'and has 'not many months to live on earth'.[19] More significantly, however, this is a play of such spectacular brutality that it seems willful to suggest its brief cameo of a poisoning Jew would stand out: Selimus' severing of the hands of Aga, loyal to Bajazeth, and the gruesome stage direction '*opens bosom and puts them in*' (Scene 14) indicate that ruthlessness is in no way equivalent to Jewishness in this play, and make Abraham's work rather restrained and dignified in comparison to these baroque excesses.

Finally, then, the case of Marlowe's play published in 1633 as *The Tragedy of the Rich Jew of Malta*. Marlowe's Jewish protagonist, Barabas, delights in embracing the hyperbolic wickedness attributed to the Jews in medieval anti-semitic libels. He boasts:

> I walke abroad a nights
>
> And kill sicke people groaning under walls:
>
> Sometimes I goe about and poison wells. (2.3.175-7)[20]

Barabas claims to have 'studied Physicke', worked as a military engineer, spy, and 'an Usurer' (2.3.182-91). He has 'set Christian villages on fire' and attacked pilgrims to Jerusalem (2.3.204 ff). As his Moorish servant Ithimore exclaims, 'we are villaines both:/ Both circumcised, we hate Christians both' (2.3.215-6). With the suggestion of crucifying a child (3.6.49), and the murder of the nuns in the Friary, Barabas is an index of the blood-libels of late medieval anti-semitism.[21] For Harold Bloom this deliberate and exaggerated performance of anti-semitism cancels its charge: 'Barabas of course is a superbly outrageous representation of a Jew; he is no more Jewish than Marlowe's Christians are Christians or his Muslims are Muslims.'[22] Emily C. Bartels sees that 'instead of *being* the Jew, Barabas strategically *plays* the Jew – or rather, the various Jews, which others fabricate', and suggests that within the play 'he plays the Jew … his spectators want and need to see, a Jew who ironically tells us more about them than about him'.[23] While Bartels' argument implies an available 'type' of the stage Jew which Barabas raids for his own improvisatory self-presentation - a type for which is it is hard to find

evidence - her suggestion that Barabas is a product of audience desire provides a template for assessing his critical appropriation. The extent to which the radically individual Barabas has been constructed as a stereotype in accounts of stage Jews suggests that he continues to present the Jew we 'want and need to see', even while his terrible charisma exceeds such racial and dramatic typing. As the play's 'most energetic and inventive force' the influence of Barabas's triumphant amorality and his engaging, sardonic performance to the audience is more evident in Shakespeare's *Richard III* than in *The Merchant of Venice*: or, to put it another way, Jewishness is only a part, and perhaps only even a minor part, of the significance of Barabas' characterization for Shakespeare.[24] These stage histories purporting to lead up to *The Merchant of Venice* emerge as back-projections *from* the play. Setting out the history of marked Jewish characters on the stage before Shylock does not support the assumption that Elizabethan audiences were primed to expect a wicked stereotype, nor even that such a stereotype can be traced.

That *The Merchant of Venice* responds to the Lopez affair is another critical commonplace. The outline of the Lopez case is relatively straightforward, although the intricacies of conspiracy and counter-conspiracy in the English, Spanish, and Portuguese courts quickly become befuddling.[25] In 1593/4 Ruy or Roderigo Lopez, a doctor of Portuguese Jewish descent and the Queen's physician, was tried and executed for an attempt to assassinate her with poison. At his trial Lopez reportedly confessed 'he is a Jew, though now a false Christian', and the evidence placed before the jury described him as 'a

perjured murdering traitor, and Jewish doctor, worse than Judas himself'.[26] Maus writes that 'shortly before Shakespeare wrote *The Merchant of Venice*, an outpouring of anti-Semitic outrage was triggered by the case of Roderigo Lopez, a Portuguese Jewish convert to Christianity accused of attempting to murder Queen Elizabeth'; Bevington introduces the play in his *Complete Works* stating that in the early modern period 'anti-Semitic superstitions were likely to erupt into hysteria at any time' and citing the Lopez case as the only example; for Halio, Shylock owes 'something to the notoriety' of Lopez.[27] Both Sidney Lee writing on Dr Lopez for the original *Dictionary of National Biography* and Edgar Samuel for the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* link their subject with Shakespeare's play. Lee suggests that 'Lopez's reputation, and the popular excitement evoked by his trial, may possibly have directed Shakespeare's attention to that study of Jewish character which he supplied about the time in his 'Merchant of Venice'; Samuel asserts that 'Shakespeare responded by writing and staging *The Merchant of Venice* with its murderous Jewish character, Shylock, who hates all Christians'.[28] In the more recent biography the association between Lopez and a caricatured account of *The Merchant of Venice* has taken on the quality of fact.

Stephen Orgel's skeptical assertion that the relevance of the Lopez affair to *The Merchant of Venice* is 'both dubious and farfetched' deserves more attention.[29] David Katz concludes that 'Lopez's Jewish origin was not a key element in his prosecution', but the case is even stronger than he allows.[30] Any suggestion of Lopez' Jewishness was actually strategically suppressed in

the official publication of the trial proceedings. The discourse around the affair repeatedly associates Lopez with Catholicism rather than Judaism – obviously, since Judaism was not a political threat in 1594 whereas Catholicism most certainly was. The account of the trial published in 1594 as *A True report of sundry horrible conspiracies of late time detected to haue (by barbarous murders) taken away the life of the Queenes Most Excellent Maiestie* repeatedly describes Lopez as 'a Portingale' and stresses the perfidious role of Philip of Spain in the conspiracy: 'Lopez... confesseth that hee was of late yeeres allured to doe service secretly to the King of Spaine'.[31] There is no reference to his alleged Jewishness. Many more of the early modern references to Lopez identify him as a dangerous papist than a Jew and at the time of *The Merchant of Venice* no extant printed source had identified Lopez as Jewish.[32]

Over the next couple of decades various references overwhelmingly identify Lopez with a specifically Catholic threat. The characterization of the physician Lopus/Ropus in Dekker's sectarian *The Whore of Babylon*, or Thomas Beard's exculpation of 'that notorious villaine doctor Lopus (the Queens Phisitian) who a long time had not onely beene an intelligencer to the Pope and King of Spaine, of our English counsailes, but also had poysoned many Noblemen, and went about also to poyson the Queene her selfe', are indicative examples.[33] Marlowe, whose *Jew of Malta* is also often linked with the Lopez affair, mentions him in *Dr Faustus*, where it is Lopez' profession, rather than his religion, that is the source of the joke. Having been tricked out of forty

dollars and doused in the pond, the horse-courser suggests that the cozening Dr Faustus is worse even than Dr Lopez: 'Dr Lopus was never such a doctor'. *Englands Joy*, a scam performance promised at the Swan in 1602 specifically designed to be as attractive as possible to persuade gullible spectators to pay up front, might have been expected to offer Jew-baiting if it were as popular an Elizabethan pastime as many editors of Shakespeare's play seem to assume. Instead, the trickster Richard Vennar promises, amid representations of the Spanish Armada and the titillating suggestion that 'the play will be acted only by certain gentlemen and gentlewomen', 'Lopus, and certaine Iesuites'.[34] Again, the defining feature of Lopez is his conspiratorial alliance with Spain and Catholicism, rather than his own religious identity.[35] The strength of the strategically politicized association of Lopez with Catholicism was remarked by the Jesuit priest Henry Garnett in a letter to Father Robert Persons in September 1594, complaining that Lopez's trial had been 'greatly derived to the discredit of Catholics, although most unjustly', and remarking darkly that Lopez 'knew no Jesuit in the world, nor was acquainted with any Catholics in England that I know of'.[36]

There *are* some scattered print references to Lopez as a Jew, but these all post-date *The Merchant of Venice*. William Warner's verse history *Albion's England* (1602) recalls 'That *Spanish-Iewish, Atheist* , and Lop-heavie-headed Leach,/(Unworthy a Physitions name) fowle *Lopas'*, a formulation in which Spanishness, atheism, and the breaking of the Hippocratic oath jostle with Jewishness to capture Lopez' perfidy. An illustration in George Carleton's

1627 edition of his *A Thankfull Remembrance of Gods Mercy* shows Lopez in academic dress talking to a man in a Spanish ruff and beaver with the caption 'Lopez conspiring to poyson the Queene': in the account of the conspiracy, Lopez is called 'a Jew' on a single occasion, and his nefarious deeds are attributed to the intriguing conflation 'Romish *Rabbies*'.[37] In John Taylor's poem 'The Churches Deliverances', Lopez is identified as 'by descent a Iew,/ A Portingal by birth', who 'would poyson [the Queen] to further Spaines ambition'.[38] Nowhere in the immediate aftermath of the trial nor in the details that accreted over later retellings for different purposes does Lopez's Jewishness dominate the story.

