

# London and Literature, 1603-1901



# London and Literature, 1603-1901

Edited by

Barnaby Ralph, Angela Kikue Davenport  
and Yui Nakatsuma

Cambridge  
Scholars  
Publishing



London and Literature, 1603-1901

Edited by Barnaby Ralph, Angela Kikue Davenport and Yui Nakatsuma

This book first published 2017

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2017 by Barnaby Ralph, Angela Kikue Davenport,  
Yui Nakatsuma and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-1275-7

ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-1275-7

To Eiichi Hara, scholar and teacher,  
in gratitude and celebration



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface .....	ix
Gerald Dickens	
Foreword .....	xi
Toru Sasaki	
Editors' Introduction and Acknowledgments .....	xiii
Chapter One .....	1
Strangers, Citizens, and Saints in Shakespeare's London	
James Tink	
Chapter Two .....	17
"Therein Intermix'd": <i>Psyche</i> and the London Restoration Stage	
Barnaby Ralph	
Chapter Three .....	35
The Disappearance of London from the Early Eighteenth-Century	
London Stage	
Miki Iwata	
Chapter Four .....	49
Autonomy and Ambiguity of the Trading Capital:	
Daniel Defoe's <i>Journal of the Plague Year</i>	
Masaaki Takeda	
Chapter Five .....	65
Literature, London, and <i>Lives of the English Poets</i>	
Noriyuki Harada	
Chapter Six .....	79
"Rotten Architecture, but Wonderful Gargoyles": The Murky	
World of London and Charles Dickens' Aesthetic Signposts	
Neil Addison	

Chapter Seven .....	95
The Belly of London: Dickens and Markets	
Midori Niino	
Chapter Eight .....	111
Terror and Crime in London in the Fictional Works of Douglas Jerrold	
Yui Nakatsuma	
Chapter Nine .....	127
The Dramatist as Historian: Oscar Wilde's Society Comedies and	
Victorian Anthropology	
Yusuke Tanaka	
List of Editors and Contributors .....	143
Index .....	149



## PREFACE

### GERALD DICKENS

I am fortunate to have been born into the Dickens family: I could have been born anywhere, to anyone, but I was born a Dickens. And what a name to carry! I am often asked if it is a burden to have the Dickens name and my answer is always immediate and heartfelt: “no, it is nothing but a privilege.”

Whilst I may not have appreciated the works of Charles Dickens when I was growing up, I quickly realised that he introduced me to so many different people, both real and fictitious. The extraordinary thing about those who read and love Dickens is that they do not fall into a specific demographic category. In the same way that Dickens’ characters come from every sphere of life, so do his readers. That was true in his own time and is still true today.

The richness of his stories comes from the characters, but from the very first of his *Sketches* to the final passages of *The Mystery of Edwin Drood* one character appeared in every single novel: the city of London.

London fascinated and tormented Dickens, for it contained every form of life. It was bright, loud, exciting and vibrant, as described in *Sketches by Boz*:

Imagine yourself in an extremely dense crowd, which swings you to and fro, and in and out, and every way but the right one; add to this the screams of women, the shouts of boys, the clanging of gongs, the firing of pistols, the ringing of bells, the bellowings of speaking-trumpets, the squeaking of penny dittos, the noise of a dozen bands, with three drums in each, all playing different tunes at the same time, the hallooing of showmen, and an occasional roar from the wild-beast shows; and you are in the very centre and heart of the fair.

It was seedy, dangerous and villainous as in *Oliver Twist*:

The ways were foul and narrow; the shops and houses wretched; the people half-naked, drunken, slipshod, ugly. Alleys and archways, like so many cesspools, disgorged their offences of smell, and dirt, and life, upon the

straggling streets; and the whole quarter reeked with crime, with filth, and misery.

On a personal level London held memories of poverty and disgrace:

Thirty years ago there stood, a few doors short of the church of Saint George, in the borough of Southwark, on the left-hand side of the way going southward, the Marshalsea Prison. It had stood there many years before, and it remained there some years afterwards; but it is gone now, and the world is none the worse without it.

Not only did London haunt and torment him, but he also enjoyed his greatest moments of success. The city of London certainly held him tightly in its grasp.

And that is why this volume is so fascinating, as it introduces us to many faces of London: Charles Dickens would indeed have recognised each and every scene that has been portrayed within these pages and certainly would have adored all of the carefully researched and wonderfully crafted papers that delve into the underbelly (literally in one case) of his home city.

I have been privileged to meet Professor Hara at various Dickens Fellowship conferences, and have always been astounded by his great knowledge and passion, both of which he shares so enthusiastically. As one branch President to another I am delighted to be part of this extraordinary project and to congratulate him on bringing together such a fascinating group of writers.

I have no doubt that you will thoroughly enjoy this collection and as a result of reading it will feel that you know the extraordinary character of London of a little more intimately.

Gerald Dickens  
Oxford

# FOREWORD

TORU SASAKI

**President of the English Literary Society of Japan  
President of the Japan Branch of the Dickens Fellowship**

Professor Eiichi Hara is indisputably one of the preeminent Japanese scholars working in the field of English literature. Throughout his long and prolific career he has been interested in the English novel, mainly the work of Charles Dickens. Notable amongst his brilliant achievements is his 1986 article, “Stories Present and Absent in *Great Expectations*,” published in *English Literary History*, a most prestigious international journal in our field. This superlative piece, taking issue with the influential reading of the novel offered by Peter Brooks, has been anthologised in two collections of modern representative essays on Dickens (*Critical Essays on Charles Dickens’ Great Expectations*, 1990; *New Casebook: Great Expectations* 1994). This is a feat hardly matched by his compatriots.

