6. "Toward a Multicultural Mid-Tudor England: The Queen's Royal Entry ca. 1553, *The Interlude of Wealth and Health*, and the Question of Strangers in the Reign of Mary I." *English Literary History* 76.1 (2009): 99-129.

During my first year at Tulane, I finished revisions of this article, published in *ELH*, a top-tier journal. It argues for a rethinking of early English nationhood by investigating theatrical forms of protest for Mary I's anti-immigration policies.

Received The Martin Stevens Award for Best New Essay in Early Drama Studies, Medieval and Renaissance Drama Society, 2010.

Citations
Walker, Hope. *Hans Eworth: The Complete Catalogue Raisonné.* March 2010. online bibliography of scholarship on early modern immigrants.

Taras, Raymond. *Xenophobia and Islamophobia in Europe*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012. pgs. 2, 22, 223.

TOWARD A MULTICULTURAL MID-TUDOR ENGLAND: THE QUEEN'S ROYAL ENTRY CIRCA 1553, *THE INTERLUDE OF WEALTH AND HEALTH*, AND THE QUESTION OF STRANGERS IN THE REIGN OF MARY I

BY SCOTT OLDENBURG

Recent decades have seen an increasing number of scholarly studies of early modern England's construction of early English nationhood or a related sense of Englishness, in several cases dating early English nationhood as far back as the reign of Henry VIII.[1] Even literary critics like Richard Helgerson, Claire McEachern, Jean Howard, and Phyllis Rackin, who examine the precarious instability of nationhood, take for granted that there was something nationalist about Tudor England beginning in the first half of the sixteenth century.[2] Many of these accounts of early English nationhood emphasize the role of a popular desire among the English to differentiate themselves from other identifiable groups in constructing the nation. Liah Greenfeld, a key proponent of the argument that England became a nation early in the sixteenth century, defines the nation thus:

> The specificity of nationalism, that which distinguishes nationality from other types of identity, derives from the fact that nationalism locates the source of individual identity within a "people," which is seen as the bearer of sovereignty, the central object of loyalty, and the basis of collective solidarity. The "people" is the mass of a population whose boundaries and nature are defined in various ways, but which is usually perceived as larger than any concrete community and always as fundamentally homogeneous.[3]

For Greenfeld, sixteenth-century England was the first of such nations, imagining itself internally homogeneous and externally differentiated from other communities. Similarly, Howard and Rackin suggest that the Tudor nation manifested itself in resistance to the French, in part because "the English were notoriously xenophobic"; the "Other," argues McEachern, "is an everpresent constituent of Englishness in this period."[4] Even Philip Schwyzer, who broadens and complicates

the debate by defining the Tudor nation in terms of British (rather than English) identity, places emphasis on "xenophobic impulses to which Tudor subjects were so notoriously prone."[5] These supposedly xenophobic impulses then gave rise to a self/other paradigm essential to the construction of early English national identity.

Despite these scholars' intention of looking critically at nationalism and nationhood, their emphases on xenophobia and homogeneity in Tudor England risk effacing early modern England's very real diversity and the complex attitudes Tudor subjects had about that diversity. The literary and cultural history that follows focuses instead on mid-Tudor England's multicultural reality, the presence of sizeable merchant-stranger and Protestant refugee communities, communities that comprised as much as twelve percent of London's population at the beginning of Mary I's reign and between five and ten percent during Elizabeth I's reign.[6] By examining the cultural dynamics of immigration during the Marian regime I hope to show that although the English could have taken the opportunity of Mary I's reign to scapegoat strangers or aliens (the terms used in the period to refer to immigrants), the English more often seem to have valued and protected their immigrant neighbors. Such a view, of course, problematizes notions of an early English nation constructed homogeneously out of a self/other paradigm. Greenfeld, after all, claims that the nation forms the basis for "collective solidarity," but as this paper shows, solidarity between the English and immigrants often trumped concerns about the "otherness" of strangers.

Without a doubt, early modern England had its opponents of immigration, but it also had champions of what might be termed an early modern multiculturalism—an ethic of protection and tolerance of immigrants, an ethic opposed to the xenophobia so often cited by historians.[7] Although multiculturalism is often treated in the British press as a fairly recent and at times threatening phenomenon, sixteenth-century England dealt with many of the same issues while lacking the vocabulary and theoretical framework of multiculturalism.[8] Indeed, even the terms used in the period to designate immigrants have proven somewhat nebulous. The words "stranger" and "alien," for example, could refer to people we would today consider immigrants, those who settle in a country other than that of their place of birth, but the terms could also refer to ambassadors and their retinues, people who although born elsewhere we would not consider immigrants per se. In practice, however, early modern subjects understood the distinction. When Sir Thomas Wyatt objected to strangers, he was quite obviously critiqu-

Toward a Multicultural Mid-Tudor England

ing the influence of Simon Renard and other emissaries of Charles V; conversely, when Mary objected to strangers, as we shall see, everyone understood her to be targeting immigrants, particularly those of the Protestant faith. I am here primarily interested in solidarity between the English and immigrants and how that solidarity relates to a clearer picture of multicultural, early modern England.

What I am here calling England's early modern multiculturalism is a good deal different from contemporary formulations of multiculturalism, however. Unlike current multiculturalism, the early modern experience of multiculturalism was largely Eurocentric. While the theaters of early modern England frequently featured exotic characters representing distant cultures radically different from England's, the immigrant communities of central concern to early modern England were French and Walloon, Dutch, and Flemish, and to a lesser degree Italian and Spanish. The exotic characters of the stage enacted a variety of imaginary encounters few playgoers would have in real life; the Dutch, French, and Flemish characters occasionally depicted on the stage, however imaginary and stereotypical, depicted cultural encounters most of the audience experienced on a day to day basis at markets, in the workplace, parish churches, taverns, and most of all in the liberties, areas densely populated by immigrant communities.[9] The English perceived the Dutch, Flemish, Walloon, French, Spanish, and Italians as more distinctly different than European cultures perceive one another today.[10] While early modern England may not have been grappling with the prevalent current issues of race and post-colonialism, England's early modern multiculturalism was not unlike contemporary multicultural Britain: then as now England had to address issues of immigrant rights, linguistic diversity, and diverse cultural practices.

Immigrants were valued in early modern England but usually not for their Dutchness or Frenchness alone. More often, cultural differences were only one factor in Englishmen and women's attitudes toward their immigrant neighbors. Religion, guild affiliation, family ties, all might come into play in one's relationship with an immigrant neighbor. This fits perfectly within Joseph P. Ward's assessment of early modern English identity as fluid and varied: one belonged to a guild, a parish, a precinct, and so forth, and these different identifications sometimes came into conflict with one another so that one had choices of opinion when it came to politics, religious beliefs, and attitudes toward strangers, sometimes favoring the guild, sometimes the church, and so forth.[11] Cultural differences were of course recognized,

but points of common interest based, for example, on shared religious conviction or guild solidarity often bridged the cultural and linguistic gap between native-born and immigrant in early modern England. Often England came to incorporate certain elements of immigrant culture and industry into its daily life: as an old saying goes, "Hops, Reformation, Bays, and Beer, / Came into England all in one year"; of course, they did not all enter England in the same year, but they were all introduced to England by sixteenth-century immigrants, and this saying highlights the integral role immigrants had in early modern English culture.[12]

Early modern England was not always magnanimous, however, in its approach to immigrants. Immigrants were occasional victims of suspicion and scapegoating, and limitations on employment and property rights were imposed with varying degrees of rigor throughout the period. In that sense early modern England bears a strong resemblance to the form of multiculturalism Rajeev Bhargava terms a "particularized hierarchy," a dominant culture with one or more minority cultures subordinate to it; for Bhargava the "particularized hierarchy" is a positive step in the direction of "egalitarian multiculturalism."[13] Equality, of course, was not the rule in early modern England, so it should come as little surprise that early modern England fitted immigrants within its hierarchy. Still, England was at times quite progressive in its approach to immigration: Edward VI allowed strangers to practice their own brand of Protestantism freely, and Elizabeth I allowed the French and Dutch to reestablish their own churches, albeit without the religious freedom her younger brother had granted. Indeed, early modern English cities like Norwich and Colchester are known to have actively sought immigrant settlers. Strangers brought with them skills that many valued and wanted to learn. One stranger was moved to write to his wife who had stayed on the continent, "You would never believe how friendly the [Dutch] people are together, and the English are the same and quite loving to our nation."[14]

One might begin a multicultural history of early modern England with the reign of Edward VI, who actively encouraged the immigration of Protestant refugees and who, in the charter for the refugee churches, instructed authorities to allow the strangers "freely and quietly to practise, enjoy, use and exercise their own rites and ceremonies and their own peculiar ecclesiastical discipline, notwithstanding that they do not conform with the rites and ceremonies used in our Kingdom."[15] Focusing on Edward's reign, however, would place too much emphasis on a state-sponsored multiculturalism. Instead, this article

examines the reign of Edward's older sister, Mary I, who sought a monocultural England and met with popular resistance. During Mary's reign it was a crime to be a stranger without papers of denization, and Protestant refugees, whether denizen or not, were encouraged to leave the realm.