The history of the association of Lopez and *The Merchant of Venice* is a telling one. Like some other crucial interventions into the cultural shaping of Shylock's Jewishness, it emerges at the end of the nineteenth century in explicit dialogue with Henry Irving's influential production of the play. Irving's production opened at the Lyceum in 1879, with 250 performances in its first year and hundreds more on tour in England and America over the next two decades.[39] Irving's characterization of Shylock was 'as the type of a persecuted race', and the interpolated anguish of his return to his house to find Jessica gone was remarkable for its pathos and much repeated by later productions.[40] Irving himself reported that he was moved to play Shylock having observed a dignified Levantine Jew while sailing in the Mediterranean. He wrote to his acting manager Bram Stoker: 'when I saw the Jew in what seemed his own land and in his own dress, Shylock became a

very different creature. I began to understand him; and now I want to play the part - as soon as I can', and his Shylock was widely judged 'the only gentleman in the play'.[41] Throughout, Irving's presentation was of a tragic figure, cruelly wronged in a world of racial intolerance, retaining the dignity of 'his belief in his nation and himself', as the *Saturday Review* put it, even as he left the courtroom.[42] 'His final exit', wrote the reviewer for *The Spectator*, 'is the best point. The quiet shrug, the glance of ineffable, unfathomable contempt at ….Gratiano… the expression of defeat in every limb and feature, the deep, gasping sigh, as he passes slowly out, and crowd rush from the Court to hoot and howl at him outside, make up an effect which must be seen to be comprehended'.

The Spectator review began its account of Irving's portrayal of Shylock with a recognition that the role had accreted strong conventions. By contrast, Irving was 'no "historical Shylock"': 'the complex image which Mr Irving presented to a crowd more or less impressed with notions of their own concerning the Jew whom Shakespeare drew, was entirely novel and unexpected; for here is a man whom none can despise'.[43] That Irving's Shylock, 'whom none can despise', was seen not to be 'historical' is suggestive: a review in the *Chicago Tribune* basked in self-righteousness at the production's assumed anachronism, claiming Irving's as 'a nineteenth century Shylock… a creation only possible to our age, which has pronounced its verdict against medieval cruelty and medieval blindness'.[44] This assumption about the play's original audiences has been often repeated: Harold Bloom, for instance, has written

that 'only an audience at ease with its own anti-Semitism could tolerate a responsible and authentic representation of what Shakespeare actually wrote. In this one play alone, Shakespeare was very much of his age, and not for all time'.[45]

The understanding of Irving's sympathetic portrayal of Shylock as unhistorical explicitly prompted three influential readings which uncovered, and proposed as properly historical, more negative or anti-semitic understandings of *The Merchant of Venice* in its Elizabethan context. It is in this context that scholars began to link Shylock with Roderigo Lopez. First was Frederick Hawkins, writing in *The Theatre* in November 1879 to suggest that the play was intended in reply to the Lopez trial 'as a plea for toleration towards the Jews'.[46] But more usually credited with associating Lopez and Shylock was the young Sidney Lee, writing in *The Gentleman's Magazine* in 1880. Lee began by acknowledging the revival of interest in Shylock that Irving's production has prompted. To some extent his own interpretation is, like Irving's, interested to supply Shylock with 'Jewish' verisimilitude, and he asserts that behind Shylock is 'the living semblance of a *Jewish* trader – shrewd and covetous, it is true, but possessed of other characteristics still more distinctive of his race'.[47] But the link with Lopez – the real Jew behind Shakespeare's characterization – is also inextricably linked with ideas of Elizabethan anti-semitism: 'No one living in London at the time could have been ignorant of Lopez's history and fate'.[48]

Although Lee's account was factually incorrect and confused in certain particulars, its impact was far-reaching. And, as Alan Stewart has written, the author's own byline, 'S.L. Lee', represented a significant intermediate stage in the reinvention of Solomon Lazarus Lee, son of a Jewish merchant, as the English critic and scholar Sidney Lee, the name he used exclusively from around 1890.[49] As Stewart discusses, the significance of Lopez's Jewishness is actually less for Shylock than for Lee himself, writing at a time when so-called 'scientific' anti-Semitism was on the rise in England and in Germany: 'might it not be that Lee's identification of Lopez not only as a Jew but as a victim of anti-semitism draws on very current and pressing concerns within the Anglo-Jewish political and intellectual culture of late 1879?'[50] Stewart's recognition that the association of Shylock and Lopez does presentist rather than historical work for Lee is an instructive one. But it is also striking to see Irving's dominant, sympathetic stage presentation implicitly challenged, even undermined, by this largely invented parable of Elizabethan anti-semitism. For more recent critics, especially the editors of standard texts of the play, it has been irresistible to produce the Lopez case as the explicitly anti-semitic supplement to *The Merchant of Venice*, and to gain by its apparent clarity a perverse argumentative relief from the play's delicate and evasive sympathies.

Like Lee's argument about connections between Lopez and Shylock, two further contemporary readings of the play were a response to Irving's stage presentation, in the theatre and the study. William Poel's productions of *The*

Merchant of Venice in 1898 and 1907 as part of his project to return to assumed

Elizabethan staging practices represented Shylock as a comic villain in a red

wig and hooked nose.[51] Secondly, E.E. Stoll's essay 'Shylock', published in

1911, developed the historical contextualization for this invented tradition,

arguing that Shakespeare's intention – 'the only matter of importance' – was

towards 'rude caricature and boisterous burlesque' and that it is therefore

'highly probable… that Shylock wore …red hair and beard'. [52] Stoll argued

that Irving's 'Hebraic picturesqueness and pathos' had obscured a more

savage comic Elizabethan stage convention: 'we have tamed and

domesticated the 'dog Jew" and drawn his "fangs"'. In order to experience

'the lively prejudices of the time', modern productions should echo these

Elizabethan conventions, 'except at popular performances, where racial

antipathy is rather to be allayed than fomented'.[53]

Twentieth century performance history suggests that Irving's style of

sympathetic characterization has been more compelling in the theatre than

Stoll's call for a 'return' to Shylock as racially caricatured comic villain. But

the idea that the original Shylock was presented wearing a prosthetic hooked

nose or with red wig or beard has had a remarkable durability in commentary

and in editions of the play. Halio states that 'Shakespeare's initial conception

of him was essentially as a comic villain, most likely adorned with a red wig

and beard and a bottle nose', although he acknowledges that there is no

internal evidence for this. Bevington's introduction also claims that 'on the

Elizabethan stage he apparently wore a red beard like Judas and had a

hooked nose'. John Gross echoes 'to an Elizabethan audience the fiery red wig that he almost certainly wore spelled out his ancestry'.[54]