Amazingly, his scholarly interests include not simply the whole range of English fiction through to Kazuo Ishiguro, but also English drama from the Elizabethan period onwards. This side of his research came to fruition with the publication of *The English Literature of Apprentices* (Iwanami, 2012; the title is my translation), which is an innovative study of the rise of the novel in the context of “apprentice literature.” This book, as I understand it, stems from his examination of Pip, the hero of *Great Expectations*, who is an apprentice to a blacksmith, and whose fate curiously parallels that of George Barnwell, an apprentice protagonist of a famous eighteenth-century play. Starting from there, Professor Hara has conceived a unique history of English literature, detailing how the novel replaced the drama as the principal literary genre, a process in which representations of apprentices play a significant part. Since this study provides a genuinely original point of view, I hope he considers publishing it in English, thereby demonstrating the high standard of Japanese scholarship to the international academic community.

I have always been impressed by the breadth of Professor Hara’s interests, which, I suspect, has something to do with the fact that he is a

gourmand; he loves good food, and invariably wants to go to fine restaurants. Such an enormous scholarly appetite combined with a sophisticated palate reminds me of one of my scholar-critic heroes, George Saintsbury, who was equally comfortable writing about eighteenth-century French literature and vintage Bordeaux wine. It is true that Professor Hara does not drink much, but I would not in the least be surprised if he were contemplating a study of the relationship between good food and good literature.

Another aspect of his character that has often impressed me is that he is a man equipped with a strong sense of responsibility. For example, he does an incredibly thorough job in his roundup of the year's studies in English Literature for the *Kenkyusha Yearbook of English*. He examines a great number of publications with admirable exactitude and fairness. This kind of survey requires one to go through much material, which is troublesome enough, but what is worse, one wishes to avoid offending people one knows by criticising them, or simply by not mentioning them. It is a daunting and unenviable task, one I would be more than happy to shirk, but I can see him accepting it saying, "Well, somebody has to do it." He is also a responsible teacher. Some years ago, whilst he held a professorial chair at Tohoku University, he invited me there to do an intensive course, and I saw with my own eyes how he devoted many hours to his students, supervising their theses, giving advice on their term papers and fulfilling the myriad other duties required. In addition, inevitably for a scholar of his standing, he has had to play various official roles. He served as president of the Japan Branch of the Dickens Fellowship for six years (2005–11). I was vice-president during the same period, so I closely observed his expert leadership. Similarly, when he served as the editor-in-chief of the journal of the English Literary Society of Japan, *Studies in English Literature* (2002–3), I was on the editorial board, and many a time I witnessed his efficiency and sage judgment.

Professor Hara is a man of many parts, and I would be remiss if I do not mention the fact that he is a technowizard. Deploying his ingenious computer skills, he has become a semi-professional typesetter. He claims—or rather, calmly states, for he never makes a fuss about it—that it is simply one of his hobbies. Thus during his presidency he volunteered to typeset the *Japan Branch Bulletin of the Dickens Fellowship*, and now he offers the same service for the publications of the Shakespeare Society of Japan. Thanks to him, both literary societies have been able to substantially economise on printing expenditures. His versatility never ceases to amaze me, a poor dinosaur who does not even possess a mobile phone!

## EDITORS' INTRODUCTION AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

On the 24th of March, 1603, the reign of Queen Elizabeth I of England came to an end. London had, during her years on the throne, grown in importance to become one of the world's great capitals. Almost three hundred years later, on the 22nd of January, 1901, another great female monarch, Queen Victoria, passed from rule into remembrance, and with her, arguably, an astonishing era came to an end. These dates bookend a period of tremendous growth and creativity in London, the jewel at the centre of Britain's Empire.

The three centuries covered by the chapters in this present work were turbulent but remarkable. They were the years of Shakespeare, of Swift, of Austen, of Milton and of Dickens. To walk around London, even today, is to walk in the footsteps of these literary giants, to see where they lived, and to breathe the very air of the city that inspired them.

Literature may not necessarily be contingent upon the place of its production, but the role of London should not be dismissed. Much Dickens scholarship has it, as his great, great grandson points out at the outset of this very book, that the city is as much a character in his novels as any of the people he describes with such wit, verve and insight. Surely, then, London inhabits the work of other writers, sometimes in the background, sometimes obscured, but waiting there, just behind the written word. London is more than a collection of streets and buildings. It is also a muse.

The influence of London extends far beyond the shores of Britain. In Japan, generations of scholars have been fascinated by the culture and literature of the city, and, in the present day, a pre-eminent member of this group is Professor Eiichi Hara, the individual to whom this collection is dedicated.

A work like this is necessarily the product of many hands. The initial suggestion for a collection of essays in honour of Professor Eiichi Hara came about via a discussion between members of the editorial team and Professor Noriyuki Harada. Each of the people involved has their own relationship with Professor Hara, and it was our pleasure and privilege to bring them together to produce the collection you see before you.