Much of Mary's antipathy toward strangers stemmed from her dislike of the Protestantism with which many were associated, but her anti-alien proclamations tended to be more general in their animosity. One of her earliest proclamations described the recently arrived strangers as "evil-disposed persons" who had fled their places of birth to avoid punishment for a variety of "horrible crimes."[16] Another claimed that French strangers were "ministering just occasion of murmur and discontentation," stirring up rebellion, among the Queen's "natural and loving subjects."[17] Of course, Mary married a stranger, but, as the state propaganda argued, Philip was really English even though he could barely speak the language: among the adornments of the royal wedding of Philip and Mary was a book revealing that Philip was descended from John of Gaunt.[18] Regardless of how much English ale Philip consumed to compensate for the little English he could speak, Robert Tittler points out that popular antipathy toward Philip had less to do with his status as a stranger and more to do with his reputation as an oppressive ruler.[19]

What follows, however, is not an examination of Philip's dubious Englishness, but a close look at two much-neglected theatrical works performed for Mary. The first is the earliest theatrical performance of Mary's reign, her royal entry to London on 30 September 1553, where she viewed a number of pageants put on by the residents of London as a prelude to her accession ceremony. While we know with great certainty the date of Mary's royal entry, the second theatrical text under consideration, *The Interlude of Wealth and Health*, has been described as "[i]nnocuous and difficult to date."[20] The play was registered in 1557 and revised for publication in 1565, but these dates have not satisfied scholars, who suspect the play to have been written and performed somewhat earlier than the registration date. Although some suggest the play was written as early as 1506, T. W. Craik and C. F. Tucker Brooke offer substantial internal evidence situating the play in the latter part of Mary's reign.[21] Thus, the texts under consideration span Mary's short reign and suggest a general trend in the period.

Like the pageants that comprised Mary's 1553 royal entry to London, *Wealth and Health* was more than likely performed for the Queen.[22] Both the pageant series and the interlude deal with the fate of Eng-

land; both performances draw the monarch's attention to the issue of immigration and reveal that despite her best attempts, England could not follow her anti-alien designs. That is, these texts resist the notion of a xenophobic England and emphasize instead a multicultural mid-Tudor England that scarcely looks like Mary's vision of a homogeneous culture of Catholic revival in England.

I. THE DUTCH ACROBAT AND THE NEW QUEEN

Between 22 August and 30 September 1553, Londoners took down the scaffolds that had borne the bodies of the supporters of would-be Queen Jane—John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland, Sir John Gates, and Sir Thomas Palmer—and replaced them with stages and fanfare for Queen Mary I's royal entry to London. Having survived a fairly peaceable but nonetheless anxiety-provoking succession crisis, Londoners now needed to put together an entertainment worthy of royalty.

Royal entries afforded London the opportunity to both entertain and instruct, to impress the new monarch through the speeches, spectacle, and theatrics that made up the pageants preceding the monarch's coronation ceremony. In Elizabeth I's entry, for example, the city showed the new queen the "[c]auses of a ruinous commonweal" and the "[c]auses of a flourishing commonweale," and in James I's entry the city exhorted their new king to maintain "*MUTUIS COMMERCIIS*" or balanced trade.[23] It should be kept in mind, however, that although the royal entry was a kind of street theater authored and performed by the city as a whole, the plans for the festivities were usually submitted to the crown for approval. The official texts of Elizabeth's and James's entries, after all, were carefully crafted pieces of royal propaganda. Perhaps because of the ease with which she defeated Jane Grey's supporters, Mary I did not feel the need to publish an authoritative text of her accession for use as propaganda. To uncover London's initial message to the new queen, then, we must look to the handful of first-hand accounts, those of Giovanni Francesco Commendone, Thomas Lanquet, Henry Machyn, Edward Underhill, and Charles Wriothesley, as well as the anonymous authors of *The Chronicle of Queen Jane, and of Two Years of Queen Mary and Two London Chronicles*.[24] These accounts tend to privilege spectacle over speech, but an examination of them nonetheless sheds light on the relationship between Mary's court, which would demand a uniform culture of Catholic revival, and London, a city increasingly aware of its move away from provincial monoculturalism.

To get at the unique character of Mary's entry, I would like to begin by comparing the Fenchurch Street pageants of several early modern royal entries, Fenchurch Street being the site for the first pageant in many sixteenth-century royal entry pageant sequences. In 1547 Edward VI was greeted at Fenchurch Street by "dyvers singing men and chyldren."[25] When Elizabeth I arrived there in 1559, she was greeted by a young English child who delivered the first oration of the sequence.[26] Likewise, in 1604 when James I arrived at Fenchurch Street, he was welcomed by two English actors, one from the Children of Her Majesty's Revels and the other the famous Edward Allen.[27] As Mary I arrived at Fenchurch Street, however, she was treated to a pageant prepared by the Genoese merchants. A boy actor delivered a speech which was unfortunately not recorded in any accounts of the pageant. It is not known whether this child was Genoese or English, but we do know that the architects of this first pageant wanted to make sure that it was understood as a tribute to the new queen from London's Genoese community; one of the pageant's arches bore this inscription: "*Marie Reginae inclytae constanter piae coronam britanici Imperii et palman uirtutis accipienti* Genuenses publica *salute laetantes cultum optatum tribuunt*."[28] Before and after Mary's reign, Fenchurch Street served as the point at which the new monarch was given a properly English greeting, but in 1553 London's Mayor and Aldermen chose to begin Mary's entry with a greeting from strangers.

After the Genoese pageant, Mary and her entourage moved on to the corner of Gracechurch Street where she was again presented with a pageant by strangers, this time the "Easterlings" or Hanse merchants who occupied the Steelyard nearby. At the end of Gracechurch Street Mary observed yet another entertainment by strangers, the Florentine pageant, which featured verses claiming to speak not only for the Florentine community but "*Omnes Publica*," all the people.[29] Of the nine pageants celebrating Mary's coronation and entry to London, these first three were explicit in their stranger patronage and were described as the "myghtyest" of the various pageants: the first pageant featured several giants; the second a fountain from which flowed wine; the third a mechanical angel and an interesting set of parallels between Mary and Judith and Tomyris, for Judith and Tomyris, Sydney Anglo notes, had decapitated their oppressors just as Mary had beheaded Northumberland a month earlier.[30]

It was not until reaching Cornhill, the fourth stop on the way to Westminster Abbey, that Mary had the opportunity to observe a pageant put on explicitly by the English.[31] This pageant and the two that

followed it, at the little and great conduits in Cheap, were probably the exclusive product of native-born Londoners, as was the pageant at Fleetstreet, although Judith M. Richards claims "there were no purely English pageants" in the series.[32] Richards may well be right and such information would highlight my point, but while I have found nothing that explicitly contradicts Richards's claim, there appears to be no evidence to support her statement either. Nonetheless, what I take to be the exclusively English pageants were apparently much less spectacular—they receive scant attention in the firsthand accounts that provide the only memories of the royal entry. The pageants in honor of the new queen were clearly dominated by the presence of strangers.[33]

In fact, the first mention of a display of the arms of the city of London occurs in a description of Peter, a "Dutchman," who performed a variety of acrobatics, "triumphing and dancing" as Edward Underhill described it, on the weathercock on Saint Paul's Cathedral.[34] *The Chronicle of Queen Jane and Mary* explains that the Dutchman's acrobatics were "to the great mervayle and wondering of all the people which behelde him, because yt was thought a mattyer impossyble," and one spectator wrote,

> A man stoode on the wether cock of Paules. The pageantes in all places accustomed beyng moste gorgiously trimmed: And as her grace passed by Poules, a certain dutche man stode vpon the wethercock with an enseigne in his hande, flouryshyng with the same, and vnder hym vpon the crosse, a scaffold garnished with enseignes banners and streamers, and vnder that vpon the holle an other scaffolde with enseignes & streamers, very strange to ye beholders.[35]

The same pageant featured an oration by John Heywood, but his speech was so overshadowed by Peter's antics that no one recorded even the gist of it. Thomas Lanquet wrote of Peter's performance, "among other strange sightes there set foorthe, this was moste to be had in memory," and indeed, with the exception of Machyn and Commendone, every audience member's description of the pageant series mentions the Dutch acrobat, and other than Heywood himself, Peter the Dutch acrobat is the only performer named in the entire sequence from the Tower to Westminster Abbey.[36]

Not much is known about Peter except that he was very agile. According to *The Chronicle of Queen Jane and Mary*, Peter constructed the scaffolds on Saint Paul's roof, and in November of the same year Charles Wriothesley saw him repairing the weathercock on Paul's.[37]

This would indicate that he was an artisan, perhaps in the building trades, or, given the number of banners and streamers he used, involved in the textile industry. In any case, he did not disdain physical labor. More importantly, his was the only entertainment we know of that featured the city arms: Peter reportedly waved a flag bearing a sword and red cross, identifying himself with the City of London.[38] Nearly every sixteenth-century royal entry to London included one or two pageants put on by stranger communities (originally to help fund the lavish spectacle), but the fact that a stranger waved the banner bearing the city's arms and that the first three pageants were performed by strangers indicates that the city's mayor and aldermen wanted to showcase London's immigrants, wanted to communicate to Mary that London was made up of not only the English nobles and the artisans who lined the streets, but also merchant and artisan strangers.