The evidence for this staging practice is decidedly flimsy, whether its advocates look to the Elizabethan or earlier periods. Halio is not the only critic to cite earlier precedent, stating that 'since medieval mystery and miracle plays portrayed Judas with red beard and hair and a large nose, later stage-Jews followed suit'.[55] It is worth pressing a little on the certainty about medieval staging practices: in fact, no documentary evidence exists to attest to Judas's appearance in these plays. Only in the York Plays, performed during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, is Judas described as specifically bearded but there is no indication about the color.[56] Accounts for the performance of John Smith's historical pageant *The Destruction of Jerusalem* in Coventry in 1584 include, among payments for musicians and for the players' breakfasts and ale, two shillings and sixpence for beards, perhaps to costume Jewish characters, but again no colour is mentioned.[57] Ruth Mellinkoff cites a single Continental example for a red-bearded Judas in the drama. In the Lucerne passion play of 1588 Judas is described in the costume list with 'rott lang har vnd bart'.[58] Given the sparcity of the evidence, Frederick Wood's citation of the York cycle as evidence that 'the conventional Judas of the mysteries wore a red grisly beard which afterwards became the traditional sign of the villainous stage Jew' is bewilderingly definite.[59]

The additional passages, possibly by Ben Jonson, written for Thomas Kyd's

The Spanish Tragedy and first published in 1602, do include the line 'let their beardes be of *Iudas* his owne collour'.[60] Understandably, given the thoroughgoing theatrical self-reflexivity of the play, this reference has tended to be taken as a comment on dramatic performance. In fact it occurs in the context of Hieronimo's conversation with the Painter, as he commissions a disturbing synesthetic portrait of his son's murder. The reference to Judas' color is particularly appropriate to the iconography of pictorial art. As Mellinkoff has identified, northern European art from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries often depicted Judas with red hair: Hieronimo's line in *The Spanish Tragedy* is the OED's earliest citation of the phrase 'Judas-colour', but it does not provide evidence that the iconographic tradition passed from visual into theatrical arts.[61] In any case, the most common iconographic signifier of Jewishness in medieval art was a hat: a topos that is entirely absent from the debates about Elizabethan stage representations.[62]

The other frequently cited document on Shylock's putative appearance is by Thomas Jordan, an actor in the later Stuart period. Jordan published in 1664 a volume of ballad poetry entitled *A Royal Arbor of Loyal Poesie* (the title of the work might suggest that an accurate description of Elizabethan drama was not his main concern). Included in it is a poem often inaccurately cited as a description of *The Merchant of Venice* in early modern performance. In fact the ballad is entitled 'The Forfeiture: A Romance', and while it tells of a Jew in Venice with a daughter it never mentions Shakespeare, nor quotes from the play, nor names any of its characters. It also doesn't mention the caskets and

gives an account of a trial scene in which 'the Doctor proves [the Jew's] daughter', thus conflating Shakespeare's Jessica and Portia. It postdates Elizabethan performances by almost seventy years: Jordan himself was not born until almost twenty years after *The Merchant of Venice* was written, and the conclusion of his ballad apparently has more to do with the contemporary readmission of the Jews to England than to the Elizabethan theatre: 'I would such Jews may never come/ To *England* nor to *London*'. It would seem, therefore, that using its physical description of the Jew – 'his beard was red' and 'his chin turn'd up, his nose hung down,/ And both ends met together' – as evidence for early modern staging practices is distinctly shaky.[63] The same is true for the additional lines to the elegy on Burbage added in the early nineteenth century by the forger John Payne Collier: 'the red-hair'd Jew,/ Which sought the bankrupt merchant's pound of flesh,/ By woman-lawyer caught in his own mesh.'[64] In an interesting rhetorical move in his stage history of Shylock, Toby Lelyveld acknowledges Collier's lines as faked, but adds that this 'does not, of course, indicate that Shylock's beard was not red. The chances are it was'.[65] Lelyveld and Collier – like many other scholars - both clearly want the same thing: a red-bearded Shylock. Anthony Grafton's identification of the 'structural resemblance' between forgery and criticism is instructive here: both Collier's forgery and the critical reiteration of Shylock's caricatured appearance are belated but purposeful interventions, actively shaping the evidence to produce their desired historical narrative.[66]

Jordan's post-Restoration description of the Jew includes a description of a

hooked nose, and Stoll, Halio, Bevington and others all assume that the

Elizabethan Shylock would have worn a distinctive false or 'bottle' nose. In

Tudor drama such as Lewis Wager's *The life and Repentaunce of Marie*

Magdalene (1566) or Ulpian Fulwell's *Like Will to Like* (1587) a bottle-nose was

a mark of the devil, in the repeated phrase 'bottle-nosed knave'. But there

seems to have been no inevitable lexical connection in the sixteenth century

between the bottle-nose and the Jew.[67] In *The Jew of Malta* Ithimore describes

Barabas as 'the bravest, gravest, secret, subtil bottle-nos'd knave to my

Master, that ever Gentleman had' (3.3.9-11), echoing the devilish associations

of this physiognomy rather than any specifically ethnic connotations. Roma

Gill's gloss that 'in early drama the Jewish physiognomy was attributed to the

devil' shows a troubling investment in the inevitability of an invented racial

trope as Jewish first and only by extension devilish.[68] The logic from theatre

history is that the bottle-nose is in fact a prior characteristic of the devil, and

only later, and then only sometimes, associated with Jewishness.

A pamphlet by William Rowley in 1609 describes a usurer as a kind of

gargoyle with 'his visage (or vizard) like the artificiall Jew of Maltaes nose'.[69]

If this tells us that Barabas wore a false nose, it does not tell us anything about

Shylock. There is a tendency to read the bottle-nose back as representing

Barabas' Jewishness rather than his cartoonish villainy (or to assume that the

Elizabethan period could not possibly sustain this distinction between

wickedness and Jewishness).[70] While there is an equivalence in later drama

between usurer and a big nose, the linking term 'Jew' is always missing. The

pragmatic Jaquine in Chapman's *The Blind Beggar of Alexandria* urges her mistress Samathis to accept the usurer Leon's suit: 'Tis no matter for his nose, for he is rich': the Duke Cleanthes seems to have put on a nose to play a usurer, but no one suggests he might be Jewish. Mammon in Marston's *Jack Drum's Entertainment* is described 'with a great nose', but again there is no reference to Jewishness. When Jean Howard sees Pisaro, the Portuguese moneylender in William Haughton's play *Englishmen for My Money* (1599) as 'unmistakeably coded as a Jew' by mention of his 'bottle-nose' because of 'a bottlenose being a common stage property of Jewish characters', she overstates the legibility of the stereotype. Pisaro is never identified as Jewish, and while he may recall the popular Barabas on the Rose theatre stage, there is no evidence that his nose implicates a more extensive history of stage Jews, still less that it is connected to Shylock.[71] That the trope of the large nose on the stage so completely signals Jewishness that there is no need to even mention it is not proven: Jewishness and usury are, and should be recognized as, separate categories. Peter Berek regards this process in the plays by Haughton, Chapman, and Marston as the 'unjewing' of Barabas and Shylock in 'debased form': 'it was what the actor did on the stage and not the opportunity to contemplate a Jew that generated such amusement as audiences found in these plays'.[72] What might also be true is that these comic signifiers were not so closely tied to racial types as later criticism has assumed. In visual art a hooked nose was the property of evil characters – sometimes Jews, sometimes not – and therefore should not be seen 'as a mark of Jewishness'.[73] On the stage, a mask with a hooked nose was the

distinguishing mark of Pantalone in the *commedia dell'arte*, typically an old, avaricious patriarch associated with daughters and often paired with a doctor or lawyer figure called Gratiano.[74]

In addition, early modern accounts of Jewish people do not stress their noses. Thomas Coryate, for example, helpfully glosses 'our English proverb: To looke like a Iewe' as meaing 'sometimes a weather beaten warp-faced fellow, sometimes a phrenticke and lunaticke person, sometimes one discontented'. These are negative attributes, to be sure, but they do not include the facial features of the racial typing later spuriously classified in the 'science' of physiognomy. James Shapiro has observed that early modern illustrations of Jews do not present them as physically different from Christians (this is the burden of Coryate's observation of Jews in Venice whose appearance does not fit the proverb), and that 'English prints do not represent Jews with distinctive physical traits until well into the eighteenth century'.[75] The bottle- or hooked nose, then, seems to derive from nineteenth-century ideas about racial typing rather than sixteenth century ones: Poel's 'original' staging practices and their critical consolidation as historical fact, are, like the contemporaneous neologism 'anti-semitism', inflected with the racial assumptions of his own time.[76] The paucity of early modern references to specific visual signifiers of Jewishness suggests that Portia's question in the courtroom 'Which is the merchant here, and which the Jew?' (4.1.171) is a real one.