As well as Professor Harada, who has been supportive throughout the entire process, helping to shape the project with his kind advice and suggestions throughout, there are several other individuals to thank. Emeritus Professor Akiko Kusunoki provided valuable input and offered encouragement and support for the project as a whole. Gerald Dickens's early agreement to write a preface helped frame the project, and Professor Toru Sasaki's very kind acceptance of an invitation to contribute personal reflections on Professor Hara's career was also instrumental. We would also like to thank the staff of Cambridge Scholars Publishing, particularly Ms. Victoria Carruthers, Ms. Sophie Edminson and Mr. Sean Howley for all their support and patience. We are delighted with the cover art designed by the team headed by Ms. Courtney Blades.

Each of the scholars who contributed a chapter did so despite facing a busy schedule and a series of rather strict deadlines. We are deeply grateful to each and every one, but should mention in particular Neil Addison, who completed his chapter well ahead of time in order to allow a complete proposal to be submitted for publication, as well as offering feedback on other parts of the book.

Above all, this book is a tribute to a brilliant scholar who has been at the centre of literary scholarship in Japan for decades and inspired countless students and colleagues with his charm, gentle wit and insight. Professor Eiichi Hara has built and maintained that rarest of constructs: a genuinely valuable scholastic legacy.

Barnaby Ralph  
Angela Kikue Davenport  
Yui Nakatsuma

# CHAPTER ONE

## STRANGERS, CITIZENS, AND SAINTS IN SHAKESPEARE'S LONDON

JAMES TINK

### I

If it is true that “English drama and the English novel spring out of the very conditions of London” (Ackroyd 2003, 754), then the urge to locate William Shakespeare’s work as part of the city seems irresistible. It is a frustrating fact, then, that despite living in the city for over twenty years, London is a subject that Shakespeare did not choose to represent directly (Crawforth, Dustagheer, and Young 2015, 2). Whereas many of his fellow dramatists explored either the history of the London citizenry or the comedy of contemporary urban life, Shakespeare seems to have preferred to present other environments than that of the immediate vicinity of the playhouses. The exact reason for this artistic choice must remain part of his biographical enigma; readers and critics have instead had to seek a rather more indirect relationship of the drama to the city, and strive to detect the ambience of London emerging from within the language of the plays. As well as being a scholarly attempt to localise the drama to a specific time and place, this may also betray a desire on the reader’s part to look for London, or an idea of London, as a trace in the text.

Of course, London is hardly a complete absence in the drama; the history plays include scenes in London, such as Falstaff’s Eastcheap. One way then to look for London in Shakespeare has been to consider how the actual geography of early-modern London might be imaginatively reworked, however tangentially, in the works, such as the influence of Tyburn in the general representation of stage violence, or the Tower of London as a metonym of royal authority (Crawforth, Dustagheer and Young 2015, 21–22; 224–25). Yet as Richard Rowland argues, the difficulty in this is that the London that emerges in the history plays can often seem a monolith: a set of place names with none of the detail or

specificity that other London dramas provide (Heywood 2005, 16). Another method has been to explore the anthropology of London and the institution of the commercial playhouses. For some critics, the physical “place of the stage” in the dubious northern and southern suburbs of London is a symptom of the texts’ own subversive marginality to early-modern culture (Mullaney 1988, ix). Attractive as this notion of radicalism may be, it has been challenged by other readers who insist that the theatre had an even more ambiguous cultural status. As Peter Womack argues, early modern theatre exhibited the strange political paradox of being a court-favoured form based in the city: “an intermittent, dubiously legitimate commercial enterprise which, precisely because of its low status, was compelled to appeal for legitimation of the highest authority” (1992, 110). According to Womack, the fact that drama was nationally central (because the theatre companies were licensed for the requirements of courtly entertainment) and locally marginal (because the London authorities had less need for drama and regarded playhouses as a nuisance) explains the dichotomy of the theatre as an institution that had royal and national aspirations as well as popular and commercial motives (1992, 111).<sup>1</sup> The presence of London in drama is therefore not simply a sign of sub-cultural marginality but the duality of an art form that was both central *and* local, courtly *and* civic. Hence, for example, Thomas Dekker’s *The Shoemaker’s Holiday* (1599), perhaps the most enduring of the early citizen comedies, boasts nevertheless on its title page of its being a courtly performance for Queen Elizabeth (1999, 71).

This chapter is going to explore one way in which Shakespearean drama represents London in the history plays, and it will consider the potential paradox of representing the citizens’ London through courtly representatives. Questions of the popular voice in Shakespearean history plays are of course well known: it will be helpful to recall here Richard Helgerson’s assertion that the history plays of Shakespeare and the Lord Chamberlain’s Men differ from those of Henslowe’s Admiral’s Men (especially Dekker and Thomas Heywood) precisely as they withdraw themselves from the case of the citizens in favour of an aristocratic story (1992, 234). This detachment strikes Helgerson as a form of duplicity, but it could also help us to see ways in which the plays actually do present matters of London and citizenship despite the relative absence of citizens. We could clarify this by thinking further of the question of heroism in history plays. Claire McEachern has argued that all forms of emotional or affective community in early-modern drama, including nationalism, actually proceed through fantasies of personification or “*personableness*,” whereby the audience is invited to identify or seek pleasure from stage