Just six weeks earlier French and Flemish preachers had been forbidden from preaching, and two weeks prior to the royal entry to London, Mary had sent letters to Dover and Rye ordering, according to John Foxe, "all French Protestants to pass out of this realm."[39] At that time, London was host to a sizeable immigrant population, a population integral to London's economic and social life. Andrew Pettegree estimates that roughly 10,000 strangers lived in London or its suburbs at the end of Edward VI's reign.[40] Catching wind of Mary's intention to deport immigrants, especially Protestant refugees, London's leaders seem to have decided that the pageants could entertain Mary while sending the message that Londoners were inextricably linked with the strangers living among them. The use of strangers in the pageants was, in a sense, an oblique petition, a challenge to the new queen: having accepted the greetings of the Genoese, Easterlings, Florentine, and Dutch of the city, would it not seem ungracious for Mary to request their deportation as she had already done in other cities?

In September 1553 the Queen had hardly even begun to rule and had not yet started the fires at Smithfield. For the moment the new monarch's monocultural ambitions were placed in check by the city's theatrical lobbying. Oddly enough, Sir Thomas Wyatt's failed rebellion, in which he claimed that Mary was allowing strangers (here Catholic diplomats rather than Protestant immigrants) to take control of the realm, rekindled Mary's interest in eliminating immigrants from England even as some commoners criticized Wyatt for his stance on immigration, stating, for example, "we know most certnly that there is ment no maner of evil to us by those strangers."[41] In the aftermath of Wyatt's rebellion, new anti-alien legislation was put forth to expel

strangers from the realm. On 18 August 1554, when London celebrated Philip's royal entry and coronation, Peter, the apparent star of Mary's first royal entry as queen, was nowhere to be found; he may have left England, or he may have been keeping a low profile given Mary's now clear hostility toward Dutch and French immigrants, particularly of the artisan class. The popular acrobatics at Saint Paul's were instead performed by a Spaniard, probably from Philip's retinue. He was not, unfortunately, up to the task; Foxe records that the Spaniard lost his life as a result of one of the stunts.[42]

By this time Mary and her council had stoked the fires at Smithfield and renewed their interest in targeting England's immigrant population. London did not then have the courage to renew its protest against a movement toward a monocultural England; of Philip's royal entry pageants only one was explicitly sponsored by strangers, that of the Hanse merchants who were not at all offensive to Philip and his retinue. Still, if Wyatt's appeal to xenophobia was insufficient to garner enough widespread support for his rebellion, Mary's anti-immigrant stance also failed to homogenize English culture: the debate over monocultural England was not over. While Londoners may have opted out of another audacious display of support for strangers in Philip's royal entry, many continued to live, work with, and at times protect London's strangers.

In early 1554, for example, Mary issued a sweeping proclamation against strangers stating that

> all and every such person or persons born out of her highness'
> dominions, now commorant or resident within this realm, of whatsoever
> nation or country, being either preacher, printer, bookseller, or other
> artificer or of whatsoever calling else, not being denizen, or merchant
> known using the trade of merchandise, or servant to such ambassadors
> as be liegers here from the princes and states joined in league with her
> grace, shall within 24 days after this proclamation avoid the realm; upon
> pain of most grievous punishment by imprisonment and forfeiture and
> confiscation of all their goods and movables, and also to be delivered
> unto their natural princes or rulers against whose persons or laws they
> have offended.

The proclamation further required "all mayors, sheriffs, bailiffs, constables, and other her ministers, officers, and good subjects" to participate in the apprehension of any strangers remaining in the realm beyond the specified twenty four days.[43]

A few days after the capture of Wyatt and one week prior to this 1554 anti-alien proclamation, Simon Renard, Imperial Ambassador

Toward a Multicultural Mid-Tudor England

to England, wrote to the Emperor, "[A] new revolt is feared because the people say so much noble blood ought not to be shed for the sake of foreigners. Many foreigners have departed, because marks were found on their houses."[44] There was, then, some anti-alien activity on the streets, but it seems to have been on a small scale as only Renard mentions these events, and, notes David M. Loades, Renard had a tendency to exaggerate tensions in the realm as a way of justifying his presence there and making his successful interventions in English politics seem especially triumphant.[45] Perhaps Mary issued the proclamation to placate some of Wyatt's anti-alien followers and show that she could be just as xenophobic as Wyatt, but given the proclamation's exemptions—denizens, merchant strangers, and servants to ambassadors—along with the targeting of specific occupations—"preacher, printer, bookseller"—it is clear that this proclamation marks the beginning of Mary's efforts to do away with traces of Protestantism and to revive Catholicism and the old traditions that had been suppressed in England's Reformation. The merchant strangers and ambassadors' servants were a mix of Protestants and Catholics, while strangers who worked as preachers, printers, and booksellers were almost certainly Protestant as were many immigrant artisans. Foxe includes the proclamation in his *Acts and Monuments* because, he explains, "it chiefly and most specially concerned religion and doctrine, and the true professors thereof."[46] Shortly after the proclamation was issued, Peter Delenus of the Dutch Church and thirty of his congregation made their way to Hamburg to join the few hundred who had left England a few months earlier in anticipation of persecution.[47] Still, a number of strangers lived in England for reasons other than religion and were nonetheless ordered to leave.

One week after the proclamation, Renard wrote to Charles V, "[S]ince the publication of the edict on the expulsion of foreigners which I sent to Your Majesty, the people have behaved much better here."[48] But Pettegree estimates that about 10,000 immigrants, most of whom were not denizens, were living in London at the beginning of Mary's reign and that while we have descriptions of small groups of strangers leaving London and arriving in cities of refuge on the continent, no reports of masses of Protestant strangers leaving England nor arriving anywhere else in the 1550s have materialized.[49] Many must have stayed in defiance of the proclamation: at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign there were roughly 6,000 strangers still apparently living in London, and the denizenation rate was certainly not high enough to suggest that the majority of those remaining were denizens.[50]

Scott Oldenburg 109

Given the large numbers of strangers remaining in the realm, it is difficult to imagine that the "good subjects" entreated to help enforce the proclamation did not know the whereabouts of many strangers; if Londoners were truly xenophobic, we should expect numerous records of strangers being detained, of mass round-ups, of Londoners actively informing on strangers, but there are very few instances of Londoners informing on their stranger neighbors and no instances of masses of strangers being detained or deported by local authorities.[51]

Mary was not unaware of the large number of non-denizen strangers remaining in the realm. In 1558 she issued a proclamation reiterating the 1554 proclamation and noting that "notwithstanding there remaineth to this hour, as well within the city of London as elsewhere in sundry other parts of the realm, no small number of the said Frenchmen which be no denizens at all and yet not avoided hence according to the tenor of the said proclamation." Realizing that her subjects were not as fervently xenophobic as she had thought, Mary provided an incentive for turning in strangers: "[I]t shall be lawful for any of her said loving subjects not only to take the said Frenchmen not being denizens and every of them prisoners, and so to use them, but also for their apprehension and taking of them in that sort shall enjoy to their own proper use all such goods and chattels as the said French or any of them had or possessed at the time they were taken."[52] Her renewed concern with strangers was sparked by two factors: increased tensions with France and the more longterm concern that strangers were an important part of the Protestant underground. Indeed, some Protestants continued to enter the realm: Christopher Vitch, precisely the kind of stranger the 1554 proclamation sought to expel, came to England during Mary's reign and appears to have moved about relatively freely as he spread the word of the Family of Love.[53] The only individual who seemed especially interested in harassing strangers was Bishop Stephen Gardiner, who made it his personal mission to enforce the proclamation.[54] His animosity, however, stemmed from religious fervor rather than a generalized dislike of foreigners; indeed, he never bothered Catholic strangers in the realm. Other than that there is little to indicate that the English welcomed the proclamation or helped to enforce it despite promises of reward for doing so. Lack of evidence for vigorous anti-alien activity, however, reveals only part of the story.

Throughout Mary I's reign, committed Protestants participated in underground congregations, reading and discussing the Bible and other tracts, listening to sermons, and gathering money to administer

Toward a Multicultural Mid-Tudor England

to prisoners and the poor. Mary clearly suspected the involvement of strangers in such congregations as early as 1554—she says as much in the anti-stranger proclamation discussed above. We know a good deal about one such underground congregation because Foxe included not only a narrative of the martyrdom of the congregation's leaders, John Rough and Cutbert Symson, but also letters and testimonies of the martyrs and records of Edmund Bonner's examinations of witnesses, including several members of the congregation.[55] One witness described the congregation as "a certain company of Frenchmen, Dutchmen, and other strangers, and amongst them Englishmen" who referred to one another as "brother" and ended their meetings by contributing to a fund for poor relief.[56] Three other witnesses note that the congregation's meetings were occasionally held at the house of a Dutch shoemaker named Frog, in Saint Katherine's, an area well known for its dense immigrant population.[57]

Some of the strangers in the underground congregation may have held denizen status and were therefore exempt from the proclamation, but a good many of the congregation's stranger-members probably were not denizens, as denization was costly, so that only the well-to-do or the well-connected could obtain papers.[58] In any case, Frog and the other strangers in the congregation were very much the people Mary targeted in her proclamations, but despite their apparent visibility, the congregation was not investigated until late 1557, and even then, the strangers in the congregation seem not to have been apprehended.[59]

There are three points to be gleaned from this episode of Mary's reign. First, the English Protestants operating underground during Mary's reign had close relationships with the Protestant refugee community in the realm: similarities in religion outweighed considerations of linguistic and cultural difference. Second, the strangers seem to have had considerable influence on the practices of the underground congregation: the descriptions of the congregation's gatherings bear strong similarities to the Dutch church's practice of "prophesy," a forum in which questions could be raised by the members of the group.[60] Third, Londoners were not particularly interested in causing problems for the group: the congregation, for all its covert activity, was not invisible to Londoners, yet it was not until one of the congregation's members betrayed the group to Bonner that anyone informed on the group, and then only after some intimidation: Alice Warner, whose tavern hosted at least two of the congregation's meetings, knew that the group included Protestant strangers but only thought to reveal this information after she had been interrogated. Londoners observed strangers

among them and even observed strangers participating in actions contrary to the crown's wishes, but they did not inform on them until cornered by the authorities. The English do not seem to have been xenophobic enough to take advantage of the compromised position of their stranger-neighbors. It seems that Protestant solidarity trumped allegiance to the monarch or some abstract sense of Englishness.