Shylock's original appearance was the subject of a revealing recent exchange

of letters between Stephen Greenblatt and James Shapiro in *The New York*

Review of Books. In a review of a production of *The Merchant of Venice,*

Greenblatt had repeated the assertion that 'in the earliest productions,

Shylock was played with a bright red wig and a grotesque hooked nose. He

was in appearance the wicked Jew of anti-Semitic fantasy, one of those

hideous faces that leer at the suffering Jesus in paintings by Hieronymus

Bosch'.[77] Shapiro's reply suggested that the source of this myth was Collier's

now discredited forgery, to which Greenblatt countered Jordan's 'highly

probable glimpse of Shylock's early stage appearance'.[78] When Shapiro

replied again questioning Jordan's authority and claiming 'a fundamental

disagreement about what constitutes historical evidence for interpreting

Shakespeare's life and works', Greenblatt's answer was telling.

Acknowledging that the issue of Shylock's original appearance is difficult to

ascertain with evidential certainty, Greenblatt nevertheless put the matter

beyond doubt: 'does James Shapiro or anyone else *actually believe* that there

was no stage history of grotesquely stereotyped Shylocks' (italics mine)?[79] As

we have seen, there is no evidence that the Elizabethan Shylock was

'grotesquely stereotyped'. That original staging practices might ultimately be

a matter of belief echoes Adelman's 'reassuringly' and Halio's 'what we

might expect'. In the absence of evidence, or even in the face of evidence,

what emerges instead is a preference or bias.

Stoll and Poel responded to Irving's tragic stage Shylock by constructing a

grotesquely stereotyped 'Elizabethan' villain in his place; Lee responded by filling out the authentic Jewishness of Shakespeare's prototype in Lopez. In both cases, Shylock's Jewishness - in appearance, in influence, in reception - is propped up with material outside the play. Eric Hobsbawm described an invented tradition as 'a set of practices, normally governed by overtly or tacitly accepted rules and of a ritual or symbolic nature, which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behaviour by repetition, which automatically implies continuity with the past'.[80] Shylock's visual Jewishness on the Elizabethan stage seems such an invented tradition. That this constructed scholarly narrative appears to reiterate and perversely normalize through repetition an anti-semitic stereotype is deeply troubling. Evidential arguments that Shylock was not represented as grotesquely racially stereotyped appear to be less useful to the critical story of *The Merchant of Venice* than the imaginary clarity spuriously attached to the play's original depiction. The red-haired and bottle-nosed Shylock is a racial fantasy constructed after the fact.

One final aspect of Shylock's presentation is often taken to signal his intrinsic and deeply characterized Jewishness: his citation of Old Testament scripture, or what Julia Reinhard Lupton calls his 'Jewish hermeneutics'.[81] M.M. Mahood notes that in *The Merchant of Venice* Shakespeare deliberately developed his biblical knowledge in order to characterize Shylock: 'to get at these origins and so to endow Shylock with his pride of race, Shakespeare naturally went to the stories of the patriarchs told in the Book of Genesis'.[82]

While the story of Laban from Genesis 30 is used in Shylock's extensive speech in his first scene to figure usurious lending, in fact most of Shylock's biblical references are to the New Testament rather than the Old, and some of his most resonant phraseology comes from Christian rather than Hebrew scripture. To take examples from his first entrance in 1.3: 'peril of waters' (1.3.24) draws on 2 Corinthians 11:26 'I was often in perils of waters'; his aside 'to smell pork; to eat of the habitation which your prophet the Nazarite conjured the devil into' (1.3.31-3) draws on the gospels of Luke, Matthew and Mark, and the unfamiliar word 'Nazarite' (1.3.32) comes from Matthew 2: 23; his slur on Antonio as a 'fawning publican' (1.3.39) also derives from the gospels; 'he hates our sacred nation' comes from Luke 7:5; 'for use of that which is mine own' (1.3.112) echoes Matthew 20:15.[83] If Shylock's language is steeped in the New Testament, so too the language of the Christians borrows extensively from the Old Testament. Lancelot Gobbo (whose standardized name in modern editions obscures his initial relation to Job) and his father echo Genesis 27 in their mis-recognition scene in 2.2, Portia's 'quality of mercy' (4.1.181) has its biblical antecedents in Ecclesiasticus, Isaiah and Deuteronomy and her assumed identity as Balthasar echoes the name given to the prophet Daniel in the book of Daniel, and, ironically, Shylock's confiscated property is figured by Lorenzo as 'manna' (5.1.294), the food given to the Israelites in exile as a mark of God's favor in Exodus 16.[84] While *The Merchant of Venice* is a play rich in biblical allusion, it is hard to make the allusions form into the neat binary 'opposition of Old Law and New in terms of their respective theological principles', or to shape the play's biblical

references into the supersessionist allegory of the defeat of the Old Testament Shylock/Judaism by the New Testament Portia/Christianity.[85]

Richmond Noble wrote of *The Merchant of Venice* that it was the 'play in which Shakespeare very evidently taxed his scriptural knowledge', and the visible result of that strain was that two of the three 'defects in Shakespeare's biblical knowledge' as expressed across his canon are identified by Noble to come from the play. The first is the mistaken reading, relatively widespread in the period, of 'Sabaoth' – the Hebrew word for 'hosts' or 'armies' - as a synonym for 'sabbath' (4.1.35). The second is more substantial, the choice of 'Chus and Tubal as Countrymen of Shylock': Noble writes that 'as names of Hebrews, Shakespeare cannot be said to have been happy in his choice in either case'.[86]

Shylock refers to 'Tubal' as 'a wealthy Hebrew of my tribe' (1.3.55) who will lend to him some of the money to be lent to Antonio. Tubal comes on stage in 3.1 to bring the piercing news of Jessica's antics in Genoa, where she has spent in 'one night fourscore ducats' (3.1.100-1). Shylock arranges to meet him with an officer 'at our synagogue' (3.1.120). In the following scene Jessica, eloped to Belmont, reports that she had heard her father 'swear/ To Tubal and Chus, his countrymen' that he would prefer the bond's forfeit to the repayment of 'twenty times' Antonio's death (3.2.282-5). The text, therefore, suggests that Tubal and Chus are other members of Venice's Jewish community. Just as scholars have struggled to identify a convincing Hebrew etymology for Shylock – Orgel notes that it was an English name - so too these names have

been found wanting.[87] Naseeb Shaheen's observation that 'neither Tubal nor Chus are typically Jewish, as are names such as Isaac, Jacob, Zadok or Ephraim' goes some way to identifying the particular strangeness of these names in the play's depiction of different races.[88] But there is further to go.

As Colin Kidd has shown, early modern ethnology took as its major paradigm for understanding 'mankind's family tree' the description of the dispersion of peoples in Genesis 10 and 11 as amplified by the writings of Flavius Josephus, translated into English at the end of the sixteenth century. 'In the orthodox mainstream of early modern Protestant anthropology all lines of enquiry led back to Noah. Ultimately, race and ethnicity involved questions of pedigree: did an ethnic group descend from the line of Ham or Shem or Japhet?'.[89] It is from this much-cited Ur-text of scriptural ethnology that Shakespeare takes his problematically atypical Jewish names Tubal and Chus. That Chus, son of Noah's son Ham, was seen as the progenitor of black Africans, has been discussed by Kim F. Hall in an important article exploring the associations of Shylock with 'blackness, forbidden sexuality, and the unlawful appropriation of property'. Hall's landmark argument has reanimated the apparently inconsequential remark from Lorenzo to Lancelot Gobbo: 'the Moor is with child by you' (3.5.37) and opened up the play's 'intricately wrought nexus of anxieties over gender, race, religion and economics'.[90] She has convincingly shown that Chus's name and its associations are not accidental to the meanings of *The Merchant of Venice*: they participate in the play's wider dynamic of 'otherness' and its conflation of

sexual and economic intercourse. Tubal's associations have not had similar attention, but can also help prise open the play's historical context and its address to its initial audiences.