characters as “the tropes of subjectivity used to produce a particular Elizabethan political affect—that of corporate identity, of what we might call ‘the nation’” (1994 35). Her example in this case is to argue that *Henry V* might be less an example of royalist ideological domination than an ambiguous form of participatory fantasy. In order to explore the idea of London, the chapter will examine two relatively unfamiliar examples of Shakespearean history play: the late romance-cum-history *Henry VIII: All Is True*, co-written with John Fletcher (1612), and before that, the manuscript-only play of *Sir Thomas More*, co-written with Dekker, Heywood, Henry Chettle and Anthony Munday, probably composed around 1600–1604 (Jowett 2011, 430–32). These are both plays that address the “Great Matter” of the Henrician Reformation, when that event was still just about within a lifetime, and involve seventeenth-century explorations of nationalism, Protestantism and Tudor London. Both examples are also “personable” dramas insofar as they mediate the idea of London through charismatic characters. Moreover the two plays show a particular interest in the mixed-identity of Londoners as citizens, strangers and the more enigmatic category of Protestant Christians or what will be called “saints.”

## II

*Sir Thomas More* is a handwritten, enigmatic manuscript of a play that was probably never staged: there is no record of a performance, and the annotations of the official censor Edmund Tilney, Master of Revels, made clear to the authors that its dramatisation of a London riot was unacceptable and so should proceed “at your own perils” (Jowett 2011, 139). It is a *de casibus* tragedy of the rise of Sir Thomas More from sheriff to statesman, and his fall in the “Great Matter” of the Reformation, although the politics of the Henrician Reformation are very much suppressed in the plot. It is also a history play with an interest in the life of citizens and especially the geography of London, as has been noted (Hill 2005). Although there remain some objections, there is a growing consensus that Shakespeare collaborated at some stage, possibly amending an original script by Munday and Chettle along with revisions by Dekker and Heywood (Jowett 2011, 459). The text is fascinating for readers both as textual evidence of how the revising, editorialising, and censoring of plays was practiced in the Elizabethan era, and as a tantalising, “lost” history play that would have combined the Burbage and Henslowe company authors. Although the fact that it was probably not performed makes discussion of its audience impact hypothetical, it stands as a

singular example of some different literary strategies available to playwrights at the start of the century.

The most interesting aspect of the text is the presentation of the conflicts between citizens and strangers in early-modern London. Citizenship of London, strictly speaking, was possessed by an elite minority of free men who enjoyed economic status as guild members and, following the city charter of 1319, effective control of the civic government (Rappaport 1989, 35). However, in the context of this debate we could better describe citizens as native-born Londoners in contrast with the migrant community of strangers, who were the foreign-born residents and workers of London throughout the sixteenth century (*ibid.*, 42). In the Henrician period of the play, this had included the wealthy Dutch and Lombard communities, yet by the post-Reformation 1590s this had been swelled by French and Dutch Protestant refugees (Jowett 2011, 45). The precise relationship of native-born Elizabethan Londoners to strangers has been disputed: some historians stress the xenophobia evident in London culture at the time, whereas others argue that the shared Protestant identity encouraged a relative degree of cooperation (Jowett 2011, 44; Collinson 1988, 16).<sup>2</sup> *Sir Thomas More* was itself a bold attempt to dramatise the most notorious protest against strangers in Tudor London, the “Ill May Day” riots of 1517. This was an apparently spontaneous riot of mostly young apprentices against the strangers in the neighbourhood of St Martins, which lasted for several hours on the May Day holiday, and during which the then under-Sheriff of London, Thomas More, tried to dissuade the crowd from violence. Although there were no deaths in the rioting, three hundred people were later arrested, of whom fourteen were executed (Rappaport 1989, 15–17). It remained a controversial event in Tudor politics because it highlighted the tensions between both citizens and strangers, and London and royal government. As Annabel Patterson has argued, the description of the event in both of the major Tudor chronicle histories of Edmund Hall (who may have been an eye witness) and Raphael Holinshed suggests a slight but significant sympathy for the case of the hastily executed citizens, and in the case of Holinshed even a possible support of the citizens’ right to defend their liberties (1994, 198–99).

The artistic problem for the author Munday (whose ancestor, incidentally, was involved in the incident [Patterson 1994, 197]) was that by 1600 this remained far too controversial an incident for staging, and so the opening scene of his manuscript describing the Londoners’ animosity to strangers was censored. The existing manuscript contains a number of other city-based scenes, some of which may have been later amended by

Thomas Heywood (Jowett 2011, 25). Together, they show the grievances of the citizens against strangers, who are presented as arrogant and acquisitive, with appeals to aggressive nationalism: the independent woman Doll Williamson complains, "I am ashamed that free-born Englishmen, having beaten strangers within their own bounds, should thus be braved and abused by them at home" (1.80–82).<sup>3</sup> The suggestion of riotous disorder continues into the Ill May Day itself with tropes of festivity from Doll and the excitable Clown Betts:

CLOWN BETTS:

Use no more swords,  
Nor no more words,  
But fire the houses,  
Brave Captain Courageous,  
Fire me their houses.