Even more telling are the examples of Londoners actively defending strangers. Pettegree has described two such instances.[61] A few months after Mary's first anti-alien proclamation was issued two Dutch shoemakers were arrested for loitering after dark. When it was discovered that they were non-denizens they were detained, but after nine days were released. Allies in the Cordwainers' Company seem to have intervened. The state and city authorities could have taken action against the strangers, but decided against it, and the two shoemakers were apparently permitted to continue living in London despite their violation of the anti-alien proclamation. Similarly, in 1556 when strangers were prohibited from being employed within London (with the exception of several trades including brewers, and a variety of occupations related to the cloth trade), the Dyer's Company successfully petitioned on behalf of their alien members.[62] As with Rough's underground congregation, when the opportunity to harass or deport aliens arose, the supposedly xenophobic English did not act, and at times even protected strangers. Unlike the strangers in Rough's congregation, however, these strangers appear to have been protected primarily out of guild solidarity. Like nearly all events involving strangers in early modern England, complex considerations of religion, economy, and the traditional rights of the city trumped the more facile consideration of immigration status.

We have, on the one hand, anti-alien legislation and Bonner and Gardiner's enthusiasm for eradicating Protestant refugees from the realm, and on the other, examples of Londoners working with and helping strangers, examples of strangers playing a prominent role in Mary's entry, the maintenance of a Protestant underground, and the economic well-being of the city. The idea of a homogenous, xenophobic England highlights the all-too-real tensions between immigrants and some native-born English throughout the early modern period, but it obscures conflicts over right religion, city versus state authority, economic rights, and political power, all of which usually seemed more important to the English than differences between themselves and their stranger-neighbors. Rather than evoking a homogenous English culture defending itself against diversity in the name of some

national "collective solidarity," the pageants for Mary's royal entry and the anecdotes described above show that many tried to maintain early modern England's immigrant populations and multicultural character in the name of local guild solidarity or pan-Protestant alliance.

Sometime between Mary's first and second anti-alien proclamations, perhaps around the time Bonner was interrogating Rough's underground congregation, *Wealth and Health* was performed for the queen. Although often interpreted as anti-immigrant, *Wealth and Health* tried to open up discussion on the fate of strangers in the realm and to call into question any simplistic approach to the issue. The play begins with the characters Wealth, Health, and Liberty debating their relative importance to the realm. Eventually they reconcile themselves to one another, surmising in the end that they are interdependent. The characters Ill Will and Shrewd Wit enter the stage, reveal to the audience their plot to exploit Wealth, speak with a Fleming named Hance Beerpot, and become servants to Health and Wealth, specifically hired to manage their household. Good Remedy enters, explains that he speaks "for the comen welth," and warns Health and Wealth about their servants.[63] After Good Remedy discusses the importance of material wealth and spiritual health to England, he meets Ill Will and Shrewd Wit. Good Remedy leaves, and Wealth and Health meet with Ill Will and Shrewd Wit who inform their masters that they have allowed "revel and rout," "every knave and drab" to overtake the household, and yet Ill Will and Shrewd Wit are able to convince Wealth and Health to maintain their employment and reject Good Remedy (*W*, 678–79). Good Remedy then argues with Hance about the whereabouts of Wealth and orders Hance to leave. Health enters with a handkerchief on his head and explains to Good Remedy that Ill Will and Shrewd Wit have infected him in "both body and soul," forced Wealth into "decay and necessitie," and imprisoned Liberty (*W*, 807). Good Remedy and Health hide as Ill Will and Shrewd Wit enter rejoicing in the damage they have done to Wealth, Health, Liberty, and Hance. Good Remedy interrogates Ill Will and Shrewd Wit and sends them to prison. He then tends to Wealth, Health, and Liberty. The play ends with a direct address to and prayer for the queen and her council.

C. W. Wallace describes the development of Marian drama as a variety of hybridizing experiments mixing humanism, classicism, and native morality plays, "the classicization of the morality [play] and the Anglicization of the classic," as he puts it.[64] *Wealth and Health* certainly fits this description: like native morality plays, *Wealth and Health* con-

cerns itself with spiritual matters in the figure of Health, but like many humanist texts it also reflects on social ills and the management of the commonwealth; the play begins with a static dialogue not unlike the interludes of John Heywood, but the plot also includes a good deal of dynamic action characteristic of narrative drama. As for Anglicization, the play is without a doubt focused on England as its setting and central concern and bears a number of native traits, but it is also decidedly multilingual, featuring passages in French, Spanish, Latin, and Dutch. This multilingualism and the Flemish immigrant, Hance Beerpot, a character largely superfluous to the main plot, confront the audience with the fact of multicultural England and force the audience to think about what value to assign that multicultural element of the realm. Darryll Grantley, summarizing the main point of the play, explains that it "argues for the importance of wealth to the well-being of the commonwealth at large, and advocates its proper management."[65] That Hance does not contribute to the main action of the play and could be edited out without doing damage to Grantley's summary of the play's argument makes his presence all the more conspicuous.

In his discussion of *Wealth and Health*, David Bevington explains that Hance Beerpot is the object of "traditional hostilities" toward strangers.[66] As we have seen, however, the commoners of the 1550s do not seem to have been participating in such a tradition despite ample opportunity and state approval. In addition to relying too heavily on the idea of a tradition of xenophobia, Bevington fails to take into account the courtly audience of *Wealth and Health*.[67] Popular traditions could be represented in courtly entertainments, but an appeal to a generalized xenophobia seems strained. The queen, after all, married a stranger, and Loades notes that up to 1555 one of Mary's closest confidants in court was the French-born Renard.[68] Renard, Philip, and any number of other ambassadors and their retinues may have been audience to *Wealth and Health*. *Wealth and Health* needs to be read, then, not through the lens of a transhistorical, homogenizing "tradition of xenophobia," but within the context of tension between the state's position on immigration and the relative failure of the proclamations due to the general population's lack of enthusiasm for anti-alien activity, within the context of a complex set of social relations that at times manifested themselves as animosity toward aliens but at other times as protection of and sympathy for immigrants. If the figure of Hance Beerpot indeed represents antipathy toward strangers, that antipathy needs to be understood in terms of differences in class as well culture and religion. If Hance Beerpot is intended to be unlikeable, it is not

because he is not English but rather because he is neither English nor connected to the ruling class.

Unlike many mid-Tudor plays, *Wealth and Health* provides a curious blend of allegory and realistic narrative drama.[69] As an allegory about the social and economic troubles facing England, the play features the virtues Good Remedy, Health, Wealth, and Liberty and the vices Ill Will and Shrewd Wit. These characters supply the main action and argument of the play. Two scenes, however, include Hance Beerpot, unique in that he has been given a proper (though stereotypical) name, a personal history, and little involvement in the main argument of the play. He is even given a "local habitation," as it were; he is said to reside in Saint Katherine's, where the Dutch shoemaker Frog sometimes hosted John Rough's underground Protestant congregation. Shrewd Wit suggests that Hance's real name is War (*W*, 399, 826), but aside from Hance's claim that he can "scote de culveryn" (*W*, 414)—that he is a gunner—he does not fulfill the role of War very well. Brooke has suggested that Hance's presence in the play refers to the conflicts with Flanders between 1557 and 1558, but Craik sees "considerable difficulty" in Brooke's interpretation specifically and Hance's role as War in general.[70] Hance does not fight, bring about conflict, or inspire warlike aspirations among the characters.[71] Moreover, according to Health, Wealth is harmed "By wast and war, thorow Yll Will and Shrewd Wit," not through Hance (*W*, 808). Finally, the name Hance, not War, appears in the *dramatis personae*, and we would do well to remember that the consistently dishonest Shrewd Wit is the only character to refer to Hance as War.

It is tempting, however, to read into Hance's inebriated state traces of a stock vice character of morality plays. Might Hance be a thinly disguised Sloth or Pride? True, he is drunk throughout the play and at times expresses a pride in his skills and his native country that exacerbates his status as an alien, but Hance has at least two jobs and a personal history. He tells Good Remedy, "ic myself be en scomaker" and "Ic myself cumt from Sent Katryns' dore mot ic skyne de can beer" (*W*, 755, 753), and he offers himself up for more work: "Ic can skote de culverin, and ic can be de beare broer" (*W*, 768)—in addition to being a shoemaker and tapster, he can shoot a gun and brew beer: he is clearly not Sloth. Hance brags, but perhaps he does so because he is trying to impress those around him so he can find more and better

work, and his pride in his abilities is tempered by a subservient attitude to those he speaks with and his general appreciation of his host country. He has lived in England thirteen years, he says, and has come to "love de Englishman" (*W*, 774), but he also demands recognition for his contributions to the realm. He insists, "Ic best nen emond!" (*W*, 401)—"I am somebody!"