If from Chus, son of Ham, as the Geneva Bible gloss put it, 'came the Ethiopians & Egyptians', then from Tubal, son of Japhet, came 'the Gentiles divided in their landes, everie man after his tongue, and after their families in their nacions' (Genesis 10:5).[91] When Tubal is mentioned in Ezekiel 32:26, the gloss, in both the Geneva and Bishops bibles, is even clearer: 'that is, the Cappadocians & Italians, or Spanyardes, as Josephus writeth'. The three sons of Noah stood at the head of humanity's tripartite division, between Jews (the descendants of Shem), Africans (the descendants of Chus via Ham) and European Gentiles (Tubal via Japhet). Shakespeare refers to Japhet as the forerunner of the Gentiles in *2 Henry IV*, when Prince Henry remarks wryly that like all petitioners, Falstaff claims a common heritage with the king: 'they will be kin to us, but they will fetch it from Japhet' (2.2.109-10). The name Tubal, then, carries strong connections to the divided and multiple race of European Gentiles derived from the foundational biblical history of Noah's sons.

There are a number of reasons why, in the mid-1590s, Shakespeare might have wanted to invoke as the most prominent of Shylock's Jewish 'countrymen' a biblical figure strongly associated with the lineage of the multi-various Gentiles of Europe. Just as Hall has drawn out associations

between Shylock and blackness in the play via the reference to Chus, so the figure of Tubal allows us to connect the play's depiction of otherness not primarily with contemporary attitudes to and representations of Jewishness but with attitudes to European economic and religious migrants in Elizabethan London. The issues of trade, credit, mercantilism, value and cultural difference with which *The Merchant of Venice* is so concerned were clearly issues of considerable concern in the London of the 1590s, but they were not extensively articulated in relation to the category of Jew.

That there was a small community of converted Jews living in sixteenth century London is clear from the work of pioneering scholars early in the twentieth century including Lucien Woolf, Sidney Lee and C.J. Sisson.[92] How legible or visible the identity of members of this community as Jewish was is less clear, and the case that Elizabethans really actively cared about modern Jewishness – as opposed to biblical typology - is not proven. Nor does the available evidence suggest that Jewishness was reviled. The case in Chancery in 1596 between the widow Mary May and two Portuguese merchants discussed by Sisson, provides important evidence. May argued in court that the two merchants, business partners of her late husband, 'were Jews, and practising Jews [and] that their services as agents were interfered with by this fact'. May's star witness was Thomas Wilson, a former servant of one of the accused, Ferdinand Alvares. Wilson described in some detail the household's Passover observances: in 'supersticious ceremonyes' they 'did make Saterday their Sunday' and 'light a great wax candle and sett the same in a basen with

4 white loaves about the Candle in the myddest of a great roome'. The court agreed with May's case that the men were indeed Jews, but their response was compassionate, encouraging her to forgo some of her entitlement, 'beinge moved with the losses and trobles which the poore Straungers indured perswaded Mrs May being present to deale charitably with Alvares in regarde thereof'.[93] That the discovery of the men's Jewishness did not apparently prompt fear, punishment, derision, or any other negative reaction is striking, and all the more so if we speculate about what would happen were details of a secret Catholic mass in London in 1596 to have been laid before the authorities. Felsenstein describes how from 'the nearly complete ignorance or misunderstanding of Jewish ritual' 'it was but a short step to cast Jewish ritual in a diabolized mould'; but the court case here does not suggest any such slippage.[94] Charles Edelman's moderate suggestion that 'most, or at least some, Elizabethans did not feel all that strongly about Jews', contrasts with the extensive and resonant evidence about the troublesome presence of alien immigrants in London at the end of Elizabeth's reign.[95] Perhaps instead, *The Merchant of Venice*'s questions about cultural friction in a cosmopolitan city echo local debates about the extent to which immigrants, particularly Huguenot refugees from France and the Low Countries, should be integrated into London's commercial, financial and social fabric.

Economic and religious factors drove waves of immigration from Protestant Europe to England in the second half of the sixteenth century, and 'strangers' comprised a population of between four and five thousand in London

throughout Elizabeth's reign.[96] Public discourse about alien immigration and integration is frequently prosecuted in terms that impinge on those of *The Merchant of Venice.* The status of protestant immigrants, their economic work, the consequences of endogamous or exogamous marriages for immigrant communities, and the thorn of separate churches for the French and Dutch, map readily onto the situation of Shylock in *The Merchant of Venice*: 'I will buy with you, sell with you, talk with you, walk with you, and so following; but I will not eat with you, drink with you, nor pray with you' (1.3.33-5).[97] In addition, there is often an explicit equivalence between London and Venice. Speaking in Parliament in 1593 opposing a bill 'against Aliens selling by way of retail any Foreign Commodities', Sir John Woolley argued that 'this Bill should be ill for London, for the Riches and Renown of the City cometh by entertaining of Strangers, and giving liberty unto them. Antwerp and Venice could never have been so rich and famous but by entertaining of Strangers, and by that means have gained all the intercourse of the World.'[98] The analogy between London and Venice as commercial city-states was a common one. Other speakers in the parliamentary debate followed Woolley's comparison, arguing that just as Venice's prosperity had grown by welcoming immigrants, so too would London's. [99]

If Venice and London were connected in the discussions about immigration, so too were Jews and 'strangers' to the city. As Achsah Guibbory has explored in an important corrective to narratives of the Jews in early modern discourse as 'not just – or always – the dangerous or despised Other', the Reformation shift in typological hermeneutics meant that the Old Testament Israelites were

'people with whom early modern Christians seemed to identify'.[100] The use of the Hebrew scriptures in the debates about the place of immigrants in early modern London simultaneously identifies 'a sense of affiliation and empathy with the ancient Jews' existing alongside suspicion and antipathy, in an 'early modern nation-state struggling for independence from papal authority and for a sense of national identity'.[101] Preaching in Oxford on 'mens hard hearts to strangers' in the mid 1590s, George Abbott, later archbishop of Canterbury, recalls 'a French man' complaining that 'by a most inhospitall kinde of phrase, our Englishmen use to terme them, no better then French dogs, that fled hither for Religion and their conscience sake'. Abbott reminds his audience to remember 'the precise charge which God gave to the Israelites, to deale well with all straungers, because the time once was, when themselves were straungers in that cruell land of Egypt'. Like the English recalling their own religious exile during the period of 'persecution in Queene Maries dayes', Abbott suggests that the Jews had the historical experience of being both host and stranger.[102] Shakespeare's associate and fellow Stratford migrant, Richard Field, printed his collected sermons. Such biblical injunctions to tolerance were preempted in a pamphlet published in 1595 as a 'Complaint of the Yeomen Weavers Against the Immigrant Weavers': 'in all well-governed Comonwealthes the natyve borne are preferred before the Straunger. Though the Israelite suffered the Connonytes to live amongst them, yet not without being Contributories. And as wee are Commaunded by God not to doe the Straunger wronge, soe wee are not willed to take injurye at their handes'. The text cites the Old Testament scripture in support.[103] The

Deuteronomic experience of the nation of Israel in establishing its codes of belonging was cited both by those seeking to assuage and to consolidate anti-alien sentiment: Jews were significant and resonant rhetorical players in the discourse of early modern xenophobia.

The most prominent association of Jews with aliens in contemporary London comes from the Dutch Church Libel of 1593, a toxic broadside against strangers 'that doth excead the rest in lewdnes', according to the Privy Council, posted at the Dutch Church in Threadneedle St.[104] This libel began

> Ye strangers yt doe inhabite in this lande
> Note this same writing doe it understand

and takes up anti-semitism as an available metaphor for the anti-foreign sentiment:

> Your usery doth leave us all for deade
> Your Artifex, & craftesman works our fate,
> And like the Jewes, you eate us up as bread.