DOLL:

Ay, for we may as well make bonfires on May Day as at  
Midsummer. We'll alter the day in the calendar, and set it  
down in flaming letters. (4.33–40)

While it may be the case that Heywood tried to make the scenes more comic and less subversive by adding the clownish Betts (Jowett 2011, 25), the demotic energy of the citizens remains apparent. This presentation of Londoners can be contrasted with the play's most famous moment, the sixth scene now believed to be by Shakespeare, which includes More's speech to dissuade the citizens from attacking strangers. His address to the crowd is a display of deliberative rhetoric to appeal to the conscience of the rioters:

Imagine that you see the wretched strangers,  
Their babies at their backs, with their poor luggage,  
Plodding to th'ports and coasts for transportation,  
And that you sit as kings in your desires,  
Authority quite silenced by your brawl,  
And you in ruff of your opinions clothed:  
What had you got? I'll tell you: you had taught  
How insolence and strong hand should prevail,  
How order should be quelled. And by this pattern  
Not one of you should live an aged man;  
For other ruffians, as their fancies wrought,  
With selfsame hand, self reasons, and self right,  
Would shark on you, and men, like ravenous fishes,  
Would feed on one another. (6.85–98)

More then encourages the citizens to identify with the strangers by imagining themselves as exiles:

What country, by the nature of of your error,  
Should give you harbour? Go you to France or Flanders  
To any German province, Spain or Portugal,  
Nay, anywhere that not adheres to England:  
Why, you must needs be strangers. Would you be pleased  
To find a nation of such barbarous temper  
That, breaking out in hideous violence,  
Would not afford you an abode on earth. . . . (6.142–49)

More is shown to dissuade the bulk of the citizens by making them partially acknowledge the dignity of the strangers: “This is the strangers’ case, / And this be your mountainish inhumanity” (6.155–56). The speech encourages citizens to imaginatively “internationalise,” so to speak, their identity as native-Londoners.<sup>4</sup>

The entire scene displays an eloquence that stands out as somehow more “Shakespearean” than the rest of the text (Jowett 2011, 21), and this matter of style also helps us to think further about charisma in the Shakespearean history play. More’s intervention is another sign of how Shakespeare shows a “particular Elizabethan political affect” (McEachern 1994, 35) in that the idea of London is produced through an identification with the patrician speaker rather than the dialogue of the citizens. Whereas, in Heywood’s *Edward IV Part One*, for example, the rowdy citizens themselves reveal their own ability to support the common peace (Scene 5), in this extract More has to lecture them, in keeping with the forms of authority otherwise noted by Helgerson (1992, 234). When included in the rest of the text, it demonstrates the tension between the citizen-led and centralised tendencies of the Tudor history play.

Moreover, there is something inchoate about the rhetoric that can have an affective and anachronistic quality. The apparently anti-racist argument of More (if not Shakespeare) has been attractive to a modern liberal readership that is opposed to xenophobia (Wells 2007, 116; Bryant 2016). In fact, there is also much in the speech that is an orthodox Tudor statement of obedience (“For to the King God hath his office lent / Of dread, of justice, power and command; / Hath bid him rule, and willed you to obey” [6.112–14]) and not cosmopolitan, yet both these readings can derive from the speech. Another way to understand this would be through the early modern concept of friendship or amity. This was the term frequently used in Renaissance political discourse to describe international relations between nations as well as unity within a commonwealth

(Roshchin 2006, 602). It is also used by John Stow to describe the allegedly traditional uses of festivity and midsummer bonfire feasts to resolve conflict inside London: "These were called Bonefiers as well of good amitie amongst neighbours that, being before at controuersie, were there by the labour of others, reconciled, and made of bitter enemies, louing friendes, as also for the vertue that a great fire hath to purge the infection of the ayre" ([1598] 1971, 101). The "Ill May Day" of the play is another sort of bonfire that threatens the safety of citizens and strangers, but is defused by More's presence and call for reconciliation and amity. This underscores the way that ideas of community are personified here in the charismatic figure of More. As Steven Mullaney notes, charisma can be an unpredictable dramatic factor in history plays in the way it allows identifications with different subject positions and identities; it is also, he notes, a word that refers originally to a gift of grace and power granted by God (2015, 131). It is revealing then that when More calms the mob, Doll says "Before God, that's as true as the Gospel" (6.100): the association of charisma, rhetoric and grace is suggested in the text itself. *Sir Thomas More* as a whole struggles to reconcile the adept London politician of the first half with the Catholic martyr of the latter (Jowett 2011, 68–69) and actually ignores Reformation controversy. Instead, More emerges in this scene as a wise Londoner. Shakespeare's later attempt to dramatise 1530s London would be more assertive.

### III

*King Henry VIII: All is True* was Shakespeare's most dedicated attempt, working in collaboration with John Fletcher, to dramatise the Henrician period. This late work, dating from at least 1613, combines the history play with modes of romance and tragicomedy, and, as its editor Gordon McMullan notes, has subsequently become a relatively unpopular and confusing drama in the Shakespearean repertoire, partly because it dramatises the machinations of a stable Renaissance court rather than a medieval civil war as in the earlier tetralogies (Shakespeare [1613] 2000, 107). As well as famously being the last play ever performed at the original Globe (where the performance caused a fire), it was also probably performed, along with Samuel Rowley's earlier comic-history play *When You See Me, You Know Me* (1605), at the wedding celebrations of Princess Elizabeth Stuart to Frederic the Elector Palatine of Bohemia in 1613 (Bullough 1962, 437), again demonstrating the civic/courtly double nature of Renaissance English theatre. This is addressed in the Prologue with a disparaging reference to "they/ That come to hear a merry, bawdy play/ A

noise of targets” and “The first and happiest hearers of the Town” who would appreciate the more complex work (Prologue 13–15; 24).<sup>5</sup> It might also be seen as Shakespeare’s second attempt to present Sir Thomas More: the play mentions More as Lord Chancellor (3.2.393), and the Folio includes that character as an onstage character, but with no dialogue (5.2.33–34). It is another play that develops arguments about citizens and strangers, but the political affect is more strongly Protestant, especially in the use of Thomas Cranmer as a prophet of the future Elizabethan settlement. *Henry VIII* is arguably part of the “Elect Nation” genre of Jacobean history plays, including Rowley’s, which “celebrated a civic ideal of a people happily bound in social and religious unity” (Butler 2002, 585). It will be necessary to explain how stranger, citizens and Protestant community of saints are explored in the drama.