Unlike the strangers' performances in Mary's royal entry, however, the character of Hance is mediated by an English author and actor. Always inebriated and only barely intelligible, Hance Beerpot fulfills a certain stereotype, but his individual traits complicate that stereotype and lead Peter McCluskey to claim that Hance "transcends his allegorical role" and is imbued "with a sense of realism" while Hoenselaars concludes that Hance is the "dramatist's attempt at a realistic portrayal of a Fleming."[72] He is, in many ways, a composite picture of immigrants of the period: he lives in an area and performs several of the jobs associated with mid-Tudor strangers. Rather than represent an abstract concept, Hance stands out as a character conspicuously grounded in the real life of London.

Just as Hance is generically different from the other characters of *Wealth and Health*, so the characters' attitudes toward him seem to trouble the allegory of the play. Throughout the play Wealth, Health, and Liberty are subjected to the conflicting influences of Ill Will and Shrewd Wit on the one hand and Good Remedy on the other. As one might expect, Good Remedy differs greatly from Ill Will and Shrewd Wit. Good Remedy advises Health, Wealth, and Liberty to "take heed / Of excess and prodigality" (*W*, 709–10) while Ill Will and Shrewd Wit manage their masters' household with "revel and rout" (*W*, 678), and are, according to Good Remedy, "full unthrifty" (*W*, 641). Shrewd Wit brags about his ability to "flatter and lie" (*W*, 439) while Good Remedy prides himself on the fact that he can "speak without blame" (*W*, 589), that is, freely and honestly as an advisor.[73] Good Remedy tells Health, Wealth, and Liberty that he works "to promote this realm; / That you three may prosper" (*W*, 567–68) whereas Ill Will and Shrewd Wit seek to exploit Wealth by encouraging "Bribery, theft, and privy picking" (*W*, 442). The advice and actions of the virtue, Good Remedy, and the vices, Ill Will and Shrewd Wit, form binary sets: frugal/wasteful, honest/dishonest, selfless/selfish, lawful/lawless. As should be expected in such an allegory, Good Remedy is opposed in nearly every way to Ill Will and Shrewd Wit.

The one thing Good Remedy, Ill Will, and Shrewd Wit agree on is the status of immigrants: none of these characters speaks respectfully

to Hance, despite his claim "ic love de Englishman" and his offer to buy each a beer. In his first appearance on stage, Hance sings a Dutch song and then speaks with Ill Will and Shrewd Wit, who ask Hance about where he has come from and what he is doing in their presence. Ill Will then dismisses Hance, but Hance remains and explains that he is looking for work and that he wants to bring him to the house of a great lord (*W*, 421); Ill Will tries to use Hance to get at Wealth by suggesting that he ought to "go to the court, and for Wealth inquire" (*W*, 422). Hance explains that Wealth is in Flanders, not England. Ill Will becomes enraged and dismisses Hance. A similar conversation occurs when Hance meets Good Remedy: Good Remedy asks where Hance comes from and what he is doing; Good Remedy then dismisses Hance, but Hance continues to talk about his work as a shoemaker. Exasperated, Good Remedy states, "There is too many aliants in this realm; but now I, / Good Remedy, have so provided that Englishmen shall live the better daily" (*W*, 760–61). Hance states his love of Englishmen, and Good Remedy accuses him of flattery and exporting England's wealth; Hance explains that he has lived in England thirteen years and brought with him many skills, so Good Remedy asserts in awkward syntax, "Trust see so provide that wealth from you have I shall" (*W*, 769); that is, Good Remedy, as representative of the commonwealth, wants to ensure that England profits from Hance's (and by extension, all aliens') work. Hance then explains that real wealth (in contrast to the allegorical figure) is no longer in England. Good Remedy becomes enraged and tells Hance to leave. Both conversations follow the same pattern: beginning with questioning Hance's whereabouts and a first attempt at dismissing him, moving on to an attempt at getting at wealth through Hance, expressing outrage at Hance's belief that wealth resides in Flanders, and ending with a second, effective dismissal of Hance. Considering that Good Remedy is diametrically opposed to Ill Will and Shrewd Wit, his exchange with Hance is remarkably similar to theirs.

What is more striking about Good Remedy's conversation with Hance is that Good Remedy echoes Ill Will (and to a lesser degree Shrewd Wit) throughout. Both Ill Will and Good Remedy describe Hance as "drunken" (*W*, 397, 776) and Shrewd Wit and Good Remedy call him a "knave" (*W*, 399, 765). When Hance enters the stage, Ill Will asks, "Wherefore comest thou hither" and Good Remedy asks, "Thou Fleming, from where comest thou . . . ?" (*W*, 412, 752). Upon Hance's exit, Ill Will asks, "Is he gone, farewell Hanijkin bowse / I pray God give him a hounded drouse" (*W*, 429–30)—"drouse," explains

Jasper Platt Jr., here means "devil."[74] Good Remedy sounds surprisingly like Ill Will when Hance exits from the second exchange: "Is he gone? I pray God the devil go with him" (*W*, 779). At Hance's exit, Ill Will and Good Remedy not only express the same sentiment but use many of the same words. Charles Baskerville thinks that the line, "Is he gone[?]" comes from a popular ballad trope of the period; if Baskerville is right, it may be that Good Remedy and Ill Will even sing the same tune.[75]

Whether Baskerville is right or not, in the exchanges with Hance Good Remedy acts and sounds like Ill Will. The allegorical dichotomy of *Wealth and Health* breaks down precisely where the play breaks with the genre of allegory, where the play's multigeneric plot runs into early modern England's multicultural reality. To suggest that the play covertly condemns Good Remedy would be reading too much into this moment superfluous to the overall plot of the play; to suggest that the moment therefore does not matter, however, would be folly. There is a real paradox surrounding Hance. For example, Good Remedy, as has been mentioned, expects to extract wealth from Hance's labor, but his statement, "Get thee hence, drunken Fleming! / thou shalt tarry no longer here" (*W*, 776–77) is generally read as Hance's expulsion from the realm.[76] How can Good Remedy expel Hance from the realm and at the same time exploit his labor?

Craik lists Hance as one of several "comic and sinister foreigners" to appear in Tudor drama. McCluskey tends to agree, describing Hance "as a drunken troublemaker." Hoenselaars doubts Hance's comic potential and suggests that Hance's drunkenness was intended not to add comedy to the morality but "to arouse the audience's aversion."[77] I believe Craik is right that Hance's drunkenness was intended for comic relief, but even if one agrees with Hoenselaars that Hance is not comical, it is difficult to see him as a sinister troublemaker.[78] Hance is not involved in Ill Will and Shrewd Wit's exploitation of Wealth, Health, and Liberty. He is bluntly honest about real wealth in Flanders. He seems to be a hard worker, though often drunk, and the play makes the case that he offers England a number of valuable skills including military protection from foreign powers. In the end Ill Will and Shrewd Wit have victimized Wealth, Health, and Liberty, and laugh that Hance was, according to Shrewd Wit, "beshitten for fear, / Because he should void so soon" (*W*, 827–28). That Ill Will and Shrewd Wit should relish Hance's expulsion from the realm, that he is in a sense among the casualties of their devious plots, renders some sympathy for the character. Hance's status as victim aligns him more

Toward a Multicultural Mid-Tudor England

closely with Wealth, Health, and Liberty than with the truly sinister Ill Will and Shrewd Wit.

Wealth and Health presents an allegory of England in which detrimental elements in the realm can be contained so that, as Health puts it, "Wealth, Health, and Liberty may continue here alway" (*W*, 954). But the play also presents the multicultural reality of England, and this troubles the simplicty of the allegory. Craik, Hoenselaars, and McCluskey think that Hance should be seen negatively and that Good Remedy's attitude toward Hance reflects an enthusiastic endorsement for Mary's policy of expelling strangers from the realm. However, Hance does not so easily fit into the play's system of virtues and vices. He stands outside the clearcut allegory of the main plot: he is industrious but drunk, honest but sometimes offensive, perhaps not great company but harmless throughout. Neither Craik nor Hoenselaars notices that Good Remedy's attitude toward Hance is similar to Ill Will's and that Good Remedy thinks that wealth can be had through Hance's labor. McCluskey notes that the vices and virtues oddly agree about Hance, but he claims that this only reinforces the play's anti-alien stance. By failing to examine how the allegory's neat categories of good and bad break down around Hance, critics miss the play's complexity regarding the issue of immigration.

By presenting an immigrant in the realm, *Wealth and Health* may have been suggesting that Mary needed to renew her anti-alien proclamation or intensify efforts to enforce it. Indeed, Ill Will and Good Remedy's first dismissals of Hance, dismissals that Hance ignores, may be allusions to the ineffectiveness of the 1554 proclamation. But the play presents the native English Ill Will and Shrewd Wit, not the immigrant artisan, as the source of harm to the realm. This is not to say that Hance appears as a positive representation of England's immigrant population, but his presence is not altogether negative either. Hance's role in the play is too ambiguous to fit the absolute categories of "ill" and "good" put forth by the allegory.