Biblical history is invoked: 'Egipts plagues vext not the Egyptians more/Than you doe us.' The libel alludes to the French wars of religion between protestant and catholic: 'nor paris massacre so much blood did spill', and ends, menacingly, 'Weele cutt your throtes, in your temples praying'.[105] Its

proximity to the world of the theatre is clear. It is signed 'Tamburlaine', and playwrights Marlowe and Kyd were fatally drawn into the official enquiry into its provenance. As Shapiro points out, its rhetoric, with its reference to a 'Machiavellian Merchant' and 'counterfeiting religion' circles around allusions to *The Jew of Malta*, performed earlier that year.

The libel is an extended warning advocating forcible anti-alien economic protectionism.[106] The structural balance of that simile 'like the Jewes you eate us up as bread' has tended to be overwhelmed by a critical focus on Jews rather than Protestant immigrants. Anti-Jewish rhetoric is a clearly available trope for the writer of the libel, but modern scholarship's preoccupations have submerged the historically denotative subject – immigrants - with the connotations of the object of comparison – Jews. Shapiro's analysis that the libel 'provides a remarkable example of how the alien threat shifts easily into anti-Jewish discourse' risks such a disturbance of connotative and denotative syntax.[107] Because the representation of anti-semitism is more interesting and significant to us than attitudes towards Protestant migrants, 'like the Jewes' constantly exceeds its subordinated – and historical - syntax of similitude. In fact the idea that Jewishness might be figurative rather than essential is a common thread in Shakespeare's limited deployment of the term outside *The Merchant of Venice.* The imaginary conditionals in Benedick's 'If I do not love her, I am a Jew' (*Much Ado About Nothing* 2.3.250-1), or in *1 Henry IV*: 'Every man of them, or I am a Jew else, an Hebrew Jew' (2.5.179-80) offer up the identity of 'Jew' as a rhetorical construction in order to construe the speaker's

own behavior (there is a strange half-echo of this substitutive rhetorical externalization in Shylock's own extended comparisons in his 'Hath not a Jew eyes' speech (3.1.54)). Similarly, that 'Jew' might be an adjective rather than a noun – an attribute of a person which does not always or only denote religion or race – is common in its deployment in early modern English. It is this usage that prevents Falstaff's modifier 'Hebrew' from becoming entirely tautological.

Many of the rhetorical associations of Jewishness and usury, for example, actually enact a separation between Jewish people and the adjectival form 'Jew'. Thomas Wilson's *Discourse of Usury* (1572) simultaneously asserts and disavows the connection between usury and religious Jewishness. He states that usury is the cause the Jews 'were hated in England and so banyshed worthelye, wyth whom I woulde wyshe all these Englishmen were sent that lende their money or their goods whatsoever for gayne; for I take them to be no better than Iewes. Nay, shall I saye: they are worse than Iewes'.[108] Thomas Dekker calls usurers 'Christian Jews' in *The Dead Term* (1608), just as the Turkish judge at the end of Wilson's *The Three Ladies of London* notes that the adjectives Christian and Jew have been switched by the behaviors of Mercadore and Gerontus.[109] R.H. Tawney – along with Shakespeare's own biography - demonstrated long ago that Elizabethan moneylending was 'not a profession but a bye-employment'.[110] Thus the early modern association between Jews and moneylending was almost always a knowing fiction. David Hawkes' provocative claim that 'most literate people in early modern

England were hermeneutically sophisticated enough to conceive of two forms of "Judaism": the literal and the figurative' helps challenge the over-literalism with which Shylock has been interpreted. In the early modern period, the signifier 'Jew' had become at least partially detached from the racial or religious signified with which it is now firmly associated.[111]

Whereas for the twenty-first century, the history and the representation of Jewishness is, rightly, politically and ideologically charged, it may be useful to conduct the thought experiment into an Elizabethan world where European migration was far more pressing. It was more politically useful to represent Lopez publicly as a Jesuit than a Jew. As Edmund Campos suggests in his analysis of the Lopez case, 'some aspects of English anti-Semitism can be interpreted as transposed anti-Hispanic racism'.[112] For Shakespeare, Jewishness may have served as an actually less problematic term than more immediate forms of alien. *The Book of Sir Thomas More*, after all, had been censored for its representation of anti-alien riots, and much of the Master of the Revels' attention to the problems of the text was located in the detail of its identification of the strangers. Tilney twice intervened into the manuscript to turn the words 'stranger' and 'Frenchman' into the more neutral 'Lombard'.[113] More's own speech attempting to quell the London riot draws on terms familiar from *The Merchant of Venice* and often misleadingly interpreted there as having particularly scriptural relevance to a conflict between Christian and Jew.[114] In what Jeffrey Masten calls 'cross-identification', More threatens that the rioters will themselves be exiled where the natives with 'whet their

detested knives against your throats,/ Spurn you like dogs' (6.149-50).[115] The theatre had invented a type of comic, heavily accented Dutch or French foreigner to rework the alien threat: and the relative frequency of this figure on the early modern stage compared to that of the stage Jew is instructive.[116]

Writing of *The Merchant of Venice*, G.K. Hunter suggested that the figure of the Jew as 'infidel outsider still had the general effect of stilling internal European oppositions and stressing the unity of Christendom'.[117] By contrast, it is via the figure of the Jew and Noachic ethnology that the play hints at a disunited Christendom, in which nationality rubs fretfully against religious affiliation. The aliens in London may well have been Protestants, and many were refugees from the wars of religion in continental Europe, but they had separate, specially licensed churches, and complaints against them stressed their religious separatism over any shared religion. A petition from the Weavers' Company to the Elders of the Dutch and French churches, complaining about anti-competitive practices, questioned whether such foreign workers were Christians at all: ''Nowe we beseech you enter into your owne Consciences and saie whether wee be wronged or noe, or whether thei men deale Christian like with us, as they ought to doe. What love, what Charitye, or what Religion is in this?'[118] Immigration was a dangerously topical issue.[119] Tubal's recognizable associations not with the Jewish race but with the divided Gentile peoples hints at the ways in which *The Merchant of Venice* addresses through analogy contemporary problems of multicultural city living.

That *The Merchant of Venice* might speak to these debates about European aliens in London is not new. But it's poignant that Andrew Tetriak's argument that Shylock represents the Huguenot in London is published in *The Review of English Studies* in 1929, almost the last point in the twentieth century at which we could possibly entertain the idea Jewishness could be semantic rather than semitic - a metaphor, not an essence.[120] Perhaps, as Bernard Grebanier wrote, 'far too much has been made of Shylock's being Jewish'.[121] We know some of the terrible cultural work undertaken by destructively anti-semitic readings of Shylock's Jewishness in the centuries since Shakespeare:[122] de-essentializing the early modern figure of the Jew by investigating unfounded assumptions about his role, antecedents and reception in the Elizabethan theatre and by challenging their repetition in modern scholarship, offers a tiny piece of restitution.

[1] Jay L. Halio (ed.), *The Merchant of Venice* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 85. The transfer of the rights from James Roberts to Thomas Heyes in October 1600 gives the title as 'the m chant of Venyce'.

[2] *The most Excellent History of the Merchant of Venice* (London: 1600).

[3] John Drakakis argues that 'Iewe' was the intended designation in the play's apparatus, and that only a shortage of italic 'I' type forced the compositors of Q1 to shift to 'Shyl'. See Drakakis (ed.), *The Merchant of Venice* (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2010), 421-3, and his '*Jew*. Shylock is my name': Speech prefixes in *The Merchant of Venice* as symptoms of the early modern' in Hugh Grady (ed.), *Shakespeare and Modernity: Early Modern to Millennium* (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), 105-21.

[4] Hermann Sinsheimer, *Shylock: The History of a Character, or the Myth of the Jew* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1947), 17; Jay L. Halio, 'Shylock: Shakespeare's Bad Jew', in Yvonne Bruce (ed.), *Images of Matter: Essays on British Literature of the Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Newark: U Delaware P, 2002), 245; 251; Harold Fisch, *The Dual Image: The Figure of the Jew in English and American Literature* (London: World Jewish Library, 1971) 34; Joseph Hatton, *Henry Irving's Impressions of America* vol. 1. (London: 1884), 269.