In *Henry VIII*, the role of the stranger is arguably that of the Queen, Katherine of Aragon, who, following the well-known historical story, is gradually dislodged from her royal husband, her marriage, and the English kingdom by the charismatic Ann Bullen (Boleyn) at the same time as her enemy Cardinal Wolsey is exposed as an ambitious upstart against the English throne. The play develops a perhaps surprising pathos and sympathy for the Spanish queen who becomes “a stranger now again” (2.3.18) and, with her trial and divorce, participates in a form of calumny romance plot used in other late Shakespearean plays (Cooper 2004, 275–76). At times, the play deploys metaphors of displacement and loneliness for similar effect as in Sir Thomas More’s speech on strangers:

What will become of me now, wretched lady?  
 I am the most unhappy woman living.  
 [To her women] Alas, poor wenches, where are now your  
 fortunes?  
 Shipwrecked upon a kingdom where no pity,  
 No friends, no hope, no kindred weep for me,  
 Almost no grave allowed me, like the lily  
 That once was mistress of the field and flourished,  
 I’ll hang my head and perish. (3.1.147–53)

This passage of Katherine from English Queen to outcast stranger is contrasted with the charismatic figure of native-born Anne, which also provides a way to represent London citizens.

The play draws on chronicle history to possibly explore the “politics of unease” in early Jacobean England (following the widespread Midlands disturbances of 1607) that McMullan detects in the work of Fletcher as well as Shakespeare (1994, 55). The early part of the play alludes to the

“Amicable grant” protests of 1525 in which artisans objected to new taxes (Guy 1988, 103):

The clothiers all, not able to maintain  
 The many of them longing, have put off  
 The spinsters, carders, fullers, weavers, who  
 Unfit for other life, compelled by hunger  
 And lack of other means, in desperate manner  
 Daring th’event to th’tooth, are all in uproar. (1.2.30–37)

At this point of the play, Katherine is presented as a defender of the common subjects against Cardinal Wolsey (1.2.65–67). However, during this drama, in which the precise reasons for King Henry’s crisis of conscience are ambiguous (Strohm 2010, 219–20), the threat of social unrest is replaced by the enthusiasm for Anne Bullen’s coronation and childbirth. This royal presence introduces a new trope of subjectivity for citizens.

The coronation of Anne is represented as a detailed but silent on-stage pageant in 4.1, including the Lord Mayor of London, but the description of the citizens is given via the dialogue of gentlemen, and this is how idea of inclusivity and revelry are implied.

’Tis well. The citizens  
 I am sure, have shown at full their royal minds-  
 As, let ‘em have their rights, they are ever forward-  
 In celebration of this day with shows,  
 Pageants, and sights of honour. (4.1.7–11)

This is followed by a strangely polymorphous description of the people enjoying the sight of the newly crowned queen:

Believe me, sir, she is the goodliest woman  
 That ever lay by man—which when the people  
 Had the full view of, such a noise arose  
 As the shrouds make at sea in a stiff tempest,  
 As loud and so to as many tunes. Hats, cloaks—  
 Doublets, I think—flew up, and had their faces  
 Been loose, this day they had been lost. Such joy  
 I never saw before. Great-bellied women  
 That had not half a week to go, like rams  
 In the old time of war, would shake the press  
 And make ‘em reel before ‘em. No man living  
 Could say ‘This is my wife’ there, all were woven  
 So strangely in one piece. (4.1.6981)

The imagery is festive, erotic, riotous, and historically false: during the actual coronation of Anne Boleyn in 1533, witnesses recorded, the crowd stood mute (Smuts 1989, 76). Within the play, however, it establishes the London citizens as a loyal and jubilant collective witness to the origin of Queen Elizabeth. Yet this also remains an entirely explanatory deictic description rather than an on-stage mimetic scene. In Rowley's *When You See Me*, in contrast, the use of a comic, disguised-king plot allows the audience to watch Henry mingle with the citizens; a familiar plot-device that Shakespeare and Fletcher shun (Rowley [1605] 1970, E2–E3).

The closest the play gets to the unruly clowning of popular theatre is the subsequent scene (Act 5 Scene 3) of the harried Porter and Man (Weimann 1978, 213). It describes the tumult of the crowds celebrating Elizabeth's christening as a form of carnal appetite that cannot be satiated: "Bless me, what a fry of fornication is at door! On my Christian conscience, this one christening will beget a thousand: here will be father, godfather, and all together" (5.3.34–36). This comic-grotesque description seems to conflate physical expulsion through sneezing with the disputation of shopkeepers and the riotous stonethrowing of apprentices, but all as a sign of good humour:

There is a fellow somewhere near the door—he should be a brazier by his face, for, o'my conscience, twenty of the dog-days now reign in's nose discharges against me. He stands there like a mortar-piece, to blow us. There was a haberdashers's wife of small wit near him that railed upon me till her pinked porringer fell off her head for kindling such a combustion in the state. I missed the meteor once and hit that woman, who cried out 'Clubs!', when I might see from far some forty truncheoners draw to her succour, which were the hope o'th Strand, where she was quartered.