One would expect an allegory to portray the actions of Ill Will as ill and those of Good Remedy as good, but both dismiss Hance. Good Remedy and Ill Will differ, however, in their respective intentions. Ill Will dismisses Hance out of malice, while Good Remedy dismisses him for the sake of the commonwealth. In that sense, *Wealth and Health* seems to confront the audience with the question of means and ends regarding Mary's policy toward strangers. The play seems to ask, "To what degree does expelling strangers improve or deteriorate the health, wealth, and liberty of the realm?" Early in the play Health, representing

spiritual well-being, argues for his preeminence above Wealth by advocating for a decidedly Catholic, predictably Marian, theology: "Grace, heaven, nor cunning cannot be bought," he says, "Without great pain, and good deeds wrought; / Else man cannot them have" (*W*, 121–23), but when Wealth asks, "May not men buy heaven with richesse, / As to build churches and make by-ways[?]" (*W*, 125–26), Health responds affirmatively.[79] In this way, Health and Wealth begin their reconciliation in the opening debate, but the issue of intent and the ambiguity implied by Ill Will and Good Remedy's agreement regarding strangers introduces an unspoken problem for that reconciliation.

Mary, as has already been demonstrated, issued her anti-alien proclamation primarily to eliminate the foreign Protestant influence from the realm, to further her goal of creating a thoroughly homogeneous Catholic England. McCluskey believes Hance is banished because of his Protestantism, but he only arrives at that conclusion by assuming that Hance is Protestant and that "drunkeness itself functions as a metaphor for the corruption of English society by continental reformers."[80] Hance's religious beliefs, however, are never hinted at, and he says that he came to England thirteen years ago; assuming, as McCluskey does, that the play was composed between 1554 and 1555, Hance immigrated to England well before Edward VI's reign when the first significant wave of Protestant refugees entered the realm. Hance may well have been intended to be Protestant, but if he were the source of malignant false doctrine, we should expect his expulsion to coincide with Health's revitalization rather than his demise. Hance has already left England when Health appears withered with a handkerchief on his head. Hance's expulsion seems to have no relation to the spiritual well-being of the realm.

Moreover, *Wealth and Health* presents Hance, despite his insobriety and offensiveness to Good Remedy, as a source of material wealth and military protection for the realm. The audience must wonder, then, if it is more than a coincidence that after Hance is exiled, Wealth falls into "decay and necessitie / By wast and war" (*W*, 807–8). What if strangers were good for material wealth by generating taxable income and bringing new skills to the realm, but bad for Catholicism in England by introducing Protestant theology to the English? Hance's expulsion recalls and implicitly reopens the play's debate about whether Health or Wealth deserve more preeminence in England, and by extension whether decisions about strangers ought to be considered in light of the material or the spiritual interests of the realm.

One may argue that despite *Wealth and Health*'s two statements that wealth can be got at through Hance, Hance is nevertheless depicted

Toward a Multicultural Mid-Tudor England

as bad for the economy. His many jobs could be filled by Englishmen. Shrewd Wit, after all, tells Hance, "We have English gunners enow" (*W*, 416), but we should be suspicious of anything Shrewd Wit says. The fact is that there were not very many capable English gunners and even fewer English beer brewers in the 1550s. Moreover, from the state's point of view, stranger-artisans were a greater source of revenue than their English counterparts. At the same time that the state insisted that stranger communities take care of their own poor relief, it taxed strangers at twice the rate imposed on their English counterparts in the Lay Subsidy and included the children of strangers in the poll tax.[81] The precarious position of immigrants in early modern England made them easier to exploit.

Exploitation, of course, is not a multicultural value, but it does offer one of the ruling class's motivations for sometimes advocating on the behalf of strangers. Still, as we have seen, although some harbored ill will toward aliens in the form of expelling or exploiting them, others lived, worked, and worshiped side by side with them and when times got tough had the courage to lobby to protect them from onerous restrictions on employment and to hide them from religious persecution. *Wealth and Health* hints at the existence of such allies of strangers when Ill Will tells Hance, "But goe thy way, they be not here that promote thee can" (*W*, 420). Perhaps few if any members of the audience of this performance for the queen had in fact advocated on the behalf of strangers, but throughout the realm and especially in London there seems to have been a reasonably large population of people who tolerated and even valued the presence of strangers in the realm.

Around the time Craik supposes *Wealth and Health* was performed, John Christopherson, the queen's chaplain, in *An exhortation to all menne to take hede and beware of rebellion*, attacked anti-alien sentiment directly by debunking the myths of seditious aliens and drawing attention to the Christian call to acceptance of strangers:

> As for straungers we nede not to feare. For yf they do any injury to any subjecte of hers, they shalbe punyshed by the lawes of thys realme, as we be. And yf they behaue them selfe gentlye, as it is very lyke that they will, we shall haue cause to love them to ioyne frendship with them, and to make muche of them. For so shall we deserue thankes both of them & at goddes hand to, who wylleth us that we offende not, or hurte anye straunger.[82]

Christopherson's main goal in *An exhortation* was to show that there are no valid motives for rebellion. He advises the poor, for example,

to understand that poverty is God's will and perhaps punishment on them; the poor should, he claims, "patiently suffer their pouertie, & thanke God hartelye for it" rather than openly resist exploitation.[83] Christopherson's advice concerning strangers was designed specifically to argue against Wyatt's rebellion, but unlike his advice to the poor, his view of immigrants seems fairly progressive. He objects to xenophobia as an irrational fear, asks that strangers be treated equally under the law, and turns acceptance of strangers into a virtue. What place might these multicultural sentiments have had in Mary's monocultural vision of England in which strangers are *de facto* criminals, heretics, and rebels? Christopherson, despite his close ties with the Protestant persecutions that dominate discussions of the Marian period, does not fit well into the histories that emphasize English xenophobia in the service of nation formation anymore than Mary's royal entry and *The Interlude of Wealth and Health* fit a monocultural model of early modern English literature. All three emphasize precisely what is effaced in claims about so-called traditions of xenophobia and the history of Englishness: England has been multicultural and wrestled with the central questions of multiculturalism for centuries.

To be sure, *Wealth and Health*'s questions about the relative merits of expelling strangers are put forth with a number of safeguards. Unlike the pageants of the royal entry which celebrated the coronation of the new queen alongside an open celebration of London's diversity, *Wealth and Health* presents early modern England's multicultural reality obliquely in the subplot through the ambiguous and comic figure of Hance Beerpot rather than in the main plot with its allegorical absolutes, and it frames the issue of immigration in terms of economic advantage rather than mutual respect. *Wealth and Health* simply suggests that immigrants, regardless of any number of negative attributes, might serve to protect the realm as gunners and to increase the state's revenue as easily taxable, highly industrious individuals. Like Christopherson and the royal entry, however, *Wealth and Health* portrays strangers as a relatively harmless and ultimately integral part of England. Mary I expressed fears about the influence of immigrants, but these were not the sentiments expressed by her chaplain in *An exhortation to all menne*, by her London subjects in her royal entry, nor by the author(s) of *Wealth and Health*. Mary Tudor may have sought a monocultural England, but all around her were signs of early modern England's multicultural reality.

Tulane University

NOTES

Special thanks to Mariana Oldenburg, Barbara Bono, Leslie Graff, Rachel Greenberg, Tony Hasler, James Holstun, Gordon Kipling, Kim and Phil Stern, Scott Stevens, and Jim Swan for their support and feedback on this essay.

[1] See Liah Greenfeld, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1992), 30. Of course, some scholars see English nation formation occurring in the premodern period; see, for example, Anthony Hastings, *The Construction of Nationhood. Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1997), 47–51; M. T. Clanchy, *England and Its Rulers, 1066–1272* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1998), 173–89; and R. R. Davies, *The First English Empire: Power and Identities in the British Isles, 1093–1343* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2000), 158.

[2] See Claire McEachern, *The Poetics of English Nationhood, 1590–1612* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996), 1; Jean Howard and Phyllis Rackin, *Engendering a Nation: A Feminist Account of Shakespeare's English Histories* (London: Routledge, 1997), 12; and Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: the Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1992).

[3] Greenfeld, 3.

[4] Howard and Rackin, 49; McEachern, 25.

[5] Philip Schwyzer, *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2004), 2.

[6] See Lien Bich Luu, *Immigrants and the Industries of London, 1500–1700* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), 92.

[7] Nigel Goose has offered the most comprehensive critique to date of the notion of early modern English xenophobia. See his "'Xenophobia' in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England: An Epithet Too Far" in *Immigrants in Tudor and Early Stuart England*, ed. Goose and Luu (Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2005), 110–35.

[8] For an overview of the idea of multiculturalism as a perceived threat to national identity, see Christopher H. J. Bradley, "Chapter 24," *Mrs. Thatcher's Cultural Policies: 1979–1990, A Comparative Study of the Globalized Cultural System* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1998), 351–68.

[9] On the demographics of early modern England, see William Cunningham, *Alien Immigrants to England*, 2nd ed. (London: Frank Cass & Co. Ltd, 1969), 144–46; Andrew Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 21; Irene Scouloudi, *Returns of Strangers in the Metropolis 1593, 1627, 1635, 1639: A Study of an Active Minority*, Huguenot Society of London, Quarto Series, vol. 57 (London: Huguenot Society of London, 1985), 77; and Luu, *Immigrants and the Industries of London*, 87–104.