[5] Jonathan Gil Harris, *Sick Economies: Drama, Mercantilism, and Disease in Shakespeare's England* (Philadelphia: U Pennsylvania Press, 2005), 71.

[6] Stephen Greenblatt et al (eds), *The Norton Shakespeare* (London: W.W. Norton, 1997), 1111.

[7] M.M. Mahood (ed.), *The Merchant of Venice* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987), 21; Halio, 9.

[8] See Charles Edelman, 'Which is the Jew that Shakespeare Knew?: Shylock on the Elizabethan Stage', *Shakespeare Survey* 52 (1999), 99-106.

[9] Paulina Kewes, 'Jewish History and Christian Providence in Elizabethan England: The Contexts of Thomas Legge's *Solymitana Clades (The Destruction of*

Jerusalem), c.1579-88), in Allen Michie and Eric Buckley (eds), *Style: Essays on Renaissance Poetics and Culture* (Newark: U Delaware P, 2005), 228-66, 254. Legge's production notes describe historically authentic costuming for his Jewish characters.

[10] R[obert] W[ilson], *A right excellent and famous Comoedy called the three Ladies of London* (London, 1584).

[11] Peter Holland (introd.), *The Merchant of Venice* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2005), xxxiii.

[12] M.J. Landa, *The Jew in Drama* (London: P.S. King & Son, 1926), 54; 9.

[13] Halio, 6.

[14] Janet Adelman, *Blood Relations: Christian and Jew in 'The Merchant of Venice'* (Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 2008), ix.

[15] Adelman, 17.

[16] Adelman, 13.

[17] *The Pleasant and stately Morall, of the three Lordes and three Ladies of London* (London, 1590), F4.

[18] Adelman, 14; Lloyd Edward Kermode (ed.), *Three Renaissance Usury Plays* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2009), 36.

[19] *Selimus, Emperor of the Turks* in Daniel J. Vitkus (ed.), *Three Turk Plays from Early Modern England* (New York: Columbia UP, 2000), Scene 18 l 85.

[20] Christopher Marlowe, *The Jew of Malta* in *The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe* vol. 4 ed. Roma Gill (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987). All subsequent references to this play are to this edition.

[21]See Frank Felsenstein, 'Jews and Devils: Anti-Semitic Stereotypes of Late Medieval and Renaissance England', *Journal of Literature & Theology* 4 (1990), 15-28.

[22] Harold Bloom (ed.), *Major Literary Characters: Shylock* (New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1991), 6.

[23] Emily C. Bartels, *Spectacles of Strangeness: Imperialism, Alienation, and Marlowe* (Philadelphia: U Pennsylvania P, 1993), 100; 106.

[24] Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Marlowe* (Chicago and London: U Chicago P, 1980), 204.

[25] The most complete recent account is David Katz's chapter 'The Jewish Conspirators of Elizabethan England' in his *The Jews in the History of England, 1485-1850* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1984).

[26] *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, Elizabeth 1591-4*: 455; 446.

[27] *Norton*, 1111; David Bevington (ed.), *The Complete Works of Shakespeare* (New York and London: Longman, 2009), 180.

[28] S.L.Lee, 'Lopez, Roderigo (d.1594), *Dictionary of National Biography* (1893); Edgar Samuel, 'Lopez , Roderigo (*c*.1517–1594)' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, January 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/17011 (accessed May 25, 2011)

[29] Stephen Orgel, *Imagining Shakespeare: A History of Texts and Visions* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003), 149.

[30] Katz, 106.

[31] *A True report of sundry horrible conspiracies* (London: 1594), 7-8.

[32] Manuscript sources, in addition to the Calendar of State Papers, include Gabriel Harvey's marginalia to his copy of *In Iudaeorum Medicastrorum calumnias* (1570), as transcribed in Frank Marcham, *The Prototype of Shylock: Lopez the Jew Executed 1594. An Opinion by Gabriel Harvey* (Harrow Weald: n.p., 1927), n.p..

[33] Thomas Beard, *The Theatre of Gods Iudgements* (London: 1597), 222-3

[34] John Chamberlain, *The Letters of John Chamberlain* ed. Norman Egbert McClure (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1939). 1:172; 'The Plot of the Play Called Englands Joy', reproduced in W.J. Lawrence, *The Elizabethan Playhouse and Other Studies, Second Series* (Stratford-upon-Avon: Shakespeare Head Press, 1913), 68.

[35] On Vennar's own links with the Lopez affair, see Herbert Berry, 'Richard Vennar, England's Joy', *English Literary Renaissance* 31 (2008) 240-65, 250.

[36] Quoted by Alan Stewart, 'The Birth of a National Biography: The Lives of Roderigo Lopez, Solomon Lazarus Levi and Sidney Lee', *EnterText* 3.1. (2003) 183-203; 196.

[37] George Carleton, *A Thankfull remembrance of Gods Mercy* (London: 1627), 164.

[38] John Taylor, *All the Workes of Iohn Taylor the Water-Poet* (London: 1630), 145.

[39] James C. Bulman, *Shakespeare in Performance: The Merchant of Venice* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1991), 28.

[40] Hatton, 265.

[41] Quoted by Bulman, 30-1.

[42] Quoted by Bulman, 46.

[43] *The Spectator* 8 November 1879, 1408.

[44] Quoted by Bulman, 33.

[45] Bloom, 7.

[46] Frederick Hawkins, 'Shylock and Other Stage Jews', *The Theatre* 1 November 1879, 191-8; 193. Shakespeareans including James Spedding and F.J. Furnivall (both of whom refuted Hawkins' argument) contributed responses in the following issue ('The Character of Shylock', *The Theatre* 1 December 1879, 253-61).

[47] S.L. Lee, 'The Original of Shylock', *The Gentleman's Magazine* CCXLVI (1880), 185-200, 186.

[48] Lee, 195.

[49] See Alan Bell and Katherine Duncan-Jones, 'Lee, Sir Sidney (1859–1926)' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, October 2009, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/34470 (accessed May 25, 2011).

[50] Stewart, 197-8.

[51] See Charles Edelman (ed.), *Shakespeare in Production: The Merchant of Venice* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002), 36-7.

[52] Elmer Edgar Stoll, 'Shylock', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 10 (1911), 236-79; 238; 249; 246.

[53] Stoll, 278.

[54] Halio, 10; Bevington, 180; John Gross, *Shylock: Four Hundred Years in the Life of a Legend* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1992), 16.

[55] Halio, 10n.

[56] Richard Beadle (ed.), *The York Plays* (London: Edward Arnold, 1982), XXVI 167.

[57] R.W. Ingram (ed.), *Records of Early English Drama: Coventry* (Toronto and London: U Toronto P, 1981), 304, cited in Kewes, 253.

[58] Ruth Mellinkoff, *Outcasts: Signs of Otherness in Northern European Art of the Late Middle Ages* (Berkeley: U California P, 1993), I: 153.

[59] Frederick T. Wood, 'The Comic Elements in the English Mystery Plays', *Neophilologus* 25 (1940) 194-206; 199.

[60] Thomas Kyd, *The Spanish Tragedie* (London: 1602), sig. H4. See also Felsenstein, 19.

[61] Ruth Mellinkoff, 'Judas's Red Hair and the Jews', *Journal of Jewish Art* 9 (1982) 31-46, 45; *Oxford English Dictionary* 'Judas-colour' (Accessed 18 May 2011).

[62] Debra Higgs Strickland, *Saracens, Demons, & Jews: Making Monsters in Medieval Art* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton UP, 2003), 105.

[63] Thomas Jordan, *A Royal Arbor of Loyal Poesie* (London: 1664), 36-40.

[64] J. Payne Collier, *Memoirs of the Principal Actors in the Plays of Shakespeare* (London: Shakespeare Society, 1846), 53.