(5.3.37–51)

The overall effect is to imply riot and disorder as a celebratory carnival, which is also made explicit in the man's description of the surging of the crowd as a form of May Day:

Pray, sir, be patient. 'Tis as much impossible  
Unless we sweep'em from the door with cannons,  
To scatter'em as 'tis to make 'em sleep  
On May-Day Morning—which will never be.  
We may as well push against St Paul's as stir'em.

(5.3.10–15)

In contrast with *Sir Thomas More*, themes of festivity and disorder are utilised for a jubilant description of the citizens' amity and loyalty (almost to the point of fusion) with both the young queen and infant princess. It is



even possible to read the dishevelment in the scene above (4.1.75–77) as another allusion to Ill May Day through Holinshed's description (1587) of Henry's pardoning of the rioters:

Now when the generall pardon was pronounced, all the prisoners showed at once, & all together cast up their halters into the hall roofo . . . [and] diuerse offenders, which were not taken, hearing that the king was inclined to mercie, came well appareled to Westminster, and suddenly stripped them into their shirts with halters, and came in among the prisoners willinglie, to be partakers of the king's pardon. (Holinshed 1587, 844)

*Henry VIII* imagines the birth of the royal heir as a similarly exceptional moment of royal generosity and divine favour (even in the Christian sense of jubilee as forgiveness).<sup>6</sup> However, although the play uses the descriptive language of the carnival to evoke London, it does not stage that festivity in dramatic terms. Rather like the Chorus describing the King's return in *Henry V*, which imagines "[h]ow London doth pour out her citizens/ The mayor and all his brethren, in best sort, / Like to the senators of th'antique Rome" (5.0.24–26), it substitutes drama with a description of London at a privileged historical moment in its history. But what precise moment is this?

As noted above, the play was first performed in the context of popular elect nation plays and a Protestant alliance with Bohemia. Julia Reinhard Lupton, among others, has analysed the early-modern period through the means of political theology, emphasising how theological and secular concepts of identity and history, such as the citizen or subject of the commonwealth who is also a member of the Invisible Church, are important.<sup>7</sup> According to Lupton, Shakespeare's works "are preoccupied by the strange cohabitation of the saint and the citizen, especially in situations of political emergency when exceptions become the norm" (2005, 12). The royal wedding of 1613 was itself a moment of heightened expectations of Protestant internationalism (MacCulloch 2003, 490–91). Another approach to the idea of citizenship in *Henry VIII* is this exceptional identity of the Londoners as saints; elect members of a wider Protestant community that is identified by Cranmer in her triumphalist prophecy about Elizabeth Tudor at the end of the play.

In her days, every man shall eat in safety  
Under his own vine what he plants, and sing  
The merry songs of peace to all his neighbours.  
God shall be truly known, and those about her  
From her shall read the perfect ways of honour  
And by those claim their greatness, not their blood.

(5.4.33–38)

Cranmer's full speech (5.4.47–54) may refer to the new Virginia colony or to a wider international community; it elevates London and national identity to that of an invisible collective. In truth, the speech may now seem too encomiastic (or alarmingly nativist) to be attractive to audiences, but it attempts another form of affect through the charisma of the stage character to provide a form of identification for the listener, whatever their status. We might imagine that the citizen of Jacobean London is invited to see themselves as part of the continuity of the citizen-saint and descendants of the inaugural festivity of Protestant England enacted on the stage; the royal audience basks in an exalted image of British *imperium*. Both co-habit this hybrid drama that turns from a tragedy of royal strangers into a comedy of its citizen-saints.

By way of conclusion, we could return to this matter of fantasy and the imagining of a community, and suggest that there is a certain anachronistic or untimely affect at work in these representations of Tudor London. Both dramas invite audiences, then and now, to re-imagine the London of Henry VIII as moments of potential chaos that lead to amity or cohesion. This is not necessarily an example of a carnivalesque use of dialogic language (a device that in these cases Shakespeare was possibly repudiating) but rather through the use of tropes of subjectivity, based on charismatic personalities (who do not even necessarily speak), and intended for a political affect. If this was involved in ideas late Elizabethan or Jacobean public identity or “elect nation,” does it retain any anachronistic affect? Given the enduring contemporary fascination in Britain with Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn in the popular imagination of national history, a desire for the past that can often seem nostalgic, it is salutary to look again at how Shakespeare, Fletcher and the other writers themselves began to reflect on the Tudor past of seventeenth-century London. Could we begin to find in their collective imagination of the citizens, strangers and saints of London a way to look again at our own hybrid and contentious identities of local and global citizenship, and sense of the place London?