[10] The tensions arising from the creation of the European Union, however, reveal that Europe continues to experience itself as heterogeneous. See, for example, Olivier Klein and Laurent Licata, "Does European Citizenship Breed Xenophobia? European Identification as a Predictor of Intolerance Towards Immigrants?" *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* 12 (2002): 323–37.

[11] See Joseph P. Ward, *Metropolitan Communities: Trade Guilds, Identity, and Change in Early Modern London* (Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 1997).

[12] Quoted in J. Arnold Fleming, *Flemish Influence in Britain*, vol. 1 (Glasgow: Jackson, Wylie & Co., 1930), 301.

[13] Rajeev Bhargava, "Introducing Multiculturalism" in *Multiculturalism, Liberalism, and Democracy*, ed. Bhargava, Amiya Kumar Bagchi, and R. Suarshan (New Delhi: Oxford Univ. Press, 1999), 12.

Scott Oldenburg   123

[14] Clais van Wervekin [hatmaker] to his wife, 21 August 1567, quoted in Richard Henry Tawney and Eileen Power, *Tudor Economic Documents*, 3 vol. (1924; repr., London: Lowe and Brydone Printers, 1963), 1:299. On the specific communities in Norwich and Colchester, see Goose, "The 'Dutch' at Colchester: The Economic Influence of an Immigrant Community in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," *Immigrants and Minorities* 1 (1982): 261–80; Henry Laver, "A Sketch of the Early History of Colchester," *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of London* 4 (1894): 45–52; Douglas Rickwood, "The Norwich Strangers, 1565–1643: a Problem of Control," *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society* 24 (1984): 119–28; and Christine Vane, "The Walloon Community in Norwich: the First Hundred Years," *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society* 24 (1984): 129–37.

[15] *Charter of King Edward VI, Granting the Church of the Augustine Friars, London to Foreign Protestant Refugers*, quoted in Johannes Lindeboom, *Austin Friars: History of the Dutch Reformed Church in London, 1550–1950* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1950), 202.

[16] "Proclamation for the Driving Out of the Realm Strangers and Foreigners" in *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, ed. Paul L. Hughes and James F. Larkin, 3 vol. (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1964–1969), 2:31.

[17] "Order Deporting French Aliens" in *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, 83.

[18] John Christopherson writes, "the Prince of Spayne is vnto vs no straunger, but one of the bloude royall of Englande, by reason that his father the emperours Maiestie, that nowe is, bothe by hys father syde & mothers cometh of the Kinges of Englande" (*An exhortation to all menne to take hede and beware of rebellion wherein are set forth the causes, that commonlye moue men to rebellion, and that no cause is there, that ought to moue any man there vnto* [London: 1554], 93 (STC, 2nd ed. / 1230:07, Early English Books Online, *http://eebo.chadwyck.com* [accessed 5 April 2006]).

[19] See Robert Tittler, *The Reign of Mary I* (London: Longman, 1983), 23.

[20] Frank Percy Wilson, *The English Drama, 1485–1585* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1969), 34.

[21] Mark Hunter disagrees and suggests a date prior to 1506, but the basis for his dating is flimsy at best; he claims that the play's affinities with the early sixteenth-century play *Youth* and the play's reference to the Flemish character Hance Beerpot as a mercenary (a gunner to be precise) and to wealth being transported to Flanders indicate that it was composed prior to 1506. See Hunter, "Notes on the Interlude of Wealth and Health," *Modern Language Review* 3 (1907): 366–69. While *Wealth and Health* may be fruitfully compared to *Youth*, more critics have found telling similarities between *Wealth and Health* and the Marian interlude *Respublica*, and in part because of these similarities, critics have taken the two plays to have been written and performed at around the same time; see Thomas Wallace Craik, "The Political Interpretation of Two Tudor Interludes: *Temperance and Humility* and *Wealth and Health*," *The Review of English Studies*, new series 4.14 (1953): 98–108; A. J. Hoenselaars, *Images of Englishmen and Foreigners in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries* (London: Associated Univ. Press, 1992), 30; and Ranier Pineas "The Revision of *Wealth and Health*," *Philological Quarterly* 44 (1965): 560–62. As for the reference to wealth being transported to Flanders, David M. Loades notes that Mary began her reign in considerable debt and chose to increase foreign debt in her first year as queen. Much of that debt was owed to bankers in Antwerp which had been annexed to Flanders since 1365, so a loss of wealth to Flanders could well signal a 1550s composition date. See Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor: Politics, Government and Religion in England,*

1553–58, (London: Longman, 1991), 129–33, 232–39. Regarding mercenaries, it is well known that Mary employed foreign mercenaries occasionally. Historian Thomas Wyatt, for example, writes, "Most of the gunners in the Tower were Flemings, Italians and fewer Englishmen" ("Aliens in England before the Huguenots," *Huguenot Society's Proceedings* 19 [1958]: 85). See also C. V. Malfatti, ed. and trans., *Two Italian Accounts of Tudor England: A Journey to London in 1497; A Picture of English Life Under Queen Mary* (Barcelona: Itinerarium Britanniae, 1953), 56; William Page, Preface to his *Letters of Denization and Acts of Naturalization for Aliens, 1509–1603*, in Publications of the Huguenot Society of London, 59 vol. (Lymington, 1893), 8:iv-xcviii; Ralph Sadler, *The State Papers and Letters of Sir Ralph Sadler*, 3 vol. (Edinburgh: James Ballantyne and Co. 1809), 1:393; and Cunningham, 142. Hunter is right, however, to focus on the character Hance Beerpot. Flemings were not closely associated with beer brewing in England, as Hance Beerpot is, until after 1524, and the word "berepot" does not enter print until well after Hunter's proposed date of composition. Thus, I agree with C.F. Tucker Brooke, Craik, and Darryll Grantley that the play was written and performed sometime between 1553–1557. See Brooke, *The Tudor Drama: A History of English National Drama to the Retirement of Shakespeare* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1911); and Grantley, *English Dramatic Interludes, 1300–1580: A Reference Guide* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2004), 363–65.

[22] See Craik, "The Political Interpretation of Two Tudor Interludes," 30.

[23] Richard Mulcaster, *The Queen's Majesty's Passage*, in *Renaissance Drama, an Anthology of Plays and Entertainments*, ed. Arthur F. Kinney (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2001), lines 658, 664; Thomas Dekker, *The Magnificent Entertainment*, in *Renaissance Drama*, line 706.

[24] See Giovanni Francesco Commendone, "Events of the Kingdom of England Beginning with King Edward VI until the Wedding of the Most Serene Prince Philip of Spain and the Most Serene Queen Mary," in *The Accession Coronation and Marriage of Mary Tudor as Related in Four Manuscripts of the Escorial*, trans. Malfatti (Barcelona: published by C. V. Malfatti, 1956); Thomas Lanquet, *An Epitome of Chronicles Conteyning the whole discourse of the histories as well of this realme of England, as al other cou[n]treys, with the succession of their kinges, the time of their reigne, and what notable actes they did* (London: 1559), STC, 2nd ed. / 15217.5, Early English Books Online, *http://eebo.chadwyck.com* (accessed 5 April 2006); Henry Machyn, *The Diary of Henry Machyn, Citizen and Merchant-Taylor of London from A.D. 1550 to A.D. 1563*, ed. John Gough Nichols (Camden Society New York and London: AMS Press, 1968), series 1, 42; Edward Underhill, "The History of Wyatt's Rebellion" in *Tudor Tracts, 1532–1588*, ed. Alfred F. Pollard (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1903), 170–98; Charles Wriothesley, vol. 2, *A Chronicle of England During the Reigns of the Tudors from A.D. 1485 to 1559*, ed. William Douglas Hamilton (London: Camden Society, 1877); *The Chronicle of Queen Jane, and of Two Years of Queen Mary, and Especially of the Rebellion of Sir Thomas Wyat*, ed. John Gough Nichols (London: Camden Society, 1850); and vol. 12, *Two London Chronicles from the Collections of John Stow*, ed. Charles Lethbridge Kingsford, Camden Miscellany (London: Camden Society, 1910). On Mary's failure to effectively use printing as a tool to assert her authority see Loades, "The Press Under the Early Tudors, a Study of Censorship and Sedition," *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographic Society* 4.1 (1964): 29–50. One should note, in contrast, the relative dominance of the printing trade by Protestant refugees: see, for example, Colin Clair, "Refugee Printers and Publishers in Britain during the Tudor Period," *Huguenot Society Proceedings* 22 (1972): 115–26; Fleming, 254–261;

and Ernest James Worman, *Alien Members of the Book-trade During the Tudor Period* (London: Blades, East and Blades, 1906). Mary was undoubtedly aware of the power of the press, especially in its capacity to promote Protestantism—see for example her proclamations against printing related to doctrine in *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, 5–8, 57–9—but she seemed to believe that one simply needed to remove the Protestant propaganda to ensure her subjects' obedience.

[25] Quoted in Sydney Anglo, *Spectacle, Pageantry, and Early Tudor Policy*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 283.

[26] See Mulcaster, 65–130.

[27] See Dekker, 304–10.

[28] Commendone, 32; my emphasis.

[29] Commendone, 32.

[30] *Two London Chronicles*, 29. See Anglo, 320–21; and *The Chronicle of Queen Jane*, 29.

[31] See Machyn, 45.

[32] Judith M. Richards, "Mary Tudor as 'Sole Quene'?: Gendering Tudor Monarchy," *The Historical Journal* 40 (1997): 899 n.20.