[65] Toby Lelyveld, *Shylock on the Stage* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd, 1961), 8.

[66] Anthony Grafton, *Forgers and Critics: Creativity and Duplicity in Western Scholarship* (London: Collins and Brown, 1990), 125.

[67] The *OED* glosses simply as 'a nose resembling a bottle, a swollen nose' without any suggestion of racial typing.

[68] Gill, 112.

[69] Thomas Coryate, *Coryats crudities* (London: 1611), 232.

[70] William Rowley, *All for Money* (London: 1609) sig. C2v.

[71] Jean E. Howard, *Theater of a City: The Places of London Comedy 1598-1642* (Philadelphia: U Pennsylvania P, 2007), 44.

[72] Peter Berek, 'The Jew as Renaissance Man', *Renaissance Quarterly* 51 (1998), 128-62, 158-9.

[73] Strickland, 78.

[74] K.M. Lea, *Italian Popular Comedy: A Study in the Commedia dell'Arte, 1560-1620* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934), I: 18-25. See also John Robert Moore, 'Pantaloon as Shylock', *The Boston Public Library Quarterly* 1 (1949) 33-42.

[75] James Shapiro, *Shakespeare and the Jews* (New York: Columbia UP, 1996), 233. See also Anthony Bale, 'The Jew in Profile', *New Medieval Literatures* 8 (2006), 125-150, which argues instead for a marked identification: 'the Jew in profile … forms a radical continuity between the Middle Ages and the twentieth century' (150).

[76] The OED's first citations of 'anti-semitism', 'anti-semitic', and 'anti-semite' are all from 1881-2 (accessed May 19 2011).

[77] Stephen Greenblatt, 'Shakespeare & Shylock', *The New York Review of Books* 30 September 2010.

[78] James Shapiro, reply by Stephen Greenblatt, 'Shakespeare in Red?', *The New York Review of Books* 14 October 2010.

[79] James Shapiro, reply by Stephen Greenblatt, 'Shylock on Stage and Page' *The New York Review of Books* 9 December 2010.

[80] Eric Hobsbawm and T.J. Ranger (eds), *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983), 1.

[81] Julia Reinhard Lupton, 'Exegesis, Mimesis and the future of Humanism in *The Merchant of Venice*', *Religion and Literature* 32 (2000), 123-39; 125.

[82] Mahood, 197.

[83] All references to Shakespeare's plays are to Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor (eds), *The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works* 2nd edition (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005).

[84] These references are indebted to Naseeb Shaheen's discussion of the play in his *Biblical References in Shakespeare's Plays* (Newark: U Delaware P, 1999), 156-83.

[85] For an influential articulation of this argument, see Barbara K. Lewalski, 'Biblical Allusion and Allegory in "The Merchant of Venice"', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 13 (1962) 327-43; 338.

[86] Richmond Noble, *Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge and Use of the Book of Common Prayer as Exemplified in the Plays of the First Folio* (London: SPCK, 1935), 96; 99; 104; 161.

[87] Orgel, 151.

[88] Shaheen, 161.

[89] Colin Kidd, *The Forging of Races*: *Race and Scripture in the Protestant Atlantic World, 1600-2000* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006), 58. See also Benjamin Braude, 'The Sons of Noah and the Construction of Ethnic and Geographical Identities in the Medieval and Early Modern Periods', *The William and Mary Quarterly* 54 (1997), 103-42.

[90] Kim F. Hall, 'Guess Who's coming to Dinner? Colonization and Miscegenation in *The Merchant of Venice*', *Renaissance Drama* 23 (1992) 87-111; 101; 89.

[91] Quotations from the Geneva Bible are taken from Lloyd E. Berry, *The Geneva Bible: A Facsimile of the 1560 Edition* (Madison: U Wisconsin Press, 1969).

[92] Lucien Wolf, 'Jews in Elizabethan England', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society* IX (1926) 1-91, which claims 'an identified Jewish community of between eighty and ninety souls living in the England of Good Queen Bess' (19); C.J. Sisson's 'A Colony of Jews in Shakespeare's London', *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association* 23 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938) 38-51; Adelman, 1-10. On the interest of early modern England in the biblical Israelites, see Achsah Guibbory, *Christian Identity, Jews, and Israel in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2010) and Sharon Achinstein, 'John Foxe and the Jews', *Renaissance Quarterly* 54 (2001), 86-120.

[93] Sisson, 41, 45, 51.

[94] Felsenstein, 24.

[95] Charles Edelman, 'Which is the Jew that Shakespeare Drew?', *Shakespeare Survey 52,* 99-106, 102.

[96] Laura Hunt Yungblut, *Strangers Settled Here Amongst Us: Policies, perceptions and the presence of aliens of Elizabethan England* (London, 1996); 21.

[97] See Andrew Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant communities in Sixteenth-century London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986).

[98] Sir Simonds D'Ewes, *A compleat journal of the votes, speeches and debates, both of the House of Lords and House of Commons throughout the whole reign of Queen Elizabeth, of glorious memory* (London, 1693), 505-6.

[99] On the comparison between London and Venice, see Carole Levin and John Watkins, *Shakespeare's Foreign Worlds: National and Transnational Identities in the Elizabethan Age* (Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell UP, 2009), especially 112-40.

[100] Guibbory, 3, vi.

[101] Guibbory, 13.

[102] George Abbott, *An Exposition upon the Prophet Ionah Contained in certaine sermons, preached in S. Maries Church in Oxford* (London: 1600), 84, 87, 88.

[103] The complaint is quoted in full in Francis Consitt, *The London Weavers' Company* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933), 312-18; 314.

[104] John Roche Dasent (ed.), *Acts of the Privy Council* 1592-3, 222.

[105] Arthur Freeman, 'Marlowe, Kyd, and the Dutch Church Libel', *English Literary Renaissance* 3 (1973), 50-1.

[106] See Andrew Ortony, 'The role of similarity in similes and metaphors', in Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought* (2nd ed., Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993), 342- 356; 343.

[107] Shapiro, 184.

[108] Thomas Wilson, *A Discourse Upon Usury* introd. R.H. Tawney, (London: G.Bell and Sons, 1925), 232.

[109] Thomas Dekker, *The Dead Tearme* (London: 1608) sig.Cv.

[110] Wilson, 21; on Shakespeare lending money see Samuel Schoenbaum, *William Shakespeare: A Documentary Life* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), 182-4.

[111] David Hawkes, *The Culture of Usury in Renaissance England* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 69. Hawkes also helpfully points out the association of usury with Catholicism, 84ff.

[112] Edmund Valentine Campos, 'Jews, Spaniards, and Portingales: Ambiguous Identities of Portuguese Marranos in Elizabethan England', *English Literary History* 69 (2002), 599-616; 602.

[113] John Jowett (ed.), *Sir Thomas More* (London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2011), 45-6.

[114] See, for example, Noble, 97.

[115] Jeffery Masten, '*More* or Less: Editing the Collaborative', *Shakespeare Studies* 29 (2001), 109-31, 118.

[116] Wilson O. Clough lists more than fifteen plays pre-dating *The Merchant of Venice* in which characters' broken English indicates they are European outsiders in an English context: 'The Broken English of Foreign Characters of the Elizabethan Stage', *Philological Quarterly* 12 (1933), 255-68. See also A.J. Hoenselaars, *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* (Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1992) and Lloyd Edward Kermode, *Aliens and Englishness in Elizabethan Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009).

[117] G.K. Hunter, *Dramatic Identities and Cultural Tradition: Studies in Shakespeare and his Contemporaries* (Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 1978), 24.

[118] Consitt, 314.

[119] See Gillian Woods, '"Strange Discourse": The Controversial Subject of *Sir Thomas More*', *Renaissance Drama* 39 (2010), 3-36.

[120] Andrew Tretiak, '*The Merchant of Venice* and the 'Alien' Question', *The Review of English Studies* 5 (1929), 402-9.

[121] Bernard Grebanier, 'The Truth About Shylock' (1962), repr. Bloom (ed.), 202-11, 2011.

[122] See Gross, 287-36.