## References

- Ackroyd, Peter. 2003. *London: The Biography*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Bryant, Chris. 2016. “This sceptic-isle would most displease pro-Europe Shakespeare.” *Guardian*. 21 April. Accessed 1 July 2016.  
<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/apr/21/how-love-eu-count-william-shakespeare-remain-brexit>.
- Bullough, Geoffrey, ed. 1962. *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*. Vol. 4. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

- Butler, Martin. 2002. "Literature and the theatre to 1660." In *The Cambridge History of Early Modern English Literature*, edited by David Lowenstein and Janel Mueller, 565–602. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Collinson, Patrick. 1988. *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Cooper, Helen. 2004. *The English Romance in Time: Transforming Motifs from Geoffrey of Monmouth to the Death of Shakespeare*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crawforth, Hannah, Sarah Dustagheer, and Jennifer Young. 2015. *Shakespeare in London*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Dekker, Thomas. 1999. *The Shoemaker's Holiday*. Edited by R.L. Smallwood and Stanley Wells. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. 2004. *Will in the World: How Shakespeare became Shakespeare*. New York and London: Norton.
- Guy, John. 1988. *Tudor England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haverkamp, Anselm. 2011. *Shakespearean Genealogies of Power: A Whispering of Nothing in Hamlet, Richard II, Julius Caesar, Macbeth, The Merchant of Venice, and The Winter's Tale*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Helgerson, Richard. 1992. *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Heywood, Thomas. 2005. *The First and Second Parts of King Edward IV*. Edited by Richard Rowland. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
- Hill, Tracey. 2005. "'The Cittie is in an uproare': Staging London in *The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore*." *Early Modern Literary Studies*. 11.1 (May). Accessed 1 May 2016.  
<http://extra.shu.ac.uk/emls/11-1/more.htm>.
- Holinshed, Raphael. 1587. *The Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland*. London.
- Howard, Jean E. 2007. *Theatre of a City: The Places of London Comedy 1598–1642*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- . 2011. "London and the early modern stage." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Literature of London*, edited by Lawrence Manley, 34–49. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jowett, John, ed. 2011. *Sir Thomas More*. London: Methuen.
- Lupton, Julia Reinhard. 2005. *Citizen-Saints: Shakespeare and Political Theology*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

- MacCulloch, Diarmid. 2003. *Reformation: Europe's House Divided, 1490–1700*. London: Penguin.
- McEachern, Claire. 1994. "Henry V and the Paradox of the Body Politic." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45, no. 1 (Spring): 34–56.
- McMullan, Gordon. 1994. *The Politics of Unease in the Plays of John Fletcher*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Mullaney, Steven. 1988. *The Place of the Stage: License, Play, and Power in Renaissance England*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- . 2015. *The Reformation of Emotions in the Age of Shakespeare*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Patterson, Annabel. 1994. *Reading Holinshed's Chronicles*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Rappaport, Steve. 1989. *Worlds within Worlds: Structures of Life in Sixteenth-Century London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roshchin, Evgeny. 2006. "The Concept of Friendship: From Princes to States." *European Journal of International Relations*. 12, no. 4:599–624.
- Rowley, Samuel. 1970. *When You See Me You Know Me*. New York: AMS Press.
- Shakespeare, William. 2000. *King Henry VIII*. Edited by Gordon McMullan. London: Methuen.
- Shepherd, Simon and Peter Womack. 1996. *English Drama: A Cultural History*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Smuts, R.M. 1989. "Public Ceremony and Royal Charisma: The English royal entry in London, 1485–1642." In *The First Modern Society: Essays in English History in honour of Lawrence Stone*, edited by A.L. Bier, David Cannadine, and James M. Rosenheim, 65–94. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stow, John. (1598) 1971. *A Survey of London*. Edited by Charles Lethbridge Kingsford. Vol. 1. Oxford, Clarendon.
- Strohm, Paul. 2010. "Conscience." In *Cultural Reformations: Medieval and Renaissance in Literary History*, edited by Brian Cummings and James Simpson, 206–26. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Weimann, Robert. 1987. *Shakespeare and the Popular Tradition in the Theater: Studies in the Social Dimension of Dramatic Form and Function*. Edited by Robert Schwartz. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press.
- Wells, Stanley. 2006. *Shakespeare & Co. Christopher Marlowe, Thomas Dekker, Ben Jonson, Thomas Middleton, John Fletcher, and the Other Players in His Story*. London: Penguin.
- Womack, Peter. 1992. "Imagining Communities: Theatres and the English Nation in the Sixteenth Century." In *Culture and History 1350–1600*:

*Essays on English Communities, Identities, and Writing*, edited by David Aers, 91–146. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> A response to Mullaney is developed in Shepherd and Womack (1996), 109–10.

<sup>2</sup> The relationship between citizens and strangers was the subject of dramas, such as *The Three ladies of London* (1590) and *An Englishmen for My Money* (1598). Moreover, plays about London citizens could also include themes of foreign trade and international commerce, such as *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody* (1605). For the global presence of early modern London in drama, see Jean Howard (2007, 49). See also Howard (2011).

<sup>3</sup> All references to the play are from Jowett (2011). This edition does not use act divisions for the play.

<sup>4</sup> This point is developed by Greenblatt (2004, 263–65).

<sup>5</sup> All references to the play are from the Arden Third Series edition edited by Gordon McMullan (Shakespeare 2000).

<sup>6</sup> See also, for example, Dekker's *The Shoemaker's Holiday* ([1599]1999), where a pancake feast is described in these terms: "Nay more, my hearts, every Shrove Tuesday is our year of jubilee, and when the pancake bell rings, we are as free as my Lord Mayor" (Scene XVIII, 221–23).

<sup>7</sup> For an overview of political theology in Shakespeare criticism, see Haverkamp (2011, 47–56).