[33] *Two London Chronicles* makes no mention of the pageants at Cheap and Cornhill and only mentions a Dutch entertainer at Paul's and the three stranger pageants. Commendone claims that of all the pageants, "only two of them [were] worth noticing, one by the Genoese, the other by the Florentines" (31). *The Chronicle of Queen Jane* devotes very little attention to the English pageants. Machyn devotes more description to the strangers' pageants, but applies the adjective "goodly" even-handedly (44–45). Charles Wriothesley describes the whole series but devotes considerably more attention to the strangers' pageants; Edward Underhill mentions only the Dutch entertainer at Paul's. See Underhill, 182.

[34] Underhill, 182.

[35] *The Chronicle of Queen Jane*, 55; *Two London Chronicles*, 235.

[36] Lanquet, 327. There are some letters that do not mention Peter, but all letters and chronicles that give details about the pageants, that is say, those that go beyond simply mentioning that the royal entry occurred, include a description of the acrobatics at Saint Paul's.

[37] See *The Chronicle of Queen Jane*, 55; and Wriothelsey, 104.

[38] See *The Chronicle of Queen Jane*, 30. It is worth noting that like Peter, the authors of Florentine pageant presumed to represent all of London.

[39] John Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, 12 vol. (Albany, OR: Hartland Publications, 1997), 10:737. See *Calendar of Letters, Despatches, and State Papers Relating to the Negotiations between England and Spain*, ed. Royall Tyler, 13 vol. (London: Hereford Times, Limited, 1916), 11:173.

[40] See Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant*, 292–93, Pettegree, "The Stranger Community in Marian London," *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society* 24 (1987): 391; and Luu, *Immigrants and the Industries of London*, 92.

[41] John Proctor, *The historie of wyates rebellion with the order and maner of resisting the same, wherunto in the ende is added an earnest conference with the degenerate and sedicious rebelles for the serche of the cause of their daily disorder* (London: Robert Caly, 1555), 27–28 (STC, 2nd ed. / 20408, Early English Books Online, *http://eebo. chadwyck.com* [accessed 5 April 2006]). Proctor here quotes Sir Robert Southwell, Sheriff of Kent, as he dissuaded a crowd from supporting Wyatt by focusing on Wyatt's appeal to xenophobic impulses. Of course, Wyatt's anti-alien battle-cry protested the

plans for Mary to marry Philip and therefore give a stranger authority over English subjects, but his rhetoric seems to have been generally received as an attack on all strangers. Later, Proctor writes that the commoners felt that accusations of treason were unwarranted, "calling to their remembrance how Wyat in al apparance made his whol matter of styr, for strangers, & no waies against the quene" (55). Christopherson claims that there were two motives for Wyatt's rebellion: "One, to delyuer our countrie from the oppression of straungers, as it was reported, and another to restore agayne Luthers lewde religion" (82). Chronicles tend to emphasize xenophobia as a motive in rebellions. See Clair Valente suspects that this emphasis was a way of discrediting and distracting from the main grievances of many rebellions. See Valente, *The Theory and Practice of Revolt in Medieval England* (London: Ashgate, 2003), 59, 133.

[42] See Foxe, 10:1033.

[43] "Proclamation for the Driving Out of the Realm Strangers and Foreigners" in *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, 32.

[44] Simon Renard, in *Calendar of Letters*, 11:96.

[45] See Loades, *The Reign*, 25.

[46] Foxe, 10:803.

[47] See Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant*, 117.

[48] Renard to Charles V, in *Calendar of Letters*, 12:126.

[49] See Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant*, 78, 118; Pettegree, "The Stranger Community," 391; and Luu, "'Taking the Bread Out of Our Mouths': Xenophobia in Early Modern London," *Immigrants and Minorities* 19.2 (2000): 1–22, esp. 9.

[50] By 1593 most of those who had remained in the realm throughout Mary's reign would have died, but the *Returns of Aliens, 1593* does list some non-denizen strangers who were present as early as 1539. See R. E. G. Kirk and Ernest Kirk, ed., vol. 10, *Returns of Aliens Dwelling in the City and Suburbs of London, 1525–1571*, Huguenot Society of London (Aberdeen: Univ. Press, 1900), 218. See also Luu, "'Taking the Bread,'" 9.

[51] See Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant*, 120.

[52] Mary I, "Order Deporting French Aliens" in *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, 83.

[53] See Page, xxxi.

[54] See Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant*, 115–6; and *Calendar of Letters*, 11:217.

[55] See Foxe, 11:769–99.

[56] Foxe, 11:256–63

[57] See Foxe, 11:796, 10:793–95. Little is known about Frog, but hosting the meetings indicates that he was clearly a prominent figure in this particular congregation. The Lay Subsidies, taken on 14 May 1559, records three strangers with the surname Frogge living in Saint Katherine's: Martyn and Gover Frogge, who were servants to William Joneson, and John Frogge, a resident of Saint Katherine's as far back as 1540 and as late as 1571 when he was listed as a denizen. See Kirk and Kirk, 251–52, 20, 457. On the immigrant population in Saint Katherine's, see Scouloudi's "Notes on Strangers in the Precinct of St. Katherine-by-the-Tower," *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society* 25 (1989): 75–82.

[58] Much less than half the total stranger population at the time were denizens. See Page, lii–liii.

[59] Foxe records only one execution of a stranger throughout Mary's reign, one Lyon Cawch, a Flemish merchant. See Foxe, 11:256–63.

[60] For a discussion of prophesy, see Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant*, 63–65.

[61] See Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant*, 123.

Scott Oldenburg

[62] Page notes that the Mayor was compelled to issue the regulations against aliens because Mary's 1554 proclamation had been such a failure. See Page, xxx.

[63] *The Interlude of Wealth and Health*, ed. W. W. Greg (London: Chiswick Press, 1907), line 590. Hereafter abbreviated *W* and cited parenthetically by line number.

[64] C.W. Wallace, *The Evolution of the English Drama Up To Shakespeare* (Port Washington, NY: Kennikate Press, 1968), 101.

[65] Darryll Grantley, *Wit's Pilgrimage: Drama and the Social Impact of Education in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), 152–53.

[66] David M. Bevington, *Tudor Drama and Politics: A Critical Approach to Topical Meaning* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1968), 133–34.

[67] See Hoenselaars, 30; and Craik, "The Political Interpretation."

[68] See Loades, *The Reign*, 25.

[69] I can find no mid-Tudor play that intermixes characters as *Wealth and Health* does. The Marian plays *Respublica* and *Love Feigned and Unfeigned*, for example, do not intermix allegorical and realistic characters. See W. R. Streitberger, *Court Revels, 1485–1559* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1994), 206.

[70] Craik, "The Political Interpretation," 106. See also Brooke, 107.

[71] C. S. Lewis discusses the proper function of the allegorical figure of War in the *Thebaid*, for example. See Lewis, *The Allegory of Love: A Study in Medieval Tradition* (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1973), 50–51.

[72] Peter McCluskey, "The Strangers' Case": Representations of Flemish Immigrants in Renaissance English Drama, 1515–1635," dissertation (University of Arkansas, 1998), 56; Hoenselaars, 40.

[73] For all Shrewd Wit's bragging about being a great deceiver, Shrewd Wit and Ill Will turn out to be horrible liars; much of the play's comedy emanates from their habit of saying precisely what they are doing and then falling over themselves to cover up the truth they have just revealed to their masters. See, for example, *Wealth and Health*, 499–510.

[74] Jasper Platt Jr., "'Drowse'=Devil," *Notes and Queries* 116, 6 July 1907, 6. Prior to Platt's suggestion, Greg had declared the word "unintelligible" ("Notes on the Society's Publications," *Collections 1* [London: Malone Society, 1907], 1). A. E. H. Swaen agrees with Platt. See Swaen, "*Wealth and Health*," *Englische Studien* 41 (1910): 456. St. Swithin disputes Platt's gloss, but I find Swithin less persuasive. See Swithin, "'Drowse'=Devil," *Notes and Queries* 116, 27 July 1907, 73. Even if Platt were wrong, there remain a considerable number of echoes of Ill Will reverberating in Good Remedy's speech during his encounter with Hance.

[75] See Charles Read Baskerville, *Elizabethan and Stuart Plays* (New York: H. Holt and Company, 1934), 180 n.3.

[76] See Craik, "The Political Interpretation," 106; Hoenselaars, 41; McCluskey, 83.

[77] Craik, *The Revels History of Drama in English*, 8 vol. (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1977), 2:197; McCluskey, 82; Hoenselaars, 40.

[78] Ferdinand Holthausen also finds humor in Hance's inebriated speech. See Holthausen, Einleitung in *An Interlude of Welth and Helth, Eine Englische Moralität des XVI. Jahrhundrets* (Kiel: Universität Kiel, 1908), 65.

[79] This representation of Catholic theology is admittedly crass. This part of the play may have been revised for publication by someone interested in writing into the play a bit of protestant polemic. Nonetheless, it is clear that in the course of the debate, Wealth and Health resolve their differences, and the argument that follows regarding Hance withstands hints of Elizabethan revision.

[80] McCluskey, 82. See also McClusky, 41.
[81] See Scouloudi, *Returns*, 17–18.
[82] Christopherson, 121–22.
[83] Christopherson, 23.